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Abstract

This thesis seeks to not only identify and describe the factors that influence identity in people of mixed parentage, but also to analyse why and how these influences operate. In order to do this, an ecological approach is taken which attempts to illuminate issues at the macro, meso and micro levels of influence. This is in order to understand the breadth of possible pressures and the subtle nature of how issues of race and ethnicity are conceptualised. To begin this, a historical précis of how ideas about race have been framed is given, emphasising their economic, social and political origins.

Then this is applied more specifically to New Zealand and the state of both Samoan and Pakeha ethnic groups. Here it is argued that the nature of colonisation demands the politicisation of ethnicity which in turn supports a polarised, essentialised and simplified view of ethnic difference. This dynamic also demands signs of 'legitimacy' from members of minority ethnic groups, thus strengthening boundaries between different groups. This then places people of mixed ethnic origin in the position of having to choose one group or the other, although each of these options is not without its own problems.

One of these is the concept of 'marginality' which has historically been patronising and pathologising of people of mixed parentage. More recently, however, it is being claimed as potentially positive, and identified as originating more from the demands of society rather than an innate defect in the individual of mixed parentage. This discussion then explores some of the more psychological, micro level theories of identity and ethnic identity which both needed to be included given that they are ultimately inseparable. Emphasised at this point is the impact of an individual's narrative or the way they interpret and act on experiences which ultimately make broad generalisations impossible. Also challenged are the more structural, modernist theories of identity development which tend to pathologise those of mixed parentage who may not follow them. Instead a more flexible postmodern paradigm is proposed.

From this the specific factors identified in the literature pertaining particularly to people of mixed parentage are covered, for example issues such as parental attitudes,
class, appearance and school experiences. These specific influences and the wider conceptual issues are then applied to this study. This study was a small, qualitative investigation of four people of mixed Samoan and Pakeha parentage. They were all interviewed individually using an open-ended questionnaire, then met twice as a focus group to discuss the issues arising from the interviews.

This produced several findings. Many of the issues given in the literature were found to be influential, but so too were the wider demands for legitimacy and the personal narratives of the individuals involved. This points to the redundancy of identity theories based solely on 'race' or 'mixed race', and highlights instead the complex interplay of ideology, history, politics, culture and the individual or group. Finally, this is applied to the practice of social work, proposing an approach that rejects simplistic presumptions about a person's culture (beliefs, attitudes and preferences) based on their ethnic group(s). The meaning given to ethnicity must instead be ascertained deliberately in order to work appropriately with each person or family.
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Introduction

The face of New Zealand demography is changing fast. By the middle of next century, almost half of us will be of Maori, Pacific Islander or Asian ethnic origin (Welch, 1999). However, statistics such as these tend to obscure another important trend: that of people of mixed ethnic origin. While this is nothing new in New Zealand, particularly between Maori and Pakeha, the incidence of this between other ethnic groups, and the impact of this 'mixing' on those so numbered has been virtually ignored. This is in part due to the way this country perceives the phenomenon of culture and ethnicity as being discrete and polarised. This paradigm is supported by both Western historical views about race and the particular context of cultural politics engendered by colonialism. This context lends itself to a polarised understanding of ethnic differences. This polarisation in turn pathologises and marginalises those who are then perceived as 'in between' two ethnic groups, or forces them to be one or the other.

In 1996, the first full year within which it was possible to name all of a child's ethnic groups on birth certificates, 19% of babies registered more than one ethnic group (Department of Statistics, 1998). An increase in inter-ethnic unions was given as the reason for this changed way of recording births and deaths, as well as changes in census questions (Department of Statistics, 1998). However, equally influential are the demands being made that people of mixed ethnicity should have a right to claim all of those ethnicities, rather than be forced to name one category in the 'please tick one' scenario of recent history. This system almost always categorised that person as belonging to the minority group, whatever that was, a method that can be traced to ideas about racial purity and maintaining White power bases. Because of these ideas and the necessity of localising any theory about ethnicity or identity, it is important to ground a study of this kind in its historical and cultural context in order to gain a clearer understanding not only of what occurs but why.

Given these factors, what is the actual experience of people of mixed parentage in New Zealand, and in particular the South Island, where Pakeha make up the vast majority
of the population? This is what I sought to find out, focusing on those of Samoan and Pakeha parentage. It is clear from both international research and my own that generalisations about people living in a global, modern situation of rapid migration and numerous cultural influences are impossible. This led to my rather narrow focus on the experiences of such a specific group, as an attempt to identify at least some similarities of experience.

To delve into identity theory is to approach another minefield of controversy. The main crux is whether identity is something that is objective, develops as a series of observable steps or phases and is therefore universal, or is explained by a more postmodern definition which would claim identity is contingent, situation-specific and non-linear in its development. Combine this with the traditional theories of 'mixed race' people as being 'marginal man' and the ways in which ethnic identity is constructed and the issues are complex. Another consideration is one of the main conflicts of psychology and sociology: whether or not people can function autonomously from their social context and the meta-narratives that inform and construct it.

Various specific factors have been identified as being possibly influential on identity in people of mixed parentage. While these are given different meanings depending on the cultures within which they are operating, they have been named in the literature as: parental attitudes and parenting styles, school, community/neighbourhood, personality, role models, class, cultural exposure, physical appearance, language, names, status of the ethnic groups involved, psychological identification with a particular parent and acceptance of individuals by their heritage groups (Twine, 1997; Pinderhughes, 1995; Stephan, 1992; Kich, 1992; Harre 1966). Finally, of course the specific content of a group's norms affects the child's understanding of ethnicity and the way it impacts on the child (Phinney and Rotheram, 1987). These factors in turn are influenced by the way an individual gives them meaning, and by the way these issues are given meaning by society. This interaction of individual and meta-narratives combines to produce the way in which individuals see themselves.
For my study, I used a research approach based on narrative and ecological theories in order to ascertain what issues were important or influential (from ecological theory), and why (from narrative). I found that while all of my small sample (four) had experienced some kind of 'marginality' when defined as not feeling as if they belonged completely in one group or the other, this had seldom resulted in major trauma or crisis for them. This issue tended to be recurring and cyclical in its significance and impact on the participants. Moreover, 'marginality' is further complicated by other causes of feeling marginal or different, for example being perceived as not being White, and feelings of rejection by family. Issues such as these caused feelings of marginality but are unrelated to specifically being of mixed parentage. For most the resolution of this marginality allowed them to embrace an identity that claimed both cultures and heritages. This forced the recession of oppressive meta-narratives and allowed the individual narrative more power in individuals' own definition of self. However, this in turn is influenced by changes in some less rigid identity theories (which are themselves a kind of narrative) that suggests this is acceptable.

While most of the above factors did have some effect on identity issues for my participants, others more specific to both the Samoan/Pakeha context and the individual context of their lives were also influential. These included church attendance, school achievement, physical attractiveness, physical abuse and demands for legitimacy.

Finally, I include a brief discussion of the impact of these findings on social work practice in general, and fostering and adoption in particular, where I have questioned the uncritical drive for 'same race' placements. I conclude that there is no easily extrapolated method or model for working with people of mixed parentage, because of the diversity of experiences and interpretation which means there is no neat practice approach to apply. Although there are some broad similarities of experience within my sample group, there are also important differences, reminding us of the necessity in practice of approaching each person as an individual about whom we can presume nothing, regardless of ethnicity, culture, gender or class. Because of misdirected concepts about race and culture, children of mixed parentage requiring care outside their natural family have at times been placed unhesitatingly with a family from their minority ancestry group. I have
suggested a more individually specific biographical approach in order to ascertain the meaning of ethnicity for the child and family involved.
Chapter One: Epistemology and Methodology

Any research regarding issues of ethnicity and culture needs to be carefully considered and constructed. This is because most study in this area is based on a tradition of logical positivism that has resulted in "ideologically determined and culturally biased production of knowledge" (Stanfield and Dennis, 1993, p4). Moreover, this biased production has been firmly rooted in folk notions of 'race' and the implication that the cultural assimilation of minorities into the 'mainstream' is both inevitable and desirable (Stanfield and Dennis, 1993). Many social scientists still hold this view because of their personal and emotional investment in these ideologies; after all, they too are products of a Western socialisation process that as a result of historical cultural traditions "...encourages citizens to link phenotypic differences with presumptions about moral character, personality, interpersonal behaviour and intelligence" (Stanfield and Dennis, 1993, p17). The result of this logical positivism combined with researcher bias has been "an irrational, circular logic attributing deviance in multiracial people to the intrinsic consequences of racial mixing ..." (Root, 1992, p182). These underlying presumptions prevent viewing ethnicity as a fluid and dynamic socially created concept, and make validity and reliability in research difficult to establish (Katz, 1996).

In order to deal with these problems, Stanfield and Dennis (1993) suggest major epistemological reflections such as considering values, ethics, politics and the structure of the relationship between researcher and researched, as well as stopping evolutionary arrogance. This epistemology accepts the normality of pluralism and cultural difference, and uses this acceptance as a way of reconstructing the research process in this area. Root (1992) suggests research on 'mixed race' people should be based on ecological models that "emphasise the interaction of social, familial, and individual variables within a context that interacts with history" (p182). It is these guidelines I have attempted to follow.
Qualitative Methods

I contend that the use of qualitative methods is therefore more appropriate than quantitative ones for study in this area (Katz, 1996; Root, 1992). Qualitative methods are more likely to recognise the researcher's rapport with participants, as well as the impact of their own values and life history (Stanfield and Dennis, 1993). Indeed, the researcher in these methods is recognised as being the research 'instrument' (Patton, 1990; Rossman and Marshall, 1992). Quantitative studies are sometimes viewed as being more valid than qualitative. However, not only are the rules of procedure and evidence used in quantitative research reflective of a strongly European tradition of research, but one can never control for historical legacy, researcher bias or theoretical limitations (Root, 1992; Stanfield and Dennis, 1993). Accordingly, quantitative studies are reductionistic to the point of being irrelevant in this area of inquiry (Root, 1992). As Stanfield and Dennis note:

... can we really learn something about the complexity of social stratification ... when we drain the factor of subjective experiences of different populations and construct standardised statistical categories ... for making statistical comparisons and coming up with correlations? ... What are 'Whiteness' and 'Blackness' anyway? (1993, p14).

Indeed, this question strikes at the core of this research, which seeks to investigate identities in people of mixed parentage living in New Zealand, in particular those of mixed Samoan/Pakeha ancestry.

It can also be argued that qualitative research methods allow the in-depth feelings and perceptions of the participants to be recorded in their own words, rather than the standardised statistical aggregates gained from quantitative data (Patton, 1990). This inductive form of inquiry allows those studied to 'tell it as they see it', instead of being restricted by the researcher's preconceptions and the resulting questionnaire categories (Patton, 1990). This is particularly important in research involving issues of ethnicity which are inevitably fraught with passion and emotion that can be stifled if they are forced into the confines of translation into the language of the academic elite, or
predetermined statistical categories (Stanfield and Dennis, 1993). The process by which a qualitative researcher builds theory from the data, rather than setting out to prove or add to an existing theory is obviously appropriate in a research area fraught with bias and ethical difficulties (Rubin and Rubin, 1995). This 'grounding' of the resulting theory in the details and specifics of the data is the basis of 'grounded theory', also applicable to this study (Glaser and Strauss, 1967).

**Narrative Theory**

The ideas of narrative research which recognises the ways in which people explain and construct their life history and identity also influenced my research approach (Ricoeur 1992). Ricoeur proposed that people draw on meta-narratives to explain and form into a coherent whole their own life experiences. The use of a narrative method also recognises the subjectivity of how meaning is attached to life events by each individual, allowing for similar events to be explained differently (Katz, 1996). The focus of this kind of postmodern method emphasises the importance of specific location and time, something other writers about ethnicity see as being important to consider (Phinney and Rotheram, 1987).

Moreover, a narrative research approach recognises the impact of the researcher on the process, acknowledging that the telling of the narrative varies depending on a number of factors, including who it is being told to. This is congruent with the ideas of those involved in researching concepts related to ethnicity, such as those named above (e.g. Stanfield and Dennis), and with feminist research epistemologies discussed below which were also incorporated into this research design.

My extensive description of ethnic relations and historical factors that have shaped the specific context within which Samoan/Pakeha people live in New Zealand is therefore justified and seen as important by both a postmodern, narrative paradigm and current ecologically based ethnicity research. These historical and cultural factors have shaped the meta-narratives which provide many imperatives regarding the ways in which
identities are constructed for everyone (Spencer, 1987; Muga, 1984). This method therefore allowed recognition of how they affect 'objective' reflection. I have sought to show how these narratives particularly affect people of mixed parentage.

**Sampling**

Small, selectively sampled participant groups with no control group are recommended when researching people of mixed parentage, and this was the approach I took (Root, 1992; Ponterotto and Casas, 1991). This is to avoid further pathologising mixed heritage people; after all, who would the control group consist of? Who is 'normal'? Even a randomly selected control group would most likely have a majority of White people and therefore merely reinforce a tradition of comparing studies amongst any non-White people with the majority, White norms (Stanfield, 1993). This makes controlling for random variability almost impossible with this population (Root, 1992). Moreover, research design should be concerned with establishing what is normal for 'mixed race' people, rather than being based on clinical samples that further reinforce pathological notions.

So, via a small sample group, a 'theoretical sample' can be obtained, where the number of participants is not as important as what they can contribute (Ponterotto and Casas, 1991). This has also been described as 'intensity sampling', which enables the participants, although small in number, to yield a richness of information about the issue at hand (Patton, 1990). This also has similarities to an expanded case study approach, and validity using this method can be established via triangulation, in this case, methodological and interdisciplinary (Patton, 1990; Ponterotto and Casas, 1990; Janesick, 1994). Moreover, given the diversity of experience and subjectivity of meaning surrounding this issue, it is questionable whether a larger sample would necessarily establish more validity or reliability. This triangulation has also been adopted by feminists, a number of whose ideas and epistemologies influenced this project (Cook and Fonow, 1986).
Sampling Method

The method of sampling was via personal contact. Three of the participants were already known to me, two of them being members of my own extended family. This meant that they already knew of my personal connections to the topic (see below). Therefore I did not have to state my position blatantly, or necessarily do anything to establish my own legitimacy as a researcher on this topic. This helped establish an element of trust and a rapport with the participants. I employed selective sampling of people with one Samoan and one Pakeha parent. Two were men and two were women, so as to ensure a gender balance.

I also selected for people with some tertiary education and awareness of the issues involved. This was because I wanted them to analyse themselves, rather than have me analyse them, as a way of lessening both the chance of misinterpretation and the power differential involved in any researcher/researched relationship. This decision, however, obviously had an impact in terms of class, as the result of this was that they were all basically middle class. Moreover, they were all over twenty-five and to my knowledge had no obvious 'problems' surrounding their identity. They could also be considered as 'key informers' in many ways, given their small number, generally having a good rapport with myself the researcher, and being able to theorise and reflect on their positions and identities (Pelto, 1970).

The Data

I considered as data several different sources of information. These included:

1. Book research about the history of race, the impact of this on New Zealand and Samoa, and the nature of ethnic relations in Aotearoa New Zealand. I felt this was extremely important in view of the particular binary nature of cultural politics here which is reminiscent of older theories of race, and I wanted to explore how this would impact on identity issues.
2. A review of the literature about identity, ethnic identity and mixed identity issues. These two major pieces of book research (1. and 2.) encompassed writers and theorists from the disciplines of history, politics, science, ethnography, anthropology, sociology, psychology and philosophy. I felt it was important to gain viewpoints from all these major traditions so as to heighten validity based on the resulting theoretical and interdisciplinary triangulation. I also wanted to be guided by an ecological framework, and therefore needed all these perspectives in order to consider factors at micro, macro, meso and exo levels (Bronfenbrenner, 1979).

3. Transcriptions from four in-depth interviews with a selectively sampled group of people with one Pakeha and one Samoan parent, and written notes from two focus group meetings comprised of the same people. Having a small number of participants allowed me to gain an appreciation of the complex issues involved. I also wanted to give due attention to the historical and cultural factors that are often overlooked or given cursory examination only. My initial themes, gained from the literature review, were built upon by the interviews and focus group meetings, a process common to qualitative inquiry (Rossman and Marshall, 1995). After the interviews I prepared an overview of the findings from them (Appendix D), which the participants had the opportunity to read before the focus group meetings. This provided the discussion material for the group meetings.

4. My own lived experiences and observations as a Pakeha partner of a person with a Samoan father and Pakeha mother. Having also lived for some time as a teenager with a Pacific Island/Pakeha family gave me some ability to make comparisons, as did contact with other friends and relations. I felt this placed me in the latter category of Root's (1992) recommendation of who should be conducting this kind of research: either a person who is themselves of mixed parentage, or someone who lives in a multicultural environment as an everyday experience.
Research Questions

My formulation of the research questions came out of the initial period of book research. I found that the way I approached the topic changed as I gained more of an understanding of the issues and meta-issues involved. I moved from 'what are the influential factors in identity formation in people of mixed Samoan/Pakeha parentage?' to 'How/why are these factors influential?' to 'What is the meaning given to certain factors by individuals which cause them to be influential in identity construction?', 'How are these meanings or interpretations explained to create a coherent narrative?' and 'What are the meta-narratives which inform these meanings?' This is a similar progression to Katz (1996), and shows a process from a structural-developmental approach to a more postmodern, subjective approach.

The Questionnaire

My questionnaire checklist may have been in hindsight a little too prescriptive to answer the above questions fully. This was due to it being constructed by combining an ecological framework with the factors identified by the literature and my own observations (Appendix A). However, the extent of overlap between these informed presumptions and the participant's experience was borne out by the level of these factors being recognised as important by the participants themselves. Moreover, an ecological model lends itself by its wide-ranging nature to most relevant factors being covered, as does the semi-structured interviewing technique I employed. This allows for diversions and a more natural conversation to emerge.

The questionnaire covered factors at the individual, family, and community level, with each of these areas having several mostly open-ended questions based on the specific factors identified in the literature. This allowed for exploring of related issues as they arose, while providing a framework to keep us on task.
Ethics

The ethics involved in any area of research regarding ethnicity are inevitably messy, especially for a White, middle class researcher researching partly outside their own ethnic group. However, this perceived 'messiness', bordering on the 'inappropriate' is in itself an effect of the history of the ways in which ethnicity has been conceptualised and articulated. Because of this history, I was aware of the power differential this produced as an overlay to the already unequal researcher/researched relationship.

I was struck as I sat down to begin my first interview by the oddness of any relationship that expected personal information to be revealed for the dubious purpose of 'research'. I attempted to lessen this differential by selecting people with similar educational and therefore class status to my own. I consider this a conscious attempt to further blur the distinction between self and other discussed below. The nature of my interviewing style and the qualitative approach also lent itself to encouraging them to, where possible, self-analyse, rather than me doing so afterwards. While this implies that those who are not 'middle class' cannot self-analyse, I mean instead that I am more likely to 'speak a shared language' with those of similar education, and am therefore more likely to understand and interpret them more accurately.

The Importance of Personal Relationships

In considering the contention that personal relationships between the researcher and participants can invalidate one's research, a common complaint from traditional quantitative Western research, I decided that in this instance that was inconsistent with my chosen method and position. In light of the power dynamic outlined above, I considered the basis of my personal relationships with most of the participants vital for two reasons. Firstly, this relationship was important in order to have any right to ask them such personal questions, and secondly, I felt a lot safer interpreting the material from the people I knew better, as I felt I had more of an understanding of their experiences and the context within which these occurred. Moreover, given that the supposedly 'objective'
researcher is largely a myth, I felt that these relationships actually helped rather than hindered the validity of the research results.

This reflects my general attitude towards research, which approaches a feminist epistemology of recognition of the implicit lack of objectivity in any research. This does not necessarily lead to a lack of validity, and can in fact increase it in some circumstances (see Cook and Fonow, 1986). Patton (1990) recommends a neutral stance to be taken in the interview, for the purpose not only of as little 'bias' as possible, but also to convey a non-judgmental attitude to the participants. While this latter point in particular is important, it masks the inherent and entirely appropriate and ethical need to show empathy or make some moral judgement in order to support the participant. For example, when these participants were talking about some of the abuse that they had suffered, I felt it would be entirely inappropriate and unprofessional to maintain a passive, non-committal attitude about that experience. This embracing of personal connections and questioning of the nature of objectivity represents a challenge to the wider philosophical ideas about the divisions between subject and object, self and other, which I will now explore further.

Subject and Object

This division between a traditional object/subject approach is a major methodological issue in sociology and anthropology as a whole. Some feminists, such as Oakley (1981) argue that a way around this inherent power difference is for women to work collaboratively as researchers and participants, emphasising their commonalities as women. However, others say that this approach has potentially more possibilities of being exploitative, as it pretends to an extent that this collaboration makes the relationship equal (Stacey, 1991; Patai, 1991). Regardless of how closely women work together as researchers and participants, at the end of the day the final product is both the responsibility and the property of the researcher. These attempts, while they may well lower the power difference, go further to pretend that it in fact no longer exists, and it is in this that a danger lies. My research lies within this complex context, made even more
so by issues of ethnicity referred to earlier. I will further explore how this attempt to lessen the power difference affects my own position as researcher below.

I think it is only ethical to attempt to lessen the inequalities of power inherent in the work, but still acknowledge that they exist. An honest researcher needs a certain amount of graciousness in learning to accept that what the participants are offering them can only be humbly accepted. They are volunteering information for the researcher's and hopefully both their own and others' gain. The academic arguments in defence of this act are scant.

Self and Other

A related issue also of particular relevance to the fields of anthropology and sociology is the division between self and other, in part created and reinforced by the object/subject division described above. Historically, researchers investigating 'other' ethnic groups have maintained a clear division between themselves, and by extension those who are 'like' them, (objective), and 'others', those who are essentially 'different' from them (the subjects). However, in more recent times, a number of people find themselves as researchers identifying themselves with their 'subjects', and therefore blurring these lines of delineation. This identifying of 'self' in a traditional anthropological sense with the 'other' is a dilemma of several groups of researchers, best explained by Abu-Lughod (1991). These politics of voice, still being debated, are important in terms of my own position. Abu-Lughod argues that feminist anthropologists, what she calls 'halflies' (and defines as "people whose national and cultural identity is mixed by virtue of migration, overseas education or parentage", p43), and Western researchers who research their own society face intolerable dilemmas regarding the traditional division between self and other. As I see myself as having some similarities with all these groups of researchers, this particularly applies to my position. She argues that the more traditional study of 'culture' enforces an inevitable sense of hierarchy and maintains the subordinate position of the 'other' to the 'self.'
This relationship between self and other, because of the nature of the inherent power inequalities, is adversarial and conflictual. Further, for anthropologists to validate their position, they rely on maintaining the self/other division in order to be recognised as anthropologists. For the researchers described above, however, because they cannot "comfortably assume the self of anthropology ... the self is split, caught at the intersection of systems of difference" (Abu-Lughod, 1991, p140). Therefore they blur the distinctions between the self and other, either by way of their philosophy or membership of the group being studied, and this may result in their position and validity as researchers being questioned. This questioning shows the reluctance of anthropology to examine its own position or 'situatedness', despite a long-standing suspicion of the ideology of 'objective' science (Abu-Lughod, 1991).

My consideration of this dilemma is unresolvable, but makes explicit my approach which refuses to claim the objectivity of self and the concept of culture upon which it rests. To explain further, the idea of being an objective observer of an-'other' culture serves to reinforce the self-other divide (Abu-Lughod, 1991). This rests upon essentialist and hierarchical notions of culture and ethnicity which a large part of this thesis refutes. As argued above, this blurring of the boundary line cannot hope to erase the inherent power differential between researcher and participant. Instead it serves to lessen this difference and by articulating it I hope to make explicit my own position.

Power differentials also exist not only in the specific research interviews, but in the larger context within which this research took place. As an academic of some description I have access to a voice that is denied to others by way of class, education and ethnicity. My act of speaking is therefore not free of wider structural inequalities. These inequalities mean that a researcher can be sometimes presumed to be representative of their participants and others who fit the same criteria. I reject this presumption.
Ethical Proposal Process

In proposing to do this research, I had to apply to a Divisional Ethics Committee, and was granted approval. However, some time later, my supervisor was contacted by the Central University Ethics Committee who felt I should have instead applied to them for approval, given that I was collecting potentially extremely personal information. While there are strict and wholly appropriate regulations attached to research with human participants, this response also seemed to presume that there would be some trauma involved for the participants. My supervisor and I agreed this was reminiscent of the attitude that identity issues for people of mixed parentage are bound to be difficult and traumatic. I reassured the Committee that due to my training as a social worker and ability to identify trauma, I would therefore be able to deal with any difficulties should they occur.

All the participants when first approached were provided with an information sheet and signed a consent form (Appendices B and C). All participants were provided with a copy of the work in process, and were able to comment on it, as well as a final copy.

My Own Position

This leads me to a discussion of my own position with regard to the research process, where I will seek to make explicit how my own life experiences have shaped my research approach both theoretically and methodologically. I consider this awareness to be crucial in order to avoid the inherent racism described at the start of this chapter. This is because "every view is a view from somewhere, and every act of speaking a speaking from somewhere" (Abu-Lughod, 1991, p141).

Having lived in areas of New Zealand where I was in the minority ethnically (South Auckland), made me aware of both the existence of my own Pakeha culture and the structural inequalities based on ethnicity that exist in this country. This experience also gave me some understanding of Maori and Pacific Island cultures. Studying both New
Zealand history and Maori Studies at university further educated me as to the root causes of structural inequalities and the basis of cultural and identity politics. Living and travelling overseas led me to consider the impact of globalisation and intense migration, especially working as a social worker in London where contact with refugees and other people from all over the world is an everyday experience. The differences in how ethnicity is conceptualised in different countries made me more aware of the specificities of the New Zealand context. Finally, my partnership mentioned above and the birth of our child further highlighted to me the inadequacies of traditional theories of identity in people of mixed parentage. Needless to say both my own life history and my position are firmly rooted in an anti-racist and anti-essentialist approach. However, in recognition of the power of meta-narratives, this anti-essentialism is in fact a privilege, strongly linked to the privileges of both being Pakeha and having access to education.

Contemplation of these experiences led me to consider myself in the research arena not as an 'insider', but as an 'outsider on the inside' in relation to this issue. While no one is ever completely inside or outside any given group, this description spoke of my feeling with regard to both Pakeha and Samoan cultures at times. This was somewhat ironic as some of the participants also felt themselves to be positioned thus at various times, allowing for an element of empathy at some level between us. On another level, however, I was also aware of my increased power and access to resources as a middle class Pakeha researcher, and all the cultural capital encapsulated in that, despite my experiences and worldview. All of these ethical issues from the philosophical to the practical were important in shaping my research design and journey.

The Research Process

The Interviews

The interviews and the focus group took place in my home, which lent itself to an informal and relaxed atmosphere. I interviewed the two women together, as they preferred it that way, especially given that I did not know Malia before she arrived. (All
names of participants have been changed) They were late arriving to my home, and the first thing Malia said when she arrived was "Oh, it's a cultural thing". I thought this was interesting in that she was immediately asserting a Samoan identity, albeit in a stereotypical manner. The interview with the two women took some hours, but was generally relaxed and comfortable, with much laughing. It was also interesting for the participants, who were cousins, to hear each other's views about their common extended family and life events. I think this added something to the interviews, allowing something to be gained not only by me, the researcher, but also by them in terms of their relationship. Of course, the presence of each other no doubt influenced what they said, but given that every narrative of life events can be different in different contexts and on different days, and told to different people, this was not a major issue (Katz, 1996). They also prompted each other at times, which added to the depth of information gained.

The men, both of whom I know well, were interviewed separately. Because of our prior relationships, they too were relaxed and the quality of information gained was rich and informative. All the participants had an opportunity to look at my interview outline before being questioned. I feel this was appropriate given the in-depth and complex nature of some of the questions. I wanted them to have considered their answers before replying. It also helped to lessen any anxiety and the inherent power involved in me knowing what was going to be asked and them not knowing.

All the interviews were taped and transcribed. However, due to one interview in particular being of poor quality, the transcriber I employed struggled in some areas. It was interesting that in the sections that were unclear, what she presumed was being said reflected her own presumptions about people of mixed parentage. This reminded me of the reflection of any data through the eyes and view of those who interpret and represent it. This meant that I had to go through all the tapes myself and correct them where necessary.

While the participants were not offered any form of reimbursement as an incentive for taking part in the study, at its conclusion I gave them all a small card and gift as
thanks for their participation. I considered this to be a personal and appropriate token of recognition for their essential input.

To Participate or Not to Participate?

Although I had originally planned on having a follow-up focus group to the interviews, after the interviews I felt I had more than enough data to draw conclusions and interpretations. When my participants read these conclusions and the way I had presented them, however, two of them raised a number of concerns with me. They felt that they had given me the information in the interviews on the understanding that a focus group would follow. They felt that the way in which I had presented the data (consisting of large tracts of quotes from their transcripts, the use of false names and conclusions based around various themes) exposed them and their personal stories to a level which they were uncomfortable with and had not anticipated. They had been extremely explicit and open with me based on the understanding that the ensuing focus group would generalise the themes gained from all four interviews, with quotes only being used sparingly to back up or illustrate the themes gained. They reminded me that their stories were not only theirs but also those of their parents and families, and as such they were responsible not only for themselves but for them too. They also pointed out that the inclusion of focus groups was a much more active and empowering form of participation for them. This reminded me that research can never be about merely collecting information. It is also about an ongoing relationship within which everyone's personal safety must be the overriding consideration, especially that of the participants whom one is ultimately responsible for in the research process. This was also, as they said, much more in line with their (Samoan) culture, and embodied a process whereby we (both researcher and participants) walked along together on the research journey, rather than them giving me information and me going off and drawing my own conclusions from it. They also pointed out that this would also make the end product more valid and less open to criticism. For all these reasons I readily agreed to return to the focus group idea, as all these issues fitted easily with my existing research theory which I had been somewhat
diverted from by the pressures of time and the overwhelming volume of data gained from
the initial interviews.

I felt this was an important learning experience for me as a researcher. I felt indebted
to my participants for the input they therefore had in drawing me back to my original
intentions. I also felt satisfied that they felt they had enough power in the relationship
with me to be able to raise their concerns and renegotiate the terms of their participation
and consent. While my intention in using large amounts of verbatim had been to allow
their voices and stories to be heard without the overlay of the researcher's voice, this had
been somewhat misplaced. This was due to a period of the research process when I had
not been in much contact with my participants and so my research approach had been
dislocated from the overriding concern of the participant's active involvement, input, and
comfort.

The form of focus group we agreed to proceed with was two meetings where the
participants commented on a prepared overview of the themes drawn from the interviews
(Appendix D). We also discussed in the group context exactly how the information would
be presented. I then re-wrote the results and analysis chapters, returning them to the
participants for any further comment. I also approached individually the participant who
had disclosed sexual abuse in the interviews. I asked that participant if they would feel
comfortable with me referring to that information, and if so in what form. We agreed I
could use the information, but not refer to their pseudonym. This ensured an appropriate
level of confidentiality for that person.

Data Interpretation and Conclusions

Interpreting and forming a critique of the literature was done by considering the
meta-narratives implied by actions and comments. Similarly, the discussion about
identity and its development was done from the perspective of anti-essentialism and a
postmodern paradigm that emphasises personal subjectivity.
The task of data analysis of the actual interviews and focus groups was difficult due to the overlap of themes. I did not want to break it down into sections that were so small the bigger picture was lost. I decided to draw out several, but not all the possible themes, so as to do them some justice, rather than all at a surface level. This is common to much data analysis (Rountree and Laing, 1996). After drawing out these themes and taking them to the focus groups, I was able to further analyse and add to them. The final presentation of the raw data section, in keeping with the participants' wishes, was in the form of an examination of some of the specific factors, and some of the wider themes involved. This was justified with limited use of direct quotes and summarisation of participants' views. While this summarisation felt somewhat uncomfortable for me, this was in line with the participant's wishes. It was agreed that the use of pseudonyms was still appropriate. This analysis was then linked back to my other sources of data gained from the literature review.

