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ABSTRACT

Transnationalised belonging: second generation Filipinos in England

This study is framed by the question: By looking at the case of second-generation Filipinos in England, how is belonging constituted in a transnational social field? The study examines external/official and internal/individual representations of belonging of young people in England with Filipino background. First, using almost five decades of settlement and citizenship statistics from both the governments of the Philippines and the UK, the study establishes an identifiable ‘second-generation’ as a sizeable component of the Filipino diaspora in the UK. Second, using 20 biographic narratives analysed through a combination of thematic and poetic approaches the study problematises a notion of ‘transnationalised belonging’. The study argues that whilst they are ‘English/British’, a 'Filipino' self also emerges in their narrated life stories particularly with regard to temporality of events and experiences across the life course, spatiality of communities of belonging, and relationships with significant and generalised others. There are significant moments and significant others that may influence whether a second-generation individual will associate or dissociate with a Filipino self.
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CHAPTER 1

TRANSNATIONAL BELONGING AND THE SECOND-GENERATION: AN INTRODUCTION

Extract 1: Alona (second-generation) telling the story to her daughter Anne (third-generation)

1 Once upon a time lola travelled many miles
2 and came to strange new land.
3 In this land of hope they worked hard
4 but the masters did not always treat them right.
5 So when they had children,
6 they were wary and did not teach them of their far away sunshine.
7 So as the children grow up, they were puzzled
8 and did not know about their home.
9 They saw the other children enjoy their differentness.
10 And the children of the sunshine land thought,
11 “We must find out and not hide anymore
12 for the others do not.”

Extract 2: Alvin’s post on his Facebook wall, 3 August 2010

1 Invited by a workmate,
2 I met a Filipino woman at her grandson's 1st birthday.
3 My colleague introduced me as a Filipino organiser,
4 and then the woman asked where I was born.
5 I replied, “London.”
6 She turned to my colleague and said (In condescending tone),
7 “Born and raised in London - he ISN’T Filipino.”
8 Identity is funny.
9 Tell me, can you claim to be "Filipino"
10 if your parents are from the homeland but you're a British-born citizen?"

Introduction

Manila and London are 6,679 miles (10,748 km) apart and are separated by around 13.5 hours of flight time. Manila, the capital of the Philippines, is in Southeast Asia, whilst London, the

1 Tagalog term for grandmother. Tagalog is the official and major language in the Philippines.
capital of the United Kingdom, is in the north-western coast of continental Europe. The two
countries are linked together by generational flows of people over centuries of trade and
travel. It is a narrative framed by a context of a labour-sending country and a labour-receiving
country; of migrants coming from a place of origin to a place of destination; of immigrants
who live and work in hostland and long for an eventual return to homeland. The emphasis
was on their movement in here from there.

The trajectory followed is from migration to settlement to integration. People’s legal status
changed from migrant workers to permanent residents to citizens. International migration has
contributed much to the social and cultural diversity of destination countries. By carrying
their particular cultural heritage labour migrants attain employment and later seek permanent
settlement and citizenship in their countries of destination. The volume of the foreign-born
population – who arrived for numerous reasons, from different origins, and at different times
– suggests the extent to which the UK has become a country of destination and settlement in
international migration (Kofman et al., 2009, p.63). As such the UK has now created an era
of ‘super-diversity’ expressing in a ‘diversification of diversity’ (Vertovec, 2006b, p.1) in
relation to migrants’ and immigrants’ country of birth/origin, ethnicity, language, religion,
legal status, human capital, locality, and transnationalism. The foreign-born population of the
UK increased from 4.1 million in 1997 (Kofman et al., 2009) to an estimated 6.9 million
individuals in 2009 (Salt, 2009). The majority of migrants originate from Indian sub-continent
countries (Kofman et al., 2009). Over the years, nationalities of migrants have become more
varied. Ranking 16th in the list of foreign-born population in the UK are people born in the
Philippines (Kofman et al., 2009).

Academic thinking on international labour migration also changed from a narrative of asynchronism to that of simultaneity. Despite great distances of relocations that traverse continents, cross nation-state borders, and change in country of nationality, migrants continue to maintain and nourish economic, social, political, and cultural links around the world and particularly to the homeland. Belonging is now to be constructed in a transnational context of both here (in the UK) and there (in the Philippines and the rest of the world where they have significant others). One example of cross-border connections can be seen in the amount of remittances sent from the UK to the Philippines. Filipinos in the UK are among the top ten remittance senders to the Philippines thus making them one of the most economically significant group of overseas Filipinos. Over the previous eight years the average yearly remittance from UK Filipinos to the Philippines is US$533. In 2009 alone the remittances from Filipinos in the UK amounted to US$860 million (4.95% of the total remittances of US$17.35 billion sent from overseas Filipinos around the world – (Bangko Sentral ng Pilipinas, 2010). A legal indication of simultaneity can be seen in the implementation of dual citizenship law that allows the reacquiring or retaining Philippine passports after being granted British citizenship.

Whilst the migration stream continues the narrative that links the Philippines and the UK becomes more and more complex over the years with new twists and even more actors. The story is about migrancy as much as it is about settlement and the multi-stranded relations that link ‘here’ and ‘there’. The migration of Filipinos to the UK today is no longer just about the series of waves of labour migrants who have worked as nannies, cleaners, hotel workers, caregivers or nurses amongst others since the 1960s. After more than five decades of migration and subsequent settlement there are now thousands of people who have ‘Filipino background’: the children of immigrants who are collectively called the *second-generation*. 
The second-generation who were born and raised in the UK are, technically, not migrants. ‘Homeland’ for them may not necessarily be the Philippines but rather the UK. Contradictory as it may seem, in a superdiverse place, as Alona tells, enjoyment of ‘differentness’ is not always guaranteed and, at some point, may even be made ‘hidden’. For example, Alvin’s identity claim as Filipino was challenged on the grounds of his place of birth and socialisation. Alona’s story and Alvin’s personal experiences suggest that belonging, ‘as a sense of ease with one’s self and one’ surrounding’ (Mason and Muir, 2010; May, 2011) is an on-going and sometimes problematic project in the lives of the second-generation. Let me briefly illustrate this point using the opening extracts.

The first extract, which opened this chapter, was taken from a short YouTube video about second-generation Filipinos in the UK. In this extract Alona, a mother and a second-generation Filipino, is (seemingly) telling a children’s story to her young daughter, a third-generation Filipino. A closer analysis of this brief narrative shows that it makes creative references to the case of Filipino diaspora in the UK. By definition diaspora refers to ‘an imagined community living away from a professed place of origin’ (Vertovec, 2010, p.63). It begins by highlighting the feminized labour migration of Filipinos to the UK (Line1) – female labour migrants working in the service sector. Their motivation was clearly to seek an improvement in living conditions even if it means working in ‘a strange new land’ (L2) which to them is ‘a land of hope’ (L3). Starting with the migration story, the narrative then moves to possible consequences such as the eventual settlement and building their own families (L5). This leads to the birth of the second-generation. The parents decided they wanted a better life for their children and decided to do so by raising their children far from homeland. As labour

---

3 Source: ‘We are…’ [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OBs5fyGVnU](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OBs5fyGVnU) [Accessed 17 September 2009]
migrants some of them were not properly treated by their work sponsors. To improve the social situation of their children and avoid having been put in the same negative situation the parents ‘did not teach them of their far away sunshine’ (L6). This line suggests that these children, although now living in the ‘strange new land of hope’, remain to have, at best, a sense ownership and at the very least a stake at the far away sunshine⁴. The decision to not teach or tell about the parental homeland is justified as a strategy to facilitate the child’s integration to the new homeland so as not to (perhaps) confuse them whilst they are in the process of adapting to life in the UK. It can be implied that the aim is somehow to be like one of natives of the ‘new homeland’. This resulted in making them ‘puzzled children’ (L7) and losing a functional knowledge of the life in the ‘land of the far away sunshine’. This situation became even more emphasized when they realised that they are not the only different children in the new homeland. Unlike the children from elsewhere who are freely showing their differentness (L9, L12) the children of the sunshine land’s uniqueness is hidden (L11). Inspired by what they saw in others they then decided to recover a lost side of who they are and make it visible once again. (L11).

This narrative is analytically important in thinking about transnational belonging. First, in less than 100 words and illustrated as a generic story, the text is able to distinguish several generations of Filipinos in the UK (e.g. first, second and third generation presuming there is a confluence between the story characters and the teller and the immediate listener) and the Others with whom they relate to (e.g. the British masters, other children of immigrants), and the places that frame their experience (e.g. land of hope, Britain and land of far-away sunshine, the Philippines). In other words this text highlights the spheres of belonging that the

⁴ Figuratively, this sunshine maybe taken to refer to tropical country the Philippines which has considerably more sunshine compared to the ‘strange new land of hope’ which in this case is the UK. It is also important to note that the Philippine flag has a prominent sun symbol.
second- and later generations navigate. Secondly, it also suggests a vision that puts forward an explicit possibility and strategy on how to belong in the land of hope. Assuming that the differentness they are referring to is cultural they advance to celebrate this uniqueness. Together with ‘different others’ they paint a picture of a multicultural landscape. Finally, given that this narrative form part of an audio-visual presentation about second-generation Filipinos in the UK, it raises question on the function it serves. The video is freely available for anyone to see and was uploaded in 2009. As of September 2012 it only had 946 views: a relatively weak circulation of material that seeks to raise consciousness and interrogate cultural belonging. Nevertheless its presence sets online spaces as arena for addressing identity issues.

Following the logic of ‘online engagement’ with Filipino-ness the second extract presents a Facebook wall-post of Alvin about his direct and more personal encounter of claiming a Filipino identity (L3) but being denied of such label by a Filipino grandparent (L2) on the basis of place of birth and socialization (L7). Although Alvin does not provide how he replied to the Filipina grandmother he then poses the question of whether one can claim to be Filipino if one is UK-born and a British by citizenship (L9-10). Whereas in the first extract the ‘masters’ were thought to be a hindrance to celebrating uniqueness, in the second extract the very ‘carriers’ of culture (i.e. the grandparent who in this context is assumed to be Filipino) deny a second-generation’s claim to being Filipino. This brief account illustrates the tensions that may arise between notions of authenticity relative to ethnicity and citizenship. Is being native to the UK enough to disqualify a person from claiming a Filipino identity despite being raised in a Filipino-way? This highlights the politics of belonging: that belonging has to be claimed or granted. In other words Alvin begs to ask: Who is Filipino? What does it mean to be Filipino? What makes a person legitimately Filipino?
An important insight from the two introductory extracts is the view that self is an on-going project. To Alona and her daughter it is a process of demonstrating a distinct cultural identity and making sure that the legacy continues in the succeeding generation. To Alvin it is about taking pride in one’s cultural heritage and continually asserting this identity whenever necessary. Several issues can be raised: If the question is a matter of legacy that needs to be passed on and continued then what aspects of Filipino culture matter? How does this transmission proceed and how it is facilitated? Under what conditions and in what spaces should Filipino identity be asserted? This study focuses attention on how this on-going project of building a self that draws from two cultural heritages is lived out in the experiences of second generation Filipinos.

### 1.1 The case of second-generation Filipinos

Why is a study focusing on second-generation Filipinos important? Statistics on the migration, settlement, and acquisition of citizenships suggest not only the ethnic diversification of the UK but also the growth of the second-generation as a population (Caponio, 2008; Morawska, 2008). This shows that new citizens with Filipino ethnicity are numerically and demographically relevant now and will be more so in the years to come. Filipinos now join Indians, Afghans, Africans and Pakistanis as nationalities with the largest number of British citizenship grants in 2007 (Mensah, 2008). As early as 2000 a survey found that the Filipino language is among top 40 of the more than 350 languages spoken by schoolchildren in London (Baker and Eversley, 2000). As such the second-generation is a compelling area of research.

Further the presence of a second-generation population marks the next stage of reproducing the family in the face of international migration. In the recent past Filipina mothers would
leave the immediate family (husband and children) in the Philippines for overseas work. They would regularly send remittances for economic support and communicate through modern technologies (e.g. email and video-calls) (Asis, 2008a) and employ other strategies of ‘transnational mothering’ (Fresnoza-Flot, 2009; Parrenas, 2010) or ‘transnational fathering’ (Parreñas, 2008). Through the opportunities granted by family reunification policies, the granting of permanent residency status, and the earning of citizenships overseas Filipinos now have the option of bringing their family members in their societies of settlement. As will be shown in Chapter 4 the children of Filipino immigrants are either raised or born in the UK. Unlike the first-generation parents who are linked to the Philippines as their country of birth and homeland, most of the second-generation consider the UK as their first and the home that they have come to know.

Additionally, apart from the demographic and social significance, scholars argue that the second and later generations are ‘the most consequential and lasting legacy’ of immigrants (Portes and Rumbaut, 2001, p.18). The growing population of children of immigrants are described to have that ‘transformative potential, for better or worse’ (Portes and Rumbaut, 2001, p. xvii), not only for their cohort and their immediate families but also for the migrant-sending and -receiving nations at large (Castles and Miller, 2008a). The immigrant population in general, and the second-generation in particular, are seen as crucial because of their role as social change agents (de Fina, 2003; Portes and Rumbaut, 2001) in societies of settlement.

Arguing about the importance of immigrant minorities, Modood (2007) persuasively writes:

They have a take on their societies that the majority does not experience...[and have] a different perspective on their shared society, its institutions, discourses and self-image. They hold a critical mirror to that society... [And have] sensibilities, ways of thinking and living, heritages that they can call upon to widen the pool of experience and wisdom. (p.65)
Clearly, as a group that is growing in number and with a particular language and socio-cultural heritage that is putatively consequential Filipinos and their descendants merit further description than the too general term ‘other Asian’ – as it was previously done in censuses and surveys. Little is known about the life experiences of overseas Filipinos and their descendants in the UK and they remain largely invisible faces and unheard voices (dela Guardia and Lopez-Vito, 2008; Ong, 2009). Often studies are about the migration of Filipinos to the USA (Espiritu, 2002; Wolf, 2002a) Hong Kong, Japan, Singapore and the Middle East. The studies about Filipinos in Europe are generally about those in Italy (Yukawa, 1996). This is because these countries were more popular destinations of Filipino labour migrants in the 1980’s and 1990’s. However, as will be illustrated in Chapter 4, the UK now hosts the largest segment of overseas Filipinos in Europe and there is now a critical mass of second-generation Filipinos in the UK.