After focusing on the themes as they related to the specific, micro and meso issues such as parenting styles, acceptance by extended family, 'marginality', school etc., I then attempted to link these findings back into the broader picture by social meta-narratives such as demands for legitimacy brought on by the greater socio-cultural and historical context. Overlaying it all were ideas about race and the essentialising of ethnicity which produced some difficult negotiations for the research participants. I then had a general discussion about the wider implications of the conclusions reached at a macro and even exo level, with regard to social work practice. I felt it was important, coming from a social work background, to provide some practical application for what is essentially a heavily theoretical and ideological thesis. This is not to suggest that the two are in conflict, but instead to articulate how they complement one another in this area.

Conclusion

So, my research project, consisting of both literature and direct empirical research, was broadly based on the suggestions of researchers involved in ethnicity studies and a postmodern/feminist framework. These were in turn mediated by the input of my
participants. While the former resulted in the identification of potentially major influential factors and the importance of an ecological approach, they together emphasise the importance of cultural, historical and social location, and the subjectivity of meaning of the individual. On this basis I conducted some in-depth research of the history of the ideas of race, and how they have influenced New Zealand, and Samoans and Pakeha in New Zealand, both historically and in the present day. I also looked at the current meanings attached to ethnicity and the influential factors in cultural politics here in New Zealand. I then reviewed the relevant literature surrounding identity, ethnic identity, and 'mixed race' identity, identifying potentially major influential factors. I conducted a small, purposeful study on how identity is constructed by four people of Samoan and Pakeha mixed parentage that grew up in the South Island. I interpreted this data, comparing the things that were given meaning by them and the context they live in with the factors considered influential by mainly overseas writers. I focused on the main themes that the data produced. I also attempted to then link this back to the specific cultural climate of New Zealand and the South Island.

While I struck several problems during the research process, these were rectified, and in fact caused me to contemplate in more depth several relevant research issues including participation, consent and the self/other division. The final result was therefore satisfactory to both the participants and me.
Chapter Two: Historical Conceptions of Race

The topic of racially mixed persons provides us with a vehicle for examining ideologies surrounding race, race relations and the role of the social sciences in the deconstruction of race (Root, 1992, p10).

In order to approach any topic regarding ethnic or cultural identity issues, we must first examine the historical background of the concepts that underpin our present day understanding of both ethnicity and identity. These ideas and understandings are governed in many ways by the sociohistorical context within which they exist (Muga 1984; Ogbu 1983; Spencer 1987). Moreover, theories about the identity of 'mixed race' people that are "ahistorical and acontextual" (Miller, 1992, p31) often serve to further pathologise and problematise these people. It is, therefore, important to carefully examine the historical and contextual factors that provide the setting for this topic.

Ideas about the meaning of differing appearances and ways of living among humans have existed since the beginning of contact between people groups. These ideas came to be known as concepts regarding 'race' initially, and more recently, culture and ethnicity. As Chapman points out, "All modern discussions of 'ethnicity' take place in the shadow of earlier discussions of 'race'" (1993, p6). The way these ideas have been conceptualised has relied on many factors, including not only those studied by the various disciplines of science, anthropology, sociology and psychoanalysis, but also wider imperatives based on the dynamics of political and economic power of the time. These ideologies have in turn impacted on the way in which people of 'mixed race' have been viewed and have viewed themselves.

Race: An Historical Overview

The term 'race' was initially used in France in the sixteenth century, and applied to extended family groups rather than a wider phenotypically similar group (Guillamin, 1994). However, this soon changed, and these changes in the philosophies of Europe
were very influential on how race came to be viewed in New Zealand and the Pacific. Prior to the 17th century, British attitudes to other people groups were based on the initial experiences of contact. This was via the first voyages made by British sailors to the West Coast of Africa in the 1550s, and the involvement of the British in the slave trade both to the New World and to Britain, which began in 1555 (Hakluyt, 1589). It is clear that the British reaction to the African peoples they encountered was based on a strong sense of physical and cultural differences, and took the form of a relatively unsystematic 'race prejudice', with the emphasis being more on cultural differences as opposed to any set ideas about 'race' per se (Benson, 1981; Rich, 1990).

In the Americas, the gradual extension of privileges to White over Black indentured labourers marked the beginning of a long and shameful practice of slavery and oppression in that country. This manufactured the creation of a collective White identity which, by proxy, also marked the beginnings of the necessity of a reactive Black identity (Allen, 1994). James Baldwin perhaps put this creation most eloquently: "I say to 'become' White, for they had not been White prior to their arrival any more than I, in Africa, had been Black. In Africa, I had been part of a tribe and a language and a nation." (1985, p30). This creation was necessary to justify the practices of slavery, and necessitated the ensuing biological theories of race and racism (Allen, 1994). Allen goes on to further emphasise the result of his extensive research being that it was the practice of slavery which created racism, not that racism was a naturally occurring attitude which precipitated slavery. This is a clear example of how an ideology of race grew out of economic and social imperatives.

'Race Mixing'

As with all contacts between people groups, from the time of first contact children who were the result of unions between them appeared. These unions "ranged from simple commercial transactions to durable concubinage" (Benson, 1981, p2, from Jobson, 1623). Although this practice was disapproved of by visitors from Britain, it was fairly common by the eighteenth century (Benson, 1981). This contradiction of attitudes was widespread
in colonial contexts, but disapproval was prevalent (Phoenix and Owen, 1996). In the English colonies of the Americas, unions were less benign than in West Africa, with rape and brutality being commonplace (Benson, 1981). These unions, both in America and Africa, led to the emergence of a relatively privileged social stratum of people known as 'Mulattos'. This word was based on the Spanish word 'mulato' meaning mule, a reflection of the growing attitude that these people were the offspring of two different species and as such an infertile hybrid (Scales-Trent, 1995). They were recognised in legislation as a group separate from both Whites and Blacks. This effectively created a buffer between the numerically inferior Whites and their Black labourers, reinforcing a hierarchy based on race (Allen, 1994).

With the entrenchment of slavery came extreme racist ideologies, for example Edward Long's History of Jamaica in the 1770s, in which he argued for a gradation of the species (in Rich 1990). He claimed that Black people were inferior to Whites because they possessed no ability to reason. He formalised this view with pseudo-scientific reasoning that the offspring of Blacks and Whites were infertile, contrary to the evidence already obvious in British and Jamaican societies of the time (Rich, 1990). This view also converged on several points with Darwinian notions of evolution. The notion that Black people were inferior was explained by some evolutionists as indicative of them being at a lesser state of evolution than Europeans.

**The Abolition of Slavery and the Growth of Pseudo-Scientific Racism**

After the Somerset case of 1772, which resulted in the end of legally enforceable slavery in England, the formal abolition of slavery was soon to follow in 1807. After this time, the prevailing attitudes became more based on scientific positivism than overt racism, with the more extreme of these theories cushioned by the impact of the Liberal middle class of the time (Rich, 1990). This was the birth of scientifically justified racism, with general anthropological opinion being that Black people had both biological and cultural differences that separated them innately from White people, and more specifically, Anglo-Saxons (for example, Robert Knox's Races of Man, 1859, Rich,
1990). This view therefore impacted not only on people who were not White, but also the various Celtic and other European peoples. Moreover, the association of Black people with being inherently base, brutal and sexually deviant was further reinforced by this 'science' (Gilman, 1985). The fledgling social sciences of the time accepted this belief without question. Combined with a positivistic tradition, this resulted in reinforcing and 'proving' many racist beliefs, giving added legitimacy to their 'scientific' foundation (Zack, 1993).

**Eugenics And The Nature-Nurture Debate**

This newly systemised view of race became the justifying base of continued British imperialism, and prevailed in British thought until at least the Second World War (Rich, 1990). Indeed, by the late 1800s anthropologists finally agreed on an index classifying the various racial 'types' based on skull shapes and anthropometrical measurements. This practice was reinforced by the views of Francis Galton, the father of eugenics and a statistician who was appointed President of the Anthropological Institute between 1885 and 1889. Dissenting voices such as that of Franz Boas were largely ignored. Earlier in the century he had found that in fact differences in the measurements of skulls and skeletons were more because of changes in living conditions and diet rather than race (Guillamin, 1994).

Boas and Galton led the two completely opposing views of the day: one based on biological determinism and evolution, the other on cultural determinism. This debate raged through the early decades of this century, and although it had initially been termed the 'race-nurture' debate, it was modified to the 'nature-nurture' debate before the turn of the century. Francis Galton and his followers embraced natural selection and Darwinism when *The Origin of Species by Natural Selection* was published in 1859. They extended this concept further than Darwin ever did, to include man's mental, religious, moral and physical characteristics. They were therefore convinced that the differences between 'savage' and 'civilised' societies were explained by the "innate character of different races" (Pearson, 1924, p86).
Boas, the famous Professor of Anthropology at Columbia University, was completely opposed to this idea and the subsequent 'cult' of the supremacy of nature and heredity and the resulting eugenics movement of the time (Freeman, 1983). Boas argued that all human characteristics were determined by the environment within which the human was living; however, during the first decade of the century, the "doctrine of the vastly preponderating importance of heredity gained ascendancy" (Freeman, 1983, p14).

The American Reaction

The call for racial purity was pounced upon in the States, where the American Breeders Association established a committee on eugenics, headed by David S. Jordan, Chancellor of Stanford University, and supported by geneticist C. B. Davenport (the author of such works as Eugenics: The Science of Human Improvement by Better Breeding). So by 1910, eugenics was established on both continents, and even after Galton's death in 1911, continued to flourish. This controversy was, coincidentally, to have particular consequences for the people of Samoa as a student of Boas, one Margaret Mead, was to study adolescence in Samoa in a direct attempt to establish "the independence of cultural achievement from race" (Boas quoted in Lowie, 1937, p17).

Segregation, Miscegenation and American Legislation

The rapid adoption of eugenic principles in the States was not surprising considering it too had a history of strong adherence to pseudoscientific racism and anti-miscegenist legislation and ideology. This logically led to the practice of segregation. Segregationism was growing in South Africa, the American South (and to some extent, Queensland in Australia), to the point that many liberals in England were concerned. This was in opposition to the growing Commonwealth notions of relationships between the races, which sought to occupy the middle ground between complete global segregation on the one hand, and radical critics of imperialism on the other (Rich 1990). While Commonwealth proponents saw segregation as the ideal way to maintain a controlling
White administration in the countries it was withdrawing from, as the century progressed there were continuing critiques of both the Commonwealth and segregation, with many arguing for a more assimilated society (Rich, 1990).

The Role of the Law in Creating 'Races'

This segregation between Black and White was illustrated clearly in the American South, where the growth of Jim Crow segregationism advanced to such an extent that in 1898 the Supreme Court ruled that legislation was "powerless to eradicate racial instincts" (Plessy vs Ferguson in Van Woodward, 1974, p69). Once again, the implicit assumptions of White eugenic superiority were maintained. This case involved a man who was 'one eighth Black' and appeared White who attempted to argue that because he looked White, he should be able to ride in the 'Whites Only' section on the train. This court case solidified in legislation the previously socially practised 'one drop rule', whereby anyone with any Black ancestry was considered to be Black by the dominant Whites (Zack, 1993). This 'one drop rule' came to be known in anthropological circles as the law of hypodesence, that is, where the child of two socially defined groups is automatically assigned to the subordinate group. Despite the laws against 'miscegenation', by the 1920s it was estimated that at least 70% of those designated Black in fact had some White ancestry (Zack, 1993).

Prior to this, in the middle of the century, there had been a relatively liberal continuum in the United States from slaves through to a 'free elite' among Black people, including those who could 'pass' as White. This situation arose due to 'mixed race' children being more likely to be educated by their White fathers, therefore gaining limited access to resources. This meant that, in turn, they were more likely to be able to buy their freedom. Mixed race girls were sought after as concubines for Whites, so the children became increasingly light skinned. Thus a group of relatively privileged light skinned people were created and unlike darker skinned people, became urbanised and comparatively wealthy. This led to light skin being equated with status. This status was also recognised in some state laws, but by the mid 19th century, this recognition was
withdrawn. This was due to the increasing need of the White population to maintain their own status and 'racial purity', and led to ever-increasingly stringent definitions of who was and was not 'White' in order to maintain their own power base (Harris, 1995). This tightening of legal 'whiteness' led to the destruction of the previously privileged mulatto elite who had had their own 'mixed race' identity that was recognised by both Blacks and Whites.

By the time of the 1920s and the Harlem Renaissance (an upsurge in Black pride and the construction of a more positive and unified 'Black' identity and culture), those who had previously identified as mulatto began to identify as Black (as the legislation and much older dominant attitudes forced them to), and many became leaders of this new Black movement (Zack, 1993; Davis, 1991). Moreover, not only was Blackness enshrined and defined in legislation, but relationships were too. The first law banning 'miscegenation' was passed in Virginia in 1662 (Zack, 1993), and so in most states intermarriage was outlawed. This effectively made all 'mixed race' children illegitimate, further stigmatising them. The surviving laws prohibiting miscegenation that remained in 16 states were not refuted by a Federal Court until 1967 (Root, 1992; Miller, 1992).

Cultural Relativism

The ideology behind segregationist thinking in Britain was bolstered by the works of Mary Kingsley, a traveller and amateur ethnographer, who developed her ideas out of the ideal of the 'noble savage' of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. She argued on the one hand for a more positive evaluation of Africans and African society, recognising that they had a 'separate cultural worth', while on the other arguing for a polygenic view of different people groups (Rich, 1990). Her theories were used to support ongoing notions of needing to 'protect' Africans especially from the influence of Europe, and to maintain their cultures. Some aspects of this kind of attitude can be seen in the present day 'multicultural' ideology. This was used to support the practice of segregation which began in Britain during the First World War, when imported Black labourers were kept in compound-like semi-imprisonment, with chaplains as overseers.
This segregationist view was also apparent in colonial policy, where in many colonised countries, including New Zealand, land was set aside for 'native use only'. The more extreme version of this move towards segregation resulted in the Native Lands Act being passed in South Africa in 1913, effectively beginning the legal process towards apartheid in that country. This resulted in ever more distinct 'racialised' territories, and enabled a system of economic exploitation of the indigenous population to occur (Rich, 1990). Indeed, many Black and Asian people at this time recognised the difference between the less systematised colour prejudice encountered in England and the more virulent form of racism encountered in colonial contexts (Rich 1990).

The Beginnings Of Modern Anti-Racism

In the meantime, however, English liberal opinion was finally becoming more cohesive. In 1911 Gustav Spiller, a German Jew living in London, organised a 'Universal Races Congress', the conclusions of which exploded traditional Victorian thinking on race. It aimed to promote discussion on "the larger racial issues in the light of modern knowledge and modern conscience, with a view to encouraging a good understanding, friendly feelings and co-operation among all races and nations" (Spiller, 1909). It represented a renewed effort to link more rigorously a liberal theory of international relations and race (Rich, 1990).

The congress generally denied polygenism, emphatically stating that there was one species of human only, proving this by the fact of the complete fertility of all human offspring, whatever their parentage. In particular, the views of Frenchman Jean Finot were welcomed by the Congress:

Nothing could be more illusory than the physiological distinctions established among humans. It is our brain which shapes our life. Under the influence of external physiological conditions we are transformed and adapted to the current type ... (Finot, 1911, pp363-4).
He proceeded to argue that there were no 'pure' races, and instead that a large degree of racial 'mixing' created a vital and invigorated society. Spiller himself advocated teaching children throughout the world that all races were equal and that sociologists and anthropologists should focus more on a dynamic rather than static concept of race (Spiller, 1911).

**World War II and Changing Demography**

With the outbreak of the Second World War once again West Indian and Africans were brought to Britain as extra labour. While many returned home at the close of the war, many also stayed on, adding significantly to the already well-established 'coloured quarters' within which most of the Black population lived. As these labourers were mostly male, "interracial liaisons were the norm" (Benson, 1981, p6). There was much hostility directed at this rapidly swelling Black population and the White women who lived with them by the White indigenous people. As the century progressed, British policy became more concerned with 'race relations' within Britain as it became obvious that the Black population was going to be a permanent feature of British demographics (Rich, 1990).

The Black population continued to swell in the post-war years in Britain, as did the various Asian populations, and the discussions in the press, medical and academic circles about 'miscegenation' were a focus for the wider anxieties of the White public about Black immigration in general (Benson, 1981). Meanwhile, the civil rights movement in the USA was winning important gains for Blacks, and brought an end to segregation and anti-miscegenation laws there. However, in both countries race and racism continue to be major cleavages of society.

**The 'Half-Caste' Ideology**

The underlying biological theories regarding race continued in anthropological circles well into the century (as late as 1974, there was a Symposium in London
regarding the "Racial Variations of Man"). There was a particular concern by many to avoid the creation of 'mongrels', especially when this occurred between "a more advanced and a more backward race" (Gates, 1928, p529). With this continuing adherence to scientifically justified racism came the notion that not only were those of African descent of inferior racial stock, but also that miscegenation was a "physically harmful and socially dangerous process" (Benson, 1981, p6).

Supposedly scientific theorising about the 'mixing of the races' led to the 'hybrid degeneracy theory', that is, that the offspring of two races is inherently weaker in body and mind than either of its parents' races. This was thought to be due to all kinds of notions, such as a 'clash of blood', and that these people would be both unstable psychologically and out of control sexually. This was supported by Davenport's research, and supported the view that miscegenation was 'unnatural' and against God. Moreover, even various acts of aggression were based on these theories, such as the war and subsequent annexation of parts of Mexico by the USA, justified by the fact of most Mexicans being mixed descendants of Native Americans and Spanish conquistadors (Nakashima, 1992). Contradictorily, some believed those of mixed parentage occupied a middle strata, being not as bad as Blacks, but not as good as Whites. In literature we also see a reflection of this view of people who were 'racially' mixed (see Berzon, 1978).

**The Half-Caste 'Problem' In Britain**

Following the First World War, many Black seamen from various British colonies found themselves in Britain and out of work as the shipping industry contracted. The ensuing children were therefore present mainly in the poor dock areas of port towns (Rich, 1990). This resulted in 'half-caste' children coming to be seen as a social and moral 'problem', necessitating the involvement and creation of various welfare agencies, for example "The Liverpool Association for the Welfare of Half-Caste Children". Moreover, the hostility towards the growing number of Black seaman and their children resulted in large scale rioting and racial attacks by White workers in 1919. This formed the basis for tightening immigration procedures, and even the arguing by some, for example the
Cardiff Chief Constable James A. Wilson, for legislation to prohibit sexual unions between Blacks and Whites in a similar vein to the recently passed Immorality Act in South Africa (1927) (and much older laws in America):

The day may come when public opinion will awaken to the fact that our race has become leavened with colour strain to such an extent that calls for action. Someone must have the courage to ... strike a warning note ... (in Rich, 1990, p128).

While this legislative proposal was never manifested, calls for the repatriation of Blacks and the 'problem' of 'half-caste' children continued until the outbreak of war.

Unions between Whites and Blacks continued. They tended to be between White women, usually from the lower class, and Black men. They mostly lived in predominantly Black areas where their children were more accepted. As the women of these partnerships were immersed in Black Culture and could not easily return to White society (or partners), they often identified with Black interests (Benson, 1981). However, for some of these relationships the sense of opportunism on both sides led to mutual mistrust and contempt (Banton, 1955). These partnerships were increasingly viewed more positively by the sociologists of the day, as a method of assimilation of the races, and a way to ease hostility and prejudice (Benson, 1981). However, the rate of inter-marriage slowed as more women immigrants arrived. The arguments against these partnerships also continued, as the scientific eugenic concepts of earlier days maintained their tenacious grip in some circles. For example Dr. E. Claxton, the Assistant Secretary to the British Medical Association in 1963, issued a plea for 'chastity' in order to reduce the number of children of 'mixed blood'. This was widely reported in the press, and politicians of the day used the fear of miscegenation as a basis for tighter immigration procedures from 1964-1968 (Benson, 1981). However, as the 1960s progressed, the 1965 Race Relations Act and a growing radical liberal element, together with the civil rights movement in the USA, began to lessen racism.
Black attitudes on the subject of intermarriage are less documented, but appear to have been ambivalent, with many looking down on White women who married Black men as being rejects from their own society, and the men involved as having inferiority complexes based on years of being taught that White was better that Black ("West Indian World", 1974 in Benson 1981).

**Modern Discourse on 'Race'**

It can be seen by the interplay of political and social factors and their impact on the way issues of 'race' have been viewed that it is these things which determine how people are perceived and labelled more than any innate physiological tendency. The period of the 1960s to the present has seen a growing acceptance of this fact in sociological, physical anthropological and geneticist circles. This is evidenced by Jean Hiemaux, a physical anthropologist remarking simply: "Race is not a fact, but a concept" (Hiemaux, 1986). This rejection of what had previously been considered a legal, international, social, physical and 'natural' construct, however, has not spread amongst the general population or amongst all of academia (Guillaumin 1994; Stanfield and Dennis, 1993). It is because of this that the concept of race and the study of race still have some salience: because society continues to derive meaning from phenotypical attributes, so they are worth being studied as social phenomena. Moreover, this is especially worth study and exposure because a common form of discrimination is based on this, that is, racism. As Pierre van den Berghe (1978) pointed out; "without racism, physical characteristics are devoid of social significance" (p.11).

While race may have some limited biological salience, with a modern understanding of genetics, it is obvious that this is no more than clusters of traits amongst once-discrete populations. However, biologists agree that there are no genetic or physiological characteristics common to all members of any so-called race, and in fact there is more variation, both genotypically and phenotypically, within each 'race' than between them (Zack, 1993; Root, 1992). Of course, in today's language, 'race' as a word has become rather politically incorrect, due to a growing awareness of its lack of scientific validity.
However, other words have come into common usage to describe the social, political and behavioural differences amongst people groups. These words such as 'culture', 'ethnicity' or 'difference' are at times used in the same way as 'race' once was. Therefore, the concept of racial divisions remains, having merely taken another name (Guillaumin, 1994; Anderson, 1991; Chapman, Mcdonald, and Tonkin, 1989). This is a mistake easily made, especially when trying to describe and study the impact of a notion while simultaneously challenging its validity:

Denying its existence as an empirically valid category, as the human, and ultimately, the natural sciences are trying to do, can never, however correct the intention, take away that category's reality within society or the state, or change the fact that while it may not be valid empirically, it certainly exerts an empirical effect. To claim that a notion which is present in a society's vocabulary, i.e. in both its way of organising the world and in its political and human history, can be negated in this way is a paradoxical position, because that which is negated has de facto existence (Guillaumin, 1994, p.106).

The Impact of 'Race' and 'Half-Caste' Theories in Aotearoa New Zealand and the Pacific

The attitudes initially of Britain and more recently America have influenced New Zealand theories of race, ethnicity and culture. In the initial period of contact between Maori and the British, the British clearly subscribed to the developing systematic, pseudo-scientific ideology of race of the time. The beginnings of missionary activity from 1814 in particular were a direct attempt to convert not only the spiritual beliefs of Maori, but also to 'civilise' them, that is, change most aspects of their culture and lifestyle. This was based on an implicit supposition of racial and cultural superiority (Walker, 1990).

In the early years of contact, many Pakeha men took Maori wives or visited Maori prostitutes, due partly to the extreme gender imbalance in the Pakeha population. Various iwi Maori made trade deals with Pakeha, and sealed these deals in the customary way by offering a high-status woman as a wife to seal the contract (Walker, 1990; Anderson,
1991). This was part of an economic welcome that bound the trader to the tribe more powerfully than perhaps any other means. The protection and trade in essential items then offered to the Pakeha was crucial to their survival. In the South, these 'mixed' families tended to live in Pakeha towns and houses, whereas in the North, there was much more variation, with many families living in Maori settlements (Anderson, 1991). This meant that the differences in experience and culture of the resulting children were vast.

However, by the 1890s Maori women whose Iwi were bound to the Kauhanganui (Maori Assembly) of the Maori King, Tawhiao, were forbidden to marry Pakeha. This was to limit the amount of control outsiders could wield via marriage over the remnants of Maori land, and to prevent 'half-caste' children from becoming stakeholders in tribal land (Walker, 1990). It is obvious from this that these children were under intense suspicion by Maori at this time, as political and physical survival, contested by both Pakeha legislation and war, necessitated a polarisation of the two people groups. The rejection of mixed parentage people from positions of power was an attempt to stay the flow of cultural invasion (Walker, 1990). However, the attempt to assert discrete boundaries was much too late, as there were already significant biological, cultural and economic links between the once-distinct groups. Intermarriage was so widespread that now it is the norm for Maori to have some Pakeha ancestry.

**Racial Attitudes in Samoa**

Samoa was fought over by America, Britain and Germany during the latter half of the 19th century. Samoans had their own power struggles and civil wars which the Western countries used to their advantage, and in turn were used by the Samoans to bolster their power in various political endeavours. However, the three Western nations became tired of the constant tensions their shared interests created, and in 1900 Western Samoa, with little consultation with the people themselves, was given to Germany, and the remaining islands to the USA. In return, Britain gained acquiescence from Germany in other parts of the world (Field, 1984).
A major event during German rule was the start of importing Chinese labourers in 1903. German rule also introduced the notion of racial purity to Samoa, issuing decrees to prevent the male Chinese labourers from forming common-law marriages with the local Samoans. The Chinese in general were ill-treated by the Germans, despite protests and attempted interventions from Beijing (Field, 1984). However, the 'ethnic purity' principle was not applied to any German or other European living there who wished to marry a Samoan, even though based on their logic, this would have seemed desirable.

New Zealand troops landed in Samoa in 1914 on the outbreak of the First World War, effectively taking over from the previous rule asserted by Germany. This colonial rule by New Zealand was to last almost sixty years, and formed the basis of New Zealand-Samoa relations. The occupying New Zealand commanders obviously held the views of the time about race, and traits noted by them regarding the Samoans, whether positive or negative, were couched very much in the language of 'racial' determinism. Colonel Smith remarked:

The natives impressed the troops at once, with their quiet dignified ways, their intelligent faces and superb and manly bearing. The native women with their handsomely molded features and figures, gentle, musical voices and happy smiles, shared with their menfolk the regal carriage of their race.  
(Quoted in Field, 1984, p16.)

They were often treated as if they were children, a common theme in relationships between Europeans and Pacific peoples. Moreover, the level of racism was such that White people felt compelled to maintain their dignity and superiority at all times, to the extent that even films that portrayed Whites in a negative or even ineffective manner were banned from being shown there (Field, 1984).
The Administrators:

Logan

Samoa was ruled by a series of Administrators sent from New Zealand to oversee the colony. The first Administrator of Samoa, a Colonel Robert Logan, maintained the system of racial separation put in place by the Germans, with Whites above the 'half-castes', the Samoans and the Chinese, whom he despised, and sought to repatriate (Field, 1984). He also issued a proclamation forbidding any Chinese from entering the house of a Samoan, and vice versa, in an attempt to stop intermarriage, and then set about breaking up existing relationships. Needless to say, the human suffering caused by this practice, which was solidified into law, was immense. Some villages, under pressure from Logan, agreed to forbid their women from this practice. However, by 1916, there were about 118 Chinese Samoan children in Samoa, and about 1200 European Samoans (Field, 1984).

Logan was also made infamous by the inept handling of the influenza epidemic of 1918, which killed 22% of the Western Samoan population. By contrast, American Samoa was practically untouched. Logan was further endeared to the Samoans by statements during this time such as: "I don't care if they all die, let them die and go to hell" (Field, 1984, p43). As a result of this huge death toll wreaked mainly by mismanagement and downright racism, the Samoans made a formal request to be placed under American mandate instead of New Zealand. This was withdrawn when Logan promptly left the Islands, never to return.

Tate

The new Administrator, Tate, was also extremely racist from a modern viewpoint, becoming upset that visiting New Zealand MPs gave members of the Fono a Faipule (an advisory body with no legal powers): "... the impression that the country was to be governed entirely in their interests ... and beliefs in their capacity to do anything whatever the white man could do, were given a fillip ..." (Field, 1984, p53).
An overbearing, autocratic rule was established by New Zealand via the Samoan Constitution order in 1920, setting up a civil government and giving executive power to the Administrator. Samoans were excluded from any real power over the running of the country, and import duties were high. Many protested by publicly challenging Tate, sending deputations to him, boycotting local businesses, and even petitioning the King.

This political conflict had implications for everyone, including those who were of mixed European/Samoan ancestry. Taisi Olaf F. Nelson, a prominent Swedish Samoan 'afakasi ('half caste') had this to say in a letter to William Massey, the New Zealand Prime Minister of the time: "Being a Samoan by birth, blood and sentiment, my interests in the welfare of Samoa and its inhabitants are as deeply rooted as anybody's can be for his country" (in Field, 1984, p56). This statement was radical for its time. Field explains:

He, (Nelson), was officially classed as a white, and in a time of colour bars and entrenched feelings of racial superiority Nelson seemed to be deliberately lowering his social status before the elite whites of Apia (1984, p56).

Nelson was indeed ahead of his time in that he understood the power of identity politics in gaining a legitimate voice with his audience. He went on to show his unswerving support for Samoa to be able to rule itself as the century progressed. His arguments concerned the abilities of the 'native mind' to grasp the issues at hand, something that the colonial rulers very much doubted (Field, 1984, p67). His unique position of having kinship ties with both groups improved his ability to have a powerful influence and an insider's view of both, although his primary allegiance was to Samoa as a nation more than anything else.

While 'afakasi' people were allowed to mix socially with whites, they were generally looked down on by them. Many of them helped begin the process of agitation which led to Samoa's independence. As such they were perceived by the New Zealand administration as a threat both to them and to the 'true natives', who needed protection
from the afakasis' desire for power. This was despite the fact that Nelson was calling for the return of power to the chiefs according to the Fa'asamoa. The problem from the administration's point of view was conceptualised within a racialised paradigm, rather than a political one.

Richardson

The next Administrator, Richardson, was capable but autocratic, and invoked his powers of title removal against any who sought to protest. The gravity of this action cannot be underestimated, as much of the process of social organisation is based around titles, according to the 'Fa'asamoa', or Samoan way (for a full description of this, see the description by Tupuola Efi in Field, 1984, pp20-22, or in Freeman, 1983). However, amongst Samoans, these title removals were often ignored, especially when high titles were involved. Richardson tried to block moves to send a delegation to New Zealand to protest about the way Samoa was being run, including banishing people from their home villages and withholding passports. Nelson continued to advocate eloquently for the Samoans:

Needless to say, oppression never has a satisfactory result and the people of Samoa will continue to seek redress until they have been relieved of all their troubles and again made free citizens ... and to live their life without having to submit to the military autocracy now prevalent (in Field, 1984, p82).

Once again, Richardson responded from a racialised viewpoint, claiming that Nelson was not a 'real' Samoan because of his mixed ancestry, and was just looking for power. He then passed the Maintenance of Authority in Native Affairs Ordinance, further restricting any criticism of the administration.

In 1926, as a result of all this, the League of Samoa was formed, and came to be known as Mau. They had sprung from a citizens' group that Nelson was a part of. It had initially consisted of whites and afakasis, but by this time was mostly Samoans. They pledged to procure, by lawful means, a form of government that recognised that all people were equal in the sight of God, and should be treated as such. Richardson argued
that the Samoans were not at a 'stage of development' whereby they could manage themselves, a clear sign of the impact of evolutionary thinking on his views. He also presumed that Nelson and the few Whites who were part of the Mau were in fact its leaders, and were 'stirring up the natives'. He could not conceive of an organisation run and managed by Samoans. Nelson was deported to New Zealand in 1927, but despite this, the Mau remained strong. They continued to protest that the laws governing them were more restrictive than in New Zealand, and said that because of this they would rather be ruled by Britain than New Zealand. Richardson's response was to order New Zealand gunboats to come and 'keep the peace'. Hundreds of Mau were arrested, but passive resistance continued.

Richardson was outspoken in his opposition to White people marrying Samoans, because he claimed the European man:

... soon realises that his physically attractive young wife is mentally unsuited to make him a help-mate or congenial companion, while his half-breed children remind him that he is permanently isolated from that which is so dear to the White man - his home and native country. With ... little prospects (for) his children on account of the uneugenic mating of their parents, the European father ... ultimately gives up the struggle to maintain the prestige of his race (in Field, 1984, p122).

Allen

In 1928, Richardson left and was replaced by Colonel Stephen Allen. He held similar views to mixed relationships as Richardson, and on the basis of this recommended that civil servants be forbidden to marry Samoans or half-castes, and those already married should be forced out for having 'lowered themselves'. Allen's attitude is particularly well illustrated with this quote: "For those Samoans who show quickness and receptivity in learning, it is the quickness of that great imitator the ape that is being developed, and not that of the human species" (in Field, 1984, p127).
The continuing actions of the Mau led to the deportation of their new leader, Tupua Tamasese, a holder of one of the four highest titles in Samoa. On his return, at a peaceful protest on the 28th of December 1929, Tupua and seven others were shot dead by New Zealand police. At the time of the fatal shootings, Tupua was walking out in front of the crowd gathered to protest calling out 'Filemu Samoa' (Peace, Samoa), exhorting the crowd to maintain its peaceful method of resistance. In the time between being shot and his death some hours later, he was still mindful to continue his peaceful influence, saying: "My blood has been spilt for Samoa. I am proud to give it. Do not dream of avenging it, as it was spilt in maintaining peace..." (in Field, 1984 p157). This from a man who was supposedly more like an ape than a human being. These killings, still not widely known about, epitomised the shameful nature of New Zealand's at times indifferent and at times actively oppressive rule of Samoa.

The Mau continued, and in the face of increasing numbers of New Zealand troops deployed in Samoa and the necessity for the men involved to hide out in the bush, the women's Mau became more prominent. Similarly to the men's, it was written off as a tool of the 'half-castes' and whites, with Allen saying that its leader, Ala Tamasese (Tupua's wife), was "well in the hands of the half-caste women" (in Field, 1984, p195). Allen's understanding of the situation was still framed in issues of race, rather than the more accurate issues of politics:

... the whole issue was and still is whether the White man or the half-caste should control the island; that is, whether the island should be administered on behalf of the natives, the Samoan race preserved and gradually fitted for its own government; or that the half-castes should gain control of the government, exploit the natives for their own benefit and reduce the islands to a half-caste community. This is the cause of all the political trouble here... (in Field, 1984, p196).

Field notes this difference in framing the problem, when he says:

As with all colonialism, racism was at its ideological foundation. New Zealanders could not, or would not, accept that the Samoan point of view was
a valid one. Their attitude clashed directly with the fundamental Samoan pride in country and culture (Field, 1984, p221).

This period of the history of New Zealand in Samoa laid the foundations for future relations. Samoans finally gained their independence in 1962, and continue to fiercely protect their own culture in the form of the Fa'asamoa.

In Recent Times

Tupua Tamasese's son, a prime minister of Samoa and present on the day his father was killed, says that nowadays: "We have grown to regard New Zealand as 'aiga" (family) (in Field, 1984, p225). This turnaround of opinion speaks of the many ways in which New Zealand and Samoa have become inextricably linked with the influx of Samoans to New Zealand in recent years, and the social, political, economic and familial bonds that this has created. However, even in this changing climate, the ideas about race that governed the history of contact between the two countries, while not as virulent and overt, still have some influence over current attitudes, beliefs and behaviours. Moreover, the power differential which makes these attitudes dangerous also still exist in different forms. It is these dynamics which also therefore influence those who can claim ancestral ties with both groups, both coloniser and colonised, dominant and oppressed, as it did for historical figures such as Olaf Nelson.

So from this brief sojourn into New Zealand and Samoan history, we can clearly see the influence of at times extreme racism at work, which within the context of unequal power relations, resulted in oppression and suffering.

New Zealand in the Present

Surely the days of antiquated ideas about race in Aotearoa New Zealand are long past. However, even in 1991, Anderson, in his discussion of 'mixed race' in New Zealand said he talked about race in its 'commonsense' meaning to "imply prominent differences in the physical appearance of populations that were once geographically separate" (1991,
This simplistic approach reflects how traditional views about race still hold 'commonsense', that is, widespread influence over attitudes and beliefs. As recently as the 1981 census, people of 'mixed' descent were asked to describe in fractions exactly how much 'blood' from each ethnic group they had (Department of Statistics, 1988). This practice is a direct result of beliefs based on how much of a particular 'race' one inherited from one's forebears. Moreover, individuals who named more than one ethnic group were assigned to whichever group they named as 'half or more', and if they were 'half and half', they were "... coded to a single ethnic origin using the following arbitrary priority rule:

This procedure reflects a number of things. It is obviously reminiscent of an American-style 'one drop rule', whereby if you have ancestry that is not White, you are presumed to be part of the non-white group (Zack, 1993). This was also generally applied here in Aotearoa New Zealand (Harre, 1966). Moreover, while the report quoted claims the order of priority is arbitrary, surely this hierarchy of priorities shows who is most seen to be 'other' or 'most not like us' from the dominant Pakeha paradigm (Chambers, 1994). In the 1986 Census, although one was no longer required to describe oneself in terms of fractions of descent, anyone who ticked a Pacific Island group as one of a number of ethnic options was actually assigned to that group when the statistics were collated, even further emphasising the 'one drop rule' described above (Macpherson, 1996). At least at this census, however, the 'Pacific Island Polynesian' category was changed to the various ethnicities concerned: Samoan, Tongan, Cook Islander, Niuean, Tokelauan and Fijian after numerous complaints to the Department (Department of Statistics, 1988).

This aggregating of Pacific Island peoples for administrative purposes has a long history, and takes no account of the considerable historic, cultural and linguistic differences between these groups (Macpherson, 1996). Moreover, it provides more evidence of belief in the particular racial paradigm previously described based on biological inheritance of cultural traits, and while the Statistics Department agrees that "this notion has, of course been discredited", it argues that:
This type of statistic has continued to reveal considerable socio-economic, health, and other variations between ethnic groups. Thus, while there is a significant degree of correspondence between biological characteristics and socio-cultural groups which are subject to socio-economic disadvantage, a biologically-based measure of ethnicity has proved convenient (Department of Statistics, 1988, p29).

This is a dog-chasing-its-tail kind of logic, implying that it is by the biological factor of their ethnicity that these people experience socioeconomic disadvantage, rather than because of historical and political-economy elements (Pearson, 1990). While it may indeed be valid to try and document these inequalities, care must be taken over the justification for doing this. The use of ethnicity to some extent masks the class nature of these inequalities. This is therefore an unsatisfactory waiver.

In more recent years, however, the Department of Statistics has implemented a more liberal and realistic method of categorising ethnicity, in recognition of the rapidly increasing numbers of people who are identifying with more than one group (Department of Statistics, 1998). Since 1995, all people registering births and deaths have been able to claim more than one ethnicity. In the most recent census a person could self identify with a number of ethnic groups and this was reflected in the ethnic breakdown section of the Census results.

There have been some major advances in recent years in the form of addressing Maori grievances, and the political expression of racism here is relatively minor when compared with other countries such as Australia and Canada (Spoonerley in Welch, 1999). However, 'everyday' racism continues to operate, and in fact one could argue that the political progress made only serves to "... drive racism underground: it still operates covertly in the job and housing markets; erupts like a boil from time to time ..." (Welch, 1999, p18). Spoonerley also proposes that "the further you get from Auckland, the more you're likely to encounter racism". This is an interesting proposition, given that Auckland is probably the most distinctly racially segregated city in the country, but if true obviously has some implications for my study, given that those of mixed parentage living
in the South Island would be likely to encounter this supposedly more virulent strain of southern racism.

**Terminology**

The difficulties of categorisation encountered by the Statistics Department are very real ones. What is an appropriate set of terms to describe in a non-racist way the set of relationships and states that have previously been termed as 'mixed marriages', 'mixed race', 'half-caste', or 'bi-racial'? The terminology used to discuss these issues is inherently problematic. If the idea of race has little objective reality and is more about power structures and dynamics than biology, then to talk about it as if it were 'real' can serve to reinforce those power dynamics, rather than challenge them. Moreover, to use the terms described above implies an objective reality of polarised, discrete entities coming together (Phoenix and Owen 1996). Neither can this be supported by modern understandings of what race is. 'Mixed parentage' is another option, and is in fact the one I have chosen to use. This is still based on racist undertones and implies that some people are of more mixed parentage than others, when every person is in fact a mixture of both of their parents in a world where there are no 'pure races' per se, and so everyone is to an extent of 'mixed parentage' (Thornton, 1992). However, at least by focusing on the parents rather than the children, this allows a space for those children to define themselves. Post-modern terms such as hybridity or diaspora-isation include a process view of people of mixed parentage, but these, hybridity in particular, still imply the 'cross-breeding' ideas of the other terms above. Like race, 'mixed race' is still important because people still give it meaning. The ways they give it meaning often result in racism, which is what makes studying it, discussing it and describing it such a political and moral minefield as to necessitate this somewhat verbose discussion of terminology.

I have also chosen to use the word 'Pakeha' to describe New Zealanders of European descent. While I examine the nature of objections and support for the use of this word later, I feel it is appropriate for use in the New Zealand context, as a way of describing people who are now rather different culturally from Europeans. I also wanted to avoid
defining people of European descent from a Samoan viewpoint, that is, as Palagi, so as to examine each cultural 'category' on its own terms as well as examining how the two interact. In describing people of European origin of other nationalities, I have used the word most used by that country, for example, White when referring to Americans and English people.

**Conclusion**

The history of ideas regarding race in Britain and American has had various influences. The tendency to stereotype particular population groups largely on the basis of their appearances and cultures has been influenced by social, political and economic factors that have served to maintain a White power base in both countries. These factors have been masked to some extent by pseudo-scientific means of explaining these differences and therefore legitimising the resulting oppression and racism. These ways of defining race have also been applied to the colonial context of relations between Britain and New Zealand, and New Zealand and Samoa. In modern New Zealand, this history means that the 'commonsense' understanding of race is still salient in many people's minds, with a number of consequences for those who subscribe to more than one ethnic group (Anderson 1991; Zack, 1993). These include expectations of automatically being ascribed to the subordinate group regardless of other factors, and also create a context of oppositional politics that will be discussed further in the next chapter. While a widespread measure of public beliefs and opinions about race is beyond the scope of this project, the census can be used as an example of the ways in which the concept of race is constructed. However, its recent moves towards recognising the social realities of multiple ethnic allegiances are probably far ahead of the public arena, where the reality of 'everyday racism' is conceded by most working in this area and those who are the targets of it.
Chapter Three: Culture and Ethnicity in Aotearoa

As is discussed earlier, ethnicity is often used as a synonym for race, or implies similar connotations of intrinsic, genetically determined qualities. However, it implies something further than ancestry to include patterns of thinking and behaving, values, social customs, perceptions, roles, language use and rules of social interaction (McGoldrick et al. 1982; Ogbu, 1981). There is therefore little difference between this expanded definition of ethnicity and what is understood to be culture, apart from the ancestry aspect. Both can be problematic in terms of their presumed ability to determine social action. Given this inability early researchers even moved to dismiss ethnicity as a valid research category (e.g. Weber in Baumann and Sunier, 1995). Indeed, it cannot be stated too strongly that as Chapman points out, "All modern discussions of 'ethnicity' take place in the shadow of earlier discussions of 'race'" (1993, p6).

Against Essentialism

This shadow is exposed by attempts to reify ethnic difference, that is, portray the social phenomena associated with ethnicity as if they were concrete facts of nature in a similar way to how race and behaviour were once linked. This portrayal has a sinister undertone: "In systems where 'ascribed' cultural differences rationalise structures of inequality, ethnicity takes on a cogent existential reality. It is this process of reification that gives it the appearance of being an autonomous factor in the ordering of the social world." (Comaroff and Comaroff, 1992, p61). The congruence between this view and earlier views about race is shown here, as well as the linked concepts of ethnicity and culture.

The process of essentialising ethnicity by way of a primordialist approach cannot stand up under rigorous scientific scrutiny. Moreover, it serves to reinforce racist notions that link particular people groups with particular behaviours. The recent move to refute an essentialist view of ethnicity is therefore the only way to proceed, especially in view
of the patterns of global mobilisation of people from everywhere to everywhere, and the intense conflation of people both biologically and culturally that this engenders (Comaroff and Comaroff 1992; Baumann and Sunier, 1995; Chambers, 1994; Chambers and Curti 1996; Kallen, 1982). Indeed, the inability of monolithic, static theories of ethnicity and culture to account for the social realities to be found in most modern metropolitan areas is mute evidence of their nullity (Chambers, 1992; Root, 1992; McRobbie, 1996). It is these complex issues which make the study of ethnic identity "impossibly difficult, if not fundamentally misguided" (Gilroy, 1995, p19), because of its inherently political nature. Gilroy also refutes essential, 'ethnic absolutism' and the notion of a 'cleansed identity' that is a popular approach to ethnic identity theory: "The Sovereign Self, enthroned by this approach ... endorses the idea that its inner workings are knowable, stable and predictable if the correct procedures are followed" (1995, p20). A de-essentialist approach to the study of ethnicity must therefore focus on social cohesion and collective commitments and identities that form cross-cutting cleavages of society, as well as "make these reifications the object of study, rather than its guide" (Baumann and Sunier, 1995, p6). The urban milieu of the late twentieth century now encompasses the influences of many once discrete cultures.

A Melting Pot?

However, the concept of the 'melting pot' envisaged and longed for by many Western policy makers is not an appropriate analogy for this phenomenon. Although cultures that have previously been ascribed to specific 'racial' groups are no longer always relevant, this does not mean that a single culture that everyone will identify with is emerging, rather that, as with all cultures, changes are occurring that do not support historical cultural stereotypes. This rapid change is due to the economic, social and technological realities of late capitalism. These realities mean that different configurations of people groups are occurring and influencing each other, with new identities and expressions emerging in unexpected ways (Chambers, 1992). Some have used instead the analogy of the 'salad bowl' as a metaphor for the diverse nature of many societies world wide, both
Western and non-Western (Iijima Hall, 1992b). Moreover, the 'melting pot' theory, while appearing benign, in fact was used to obscure assimilationist agendas.

So, if ethnicity and culture have little concrete reality beyond public presumptions and political aspirations, and are less definable and specifiable, are they worthy of our study and attention? While some think not, the increasing rather than decreasing meanings attached to these concepts not only by social scientists, but also by people from all ethnic groups, politicians, statisticians, economists, educationalists and advertisers, as well as the effects of the presumptions and politics mentioned above, mean that while this area of study is becoming more complex, it is definitely not redundant (Chambers, 1992; Baumann and Sunier, 1995).

A New Ethnicity

Indeed, a new concept of ethnicity has emerged, especially amongst minority groups, that is based on an "affective/symbolic and behavioural frame of reference", rather than one based on territorial isolation (Kallen, 1982, p30). This fulfils the need of the members of an ethnic group for belonging and a sense of 'rootedness', while fulfilling a desire for resources and power within Western culture which are often denied them via class imperatives (Kallen, 1982). Ethnicity therefore becomes a symbolic system that can be situationally manipulated, still forms a collective cleavage in society, and is often more salient than class as a motivational factor due to affective ties (Kallen, 1982). This is further enforced politically by the adoption of symbolic 'diacritica' such as dress, names and ways of interacting that serve to reinforce a sense of group membership and legitimise the ethnic group in the eyes of the dominant group. However, this analysis of the 'new ethnicity' by Kallen ignores colonial imperatives that demand this form of 'ethnicisation' from its minorities as a way of maintaining dominant hegemony. It accomplishes this by continuing a long tradition of focusing on the minority group as the 'other' which draws attention away from the actions and intentions of the dominant group (Chambers, 1992). Gilroy describes this as the production of differing forms of answering
identities to different forms of racism, for example slavery, colonialism and migration (1995).

Chambers continues to be insightful on this issue when describing the reaction of Western power holders to the growing complexity amongst ethnic groups: "In the West, however, we have inherited an authoritative testimony that has always regarded cultural fragmentation and mobility with horror ... this critical tradition has persistently sought radical alternatives in the assumed continuities of folk cultures, 'authentic' habits and 'genuine' communities" (1992, p71). He goes on to explain that this in fact is the essence of ongoing imperialism and colonisation, and it is the politics of action and reaction involved in this 'critical tradition' that are pertinent to my topic.

The Consequences of Demands for Legitimacy

The 'new ethnicity' described by Kallen is one response to the 'critical tradition' of the West, and they combine to create a reaction by some within minority groups to in turn demand authentic representations from their own members (Gilroy, 1995; Anzaldua 1987). This may serve to reinforce a sense of group identity, boundary, and cohesion, but also has negative aspects. These include the foreclosure of some paths or expressions and the impossibility of identities based on gender, language or nation, for example, in the face of the domination of ethnicity: "Expression and representation are compelled to support the collective burden and unity of a presumed representation" (Chambers, 1992, p65). The ultimate result of this is that some people are rejected by a minority group because they are not seen to have a legitimate claim to it. Anzaldua comments succinctly on this, as well as illustrating the links between this attitude and the dominant culture that it originates from: "the white-looking Indian, the "high yellow" Black woman, the Asian with the White lover ... it is your internalised whiteness that desperately wants boundary lines" (1990, p143).

This obviously has particular repercussions for mixed ethnicity people, especially those who have a parent from the majority group, and one from a minority group. They
are seldom admitted into white culture unless they 'pass' for white, and on the other hand, if they want to be part of the group that their minority parent is from, within a context of contestation and colonialism, they are subjected to even more stringent tests of their legitimacy than their 'full-blooded' peers. This means that they are 'squeezed from both sides', and as such endure oppression from both the White majority and minority groups (Sandoval, 1990; Root, 1992). This oppression has been constructed from old ideas of race, domination and subordination. As Root notes: "Our tendency to think simplistically about complex relationships has resulted in dichotomous, hierarchical classification systems that have become vehicles of oppression" (1992, p4). The presence of mixed ethnicity people is a opportunity to challenge and dismantle this vehicle.

Here in Aotearoa New Zealand we have an ideal example of how a binary, dichotomous, essentialised view of 'ethnicity as culture' that demands 'authenticity' from its minority groups prevails (Sissons, 1992). I will seek to explain why this is so, as well as illustrate how this impacts on those who have one Pakeha parent and one Samoan parent, for universalist theories can only account for so much. That is, while many traditional theories present ethnic identity process as a universal, linear, ahistorical and acontextual phenomena, I would contend that "the daily life of any ethnic or racial group in a given society will be unique, and these differences in daily life experience will contribute directly to identity by influencing the meaning of group membership ..." (Miller, 1992, p31).

**Cultural Politics**

Many authors have commented about how this viewing of cultures as being diametrically opposed and mutually exclusive, especially in colonised countries, operates to continue colonisation and oppression of minority and indigenous people groups (Root, 1992; Chambers, 1992; Stephens, 1995). This is because it acts as a powerful mechanism to continue to 'otherise' and objectify those who do not belong to the dominant group. It is because of this dynamic that some have even recommended 'writing against culture', arguing that "Culture is the essential tool for making other" (Abu-Lughod, 1991, p 143).
Moreover, this results in subject peoples being forced to present their claims in terms of a presumed traditional or 'real' culture in order to be seen as legitimate. This has affected many people worldwide, such as Indians in Brazil, Afro-Caribbeans in Britain, Turks in The Netherlands ... and of course both Maori and Pacific Island groups in this country (Stephens, 1995; Da Cunha, 1995; Chambers, 1992; Greenland, 1991; Matahaere 1996).

This situation has led to various diverse legal and social implications, for example, in Brazil, indigenous land rights are not based on geneology, but on those people who both consider themselves and are considered by others to be indigenous (Indian Statute 1973 in Da Cunha, 1995). The result of this is that Brazilian Indians have to pass tests of their 'indianness' by way of wearing the right clothes, using the right language, and living the right lifestyle. The intended outcome of this approach by the Government was an end to indigenous land rights once the Indians had reached an "advanced state of acculturation" and therefore could no longer claim to be 'real Indians' (Da Cunha, 1995, p285). Moreover, the lifestyle aspect of the test often included living in poverty as being an 'Indian' lifestyle, further stigmatising and oppressing this group of people.

This seems very strange to us in this country, because we are so accustomed to claims and criteria for belonging being based solely on geneology by Iwi Maori and the Government in the latter half of this century. Who is and is not Maori is currently, as mentioned earlier, defined legally as anyone who is a descendent of a Maori (Maori Affairs Act 1953; Electoral Act 1956). As with all ethnic definition, this criterion is not without its own specific historical and social origins. This can be linked to, on the Pakeha side, being derived from a doctrine of 'race' that subscribed to the 'one drop rule' notion of American legal and British social history. On the Maori side, the emphasising of geneology in social cohesion has also contributed to this legal definition (Brown, 1984).

However, again it is the underlying power differential which makes this definition potentially harmful. For example, the findings of Harre's study of Maori-Pakeha marriages in the sixties coincides with Zack's findings in America whereby even relatively liberal White/Pakeha people objected to their children marrying Maori/African
Americans. The reasoning behind these objections is remarkably similar: not wanting 'Black' or 'Maori' grandchildren (Harre 1966; Zack, 1993). Zack goes on to explain that this is based on the perceived threat to a White family's identity due to the 'assymetrical kinship schema' of the 'one drop rule' ideology, that is, that those children are automatically assigned to being Black (and by extension their family is Black).

Moreover, despite the huge increase in intermarriages between Maori and Pakeha during the intense urbanisation in the post-war period, people continued to identify as being Maori, and Maori only (Brown, 1984). This was much to the consternation of Government agencies who expected this urban milieu to be "the quickest and surest way of integrating the two species of New Zealander." (Hunn, 1961, p14). The fact that many chose to refute their Pakeha ancestry in favour of the Maori may also have been due to related factors such as the higher acceptance of children of Maori-Pakeha families by the Maori side of the family than by the Pakeha, as well as the increasing legitimacy and solidarity associated with being Maori (Harre, 1966). Moreover, the fact that most Pakeha viewed those who had any Maori ancestry as being Maori meant that the option of being Pakeha or both was not recognised and therefore seldom considered as an option. The overriding factor taken as a given was that the only options were one or the other.

So, while a cursory examination of this issue appears to show that both Maori and Pakeha are satisfied with this criterion, the inherent racism involved in the Pakeha definitions and the inequalities associated with colonisation make these attitudes problematic. It also implies a false line of delineation on what can only be described as racial grounds that in fact has little reality outside of political necessity and survival for Iwi Maori, and continuing colonising attitudes of the Pakeha majority. Therefore it is the meanings given to this criterion and the attitudes that accompany it that are problematic, apart from the criterion itself. That is, while the criterion used by Maori and Pakeha seem as if they are in agreement, they are in fact based on different underlying ideologies, and therefore expect different outcomes. More importantly for this topic, the result of both
these dynamics is the predominance of descent or 'race' over other factors being used to define ethnic group membership of a minority group.

**Maori at the Crossroads**

Let me illustrate further. In the 1970s cultural solidarity based on descent was promoted as a binding factor for resistance and the creation of a 'radical' Maori movement that was more militant and outspoken than any had been for some time (Greenland, 1984; Te Ahu Poata-Smith, 1996). This was perceived as necessary by many young, urbanised Maori in order to advance the grievances still carried by many Iwi.

While these facts of history are not the focus of this work, it is these events that produced a context that required the politicisation of Maori ethnicity in order to provide a 'legitimate' vehicle to advance and illustrate the issues raised, and to agitate for some kind of approach to a just solution. The portrayal of the land-hungry predatory Pakeha versus the noble Maori as well as Maori spiritual concepts and symbols were used to encourage people to assert a rigorous Maori identity as a method of solving social problems. However: "Such collapsing of socially-constructed and historically specific phenomena into genetic ones was a fundamental assumption in radical ideology and itself a metaphor encapsulating the grievances radicals sought to express" (Greenland, 1984, p93, italics mine). It was on the basis of these genetic factors that Maori were said to share a particular consciousness (Galton would agree), and therefore were entitled to a distinctive ethnic identity based on notions of sovereignty and nationalism (Greenland, 1984). Moreover, this identity came to be expressed through the symbolic 'diacritica' previously described, and excluded Pakeha liberals (Greenland, 1984).

This meant that those who had mixed ancestry that included Pakeha (which were most people who identified as Maori), were strongly discouraged from asserting a multi- or bi-ethnic identity, therefore further solidifying a dichotomous, binary view of ethnicity demanded by the need for solidarity. While this increased resistance to the State won some major advances, it was quickly absorbed and neutralised by the State. The
continuing 'Treaty rhetoric' has now become a legitimate, almost expected form of resistance which, being framed in the language and symbolism of a mythical 'real' Maori culture, has been given the State's stamp of approval (Matahaere 1996). This is a difficult issue, because to reject the legitimacy and power gained tooth and nail by Maori in the form of re-making themselves as the 'authentic native' (and under the Treaty) is to be returned to the uncomfortable and unacceptable position of having no power again (Matahaere 1996). Conversely, to accept the essentialised image that the State would like Maori to occupy is to be then limited to participation only in those aspects of society deemed to be appropriate, once again occupying a subordinate and externally defined position. As Chambers notes: "So the minority spokesperson is expected to speak in the terms of the ethnic group, restricted to the black 'community', while the white writer, artist or film maker is left free to speak about everything" (1992, p39). In this sense, the trade-off encapsulated in this colonising dynamic is unacceptable (see Stephens, 1995). Moreover, another result of accepting the State's definition is to ignore major differences between those categorised as Maori, the main one being Iwi (tribal) differences, but also those based on gender, class, age and location (Matahaere, 1996; O'Regan, 1995).

Pakeha Ethnicity

In response to the contemporary discussions of Maori ethnicity, many Pakeha have begun to reflect on what Pakeha ethnicity entails (e.g. King 1985; Spoonley, 1995), as this is often invisible (well, at least to Pakeha). This invisibility is due to its dominance and acceptability as being 'normal' or 'ordinary', with the implication being that everything else is the opposite. Moreover, this is exacerbated by a tendency for academics in most Western countries to focus on minority and marginal groups, rather than their own (Chambers, 1992; Swift, 1995).

Many people of European ancestry in New Zealand dislike the label 'Pakeha' due to its political implications (Department of Statistics, 1988). Those Pakeha who like it and use it tend to be those who recognise the harm of colonisation and in general the validity of Maori aspirations (Bell, 1996). It also speaks of a distance from the term 'European'
and all that it implies. Due to our location as Pacific islands, our history which is 150 years removed from Britain, and our relationship with both Maori and other Pacific and Asian peoples the culture of the descendants of the British is often far removed from being 'European'. Moreover, there is a marked split between these two groups. The former object to the word Pakeha because they do not want to be defined in relation to Maori, using a Maori word. Many do not like being described as a member of an 'ethnic' group at all, and are more likely to identify with nation and State than minority groups (Bell, 1996; Pearson, 1989). These differing attitudes reflect the variance of views within those of European descent, which could by no means be called a 'community'. While this sounds self-evident, many are quick to attach this label to Maori and other minority groups who may have an equal amount of diversity within them, and in fact, may not be a 'group' at all (e.g. Macpherson 1996).

Pakeha in New Zealand have from the time of their arrival continued a worldwide colonisation trend carried out by many European countries. Those to lay claim to New Zealand were predominantly of British (English, Irish and Scottish) origins, with significant numbers of other Europeans such as Slavs and Dutch also settling in relatively large numbers in later years. Other post-British immigrant groups include Chinese, Lebanese, Croatians, Somali, South Africans ... and at least a few from almost everywhere.

Pakeha, generally those of British ancestry, have maintained a hegemony over Maori and most other immigrant groups since their arrival, establishing and controlling the systems of government and most access to resources. They established their legal right to be here via the Treaty of Waitangi, signed by representatives of the British Crown and rangatira of most Iwi Maori. However, ambiguity of the wording of the Treaty as well as Treaty breaches make the outright claim of Pakeha to the sovereignty they soon established questionable to say the least (see Orange 1987; Walker, 1990.)

Pakeha in this country, like many Western countries, tend to follow the tenets of Western philosophy and science which are usually dominated by White males, and
promote values such as individuality, material success, dichotomous, hierarchical paradigms and logical positivism ((Zack, 1993; Daniel, 1992; Tajitsu Nash, 1992). While these generalisations are extremely broad and are also problematic in terms of class issues, I contend that they need to be made explicit in order to avoid the invisibility described earlier, and as a basis for the development of my discussion. As I go on to describe the impact on individuals and society when people from two once-distinct groups have children, if the culture of one of those groups is seen as either non-existent or normal the conclusion would be misleading at best.

**Maori and Pakeha Cultures**

The desire for many Pakeha to maintain this invisibility as an ethnic group can only be interpreted as an attempt to maintain domination and comfort as an unchallenged 'norm'. What is more, the invoking of nationalist and traditional spiritual concepts by Maori can be seen as an attempt to regain some power from a powerless position by claiming legitimacy under concepts outside of mainstream Pakeha culture, that is, defining themselves on their own terms. However, this reaction is shaped in some ways by Pakeha desires to maintain their hegemony and therefore a demand for a clear and identifiable 'Other' box for Maori to fit into. As Dominguez (1992) suggests, we should be asking more "contextually specific questions about what is being accomplished socially, politically and discursively when different notions of culture are invoked by different groups" (in Stephens, 1995, p22). I would add to this that these questions also need to be asked when notions of culture are not invoked, and instead a strange silence prevails (Scales-Trent, 1995).

While this is obviously a simplified discussion of historical and cultural features, the purpose is to outline the specific context of ethnic relations that Pacific Island immigrants inherited upon their large-scale arrival in the post-war period. As Spoonley notes:

... they were not simply labour; they arrived in these urban centres as an integral part of a pre-existing set of colonial relations. These relations were based upon certain ideological constructions (typically of these migrants as
coming from 'backward' or 'primitive' communities), and they encountered and contributed to the development of a particular set of relations in their new location ... They were seen in racial terms, as inferior in some way and as constituting a 'problem' (1996, p58).

This observation from the 1990s can be seen to clearly link the ideas of the earlier New Zealand rule of Samoa described in the last chapter with present-day attitudes and dynamics.

**Samoans in New Zealand**

Immigration from Samoa began occurring in large numbers in the 1950s with the expansion of the secondary and primary industry sectors of the New Zealand economy (Macpherson, 1984). This expansion produced a shortage of labour, and caused this country to search amongst its territories and former territories for possible solutions. First came the Cook Islanders and Niueans, then the Samoans, Tongans and Tokelauans. The populations here mushroomed, with the number of Samoans doubling every five years since 1956 (Macpherson, 1984). The first waves of Samoan immigrants tended to be those who had already lived and worked in Apia (i.e. a semi-urban environment) and had a relatively high level of education: some were of mixed Samoan/European ancestry (Kallen, 1982; Macpherson, 1996). As time went on, people began to migrate from more rural/village locations, and tended to be more 'traditional', conservative, and with less urban experience.

**Economic Recession and Unemployment**

With the economic recession of the 1970s hitting hard the industries that Samoans were most likely to be employed in, the Government attempted to renege on its previous policy of encouraging Pacific Islanders to immigrate. It implemented harsh measures such as the infamous dawn raids in an attempt to reverse the flow of immigration (Krishnan et al. 1994). This consisted of 'raiding' the houses of Pacific Islanders to check
for overstayers, and stopping people on the street who appeared to be Pacific Islanders and asking them for evidence of legitimacy.

Despite an increasing unemployment level, the Pacific Island population increased by a third between 1986 and 1990, with two thirds of this increase being accounted for by continuing immigration (McCall and Connell, 1993). Most of these immigrants tended to be in the 20-40 age group, and came here mainly to work (Krishnan et al., 1994). While about half of all Samoans now living in Aotearoa were born here, the proportion of Samoan children (under 20) born here as opposed to those not born here is about 4:1 (Krishnan et al., 1994).