Studying the second-generation is a response to the social-scientific challenge of accounting the UK’s super-diversity (Vertovec, 2006b): by focusing on one of the ‘contributors’ to such diversity. This study empirically examines the space Filipinos – including labour migrants, immigrants, citizens and their descendants – occupy in the super-diversity of British society. The second-generation is at the crux of this task because their lives are points of ‘contact’ that challenge notions of difference and sameness, boundaries and hierarchies, and identity and subjectivity that flag up multiple cultural competences (Vertovec, 2006). They challenge notions of what is and what becomes of ‘Filipino’ and ‘British’ in a transnational age.
1.2 Research questions

The central research question of the study is stated as:

*By looking at the case of second-generation Filipinos in (London) England, how is belonging constituted in a transnational social field?*

This focus implies three main ideas: (a) second-generation Filipinos (b) an attention on belonging and (c) the sociological concept of transnational social field. These concepts will be discussed fully in the next chapter by reviewing the empirical and theoretical literature. An overview will be provided at this point. As (broadly) defined earlier the children of immigrants are referred to as the second-generation and it can be expected that there will be variation within the purported. For one, most of them are no longer children. The many years of migration and subsequent settlement of Filipinos in the UK now allows a discussion about a second-generation who themselves are now adults. Another point that must be clarified at this stage is that whilst I use the term ‘second-generation Filipinos’ to label a segment of the Filipino population in the UK, this usage should not be taken to suggest solidarity as a group nor a strong or exclusive self-identification as Filipinos. As will be explained in Chapter 3, I treated these self-identifications as empirical questions and approached each participants as a *person with Filipino background/heritage*.

As an alternative to the concept of *identity* that narrowly manifests into social category labels such as being a nurse, a male or American; or the too fluid, individualised and privatised concept of *subjectivity* (Wetherell, 2008), I problematise in this study the concept of *belonging*. Similar to their first-generation migrant parents the second-generation are arguably ‘global subjects’ (Schweiger, 2012). In later chapters, it will be demonstrated that they too have transgressive life stories that transcend national borders. Whilst they are growing up and
throughout their adult life events are oriented towards at least two countries: the Philippines and the UK. As stated belonging connotes a sense of comfort relative to self/others and the environment where one is. But in succeeding chapters this notion of belonging will be theoretically unpacked by analytically separating the sense of belonging from the politics of belonging.

Viewing the lives of second-generation Filipinos as being framed by at least two places (the Philippines and the UK) already hints the use of the term transnational social field which seeks to capture simultaneity (Levitt and Glick-Schiller, 2004). Using an optic that connects the symbolic and physical places between Philippines and the UK it can be understood how the second-generation are structured by or become agents of transnationalism. Whilst persons cannot literally be in two places at the same time the socio-geographic context within which they live are in effect expanded.

Having set the terms with which the central research question operates I suggest that exploring what constitutes belonging of second-generation Filipinos in a transnational context, or simply transnational belonging, can begin by distinguishing two forms of representations. I ask the following methodological and analytic questions:

1. How is the second-generation officially represented in government statistical records?
   1a Are there administrative records that can be used to estimate the population size of the second-generation?
   1b What is the empirically verifiable population size of the second-generation relative to overall Filipino diaspora in the UK?
Research Question 1, 1a and 1b interrogate external representations of belonging as attributed by powerful Others particularly the nation-states or governmental instrumentalities of the Philippines and the United Kingdom. In other words: how are the second-generation positioned by (institutional) Others? This representation of belonging results from external categorisation processes which form identity groupings based on previous nationality, country of birth, year or migration, or parentage. As such, it may be argued that an ‘objective’ and ‘external’ representation of who belongs reveals dual constructions of belonging: (a) as an ethnic citizen, from the point of view of the UK; (b) and as members of diaspora in a particular country from the point of view of the Philippines. This strategy might be criticised because forms of representation reproduce the old logic of migration theories that reckon migration as movement that cross nation-state borders and therefore treat ethnicity and citizenship as pre-existing. Whilst this may be true this approach alerts to current and institutional ways of categorising people.

2. How do the second-generation themselves narratively represent their lives as persons with Filipino background?

2a How is a sense of self positioned in relation to notions of Filipino-ness and British-ness?

2b What influences the continuity, discontinuity, and change of these self-positionings over the course of a person’s life?

Research Questions 2, 2a and 2b recognise that belonging is process-based and involves complex contradictions: A person may be categorised as ‘Filipino’ or ‘of Filipino descent’ on account of country of nationality of at least one parent but this may not resonate in terms of feelings of belonging. There are also those who, by self-definition and by practice, feel
‘Filipino’ but are rendered ‘invisible’ in the counting (e.g. third and later generations). These inconsistencies point to formations and transformations of internal representations of belonging which is self-attributed. Identity becomes an on-going project where ethnicity and nationality are treated as complex outcomes in a person’s life.

By turning to official representation (i.e. state-produced statistics) and narrative representations (i.e. life stories) the study seeks to problematize belonging of the second-generation along the axes Filipino-ness and British-ness and between Philippines and the UK. The move to use official and narrative representations reflects a methodological and analytic approach to studying the belonging in the context of lives that transcend national borders. Methodologically uses both secondary and primary data in inquiring about how social identities are produced and reproduced. Analytically the present study juxtaposes public and private constructions of identity and belonging. The study aims to re-tell the story of the Filipino second-generation using statistical and biographic narratives.

Put in another way this study accepts that there is no denying that the Filipino second-generation in the UK is here to stay. The interest is around what lessons that can be learned. They are (t)here and they are growing in numbers. But how many? They are (t)here living their lives. But what is known about what they have become and how they are becoming?

1.3 Outline of dissertation

The thesis is organised into seven substantive chapters. Chapter 1 introduced the study in perspective by presenting an overall account of the labour migration of Filipinos to the UK and the emergence of a population segment called the second-generation. This chapter also outlined the study research questions. The study problematises belonging in a transnational
context. Specifically it seeks to construct the second-generation narratives of belonging using statistical and biographic narratives.

Chapter 2 reviews the empirical concepts and theoretical perspectives that frame the current study. It discusses the concept of ‘second-generation’ as a category of practices and as a category of analysis. It examines the ubiquity of the term in personal, public and online spaces. The different operational definitions of the term are also considered. Chapter 2 also briefly summarises key studies about the second generation particularly those focused on the case of Filipinos. More importantly, the chapter also explores literature on transnationalism (issues of groupism, methodological nationalism, simultaneity), identity (essentialist and constructionist perspectives) and belonging (definitions and frameworks).

Chapter 3 presents a discussion of the study’s research design. The study is divided into two phases. Phase 1 examines macro and official narratives of second-generation Filipinos using statistical sources (e.g. reports on settlement, citizenship grants, population estimates) to estimate their population size and growth patterns relative to the overall Filipino diaspora population in the UK. Phase 2 of the study examines the micro and biographic narratives of 20 second-generation Filipinos who are living in London. This phase aims to understand (‘English and/or Filipino’) self-positionings including its transformation over time.

Chapter 4 builds the statistical narratives of Filipinos in the UK. As a background, the chapter describes how international migration in the Philippines is both a culture and a history, and of great economic value. It then focuses on the growth of Filipino population across Europe and situates the UK as the home of the largest Filipino diaspora in the region. Using various statistical reports the chapter also describes the mobilities (as passengers and persons living in the UK) and fixities (as permanent residents, naturalised British citizens, dual citizens and
organisations) of Filipinos in the UK. Most importantly this chapter provides an evidence-based estimate of the second-generation Filipinos in the UK.

Chapter 5 presents a thematic gaze on life stories of 20 second-generation Filipinos. The chapter argues that transnationalised belonging is negotiated temporally, spatially and relationally. Broadly, this chapter finds that a nuanced understanding of the second generation should understand them both as a biological and as a historical generation. Their narrated life stories are at the very least framed by geographical and social spaces between the Philippines and the UK. Significant and generalised other also play a role in creating experiences of (non)belonging.

Chapter 6 develops an analysis that stand alongside the subjectivities of four select second-generation participants namely, Ellie, Jesse, Martin and Marie. Using a modified version of the Listening Guide or the Voice Centred Relational Method of Analysis (VCRM), the chapter identifies the different voices or senses of self that emerge at particular life stages across a second-generation Filipino’s life course. In hearing these voices, the continuities and discontinuities of self-identifications with respect to Filipino-ness are traced. Chapter 6 also re-evaluates the importance of relational belonging by identifying and differentiating significant relationships in which second-generation participants see themselves as part of.

Chapter 7 concludes the dissertation with a summary and reflection on the empirical and methodological purchase of the study along with proposals for future research.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF
EMPirical AND THEORETICAL LITERATURE

‘Belonging’ may well be one of the ‘softer’ social science concepts but it is central to any discussion of some of the hardest issues facing human societies today: immigrant integration and cultural diversity. (Skrbiš et al., 2007, p.261)

Introduction

The previous chapter outlined that this study aims to understand the representations of the transnational belonging of second-generation Filipinos in the UK. This chapter aims to review the empirical and theoretical literature on which the current study stands. To achieve this I have thematically divided the chapter into four sections.

Section 2.1 interrogates the concept of ‘second-generation’. It clarifies its common and popular uses from its academic operationalization; it summarises key themes from a growing literature on second-generation and, for purposes of the present study, it pays particular attention to case-studies that examine second-generation Filipinos.

Section 2.2 analytically unpacks the concept of belonging as an alternative to two other sociological concepts: (a) identity and (b) subjectivity. Drawing from key theorists on belonging the section will differentiate the ‘sense of belonging’ from the ‘politics of belonging’.

Section 2.3 reviews the analytical optic of transnational social field in understanding simultaneity and transborder connections of (im)migrants and their descendants. I close the
chapter in Section 2.4, by appropriating the concepts of belonging and the transnational social field as an analytic framework.

2.1 ‘Second-generation Filipinos’: as a concept and research area

2.1.1 Second-generation as a category of practice

The term ‘second-generation’, at least in the context of Filipino migration, is both a category of practice and a category of analysis (Brubaker and Cooper, 2000). It is a category of practice in the sense that there is a growing awareness in the public sphere about the use of the term ‘second-generation’ particularly among government officials and online.

In a number of gatherings at the Philippine Embassy the term would often be used by the speakers to refer to a young cohort of sons and daughters of Filipino (im)migrants. More particularly the embassy identifies the second-generation as specific segment of the Filipino community in the UK and describes majority of them as ‘finishing university courses’\(^5\). There are also voluntary organisations that claim to be organisations for and by the second-generation such as Philippine Generations\(^6\) and Phil-UK\(^7\). Another poignant example is from the speech of then Philippine President Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo when she addressed a Filipino audience during her visit to London in 2007. She said:

\(^5\) See http://philembassy-uk.org/rpRelations_RPUKcommunityProfile.html [Accessed on 29 September 2010]. As of November 2012, this webpage is no longer present after the Philippine Embassy revised the interface of its website. The new webpage on Bilateral Relations (See http://philembassy-uk.org/bilateral-relations) makes no mention of the ‘second-generation’ as a segment of the Filipino diaspora in the UK.


\(^7\) See http://phil-uk.com/home [Accessed 29 September 2010].
Just like most of Filipino migrants who are seeking success in a different country… I do understand your situation having to send your children or grandchildren here in the UK to study. Come to think of it, between the UK and Ireland, six Filipinos are being born everyday. That is why we now have a second, even a third generation. We hope that our second and third generation fellows would continue to develop their identity and pride as Filipinos. According to Ambassador Espiritu, our embassy in London, in cooperation with the Filipino organisations that you lead, is conducting activities that provide opportunities to our second and third generation to learn our rich and glorious legacy as Filipinos. So, thank you for that.\(^8\)

The president’s speech seems to suggest two broad groups of Filipino descendants in the UK.

The first group is composed of the children and grandchildren of migrants who were born in the Philippines but are now in the UK to study through of the financial sponsorship of migrant parents or grandparents. The second group is composed of children who are actually born and raised in the UK. As this second group has been in the UK for a longer period of time they have now grown up and are forming their own families where a ‘third generation’ of Filipinos are born. In addition, as a representative of the Filipino nation, the president brings to the fore the ideological project of maintaining a Filipino identity and continuation of cultural traditions in the lives of the second-generation. She specifically mentions that the Embassy, as a governmental arm, is at the forefront of achieving this political/cultural goal.

The term second-generation has also been widely popular online (particularly on social networking sites). Generally these webpage posts list markers that identify a person as a

\(^8\) The original text of the speech is as follows:

‘Gaya ng mga migrante marami sa mga migranteng Pilipinong naghanap ng kanilang tagumpay sa ibang bansa, yung sinabi nga ni Ed Espiritu kanina nauunawaan ko yung kalagayan ng marami ninyo na yung mga anak o apo ay pinanganak, pinalaki at pinaaral dito sa U.K. biro mo between U.K. and Ireland, six Filipinos are being born everyday. Kaya meron na tayong mga second and even third generations of Filipinos. We hope that our second and third generation kababays would continue to develop their identity and pride as Filipinos. Sabi ni Ambahador Espiritu na yung ating embahada sa Londres kasama na ang ating mga organisasyong pilipino na pinamumunuan ninyo ay nagpapairal ng mga gawain na bibigyang pagkakataon ng ating mga kasaping pangalawa at pangatlong henerasyon na matutunan ng ating ang mayaman at maluwalhating pamana na kanila bilang pilipino. Kaya maraming salamat doon.’
second-generation Filipino’. For example there is a Facebook fanpage, a YouTube video, and a trending topic on at least two discussion sites about second-generation Filipinos. Examples such as these illustrate the public popularity and online usage of the term. One site has a page titled ”Top Ten Reasons You Know You are a 2nd Generation Filipino” and lists down the following for viewers to like or dislike:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>like</th>
<th>dislike</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 You still call your grandparents Lolo and Lola.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 You still find Balut disgusting.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Your parents’ house still has the furniture you grew up with.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 You like to make FOB jokes.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Your friends and co-workers don’t call you by your Filipino nickname.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 You don’t go to church anymore.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Although there are now creative ways to eat Spam, you still like it the classic Filipino way – fried with rice and ketchup. Same with corned beef except without the ketchup.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 As a child you hated being a Filipino.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 You know how to cook at least one Filipino dish.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 You understand a lot of Tagalog but hardly speak it.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the outset these statements seem trivial and humorous but a closer analysis can be quite revealing. These statements can be broadly seen as a means of characterising ‘a typical’ member of the second-generation. It establishes “common ground” by bonding or linking resource among those who self-identify as second-generation. These statement also suggest what remains (e.g. respect for elders, cooking and eating of Filipino food, having a nickname) and what changes (e.g. losing of language, non-practice of parental religion, intolerance to

---


10 See http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YOqDGGfl0LM [Accessed 29 September 2010].


certain delicacies such as boiled 9-day old duck egg) with respect to ‘Filipino-ness’ of young people in the diaspora. The circulation of the term ‘second-generation’ in the public sphere attests to its status as a category of practice. But the term has also been used as an analytic category. The next subsection unpacks the two terms (second and generation) that form the main concept of the study.

### 2.1.2 Second-generation as category of analysis

‘Second’ what?