The Politics of Class

As with any large group of identifiable and class-located immigrants, Samoans have been the target of racism and the object of blame for social problems since soon after their arrival, an unenviable position shared by other Pacific Islanders and urban Maori (Spoonley, 1996). Indeed, the class dynamic of this process deserves further attention, as the channelling of Samoans into narrow sectors of the labour market has served to reinforce social divisions based on ethnicity and racism (Ongley, 1996). It has also led to the connection of values and practices of Samoans and their generally low socioeconomic status, masking the political and economic foundations of this class location (Ongley, 1996; Pitt and Macpherson, 1974). This concentration of Samoans in particular industries in which the need for human labour is rapidly becoming redundant has resulted in many living with poverty and unemployment, with three out of every five Pacific Islanders receiving some kind of Income Support in 1991 (Krishnan et al. 1994). Where any ethnic group 'fits' in terms of the mode of production must also affect children's experiences and therefore their identities (Muga, 1984; Spencer, 1987). However, some, especially New Zealand-born Samoans, are managing to achieve middle class status by virtue of tertiary education and the resulting increased job opportunities (Macpherson, 1996). Intermarriage with non-Samoans has been a feature of life both in Samoa and in this country, and is increasing as young Samoans, more fluent with the language and culture
of New Zealand than their parents, marry 'out' (Macpherson, 1991; Department of Statistics, 1992; Trlin, 1971).

**Social Structures**

Despite officials in this country encouraging assimilation and the adoption of Pakeha values as the way 'forward' for the Samoan people, many of the social structures important in Samoa have been adapted to the New Zealand context. Far from being the impediment supposed by these officials, this has been crucial in many ways for their survival, both culturally and even physically (Pitt and Macpherson 1974). These structures include the 'aiga (extended family), usually headed by a matai (chief), with close ties to both the village (usually a number of extended families often related to each other), and church (Freeman, 1983). Valued character traits traditionally include hospitality, generosity, being polite, an ability to carry out one's obligations to church and family, obedience, respect and in general following the Fa'asamoa (Samoan way) (Kallen, 1982; Tiatia, 1998). Social structures are often formed around titles which indicate status, and the gains of an individual are seen to reflect on the group as a whole.

In this country, these general structures have led to the development of a 'kinship bridge'. After the initial immigrants' arrival, many of their relations followed, with the necessary support and help on their arrival being provided by their relatives already here. While many people cite work and education for their children as major factors for their coming here, the language, cultural and economic barriers present to education have meant that only a few have attained their parents' hopes for them (Macpherson, 1984).

**Internal Differences**

It is important to articulate further intragroup differences as a way of refuting essentialist notions, and these differences rely on a number of factors. Some of these are named by Macpherson (1984), and are related to identity outcomes; firstly, the kind of background in Samoa from which the family comes, and secondly, the family's degree of
commitment to traditional Samoan culture. Macpherson (1984) comments on this degree when he describes three loosely grouped kinds of family orientations within the Samoans in New Zealand. The first promotes Samoan language and values exclusively, the second allows both Samoan and non-Samoan values to co-exist. The children of this second kind of family learn to move between the two and to choose from a range of options as to what is right and wrong in any given situation. This family may be intermarried, and if the male partner is Samoan, the commitment to Samoan culture may be stronger. This family maintains kin and church ties, and a predominant orientation to Samoan culture still develops. In the third kind of family described, non-Samoan (i.e. Pakeha) values and language are exclusively promoted. The parents of this family tend to be white collar workers from Apia, or be intermarried; however, the devaluing of the Fa'asamoa may come from either partner.

The Connection to Demands for Legitimacy

Macpherson wryly proposes that these family styles in terms of identity produce 'real Samoans', 'Samoans' and 'the right kind of Samoans' respectively, but that children may change their category upon reaching adulthood. For example, the child who has been raised to be 'the right kind of Samoan' may decide they want to learn to speak Samoan as an adult in response to exclusion from a Samoan social group, that is, not being perceived as being 'authentic', or in Macpherson's words, 'real'. This is not empty hypothesising: the statement for debate at the 1998 Samoan Students' Association So'otaga was "That to be a real Samoan, you have to speak Samoan" — and the affirmative won. This is a clear example of adapting one's self and identity in order to be perceived as more 'real'. This dynamic is evidence of the impact of the demands for legitimacy discussed earlier as applied to Samoans in New Zealand.

This question of legitimacy hints at greater complexity than Macpherson's study of parenting styles can show. The impact of globalisation, and the experiences of being a minority group at the lower end of the class ladder all impact on this issue, and identity can no longer be viewed as "a consequence of the simple repetition of racialised or ethnic
culture" (Gilroy, 1995, p18). For example, most Samoan children, even those raised in
the first kind of family, one that promotes exclusively the Fa'asamoa, are forced to learn
at least some aspects of Pakeha culture in order to survive, even if their parents
disapprove. This bicultural competence and the resulting synthesising of multiple
identities is the norm in most minority peoples (Spencer, 1995; Phinney and Rotheram,
1987; Cross, 1987). These demands and influences from wider social imperatives display
the complexity of the issues involved.

Differences Between Samoan-born and New Zealand-born Samoans

The final intragroup difference I want to describe is the difference between Samoan-
born and New Zealand-born Samoans. As previously noted, the majority of young
Samoans are born here in New Zealand, and their experiences and identities are
somewhat different from both their parents and Samoan-born peers (Pitt and Macpherson,
1974). Many, even at the time of Pitt and Macpherson's early study had not been to
Samoa, did not speak Samoan fluently, and felt they were both Samoans and New
Zealanders "in different senses, contexts and situations" (1974, p19). However, a
prevailing Samoan identity remained. This development of an identity that is separate
both from their parents' and other New Zealanders' identities has continued along these
lines, and has at times resulted in difficulties, but also in creative resolution, when the
expectations of the two cultures conflict (Anae, 1995; Schoeffel and Meleisea, 1994;
Tiatia 1997, Pulotu-Endemann and Spoonley, 1992). They are more likely to marry out,
and are more likely to hold higher educational qualifications than the Island-born
population, therefore gaining better paying jobs (Pulotu-Endemann and Spoonley, 1992).
Benson (1981), in her study of mixed Black/White families in Britain, noted that
similarly to Blacks born in Britain, 'mixed race' young people had to overtly embrace a
Black identity in order to be accepted by other Black people. In this respect, therefore,
differences between NZ-born Samoans and mixed Samoan/Pakeha people may be
minimal.
These intragroup differences and increasing divergence mean that aggregating people of 'Pacific Island descent' is becoming somewhat redundant without an understanding of what that actually means for those people, and this increasing variation is likely to continue (Macpherson, 1996). Intermarriage and being of mixed parentage are threads of this diverging reality.

Impacts on Identity

These issues of identity as a minority ethnic group must be taken into consideration when examining people with one Pakeha and one Samoan parent; that is, one cannot ignore the dynamics and influences already occurring between Samoan and Pakeha when discussing those who are of mixed parentage. The fact that people with two Samoan parents living in this country are compulsorily influenced by living in a Pakeha dominated country may blur any distinction between them and those with a Pakeha parent, who must also contend with both cultures in a slightly different way. Moreover, speaking of 'two cultures' in a simplistic fashion such as this is problematic because of the subtleties of interaction and influence that have already occurred, most obviously at the level of 'popular culture', especially amongst young people.

Conclusion

I have been at pains so far to illustrate the influences of history and context which will provide the foundation for examining the issue of mixed parantage identities: "Ethnocultural identity involves concepts that depend heavily on the society in which it is defined" (Harris et al. 1995, p12). In providing a brief outline of the sociopolitical and economic factors that have shaped our society with regard to issues of culture and ethnicity, I hope to have made explicit the societal factors that influence the ways in which the members of my chosen population have been created and must create themselves. The struggle to assert an identity that embraces all aspects of their ancestry is made difficult by the particular binary, descent-based approach to ethnicity and cultural issues in this country which is a direct result of the historical factors described. This
obviously has implications for Samoans in New Zealand, and by extension, those of mixed Samoan/Pakeha parentage. The silence surrounding this issue of mixed parentage speaks of the difficulty in conceptualising this in the face of the domination of a dichotomous ideology of cultures. While for some an ability to be able to assert bicultural identities may not be relevant, this preference in itself can be seen as a product of the prevailing meta-narratives regarding ethnicity within our society.
Chapter Four: Ethnic Identity and 'Mixed Race'

The issue of ethnic identity is one that has long been explored by researchers from many disciplines. In keeping with Western traditions of research, the literature concerning ethnic identity typically focuses on non-White minorities, and has historically presented ethnic identity as a linear, universal process of an aspect of social development (Root, 1992). In more recent years, however, study has been done on both the constructions of White majority identities, and theories that encompass multidimensional, ecological models of the process of identity development (Allen, 1994; Root, 1992). Root (1992) comments on the result of this new focus in the study of ethnic identity:

The recent consideration of multidimensional models has allowed the possibility that an individual can have simultaneous membership and multiple, fluid identities with different groups ... these models abolish either/or classification systems that create marginality. Multidimensional models of identity will not be perplexed that phenotype, "genotype", and ethnicity do not necessarily coincide with or reliably predict identity. (p6).

The ecological aspect of this approach recognises the complex and dynamic influences of variables at individual, family, institutional, societal and global levels (Bronfenbrenner, 1979).

In this chapter, I will explore this tension between modern and post-modern paradigms more fully, as well as the way ethnic identity and identity in general are constructed. I will go on to examine the various theories and factors that other researchers have found to be important in the way in which identity is constructed for the person of mixed parentage.

What is 'identity'?

Ethnic identity cannot be separated from identity in general, as the way people perceive themselves in ethnic terms has inextricable ties with the way they and others
perceive themselves as a whole (Katz, 1996). Identity and ethnic identity, each subsumed by the other, as we have seen in the last chapter, are extremely contestable in a climate of political conflict, and the ways in which they are conceptualised impact on this.

Differing definitions of identity lucidly illustrate its socially constructed nature. For example, identity has been described as "a fixed set of beliefs or dispositions that develops into a stable structure over time" (Katz, 1996, p186). This definition is an example of a modernist, structural-developmental approach that presents identity as an objective, universal, observable feature of human development. This theory further postulates that a 'mature' identity is reached as a result of definite factors being present and phases completed. This way of theorising about identity is firmly entrenched in the primacy of the autonomous individual postulated by Western bourgeois philosophy (Lacan in Harland, 1987; Katz, 1996). These presentations of identity as a concrete, unified reality are, however, contestable because while people need to have shared meanings and ways of explaining those meanings, these are not concrete realities, but instead are socially created (Berger and Luckman, 1966).

Erikson as a Structural Example

A popular example of the structural-developmental way of conceptualising identity is the theory put forward by Erikson. Erikson theorised that a person passes through eight discernible life stages, with an autonomous adult identity emerging as a result of a long period of exploration in adolescence (1959, 1968). Each phase of development presents the individual with a 'crisis' that must be resolved in order to be able to move on to the next level. In early childhood, the mother provides the basic vehicle by which trust is learned, and Erikson pointed out that the patterns of child-rearing performed by the mother are determined by the cultural milieu she is surrounded by. This theory, like many others of its time emphasises internal conflicts and a need for similarity between a person's own and society's perception of them.
While Erikson provides some useful ideas, his model and others like it presume the attainment of a single, 'healthy identity' as a predictable outcome in adulthood that is then static and will be achieved provided the right steps are taken, or the appropriate level of biologically-linked development has been reached. Moreover, this model is based on many Freudian notions of psychological development, and like many other theories of its time (such as Winnicott), proposes a direct causal link between early life experiences and later identity and behaviour. Recent evidence suggests that while early life experiences are influential, they are just another link in the chain of ongoing development rather than the 'critical period' assumed in earlier studies (Smith, 1992).

**Postmodernism**

The recent moves towards what is referred to as 'postmodernism' question the philosophical foundations of structurally based theories, and provide us with more flexible ways of conceptualising human development and identity. Postmodernism prefers to emphasise the complex interactions of factors that produce what is perceived as being 'the truth'. Derived from this, postmodernism proposes that notions of identity and development as having some pattern, rhyme and reason are, at the least, controversial. Thus postmodernism is the underlying philosophy refuting essentialist identities, as essentialism is based on a modernist notion that "peoples, cultures and society have ... an essence or true nature which ... is able to be discovered by 'Science'". (Katz, 1996, p49). Therefore postmodernism is a way of articulating a philosophical base that allows people of mixed parentage non-essentialised identities that are ecologically influenced.

Postmodern theories challenge the view presented by modernist paradigms of an unproblematic society as being an objective reality, and any challengers of this as being "irrational, immature or marginal ... the dehumanised 'other' who needs to be resisted and eliminated." (Katz, 1996, p49). This strong element of pressure to conform can be dangerously totalitarian in the context of colonialism, racism and other vehicles of oppression. Postmodernism goes even further to argue that not only do people's identities
have little pattern or stability, but likewise society is conflictual, irrational and constantly changing (Katz, 1996).

Postmodernism sees truth as being more grounded in culture, time and place, which many working in the area of ethnic identity see as being extremely important (Root, 1992; Spencer, 1987). While this approach is not labelled by most of these writers as postmodernism, it is clear that many of the ideas of postmodernism are contained in this new way of thinking about ethnic identity, especially as it applies to the person of mixed parentage. This is because postmodernism embraces subjectivity and the possibility of a number of 'identities' for use in different situations. This therefore contests the previous ideology which postulated that those who have a number of identities that are contextually triggered are deviant or 'unhealthy', rather than using them as creative strategies to resolve complex situations (Root, 1992). More recent research explores the common occurrence of contextual changes in identity. Breakwell (1983) found that all those he studied had some degree of identity change depending on the context, for example, the wife and mother who is also the company vice-president.

**Further Complications**

However, even the postmodern/modern dichotomy is somewhat simplistic, as there can be some overlap at a practical level. For example, some theoretical points from modernist theories can allow for contextual changes in identity. One example of this is the idea that a person is primarily socialised by the mother, and as a result of this gains a concept of a 'true self'. If the true self is for whatever reason thwarted in its expression, especially during primary socialisation by the mother, then a person instead develops a 'false self' that is presented outwardly (Winnicott, 1965). However, if this sense of a true self is strongly challenged by society during secondary socialisation, then although the results can be severe, if the 'true self' is secure, then the person's sense of identity will not disintegrate. With a stable 'true self', a person can play a number of different roles, and maintain intact their 'true' identity (Katz, 1996). While this has some use in framing the possible tensions experienced by the person of mixed parentage, it begs the question,
what is the 'true self' for these people? Can there be more than one 'true self', or is there one at all? (Strict postmodernism says no.) Is the true self ethnically constructed or labelled, or does it develop before any sense of ethnic identity is formed? How is it influenced by the culture of both the mother and society?

The Influence of Early Life Experiences

Another example of the complexity of modern/postmodern philosophies can be seen by examining another important issue: how much cause and effect is there between early life experiences and later states of being? Structural theories postulate clear, direct cause and effect relationships. Boyd (1989) a feminist psychoanalyst, argues for the supremacy of early parenting, and mothering in particular, in shaping gender identities. It could be deduced from this that a particular kind of parenting could also determine a racial identity (Katz, 1996). However, the impact of later experiences and the subjectivity of meaning cannot be underestimated, and this means that it is impossible to predict an individual's later identity development (Katz, 1996; Brazelton and Cramer, 1991). Katz (1996), in his study of the effects of early parenting on later identity in children of mixed parentage in Britain found that:

The family's role is not analogous to a gun shooting a bullet in a predetermined direction. They are more like authors who write the first chapter of a book, leaving the children to write the rest of the story. They set the scene for later development which may constantly refer back to them, but they do not determine the story ... The findings do not, however, confirm the full-blown post-modernist assertion that identity is a fabrication by the individual which is used to paper over the cracks of discontinuous and contradictory experience ... (p181).

Thus, as has been found in global identity development, early life experiences in general may be influential in the formation of ethnic identity, but are not prescriptive of later behaviour. I will be further exploring this in my fieldwork.
Autonomous versus Automaton

This leads us to examine the extent of social creation of an identity. While some modernists and all postmodernists would argue that identity is completely socially created, there are other views. Sociologists presume that "macrocosmic tensions must be reflected in the individual microcosm" (Wilson, 1987 in Katz, 1996, p23), and this has consequences for any study of identity. This view contends that: "self and society are twin born ... and the notion of a separate and independent ego is an illusion" (Cooley, 1902). Other studies have shown that some aspects of identity can be separated thus, especially when they are seen to be in conflict with one another, that is, when a social role and personal beliefs or values clash (Hollis, 1977). However, they are for the most part inextricably linked: "personal identity is that part of the self-concept that is free of role or relationship determinants ... but ... it is difficult to see how personal identity can be defined except in terms of its social history and context" (Breakwell, 1983, p9).

Another way of describing this is the 'autonomous versus automaton' ideas of Harre (1979). Harre conducted studies into whether people had individual choice over their identity and behaviour and were therefore 'autonomous' from it, or were merely products of their societies and contexts: automatons. He concluded that people have a kind of 'relative autonomy', that is, contextual/social factors are mediated through individual agency to produce behaviour and identity in an individual. This concurs with subjectivity of meaning, that is, how each person interprets what happens to them results in differing outcomes. However, the individual has already to some extent been created by previous social experiences. This would also relate to Katz (1996) and Brazelton and Cramer's (1991) findings that the influence of family and society was interpreted and acted upon differently by different individuals depending on the meaning attached to those influences. Both the sociological and structural developmental approaches described above presume people and especially children to be passive recipients of either societal forces or inevitable life phases. However, it has been found that children are instead much more active participants in their own development and identities than these theories presume (Smith, 1992).
Narrative theory

Theoretically speaking, this way of viewing identity process can be contained in the ideas of Ricoeur (1992). He proposed the concept of 'narrative identity', whereby one's identity is constructed and reconstructed continuously, held together by a narrative which explains life events and gives them coherence, despite underlying discontinuity and conflict. This narrative is then 'legitimised' by a meta-narrative that can be in the form of a theory or societal norm (Katz, 1996). A mature identity is a person who faces the challenges of underlying discontinuities and conflicts, and resists the pressure to write their story as necessarily demanded by some powerful meta-narratives. The understanding of the role of historical and societal features (how meta-narratives are created) has been shown to allow people of mixed parentage to begin to choose their response, that is, become more autonomous: "Prerequisite to embracing the right to self-determination is an understanding of race as a social and political construct, primarily a tool of dominance" (Bradshaw, 1992, p81). This method of re-constructing one's narrative allows for an empowering reinterpretation of events, and how one goes about telling one's story informs the observer of how that person interprets and creates their own identity.

This approach allows for a different story and identity each time it is told, and recognises that a 'true' account of a person's life is changing daily as meaning and context change, including who one is telling the story to. However, this theory, similarly to Katz (1996) does not go so far as to suggest a completely constructed or contingent identity. To take this to the extreme, one could argue, for example, that the perception of racism or abuse was merely how one interpreted and gave meaning to a particular event. While this is, of course, true, this draws attention away from both the reality of the racism or abuse experienced and the perpetrators of it, both individual and structural.

So, in returning to the question 'what is identity?' it is obvious that more complex definitions of identity need to be formulated. The fact that identity exists in some shape is
not being contested, but the way in which it is conceptualised, created and acted upon surely is. A more postmodern, flexible definition than the one quoted initially is: "Identities are meanings that the self acquires through social interaction ..." (Stephan, 1992, p51). Another with much potential is this from Katz: "Identity represents the interface between self-perception and attitudes towards others" (1996, p20). Katz, for the purpose of a working definition, suggests the content of one's identity consists of the interactions between biological make-up, conscious and unconscious beliefs, opinions and ideas about oneself, relationships to significant other people and groups, and how one is perceived by those people and groups (1996, p43). These are all dynamic concepts.

While this section contains a number of philosophical questions with no clear answers, they are relevant when discussing ethnic identity, especially the identity of those who have an ambiguous ethnicity and therefore an ambiguous 'society' from which they have been created, or at least influenced. To frame this another way, how have individuals mediated the impact of two ethnic groups which are themselves inextricably intertwined (and arguably internally conflictual) but which still each retain a number of distinctive features? How do these complex factors interrelate? How do people of mixed parentage interpret their lives so as to inform their identities?

I will now look more specifically at ethnic identity, remembering that the separation of this from identity in general is problematic but will help us to further untangle the questions asked above.

Ethnic Identity

The need for and the occurrence of an ethnic identity is a result of living in an ethnically heterogeneous society (Root, 1992). This kind of identity is based on ethnicity and is tied to issues such as group belonging, ethnic awareness, ethnic self-identification, experiences of racism, group cohesion and collective commitments (Phinney and Rotheram, 1987). These factors therefore are mostly socially determined through contact with people outside one's own group. In an ethnically heterogeneous society an
'ethnicised' identity assumes primacy in people's psychological profiles, especially when racism is harsh. That is, a person is more likely to view their own ethnicity as being a primary index of identity if it is held to be extremely significant in society, and if wider society is perceived as a threat. High levels of internal cohesion of an ethnic group can also create this. Ethnicity is often reinforced by national or religious ties, or a history of injustice. Obviously many of these factors apply to Samoans in New Zealand, although the perception of external threat may be weakening (Macpherson, 1991). Few could be seen to apply to Pakeha. Understanding how ethnic identity develops and is given meaning enables us to actively create environments within which diverse identities are acceptable, as well as being helpful when problems arise (Miller, 1992). However, one's ethnicity in a society which attaches meaning to it must also impact on the more global aspects of identity described above.

**Theoretical Similarities Between Identity and Ethnic Identity Theory**

Research into ethnic socialisation and identity has discussed the autonomous versus automaton concept of 'global' identity theory in a number of ways. One is that of 'ascribed criteria' (imposed from an external source) versus performance criteria (how one feels and acts) which may be discrepant (Phinney and Rotheram, 1987). Ascribed criteria with regard to ethnic groups tend to take the form of essentialist assumptions about what people from a particular group are 'really like', while performance criteria are about how a person or group describes themselves and experiences life. These criteria necessarily have an impact on each other in an ethnically heterogeneous society.

Another way this has been described is that the primary task for 'biracial' children is to separate others' opinions and evaluations from the reality of their own experience (Pinderhughes, 1995; Kich, 1992), that is, to separate the ascribed criteria from the performance. However, as has been stated previously, the separation of these two agents may well be impossible and somewhat unrealistic. If the reality of a person's experience is a result of others' evaluations and opinions, attempts made to separate these may be naive, especially for children. However, this concept does have limited applicability in
some circumstances, and the task of separation as described above may well be necessary to gain a sense of stability, given that being of mixed parentage a person is more likely to be exposed to a wide variety of attitudes from others, which cannot all be accepted unquestioningly. Scales-Trent on a personal level writes about this dilemma: "But tell me, if others do not know that you 'know Chinese', if others do not know that you are family - are you family? Are you Chinese? Who controls what is real? Can you do it yourself, or do you need the corroboration of others?" (1995, p27). This feeling of being somewhat at the mercy of others' perceptions and understandings brings into stark focus the tensions of subjective self-definition, being as it is so intrinsically tied to the process of socialisation by others. As I continue, it is important to keep these tensions in mind as overall considerations in discussions of ethnic identity in people of mixed parentage.

**Marginal Man**

As has already been discussed, people of mixed parentage were historically labelled as confused, bewildered and deviant. Some studies have found that these people show identity confusion, low self-esteem, ambivalence towards family, parental rejection and other psychological and behavioural problems (Gibbs, 1989; Faulkner and Kich, 1983; Ladner, 1977). However, these are often clinical samples, and are based on linear models of what identity development should be like (Root, 1992). Moreover, early theories about mixed heritage people are based on a bipolar framework that begins from a presumption of deviance and pathology, and the theory that identity is a static, unitary concept. These theories have only served to further marginalise people of mixed parentage, who are often seen in terms of an intermediary step of assimilating the minority group into the majority culture with all the evolutionary theory that this implies (Root, 1992). One need look no further than our own shores to gauge the effectiveness of this.

The original 'marginal man' theory held that a 'mixed race' person was marginal because he was: "An individual who lives in, or who has ties of kinship with, two or more interacting societies between which there exist sufficient incompatibility to render his own adjustment to them difficult or impossible. He does not quite 'belong' or feel at home
in either group" (Stonequist, 1942). While this analysis is problematic, it does point to potential similarities of experience of both second generation immigrants and those who are of mixed parentage. Even some more recent writers feel that this form of identity conflict is unavoidable (Benson, 1981). This concept of marginality was extended by Green (1947), who argued that the pinnacle of marginality is when a person identifies with both groups "and is psychologically prevented from joining either". Moreover, a crisis was thought to occur when a person held the values and culture of the dominant group but was not allowed to enter it (Hitch, 1983). This kind of psychological crisis was thought to be an experience of intense emotional pain and confusion suffered when a person realised their predicament and the isolation this engendered. Others proposed that marginality was created when a person cut themselves off from one group, but is excluded from another by its members. The psychological results of being 'marginal' were supposedly being hyper-sensitive, intensely self-conscious, and highly critical of others (Breakwell, 1983).

The presupposition of all of these theories is that there is a coherent, monolithic 'society' (or societies) from which one is able to be marginalised, something that has been contested by post-structuralists, who argue that in fact society is basically chaotic and conflictual (Katz, 1996). The other major relevant presupposition to these theories is that a marginal status cannot be anything other than negative and psychologically damaging for the people involved. These theories are also all based on a bipolar philosophy of cultural contact that presumes discrete and essential boundaries between the two groups involved.

'Marginality' Today

While some people of mixed parentage (and minority members) may at some point identify with "not quite belonging in either group", difficulty in reconciling differing cultural norms and being forever excluded from both groups appears to be in most cases non-existent (Miller, 1992; Tizard and Phoenix, 1993). Instead many people show increased contact with various groups, enjoyment of their cultures, increased language
proficiencies and intergroup tolerance (Stephan, 1992). Iijama Hall (1992a) found that people of mixed parentage in his study made twice as many positive comments about the experience of being mixed than negative. While some expressed feelings of marginality and not being fully accepted by either group, positive aspects such as being able to identify with both groups, understand both cultures, empathise with others, having the best of both worlds and having good parents were more common. Numerous other studies have found no evidence to support the assertion of widespread identity confusion or other psychological pathology (Wilson, 1987; Tizard and Phoenix, 1993; Katz, 1996).

Further, I would contend that provided that various familial and societal factors are in place, potential negatives can be avoided and even turned into positives: "For years I accepted the definition of others ... what sociologists call 'marginal' ... if you turn the word marginal over, you find the word 'bilingual'- and at the same time you emphasise inclusion and richness rather than exclusion and isolation" (Scales-Trent, 1995, p114). Anzaldua speaks of the 'new mestiza', a person who learns to tolerate ambiguity and contradictions, learns to be an "Indian in Mexican culture (and), to be Mexican from an Anglo point of view. She learns to juggle cultures. She has a plural personality, she operates in a pluralistic mode - nothing is thrust out, ... nothing rejected, nothing abandoned" (1987, p79-80). Anzaldua sees this site as a fulcrum, a source of intense pain but also creative energy. This is an ideal illustration of the active agency of people in response to a particular potentially negative meta-narrative.

This emotional pain encountered at times by the person of mixed parentage must, however, also be given due recognition, together with the potentially positive aspects of their unique position. These positive and negative aspects are not necessarily mutually exclusive and it would be simplistic to think otherwise (Stephan, 1992). However, the source of this pain needs to be located firmly outside of biological determinism. Data in modern studies supports that "the difficulty encountered by the mixed race person originates externally to the individual in social structures that idealise racial purity and in which racism is institutionalised." (Bradshaw, 1992, p78). That is, while varying degrees
of marginality may be imposed by society, it is not an innate factor in the psychological composition of ethnically mixed people (Root, 1990).

An apt example can be found in Tiatia's study of young New Zealand-born Samoans in a church context. She was investigating differences and conflicts between young New Zealand-born Samoans and their Island-born elders. Her one participant who was of mixed Pakeha/Samoan descent experienced a "much deeper conflict" than any of the other participants (1998, p56). She was seen to be 'fiapalagi' (acting/wanting to be European) by the other members of her church because her family did not attend any of the distinctly Samoan activities. She was the only participant to say that she felt 'more Samoan' outside the church context than within it. Tiatia proposes that this is due to her "half-caste ethnic makeup", and simplistically explains her feelings of being an outsider in this way. However, by the participant's own explanation, her feeling was due to her family's lack of involvement in the church rather than her 'racial' makeup. I would further contend that it is not that person's ethnic makeup, but the criteria imposed on her by others (and possibly by Pakeha society although this is not discussed) that caused this "deeper conflict". Tiatia herself goes on to somewhat contradictorily quote Taule'ale'ausumai, who says that mixed parentage children:

... are very much taught the values and culture that their parents choose for them, and that may be Pakeha, or it may be Samoan, or it may be both. The choice which one's parents make determines their knowledge and facility within a particular culture (1991, pp14-15).

I will argue, however, that the influence of the family only goes part of the way towards explaining identity construction and cultural facility. More of that later.

The presumption of every person of mixed parentage having some extra 'difficulty', although likely because of the social structures named above, is not inevitable. In this debate about whether people of mixed parentage are unavoidably going to suffer some form of identity conflict both those who say it's inevitable (e.g. Stonequist, 1937; Benson, 1981) and those who say that it never occurs (e.g. Wilson, 1987) are
generalising. Even if all of those concerned are categorised a certain way by society, their reactions to this are very different. In other words, what is the meaning they attach to the racialised aspects of their environment? Katz (1996) suggests that perhaps individuals can live in a marginal space in terms of their group, but not suffer any internal conflict as a result of this. Because of this, it is important to identify factors in the family and society as well as institutionalised racism and pervasive assumptions about racial purity in order to understand the resolution of identity process (Root, 1990).

Identity and Identification

The 'pluralistic mode' of Anzaldua also rejects a person automatically being assigned to their minority ancestral group and therefore formulating an identity solely on the strength of that group (race rears its ugly head again). Hitch, commenting on White/Asian children in the UK, notes that: "On the whole it appears to be assumed that individuals will take the role connected with the ascribed status, and that attempts to take the identity of a different racial group will be seen in deviant terms ... " (1983, p122).

He goes on to say the majority of these children are socialised into and perceive themselves as being part of White culture, and therefore they experience no 'clash' of reference groups, as may those who identify with two. One option for this child is to try and 'pass' for White, with the implication being that the child is deluded. But if we understand race to be " ... not a biological fact but a social construct - and a clumsy one at that ... it is a continuing act of imagination" (Scales-Trent, 1995, p2), then the child actually is White. Zack comments on this when she says: "Received opinion holds that racial identity is a good thing to have: knowledge about one's "own people" enriches an individual's life, it's good to know what one is"(1993, p63). In other words, who one truly is, one's real 'roots', are solely connected to the minority ancestry. This is not only illogical, it is not reality for many people with ancestry from various 'racial' groups: "It is not that such persons have 'difficulty' with their black identities but that they cannot conclusively choose any one racial identity."(Zack, 1993, p165).
Unfortunately, research continues to support this notion; for example, Vaughan's (1987) study of 'Maori' children concluded that those with one Pakeha and one Maori parent were more likely to show 'preference' for the Pakeha doll used in the study than the children with two Maori parents. He called this a classic case of 'race dissonance' or 'race misidentification', arguing that: "An external world dictates that a perceptible racial cue places the child in a Polynesian category". It is interesting to note that when he retested these children as teenagers, they had all adopted a Maori identity. Far from 'proving' Vaughan's initial justification, I would contend that this is a result of racism and the societal factors described in the last chapter rather than a 'racial' inevitability. It may also be a result of the subjects now being old enough to be aware of how they are perceived by the researcher (and society), and fulfilling those expectations (Stanfield and Dennis, 1993).

Moreover, Vaughan's study is based on a research epistemology that feels compelled to designate an accurate or inaccurate identity so that the researcher can measure the attainment of a concept of similarity that matches an objective judgement of similarity (Phinney and Rotheram, 1987). Obviously this is a simplistic approach to ethnic identity issues that presumes a congruence between appearance and identity, and is clearly derived from notions of race. That is, ethnic identity is usually regarded as being determined by biological ancestry, but this is not necessarily so. It is not something which is objectively measured, but rather is subjective, unstable and situational (Stephan, 1992). As Stephan concludes, the best way to evaluate a person's ethnic identity is to ask them, that is, allow them to define it for themselves rather than interpret their response as flawed if it does not fit into the researcher's racist paradigm.

**Ethnic Identification in New Zealand**

Let us look more closely at ethnic identity in New Zealand, using the concepts of narrative identity and self-definition. We can see that here in New Zealand, the idea of people identifying themselves as being Maori (or being Pakeha) is part of meta-narratives
that allow and encourage that identification. Ihimaera speaks of the variety of contributors to his book that identify as being Maori:

... all the contributors are here because they identify themselves as being Maori ... Some of the contributors have grown up Maori because their cultural context was Maori. Others have grown up Maori because although their context was Pakeha, there was a parent or grandparent who hooked them back into Maori identity. Yet others have grown up Maori because, well, they didn't want to be Pakeha. (1998, p14-15).

Many of the contributors to this book, especially those who have grown up in stereotypically Pakeha contexts and look Pakeha, consciously construct and reconstruct their life experiences as part of a narrative which culminates and leads them to identify as being Maori. In Carter's chapter entitled "None of Us is What our Tupuna Were: When Growing Up Maori is Growing Up Pakeha", she speaks of 'discovering' that she was 'really' Maori via a number of legitimating experiences. The first was being told by her Maori teacher that it was her wairua (spirit) speaking when she felt moved while thanking some people who had hosted their class trip. Another was when a person on a marae she was visiting said: "She may be White, but she's definitely a hori" (p258). She also talks about feeling like something inside her dies when she is not recognised by other Maori as being Maori. These are all part of her narrative that authenticates her current identification as being Maori, legitimised by meta-narratives regarding the influence and importance of whakapapa. She also implicitly suggests that she cannot be both Maori and Pakeha, indicative of the meta-narratives explained in the last chapter which tend to create ethnic identities as mutually exclusive in this country.

Carter's example also illustrates the difficulty (but not impossibility) of maintaining an identity that is not recognised by others whom you are trying to identify with. I mean in no way to suggest that her identification is somehow inauthentic because of this: all identities, ethnic and otherwise are similarly constructed, but it is a good example of how the theory of narrative identity can be applied, as well as being a good New Zealand example. It also shows how individual factors and social experiences combine, and how the way in which they are given meaning by an individual influences the way that person
creates their identity. The need for her to use Maori spiritual values as part of her meta-narrative is also a result of the need to present herself as being 'authentic'.

No matter how much Pakeha blood flows through my veins there is something else ... like a karanga inside me ... or a fire burning deep within me. It is a fire lit there by my Tupuna. This fire began when my mauri brought together my tinana and my wairua. It is my mauri which called forth my potential to be Maori (p260, original emphasis).

This process is especially necessary given the inability, as she lucidly points out, of 'traditional' cultural values or blood quantum to either predict or authenticate a 'Maori identity'. This need to establish some basis for legitimacy and the totalitarian manner in which this is presented is demanded by the structure of colonialism described more fully in the last chapter. The resort to Maori traditional concepts cannot be challenged by the State because they rest on an entirely different set of values and beliefs. This in itself is therefore a method of resistance and challenge to the imposed values of colonialism. The political need for this exclusive way of presenting and constructing identity is therefore important in many contexts. However, it is important to recognise this dynamic and its influence on both identity options and anti-racist theory. I concur with Katz when he states:

I am not advocating that modern theories of development, racism and racial identity should be jettisoned in favour of post-modern theory. I believe that there are times when totalisation is absolutely necessary ... However, I believe that solidarity with anti-racism should not be equated with an uncritical and 'knee-jerk' (reaction)" (p203).

Samoan Identities

The potential for Samoan identity to encompass a similar dynamic to this absolutism is eminently conceivable. The history of colonisation and oppression by New Zealand both in Samoa and in this country provides a similar basis for identity to be framed this way. While there are major differences between Maori and Samoan history (for example, Samoans have no Treaty or tangata whenua status to call upon), the use of a cultural
paradigm that differs from the dominant Pakeha one to justify identity politics and actions is already in use. Young urban Maori 'radicals' in the 60s and 70s were told they were 'playing at being Maori' by their elders because of their militant and aggressive tactics (Greenland, 1984). Similarly, young Samoans who are more overt in their critique of oppression are seen to be going against the Fa'asamoa in which politeness and courtesy are paramount, even in situations of conflict (Field, 1991). With regard to Samoan culture and identity, it would appear from an outsider's perspective that many older, Island-born people are trying to hold onto a notion of the 'true' Fa'asamoa, and with it the notion of a 'real' Samoan:

To qualify, one must be a competent speaker of the native language, have learnt to prioritise the extended family and cultural commitments of the church, to observe the Pacific Island doctrine of respect in the presence of elders, and to have mastered an unquestioning obedience. Failure to fulfill these requirements will instinctively mean one's identity will be in question ... (Tiatia, 1998, p7).

Others, such as Tiatia herself, are accepting a less essentialised image of what it means to be Samoan in New Zealand. However, the Fa'asamoa, being such a strong, explicitly articulated meta-narrative, means that for many Samoans it functions as a basis of identity and solidarity. This is further strengthened by its inexplicable ties with the church and Christian principles (Tiatia 1998). Indeed, it was used as such in Samoa in reaction to New Zealand's harsh rule (Field, 1991), and in New Zealand as a method of survival and maintenance of morale and community in the face of oppression. As such the Fa'asamoa has a long history of politicisation. An ideal example is the rapper 'King Kapisi', who shows an old picture of the Mau on the cover of one of his albums, and expounds a number of their principles as a basis for resisting oppression and having pride in being Samoan in New Zealand in the present day. While this obviously has many useful aspects for both the person of mixed parentage and the New Zealand-born young person who wishes to reject or adapt some or all of the imperatives of the 'traditional' Fa'asamoa, this may cause some conflict and discontinuity with older family members (Tiatia 1998). The conflictual and oppressive context within which Samoans live in New Zealand means that attempts to modify traditional culture are perceived as a threat to
community and culture, and with good reason. After all, colonialism continues in the form of mainstream, Pakeha culture and values being held up as normal, ordinary and desirable. This context must impact on identity outcomes for people of mixed Pakeha-Samoan parentage.

Identity Options

So, realistically, what are the likely identity options for people of mixed parentage? They can identify either solely with one aspect of their ancestry, both, or neither, or adopt all of these identity options in different situations. Root (1996) identifies four ways for people of mixed parentage people to negotiate/construct racial borders: 1. Both feet in both camps; 2. Practising 'situational ethnicity'; 3. Border identity; 4. Locating in one camp for an extended period. The choice taken is dependent on each person's experiences and social location, that is, a combination of individual and social factors: both autonomous and automaton, and how one's narrative is constructed. I will go on to explore some of these ways of constructing identity.

Neither

Zack proposes a new ethnic identity 'category' altogether of 'mixed race', as is gaining some salience in Britain. Mel B, the Spice Girl, was interviewed last year on "Black Britain", a news show covering items of interest to the African-Caribbean and African peoples of Britain. She was asked "What's it like to be the only Black member of the Spice Girls?" She replied in a manner innocent of the political minefield she was about to enter: "I'm not Black, I'm mixed race ... I don't see myself as Black or White." She went on to explain that this was to be able to acknowledge the contributions of both her parents. Needless to say the interviewer was not impressed. Zack qualifies her suggestion of this kind of 'new category' by saying that this right to an appropriate identity is only inasmuch as anyone can base an identity on 'race'. "If races do not exist, then mixed races do not exist either ... But of course people exist who designate themselves and others in these ways." (Zack, 1993, p70).
The problem of an identity based on 'mixed race', however, is that not only would these people then have few role models either within their families or in wider society, but a new category may just become new grounds for stereotypes and racism (Zack, 1993, Katz, 1996). Moreover, in an environment of colonial subjugation and oppression, it may be used to divide 'mixed race' people from people who identify solely with a minority group. An example of this can be seen in South Africa, where 'Coloured' people were kept separate for years from Blacks both geographically and socially with the express purpose of 'divide and rule'. Asserting a 'mixed race' identity when the two groups are separated socioeconomically and therefore by perceived status is even more difficult, as opposition from both groups is likely to be stronger than if the two groups are not separated thus (Spickard, 1992). However, the strength of shared experience and increasing ability to be able to assert this kind of identity may make this viable for some.

The other issue with regard to a separate 'mixed race' identity is that when the term 'mixed race' is used in Britain, it is referring to those of Black-White ancestry, regardless of where the Black and White parents are from (Jamaican/Irish? Nigerian/Polish?), and is not used to refer to those who are White/Asian, or Black/Asian, etc. Because of this, and because of the fatally flawed definition of race to begin with, how much 'shared experience' actually is there? Harre (1966) noted the lack of a tendency of a special 'mixed race' group to develop here in New Zealand in his study of Maori/Pakeha families. The construction of the politics of Maori and Pacific Island identities makes this impossible and undesirable for many.

**Racelessness?**

The other option available in asserting an identity that is based on neither heritage group is an attitude of 'antirace' or 'racelessness'. Zack contends that this could be a valid option for those who choose to opt out of the either/or dichotomy. However, this ignores structural imperatives that do not allow people the privileges of being able to identify as 'raceless', unless they are White (or perceived as White). Indeed, Twine (1997) uses childhood feelings of racelessness as an indicator of a White identity under certain
conditions (that is, African-ancestry girls growing up in a middle class, mostly White environment). She justifies this by saying that those who are not White usually become aware of a feeling of 'difference' fairly early in life. In the USA, this has been observed at around age four and even younger, and is possibly because of the higher salience of race in the lives of Black children than in the lives of White children (Katz, 1996; Wilson, 1987). The importance of location and social environments cannot be underestimated. The difference in meanings attached to both ethnicity and identity can be vast depending on what groups are involved, and the specific class and political location of those concerned. Once again, generalisations are difficult.

**One Parent Only**

Both pluralist and assimilationist writers have argued that mixed heritage people are likely to identify solely with one group (Stephan, 1992). In common practice, an identity based on one parent/ethnic group has been demanded historically for many people of 'mixed race':

Racism is so deeply embedded in our consciousness that we don't often realise that society asks us, on a regular basis, to reject part of our family when we are required to take sides in this tragic war-game of race and color. (Scales-Trent, 1995, p62).

Because of the prevalence of racism and the 'law of hypodescence' (whereby a child with kinship ties to two ethnic groups is automatically assigned to the subordinate group), this is usually based solely on one's minority ancestry. Familial and class issues also impact on this (Twine, 1997; Root, 1992). For example, if a child is raised exclusively by one parent or another, this may have an impact on how that person attaches an 'ethnicised' or 'racialised' meaning to their life events. The 'racialisation' of something can be described as "when ... interactions and behaviours are attributed to race rather than being personalised." (Katz, 1996, p91). In families where this happens, the potential is for aspects of the self or ways of being to become racialised. This in turn will impact on how one's identity is created. Class and social position will interact with this created identity
and shape it further. To base an identity on one parent only may be even more likely in an area largely populated by people from the same ethnic group as the parent one lives with.

If the child lives with both parents, an ethnic identity constructed solely on the ethnic group of one parent and taken to the extreme of complete denial of the other parent and heritage may have negative consequences and create tension for both the individual and the family (Pinderhughes, 1995). Another possibility, especially if one appears White and has lived in a mostly White environment, is to identify as White. This has historically been labelled as 'passing' in the USA, but this is illogical. The whole notion is based on White fears of 'infiltration' by those who, according to 'racial' (racist) definitions, are not 'really' White. This fear of loss of exclusive White privilege was historically heightened in the colonial environment, as can be seen by the previous discussion of aspects of Samoan history. With these legitimacy tests from both sides can often come a feeling of effort to be accepted in both groups: "Sometimes I feel like I'm Black, passing for White, sometimes I feel like I'm White, passing for Black" (Scales-Trent, 1995, p14).

Increasingly, people of mixed ancestry are beginning to reject essentialist notions that necessarily direct them to be 'in between', and instead are claiming aspects of both ethnic groups as their own. In Tizard and Phoenix's (1993) study of young Londoners, they found that only some subscribed to 'one drop thinking', but many expressed themselves differently in different contexts, including in ways that reflected class and gender rather than 'race'. Many rejected identities imposed on them by others, including their parents. They found that half of all mixed parentage young people at some time in their lives wished they were a different colour, but so had a significant proportion of Black and White teenagers also studied.

Both

What is becoming more acceptable and recognised as an option is to identify with both cultures, heritages and parents, using aspects of both depending on the situation.
This way of dealing with different demands is becoming more positively viewed as a normal and healthy occurrence. This is due to the fact that it is becoming more common to have mixed ancestry, and with the spread of post-modern globalism and liberal ideals in the Western world, there is more emphasis on people being able to define themselves as they wish, and as reflects their particular backgrounds and experiences (Katz, 1996; Phoenix and Owen, 1996; Department of Statistics, 1997). The recognition of eurocentric tendencies to define other people groups according to culturally defined criteria (that is, according to European culture) is also impacting on this. To identify with aspects of both or all groups emphasises the unique position occupied by 'mixed race' people. This 'situational ethnicity' has been observed in both minority and mixed parentage people, and must also occur in White people who are exposed to minority cultures. After all, even in oppressive structures such as colonisation, it is not only the minority culture that is influenced by the majority, the influence is also reciprocated in some ways.

There is increasing data to support normal, contextual changes in culture, for example amongst college students in New Mexico and Hawaii (Stephan, 1992, Bradshaw, 1992, Johnson, 1992). Indeed, in Hawaii, where it is the norm to be of mixed 'race', many students identified not only with their ancestral groups, but also with groups and cultures they had no ancestral ties to but had been exposed to via friends and family (Stephan, 1992). Others remark that in Hawaii, race has less influence over identity and acceptance than does whether one qualifies as being 'local' or not (Johnson, 1992). This reminds us of the salience in some contexts of identities based on factors other than ethnicity, as people reject identities imposed upon them and are influenced by the global milieu.

As cultures and their connection with race becomes more tenuous, people are both being exposed to and choosing to adopt values and opinions from cultures traditionally associated with a particular ethnicity or 'race' that may not be part of their own ancestry. Moreover, as values or practices traditionally associated with a race or culture become 'deracialised', people adopt them without necessarily perceiving them as an indicator of a racialised identity. An example of this would be the relatively widespread exposure to
'new age' beliefs traditionally associated with Eastern mysticism and by extension, Indian and other Asian cultures.

Conclusion

In this chapter I began with describing theories of identity and how a structural approach is rapidly becoming outmoded by social realities. These realities are more convincingly explained by postmodern paradigms that emphasise the differing 'truths' of time, place and context. The resulting theories emphasise the social interactive, culturally specific, non-lineal and non-universal ways in which identity develops. While there is much debate about the extent of the impact of social context on identity, the ideas of narrative theory help to clarify this issue by describing how meta-narratives and individual narratives combine to influence identities and behaviours. This way of conceptualising identity relies heavily on the power of social contexts, but allows for people to retain a 'relative autonomy'.

Ethnic identity theories also explore the nature of differing social contexts, but tend to present ethnic identities as discrete and exclusive identities. It can be seen as a result of this that the 'marginal man' theories served to further pathologise people of mixed parentage, especially when presented as a biological rather than socially created problem. More recent views of marginality acknowledge it does exist to some extent for some people of mixed parentage, but that as well as causing emotional pain, it can also have positive effects. Therefore his concept in modern discussions is used to explain impositions made by society that continue to marginalise.

In New Zealand it can be seen that the polarisation of ethnic identity options as a result of factors described in the last chapter has a direct result on ethnic identities. That is, the meta-narrative has a powerful effect on the narratives of individuals. I finished the chapter with a more objective description of the options for identity for those of mixed parentage, including basing an identity on either one aspect of their ancestry, both or neither. In reality, people often have a number of identities that may or may not be
However, what are the factors which help to decide which of these options will be chosen? This is what I will explore in my next chapter.
Chapter Five: Influential Factors in Identity Outcomes

So, what are the factors at the micro (individual) and meso (organisation/institution) levels that may influence the outcome in identity formation and resolution? How are these factors interpreted by the individual and what influences these interpretations? The consideration of a number of factors implicitly suggests that "all theories which view racial identity and its development as an essentially unidimensional process are arguable" (Katz, 1996, p47). Further, given the wide variance in the active participation of individuals in the way meaning is assigned to life events, one can never hope to cover all factors for all individuals. However, the literature points to a number of factors that acquire significant meaning in Western settings. These are in addition to the macro factors and cultural specifics already explored. I will outline these more conventionally identified factors and, where appropriate, propose some hypotheses/research questions as to how they may affect and be given meaning by my chosen population, people of Samoan/Pakeha parentage living in the South Island of New Zealand. I will return to these factors and questions in the discussion of my research data.

The first factor involved must be the historical and social context within which the person is living, in this case, in Aotearoa New Zealand in the 1990s, and more specifically, Te Wai Pounamu the South Island. New Zealand in turn exists in the context of increasing globalisation and an international 'culture of modernity' (Stephens, 1995). These factors have been discussed in the previous chapters. The micro and meso factors that have been found to be influential are: parental attitudes and parenting styles, school, community/neighbourhood, personality, role models, class, cultural exposure, physical appearance, language, names, status of the ethnic groups involved, psychological identification with a particular parent and acceptance of the individual by their heritage groups (Pinderhughes, 1995; Stephan, 1992; Twine, 1997; Kich, 1992; Harre 1966). Finally the specific content of the group's norms affects the child's understanding of ethnicity and how it impacts on the child (Phinney and Rotheram, 1987). All of these variables combine to influence the dynamic, ecologically based process of identity
development that changes across time, place and context (Miller, 1992). Moreover, I realise I am also suggesting some kind of synthesis between psychological and social theories, which cannot be easily amalgamated. However, as Katz explains:

These explanations (psychological and sociological) are complementary and not contradictory, but they can never be simultaneous ... even if it is, however, impossible to create one composite 'psychosocial' theory, can one dovetail these theories to provide a more holistic theoretical background for the study of ... personal and racial identity? (1996, p42).

The answer must be yes.

Parenting Attitudes and Parental Styles

In many studies of ethnic identity, parenting styles are not included as a variable, despite studies of global identity pointing heavily and sometimes exclusively to their influence, as have studies of how racial prejudice in children develops (Wilson, 1987; Katz, 1996). Parenting must be considered as important, as it has many influences on later beliefs and behaviour. While the main parental influence has traditionally been presumed to be the mother, this is hotly contested by many (Clancier and Kalmanovitch, 1987). Katz (1996) found that the father's input for children of mixed parentage was just as influential on the child's early development and identity as the mother's, despite Katz's original premises based on psychoanalytic and structural developmental theory that suggested otherwise.

Parenting in a Racist Society

Parental attitudes towards the identity of their children reflect their own ideological views and social circle (Benson, 1981). Benson, in a British study of 'mixed' families, found that children who showed signs of being emotionally disturbed were those whose parents held racist views, or were ambivalent about being in a 'mixed' relationship (1981). Mixed parentage children are likely to be perceived as Black or 'other'. "At home I see my mom and dad and I'm part of both of them. But when I walk outside that door, it's like
my mom doesn't exist. I'm just Black. Everyone treats me that way." (Spickard, 1989, pp360-361). In order to be able to effectively parent children who are going to be perceived like this, White parents in particular need to examine their own racism:

It is crucial for White parents of Black children to be aware of their own racism and engage in a conscious, continuous effort to eliminate their personal racism. Without this introspection, the White parent may consciously or unconsciously express racist attitudes to his or her Black child as well as define their Black child's behaviour according to racial myths and stereotypes (Hill and Peltzer, 1982, p564).

I take issue with this author's uncritical acceptance of these children being 'Black'; the political and social motivation as to why these children are uncritically labelled thus has been outlined in the previous chapters. However, the need for an understanding of racism and the powerful system which has denigrated a child's minority heritage is imperative (Pinderhughes, 1995). Ideally this awareness would then naturally extend to helping their children recognise and deal with racism with all its subtleties, something White people are often unaware of (Twine, 1997; Miller and Miller, 1990). The role of racism in wider society also means that unless some form of intervention occurs children with two minority parents often show preference for White culture in very early childhood due to being socialised in a White context (Spencer, 1987). This necessitates "compensatory cultural emphasis on the strengths of the castelike minority group by significant others" (p108). Often parents can fill this role, which due to racism is also important for the mixed parentage child.

**Negotiating Difference in the Family**

Parents who take the extreme measure of pressuring their children to identify one way or the other, however, can produce ambivalence and stop the necessary exploration of both cultures by imposing rigid boundaries (Root, 1992). The tensions involved in negotiating difference within the family can be difficult. For the minority parent, Katz found that:
The image of their child choosing their own culture of origin seemed sometimes to involve a fantasy which they harboured of returning to their own roots, but which they themselves could not do because of the life choices they had made or their disruptive experiences of migration (1996, p164).

This process involved idealising and essentialising the minority parent's own culture of origin, despite the fact that the culture in their own country had also changed and evolved. If this is combined with a siege mentality, then children can come under harsh pressure to conform. This can be confusing for the child, who is not only different from the mainstream but from both of their parents (Pinderhughes, 1995). However, just how much difference the child actually experiences and feels from their parents needs further study, as does whether this applies only to the mixed parentage child, to minority children, or children in general. Certainly the negotiation of being different from one's parents is performed by all children regardless of their ethnicity, and care needs to be taken that this discussion does not serve to pathologise a normal part of growing up for all children for those of mixed parentage. However, for these children the specific issue of ethnicity should be highlighted. So the child's experience of tension and understanding of difference can in some ways be coloured by both parents' essentialisation of ethnicity, if we understand this to include the White parent's potential racism and the minority group parent's potential idealism.

**White Parents: Inadequate?**

Some assert that because of the influence of racism and different cultural paradigms White parents can never appropriately parent children who will be perceived as Black. This assertion is reductionistic in the extreme. Some go so far as to say that any kind of bonding between White parents and their non-White children is nothing more than a kind of 'sham bonding' which falls into stark relief when the child becomes aware of race and colour (Harris, 1991). It is an easy link to make to see how this way of thinking stems from a popular simplistic 'multicultural' perspective that valorises and essentialises cultural differences to the point of obscuring similarities. Numerous recent studies have shown that both adopted and natural 'Black' children with White parents suffer no higher
rates of mental illness or low self-esteem than other children, problems which are often linked to parental care (Bagley, 1993; Tizard and Phoenix, 1989). Others question the simple inversion of pathological imagery that asserts the strength and durability of the Black family, and the crudity that this model implies of how racial identity is conceived and transmitted (Gilroy, 1992; Katz, 1996).

Further, Tizard and Phoenix (1989, 1993), in their study of London young people, found that few had discussed race or racism with their parents. They also found that there was no significant pathology amongst the mixed parentage young people in their sample. They extend their challenge to the contention that racism must be discussed by the family by examining the underlying assumption that those who are perceived as being 'Black' must attach an explicit positive salience to that one particular aspect of themselves: "Self-esteem and mental health do not appear to necessarily be tied to attitudes to race ... The belief that there is a 'positive Black identity' which must be acquired by Black children is over-simplified and presumptive" (1989, p245). Cross, after his expansive research on Black identity, similarly concludes that: "... thus Black identity is not predictive of personal happiness, but it is predictive of a particular cultural-political propensity of worldview" (Cross 1987).

Katz (1996) suggests this discussing of race within the family may be a class difference, as in his more middle class sample, issues of race and racism were often discussed. The point, however, is that in both cases there was no significant level of pathology as one would expect if White parents were so innately inadequate by the mere factor of their race. Even in families that did not explicitly help their children deal with racism, the children showed no marked damage or conflict. Obviously, however, helping one's child deal with racism would be optimal, as would engendering positive feelings in one's child that necessarily include ethnicity. To swing to the other extreme and instead adopt a completely humanistic approach (i.e. 'we're all just people'), can leave a child "unprepared to handle institutionalised constraints that result from racial group membership ... this may actually exacerbate children's experience of risk" (Spencer 1987, p 106). Moreover, the mixed family may be more likely to adopt this stance, especially,
as previously mentioned, if the family is lower or working class (Johnson, 1992; Tizard and Phoenix, 1993). Therefore, discussing race and racism within the family, while it may be helpful, is not necessarily essential in providing identity options or protection from racism.

**Public and Private Divide**

Sometimes people may construct their identity in a multicultural way at home, and in a monocultural way outside the home. While some view this as a transitory, temporary measure on the path to a fully 'integrated' identity that is constant in both settings, others see this as a normal and creative aspect of functioning (Pinderhughes, 1995; Root, 1996). It also allows for the fact that historically people have been forced to 'choose one' in public arenas, but may well have always acted differently in the private domain.

One way of exploring and conceptualising this area of potential tension for children is by looking at the 'three realms of negotiation': values, expectations and rituals (Boykin, 1985). Boykin proposed that these realms are fairly consistent for the White child both internally and externally to the family, but for the Black child, there are major inconsistencies in these areas. Johnson (1992) comments that for the mixed parentage child, these realms become even more complex, with differing expectations potentially existing not only across the public/private boundaries, but also within the home environment. However, the level of tension in these areas is difficult to ascertain, as the individual circumstances of the family are largely unknown. Perhaps the White partner has basically adopted the minority member's culture, or vice versa. Perhaps the parents have negotiated a consistent parenting style that includes aspects of both cultures, or in fact hold similar basic values that are in common with their cultures of origin. Moreover, even in a home in which both parents come from the dominant ethnic group, there may be major inconsistencies between the internal and external culture, dependent on factors such as religion, sexual orientation, nationality or political beliefs.
All Heritages Positively Valued

Having both or all sides of a child's heritage accepted and presented as having positive value is important in helping a child attain a healthy regard for themselves and others. The availability of the minority parent and group is critical in this, as it is less likely that this can be accessed elsewhere (as the majority culture can be) (Pinderhughes, 1995). However, this must be viewed in the context of each individual. While it may be optimum (as for any child) to have both parents available, those who take this to the extreme by saying that this is necessary for the child to develop a 'healthy' identity must be challenged. It is important to recognise once again that children do not necessarily have to adopt an identity that is congruent with their ancestry. Moreover, who decides what is congruent? Once again it is easy to slip into essentialist and even racist theorising if we say that a child must identify equally with both ethnic groups in order to be 'healthy'. The diverse and specific nature of each person's experience means that we must resist making absolute generalisations. A child may strongly identify with a particular parent for whatever reason, be it gender, a common interest, similar appearance, the fact that person cares for them more often, or factors outside the family.

However, the potentially positive role of the minority parent in providing access to the minority group is threatened by divorce (Jacobs, 1992). The attaching of positive meaning to ethnicity can also be threatened if there is violence or abuse in the home that becomes 'racialised', that is, extended beyond the individual perpetrator to encompass their ethnic group. This is obviously further exacerbated if that group is held in low regard by society and by racism, which may encourage this kind of racialisation. This may be more likely to occur if the perpetrator is from the minority group involved, as their culture is more 'visible' and essentialised in a context that portrays the dominant culture as being 'normal' and basically pluralistic.
In New Zealand ...

For the Samoan-Pakeha family, there is the potential for conflicting expectations for the children. Essentialised Samoan values such as loyalty to the family, the preference of the group over the individual, emphasis on academic achievement, harsh discipline, generosity to extended family, and the expectation that children take on many household chores are all in conflict with many essentialised Pakeha values. While the negotiation of these values by the partners involved could be the subject of another thesis, the children's perceptions of these negotiations and what meaning they give to the outcomes is of more relevance to this text.

Another consideration in these negotiations, whether articulated or not, is that of gender. While statistically it is impossible to verify, it would appear that is much more likely for this kind of partnership to be between a Pakeha woman and Samoan man. Given the gender roles and sexism found in both cultures, and particularly entrenched in Samoan culture, it could be hypothesised that the home would predominantly operate along Samoan lines. However, this could in fact be offset if it is the mother who performs most of the childcare, thus exposing the children to more Pakeha values and culture.

Community and Class

Iwisaki Mass (1992) found in her study of mixed Japanese/White Americans that location and the ethnic make-up of the surrounding community had a big effect on the outcome for individuals, with those living in predominantly White areas experiencing more racism than those in more ethnically diverse areas. However, this was similar to her control group of Japanese Americans. Twine (1997) found in her study of African-ancestry girls growing up in White neighbourhoods, that they experienced little or no racism until they reached their teenage years.

Here in New Zealand, due to class, kinship and political economy issues, the concentration of Samoans in various locations is marked. As a minority group in New
Zealand, the Samoan population is concentrated around the urban centres of the North Island, and is extremely concentrated in several working class neighbourhoods within those cities. This means that many other people of all backgrounds living in those neighbourhoods are likely to gain exposure to Samoan and other minority cultures. For the mixed Samoan/Pakeha child, if they are living in these areas, this means that they are more likely to gain exposure to and positive reinforcement of Samoan culture. This is due to the likelihood of being in more contact with other Samoans and the Fa'asamoa, having more Samoans at their schools and in their neighbourhoods, and possibly of being closer geographically to the Samoan side of the family. Moreover, the linking of class with ethnicity could strengthen this identification, especially because the boundaries between ethnic groups of generally differing economic status are more rigid than those between groups of equal status, therefore making a Samoan identity the only feasible option (Spickard, 1992). Benson found that in Brixton, a working class largely Afro-Caribbean area of London, mixed Black and White youth were perceived by their peers as "just another brother ... " (1981, p134). Similarly, those growing up in a White, middle class context would presumably be more influenced by White culture, as were the subjects of Twine's study (1997).

The potential benefits of this cultural exposure, however, may be negated if poverty and hardship are experienced, and this hardship is then equated with being Samoan due to the concentration of Samoans in lower socioeconomic groups. If the same child growing up in a majority White community experiences much racism, this may be just as influential in reinforcing a Samoan identity. However, the potential for this identity to gain negative salience is high in this context. In the South Island, with the percentage of all non-Pakeha groups being well below the national average, the mixed parentage child is living in a majority White context which must have an impact on their identity.

School

Schools become a microcosm of the surrounding neighbourhood and community, especially at the primary level, where they are geographically more localised. The mixed
parentage child is most likely to benefit from a school environment that does not stigmatise or marginalise them in any way. A school that actively promotes an understanding of all relevant cultures and whose pupils come from a wide range of ethnic backgrounds is most likely to provide this kind of reinforcement, and once again is less likely in the South Island context. However, this idealistic view of the possible role of schools is hampered by the dominance and preeminence of Pakeha values and culture, meaning that a 'multicultural approach' can only ever be at a tokenistic level without momentous changes in the balance of power in this country. The school becomes a manifestation of the dominant culture of the larger society, and as such reflects the values, expectation and attitudes of that culture (Bronfenbrenner 1979; Bourdieu, 1977).

Bourdieu's reproduction theory proposed that the school setting is one context which seeks to reproduce the culture of the dominant society by valuing certain kinds of knowledge and understandings, in New Zealand's case, that of Pakeha middle class culture. The children who enter school already holding these values possess what he described as 'cultural capital', therefore passing more easily through the education system, better armed to 'succeed' within it. Those who do not are therefore less likely to succeed in this way. They do not have the necessary 'habitus' (the way in which culture is encompassed in a person). In this way, the inequalities of society are automatically reproduced.

Tiatia (1998) points out that for the Samoan young person to gain this kind of cultural capital, they must to some extent assimilate the values of the dominant culture in order to do so, thus developing a 'Westernised self'. In fact, they are not only 'pulled' by the dominant culture to do so, but also 'pushed' by their own families to do so in order to achieve academically. However, if they do this to the extent where they also adopt the Pakeha values of thinking critically, and from an individualistic viewpoint, they are labelled as 'fiapalagi' (wanting to be Pakeha or acting Pakeha) by their elders and reprimanded accordingly (Tiatia 1998). This is because this kind of challenging is seen to be in conflict with the Fa'asamoan concept of fa'aaloalo (respect), that means you should unquestioningly obey one's elders (Tiatia, 1998). For the mixed Samoan/Pakeha child,
the cultures of home and school are not so clearly delineated. The children are likely to be exposed from an early age to at least some aspects of Pakeha culture in their home environments. This is due to the prevalence in both cultures of gender roles in terms of childcare, given that the woman is more likely to be the Pakeha partner, it could be concluded that the child is therefore likely to have gained more of this 'capital' than children with two Samoan parents. They learn from an earlier age what the 'rules' are according to Pakeha thinking, therefore suffering less of the 'clash of codes' that other Samoan children may encounter (Tiatia, 1998). Or it may be that they learn from an earlier age how to 'switch codes', that is, practise 'situational ethnicity' according to the context. However, the fact that they are also likely to be working class may negate this to some extent, as the maximum capital is gained from being not only Pakeha, but also middle class.