The term second-generation is also a popular analytic category among social scientists. A number of operational definitions are worth mentioning:

(a) children born in the host country to two immigrant parents (King and Christou, 2008, p. 5)

(b) children under age 18 with at least one foreign-born parent (Jensen and Chitose, 1994, p.714)

(c) second-generation immigrants... defined as native born children with at least one foreign-born parent or a child born abroad who came to the United States before age 12. (Portes and Zhou, 1993, p.75)

(d) ...the adult 1.5 generation, defined as immigrants who arrive in the U.S. under 10 years of age. (Ellis and Goodwin-White, 2006, p.901)

(e) the second-generation category to include those born in Italy or who arrived before age 6 (i.e. before commencing school) (Andall, 2002, p.391)

(f) I have coined the terms “one-and-a-half” or “1.5” generation in the 1970s...The concept applies best to situation of children who immigrate after reaching school age in the country of origin but before reaching puberty (i.e. roughly ages 6-12). Teenagers and school children are at different developmental stages and seem closer to the experience, respectively of first and second generations, and might even be termed pursuing the decimal system, 1.25ers and 1.75ers. (Rumbaut, 1997, p.29)
‘We suggest that it is time to redefine the second generation to include the entire generation in both homeland and new land who grow up within transnational social fields linked by familial, economic, religious, social and political networks.’ (Fouron and Glick-Schiller, 2002, p.193)

In discussing the nuances of these definitions I will take a migration perspective and the parental (first) generation as a reference point. In this regard homeland refers to the parents’ country of origin which is also normally their country of birth, socialization, and (previous) citizenship. Hostland, on the other hand, refers to the country of destination or place of immigration and settlement. I am aware that the use of the terms ‘homeland’ and ‘hostland’ is appropriate when the person/migrant has not yet been granted citizenship or has not yet been acculturated in the country of destination. When the conditions of citizenship and social integration has been met Ben-Rafael and Sternberg (2009) suggest that it will be more appropriate instead to use the terms ‘original homeland’ and ‘new homeland’. Of course, in the case of the second-generation, these terms take on a different meaning. For example the parents’ original homeland is the child’s new (or far away) homeland (and vice versa).

Although the seven definitions cited above differ from each other three important qualifiers emerge: (a) parental country of birth; (b) child’s country of birth and (c) age of child during immigration. Strictly speaking the classic definition of the second-generation, as shown in definition-(a), assumes that the child is born (and raised) in the hostland and both of the parents are homeland-born. In a conservative and strict sense they might be referred to as the technical or ‘true’ second-generation (King and Christou, 2008).

This definition is very restrictive and excludes the case of immigrant children and those with only one parent coming from the homeland. Definition-(b) above takes a broader definition by

---

13 Some scholars spell the term as hyphenated whilst others do not. Since this dissertation has a word limit and the term will be repeated many times throughout the whole text, I have decided to adopt the hyphenated spelling.
relaxing criterion on parental country of birth and in effect accommodating children who are
born in intermarriages – meaning one parent is a native of the hostland and the other parent is
from the homeland. This marital union may be described as a ‘cross-border marriage’ that
emphasises geographical, national, racial, class, gender and cultural borders constructed in the
hosting societies’ (Lu, 2007, p.3). It is likely that among Filipinos in the UK, intermarriages
will be between a Filipina woman and a British man\textsuperscript{14} given a global trend of Asian women
marrying Western men (Lu, 2007). Although the stereotype is that Asian women migrate to
marry, it is equally possible that their decision outside the ethno-racial category is only
secondary to their labour migration and happens at a later time (Piper, 2003). Having Filipina
mothers is consequential for the negotiation of belonging among the second-generation. For
Filipinos, child-rearing, and hence cultural transmission during child socialisation, is largely a
mother’s role (Medina, 2001). However, in the context of mixed race families what to teach
and what not to teach become less straightforward.

Definition-(b) above also takes an inclusive stance by being silent on the nativity status of the
child and simply uses ‘having at least one foreign-born parent’ as a selection criterion. In their
analysis using US census data Jensen and Chitose (1994) further segregated the second-
generation into native-born (hostland) and foreign-born (homeland).

The threshold age used in defining the offspring of the first-generation is of being less than 18
years old. This age requirement, especially in the case of the homeland-born/immigrant
second-generation, puts premium in having a considerable amount of time spent in the
hostland as a place of socialization. In other words children have to have spent a significant
period of time being raised in the ‘new homeland’ in order for it to have an impact on a

\textsuperscript{14} According to CFO, from 1989 to 2011 about 9,000 Filipinos migrated to the UK as a spouse or partner of a
British citizen.
person’s identity and sense of belonging. If the hostland-born is the technical/true second-generation then homeland-born/immigrant children are sometimes referred to as the de facto second-generation (Thernstrom, 1973 as cited in Oropesa, 1997).

Other scholars offer more specific operational definitions and variability is shown depending on their interest. The definition of Portes and Zhou (1993) includes a liberal qualifier with respect of the parental country of birth but introduces a cut-off age of 12. One issue with this definition is that both the hostland-born and the homeland-born are collectively called ‘second-generation immigrants’. It is correct to assume that at least one parent is a ‘first’ generation immigrant making the homeland-born child a ‘second’ generation immigrant. However ‘immigrant’ status may not always apply to the hostland-born child especially so if the hostland law grants citizenship to children on the basis of being born on her soil. On this same basis the child has not migrated at all. From the point of view of the child that which the homeland-born parent considers as ‘hostland’ is the actually the child’s ‘technical’ homeland.

Returning to the threshold age for immigrant children Definition-(d) by Ellis and Goodwin-White pegs it at age 10 whilst Definition-(e) by Andall pins it at an even stricter age of 6. It is important to point that homeland-born children are generally called a half-second-generation or ‘1.5’ to differentiate them with the hostland-born technical second-generation. Whilst having a threshold age may be attempting methodological precision I think that it also excludes in the analysis immigrant children above the cut-off age but less than 18 years old. They too face the issues of immigration and integration to the hostland which may be qualitatively different from their parents because they are of minor age (Oropesa, 1997).

By following Rumbaut’s position (see Definition f) age at immigration and timing of arrival at the hostland are important criteria in defining the de facto second generation. Rumbaut
collectively called the second-generation born in the parental homeland as a decimal generation and disaggregated them into 1.25, 1.5, and 1.75 generations based on their age at migration in the parental hostland. Simply put the 1.25 generation migrated as a teenager between ages 13 to 17. Those who migrated to the hostland as pre-teen school-age children between ages 6 to 12 are grouped as the 1.5 generation whilst those who migrated as pre-schoolers aged five years or less are classified as 1.75 generation. The decimal assignment seems to be intuitive as well: the greater the number then the closer the similarity is to the conditions faced by the technical second-generation.

One final point to mention is that most of the definitions assume and locate the second-generation as children of immigrants living in the hostland. However Fouron and Glick-Schiller (2002), following a transnational framework, propose that the second-generation should also include all other children who were left behind in the homeland. As noted in the Philippine case: this could add up to a great number. For Filipinos in the UK the evidence of this is in the number of young people who have been granted settlement over the years. Whilst first-generation migrants are working on the requirements for permanent residency they maintain an active emotional and economic links with their nuclear families in the Philippines. Children were left behind to then join their parents at a later date. Having said this according to Jones-Correa (2002) this proposed redefinition is premature given that the literature at this point requires further differentiation or specification than being too inclusive.
Table 2 Conceptualising the second-generation Filipinos in the UK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BIOLOGICAL GENERATION</th>
<th>HISTORICAL GENERATION</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EARLIER / OLDER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST</td>
<td>Parent(s)</td>
<td>Parent(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECOND</td>
<td>Child A</td>
<td>Child B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parent(s)</td>
<td>Parent(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
‘Generation’ what?

I now turn the discussion to unpacking what is meant by the term ‘generation’ in the concept ‘second-generation’. The notion of generation is of vital importance in clarifying the case of immigrant descendants because, as Mannheim (1952, p.291) states:

- generation [is]... a particular type of social location... [which] endow the individuals sharing in them a common location in the social and historical process, and thereby limit them to a specific range of potential experience, predisposing them for a certain characteristic mode of thought and experience, and a characteristic type of historically relevant action.

Whilst there is no denying its significance the confusion lies in using the term in four different senses. According to Kertzer (1983), generation may refer to (a) a principle of kinship descent; (b) a cohort; (c) a life stage; or (d) a historical period. In a limited sense, generation as descent denotes succession relation between a parent and a child but, more broadly, this refers to how a person is placed in relation to a ‘larger universe of kinship relation’ (ibid., p. 126).

Generation can also be thought of as a birth cohort when people of the same age move through life together. This cohort also passes through specific life stages which may be a ‘particular life-course segment (infancy, childhood, adolescence, adulthood, middle age, elderly etc.) or to more generalised contrasts (younger generation, older generation, college generation etc.)’ (King and Christou, 2008, p.6). Generation may also refer to a particular historical period in which different cohorts are embedded (e.g. post-1965 immigrants in the US, the 90’s generation).

What I have presented so far in this subsection is a deconstruction of some operational definitions of the concept ‘second-generation’ with an emphasis on clarifying what is meant by the term ‘generation’. To further make sense of this discussion I will apply these terms in
the context of the present study. Table 2 presents an attempt to locate the particular second-generation Filipinos that this seeks to reach. Note that this does not yet translate to actual participants in the study. The table simply seeks to illustrate some ideal types in describing variants of second-generation Filipinos in the UK. It is by no means exhaustive but nevertheless frames specific segments as a researchable subset population.

In general, the *biological* second-generation (see rows) must be conceptually differentiated from the *historical* second-generation (see columns). The term biological second-generation refers to offspring of at least one Philippine-born parent (i.e. as indicated by ‘parent’ in a singular or plural sense) who were both born and raised in the UK or those who joined their parent(s) before they assumed adulthood. For purposes of comparison the table assumes that each of offspring is for the moment a child who is less than eighteen years of age.

Following Rumbaut’s decimal classification, Child A and E may be classified as the *technical* second-generation: at least one of their parents is Filipino (usually the mother) and they were born and raised in the UK. Children, B, C, D, F, G and H compose the *de facto* second-generation. They may also be referred to as *immigrant children* because all of them were born in the Philippines. Child B and F represent the 1.75 generation who emigrated to the UK when they were five years old or younger. Child C and G can be called the as the 1.5 generation: they joined their parent(s) in the UK when they were between ages 6 to 12. Finally Child D and H portray the 1.25 generation who began residing in the UK during their teenage years between 13 to 17.

Each ‘child’ in Table 2 symbolizes particular cohorts of same-age individuals. It can be expected that there is a range of ages within groups of immigrant children. For example 1.5 generation would include children who are both in the primary (Year 2 to 6) and secondary
school (Year 7 and 8). In other words, different age cohorts have different life situations (e.g. year in school) that bring about particular modes of thinking (Mannheim 1952).

Purported members of a particular cohort move through their life courses (the ‘series of life stages through which an individual passes’, (Lauer and Wong, 2010, p.1055). For example members of the 1.75 generation who immigrated to the UK when they were pre-schoolers move together over time from one life stage to the next. They will at some point become pre-teens and teenagers themselves or begin attending school then eventually become junior and senior school students.

In addition to considering genealogical and developmental aspects in defining the second-generation it is also important to be historically aware when researching the second-generation. Whilst Filipino sailors may have settled in Liverpool back in 1860’s (Enriquez, 2002) and could be used as reference point when comparing and counting generations this current study is only concerned with contemporary migration of Filipinos in the UK (which in this case begins in the 1960’s and continues to the present day). What I want to argue is that the last 50 years of Filipino migration to the UK can be broadly divided into two temporal stages: (a) the earlier migration flow from 60’s up to late 90’s; and (b) and the recent migration flow from 2000 onwards. In Chapter 4 I will further illustrate this pattern of migration and settlement of Filipinos to Britain from 1962 to 2009.

Moving into the present time the earlier Filipino migration has given birth to what I call the older second-generation whilst the recent Filipino migrants will bear the younger second-generation. The older second-generation are by now adults (having been born or migrated beginning in the 1980s or earlier). All the interview participants for this study are offspring of first-generation parents who belong to the earlier historical generation of migrants who have
mostly worked in the service and health industries. At the time of the interviews all interviewees were of legal age with the youngest aged 19 and the eldest aged 32 years.

The younger second-generation of Filipinos who are now living in the UK have parents who migrated to the UK as a result of vigorous stage-managed recruitment of health professionals in the late 1990’s and early part of 2000’s (RCN, 2003). Compared to the older second-generation, and as what can be expected from the migration history of their parents, a great majority of younger second-generation are of minor age. For example: if a child was born in 2000 then such child will be 11 or 12 years old in 2012. Having clarified what is meant by second-generation the next sub-section focuses attention on the key themes on second-generation literature.

### 2.1.3 Studies on the second-generation

There are two broad research programmes focusing on second-generation as a substantive area. The first focuses on the social and economic integration of the second-generation to parental hostland (e.g. Algan et al., 2010). The second focuses on the transnational lives of the second-generation (Kurien, 2005; Skrbiš et al., 2007).

The earliest studies (e.g. Portes and Rumbaut, 2001; Portes and Zhou, 1993; Zhou and Bankston, 1994) on second-generation were completed by American scholars who were concerned not only by the growing immigrant population in the U.S. but, more importantly, on the incorporation of immigrants’ descendants in every aspect of American society. The most important research programme focusing on the second-generation was started by Portes and Rumbaut which produced the *Children of Immigrants Longitudinal Survey* (the CILS). This data set began with 5,200 youth participants in 1990 (Rumbaut and Portes, 2001) for its first wave and ending with more than 3,500 cases for the third and final wave in 2002 (Portes
et al., 2009). The parent(s) of the overall sample originated from 77 different countries (Portes and Rumbaut, 2001) which particularly included Filipinos among others. The study sought to examine the children of immigrants’ ‘pattern of acculturation, family and school life, language, identity, experiences of discrimination, self-esteem, ambition and achievement’ (Rumbaut and Portes, 2001, p.xvii). This research collaboration has resulted in important volumes documenting the lives and adaptation outcomes of the second-generation such as *Legacies* (2001), *Ethnicities* (2001) and *Immigrant America* (2006). These studies are the empirical basis of the theory of segmented assimilation which posited three possible integration outcomes for the second-generation: (a) upward assimilation characterised by ‘professional and entrepreneurial occupations and full acculturation’, (b) selective acculturation, characterised by ‘attainment of middle-class status through educational credentials’, or (c) dissonant acculturation characterised by low educational achievement and poverty (Portes et al., 2009, p.1080).

Given the particular focus of the present study on second-generation Filipinos in the UK, it is important to mention that there are studies about the Filipino second-generation such as those in the US (Espiritu, 2002; Nadal, 2009; Portes and Rumbaut, 2001; Root, 1999; Wolf, 2002a) Canada (Pratt, 2003/04; 2010), Australia (Torres-D'Mello, 2003), Japan (Almonte-Acosta, 2008), and Austria (Reiterer, 2010). These studies broadly paint a complex picture around ethnic identity formation of second-generation that depend on the country in which they are located and their ages. With the exception of one quantitative study, which drew from the Filipino sub-sample of the CILS, all other studies on Filipino second-generation used qualitative approaches in describing their identity formation process. Let me briefly describe key findings from these studies.
Espiritu and Wolf (2001) found that second-generation Filipinos from the CILS longitudinal data developed a distinct Filipino or Filipino-American identity than a purely American identification. Second-generation Filipinos in the US navigate between nativism by self-identifying with the national origin of their parent(s) and assimilation by their preference to English language than Tagalog (or any other Philippine languages) and favouring living in the US than in the Philippines. The participants were also found to have high academic achievements with the female second-generation having higher educational aspiration, grades and stricter parental expectation for achievement compared to their male counterparts. These young Filipinas are also more likely to experience communication problems with parents, depression, and low self-esteem than their young Filipino counterpart. Espiritu and Wolf commented that whilst it is important to describe the outcomes of economic integration of second-generation Filipinos longitudinal survey results do not reveal the process and meaning of socio-emotional life (a subject they focused on in their qualitative studies).

Using focus groups of undergraduate students, Wolf (2002a; b) examined the emotional struggles of children of immigrants. She found that second-generation Filipinos in the US have three core characteristics: familiarity or ability with Tagalog language, and values for pride and respect, and being family-oriented. However, her data also highlighted educational ambivalence, especially for female respondents, who echoed their parents’ high educational expectation and control over their sexuality and body. The centrality of family in social life, ‘…mean accepting patriarchal family dynamics and the predominance of parental wishes over children’s voices, resulting in internal struggles and an inability to approach parents openly for fear of sanctions’ (Wolf, 2002a, p.369).
For her part, Espiritu (2002) gathered the life stories of second-generation Filipinos who were on their 20’s and 30’s. She found that ethnic identity amongst her respondents was largely symbolic in that they maintain ties with relatives in the parental homeland but do not intend to live or settle in the Philippines. Whilst growing up they also had weak socialization of Filipino culture such as non-teaching of Tagalog, Philippine traditions, and history. Respondents have also reported experiences of being ‘invisible’ Filipinos and racial discrimination and as a result increasingly identified with ethnic identity when they reached young adulthood. Comparing the case of first and second-generation Filipinos in the US, she concluded that:

> the immigrant and the second-generation may differ among themselves not only in degree but also in nature of their identification with ethnicity… For the immigrant generation, ethnicity is deeply subjective, concrete, and cultural born out of common life experiences that generate similar habitual positions; for the second-generation, it is largely cognitive, intermittent, and political, forged out of their confrontation with the struggle against the dominant culture. (p.165)

In Canada, Pratt studied the cases of second-generation Filipinos who are members of a youth activist organisation (Pratt, 2003/04) and youth migrants (Pratt, 2010) following their mothers who worked under the Live-in Care Programme. Her first study highlighted the importance of parental narratives of exclusion and deskilling that served as potent postmemories of dislocation for the members of the youth organisation. On the other hand interviews from recent youth migrants, which may be classified as a 1.25 and 1.5 generation, included stories of ordinariness where individuals who used to be bright and engaged students (in the Philippines) emerged as high school dropouts with extremely limited chances (in Canada) just a few years later (Pratt, 2010).

In Austria, Reiterer (2010) interviewed 42 second-generation Filipinos aged 14 to 25. All have Filipino mothers, 36 have Filipino fathers, five have Austrian fathers and one has a
Hungarian father. Reiterer described household from where the participants come from as matrifocal because of the important role of the mother in raising the children. As such the participants were raised as ‘Filipinos’ but a conflict in socialisation ensued when the second-generation needed to confront a Filipinized family and a westernised school. Their identifications changed over the years in which they acknowledge their Filipino descent but claim that Austria as their home. Even though they have stronger identification for an Austrian identity they had, ‘…little concern for Austrian culture, politics and social affairs and have no plans of being active in Austrian society’ (p.162).

One final illustrative example of a study on second-generation Filipinos is the work of Almonte-Acosta (2008) among Filipino-Japanese children (i.e. Filipina mother, Japanese father). Her sample included 13 participants aged 6-12 years old and 17 participants aged 12 to 18. Similar to previously cited studies her participants are aware and do recognize their Filipino ethnicity but define themselves as Japanese. Unlike the households described by Reiterer the Filipina mothers in Japan did not hold much influence for cultural socialization thereby making their children to ethnically prefer the Japanese culture. Although the second-generation desire to be accepted as pure Japanese they are always viewed as *hafu-hafu* or mixed. For example speaking Tagalog is viewed negatively and oftentimes their mothers have been a target of their correction.

Oftentimes, in studies of second-generation, subjects are conceptualised and approached as children. The second-generation cannot be young for long time as they replaced by succeeding cohorts. Thus there is a suggestion that scholarship on second-generation should also give attention on ‘how the second-generation would act as independent adults’ (Jones-
Correa, 2002, p.234). The present study responds to this call by reaching ‘older second-generation’ participants.

Studies focusing on second-generation Filipinos in other countries foreshadow some of the key themes that will be discussed in Chapters 4 to 6. In contrast to large scale national surveys, Chapter 4 presents to ‘recover’ the second-generation Filipinos in the UK using government statistical records. Similar to second-generation Filipino counterpart in other countries, those in London are observed to emphasize: pre-migration narrative of parents (Pratt), the important socialization roles of mothers (Reiterer), struggles over competing rules and expectation on behaviour (Wolf), and their identification towards a Filipino culture whilst showing settled-ness in parental hostland (Espiritu, Almonte-Acosta).

2.2 Transnational social field

Identity and belonging, the core concerns of this study, presume a site or context within which it is formed, transformed or constituted. I subscribe to the view that the processes of identity and belonging happen in the arena of what is called ‘the transnational social field’ (Glick-Schiller et al., 1992; 1995; Levitt and Glick-Schiller, 2004) or that ‘domain created by the social relationships of persons who visit back and forth in their country of origin and persons who remain connected even if they themselves do not move’ (Fouron and Glick-Schiller, 2002). To better understand this framework I will first discuss the problems it seeks to address: (a) groupism’ (Brubaker, 2003) and (b) ‘methodological nationalism’ (Wimmer and Glick-Schiller, 2002; 2003a; b) that dominate scholarship on ‘people on the move’.
2.2.1 Groupism and methodological nationalism

Groupism, as Brukaber (2003) explained, refers to the tendency to take discrete, sharply differentiated, internally homogeneous and externally bounded groups as basic constituents of social life... and fundamental units of social analysis... as if they were [really] internally homogeneous, externally bounded groups, even unitary collective actors with common purposes. (p.164).

The reification process that groupism entails results in the conceptualisation of putative groups formed around ethnicity and nations – both as ‘...categories of ethnopolitical practice [and] as our categories of social analysis’ (ibid., p.166). In effect migration is reckoned in terms of people crossing borders between nation-states (i.e. the Philippines and the UK). Migrants, including their descendants, are seen as foreigners in the receiving countries. They are seen as belonging to a unified ethnic group representing a specific nation-state. State agencies take account or control the entry of migrants in relation to the passport they hold. For example, statistics on the granting of UK citizenship are based on a person’s former nationality. To a larger extent thinking about migration between nation-states serves some purposes but can also be methodologically constraining. This tendency towards groupism takes a specific form and is systemic within migration literature.

Wimmer and Glick-Schiller (2002, p.301) defined methodological nationalism as ‘the assumption that the nation/state/society is the natural social and political form of the modern world’. They (2003b, p.577-578) identified three modes of methodological nationalism, namely:

(1) ignoring or disregarding the fundamental importance of nationalism for modern societies; this is often combined with

(2) naturalization, i.e., taking for granted that the boundaries of the nation-state delimit and define the unit of analysis;
(3) territorial limitation which confines the study of social processes to the political and geographic boundaries of a particular nation-state.

The first mode manifests itself in grand theories of society. The second mode dominates the empirical research on migration whilst the third is prevalent in nationalism and state-building studies. Classical theories of society (e.g. Marx, Weber, Parsons) turn a blind eye to the continuing relevance of nationalism and ethnicity in the modern times. Meanwhile migration scholars have naturalized in their analysis the ‘nation’ as ‘the container model of society that encompasses a culture, a polity, an economy and a bounded social group’ (ibid., p.579). Nation-states are seen as acceptable and sufficient units of analysis when studying international relations. When migrants reach their country of destination they are evaluated in relation to a majority/ national culture that again presume a nation-state container model of society and culture.

The sustained international migration then puts pressures on modern projects of nationalism and state-building with ‘the people’ as its core. However the tendency is to mix four different referents of the term ‘the people’. Specifically:

(1) the people as a **sovereign** entity;

(2) the people as **citizens** of a state holding equal rights before the law;

(3) the people as a group of obligatory **solidarity**, an extended family knit together by obligations of mutual support; and

(4) the people as an **ethnic community** united through common destiny and shared culture. (Wimmer and Glick-Schiller, 2003b, p.581) [emphasis mine]

Each of these conceptions invokes a people in a particular domain:

The citizenry is mirrored in the concept of a national legal system, the sovereign in the political system, the nation in the cultural system and the solidary group in the social system, all boundaries being congruent and
together defining the skin holding together the body of society (ibid., p.583).

The line that divides each of these constituencies cannot be neatly drawn when (im)migrants and their descendants are considered. Who counts as a ‘people’ and who belongs to a ‘nation’ are now topics of contestation or exceptions to the rule. Immigrants who are very much part of the host country’s labour market can remain loyal to their home countries. Immigrants later become citizens but solidarity with the acquired ‘nation’ may remain to be questionable.

The call to transcend methodological nationalism echoes the poststructuralist contributions to social theory: ‘the decentering of the purportedly universal; the reorientation of the field’s focus; a corrective complexity in the ideas about categories’ (Branaman, 2010, p.145). In a globalised context, ethnicity and nation as bases for defining people’s identity are challenged to usher a more fragmented, reflexive and intersectional view (see next section). Whilst there is no denying that ethnicity and nation-states have re-inscribed relevance to shaping identities (Bailey and Winchester, 2012), other categories of practice such as class, gender or (political or religious) ideology can be equally significant. And when entho-national categories are considered, a both/and status (I am English and Filipino) is possible and not just an either/or option (I am Filipino. I am not English).

The use of nation-states and ethno-national groups as units of analysis fail to recognise the simultaneity of existence of (im)migrants and their descendants. They can be both here and there; and it is not always a case of choosing one over the other. In other words this is a move for methodological transnationalism (Amelina and Faist, 2012). Whilst nation remains to be the starting point of analysis, the dynamics of identification and processes of belonging remain open.
2.2.2 Framing simultaneity

An alternative way of addressing groupism and methodological nationalism is to think of (im)migrants and their descendants as inhabiting a transnational social field. Glick-Schiller, Basch and Blanc-Szanton (1992) explain that this social field arises out of transnationalism: the people who live in it are called transmigrants. They wrote:

We have defined transnationalism as the processes by which immigrants build social fields that link together their country of origin and their country of settlement.... Transmigrants take actions, make decisions, and feel concerns, and develop identities within social networks that connect them to two or more societies simultaneously. (p.1-2)

It is important to make three points about this concept. First, the transnational social field emerges ‘as a set of multiple interlocking networks of social relationships through which ideas, practices, and resources are unequally exchanged, organized, and transformed’ (Levitt and Glick-Schiller, 2004, p.1009). People within the transnational social field can then be both here and there when ‘nations’ are considered. (im)migrants and their descendants can be seen as balancing between two process: (a) integrating with the host country; and (b) while maintaining ties to the homeland.

Second, as a consequence of simultaneity, the boundaries of the social field may not always be the boundaries of the nation-state (especially in relation to people as citizens and people as a solidary group). Immigrants may take on the citizenship of the host country but continue to deeply engage with the homeland (politically or economically). Another example is the provision of dual citizenship: they may be carrying two passports where one says they are Filipino and in the other says they are British. Both documents are valid.

Third, not all people within a transnational social field will be transnational in their practices. The notion of the transnational social field signals ways of being on one hand and ways of
belonging on the other (ibid.). People who inhabit this space are exposed to ways of being in the field, ‘…actual social relations and practices that individuals engage in rather than to the identities associated with their actions’ (ibid., p.1010). Individuals have a choice whether or not to actually identify with these relations and practices. When acted affirmatively it will become a way of belonging in the social field. In other words the, ‘practices that signal or enact an identity which demonstrates a conscious connection to a particular group’ (ibid., p.1010).

Provided that individuals, particularly the second-generation, live in a context called the transnational social field, then two related issues must be dealt with: (a) whether to integrate in the current place of residence; and (b) whether to be transnational towards a homeland of their parents. Discourse on these issues centre around the questions of identity and belonging. The next section situates these two concepts in the theoretical debates.

2.3 Identity and belonging

2.3.1 Theorising identity

‘Identity’, as Hall (1996, p.2) argues, ‘...is an idea which cannot be thought in the old way, but without which certain key questions cannot be thought at all.’ The use of ‘identity’ as a category of analysis across the social sciences has been described negatively as: ‘highly elastic yet undifferentiated’ (Jones and Krzyżanowski, 2008, p.38) ‘bear[ing] a multivalent, even contradictory theoretical burden’ (Brubaker and Cooper, 2000, p.8); asking too much and too little at the same time (Anthias, 2002), which then eventually leads ‘on a false trail’ (Anthias, 2008, p.7). Identity, as Hall (1996, p.1) continues, is a concept ‘under erasure’
because it is ‘no longer serviceable – good to think with – in their originary and unreconstructed form’. Indeed, the use of ‘identity’ as an analytical tool is troublesome.

Brubaker and Cooper (2000) argued that ‘identity’ as a concept was used in at least five different senses. It serves (a) ‘as a ground or basis of social or political action’ (p.6) whether it comes out of an individual self-understanding or a universal interest. It often appears as (b) an objective or perceived sameness of a collective. Identity is seen as (c) ‘a core aspect of (individual or collective) ‘selfhood’... which is deep, basic, abiding, or foundational...[and therefore] something to be valued, cultivated, supported, recognized and preserved (ibid., p.7). Identity is viewed (d) as an interactive process that may result into ‘collective self-understanding, solidarity, or “groupness” that can make collective actions possible’ (ibid., p.7). Finally identity is used to (e) picture a contemporary sense of self that is ‘unstable, fluctuating, and fragmented’ (ibid., p.8).

By and large two dominant views can be identified – one underscores a basic similarity among a people over time (see second and third uses of identity); the other advances arguments against these very assumptions (third and fourth). A third view suggests a rethinking of the concept by suggesting alternatives. Scholars who study identity can be broadly categorised into such three groups. These perspectives vary in their ontological and epistemological bases of ‘identity’.

**Essentialist perspective**

A strong conception of identity often takes the form of a cultural identity (i.e. ethnic, racial or national). Ethnicity of (im)migrants for example is taken to be based on primordial ties existing before migration and settlement to country of destination. These ties are marked by
(a) physical affinity; (b) material (e.g. food, dress) and non-material (e.g. language, values, beliefs, customs, holidays) cultural distinctiveness; and by (c) emotional/ non-rational attachment (Min, 2002). These ties make the people of the putative group as unique.

Examples of this perspective are studies done by psychologists Phinney (Berry et al., 2006; Phinney, 1992; Phinney et al., 2001; Phinney and Ong, 2007) and Barrett (2002) and their colleagues. They offer tools to measure ethnic (Phinney, 1992) and national identity (BPS Developmental Psychology Section, 2001). These scholars have also used quantitative approaches to measuring identities.

**Constructionist perspective**

A constructivist view revolves around an anti-essentialist critique of identity. Rather than talking of an identity anchored on fixedness and connotes a possessive property they talk of multiple, relational, and situated identities. Identity is a process of becoming rather than a state of being. Compared to essentialist perspective empirical studies on identities that subscribe to a constructivist view also favour the discursive and narrative methods in their analysis (Bucholtz and Hall, 2004; Wetherell, 2008). The constructionist perspective on identity is summarised in this passage from Bucholtz and Hall (2004, p.493)

Identity is not necessarily inherent, individual and intentional...we can view identity as an outcome of intersubjectively negotiated practices and ideologies...Identity cannot be inherent if it is the emergent result rather than the pre-existing source of social actions; it cannot be individual if it is socially negotiated; and it cannot be fully intentional if it is produced by practices that may exceed conscious awareness.”