**Personality**

The variation in outcomes of identity even for children from the same family points to the different ways in which events and actions are perceived by the individual, as well as the influence of factors outside the family (Harre, 1966). This individual agency is commonly referred to as personality, and of course, as discussed earlier, is mired in the social/personal and nature/nurture debates. The different ways people present themselves can affect how they are perceived in ethnic terms. If a child also makes this equation via this being reinforced by others, then it can logically be deduced that that child is more likely to identify that way of being with a particular culture. For example, if someone has a natural inclination towards shyness, and shyness is equated with a particular culture, then that person is more likely to identify themself and be identified by others as belonging to that group (Harre, 1966).

Katz (1996) found that in families where interactions and behaviours are often racialised, there is a greater potential for aspects of the self or ways of being (that is, personality) to also become racialised. For example, Harre found that the more outgoing children in his study of Maori-Pakeha marriages were more likely to make the most of
opportunities for contact with Maori children. If we apply Katz's proposition, not only is the outgoing child likely to be perceived as more 'Maori' than their more reticent siblings, but they may equate their 'outgoing self' with being or feeling Maori. If we add 'situational ethnicity' to the equation, it could be concluded that they don't necessarily always feel or identify as being Maori, but when they are being outgoing they do. For this child, their narrative interprets a particular correlation between being 'outgoing' and being Maori.

**Role Models**

Role models are becoming more accessible due to the increasing numbers of people who are publically asserting a 'mixed race' identity, and refusing to allow themselves to be narrowly categorised (Spickard, 1992). However, this has yet to take place to any extent in New Zealand, despite the growing numbers of high profile people who have mixed Samoan/Pakeha parentage, for example Michael Jones, Josh Kronfeld and Oscar Kightley. It is interesting that people like this in New Zealand are often 'claimed', either by their own admission or more likely by others, as being Samoan. Because they have succeeded in areas held in high regard by many Samoans (sport and education), they, together with their 'full' Samoan peers, tend to get put on a pedestal by the Samoan community.

This phenomenon has several dynamics. Firstly, the binary nature of cultural politics means that a 'mixed' identification by others is not considered. This dynamic is reinforced by the nature of oppression that means that it is a struggle against adversity to succeed in these ways for many Samoans. Secondly, the emphasis on kinship ties and group connections overrides for many Samoans any simplistic notions of 'race'. The success of the individual is seen to be the success of the whole group, first family and then Samoans in general (Taule'ale'ausumai, 1990). The role of status in the Fa'asamoa and the fact that status can now be gained by these non-traditional avenues means that others are eager to make their connections to those who do so well known (Kallen, 1982). The negative side of the increasing numbers of Samoans, mixed or otherwise, moving
into high-profile roles is that young Samoans come under increasing pressure from their elders to do likewise, when in fact structural imperatives that prevent them in the main from doing so remain strong (Macpherson, 1996).

Cultural Exposure

No one in this country can escape exposure to the dominant, largely Pakeha culture. For Samoan/Pakeha children, access to Samoan relations and community groups is therefore important in order to maintain the 'compensatory cultural emphasis' necessary in a context of dominant-subordinate relations. Macpherson (1974) found that the risk of 'loss of identity' (it is unclear as to exactly what he means by this) was great for second generation Samoans if they were cut off from their 'aiga; this can also be applied to those of mixed parentage.

However, while exposure to the minority culture may be desirable due to this context of racism and oppression, it is neither necessary nor sufficient to ensure a minority identity (Spickard, 1992). This is significant because it moves us away from a simplistic single-factor cause and effect relationship. Indeed, 'subcultural theories', those which define minority ethnic groups in terms of their cultural 'habits' (i.e. kinship, myths, folklore etc.), do not take into account economic, sociopolitical and ideological relationships (Muga, 1984). Therefore it is not surprising that identity in the same way cannot be predicted solely by the amount of one's exposure to these 'habits'. Katz (1996), argues against the commonly held view of simple generational transmission of cultural values or ethnic identity, especially in the current context of globalisation and cosmopolitan urban lifestyles. Tiatia (1998) notes that for New Zealand-born Samoans, there is a tension between the expectations of the Fa'asamoa at home and in church, and exposure to the dominant Pakeha culture via the education and work contexts. This exposure, in her view, has resulted in a separate identity for New Zealand-born Samoans that is different from both their Island born counterparts and Pakeha New Zealand peers. similarly, the values of Pakeha are also changing as the generations progress, with
increasingly liberal and diverse values emerging. The impact of feminism has been a particular force in this area in the last thirty years.

Physical Appearance

How a person looks is critical to both how they are initially perceived in terms of their ethnicity and then how their behaviour is interpreted. Interpretations by others are of course dictated by their own experiences, narratives and meta-narratives, allowing for a wide range of possibilities. However, due to racism and the salience of ethnicity in our country, some generalisations can be made. The physical appearance of those whose ethnicity is visually ambiguous (according to racist, commonly applied stereotypes) is often subject to questioning about 'what' they are. This is a kind of 'racial accountability' that is imposed externally, and speaks profoundly about others' fears of not being able to 'identify' (categorise, label, stereotype, objectify, know) those so questioned, and of the meta-narrative that demands people be categorised 'racially' (Bradshaw, 1992).

The problems associated with this dynamic are exacerbated by the fact that for the mixed parentage person, their phenotype and identity may not 'coincide'. This can lead to a sense of 'otherness', feelings of being an outsider, and can increase external focus (Bradshaw, 1992). Resolution of this difficulty to the point where one no longer feels defensive but instead gains an understanding of others' ignorance with a view to educating them is a sign of stable identity resolution (Pinderhughes, 1995). However, this implies that it is the responsibility of the person who is 'misidentified' to educate others in this way, and therefore removes responsibility from the other person and society at large to challenge the meta-narratives of race and its meaning. This burden of responsibility to 'explain themselves' can be seen as a demand by those in the dominant culture on those who are perceived as 'other', so that they can be known and their perceived threat lessened.
The ability of the mixed parentage person to separate others' expectations of them from their own perceptions of who they are is also important. Once this is accomplished, Kich (1992) explains:

They more clearly understand the confusion of the other person, essentially the confusion of the rest of society about race and ethnicity. They are less dependent on the other person's recognition or confirmation and rely more on their own integration of a self... (p315).

However, this presumes a separation of identity from the context within which it is created, and brings us back to the 'autonomous vs automaton' conundrum.

For those who appear White, the issues can become even more complex. Scales-Trent (1995) speaks of being 'inside' both Black and White communities, and needing to strongly assert her kinship ties with Blacks. This was not an issue for her as a child, where because of her familial ties, Jim Crow segregation, and the recognition by those in her town that she was Black, she always identified as being Black. It was not until she moved away that she realised her ambiguous position when others began to mistake her for White (I speak of 'mistake' because she had been completely socialised via the factors above to identify only as Black, rather than because of ancestry.) While 'passing' for White in this country does not take on quite the same significance as it does in the USA, those who look Pakeha here are likely to escape everyday racism and be accorded privileges based on that. Depending on other factors, this may be influential in shaping a predominantly White identity, especially when combined with legitimacy tests by minority peers whose testing may be more stringent than for those who look more like the minority group. As artist Nanette Lela'au said on "Tagata Pasifika" (14.2.99), her current exhibition is about her 'identity crisis' (her words) about being a "Pacific Islander with a White face". Another issue for this country is that those who are mixed Samoan/Pakeha are likely to be mistaken for being Maori, with various accompanying political and personal implications.
Language

The issue of language is a complex one, with theorists being contentious as to its significance in shaping ethnic identity. Some, such as Rosenthal (1987), say that language is a strong binding factor of self-definition if relied upon to define one's group from others. Hitch (1983) found that for the Asian/White child in the UK, the child was effectively excluded from Asian culture by their inability to speak the relevant language. Williams (1992), in studying Japanese/Americans living in Japan, found that proficiency in both languages was an important factor in group identity, and that none of the young people interviewed would consider a mate who could not speak both languages. These young people felt most comfortable speaking a mixture of both languages. Conversely, Iijima Hall's (1992) study of Black/Japanese people in the USA found that proficiency in either Japanese or African-American style English was not necessarily important for identity, due to many Japanese Americans not being able to speak much Japanese, and many African-Americans not speaking 'Black English', but still having a strong Black identity. The variation in countries and 'mixes' seems to provide the answer to this, as does Rosenthal's qualifier: if the combination of specific historical, social and cultural factors means that language is relied upon to define a group and its boundaries, then it will be significant in identity formation. In countries like the USA where English is predominant, the knowledge of the minority language is not as important.

Samoan Language

However, in some contexts, “shared ways of speaking are basic to the formation of social relationships, and ... access to social networks and participation in social activities ... (and are) symbolic of shared background knowledge, of shared culture” (Heller, 1987, p187). This also speaks of not only completely different languages, but of variations of one language tied for example to class or region. For Samoan/Pakeha people in New Zealand, the significance of this factor may vary according to the situation. In formal Samoan situations where Samoan is likely to be used exclusively, such as at church, they will not be included due to their high chance of not being able to speak Samoan.
(Pilkington, 1990). As Fanon says: "A man who has a language consequently possesses the world expressed and implied by that language" (1967, p.18). Samoan/Pakeha are likely to be therefore excluded and dispossessed of the more traditional, formal, aspects of the Samoan world and the Fa'asamoa. However, this situation is not dissimilar to that of New Zealand-born Samoans, who are also unlikely to be proficient in formal Samoan (Macpherson, 1996; Anae, 1995; Tiatia, 1998). Due to their parents commonly speaking Samoan at least to each other, however, their understanding is likely to be greater than for those of mixed parentage (Pilkington, 1990). Language is one area that is still demanded by many, especially Island-born older people, as the sign of a 'real' Samoan (see previous chapter). Perhaps, similarly to Maori identity, the swing towards more rigorously demanded 'signs' of authenticity will give way to more flexible notions that recognise the dynamic of cultural exchange and impact (Tiatia 1998; Ihimaera, 1998). The opposing pressure to this, however, comes from the politicisation of ethnic identities that relies on and encourages increased proficiency in the minority language as a symbol of resistance to assimilation.

In less formal settings such as school and home, Samoan/Pakeha are also likely to have little exposure to the Samoan language. This situation is also similar to New Zealand-born Samoans. Although they hear more Samoan at home and begin life with a basically high level of Samoan fluency, they rapidly lose it in middle childhood and adolescence (Pilkington, 1990). This means that while New Zealand-born Samoans may have slightly more knowledge of Samoan, this is not a significant excluding factor amongst young people, especially when even between young people who can understand Samoan, English is the usual language of communication. This is an aspect of the diversifying form of what it means to be Samoan in New Zealand (Macpherson, 1991). It is this diversification which will force the recognition of less-essentialised definitions of what it means to 'be Samoan', as opposed to the definitions which are clung to by many older Samoans.

However, more recently the increasing politicisation of Samoan ethnicity and a swing towards more conscious attempts at both language and culture maintenance have
occurred, for example with the creation of A'onga Amata, Samoan language pre-schools. This is in contrast to the early Samoan migrants' attitudes, where proficiency in English was desired by parents and encouraged in children, and seen as a sign of status and education (Macpherson, 1974). While Pilkington found that Samoan/Pakeha families were less likely to use these deliberate services aimed at language maintenance, some did to a greater extent than families where both parents were Samoan.

**English Language Forms**

Another aspect of language as a vehicle of identity definition is the form of English spoken, which can also be used as a 'symbol of shared background and culture'. One form of this is what has been labelled 'Maori English' or 'Polynesian English'. As with Iijama Hall's USA findings, the use of this form of English is not necessary for the development of a strong Maori or Pacific Island identity. This usage also has regional variations, and I would contend is less used in the South Island than in the large urban northern centres. However, for the mixed Samoan/Pakeha person, it may be desirable to speak in this way in order to be 'mo' Black' (Scales-Trent, 1995) in the face of a need to overtly claim legitimacy. Moreover, this form of English is heavily correlated with class, and is therefore accessible via class to anyone regardless of ethnicity. For example, Pakeha growing up in Mangere, South Auckland, are likely to speak this form of English and develop an identity influenced strongly by Maori and Pacific Islands cultures. Class in this context may have more salience than ethnicity. This reminds us of the complexity of identity issues.

**Names**

A person's name immediately identifies them as 'other' if it is not an Anglicised name. Being treated as if one is Samoan is more likely to solidify a Samoan identity. In turn, one is more likely to be perceived as being Samoan if one has a Samoan name, although this is not as pervasive as it would be due to many Samoans having English-origin names. This is due to the pervasive influences of both Christianity and migration.
Many Samoans born here were given Anglicised names so as to 'fit in' to New Zealand better, or have both English and Samoan names for use in the appropriate settings. However, most Samoan/Pakeha tend to have English names.

Moreover, if a person has a name that others do not perceive as 'fitting' their appearance, they are more likely to be challenged about 'what' they are, as with perceptions based on physical appearance. Family names, however, can be a factor for inclusion whether they are Samoan or otherwise if they are recognised by the hearer and kinship links are therefore made explicit.

Acceptance by Extended Family and Heritage Groups

This is an important part of the process of recognition, acceptance and belonging that results in feelings of solidarity and affinity which are necessary for ethnic and cultural identity to occur (Pinderhughes, 1995). Moreover, these can occur with regard to more than one group (Williams, 1992). Obviously, lack of acceptance by a particular group or side of the family will discourage any kind of identification with that group. This is obviously influenced by the previously discussed demands for legitimacy from both dominant White society and from minority groups in a Western setting. However, I would contend that this tendency is offset somewhat in Aotearoa New Zealand by the strong emphasis on kinship ties common to many Samoans. The level of involvement that the mixed family has with the two sides of the extended family must strengthen these ties and influence the identification of the children by themselves and others. While acceptance into White culture in general may be difficult, and not even considered, this may be mediated by class factors, that is, amongst working class Pakeha families it may be more acceptable to both intermarry and claim group membership of the White, majority group. Of course, this may also be applicable to the Samoan side of the family.
Conclusion

It is clear from the literature that the way people of mixed parentage construct their identities and have identities imposed on them is influenced by a number of specific factors. These factors are at the micro and meso levels of functioning, contained within the macro factors of ideas about race and ethnicity and the historical and political context of New Zealand. I have speculated somewhat as to how these factors are particularly shaped by the context of being Samoan/Pakeha in Aotearoa New Zealand. I will now attempt to explore some of these investigative speculations further by describing and analysing my own research results.
Chapter Six: Results and Analysis of Micro and Meso Factors

The Participants

The four participants are all of mixed Samoan/Pakeha parentage, having a Samoan father and Pakeha mother. All have grown up in and are currently living in cities in the South Island of New Zealand. They are all in their late twenties. Three of them have tertiary qualifications, with the fourth working in a position where he is responsible for others. As such, they are all relatively middle class, although from working class backgrounds.

The sample group was comprised of two men and two women. The two men are brothers, one, Peter, being the oldest in the family, and Sione being the next child of that family. There is only a year between them. The women, Sina and Malia, are cousins to each other, and grew up in the same city. Both are the oldest in their respective nuclear families.

In the case of all three families, the parents' marriages were precipitated by pregnancy, and the unions were disapproved of by all the Pakeha families involved. It is interesting that although there were some other members of the Samoan families involved in New Zealand at the time, none of the participants knew of their reaction or opinion of the marriage. Despite these somewhat inauspicious beginnings, all the partnerships were relatively durable, with two lasting more than twenty years, and the third still going.

In this chapter I will examine the data with reference to some of the factors thought to be relevant from the last chapter at the micro and meso levels of interaction (Bronfenbrenner, 1979). This will cover parental attitudes, school experiences, contact with extended family, appearance, and personality. I will also refer to some of the
propositions I made in the last chapter about how these factors may impact on people of mixed Samoan/Pakeha parentage in New Zealand. In particular I will be discussing the impact these factors have had on whether a Samoan, Pakeha or mixed identity developed.

**Parental Attitudes, Parenting Styles and the Home Environment**

The home environment and parenting styles must have some impact on whether a Samoan, Pakeha or mixed identity is encouraged either explicitly or implicitly. The relevant features of the home environment are whether or not identity options were discussed with the participants as children, or whether there was any overt pressure to identify one way or the other. As discussed in the previous chapter, when parenting in a racist society, Pakeha parents need to be aware of their own racism and that of the society around them. Ideally this would lead to both parents being able to prepare and educate their children.

Another important issue regarding the home environment is the issue of negotiating potentially differing cultural attitudes between the parents, and the resulting culture(s) of the home environment. If this culture is different from the majority culture, then one would expect children to experience some discontinuity between home and public worlds. Also raised in the last chapter is the issue of violence or abuse in the home, whether or not it becomes 'racialised', and the effects of this racialisation on a child's identity.

**Discussing Ethnic Identity in the Home**

In the sample examined, none of the participants had been sat down by their parents and had the options for identity presented to them. However, one participant had interpreted things said to them by their Samoan parent, such as being respectful and doing as you were told as being Samoan, and this had therefore implicitly encouraged a Samoan identity. Another participant remembered being told to be strong in the Samoan culture and being Samoan at a family gathering, and had actually challenged the speaker
because almost all of the children and young people being told this were of both Samoan and Pakeha parentage. This participant wanted to acknowledge all the Pakeha mothers present. However, one must take care in interpreting this to mean that there was overt pressure to be Samoan, as in a context of being a minority group, this more overt encouragement may be necessary to provide the compensatory cultural emphasis noted by Spencer (1987). These two participants (Sina and Malia) also described the dominant culture of the home as being Samoan, and certainly they were more openly encouraged than the men to identify as being Samoan.

However, while the two other participants, Sione and Peter, described the dominant culture of their home as being Pakeha, all four participants shared many similarities of experience and ways of doing things in the home. This included eating Pakeha food most of the time, with their fathers eating Samoan food apart from the rest of the family on occasion. English was spoken in the home. Both parents tended to work long hours in working class jobs apart from when the children were very young, when their mothers performed most of the childcare. Other similarities included a mixture of Samoan and Pakeha ornamentation in the home, harsh physical discipline from their fathers, the valuing of education and respect especially by their fathers, and a desire to 'get ahead' as well as fulfill obligations to family.

Why did the male participants describe this as predominantly Pakeha, while the female as mostly Samoan? The female participants seem to have had more contact with their extended family on their Samoan side than the men, and their mothers were also included in this contact. On the other hand, the men's mother never visited their Samoan relations with her husband and the children, and was never really accepted by the Samoan family. She was also openly hostile to some aspects of Samoan culture. This was in contrast with Sina's mother in particular who attended many Samoan events, adopted many Samoan cultural values for herself and was openly scathing of Pakeha materialism and individualism. She was also more collusive than the other mothers with the harsh discipline meted out by her husband to the children. It would appear that this heightened contact with extended family and the mother's adoption of values and involvement with
the Samoan community helped to encourage a Samoan identity and the perception of the home environment as being predominantly Samoan.

The marked gender difference in the way the culture of the home was named may also be connected to the fact that the women were more confined and controlled than the men, resulting in them spending more time in the home and perceiving that protective kind of confinement as being a 'Samoan thing'. They were also both the oldest siblings which, combined with being female, meant that they had more responsibility both for their younger siblings and domestic tasks; this was also interpreted by them as being particularly Samoan. It was interesting to note that while the men's parents had more distinct gender roles than the women's, they were expected to perform less stereotypical roles themselves than the women and the women's brothers. This may also have resulted in their interpretation of their home as being more dominated by Pakeha culture. Another reason given by the men for the predominance of Pakeha culture in the home was that for the first seven or so years of their childhood, their father worked such long hours that they hardly saw him and so of course the predominant culture was that which was from their mother.

To return to the issue of whether or not ethnic identity was discussed in the home, it can be seen that similar to other findings particularly of working class mixed families, this issue was not openly discussed (Tizard and Phoenix 1989, 1993; Katz 1996). However, other ways of encouraging a particular ethnic identity were certainly employed, such as the exhortations of ethnicised values, usually related to Samoan culture, and what was considered to be right and wrong, good and bad. This would therefore support Katz's (1996) findings that sitting down and discussing identity may be more a middle class method of presenting the options for identity in the family, while the messages portrayed in working class families may be less explicit.
Discussing Racism

None of the families involved in the study had deliberately prepared their children to deal with racism should they encounter it. Again there was a gender split between the experiences of racism, where the women both experienced racism from about the age of twelve, forcing some family discussion about it, whereas the men said they had not experienced overt racism at all growing up. When pressed, however, Peter said that another child had once called him a racist name, but because he did not know what it meant, he wasn't traumatised by it. Sione spoke of having internalised negative expectations of himself as a Samoan in the school environment. He said he ruled out certain professions because he felt they were unattainable because he is Samoan. This can only be attributed to implicit societal racism expressed through the lowered expectations of teachers, but again he felt he had not been directly discriminated against while growing up (Simon, 1982). Certainly their parents never discussed the issue of racism with them. It could be argued that because of this lack of discussion, Peter was unprepared to react assertively to the racist name he was called. On the other hand, if he did not internalise or even understand the remark, then it could also be argued that it therefore had no negative effect on him. For Sione, however, the argument of the harm done in being unprepared to deal with more insidious forms of racism is more convincing (Spencer 1987).

When the women were confronted with racism, they both discussed it with their mothers. While one felt her mother had reacted positively in terms of being assertive and protective towards her child, the other felt her mother was passive, encouraging her to 'just love everyone' and basically let it pass without a reaction. She felt this was an entirely unsatisfactory response, both then and in retrospect.

I would concur with other researchers who have noted that ethnically mixed working class families tend not to discuss issues of racism, but whether or not this is harmful is still debatable (Tizard and Phoenix, 1989, 1993). However, whether or not this is desirable is another matter, and I would certainly concur with those who highly
recommend this kind of preparation for all children likely to encounter racism in our society (Spencer, 1987, Hill and Peltzer 1982). The proposition that White parents are inherently unable to educate their children in this way and are therefore inadequate in parenting children of colour is not borne out by this study, as there was a wide range of responses from the Pakeha mothers, one of which in particular was positive (Harris 1991). It is interesting that the issue was discussed only with the mothers involved, and not with the parent who was also from the minority group. One participant said this was due to her knowing her father's reaction would have been a potentially aggressive, protective response that she would have been embarrassed by.

**Public and Private Divide**

The responses discussed above regarding the dominant culture of the home have obvious implications for this issue. While those who said the culture of the home was mostly Samoan experienced marked differences between the cultures of public and private settings, those who said their home culture was predominantly Pakeha experienced more congruence between the two environments. So, for these mixed parentage children, some experienced the differences described in the 'realms of negotiation' as proposed by Boykin (1985). This points to the divergence of experience and interpretation of those experiences by mixed parentage children.

As for how those negotiations were carried out, a comparative study would be necessary to ascertain if they were conducted with more or less difficulty than for other minority children. Certainly as has been noted in other minority children, the participants adapted implicitly to whatever the situation demanded and developed bicultural competence. It is difficult to say whether this adaptation was made any easier due to their exposure to their Pakeha parent, or if there were more salient factors than the fact of their mixed parentage. For example, for those for whom the dominant home culture was Samoan, the negotiation may have been equally as intensive as for those who have two Samoan parents. Another possibility is that bicultural competence is learnt more because of the dominant culture of society being Pakeha rather than exposure to a Pakeha parent.
On this issue the somewhat arbitrary and fickle nature of the home and society division becomes apparent. It is also important to clarify that when I say 'negotiate' the expectations of the two contexts, this is not to imply the kind of active, conscious negotiation of adults, but instead the implicit, demanded negotiation of children from a relatively powerless position.

Johnson (1992) contends that the tensions for the mixed parentage child are not only between the public and home settings but can be further complicated by cultural conflict within the home. However, there was little evidence of this in this sample. While some mentioned parents disagreeing about what were essentially differing cultural values, it would appear that the expectations of behaviour for the children were fairly congruent between the parents. More subtle may have been the actions and values of the parents which differed in some cases. However, this can be the case in any partnership, and children often choose to adopt the values of one parent and not the other, or, increasingly in this postmodern, globalised world, neither. In the last chapter I hypothesised that the predominant culture in the home would be Samoan because of the gender politics involved, and this was borne out in part, with two of the three families having Samoan culture predominating in the nuclear family environment.

However, one must remember that just as the Pakeha partner may be influenced by her partnership and become more Samoan, so also the Samoan man is influenced not only by the partnership but by the whole New Zealand context which encourages Pakeha culture in everyone. When many Samoans first came to New Zealand, proficiency in Pakeha language and culture was something to be desired. This had an unavoidable impact on the fathers involved too. Indeed the participants also mentioned that their fathers were already revelling in the less restrictive environment here in New Zealand and were somewhat distanced from the more traditional Samoan institutions, such as the church, prior to their marriages to Pakeha women. Both marrying a Pakeha woman and living in the South Island where there are few other Samoans meant that they were less controlled by the imperatives of the Fa'asamoa than they would have been either in Samoa or if they were more active in the formal Samoan community. Therefore when
discussing cultural difference within the home (and in general) it is important to remember that the discussing of it as a simple dichotomy is only for the purposes of simplifying discussion, and cannot be accepted unselfconsciously or uncritically.

All Heritages Positively Valued

All of the participants said that as they reached the age of about twelve years they realised that in mainstream society Pakeha culture was preferred over Samoan culture. This is in direct opposition to the need for all sides of a child's ancestry to be positively valued in order for the child to feel positive about themselves and others (Pinderhughes 1995).

Another threat to this was the racialisation of the physical abuse all of the participants experienced from their fathers. As they began to locate it and name it as a 'Samoan thing', this obviously had very negative implications for their view of both themselves and other Samoans. The impact of this differed between the participants. For Peter it was a major reason in rejecting identification with Samoan culture and himself as being Samoan. Conversely, Sione felt that although it was extremely negative, it actually acted as a binding factor with other Samoans, as this quote shows:

I think being physically abused was definitely part and parcel of the Samoan culture; even though I know there is physical abuse in both cultures, I thought that the physical abuse I got was just a Samoan thing ...

Int: So how did that influence your sense of being Samoan ... did it?

I just accepted that is what happens to all Samoans so ... that made me Samoan so it was a positive thing and a negative thing, positive because it was just the Samoan way of life, and a negative thing because it wasn't enjoyable ... I talked to friends about it and they all got hidings as well but it was cool, because we were all altogether and all the same, so that made me feel more Samoan and I quite enjoyed that.

Another participant who experienced it as negative only, still emerged with a Samoan identity due to the prevalence of other influences. This leads us to the fact that
although there were these negative influences attached to the concept of being Samoan, three of the four participants still described themselves as both Samoan and Pakeha, while the fourth thought of himself as being more Pakeha than Samoan. The negative, racialised experience of abuse was offset by other positive factors attached to being Samoan, and the rejection by some of essentialised Pakeha values.

Another factor in identity formation was the racial myths that prevented any of the participants from stating baldly 'I am Pakeha', which even the participant who identified mostly with Pakeha culture could not do. Moreover, this participant shows no major pathology or problems with his identity (any more so than the others). This reminds us of Tizard and Phoenix's examination of the underlying presumptions in much of the literature that those who are perceived as being 'Black' must attach an explicit positive salience to that one particular aspect of themselves: "Self-esteem and mental health do not appear to necessarily be tied to attitudes to race ... The belief that there is a 'positive Black identity' which must be acquired by Black children is over-simplified and presumptive" (1989, p245). Cross, after his extensive research on Black identity, similarly concludes that. " ... thus Black identity is not predictive of personal happiness, but it is predictive of a particular cultural-political propensity of worldview." (Cross 1987). Certainly the other three participants, through their education, had been exposed to more of the political aspects of cultural and ethnicised politics, and this may also have caused them to emphasise their Samoan identity more.

**Impacts on Identity**

While all of the above issues had some impact on the way in which identity was constructed for the participants, there were also other factors from the home environment. These included identifying with a particular parent for a particular reason such as because they felt they had similar personalities, they were the same gender, they spent more time with them, or felt they could talk more easily to them. Identifying with a particular parent takes on marked significance in an ethnically mixed family, as the feeling of being either the same as or different from a particular parent can be a factor in identifying with a
whole culture or ethnic group. Again, the meaning of these identifications differed somewhat between the participants. While Peter identified more with his mother because he felt they looked more alike and had similar personalities, his brother Sione identified with both parents, particularly emphasising the gender connection with his father, and learning about 'how to be a man'. The impact of this on their ethnic identity is obvious, with Peter identifying more as being Pakeha, while Sione emphasises both cultures in his identity.

School

Much has been written about the effects of the school environment as a vehicle of reproducing social inequalities and reinforcing the primacy of White middle class culture (Bordieu, 1977). In New Zealand this dynamic has also been noted, and particularly the effects of it on Pacific Island young people who are expected by their elders to achieve at school without taking on the implicit values of the education system which include individualised, critical thinking (Tiatia, 1998). How has this dynamic affected mixed Samoan/Pakeha young people, and how does their experience of school influence the way their identities are constructed?

Cultural Capital

Two of the participants achieved well in the school setting, and while the other two just 'scraped through', they both went on to tertiary education together with one of the others. This would suggest that they all had some of the 'cultural capital' valued by the school system. However, to attach this capital to a single causative variable is difficult. It may have been due to exposure to their Pakeha parent, or to exposure to Pakeha culture in general. It is likely to have been bolstered by the high status, single sex state schools all the participants attended. Moreover, the participants pointed out that some Samoan values such as respecting those in authority, achieving educationally and being generally tenacious were actually valued by the school system, and so once again the concept of a simplified oppositional cultural dynamic is confounded. However, the underlying
motivations for these values are in conflict, that is, in Samoan culture (to be somewhat essentialist) the resulting achievement is seen to be for the family or 'aiga, whereas in Pakeha culture it is more for the individual. Moreover, the encouragement of critical thinking and the moves in education pedagogy away from a passive learning approach make education today increasingly demanding of abilities not valued in more 'traditional' Samoan culture (Tiatia, 1998). Tiatia goes on to suggest that the New Zealand-born Samoan young person therefore develops a 'Westernised self'. This suggests that this self is perhaps not a true self, and while it may be precarious to take this conclusion from her discussion, it is an issue that is well worth considering alongside the Westernised/Samoan selves issue.

From this study it is clear that the participants all learned what was expected of them in the school setting with regard to behaviour and values, with even those who did not have such a strong Samoan element in their home environment recognising the implicit expectations of the school environment. Sione notes that he: "... didn't have any Samoan or Polynesian role models as teachers so ... I was never reinforced as a Polynesian person at school".

There was also an awareness and some internalisation by the participants of the lowered expectations of them in the school setting. This dynamic has been documented with regard to other Pacific Island and Maori children (Simon 1982). Sione notes at times he felt like the "dumb kid", and did not expect himself to achieve academically. There were also some professions he had ruled out for himself purely on the grounds that he was Samoan. The reason he gives for this is because he saw none of his Samoan cousins or elders achieving in this way. Sina spoke of being channelled by teachers into 'non-academic' subjects at school. Malia, who was extremely successful at school, explains her teacher's somewhat mystified attitude towards her:

... I was this little darkie that was not only not under the norm for achievement academically, but was leading the class ... and that's like I'm a freak because of it, and what's going on in this little girl's head and why is she not like how we expect these people to be ...
So although the participants in many cases possessed much of the necessary cultural capital, this did not guarantee them acceptance into Pakeha society. This suggests that the reproduction of social inequalities is not only about cultural differences such as values and attitudes, but is also connected to less sophisticated notions of race and biological 'difference'. As Malia's experience shows, the capital in itself is not enough; one is still perceived and reinforced as 'different' by Pakeha society.