In the context of international migration, three conceptualisations of identity become important. They view identity as (a) hybrid; (b) diasporic, or (c) cosmopolitan. The notion of hybridity argues that identity can be multi-cultural, syncretic and changeable over time. Thus
one ceases to think of ethnicity because identity is no longer oriented with a particular nation-state that embodies essentialized cultural elements (Anthias, 2008). Hall (1990, p.235) a key proponent of this stance, argues that identity ‘is defined not by essence or purity, but by the recognition of a necessary heterogeneity and diversity; by a conception of ‘identity’ which lives with and through, not despite, difference.’ Another related conception is to view identity as diasporic, which means that is constituted out of (a) a population dispersion (and concentration), (b) an orientation to a considered homeland and (c) a boundary maintenance of such identity in the host society (Brubaker, 2005). Diasporic identities signify notions of deterritorialised ethnicity and destabilised nations (Anthias, 1998a). Cosmopolitanism on the other hand speaks of a consciousness that emerges out of frequent international travel and challenges the assumption of being rooted on a particular ethnic or national origin (Anthias, 2008).

These three approaches seek to reconceptualise identity and fit with transnational migration framework. They counter essentialist notions of identity and suggest more dynamic and synthetic conceptualisation. But each of these approaches also presents some problematic issues (ibid.). The notion of a hybrid identity does not give much attention to intersectionality of an ethno-national/racial identity with gender and class and to temporal and subjective contexts within which cultural elements are mobilised. The diasporic identity retains an essentialized nation around which identity is formed: it also puts more emphasis on transnational connections than inter-ethnic relations in the host country. Finally the notion of a cosmopolitan identity is too fluid does not give enough attention to inequalities based on gender and class.
Identity and Ethnicity

Both the essentialist and constructivist perspectives problematised the issue of what happens to (ethnic) identity of migrants and their descendants after migration and settlement in the hostland. On one hand the essentialist perspective has sought to measure ethnic and national identity as a ‘property of being’ that individuals possess. The constructionist perspective, on the other hand, has advanced a more dynamic approach that highlights the active, emergent, and social aspects of (ethnic) identity.

Some concerns raised on these debates are as follows: If identities are intersectional then why bother beginning with ethnicity (instead of gender or class)? Can ethnic identity be separated from national and racial identity? Drawing from the critique mentioned in Section 2 of this chapter it can be commented that a focus on ‘Filipino-ness’ may unnecessarily reproduce methodological nationalism and treat the bounded nation-state as starting point of analysis whilst at the same time equating this with an essentialist notion of identity. Whilst I agree that the focus is indeed about Filipino-ness I do not seek to naturalise ethnicity. I agree that there might be other approaches to researching identity without having to start with a notion of Filipino-ness. But there must be a starting point. As the opening paragraph of this subsection states, ‘without which, certain key questions cannot be thought at all’. I also subscribe to the claim that ethnicity as in the case of ‘Filipino-ness’ is ‘justified on the grounds of its saliency as a self-descriptor’ (Aspinall, 2012, p.356-7). It is precisely the tensions between representations of such ethnicity that I seek to problematise in this study: ‘an essential being ethnic’ and ‘a constructed belonging to an ethnicity’ (ibid., p.356). Moreover, as will be elaborated in the next chapter, I treat the notions of Filipino-ness as empirical questions Phase 2 of the study seeks to address.
Having said that it is also important to make explicit what is meant by ethnicity. Two definitions are often cited. First is that of Bulmer (1996, p.35) who defines ethnic groups as:

a collectivity within a larger population having real or putative common ancestry, memories of a shared past, and a cultural focus upon one or more symbolic elements which define the group’s identity, such as kinship, religion, language, shared territory, nationality or physical appearance. Members of an ethnic group are conscious of belonging to an ethnic group.

Another definition is that of Modood et al. (1997, p.13) who explain ethnic group as:

a community whose heritage offers important characteristics in common between its members and which makes them distinct from other communities. There is a boundary, which separates ‘us’ from ‘them’, and the distinction would probably be recognised on both sides of that boundary. Ethnicity is a multi-faceted phenomenon based on physical appearance, subjective identification, cultural and religious affiliation, stereotyping, and social exclusion.

These two definitions put emphasis on the common features whether material (e.g. territory, similarity in facial features, skin colour) or non-material (e.g. language, religion) that seek to mark a population. Whilst Bulmer’s definition is careful in not assuming solidarity amongst the purported members referring to them as an aggregate or collectivity (a sense of groupism), he stresses wilful knowingness among the supposed members of the ethnic group. For this reason ethnicity becomes a basis for social identity. The second definition takes a step further than common and distinctive characteristics of a supposed ‘community’ by focusing attention to boundary maintenance and relations between ethnic groups.

To my mind these definitions function to view ethnicity from the outside looking inside. It seeks to map a population according to identifiable characteristics and how they would relate to each other. By invoking these features it allows the viewer to ‘see’ an ethnic group when these characteristics are present. Whilst this perspective is useful the complementary view ‘of
an insider looking outside’ is just as valid. Brubaker et al. (2004, p.52) suggest viewing ethnicity as cognition. They argue that:

By treating ethnicity as a way of understanding, interpreting, and framing experience, these perspectives provide an alternative to substantialist or groupist ontologies. They afford strong reasons for treating ethnicity, race, and nationalism as one domain rather than several... In addition, the empirical findings and conceptual tools of cognitive research can help illuminate the mechanisms that link the microdynamics of race, ethnicity and nationalism to macro-level structures and processes.

A conceptualisation of ethnicity as cognition results in reorienting ethnicity studies from a focus on symbolic features that mark a group or links a person to a particular community of shared identification to a focus on ‘the schemes of perception and interpretation through which the social world is experienced in racial, ethnic, or national terms’ (ibid., p.53). This is not to reduce the sociality of ethnicity to individual perception: instead it argues that individual perceptions and shared practice of symbolic identifications are mutually constitutive of each other. This cognitive perspective on ethnicity is relevant and is consequently applied in the analysis of Phase 2 results. As will be explained in the next chapter, second-generation participants were made to reflect about the significant aspects of ‘Filipino-ness’ whilst they were growing up.

**Beyond identity**

A third force in identity studies seeks to unpack the theoretical burden carried by this overarching concept. Scholars such as Brubaker and Cooper (2002) suggest that one way of unpacking the concept is by differentiating its constituent aspects. Other scholars suggest conceptual alternatives such as ‘belonging’ (e.g. Hedetoft, 2002; Jones and Krzyżanowski, 2008) in thinking about identities.
Constituent aspects of identity. The approach proposed by Brubaker and Cooper (2000) is to clarify what scholars analytically mean when they study identity. They argue that there can be no single concept to replace ‘identity’: thus they talk of three clusters of terms as alternatives.

First is the distinction between identification and categorization. The process of identification may place a person within a web of relationship (e.g. among relatives or friendships) or a categorical attribute (e.g. race, gender, ethnicity, nationality or citizenship). The process of identification also requires an agency that executes such identification, thus a self-identification can be separated from the imputed identification by (powerful and often institutional) others. Second is to specify between self-understanding and social location. These two related terms stress the importance of a situated subjectivity where a person ‘makes sense of who one is, of one’s social location, and of how (given the first two) is prepared to act’ (ibid., p.17). Third is the clarification between commonality, connectedness, and groupness. Commonality signifies the similarity based on some categorical attributes whilst connectedness refer to the relational links between people which when combined with a feeling of belonging may give rise to a sense of groupness that is distinct, bounded, and solid.

Identity vs subjectivity. Reminiscent of the essentialist and constructionist debate on identity, Venn (2006, p.79) juxtaposes the concept of ‘identity’ with subjectivity. He defines identity as:

the relational aspects that qualify subjects in terms of categories such as race, gender, class, nation, sexuality, work and occupation, and thus in terms of acknowledged social relations and affiliations to groups – teachers, miners, parents, and so on.

Whilst subjectivity refers to:
the substantive acting, thinking and feeling...a self, the product of an 
interiorization of attitudes, values, expectations, memories, dispositions,
instantiated in inter-subjective relations and activities that, through 
historically specific self-reflective practices of recognition, constitute a 
particular named person, a singularity.

In other words, identity is understood in terms of the available, ready-made, administrative,
ideological categories by which people are classified into whereas subjectivity is understood 
in terms of personal and lived experiences. Identity is in a ‘public space...[of] social 
categories, horrible clichés and modes of conduct’, whereas subjectivity, ‘sums up the actual 
complex person and lived life’(Wetherell, 2008, p.77). Of course there is not always a one-to-
one correspondence between social categories and lived experiences. For example being 
labelled as ‘Filipino’, on whatever basis, does not always translate to practicing ‘Filipino-
ness’ in everyday life.

According to Wetherell (2008), the logic of Venn’s differentiation raises three important 
issues. She argues that the categories identity invokes and performances subsumed in 
particular subjectivities are mutually constitutive of each other. The conceptual separation, 
whilst useful, fails to appreciate the interconnections and multi-layered practice of identities.
For example being female and being middle class intersects with being Filipino. Finally, 
highlighting the concept of subjectivity as interesting and rendering the concept of identity as 
dull can result into a representation of self that is ‘privatized and individualized’ (ibid., p.78).

The mutual constitution of identity and subjectivity can again be illustrated in the two phases 
of the present study. The statistical narrative presented in Chapter 4 problematises the 
available identities on the basis of settlement rights and citizenship, and being categorised as a 
person originating from the ‘Philippines’. In Chapters 5 and 6 biographic narratives 
problematis subjectivity of belonging by examining how self is positioned in relation to 
others particularly on the basis of ethnonationality.
Migrants and belonging. Instead of focusing on identity per se other migrant scholars have chosen to focus on belonging. Hedetoft (2002) argues that belonging should be understood through four parameters that occur in specific sites. His view argues that the cognitive and physical experiences during childhood socialisation form the bases for belonging via a conditioning process. However the conscious positive identification with these sources is not seen as necessary for the development of feelings of belonging: often satisfaction of belonging needs is enough. The locality, familiarity, needs satisfaction, and memory take a collective form and become institutionalised when imposed and ascribed by state agencies. But this ‘bounded, homogenous, organic and unitary’ state-sponsored belonging again becomes ‘porous’ and ‘deteriorialized’ when (im)migrants now ‘belong to the globe rather than the nation’ (ibid., p.4).

Jones and Krzyżanowski (2008) argue that a sustained critique of the concept of identity can be achieved by using ‘belonging’ as an analytic tool. Their theory posits that belonging is constructed through internal and external processes. The internal dynamics of belonging involve processes of self-representation and an assessment of the extent to which one feels aligned with a particular group. External dynamics of belonging on the other hand involve how powerful others (whether individual, collective or institutional) formally and informally ‘guard’ the membership threshold.

2.3.2 Belonging vs identity

I now turn the discussion to conceptually unpacking belonging as an alternative concept to the troublesome concept of identity. The analytic link is illustrated by Weeks (1990, p.88) in the following argument:
Identity is about belonging, about what you have in common with some people and what differentiates you from others. At its most basic it gives you a sense of personal location, the stable core to your individuality. But it is also about your relationships, your complex involvement with others and in the modern world these have become ever more complex and confusing.

The argument implies that an understanding of belonging is crucial for a sustained reflection on what is identity. Belonging, Weeks argues, embeds a person in a web of relationships that results in a sense of place and functions to construct similarities and differences with others. The intimate link between concepts of identity and belonging is further stressed in other studies. Colic-Peisker (2010), in his study on transnational knowledge workers, preferred to use the term ‘identity-belonging’. Whilst this signals an important association between the two concepts this does not address analytic precision emphasised by Brubaker and Cooper (2000). Nevertheless, Colic-Peisker explained that the reason for coupling the two concepts is that: ‘a feeling of belonging is understood as a central part of identity’ (p.469) and consequently, ‘one belongs to a group with whom one identifies’ (p.470).

Another contribution to the debate on identity and belonging is the approach suggested by Anthias (2002; 2008; 2009). Instead of coupling identity and belonging as one term, she suggested a more nuanced understanding of the two concepts by explaining that the difference lie in the emphasis:

Identity involves individual and collective narratives of self and other, presentation and labelling, myths of origin and myths of destiny with associated strategies and identifications. Belonging on the other hand is more about experiences of being part of the social fabric and the ways in which social bonds and ties are manifested in practices, experiences and emotions of inclusion.(Anthias, 2009, p.9)

Anthias’ elaboration resonates the approach of Venn (2006) discussed above. Identities are understood in the sense of a social identity or ‘that part of the individual’s self-concept which derives from his knowledge of his membership of a social group (or groups) together with the
value and emotional significance attached to that membership’ (Tajfel, 1981, p.255). The lived experiences of ‘situational self-positioning and positioning by others’ (Kraus, 2006, p.103) along these social categories constitute what is belonging.

To further the debate Anthias offers a framework called ‘translocational positionality’ to clarify the relationship of identity and belonging. She described her framework (2008, p.6) as follows:

A key question is how to think of belonging and identity within the transnational and what I have called ‘translocational frame’ which recognises that people have multiple locations, positions and belongings, in a situated and contextual way, but which does not end up as a thoroughgoing reification or deconstruction of difference.

In order to clarify this framework it is useful to explain what she meant by translocation. The concept of translocation signifies the notions of ‘location and ‘intersection’. Location refers to ‘a social space which is produced within contextual, spatial, temporal, and hierarchical relations around the intersections of social divisions and identities of class, ethnicity, gender (amongst others)’ (ibid., p.9). To think of translocation involves being concerned with either (a) relocation (e.g. migration and settlement that give rise to 1.5 generation); (b) dislocation (e.g. upward mobility within a lifetime of a second-generation); (c) and the complex nature of location (e.g. each person being situated in spaces of gender and class). Meanwhile the notion of intersection references not only the (a) crisscrossing of (b) boundaries between social divisions (e.g. ethnicity, nations, gender, class) but also (c) the hierarchies that characterise the intersectional process. For example the exchange flow of cultural elements between ‘nations’ of the Philippines and the UK in the families of second-generation maybe asymmetrical depending on who maintains the threshold and the differentiated access as influenced by class.
Positionality, in connection to locations, relates to ‘the space at the intersection of structure (as social position/social effects) and agency (as social positioning/meaning and practice)’ (Anthias, 2002, p.502). Positionality is about one’s place in the order of things as much as it is about how one is placed in such order. Such process occurs in shifting locales (Anthias, 2008): whether experiential, intersubjective, organisational or representational (Anthias, 1998b).

**Defining belonging**

In order to link the concepts of identity and subjectivity I argue the use of belonging as an alternative concept. Representations of belonging, as will be demonstrated in this study, capture both the ready-made identities illustrated in government statistical records and the subjective lived-experiences of older second-generation Filipinos in London. In Chapter 1, belonging was initially defined as ‘a sense of ease with oneself and one’s surroundings’ (May, 2011, p.368). This definition emphasises being comfortable relative to a sense of self and sense of surroundings. This sense of self also presupposes a sense of others and a process of othering through commonalities and differences (Weeks, 1990). Applying this in the context of the study, a sense of surroundings can refer to a sense of place that range from an immediate environment such as a household or school, or to wider geo-physical spaces of a country such as the UK or the Philippines, or to symbolic social spaces of British or Filipino culture. Viewed in the case of second-generation, a sense of self/others and surroundings become even more complex. The ‘self’ has to be oriented with ‘others’ ‘here but also ‘there’. In the same way, their respective surroundings is also ‘framed’ by at least two places: the UK and the Philippines. It is also in this vein that I argue the use of the concept transnational
social field as an analytic and contextual frame within which second-generation Filipinos in the UK negotiates and accomplishes a sense of belonging.

Another definition of belonging, but is more elaborate on what is meant by a ‘sense of ease’ and ‘the surroundings,’ is the one proposed by Miller (2003, p.223):

Belonging is about a certain deportment in the world, a way of being that, ideally, is related to the common spheres of our belonging (community, history and locality) and thus to whom and what we are. Such a state of being is not something that just happens; it is something that we must create for ourselves. Thus the struggle for belonging can be understood as the task of becoming selves that have both transparency and authenticity in regard to where one comes from and who one is.

Miller’s definition foregrounds important points in conceptualising belonging. He identifies three spheres of belonging a person must be oriented to: (a) community as links to people; (b) locality as geographical links; and (c) history as links to traditions. The process of positioning self to any of the three spheres involves being in a correct relationship or a sense of appropriateness (i.e. certain deportment) in order to be ‘at ease’ in these spheres. He further explains that a correct relationship emerges out of two pre-conditions: (a) transparency, which means ‘self-knowledge...a condition of the self as conscious of its own ontological condition qua true being’ (ibid., p.219); and (b) authenticity, which ‘relates to subjective truth...actualised only when it is immersed in personal experience’ (ibid., p.219). That is why, Miller underscores that a person has to struggle to achieve belonging. Having outlined a definition of belonging the next section discusses a framework in understanding belonging in a transnational context.
2.4 Sense and politics of transnational belonging

What I have done so far is an unpacking of the concept of belonging and how various authors have defined it. These conceptual definitions should also be analytically explored in empirical investigations such as by the framework suggested by Yuval-Davis (2006) and Antonsich (2010). In this section, I introduce the conceptual tools of their framework that will be helpful in reading narratives of transnational belonging among the second-generation.

Antonsich recognises that Yuval-Davis offered the most comprehensive analytic framework on belonging when she differentiated ‘sense of belonging’ from ‘politics of belonging’. For Yuval-Davis (2006) a sense of belonging refers to ‘emotional attachment about feeling “at home”’ whereas politics of belonging refers to ‘specific political projects aimed at constructing belonging in particular ways to particular collectivities that are, at the same time, themselves being constructed by these projects in very particular ways’ (p.197).

She further explained that a sense of belonging has three analytic aspects. First: a sense of belonging involves ‘different categories of social location, but categories that have certain positionality along axis of power, higher or lower than other such categories.’ This notion of location is akin to the concept of social identities described earlier. According to Yuval-Davis, even if a person gravitates towards a particular identification such as being Filipino (versus being English), a person’s ‘concrete social location is constructed along multiple axes of difference such as gender, class, race and ethnicity, stage in the life cycle, sexuality, ability and so on’ (p.200). These social identities are mutually constitutive of each other: that although social identities can be conceptually separated from other social locations, in reality they are not independent of each other. Second: a sense of belonging is also about identifications and emotional attachment that are revealed through ‘stories people tell
themselves and others about who they are (and who they are not) (p.202). To demonstrate identification and to show attachment involve a process of emotional investment on the part of the person and an active construction of ‘being and becoming, belonging and longing to belong’ (p.202). The third analytic dimension of a sense of belonging involves ethical and political values in which the first two dimensions are valued and judged against. This last dimension serves the site for politics of belonging to be realised.

Politics of belonging, Yuval-Davis explains, is about the production and maintenance of boundaries that define collectivities of people: who gets to belong and who gets to be excluded. Following her thematic focus on power, she argues that these boundaries are created not just by that in power but also by other political agents (such as the minority) who can contest these boundaries. Such boundaries of production and contestation are demonstrated in citizenship and entitlements. She reminds that citizenship is not always tied up to a nation-state but should be understood in a participatory sense of membership to a political community whether ‘sub-, cross- or supra state, such as local, ethnic, religious, regional, and international’ (p.206). Another aspect of citizenship boundary has to do with status and entitlement or, in other words, the rights and responsibilities of being a citizen. Operationally citizenship rights also entail spatial rights or ‘the right to enter a state or any other territory of a political community, and once inside, the right to remain there’ (p.208). With regard to responsibility Yuval-Davis comments that, to a larger extent, duties now become requisites for belonging such as having to establish common descent or demonstrating loyalty and solidarity with the political community.

Antonsich, however, raises the issue that Yuval-Davis’ discussion on the dimensions of sense of belonging is essentially about the ‘construction of belonging in particular collectivities’
(politics of belonging) rather than about ‘emotional attachment, [and] about feeling at home’ (2006, p.197) (sense of belonging). Thus, in the discussion succeeding, I present Antonsich’s reorganisation of Yuval-Davis approach. At the outset it must be mentioned that both Yuval-Davis and Antonsinch’s framework is an academic appraisal of belonging as a category of analysis. My aim is to re-appropriate their ideas in a transnational setting by looking at the case of second-generation who negotiate Filipino-ness and British-ness.

Developing from Yuval-Davis’ framework and, as supported by other works, Antonsich differentiates place-belongingness or the ‘personal, intimate, feeling of being at home in a place’ from politics of belonging or ‘belonging as discursive resource which constructs, claims, justifies, or resists forms of socio-spatial inclusion/exclusion’ (Antonsich, 2010, p.645).

**Sense of belonging.** Antonsinch clarifies that the term ‘place’ in place-belongingness is not limited to a territorial space but instead may also refer to being rooted to a home as ‘symbolic space of familiarity, comfort, and emotional attachment’ (Antonsinch, 2010, p.646). This sense of place is what Yuval-Davis failed to acknowledge in her discussion of a sense of belonging. Such conception of place as home in a territorial and symbolic sense is crucial to theorising belonging in a transnational context. In a macro scale place may refer to geographic and nation-states of the Philippines and the UK. In a micro-scale being at home may mean social relationships with significant others that one feel associated with.

To elaborate on place-belongingness Antonsinch explained that five factors can lead to this sense of rootedness: (a) auto-biographical factors which ‘relate to...personal experiences, relations and memories’ (p.647); (b) relational factors of ‘personal and social ties’ that individuals keep; (c) cultural factors particularly language; (d) economic factors or ‘the
condition of being fully and successfully integrated into a given economy’; and finally, (e) legal factors or the formal structures of where one feels secure.

**Politics of belonging.** Antonsinch then extends and elaborates the earlier ideas of Yuval-Davis by moving from a personal and individual notion of belonging to its social production. Briefly, ‘one’s personal, intimate feeling of belonging to a place should always come to terms with discourses and practices of socio-spatial inclusion/exclusion at play in that very place and which inexorably conditions one’s sense of place-belongingness’ (p.649). Put another way, politics of belonging highlights the contingency of ‘feelings of being at home’ with how boundaries of belonging are made and maintained. This process effectively divides individuals between granter and claimants of belonging (based on economic, social or universal reasons).

**Summary**

This chapter has reviewed the theoretical and empirical literature on the concepts that frame the present study. I have elaborated the concept of *second-generation* as a category of practice and as a category of analysis. I have illustrated the circulation of the term in the public space and clarified the various operational definitions in different studies. As a result, I argued that in researching the second-generation studies should be sensitive to defining the second-generation as a biological and as a historical generation. This chapter outlined the key ideas on *transnational social field* including the associated issues of groupism and methodological nationalism. The concepts of *identity and belonging* were analytically unpacked by discussing the essentialist, constructionist, and alternative perspectives. Finally, I also argued to use of the concept of belonging as an alternative to troublesome concept of identity. As an analytic
framework the rest of the study, belonging will be examined by differentiating sense of belonging and politics of belonging.
The sociological imagination enables us to grasp history and biography and the relations between the two within society. That is its task and its promise.

C. Wright Mills (1959) The Sociological Imagination

The application of sociological imagination in contemporary times requires challenging the usual domains within which it normally operates because biographies in the modern times are now embedded in at least two societies with entwined histories. Either by birth or by their own choosing, people are emplaced in different localities that now commonly transcend the borders of nation-states. They become members by default of bloodline and networks or imaginary and actual communities that are miles apart. This chapter aims to articulate such an approach by presenting a research methodology to account for the external and internal representations of belonging among the second-generation Filipinos in England. I will outline the procedures and technical details in arriving at estimates of the Filipino and second-generation population (Section 3.1). I will then discuss the principles and procedures of gathering and analysing biographic narratives to account for the subjective representations of belonging in a transnational context (Section 3.2).

3.1 Phase 1: Macro/official narrative

In addressing the question of transnational belonging Phase 1 focuses attention on how the second-generation is positioned by institutional others. This phase directly responds to the first set of research questions:

RQ1. How is the second-generation officially represented in government statistical records?
RQ1a. Are there administrative records that can be used to estimate the population size of the second-generation?

RQ1b. What is the empirically verifiable population size of the second-generation relative to overall Filipino diaspora in the UK?

Phase 1 aims to examine if the second-generation is a sizeable component of the Filipino labour diaspora in the UK by focusing on patterns of migration, settlement, and citizenship acquisition. It aims to provide a more accurate picture of an overall population estimate of Filipinos in the UK and aims to arrive at an estimate of the size of second-generation by imputation.

As argued in the previous chapter, social identities manifest in official categorisations of the governments as institutional Other. Specific subjectivities as represented in biographic narratives are mutually constitutive of each other. Particularly in the case of official classifications, Simon and Pische (2012, p.1358-1359) persuasively argue:

Official (and scientific) statistical categorizations both reflect and affect the structural divisions of societies, as well as mainstream social representations. As conventions, they offer arbitrary definitions of the social objects they are intended to describe, but these definitions ensue from historical, social and political processes of negotiation between public authorities and social forces. In this respect, censuses are a strategic place in which views on race and ethnicity are confronted by official statistics. In this sense, censuses do more than reflect social realities; they also participate in the construction of these realities.

Statistical records such as those examined in this study are crucial starting points to think about belonging in a transnational context. The categories they provide offer a way to shape ethnicity of immigrants and their descendants.
3.1.1 Data collection: ‘counting Filipinos’

The Philippines (as a sending / country of emigration) and the UK (as a receiving / country of immigration) monitor population movements coming out of and coming into their borders, respectively. On one hand, the Philippine government gathers migration statistics through the Commission of Filipinos Overseas (CFO) which consolidates\textsuperscript{15} an inter-agency report on the population estimates or the number of permanent\textsuperscript{16}, temporary\textsuperscript{17}, and irregular migrants\textsuperscript{18} in each known countries of destination. On the other hand, the UK government, through the Home Office, regularly releases reports on control of immigration and grants of British citizens.

These administrative reports, I argue, are data sources to narrate a collective story of a people – their migration and eventual settlement to a hostland, the relinquishing of their original citizenship in favour of another and their birthing of a ‘new generation’. As there are photo narratives (Hurworth, 2003) that use images to tell a storied experience, there are also statistical narratives (Few, 2009) that use (time series) numeric data about a population to tell a story about such population (over time).

\textsuperscript{15} A personal communication with CFO provides this explanation: ‘The sources of the stock estimate came from the reports and estimates of Philippine diplomatic posts, and outflow data of overseas Filipino workers from the Philippine Overseas Employment Administration, and registered Filipino emigrants from the Commission on Filipinos Overseas. The secondary sources are the censuses of host governments, and records from the Bureau of Immigration and Filipino associations overseas, among others.’ [email, 16 November 2009]

\textsuperscript{16} CFO (2010) defines permanent residents as ‘Immigrants, dual citizens or legal permanent residents abroad whose stay do not depend on work contracts.’ It is unclear whether Filipinos who have been naturalised citizens of the hostland are still included in this counting. Nevertheless a count of naturalised British citizens will be presented using UK records.

\textsuperscript{17} Temporary migrants are ‘Persons whose stay overseas is employment related, and who are expected to return at the end of their work contracts’. Because their stay in the hostland is tied with contracts, they were previously called OCWs or Overseas Contract Workers. The more popularly used term now is Overseas Filipino Workers (or OFWs) which now include those who have permanently settled but nevertheless are still working.

\textsuperscript{18} Irregular migrants are ‘those not properly documented or without valid residence or work permits, or who are overstaying in a foreign country.’ It is difficult to arrive at an exact number for irregular migrants precisely because of their legal status. Chances are, these figures are reasonable guesses.
Data Sources

Several secondary data sources were examined to describe the first- and second-generation Filipino population. For Philippine government, reports I used the data on *Stock Estimate of Overseas Filipinos* over a 14-year period from 1997 to 2010. CFO began preparing population estimates of Filipinos overseas in 1995 by gathering reports from Philippine diplomatic posts all over the world and allied government offices like the Philippine Overseas Employment Administration (POEA). It was only in 1997 that they started breaking down estimates according to destination countries. At the time of writing only the 2000 to 2009 tables can be downloaded from the CFO website\(^{19}\). Tables from 1997 to 1999 were only released after a request was made.

For the UK government, reports two Home Office publication series dealing with immigration and citizenship were used. First was the *Control of Immigration: Statistics, United Kingdom*\(^{20}\) which provided data on passenger admissions and grants of settlement. Although these command papers\(^{21}\) have been published since 1955 (for data on ‘foreigners’ in the year 1954) the present analysis only covers 34 years of data (from 1976 to 2010)\(^{22}\). Recent

---


\(^{20}\) The archival nature of Phase 1 shows that the publication series has changed ‘titles’ four times over the years. Published reports from 1953 to 1973 were titled “Statistics of Foreigners Entering and Leaving the United Kingdom (year considered)”. Reports published in 1974 and 1975 were titled “Immigration Statistics (year considered).” Published reports from 1976 to 1979 carried the name “Control of Immigration Statistics (year considered)”. Then, starting the 1980 publication year, the report is titled, “Control of Immigration: Statistics United Kingdom (year considered).”

\(^{21}\) An official document of the British government presented to the Parliament.

\(^{22}\) There are two reasons for this. First, the category “Philippines” started appearing only in 1976 report published in 1977. There are of course ‘Filipino nationals’ who were given leave to enter the UK as data on citizenship grants would show. Chances are, they were subsumed under “other foreign countries”. Second, the 1997 data was not included in the analysis because the report was not available in the online database. When the printed copy in the British Library was examined, it showed that the report used a presentation different from previous report so continuity and data comparison are difficult to achieve.
publications were downloaded from the Home Office\textsuperscript{23} website whilst the earlier command papers were downloaded from House of Commons Parliamentary Papers website\textsuperscript{24}.