**Demand for 'Difference'**

In terms of identity, therefore, although the participants were encouraged implicitly to develop Pakeha attitudes, they were also reinforced in many ways as being 'different', as being Samoan, by the way they were treated. This meant that despite the prevalence of Pakeha culture in the surrounding society, school, and for some, at home, a strong sense of being Samoan developed. Sione explains:

I noticed at high school that there weren't many Samoans at school; I went to an all boys school, and there was only about four of us, so we kind of stuck together ... because like all the other Europeans kids would be saying there are all those fobs or whatever ... hanging together ...

Int: You kind of had to hang out with them?

... but it was good to hang out with them as well, we enjoyed it, and I kind of felt special because there ... wasn't really many of us and that was kinda nice ... we were quite unique, yeah... and it was fun, I was happy.

Implicit in this is Sione identifying himself as being Samoan. Malia also notes the same sense of being forced to be 'different', but extends the analysis beyond the school setting:

... being seen as being 'other' and not being clear about what that 'other' is, but it is "other" than from being Palagi (and so) you focus a lot harder in resolving that.

Int: In a way you have to in order to claim it, because you're living in a Palagi society ...
Yeah because you're defined as that, so you have to know what that is, because if you don't, you're up shit creek.

As a brief but relevant aside, one of the rising stars of opera in New Zealand, Deborah Wai Kapohe, describes a similar experience. Of Maori and Pakeha parentage and raised by her (Pakeha) mother in a South Island city, she describes her experience at a predominantly Pakeha school:

I was always called the Maori girl. But I'm half Maori and half European! I was labelled as different. I was taunted. I grew up with prejudice. And the thing is, my instinct, what I'm like in the core of my being, is this mixture of two cultures. When one culture's not being addressed there's going to be misunderstanding about what kind of person I am. It can be very devastating ... part of the job of being an artist, particularly an interpreter [of other peoples' music], is to go through the boundaries of this culture business, this race business. I want to be a citizen of the world, to portray Spanish music, or Italian ... (in Chamberlain, 1999).

The demand to be different because one is perceived as different is extremely restrictive and linked with essentialist and racist ideas about what kind of behaviour or attitudes are expected of people of particular ethnic groups. Moreover, this expectation is much more rigidly applied to those from minority groups (Chambers, 1994). The same dynamic also assigns those of mixed parentage to those minority groups, which is obviously from this study as pervasive in this country as has been noted by other authors overseas (Root, 1992; Zack, 1993). This confirms my earlier suggestion that although the census and other official documents may be moving towards recognising mixed ethnicity, many people still make judgements and have expectations based on 'race'. This demand for difference, discussed in more detail later, is first encountered in a systematic form in the school setting by the child of mixed parentage.

Of course the imperatives imparted by school and social environments combine with other factors when identity pathways are forged. In the school environment, for example, Peter did not experience the same level of being forced to identify as Samoan as the others did. While he sees himself as both, he predominantly identifies with Pakeha culture, and his appearance is more Pakeha than his brother. He also found that he did not
identify much with his Samoan cousins or Samoan culture, also in contrast to his brother. These factors may have combined to rescue him in some ways from the same pressure at school to be Samoan, and so again we are reminded of the individuality of experience and interpretation.

A True Self?

The issue of a 'true self' and its relationship with the school environment is interesting. All participants agreed that they learned the differing expectations of home and school. However, although one was necessarily more 'Westernised' than the other, this was not perceived by them as being that one presentation was a 'true' self, and the other, by default, 'false'. Rather they felt that both selves were true, or rather that the ability to act appropriately in different contexts did not necessarily threaten a sense of self. Sina used the term 'foundational self' to describe the underlying sense of continuity which the participants felt existed across contexts. This also of course relates back to a definition of self, but would appear to be congruent to some extent with the concept of a true self, but one which is more basic and dynamic than traditional modernist theories allow. However, similar to Katz's (1996) findings, nor does this support the "... full-blown post-modernist assertion that identity is a fabrication by the individual which is used to paper over the cracks of discontinuous and contradictory experience" (p181). This 'foundational self', therefore, may not be ethnically labelled. However, in support of a true self concept that is ethnicised, in the interview Sione said initially that he identified as being both Samoan and Pakeha. When asked if one was more predominant, he said that it:

Depends on what situation I'm in ... I am more Samoan with my Samoan family ... I am more Samoan with my Samoan friends, and more Palagi or European with my European friends... actually more with my European friends I still feel different, even now (I) still feel different and I feel that I restrain my inner, my real inner personality among my Palagi friends, I feel like I am not really being me, I am sort of molding myself to them, molding myself to what they are like, rather than what I am like, I do it all the time.
Int: Do you feel that your true self is more shown when you're with your Samoan friends?

Yeah, ... I think so, it is hard to say ... that is who I like, that is what I like being, when I'm with my Samoan friends ... more than my Palagi friends.

This evaluation may also, however, be influenced by the demand for difference described above, whereby this quote is more evidence that Sione is treated as being different from them by his Pakeha friends, but 'the same as us' by his Samoan friends. These meta-narratives of race and culture in a colonial context may be reflected in his image of who he 'really is', therefore influencing his sense of a 'true self' at an ethnicised level.

Pressure to Perform

Most of the participants experienced a lot of pressure to achieve academically at school, particularly from their Samoan parent. This is part of the essentialist Samoan values of wanting their children to make the most of increased educational opportunities in this country. Any achievement (or failure) also reflects on them as parents and on the family as a whole. Peter referred to this pressure when he said:

... well I think Dad expected a lot from us ... because a lot of Samoan families or Samoans like they come over and they want their children to do really well, but I always felt there was always that pressure. Mum was always saying you have to do well, as well, but there was a lot more pressure from Dad to do well ... so in some ways like obviously I didn't want to disappoint them ... even if I didn't want to do it myself I felt that I had to ... do it for them really, had to do achieve or at least pass ... I just did it really.

Both Malia and Sina describe a similar pressure, but Sione did not feel this kind of pressure so heavily. In discussing this further in the group context, it became apparent that this may be due to ordinal position, that is, Sione is the only participant who is not the oldest. The others mentioned that their younger siblings did not seem to receive as much pressure as they had to achieve, or did not seem to be so bound by it. This pressure is similar to that felt by other New Zealand-born Samoans (Tiatia, 1998).
Similarities to Heritage Groups

This leads me to the issue of similarities of experience with other New Zealand-born Samoans, and the potential impact this has on identity. The participants also showed similarities of experience and culture to other Pakeha, something which must be acknowledged in order to avoid portraying Samoan culture again as 'other' and 'different', while Pakeha culture goes unarticulated and therefore reinforced as normal or generic. However, my participants were also affected by this dynamic, tending to focus more on their Samoan identities, and were more able to identify particular traits, values or behaviours which they perceived as being Samoan, than those which they perceived as being Pakeha.

As well as the similarities of experience at school, all the participants criticised the unquestioning obedience to those in authority expected by the Fa'asamoa, or rather as my participants perceived the Fa'asamoa. They were also unable to speak Samoan with any fluency. On these issues, their experience was similar to the experience of other young Samoans (Tiatia 1998). However, when we search for links from this shared experience to identity, the picture becomes somewhat more complicated. For the shared experience to have any meaning in terms of encouraging a 'Samoan' identity, several intervening steps must have occurred. Firstly, the person must be aware that they are sharing these experiences with other Samoans, and equate those experiences with being Samoan. The specifics of the experiences are more likely to become ethnicised than experiences common to Pakeha young people, because of the ease in identifying or locating experiences as being Samoan because they are seen as not 'ordinary'. It is helpful if other Samoans recognise the similarity of experience and perceive them as being alike. In these respects, there were some major differences. Sina said that:

... its just something that I have always done (been generous) but now it is more visible and I can say, oh well yes that is clearly ... (Samoan)... something that has been part of my culture that I have grown up with, whereas I always thought that is who I was, and has become part of my everyday way of doing things, and the fact that you give things to people and don't think twice about it .... but I am beginning to realise as I get older ...
that that is actually quite different, you know how other people operate ... when I came to varsity and the whole physical discipline thing, I didn't see that as anything spectacular, I mean I thought that happened to everybody ... well it has become part of my culture, whether or not we accept (it).

So for her the perception of particular values as being ordinary meant that it was not until she saw them as being specific to Samoan culture that they further reinforced a self-conscious Samoan identity. Malia noted that although she shared with her Samoan cousins an inability to speak Samoan, they pretended they could in a deliberate effort to exclude her and she therefore felt more different than similar to them in that respect. Peter felt that the harsh discipline he received was unfair because he was being treated as if he was Samoan, when he did not identify with being Samoan at all. This had the effect of reinforcing a more active rejection of a Samoan identity.

The more negative aspects of what were perceived by the participants as being part of Samoan culture can cause this response of rejecting being Samoan. This response is exacerbated if they are not exposed to other ways of being Samoan by young people with two Samoan parents. This effect could be even more extreme in the South Island where there is less variety in role models showing alternative or less essentialised ways of 'how to be Samoan' simply because there are so few Samoans in this area. Those New Zealand-born young people with two Samoan parents who reject the more autocratic and hierarchical aspects of Samoan culture must find other ways of expressing themselves as Samoan because they have little other option. Moreover, it is not that they don't want to be Samoan, but that they would like to influence those aspects of the culture that they struggle with. They, however, can assert their own ideas of what it means to be Samoan more convincingly than those of mixed parentage. For the mixed parentage young person, whose identity and legitimacy as a Samoan is already in question, it is more difficult to pursue a strong Samoan identity without recourse to 'traditional' values. This of course is symptomatic of the demands for legitimacy discussed later.
Extended Family

Most of the participants had more contact with their Samoan extended family than their Pakeha family. This in itself is significant because it puts a potential bias on the material gained. That is, it makes a comparison between the two sides of the family difficult because as variables, the amount of exposure and time spent with both sides of the family was unequal. However, several issues became apparent.

Samoan Relatives

To begin with the Samoan families involved, all the participants felt rejected at some time by their Samoan relatives, ranging from fairly localised or limited rejection to the extreme. For some, however, this was more significant than for others. For example, although Peter felt that because his family were 'half-caste' their relations "kept their distance", this had a somewhat limited impact on him because he did not spend much time with them growing up, and did not really identify as being Samoan. For Malia, on the other hand, who felt "... totally alienated ... total rejection ... " from her Samoan relatives, the impact was more severe. She felt this rejection was mainly because she was such a high achiever at school, and was therefore perceived as being more 'Pakeha' by her cousins. She felt they also resented her because she was put "on a pedestal" by her older Samoan relations. Unlike Peter, Malia was more reliant on their acceptance of her because she identified more than him as being Samoan and also had a reasonable amount of contact with them. She also had no contact with her Pakeha relatives until the age of twelve, and so was particularly vulnerable to the negative impacts of this attitude. She was identified by society as Samoan, and within herself as being Samoan and Pakeha, but was being denied the necessary acceptance and belonging to make a Samoan identity unproblematic for her (at that time).

This reliance on acceptance from Samoan family as a factor in identity is heightened by the context of being a minority group. If one is rejected by Pakeha relatives, this does not threaten one's ethnic identity as Pakeha in quite the same way, because access to
Pakeha culture and Pakeha people is easily gained elsewhere. However, at a wider level, because of the pervasiveness of ideas about 'race', even the possibility of identifying as Pakeha is also often impossible. Most Pakeha, even anti-racist Pakeha, may be 'accepting' of mixed race relatives or acquaintances, but with the implicit understanding that that person is still 'different' from themselves. This implicit understanding was gained early by the participants of this study. Although they had struggled at times with a Samoan identity, they never attempted to assert an unconditional Pakeha identity. It simply was not an option for them.

Conversely, Sina felt mostly accepted by her Samoan relatives, something she attributes to spending a lot of time with them, and because of her kinship connections. Although this was true as a child, as a teenager she felt some rejection based mainly on feelings of being not as 'beautiful' as her cousins, an issue I will return to later. In general, this sense of inclusion reinforced her Samoan identity as a child and young person. Like the other participants, this was not to the exclusion of a Pakeha identity, but co-existed fairly unproblematically for her at the family level of interaction.

Sione tended to identify as being more Samoan than his brother, and this was particularly linked by both him and Peter to his more outgoing personality. This meant that he got on well with and spent more time with his Samoan cousins than Peter. Peter also said that his lack of involvement with his Samoan cousins was because he was more like his mother and tended to be more reserved in nature. This explanation by way of personality was interesting, because it also had a necessary impact on how the two brothers were perceived by their relations.

They both recalled that when they were at their cousins' house with their father, they were allowed to eat with him and the men before the women and other children. However, when Sione was there by himself, he had to wait with the other children and eat in the kitchen with them later. In contrast, once when both brothers were there with their father, Peter was asked by his aunt if he would like a knife and fork, and although he was quite happy eating with his hands like everyone else, he accepted in order to be polite.
This incident shows that he was perceived as being somehow more Pakeha than his brother and sister, and although he only accepted to be polite, this judgement of him by his aunt was probably confirmed to her. To him, the message was also received that he was 'different' from both them and from his siblings. Similarly, Sione's being treated the same as his cousins' reinforced to him their sameness, and by extension, himself as being Samoan. However, he too felt at times different from his Samoan cousins, something which he attributes to having 'more money' than them, and in attempting to fit in even felt embarrassed by his Pakeha mother, wishing she were Samoan "... like everyone else."

These differing perspectives within the same family show the various ways in which life events are perceived and interpreted, and how even children within the same family can be treated differently. These issues were all explicitly linked by the brothers to their current identifications with ethnic groups: Sione with both, and Peter mostly with Pakeha.

**Pakeha Relatives**

Regarding the Pakeha families involved, feelings of rejection were also apparent Malia, although more accepted in later years, did not even meet her maternal grandparents until she was twelve. In this way, rejection was expressed simply by non-contact, rather than explicit rejection. Sina said she:

... never felt comfortable within Mum's family, I mean for lots (of) reasons because I was so painfully shy and ... I always felt different you know because we were like the blackies ... even though they would not say that, it was the sense that I got that we were always quite different ...

Peter felt generally accepted by his Pakeha relatives, and stressed that by virtue of their shared culture in the home, he had more in common with them than his Samoan relatives. Sione, on the other hand, stressed that he didn't have much contact with his Pakeha cousins. He also felt their Pakeha relatives looked down on them because they were Samoan, and because they had less money than them.
So, in terms of extended family it can be seen that there was significant rejection from various parts of the family for each person. This rejection was linked by the participants to several factors. The first was to their 'race' in terms of being of mixed parentage, or the related issue of portraying a trait that was considered by themselves or others to necessarily connect them with a particular ethnic group. This impacted on how that person identified ethnically, because it affected the processes of recognition and identification that are precursors in many cases to an overt identity. Various theories and narratives are relied on to explain identity and experiences. These include essentialist notions about ethnicity and 'race', for example the equating of being outgoing with being more Samoan, and being reserved with being more Pakeha.

**Appearance**

This issue has two facets: one in terms of how stereotypically Samoan or Pakeha one looks, and the other related to how typically 'attractive' or 'beautiful' a person is perceived to be. Again, Sione and Peter provide a clear contrast. While Peter appears more Pakeha or European (i.e. Italian or Spanish), Sione looks more typically Samoan. This means that Sione is more likely to be perceived and treated as being Samoan than Peter. However, both had the experience of being expected to explain themselves or identify 'what' they were to others. While Sione probably experienced this more often, it was particularly an issue for Peter because his identity does not follow conventional understandings of the meaning of race. Although he felt uncomfortable saying he was Samoan, he understood implicitly that when Pakeha people in particular ask him 'what' he is, what they mean is 'what are you that isn't Pakeha?' thus putting pressure on him to name himself as Samoan. Sometimes he says he is 'part-Samoan', and sometimes he says that his father is Samoan and his mother is Pakeha, therefore avoiding the potential vulnerability of committing to one ethnicity or the other. When the person inquiring was Samoan, he felt even more uncomfortable saying he was Samoan, something that other participants could also relate to. I will discuss why this is later with regard to 'demands for legitimacy'.
While Malia and Sina are also both perceived as being 'different' or 'not Pakeha', for Sina another issue is that her skin colour has lightened as she has got older. The way skin colour, and essentially 'race', are given meaning by others means that as a child and adolescent she was more recognisable as being Samoan (both by Samoans and Pakeha), whereas now she is more likely to be mistaken for Maori or even only Pakeha. This means she sometimes has to be more assertive in articulating a Samoan identity than previously. Like most of the participants, she sometimes feels hurt when she is not recognised as being Samoan, because she is strongly committed to a Samoan identity. This reaction by others, especially by other Samoans, provides something of a threat to her identification as Samoan.

'Beauty'

Both women felt that being 'beautiful' was strongly valued by their Samoan relatives. Neither of them felt they were 'beautiful enough' and that this was a factor in not feeling particularly accepted by their Samoan cousins. This dynamic was particularly felt during adolescence, becoming less noticeable in adulthood. They felt this strong emphasis on appearance was particularly valued by many Samoans, and was connected to pride and the status not only of individuals but also of the group or family as a whole. Moreover, the gender difference in the significance of this issue in this sample suggests the pervasiveness and impact of ideas regarding 'beauty' in many cultures, and their influence on women's identities.

Conclusion

All of these factors were indeed relevant for these participants in terms of influencing ethnic identity options and outcomes. However, for each individual, the impact of a particular factor or group of factors was more salient than others. The impacts of their parents, extended family, school, appearance, similarities of experience to heritage groups and personality were significant for most in forming an identity that
included aspects of both cultures. However, this was also influenced by wider social and political demands which I will discuss further in the next chapter.
Chapter Seven: Reflecting on the Literature: Identity Development, Marginality and Demands for Legitimacy

When returning to some of the literature discussed in chapter four, several themes from this study were obviously relevant. The first was with regard to the supposed lineal or structural development of an ethnic identity in a person of mixed parentage. Much of this theorising has been based on similar ideas regarding identity in people of colour in general. Secondly, the 'marginal man' theories initiated earlier this century that have continued to problematise and pathologise people of mixed parentage have also been influential in the literature. Another important issue is to explain the process of exactly how the societal dynamic that demands people prove themselves to be a 'real Samoan' (or whatever minority group they come from), given that all of the participants of this study noted its influence on their lives.

Identity Development

I was particularly interested in two issues in the area of identity development. The first was with regard to Twine's (1997) proposal that feeling the same as other children in early and middle childhood was a sign of a White identity. The next was regarding the propositions of Kich (1992) and Iijama Hall (1992a). They both proposed that similarly to Black 'identity development', a person of mixed parentage would pass through stages of identifying strongly with one heritage and then the other before becoming more balanced. Others contend that for all minority children, an identification with White culture in early childhood is inevitable because of the pervading influence of it through the media and social institutions (Spencer, 1987). The only way to balance this is for deliberate and conscious emphasis on the strengths and culture of the minority group.

All of the participants said that they felt the same as other children in early and middle childhood. While for Peter this continued until the present, the other participants
began to feel more 'different' at around the age of twelve or thirteen. However, this feeling of difference was precipitated largely by specific, overt acts of racism and being made to feel different, something which Twine actually notes was also the case with her participants. When I introduced Twine's notion that this feeling of sameness was actually a sign of a White identity, however, several points became clear. The participants explained that this was not necessarily a sign of a White identity nor an identification with White culture, but instead was a sign of a lack of awareness of racism and the resulting 'problematising' of being Samoan. Prior to this all had an awareness of being both Samoan and Pakeha, but had not yet become aware of the social meta-narrative that portrays both being Samoan and being of mixed parentage as negative and inherently problematic. Moreover, in terms of access and exposure to Samoan culture, at least in early childhood, some had had this emphasis through the Samoan church, and others through Samoan relations. Although this tended to drop off in later childhood and adolescence, it helped ensure a Samoan identity as well as the all-pervading Pakeha identity developed for most of the participants.

As this negative valuing by society became apparent, it catalysed various reactions in the participants. For some this meant initially strongly identifying as being Samoan in an attempt to resist this oppressive dynamic, before returning to an identity which incorporated aspects of both. This is further explained by the inability of most to avoid being identified by others, especially Pakeha, as being Samoan. For Peter, who already did not strongly identify as being Samoan and is not readily identified by his appearance as being Samoan, this growing awareness may have further discouraged a Samoan identity. This pressure from others is inherently linked to demands for legitimacy which I will discuss later. Sione felt he had always identified with both groups and being 'both'. Perhaps due to his lack of exposure to overt racism, he did not identify more strongly with one than the other for any particular time period. However, obviously context has an impact throughout the participants' lives on which culture they identify with at any given time.
This analysis of identity development therefore stresses the demands and oppressive structures of racism rather than innate, lineal, individual, inevitable processes as the cause for various reactions to one's genetic heritage. Moreover, it allows for and explains dynamic and contextual changes in identity throughout a person's life, rather than proposing a strict model which further problematises those who do not follow it. It allows for the influence of wider social institutions and attitudes than more structuralist approaches. This recognises both the ecological nature of human development and the ability of people to change and develop well beyond the first twenty or so years, and in fluid and dynamic ways (Bronfenbrenner, 1979; Brim and Kagan, 1980).

Awareness of Ethnic Difference

One further issue is the relatively late awareness of ethnic difference in the participants, which in the USA has been noted as young as the age of four. There are several possible reasons for this. One is that in mixed ethnicity families, where race as an issue may be down-played, children may become aware of ethnic difference later rather than earlier. However, others have also noted this later awareness in children with two minority group parents in New Zealand (Vaughan, 1987). It may be that New Zealand, unlike the USA, has at least the appearance if not the reality of being an egalitarian society, and it may be that it is only as children become aware of structural inequalities and racism that they become aware of ethnic differences. Or it may be that the salience of other factors in identity and social position such as class is higher than that of ethnicity, making it less of an issue.

Marginality: Acceptance and Rejection, Difference and Sameness

A somewhat larger issue which makes a substantial impact on the literature regarding people of mixed parentage is that of 'marginality'. This was found to be linked to all the issues discussed in the previous chapter, with some being more 'marginalising' than others for various individuals. As such it is potentially a pervasive influence on identity and self image. I have defined marginality for the purpose of this project as
feeling that one is not completely accepted by either Samoans or Pakeha, that one does not completely 'fit' in either group. If we accept that identity is influenced by feelings of rejection or acceptance by members of a particular group, and who a person identifies with and feels the 'same as' or similar to, then we can link feelings of marginality as well as feelings of acceptance with identity outcomes. This process of recognition, acceptance and belonging that results in feelings of solidarity and affinity is necessary for ethnic and cultural identity to occur (Pinderhughes, 1995). Moreover, these feelings can occur with regard to more than one group (Williams, 1992).

I had made my questions regarding this issue as open as possible, in order to avoid eliciting answers that exaggerated or even created a problem that in fact did not exist. However, I found when discussing particularly extended family but also most of the other issues discussed above, that this feeling of marginality was evident. Also obvious was the connection between feeling either rejected or accepted, different or similar to others, and identity outcomes, although there were exceptions to this.

Once again, the notion of being 'stuck between two cultures' is somewhat simplified in that both the cultures and people involved (that is, the participant's parents and extended family) have influenced each other culturally. In fact, it is easy when focusing on difference as is demanded by popular discourses (see chapter three) to ignore any similarities already existing between cultural groups or individuals from different ethnic groups. This means that it is problematic to speak of what is Samoan and what is Pakeha as if they are discrete entities. Moreover, a focus on only ethnicity as a determinant of identity must also be considered in a post-modern, Western environment where other indices of identity such as class, religion, music, age or political belief may be more salient. Further to this, other unrelated issues may also cause feelings of marginality. For example, one participant had been sexually abused by members of their Samoan extended family. This resulted in feeling extremely marginal and rejected by them, and had a corresponding impact on their identity. This is an example of another factor that may produce marginality, but is not related to 'race'. Again we are reminded that the reality of people's lives does not fit neatly into 'racial' and 'non racial' compartments.
Another major issue when considering marginality related to being of mixed parentage is that as a variable it is impossible to separate being of mixed parentage from being non-Pakeha. This is because in a colonial context, all people who are not Pakeha are somewhat marginalised by the dominant culture, especially if, as is the case with Samoans in this country, that group occupies a stereotypically working class position. For example, as quoted earlier, as Sione became aware of being 'different' at high school, this was in terms of being different from being Pakeha, rather than being different in terms of being of mixed parentage. This caused him to seek out and befriend other Samoans at the school. In that environment, his marginality was caused by being not Pakeha, or rather, being not only Pakeha.

All these disclaimers aside, every participant in my sample made a comment similar to this one: "... you weren't 100% real Samoan but you weren't 100% Palagi either, you were in the middle ..." This was reinforced both overtly and covertly by the experiences described in the last chapter with extended family, with the school environment, by racism, appearance and with aspects of the home environment.

Impact of Feeling 'Marginal'

So how was this marginality negotiated by the participants involved? Was it the life crisis presumed by older theories? While in some contexts this had been a difficult issue, it was not the absolute crisis of identity as proposed. However, it was a significant life issue that the participants described as being cyclical and contextual in nature. That is, in some situations it is still an issue. For example, recently Sina attended a (Pakeha) friend's wedding. Even though she was a member of the bridal party, few people spoke to or approached her, something she feels was because she was perceived as being not Pakeha. This reinforced to her a sense of being 'other' or 'different' from being Pakeha. Certainly the concept of marginality as experienced by the participants was not based around wanting to be White and being forever excluded from being able to identify as such. While this exclusion was indeed experienced as described in the school section, for the
participants there appeared to be more anxiety and focus attached to being Samoan. It is difficult to ascertain which came first: the implicit exclusion from being able to identify as being Pakeha, or the focus on being Samoan. As such, for these participants it was the site of intense pain but also creative energy as described by Anzaldua (1987).

**Growth of 'Relative Autonomy' in Self-Definition**

Another interesting finding was that although as children the participants had been heavily influenced by their social surroundings, as adults they felt less reliant on others to define themselves. Most were aware of the dynamics in various environments that were potentially threatening to their sense of identity, and because of this consciousness were able to resist them. For example, Malia remembers a (Samoan) family gathering where all the young people were being exhorted to be strong in being Samoan and remember 'who they are'. As the oldest young person present she was called on to reply, at which time she acknowledged and overtly affirmed the number of Pakeha mothers present and by proxy the fact that most of the children present were also of mixed parentage. This ability to resist others' definition of themselves as forever 'marginal' was similar to the adult reactions of other authors of mixed parentage (e.g. Scales-Trent 1994), and has also been noted as an essential achievement for those of mixed parentage to gain a secure sense of self (Pinderhughes 1995). This also has repercussions for the autonomous vs automaton ideas of Harre (1979). The relative autonomy suggested by him is strongly supported by this sample.

**Situational Ethnicity and Demands for Legitimacy**

Most participants clearly exercised the 'situational ethnicity' proposed by theorists such as Root (1995) and Anzaldua (1987). This was seen by them as a fluid and normal process whereby they used their 'insider' knowledge in both groups in different circumstances. However, the concept of situational ethnicity rests on ideas of what it means to 'act Pakeha', or 'act Samoan'. This is necessarily reliant on essentialist notions of culture. However, to completely dismiss these contextual changes in behaviour and
attitudes because of this would be short-sighted in the extreme. The social realities of differences in understandings and values cannot be nullified by anti-essentialism: only recognised as being fluid, dynamic and individually modified, rather than innate and unchanging over time.

A feeling of ease in adaptation was more evident in less formal Samoan settings, rather than more formal, where Samoan was more likely to be spoken. This was reflective of the participants' limited contact with these kind of formal situations growing up. In these situations they tended to emphasise the aspects of Samoan culture they knew about, so as to 'fit in'. Most felt comfortable in Pakeha settings, although as mentioned earlier, this could be threatened by racism.

While discussing aspects of this process with my participants, I found that the idea of situational ethnicity was in fact impossible to extricate from demands for legitimacy, that is, to prove themselves a 'real Samoan', whether it be to Pakeha or Samoan others. It can be concluded from this that the decision or choice to be either Samoan or Palagi in a particular situation is difficult to separate from the social dynamics that often force that choice. This is clearly related to the demand for difference discussed earlier. The links between contextual changes in ethnicity and demands for difference are shown by this quote from Sione:

... like when I was in the Debating Team at high school I really enjoyed the fact that I was Samoan and really played on that, that I was the first Samoan to be in a debating team, at this high school ... I didn't recognise the Europeanness in me because I wanted to be different, so I just selected that I was Samoan, and even though I am both ... .

Int: Do you think that others saw that the same?

Yeah ... definitely ... because outwardly I think on appearance, because I look different, look Samoan or Maori then ... I think that other people too didn't see me as being European, as being half, I get that a lot, or they would be looking for the Samoan things in me that make me different ...
This exchange illustrates not only situational ethnicity, but the ways in which mainstream society places pressure on people who appear different to be different, and how blind mainstream Pakeha culture is to the aspects of Sione's identity that are Pakeha, because they are seen to be so 'normal' they are invisible. It could even be concluded that they are actively ignored because the desire to perceive him as 'different' is overwhelming, given the need to preserve existing power structures and 'racial' paradigms. Therefore Sione is completely 'otherised', especially as he predominantly 'acts' and identifies as Samoan in many situations. This returns us to the 'autonomous versus automaton' debate. To what extent is Sione actively choosing or being Samoan and to what extent is this demanded by the context he is in? This is especially interesting given that much of his family and wider social environment is Pakeha.

Malia's earlier quote about being forced to identify as Samoan is another example that makes even more explicit the demand for legitimacy by mainstream culture. This was one reason that Malia focused mainly on knowing her Samoan culture. She was aware that society viewed her as such. Based on this implicit labelling (which in effect made impossible the idea of identifying as Pakeha), she instinctively 'became' Samoan. Although this was also reinforced by other factors such as the predominant culture of the home environment, she also had some powerful reasons to reject being Samoan, not least of which was the rejection she felt from her Samoan relatives.

Sina felt that her claim to being Samoan was often threatened by having to meet some standard of a 'real Samoan'. Peter also spoke of a higher or more specific standard which had to be attained in order to identify as Samoan, something which made him more reluctant to identify himself as Samoan to another Samoan, rather than to another Pakeha. Sina said:

I remember finding out in my fourth year at varsity that there was a Samoan Students' association, but I felt I couldn't join because I wasn't a 'real' Samoan ... I had been stereotyped as being Maori ... I couldn't speak the language, you know, so I would always be part Samoan, and I would be introduced like that too, in some situations ... you know 'she is part Samoan'
she is... she is really (Samoan) and that use to piss me off... you know, like that they really had to really name my identity...

Through these examples it can be seen that situational ethnicity is not a simple cause and effect equation, but instead is also influenced by wider social and structural imperatives within both Pakeha and Samoan cultures, as well as individual agency. This agency was particularly obvious in that despite strong pressure asserted by demands for difference and legitimacy, all of the participants denied ever having either pursued or rejected a sport, hobby or career because they felt it would threaten their sense of belonging to either group. While Sione felt certain careers were closed to him because of his Samoan ancestry, this is different from consciously choosing one thing or another out of fear of exclusion from a particular group. From this we can see that although in certain situations the demand for difference is strong and influential, my participants rejected its influence when they felt it came into conflict with their everyday lives and decisions. This is another example of the individual agency exercised by my participants against potentially oppressive and stereotypical forces.