A second source of data is the bulletin \textit{British Citizenship Statistics: United Kingdom (year considered)}\textsuperscript{25} which provides statistics on number of applications received grants, and refusals on British citizenship applications. I collated ‘all Filipinos who became British citizens’ from reports covering the last 48 years, that is from 1962, when data on grants were first gathered and published in a bulletin, up to 2009, for the most recent available report at the time of writing. All bulletins were gathered from the same sources mentioned.

Although there are other statistical sources such as the UK census which can estimate ‘ethnic’ population these data sets were not used for the purposes of the present study. When it comes to ethnicity questions, ‘the census is no longer able to capture the new populations’ (Aspinall, 2012, p.353) particularly from intermarriages. Alternatively, settlement statistics provide a count of ‘children’ of Filipino nationals who became permanent residents. Citizenship statistics also count minors who were registered as British citizens on grounds\textsuperscript{26} of the parents’ citizenship or settlement status. Implied in this data is an opportunity to count the ‘second-generation’ but also a limitation since third and later generation will become even more difficult to count. The censuses at the time of writing may also not be the best fit for

\textsuperscript{23} See \url{http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/} [Accessed 3 June 2011]

\textsuperscript{24} See \url{http://parlipapers.chadwyck.co.uk/home.do} [Accessed 3 June 2011]

\textsuperscript{25} The statistical bulletin on citizenship grants has had five names in almost five decades. Published reports from 1963 to 1978 carried the title \textit{Statistics of Persons acquiring Citizenship of the United Kingdom and Colonies (year considered)}. Bulletins published from 1979 to 1984 were named, \textit{Tables of Persons acquiring Citizenship of the United Kingdom and Colonies}. Reports from 1985 until 1992 to 2008, were titled \textit{Persons Granted British Citizenship United Kingdom (year considered)}. Then in 2010, the bulletin reads \textit{British Citizenship Statistics United Kingdom, 2009}.

\textsuperscript{26} See: \url{http://www.ukba.homeoffice.gov.uk/sitecontent/documents/policyandlaw/nationalityinstructions/nichapter08/chapter8?view=Binary} [Accessed 22 Sept 2012]
estimating the size of the diaspora since the readily available data sets are from the 1991 and 2001 census. Data set for the 2011 census is yet to be released at the time of writing. To supplement statistics on Filipinos living and working in the UK I also include estimates from the Annual Population Survey (APS).

3.1.2 Data analysis: ‘who counts?’

Phase 1 has three-fold aims namely: (a) to estimate the Filipino diaspora in the UK and at the same time highlight; (b) changes over the years; and to (c) estimate the second-generation population. To do this I turn to statistical information on overseas population, journeys, settlement, and citizenship grants. Full discussion of tables and patterns in graphs are presented in Chapter 4.

Journeys

To describe mobilities between the Philippines and the UK, I count the total number of journeys using the following formula:

$$JOURNEY_{TOTAL} = \sum_{i=0}^{n} (\text{Permit} + \text{Family} + \text{Student} + \text{Return} + \text{Others})_i$$

Where:

- $JOURNEY_{TOTAL}$ = Total number of journeys from 1976 to 2009 (except 1997)
- $i=0$ = year 1976
- $n$ = year 2009
- Permit = work permit holders
- Family = family members and other dependants

---

27 ‘The Annual Population Survey (APS) combines data from the Labour Force Survey (LFS) and national boosts. Datasets contain 12 months of data and responses from 155,000 households and 360,000 people. It thus improves intercensal monitoring of key variables for a range of policy purposes.’ [Source: http://ukdataservice.ac.uk/get-data/key-data.aspx#/tab-uk-surveys, Date accessed: 14 May 2013]
Journeys, in this sense, are numbers of arrivals in UK ports of individuals who are Philippine passport holders. It is possible that a person can be counted multiple times depending on the number of journeys made during a particular year: they are counted every time they arrive. Journey statistics are important indication of appreciating the flows of people that link the Philippines and the UK. Whilst most of these journeys are just short trips a defined segment of work permit holders and family members are also included. These segments are more likely to later take the permanent settlement route and therefore can potentially increase the Filipino diaspora in general and second-generation population in particular.

**Settlement**

To account for Filipinos who were granted permanent residence or indefinite leave to remain in the UK, the following formula is used:

\[
SETTLE_{TOTAL} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} (Husband + Wife + Children + Dependents + Others)_i
\]

Where:

- \(SETTLE_{TOTAL}\) = Total number of persons granted settlement from 1976 to 2009 (except 1997)
- \(1\) = year 1976
- \(n\) = year 2009
- \(Husband\) = total number of grants to husbands for year considered
- \(Wife\) = total number of grants to wives for year considered
- \(Children\) = total number of grants to children 18 years old and below for year considered
- \(Dependents\) = total number of grants to other relatives of main applicant for year considered
- \(Others\) = total number of grants on the basis of employment and other discretionary grants for the year considered
A grant of settlement is only given once and therefore each count per year refers to a discrete count that can be added to arrive at a composite figure. As such this summary statistic provides an estimate of the ‘Filipino diaspora’ in the UK. An estimate of the second-generation is arrived at by segregating ‘Children’ in the formula. These children may also be referred to as the *de facto* second-generation provided that they were born in the Philippines and were granted settlement as dependent of their immigrant parent. Using these numbers we can arrive at an estimate of the decimal generation from the 2.0 generation. Technically people who were granted settlement in the hostland remain to be citizens of the homeland. The only difference is that from the point of the view of the UK as a hostland these people now have the rights for them to have indefinite leave to remain. Unlike temporary migrants whose stay in the hostland is determined by employment contracts permanent residents are no longer bound by work permits. Another methodological point about settlement statistics is that given availability of these figures they can then be compared with estimates of permanent residents as gathered by the CFO.

**Citizenship**

In general, there are three pathways for persons of other nationalities to become naturalised British citizens: (a) by meeting residence requirements, (b) by marriage, and (c) by registration of minor children. People turn to naturalisation because it is an advantageous option to pursue with few impediments to achieving it. Naturalisation also indicates a change in legal relationship between the person and the government (Blinder, 2012). In the case of Filipinos naturalisation is a very strong indication of settledness in the UK and therefore a favourable condition where the second-generation (particularly the 2.0 generation) can emerge.
To estimate the number of Filipinos who became British citizens over the last five decades, I used this formula:

\[ GRANTS_{TOTAL} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} (Residence + Marriage + Children)_i \]

Where:

- \( GRANTS_{TOTAL} \) = Total number of citizenship grants from 1962 to 2009
- \( i \) = year 1962
- \( n \) = year 2009
- Residence = number of grants on account of residence for the year considered
- Marriage = number of grants on account of marriage for the year considered
- Children = number of grants to minors children for the year considered

Under UK rules, a minor who is born in the UK on or after 1 January 1983 and were not British citizens because of status of parents or where at least one parent became settled or naturalised citizen can be registered by entitlement. That is why an estimate of the 2.0 generation is arrived at by segregating ‘Children’ in the formula. For details on categories subsumed under each of clusters in the three formula presented above, see Appendix A.

In summary statistical records of the UK and Philippine governments on migration, settlement, and citizenship were used in order to examine official representations of first and second-generation Filipinos. This phase of the study shows that official statistics may be used to broadly ‘narrate’ and describe the growth of the second-generation and the diaspora-at-large. However, the second-generation remain to be invisible and uncounted as these resources are largely unknown to potential users such as the Philippine Embassy and the Filipino organisations throughout the UK. Although limited in its approach Phase 1 shows how individuals are categorised based on parental nationality, country of birth, and of parents’ (previous) citizenship or age at immigration. From an administrative point of view migration,
settlement, and citizenship statistics impute a person’s belonging. Whilst I have already highlighted the usefulness of this approach in surfacing the Filipino diaspora in the public arena this does not capture the shifting, multi-layered, and sometimes ambivalent sense of belonging that an individual undergoes throughout their life. In contrast to official statistical reports that consolidate these imposed categorizations, life stories offer avenues to examine self-descriptions: how they transform from childhood to adulthood, and the salient dimensions and strategies for making sense of difference and social positioning. These issues are problematised in Phase 2 of the study.

3.2 Phase 2: Micro/biographic narratives

Phase 2 reorients the question on transnational belonging by turning to individual constructions of such belonging. This part of the study is guided by the following research questions:

RQ2. How do second-generation themselves narratively represent their life as persons with a Filipino background?

RQ2a. How is a sense of self positioned in relation to notions of Filipino-ness and British-ness?

RQ2b. What influences the continuity, discontinuity and change of these self-positionings over the course of a person’s life?

Phase 2 examines the second-generation’s narration of belonging through their biographic narratives. Biographical approaches have been particularly useful in migration studies because of their value in making sense of migration as a process, the perspectives of migrants (and changes thereof), and the interrelationship of migration experiences and other spheres of life
Theoretically, a biographical approach allows for the unpacking of subjectivities that emerge and how the second-generation is positioned within a transnational social field. Transnational belonging can then be made meaningful when seen in the context of a person’s life. Methodologically a life story approach allows for an empirical exploration of biographicity which ‘means that individuals can continually reinterpret their life in the contexts in which they experience it, and that they themselves experience these contexts as ‘mouldable’ and ‘shapeable’’ (ibid., p.5). In this section I sketch the bases of data collection and analytical strategies I employed.

Pre-fieldwork

The informants were selected based on: (a) gender; (b) country of birth; (c) ethnicity of parents; and (d) current place of residence. A total of 20 informants (9 female and 11 male) were interviewed between August 2010 and February 2011.

One of the methodological concerns at the early stage of the study was deciding on ‘how many interviews were enough’ to answer the study research questions. The study used a lightly structured interview style (see Section 3.2.2) called Biographic-Narrative-Interpretive-Method (BNIM). Wengraf (2011, p.577), one of BNIM’s proponents, suggests ‘[T]hree is a good minimum to study and present. Six seems a good basic number...[but] you may need to tape between 8 to 12 interviews to get 4-6 really good ones.’ A recent experiment by Guest et al. (2006) showed that theoretical saturation or when ‘all of the main variations of the phenomenon have been identified and incorporated into an emerging theory’ (p. 65) can be achieved within the first twelve interviews, although basic elements of metathemes were present as early as six interviews’ (p. 59). I argue that the study’s sample of 20 participants captures the substantive heterogeneity that can be expected based on the biographic
dimensions of gender, generation, and parentage (see Table 8, p.138). The sample has met minimum technical requirements of the interview method used and moved to achieve theoretical saturation to address the study research questions (Bryman, 2012),

London was chosen as locale of the study because of the high density of Filipinos (Philippine Embassy, 2010) and their longer migration history in this location. Furthermore, a survey in 2000 identified some 1,600 school children in London who were speaking Filipino (Baker and Eversley, 2000). This finding suggests a concentration of young second-generation in London who could be participants in the study. It is highly likely that most of these ‘school children’ are adults already by 2010.

All of the informants were aged 18 years old or over. Whilst there is evidence to support the claim that majority of second-generation Filipinos (see Chapter 4) are in fact very young – toddlers and teenagers – which warrant a study in itself, the present study takes interest with the older second-generation. The earlier wave of first-generation migrants coming to the UK in the 1980s or earlier are the parents of this now adult cohort. It is viewed that in being adults they best fit as participants for the study given the interview task that asks them to reconstruct the significant events of their lives as persons with Filipino background. Their longer years of experience are potentially more insightful in understanding multiple belongings. Moreover, a clear analytic focus on this age group addresses the understudied area of second-generation as independent adults (Jones-Correa, 2002).

The informants were contacted through two techniques: (a) personal referral and (b) organisational linkages. Several individuals acted as gatekeepers who introduced me to their friends with children who could serve as potential informants. Two of the gatekeepers were
my aunt\textsuperscript{28} (a nurse) and uncle (a cleaner in a hospital) who settled in London in 2004. These ‘first-generation’ parents, with whom I was linked then introduced me to the ‘second-generation’ son or daughter (e.g. Billy and Martin). At the end of the interview I would ask informants to refer me other individuals who might also be interested to participate in the study. This resulted into snowballing of the sample through the informants who were interviewed. This is how I reached Ben, Ted and Lea (see Table 3, p.73). In addition, some of the participants were contacted through the help of \textit{Philippine Generations}, a non-profit organisation for second-generation Filipinos, and by attending social events at the Philippine Embassy in London. For example the embassy hosts an annual gathering for Filipino postgraduate students and other young people including the second-generation. I took this opportunity to introduce myself and my study and this resulted in getting two of my participants (Chris and Corrine).

\textbf{Reflexivity and research ethics}

I consider myself a ‘cultural insider’ (Ganga and Scott, 2006) in relation to the informants i.e. we have an almost similar cultural, ethnic, national and religious heritage – at least with respect to their ‘Filipino side’. I was born and raised in the Philippines and speak \textit{Tagalog} (the Philippine national language). The Philippines is generally a Christian nation and I was born to a Catholic family. To be more precise this cultural similarity is closer to the participant’s Filipino parent(s). As an international migrant student I may be treated as a ‘first-generation’ like their parent(s). To my mind my similarity to their parents can be used as resource to make the interview situation at ease: given my ‘Filipino background’ I am not a complete stranger. However, since our interview session is only our first or second time to see

\textsuperscript{28} I have two cousins from my aunt and uncle but they were not included as study participants. Aside from the fact that they will be ‘knowing participants’ the risks of disclosure are also high.
each other I was also aware that they will, to a certain extent, view me as largely unfamiliar person.

The informants had varying Tagalog language skills: most of them only speak English (e.g. Billy and Chris) whilst others can understand ‘a bit’ but don’t speak it (e.g. Sarah and Corrine); others can converse in Tagalog (e.g. Sophie, Drew and Ann). A few first-generation parents have their own regional languages in the Philippines thus their offspring have certain familiarity with the language (e.g. Ben can converse in Kapampangan whilst Jesse can only understand Ilocano but not speak it).

Application for ethical approval was sent to the University of Birmingham’s Research and Commercial Services on 26th May 2010 with reference number Application for Ethical Review ERN_10-0435. The project was reviewed by the Arts and Social Sciences Ethical Review Committee and conditions for ethical approval were satisfactorily met on 5th July 2010.

During the interview, participants were given information sheets about the study and were asked to sign a document of informed consent should they agree to participate (see Appendix). They were informed of their rights to withdraw participation at any point without having to explain; right to anonymity of identity, and right to confidentiality of data arising from the study. They were also asked to give consent for the interview to be audio-recorded.