However, it would appear that with regard to identity construction, the demand for legitimacy placed on minority peoples, in this case Samoans, does place extra demands on those who are of mixed parentage and who wish to claim their minority ancestry (Chambers, 1992; Matahaere 1996). This desire, however, is somewhat more complex than simply a 'wish', as in some cases it may be more like an implicit assumption on the individual's part that is then challenged as they get older. Conversely, it may also be forced upon them by a wider society which subscribes to ideologies of 'race' based on ancestry and colour. These demands place them on a 5th and 6th tier of oppression as described by Root (1992), as the internalisation of oppressive ideologies maintains rigid rules of authenticity which causes them to be rejected in some situations by other Samoans. With the impossibility of being categorised or identifying or wanting to identify as White, this 'squeezes' them between the two at times. This process is obviously related to the feelings of marginality described by all the participants.
It would appear from my sample group that this demand for legitimacy acts as somewhat of a watershed with regard to the way people locate themselves in the political minefield that is identity politics. For Peter, already influenced by his upbringing, identification with his mother, his appearance and other factors, he felt he could not and did not want to meet the demand to 'prove' his Samoanness and so a Pakeha identity was encouraged and solidified. Sione fell on the other side of this watershed, identifying mostly as being Samoan, but being somewhat flexible. He at times and the women definitely seem to have found a way, after being washed into both camps at different times, to balance on top of the watershed, thus rejecting its demands.

**Sources of Demands for Legitimacy**

But where do these demands actually come from? What causes other Samoans to apply stringent legitimacy tests to their peers of both 'full' and 'mixed' parentage? What causes Pakeha to look for signs of 'difference' to justify ideas or stereotypes based on 'race'?

The tendency to have strictly defined ideas about what is and isn't 'really Samoan' serves to maintain the boundaries and structure of a culture that has a strong and explicit articulated focus on hierarchy, status, respect, obedience, and the preference of the group over the individual (Tiatia, 1998). New Zealand-born Samoans who at times challenge aspects of this way of doing things can be dismissed by their elders as being 'not real Samoans'. For the mixed person who is already on shaky ground, so to speak, this threat takes on added significance. However, this essentialising of culture is also demanded by wider Pakeha society as a way of trying to 'know' the 'other' and to maintain their 'other' status. Some argue that the tendency of minority groups to essentialise their cultures is a response and internalisation of this demand from mainstream Pakeha/White societies, and serves to exclude minority peoples from having input into issues which are not deemed 'cultural', thereby maintaining power and control (Chambers, 1994; Anzaldua, 1987).

Certainly the freedom with which a culture in its country of origin changes over time is not present in a colonial or immigrant context, where the desire to maintain one's own
ethnic identity and the political context which makes that 'identity' necessary work together to encourage essentialist ideals that are difficult to attain for any young person born into the new context. If you are perceived as being 'other' by mainstream society, then you must cling to your distinctive features in order to consolidate a positive sense of self in a society which treats you as second rate. One must also cling to these features in order to be seen not only by one's own community as 'real' or legitimate, but also so one is perceived by Pakeha society as being legitimate. This context is created by our Western colonial history and the cultural politics this has engendered in recent times. Certainly these dynamics were present in the lives of my participants, and made further complex by the fact of their mixed parentage.

**Conclusion**

Through all of these issues runs the theme of people struggling with the dictates of societal understandings of race and culture, and in most cases, acting consciously to reject them. This is similar to the 'new mestiza' described by Anzaldua (1987), who learns to consciously choose who and how to be in each situation, and is aware of the racial paradigm that would try to exclude or marginalise her. This is indicative of a rejection of traditional meta-narratives about race and ethnicity and an embracing of new narratives that allow one to make that choice, constructing an identity that embraces aspects of all relevant cultures. This relates in turn to the liberalisation of values in many areas in the Western world, allowing more postmodern and diverse understandings and values. But as Chambers (1996) notes, this diversification of cultures scares Western power-holders, causing a reaction of trying to maintain that power.

It can be seen from the progression of this discussion from the last chapter to this one that factors at the micro and meso levels influence identity outcomes. However, these are also influenced by undercurrents of societal meta-narratives. These meta-narratives interact with the other factors to provide a complex and individualised identity journey for each person of mixed parentage.
Chapter Eight: Conclusions and Practice Implications

Summary

I began by stating my research epistemology based on an anti-essentialist view of ethnic difference and acceptance of the inherent lack of objectivity in any research. This included deconstructing the traditional subject/object relationship, proposing a narrative, qualitative approach and honestly evaluating my participatory attitude. I proceeded to examine the historical development of the ideological foundations of 'race', and how this has been applied both globally and in New Zealand and Samoa to oppress both people from minority groups and those of mixed parentage. I then developed this to analyse the polarised nature of New Zealand cultural politics, which are the result of ideas about race as a biological reality and the political need to define clear boundaries between ethnic groups. The concepts of demands for legitimacy and difference were introduced as a way of explaining pressure exerted on minority peoples to present themselves in a certain way so as to be perceived as legitimate or 'real'.

Following this, in recognition of the arbitrary delineation between theories of identity and ethnic identity, I examined and compared aspects of both, including theories specifically relating to people of mixed parentage. I rejected structural, linear theories of identity development in favour of a more postmodern, fluid identity process. The interplay between the influence of social and personal factors was discussed, with the conclusion being that both play an important part in identity construction. The idea of 'marginal man' was introduced as a traditional description of people of mixed parentage, and this was updated to show the origin of this as being external to the individual. The potentially positive aspects of occupying a so-called marginal position were also identified. Then the options for identity for people of mixed parentage were presented, covering one based on neither ancestry, one ancestry only, or both.

I went on to examine the factors identified in the literature as being influential in which of these options is chosen by people of mixed parentage, including issues such as
parental attitudes, extended family contact, appearance, school experiences, class and personality. I then applied these factors to my direct research data. These were all found to be influential, but in different ways for each person depending on their specific experiences and their interpretations of those experiences. I proceeded to apply wider theories to my research data covering identity development, marginality and demands for legitimacy. Identity development was found to be cyclic and fluid. Marginality was a real issue for all of the participants at specific times in their lives, but did not dominate them currently. All gave clear examples of how demands for legitimacy and racism create this marginality and influence their identity constructions. Ethnic identity outcomes generally encompassed aspects of both cultures and were contextually influenced.

**Some Conclusions**

Several general conclusions can be made from this data. Firstly, the relevance of a narrative approach as a coherent explanation for differing interpretations of similar events is obvious. For example, the experience of physical abuse, interpreted by most participants as being solely negative, also had some positive role in creating solidarity for Sione. This means that identity construction is difficult to predict, even if the particular events that happened to an individual are known, or are in common with others. The macro aspects of narrative theory which proposes that meta-narratives influence the narrative of the individual were also evident. This was particularly relevant in all the participants' feelings of having to work hard at being admitted to Samoan culture at certain times. However, the underlying point to be made is that they can almost never be admitted into White culture because of their appearance and the context of Pakeha domination. That is, they are likely to be perceived as being Samoan by most Pakeha people they come into contact with, and by the dominant meta-narratives about race that prevail in Western societies. There was only one participant who was seldom perceived as being Samoan and who did not present as being Samoan, for example culturally, who felt he could in most circumstances be accepted in Pakeha society. It is this 'squeeze' between on the one hand Pakeha racism and demand for difference, and on the other Samoan demands for legitimacy that resulted in all of the participants in this study feeling
in some contexts 'marginalised' from both ethnic groups. However, this too was either reduced or exacerbated by other factors specific to each individual.

Of the micro and meso level factors named in the literature, many did prove to be salient in the lives of my participants, but the ways in which they were given meaning differed depending on the individual, their specific situation and wider cultural imperatives. These factors included parental attitudes to ethnicity and racism, appearance, school experiences, extended family contact and personality. These all made some impact on the lives and identities of these participants.

**Future Predictions**

I would contend that as the meaning of ethnicity becomes less essentialised, several trends will become apparent. Exposure to and adoption of 'traditional' cultural norms will become less of an issue for those wanting to claim a strong Samoan identity, whether they have two Samoan parents or one. With increasing intermarriage, the fallback on 'blood' will also become less tenable, as will cultural criteria such as being raised with the Fa'asamoa and being able to speak Samoan. For the person who is mixed Samoan-Pakeha, this divergence of what legitimates a Samoan identity makes it more accessible as an option. However, this decreasing essentialisation may well not result in the desired 'assimilation' of Samoans into the Pakeha mainstream, but may instead, as happened with Iwi Maori, take place alongside an increased politicisation of ethnicity in order to maintain some basis of power and distinctiveness.

While Pakeha culture tends to be less essential, this liberalisation may not extend to issues of race. That is, while it is acceptable for many people to identify as being Pakeha regardless of their background (class etc.), if their ancestry includes people who are not White, this inclusiveness becomes exclusive given the pervasive threads of racism and 'one drop rule' thinking. Even modern anti-racist theory can inadvertently support this, as the essentialising of non-White cultures it at times implicitly supports serves to continue to 'otherise'.
Identity Outcomes

In situations where one's 'Samoanness' is challenged, it can be seen that all the micro and meso factors of home environment, school, extended family, personality, etc. influence the way one will 'fall', so to speak, with regard to the watershed of the demand for legitimacy described earlier. I must also speak of cultural exposure with regard to Pakeha culture, which all my participants were immersed in completely outside the home, and in some ways within it. It is interesting that given this influence, only one identifies mostly as Pakeha. Why is this? I think it is to do with both the implicit exclusion based on 'race' and appearance by Pakeha, and the explicit focus on 'difference' from the mainstream. It is also to do with the need for Samoans to assert themselves and their values in order for them to be maintained in a context of oppression and domination. These two dynamics actually encourage an explicit ethnicised identity based on being Samoan.

For the participants, the reactions to these dynamics were, however, individualised. For Sione, this 'difference' was appealing and made him feel unique. For the women involved, it was a matter of recognising that many of the attitudes and habits they had been taught by their family were 'Samoan', although this awareness did not happen in some ways until they were out of the home environment. Once again a web of factors interact to produce a complex picture. Obviously this supports the recognition of the relevance of an ecological model suggested by other authors, given that such a wide range of factors at every level influenced identity outcomes (Root, 1992; Bronfenbrenner, 1979; Johnson, 1982; Ogbu, 1981).

Practical Applications: Social Work Practice

These conclusions have some implications for those working with people of mixed parentage, either in social services, education or within one's own family. These implications are going to gain increased significance in the years ahead, as mixed parentage increases in New Zealand and worldwide (Chambers, 1994; Department of Statistics, 1998).
However, these implications are not in the expected form of generalisations about 'what people of mixed parentage are like'. This kind of outcome is increasingly inappropriate, as can be seen by this study. One can presume very little about a person on the basis of their ethnicity or mixed ethnicity status. This in itself is an important practice application. Whether being of mixed parentage acts as a significant variable in people's identities or ethnic identities remains questionable. I would argue that although the marginality issue was a fairly common experience for my participants at some time in their lives, this was being increasingly challenged by the participants in terms of rejecting the either/or meta-narrative that creates this marginality. Instead, a more fluid, multidimensional identity model was embraced (Root, 1992). Moreover, the marginality noted was not necessarily based only on being of mixed parentage. However, with regard to this experience of marginality in terms of practice, it is important to have an awareness of racism and demands for legitimacy, as the causative factors of this marginality. This is especially important given the pervasiveness of ideas that attribute deviance or pathology to people of mixed parentage, and the automatic assignment to the minority group. The other similarities between my participants were more about the specifics of the cultures involved, that is Samoan and Pakeha, than their so called 'mixed parentage' status.

This lack of any further generalisations means that there is no neat practice method or set of rules for working with people of mixed parentage. The nature of ethnicised politics in New Zealand has meant that social workers, when challenged with being more 'culturally appropriate', cast around for 'how to' manuals about how to work with particular ethnic groups. This stems from a desire to be more aware of cultural difference, but is actually based on notions of race and culture that act to 'otherise', essentialise, racialise and ultimately de-humanise clients. Do not misread me: I do not think that awareness of cultural difference is wrong or even over-emphasised. After all, the history of the conscious and unconscious imposition of Pakeha values onto all other groups in New Zealand and the resulting damage has been well documented. However, a concept of cultural difference that produces a simplified polarised dichotomy of 'cultures' can serve many covert agendas, few of which are actually helpful to either the client or the worker. As Toni Morrison said "What do you know about a person when you know their
race? ... Nothing." (Oprah Winfrey Show, 1999). Similarly, presumptions about a client's beliefs, values and attitudes based on their race, mixed or otherwise, cannot be legitimated. In fact they go against the humanist-based traditions of social work which stress the uniqueness of each person and the need to approach each person with an open mind. Certainly I would support this practice approach far and above any other for working with people of mixed parentage. Moreover, the nature of increasing globalisation and breaking of historical connections between 'race' and cultures means that an essentialist approach is simply not supported by social reality in many Western countries, including this one.

Fostering and Adoption

One area I would like to focus on as an example is that of adoption and foster care, with international and domestic debate raging about the efficacy or otherwise of 'same race' foster and adoption placements. Some argue that the overriding factor should be the ability of the parents to provide a warm and stimulating environment, regardless of other factors. Others say that only people from the child's own racial group can support an identity based on that 'race', and help the child deal with the racism he or she is bound to face (Bagley 1993; Tizard and Phoenix, 1993). As discussed in the previous chapters, some have even gone so far as to describe the bonding between White parents and minority children, whether biological or adopted, as a 'sham' (Harris, 1991). I specifically use the term race here, because factors of ethnicity or culture are in fact largely ignored in this debate. Katz aptly describes this debate as:

... a classic postmodern dilemma: transracial adoption is successful for most individuals, but the institution itself has resonances of racism and colonialism which make it reproduce unequal power relationships between communities ... by focusing on social processes, individual children may suffer, but by focusing on individuals, inequitable social relations are not challenged. (1996, p201).

But what of the child of mixed parentage? Much of the literature for either argument unproblematically assigns the mixed parentage child to its minority ancestry group, despite the fact that especially in the UK, mixed parentage children figure
disproportionately in the numbers of children in care when compared to Black, White or any other ethnic group (Barn, 1993; Katz, 1996). Others are more critical, pointing out that the simple inversion of pathological imagery asserts the omnipotent strength and durability of the Black family, taking little notice of, for example, the factors which led to the child coming into care in the first place (Gilroy, 1992).

These attitudes and solutions can also be seen in this country, which historically has had an alarmingly high number of Maori children in care. This was due to paternalistic and racist attitudes on the part of the Department (Puao-te-ata-tu, 1986). However, the simplistic turn around of placing Maori children in Maori families or extended family which may already be struggling is just beginning to be documented (Bradley, 1994). This problem is exacerbated by the Government's policy of cutting back financial aid to foster carers, especially if they are related to the child. I would agree with Gilroy that this simple inversion is questionable to say the least. To recognise the damage done by colonialism and oppression is also to recognise that even intact stable Maori and Pacific Island families deal with racism and are more likely to experience poverty and marginalisation on a daily basis. This can result in added difficulties when caring for foster children, some of whom already have extremely demanding needs. This is an ideal example of the dilemma outlined above by Katz.

Given that the idea of the placement is to 'match' the child's home culture, this is impossible to predict based on 'race', especially for the mixed parentage child. For the newborn prospective adopted child, the debate becomes even more difficult. If we recognise that culture is a learned thing and does not occur innately in a child, then the concept of a child's 'right to their culture' becomes circuitous and contestable. Even for the older child, ethnicity is often viewed as being simplistically and inherently transmitted generationally rather than being seen as a changing set of meanings and beliefs that each child constructs (Katz, 1996). Given the particular cultural beliefs of many Maori and Pacific Islanders wherein the existence of biological familial ties is a basis of identity and belonging at a spiritual level, this makes the placement of children here in New Zealand even more complicated. For example, a lack of consideration of these beliefs, and superseding them by the particular cultural beliefs of many Pakeha that
have tended historically to emphasise material wealth of the prospective adopters and individualistic 'opportunities to succeed', can be seen as part of the pattern of cultural superiority and racism embodied in colonialism.

It can also be seen that the argument supporting 'same race' placements can be used by racist commentators, if we recognise that the presupposition of inherent genetically determined factors necessitating a same race placement can be used to support racist and segregationist agendas. This shows how racisms can change and adapt themselves even to modern anti-racist theory (Katz, 1996).

As a way of resolving all of these competing issues in considering adoption and foster care, a biographical approach is necessary in order to ascertain what is the meaning given to ethnicity by the child concerned, or, if they are too young to articulate this, by the family they come from. This serves to "contextualise individual and group histories" and addresses the need to explicitly address issues of ethnicity in the assessment process which has been resisted historically (Katz, 1996, p201). This provides a much more relevant assessment tool in today's context than a simplistic 'ethnic' or 'racial' approach. This is an example of the humanist approach recommended earlier, and more specifically a narrative approach which provides a way of exploring each person's experience and view of themselves as opposed to making assumptions about what 'we' know about 'your culture'. This is obviously also applicable to other areas of social work practice.

Conclusion

Overall I would concur with Root's earlier quoted statement naming the study of people of mixed parentage as being a vehicle for the challenging of concepts based on racial stereotypes (1992). This study supports the variability of experience and interpretation of experience that make generalisations difficult. These differences are explained by narrative theory (Katz, 1996). Furthermore, an ecological approach that accounts for all possible influencing factors was found to be an accurate way of discovering influential factors on identity outcomes. Also supported is the commonness of experiences of marginality for people of mixed parentage, but these are caused by the
context of polarised cultural politics, racism, demands for legitimacy, and the oppressive nature of Pakeha/minority relations based on our colonial history. They are further reinforced by the class issues inherent in being Samoan in this country. Marginality is caused more by factors external to the person and therefore derives from social imperatives rather than individual deficiency.

Most of the participants were also evidence of a fluid, dynamic approach to identity outcomes, one which allowed multiple ethnic identities and a tenacious assertion of being able to claim all aspects of their ethnic heritages. In terms of social work practice, these analyses are important and reinforce a more humanist approach to social work based on the individuality of experience of every person, the specifics and interpretation of which must be ascertained before any presumptions can be made about how to be 'culturally appropriate' for that person. As a less essentialised approach to 'race' and 'culture' becomes more accepted, the opportunities for both mixed parentage and minority people become less restrictive and oppressive. It is important to recognise and challenge these negative dynamics both in the social services and in society in general.
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Appendix A : Questionnaire Outline

Parent's relationship and family

Which parent came from which ethnic group? How did they meet? Was their partnership approved of by both families?

Who held power and in what areas of the relationship?

Which parent did you identify most with/feel closest to and why?

How were the options for identity presented to you by your parents?

What language was spoken in the home?

Were issues of ethnicity/racism discussed in your family?

What class was your family?

In your family, what was the more dominant culture (understanding that we all have to live in a Palagi culture to some extent in NZ)?

Did you ever feel that at home you were one person, and out in public/school etc, you were another, or perceived as another?

Extended Family

How much contact did you have with both sides of your extended family?

Did you feel accepted by both sides of the family, and what did you feel either acceptance or rejection was based on e.g. personality? physical appearance? geographic proximity? blood, i.e. familial ties?

How did you relate to cousins on both sides? Did you feel different from them or the same and why?

Community and School

How were you labelled by others?

Did this affect your behaviour or self-esteem in any way?

Were you involved in any community groups, and what was the predominant ethnicity of that group?
What was the predominant ethnicity of your schools and surrounding community?

How did you deal with racism? Were you aware of it?

Did you perceive yourself to be the same as or different from other children you were in contact with?

Did you perceive yourself in ethnic terms as a child, or as being 'race neutral'?

What class was your neighbourhood?

**Individual**

When people first meet you, what ethnic group do you think they think you belong to? Why?

Do you think your name affects this?

With which ethnic group do you now identify with most strongly, if any?

Has this changed throughout your life and why do you think this is so? If you identify equally with both or with none why do you think this is so?

How do you deal with others' perceptions of you, which may or may not be the same as the cultural group you identify with?

What aspects of both cultures currently influence your behaviours, attitudes and lifestyle?

Did you feel any tensions or differing expectations growing up that you think are entirely due to having parents from different ethnic groups, or exacerbated by it? What methods did you/do you use to resolve these?

Have you ever felt pressured into being either Samoan or Pakeha, or met with hostility if you have said that you are 'both' or 'neither'?

Have there been any times when you have felt that you had to choose who you have to be/show allegiance to? Or experienced conflicting expectations about how you should act?

Have you ever rejected an interest in a certain sport, hobby or career because you thought it would threaten your sense of belonging to either group? E.g. not taken up badminton because it's not perceived to be a 'Samoan' sport?

If there was anything you experienced as being traumatic as a child (e.g. divorce, abuse, death), do you think this has influenced your sense of ethnic identity in any way?
Do you feel fully comfortable in a Samoan or Pakeha context/situation?

Do you feel generally stable and happy with your identity now?
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Project Title: INVESTIGATING IDENTITY IN PEOPLE WITH ONE PAKEHA PARENT AND ONE SAMOAN PARENT IN AOTEAROA NEW ZEALAND.

INFORMATION SHEET FOR PARTICIPANTS

Thank you for showing an interest in this project. Please read this information sheet carefully before deciding whether or not to participate. If you decide to participate we thank you. If you decide not to take part there will be no disadvantage to you of any kind and we thank you for considering our request.

What is the Aim of the Project?
This project is being undertaken as part of the requirements for a Masters' Degree in Consumer and Applied Science.

The main aim of the project is to find out about your experiences growing up having parents from two different ethnic groups and the impact of this on your identity then and now.

What Type of Participants are being Sought?
The type of participants being sought are those who have one Samoan parent and one Pakeha parent, who are over 20, and have grown up and are currently living here in Aotearoa New Zealand.

What will Participants be Asked to Do?
Should you agree to take part in this project, you will be asked to attend an interview within which you will be asked a series of open-ended questions. This interview would take 1-2 hours.

You will also be asked to attend a group discussion with the other participants (there will only be four participants altogether) after the interview, where the researcher will present her initial interpretations, (but not identify any participants specifically). You will then be given the opportunity to comment on these findings. The purpose of this is to give you some input into how the information given is interpreted.

Please be aware that you may decide not to take part in the project without any disadvantage to yourself of any kind.

Can Participants Change their Mind and Withdraw from the Project?

You may withdraw from participation in the project at any time and without any disadvantage to yourself of any kind.
What Data or Information will be Collected and What Use will be Made of it?

This project involves an open-questioning technique where the precise nature of the questions which will be asked have not been determined in advance, but will depend on the way in which the interview develops. Consequently, although the Ethics Committee is aware of the general areas to be explored in the interview, the Committee has not been able to review the precise questions to be used.

In the event that the line of questioning does develop in such a way that you feel hesitant or uncomfortable, you are reminded of your right to decline to answer any particular question(s) and also that you may withdraw from the project at any stage without any disadvantage to yourself of any kind.

The general areas covered in the interview will be about your parents and their relationship with each other and with you, about what kind of neighbourhood and community you grew up in, any experiences of racism you may have had, how you feel other factors such as your appearance, name, and the language(s) you speak have affected your current identity and ethnicity.

This information is being gathered to try and find out more about how ethnicity and identity are linked, for the purpose of both completing my Masters degree and with a view to preparing a resource for parents, teachers, and social and community workers about how best to support and work with biethnic people, given the meanings that our society attaches to ethnicities.

Results of this project may be published but any data included will in no way be linked to any specific participant. You are most welcome to request a copy of the results of the project should you wish. The data collected will be securely stored in such a way that only the researcher (Emily Keddell) will be able to gain access to it. At the end of the project any personal information will be destroyed immediately except that, as required by the University's research policy, any raw data on which the results of the project depend will be retained in secure storage for five years, after which it will be destroyed. If you would like the information given back to you instead of destroyed, this can also be arranged.

What if Participants have any Questions?

If you have any questions about our project, either now or in the future, please feel free to contact either:-

Emily Keddell
Department of Community and Family Studs
University Telephone Number: 4797951

or

Nicola Atwood
Department Of Community and Family Studs
University Telephone Number: 4797951

The Ethics Committee of the
Department of Consumer Sciences,
University of Otago, has reviewed
and approved this project.
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Project Title: INVESTIGATING IDENTITY IN PEOPLE WITH ONE PAKEHA PARENT AND ONE SAMOAN PARENT IN AOTEAROA NEW ZEALAND.

CONSENT FORM FOR PARTICIPANTS

I have read the Information Sheet concerning this project and understand what it is about. All my questions have been answered to my satisfaction. I understand that I am free to request further information at any stage. I know that:-

1. My participation in the project is entirely voluntary;

2. I am free to withdraw from the project at any time without any disadvantage;

3. I understand that the data will be destroyed at the conclusion of the project but any raw data on which the results of the project depend will be retained in secure storage for five years, after which it will be destroyed, unless I choose to receive the data myself;

4. This project involves an open-ended questioning technique where the precise nature of the questions which will be asked have not been determined in advance, but will depend on the way in which the interview develops; and that in the event that the line of questioning develops in such a way that I feel hesitant or uncomfortable I may decline to answer any particular question(s) and/or may withdraw from the project without any disadvantage of any kind.

5. The results of the project may be published but my anonymity will be preserved.

I agree to take part in this project.

(Signature of participant)

Date: ..........................................................  

The Ethics Committee of the Department of Consumer Sciences, University of Otago, has reviewed and approved this project.
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Themes identified from the initial interviews: A Discussion Document for Focus Group Meetings

1. Marginality: Acceptance and rejection, difference and sameness.

I have defined marginality for the purpose of this project as feeling that one is not completely accepted by either Samoans or Pakeha; that one does not completely 'fit' in either group. If we accept that identity is influenced by feelings of rejection or acceptance by members of a particular group, and who a person identifies with and feels the 'same as' or similar to, then we can link feelings of marginality as well as feelings of acceptance with identity outcomes.

Key Findings:

- All of the participants could be seen to experience some feelings of marginality in the broadest sense of the word, at some time in their lives. Everyone made a comment very similar to this one:

"... you weren't 100% real Samoan but you weren't 100% Palagi either, you were in the middle ..."

This feeling of marginality was seen to be caused by:
- rejection by extended family
- appearance
- academic ability
- abuse
- class status
- personality
- specifically from Samoan society, inability to speak Samoan and lack of involvement with Samoan church.
- lack of contact with relatives

Feeling of acceptance or 'being the same as' a particular group was usually based on:
- kinship ties
- personality
- knowledge of cultural norms (for either culture)
- acceptance by extended family
- personality
- class
- appearance

Most participants had more contact with their Samoan relations than their Pakeha, but this did not necessarily mean that they felt more accepted by them. There was marked variation in the specifics of the above factors and the impact they had on later identity for each individual. These issues were further complicated by wider society, which usually perceived the participants as being 'different', and demanded therefore a 'different' identity, that is, Samoan. This was not true for everyone, however.

New Zealand-born Samoans: Similarities

Key Findings: similarities to other NZ born Samoans:

- for some, predominant culture of the home is Samoan
- all criticised the unquestioning obedience to those in authority
- inability to speak Samoan (although those with two Samoan parents are more likely to have at least a limited understanding)
- being 'not white'

Reactions to the points above perceived as negative:
- rejecting a Samoan identity
- separating those aspects perceived as negative from the aspects deemed to be more positive.

**New Zealand Pakeha: Similarities**

Key Findings:

- for some, the predominant culture of the home was described as Pakeha
- all immersed in Pakeha educational institutions: all attended relatively high status single sex state high schools with very low numbers of Maori or Pacific Island students. Primary schools more mixed.
- all very fluent English speakers and comfortable in a Pakeha context/setting

**Conclusion**

- marginality linked to the above factors
- big variation in what marginality or acceptance/sameness was seen to be caused by
- sense of marginality worked through now by all participants- not major life crisis presumed by older theories, although when exacerbated by other factors, certainly difficult for some.
- marginality not linked to the earlier presupposition of 'wanting to be white' and being excluded from white society. Instead those who felt more at home in Pakeha setting generally accepted; others not consumed with wanting to be white, rather at times feeling 'in between' the two

Various reactions to this:

- rejecting being Samoan or Pakeha
- rejecting some aspects of traditional Samoan culture
- being part of a mixed peer group
- identifying with 'youth culture'

Key Findings:

Identifying with a particular parent based on:
- personality
- father always at work
- same gender as self
- nature of relationship and household hierarchy, i.e. mum easier to talk to

Issues of ethnicity or racism not discussed in any families. This was only perceived as negative by those who had experienced racism as a child (minority).

- differences in amount of Samoan culture in the home: some mostly, some hardly any.
For those with little Samoan culture in home, contact with extended family more significant.

- harsh discipline/abuse experienced by everyone

-English spoken in all participants' homes

- stricter for girls than boys, but clear family hierarchy in all homes

- differences in whether there was a 'culture clash' between home and public, depending on whether Samoan culture predominant in the home or not. Those who did experience this negotiated it easily, perhaps because of contact with Pakeha parent.

3. School

Much has been written about the effects of the school environment, with its dominant Pakeha middle class values as a vehicle for reproducing social inequalities (Bordieu,
1977). Some commentary has been added to this about the effects of this in New Zealand, and particularly on Pacific Island young people, who are expected by their elders to achieve at school without taking on the implicit values of the education system which include individualised, critical thinking (Tiatia, 1998). How has this dynamic affected mixed Samoan/Pakeha young people, and how does their experience of school influence the way their identities are constructed?

Key Findings:

- all participants did at least OK at school, some very well, perhaps showing they have some of the 'cultural capital' valued by a Pakeha school system and encouraged especially by Samoan parents.

- Tiatia (1998) says that NZ-born Samoans develop a 'westernised self' that springs from and reflects their schooling within the Pakeha system. This implies that this self is not a 'true self', not who a person really is. Do you think this is true for you?

- some had internalised negative expectations of them: " ... I had ruled out some professions, like being a doctor or a lawyer ... because I knew I wouldn't have the brains to do that because I was part Samoan, and I knew that because I didn't have educated Samoan role models around ... and I didn't think about well, actually I am European (too), ... or I've got brains." BUT still went on to 'achieve'.

- most experienced pressure to achieve academically from their Samoan parents, whereas the Pakeha parent was more likely to want their child to be 'happy'. This pressure was perceived differently by different people- some felt it heavy on them, while others shrugged it off.

4. Identity Development

Key Findings :
- some passed through stages of identifying with one ethnic group, usually initially White or 'neutral' (not wanting to be 'different'), then strongly Samoan or 'not White', then a mixture of both.

- those who were more comfortable being different were more open to being Samoan, or actively pursued a Samoan identity (necessary in a Pakeha society).

- some have not changed at all from feeling the same as everyone else/Pakeha as a child until now.

- everyone felt the same as everyone else (Pakeha?) in early and middle childhood. Relatively late awareness of potential 'difference' compared to the USA: perhaps not seen as an issue until later in life because race not stressed as an important issue in mixed ethnicity families? not as significant in New Zealand in general? What do you think?

Situational Ethnicity

Key Findings:

- those who identified as both Samoan and Pakeha practised situational ethnicity relatively easily and with implicit skills. This included being fairly confident with the cultural norms and expectations of both groups, although language still an excluding factor for everyone from Samoan groups.

- situational ethnicity influenced by worry as to whether or not they would be accepted if they openly identified as one or the other: this is a 'demand for legitimacy' sometimes applied more harshly to being Samoan than being Pakeha. This is because Pakeha culture is perceived as more fragmented and diverse, therefore easier in some ways to be accepted: on the other hand racism can operate to preclude even the option of identifying as Pakeha other factors such as appearance, names, cultural aptitude also influence this attempting to fit with one or the other.
- most participants were perceived as being Samoan or 'different' by Pakeha people/society, therefore expected to act in a certain way and identify as being Samoan, but still have struggled to be accepted at times by Samoan community.

- those who have made deliberate efforts to be included in Samoan groups (formal or informal) have been rewarded with acceptance _ this has served to further strengthen a Samoan identity. But this acceptance sometimes has included subtle pressure to deny Pakeha side/parent/family. This also operates vice versa, although less clear from this sample.

- those not perceived so readily as being Samoan or non-Pakeha are more likely to identify as Pakeha. Also feel less comfortable in a Samoan context.

Finally ...

- other indices of identity include gender, educational attainment/job, music, class, religion, i.e. identity not only about ethnicity.

- while some issues common, everyone has different perceptions and interpretations of these issues. This means that the same experience can be acted upon differently by two different people, and therefore have different influences on each person’s identity. These differences are as important as the similarities found, because they support the contention that the interaction of individual agency and social meta-narratives (rules about what is real, right, normal) produces identity, rather than solely one or the other.