All data arising from the interview (i.e. audio files, transcripts etc.) were treated as confidential. The participants’ identity remained anonymous and information about them was properly coded in the analysis of data and reporting of results. Pseudonyms were used for all references to a particular participant’s narrative. The participants were also informed of their right to keep their name in written outputs and future publications that may arise from this
research. Five of the participants allowed the use of their first name when referring to them in the text. I decided in the end to use pseudonyms for all 20 participants in order to prevent a situation of matching actual personalities with the study participants.
Table 3 Selected characteristics of informants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Born in</th>
<th>Raised in</th>
<th>Ethnicity of</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the</td>
<td>(in the Phils at age 1 to 13)</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>KATE</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Phils</td>
<td>Filipina</td>
<td>Filipino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CORRINE</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Filipina</td>
<td>White British</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ANNE</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Phils (in the Phils at age 1-14)</td>
<td>Filipina</td>
<td>Filipino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>CAMILLE</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Filipina</td>
<td>Filipino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ELLIE</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>HK</td>
<td>Filipina</td>
<td>White British</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>LEA</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Filipina</td>
<td>Filipino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>SARAH</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Filipina</td>
<td>Filipino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>SOPHIE</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Phils (in the Phils at age 1 to 14)</td>
<td>Filipina-British</td>
<td>Filipino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>MARIE</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Filipina</td>
<td>Filipino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>DAVE</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Filipina</td>
<td>Filipino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>BILLY</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Filipina</td>
<td>White British</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>DREW</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>UK (in the Phils at age 1-18)</td>
<td>Filipina</td>
<td>Israeli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>MIKE</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Filipina</td>
<td>Filipino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>BEN</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>UK (in the Phils at age 3-8)</td>
<td>Filipina</td>
<td>Filipino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>JESSE</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>UK (in the Phils at age 1-3)</td>
<td>Filipina</td>
<td>Filipino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>CHRIS</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Filipina</td>
<td>White British</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>MARTIN</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Filipina</td>
<td>White British</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>KYLE</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Filipina</td>
<td>Pakistani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>JAMES</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Filipina</td>
<td>Portuguese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>TED</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Filipina</td>
<td>Filipino</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: UK = United Kingdom; Phils = Philippines.
Interviewed informants

Table 3 shows data about the informants’ sex, age, place of birth, locale of childhood socialisation, ethnicity of parents and the length of recorded interview. The female participants were aged between 23 and 32 whilst the age range of male participants is from 19 to 31 years old.

Except for Kate, Anne, Ellie and Sophie, all other informants were born in London. Fifteen of them were exclusively raised in London. Only five of the respondents spent a considerable amount of time in the Philippines during their childhood years. Ann and Sophie both spent the first 14 years of life with their respective relatives in the Philippines. Even though Ben was born in London he was with his grandparents in the Philippines from ages 3 to 8. Drew is also UK-born but spent practically most of his life in the Philippines having been raised and schooled in the homeland of his mother. James used to visit London during the holidays before deciding to stay in the UK at age 17 to pursue his undergraduate degree.

Except for Sophie, whose mother is half-British, all other informants have a Filipina mothers. (i.e. mother was born and raised in the Philippines). There is however some variation on the ethnicity of their fathers. Thirteen of the 20 informants have a Filipino father. Ellie, Billy, Chris and Martin have a White British father. Drew’s father is Israeli whilst James’ father is Portuguese. The biological father of Kyle is Pakistani but at age 6 his mother re-married a White British man who became the stepfather who raised him. During the interview, Drew described his father as Jewish instead of being originally from Israel to highlight religious difference from a usually ‘Catholic’ Filipino or a ‘Muslim’ Pakistani. All participants including their parents are British citizens.
Each of the participants was interviewed once. On average an interview lasted for 1 hour and 45 minutes. Sarah, Ben and James were interviewed for almost an hour. These relatively shorter interviews were constrained by prior commitments of the informant. Other informants reported that ‘they tend to talk too much’. The interviews with Sophie, Billy, Drew and Martin lasted for more than two hours. The longest interview was with Mike which lasted for almost 3.5 hours (mainly because we moved from one coffee shop to another). In total I collected more than 35 hours of audio-recorded interviews.

As will be explained in Section 3.2.2, the fundamental part of the interview is a period of main narration elicited at the start of the meeting. Regardless of interview length, this initial account provides an overall gestalt of a participant’s life story and a basis for gathering of further narratives. This implies that for time-constrained interviews I have to be judicious in selecting which specific events and experiences to pursue for elucidation so that I can capture a representative range of the participant’s lived life. The longer interviews conducted only meant a longer time devoted to selecting and pursuing further narratives about significant events and experiences based on the initial and main narration which exposed the general order of presentation of one’s life (Hollway and Jefferson, 2000).

### 3.2.1 Story of telling / Telling of stories

Oftentimes, ‘stories’ are taken as synonymous to ‘narratives’ (Riessman, 2008). For example, one recent article says: ‘A story or narrative is a personal account of a sequence of actions and events, told to another person (or written to a reader)’ (Greenhalgh and Wengraf, 2008, p.244). Other researchers see a need for clarification: ‘narrative is the representation of story while a story is a sequence of events’(Pimenta and Poovaiah, 2010, p.30).
They view narrative as story-oriented account (Watson, 2009; Wengraf, 2011). A narrative results from the gathering, eliciting, interpreting or collating of stories (Greenhalgh and Wengraf, 2008). Technically, a story signifies ‘a series of events linked by causality, temporality or sequence’ (Pimenta and Poovaiah, 2010, p.30) ‘involving the interplay of characters with interests, motives, emotions and moralities’ (Watson, 2009, p.429). The present study is interested in a specific form of story called life stories.

To further unpack the concept of life stories I examine two definitions. The first is by Titon (1980, p.276) who defines a life story as:

> a person's story of his or her life, or of what he or she thinks is a significant part of that life. It is therefore a personal narrative, a story of personal experience.

In contrast, Atkinson (1998, p.8) conceptualises a life story as:

> the story of a person chooses to tell about the life he or she has lived, told as completely and as honestly as possible, what is remembered of it, and what the teller wants others to know of it, usually as a result of a guided interview by another…A life story is a fairly complete narrating of one’s entire experience of life as a whole, highlighting the most important aspects.

Titon’s definition highlights that the content of a life story is supposedly the totality or a subset of a life in focus as told by the person concerned. This is complemented by Atkinson’s definition by adding will on the part of the narrator in order to shape the told account. In addition to (a) will (i.e. what a person chooses to tell) a told life story is also structured by (b) whether a person can be honest in telling what composes the life to be told; (c) the boundaries of memory and the memorable; (d) the intended audiences.

At this point, it is important to conceptually separate three aspects of a life story: ‘(a) a reality (what is really out there, whatever that may be), (b) [its] experience (how that reality presents
itself into consciousness) and (c) [its] expression (how individual experience is framed and articulated)’ (Bruner, 1986, p.6). It is of course impossible to tell everything about a whole life and every single detail of the reality of life. Such dimensions are unknown and unknowable to the person and to its supposed audiences (Plummer, 1995). Mapping an entirety of a life defies telling because it can only be achieved by devoting the same length of time a person lived. The life as an experience is dependent on what the person can perceive and remember out of it.

This determines what can be expressed in the process of telling. The resulting told story is again structured by a fifth influence: (e) the cultural modes of telling which specifies how and what can be told in particular contexts. For example by linking the cultural modes of telling and the intended audience it can be argued that a research interview has multiple audiences (Langellier, 2001): the self, the interviewer (and others co-present), and the absent others. In the process of telling the narrator engages in self-making and world-making activity in a bid to make sense of a life. For the purposes of the present study the life story’s obvious and immediate intended audience is the interviewer. Whatever the format of the interview, whether lightly-structured or highly-structured (see Wengraf, 2001), the interviewee and the interviewer are interactants who co-construct the resulting vocal expression of life stories. The interviewee’s primary role is that of a speaker-narrator but the interviewer complements and supplements this role as a listener, coaxes (e.g. terminating a discussion over a topic), coach (e.g. guiding what may be said or elaborated), or coerce (e.g. prodding to narrate more) (Plummer, 1995).

Therefore a research interview, such as in this study, can be viewed as a narrative performance or ‘a site of struggle over personal and social identity rather than to the acts of a
self with a fixed, unified, stable, or final essence which serves as the origin or accomplishment of experience’ (Langellier, 2001, p.151). The participants are discursively constructing a life in that moment of telling during the interview. This was be validated when participants were ‘What do you think of the interview?’ at the end of the question. Most of them reported that ‘it was good’ because it made them think and reflect about these issues as it is not every day that they are asked such questions. This means that at the very moment of telling the participant were doing a narrative performance for the self, for me as a researcher, and several absent others who may hear or read their story in the future.

Another point to keep in mind is that this narrative performance is also collaborative – not only because there is an interviewer who extends or halts the telling of stories but more importantly because of the very structure of the interview method employed (see next section). Again, the participant speaks of a main narration after the interviewer has given some guidelines. Using written notes from the main narration, the interviewer then elicits more narrative episodes from the interviewee. In such a case, the interviewer and the interviewee are ‘conversational partners [who] collaborate in the production of accounts’ (Gubrium and Holstein, 2009, p.94). The minimalist role of the interviewer was an important contribution to produce an extended turn at narration.

Assuming that a life story is finally narrated, the act of telling or the oral and vocal reproduction of the narrated life story is just one of the form of expression. When life stories are told in the context of a research interview other forms of expression emerges. For example: (a) the audible life story is captured through a digital voice recorder and then textualised through transcription. In doing so it methodologically includes auditory dimension of the research interview but also excludes the visual and other sensory dimensions – again a
selection and reduction of reality to particular modes of experiencing. (b) This interview transcript summarises a life story, in words and pages, and forms part of what the researcher considers data. The textualised life story is subjected to a series of analytic readings to yield a (c) reduced but complicated version of a life story (Coffey and Atkinson, 1996).

In other words it must be appreciated that as ‘life’ travels from its totality to what can be experienced and to what can be expressed in an interview, there is always a necessary and unintended reduction. At best, narrated life stories symbolize the experiences that ‘made’ a life. No matter how much a person or a reader attempts to give us (and other audiences) ‘the whole life’ or at least all of the saliences of that life, ‘... there are always omissions and silences as well as selectivities necessarily involved in reducing the vast amount of data’ (Sociology, 1993, p.3).

In whatever form and at every stage, ‘stories are always told, retold, and interpreted from somewhere’ (McCormack, 2000, p.284). The interviewee narrates an account based on what he or she thinks is essential in representing a life lived. The interviewer-researcher retells this life through voice-capture, transcription, and styles of reading/analysis. As a consequence narrative analysis, according to Frost (2009, p.23), involves various levels of interpretation: ‘how I heard the narratives spoken in the interview, how I heard them during transcription, close study of the written and spoken interview and reflexive consideration of my role in the research process’.

Finally, the definitions cited above argue that life stories are cognitive productions. Particular events or experiences are told because they are biographically-relevant to the teller. Moreover these events are told in a particular way because ‘they make sense’ and thematically fits a
perspective whether past, present, or future oriented (Fischer-Rosenthal, 2006). Rosenthal (1993, p.65) explains these points in the following manner:

one could say that the narrated life story, as it evolves around a specified thematic focus, represents a general construct of biographical experiences that is a coagulate derived from past interactional episodes and future expectations, and is simultaneously a product of the biographer’s present situation. This biographical overall construct, a coagulate of the past and future and a creation of the lived present, determines the selective principles guiding the narrator’s choice of stories to be related in the interview. This construct, which is not at the biographer’s conscious disposal, constitutes not only the selection of experiences out of memory. It only constitutes how the biographer perceives these experiences today.

It is correct to say that biographies, as used in Phase 2 of this study, will be empirically analysed as narrated life stories. These narratives are not just devices by which multiple belongings in a transnational context are approached: they are arguably the very apparatus by which transnational belonging are made meaningful. This understanding of life stories and how they are structured and produced have methodological implications in its collection and analysis (Rosenthal, 2004). The next subsection outlines the approach employed in gathering qualitative data for the study.

### 3.2.2 Data collection: Biographic-narratives

The main interviewing style used in this study was patterned after the Biographic-Narrative-Interpretive-Method (BNIM) of interview (Wengraf, 2001; 2011). In a BNIM context, ‘biographic-narrative’ means that a participant generates ‘a story about part or all of their own lives and lived experience(s)’ (Wengraf, 2011). Following Titon’s and Atkinson’s definition, a biographic-narrative is an equivalent of a life story.

---

29 This refers to the narrator-interviewee. Rosenthal (2004) prefers ‘biographer’ as a term to highlight the socially constructed nature of life stories.
In contrast to other interviewing methods, BNIM was seen as a more appropriate because it puts more emphasis on the informant’s system of relevance than the interviewer’s (Wengraf and Chamberlayne, 2006). The interviewer is not asking structured questions guided by ready-made and often superficial frames of looking or listening. The interviewee is instead given a general instruction before an uninterrupted turn to speak and construct an oral expression of his or her life story. BNIM allows the participant more space, addressing RQ2 of the study, to narratively represent their life as persons with a Filipino background.

**Eliciting main narrative**

My identifying and personal circumstances, along with a brief sharing of background information about young people in the UK with Filipino heritage, and an overview of the interview procedures, formed the *introduction* of the interview visit. The actual interview started once the informed consent was signed and the informant agreed for the interview to be digitally-recorded. The basic conversation format was divided into two subsessions: (a) the telling of an over-all narrative; and (b) the questioning for further narratives. *Subsession 1* commenced through an opening question that intended to elicit from the informant a main (long) narrative about their life story. Specifically I said:

1. As you know I’m researching on the experiences of young people in the UK who have a Filipino^{30} background and how they feel about themselves and their lives.

^{30} The Filipino language is a little bit confusing. The language is officially called Filipino and is largely based on Tagalog, the language spoken in Southern Luzon, Philippines specifically in the provinces of Laguna, Batangas, Quezon and Bulacan. For the purposes of the study I will use Tagalog to refer to language.

But the term Filipino also collectively refer to people of the Philippines regardless of gender. Hence, there are terms such as OFWs or Overseas Filipino Workers and a government office called CFO or Commission on Filipinos Overseas. However, in situations when gender becomes an important reference, we call a female citizen as "Filipina" and the male citizen, "Filipino". A woman would have no issues referring to herself as either "Filipino" (when she would like to highlight nationality, cultural identification or nationalism) or "Filipina" (when she would like to emphasize her gender). But to call a man as "Filipina" is to imply that the man is effeminate or gay.
In a minute I am going to ask you to tell me your life story – all the experiences and events which were important for you up to now.

Start whenever you like.

Please take all the time that you need.

I'll listen first and I won’t interrupt.

I'll just take some notes: I hope this is fine. The notes will be for my further questions for after you’ve finished telling me about it all.

So, as a young person in Britain with Filipino heritage, can you please tell me the story of your life, from when you first become aware of your Filipino side up to now 31 –

all the events and experiences that have been important to you personally.

This study takes the terms Filipino and Filipino-ness as a principle of categorisation (by powerful Others) and as a principle of social organisation for people who feel they are in whatever extent (Wimmer, 2008). I particularly clarified at the start of the interview that the study is about young people in the UK who have a Filipino background (L1). This phrasing seeks to free the study from starting with an assumption of Filipino-ness as a claimed identity and belonging. By stating the opening question in this manner the hierarchy between the researcher and the researched is reshaped. The informant is given an open situation where Filipino-ness (or British-ness) may be strategically made or unmade. They have at their disposal a full range of discursive practices for the narrative construction of their significant lived experiences as defined by the qualifier person with Filipino background (L1). The use of such a phrase is a starting point and does not seek to naturalise ethnic belonging to being Filipino. Instead it recognises the ambivalence of multiple identities (Amelina and Faist, 2012). To be more precise, whilst I invoke the ‘Filipino side’ it also simultaneously (although

---

31 If the informant was born in the Philippines and migrated to England at a later age, this phrase reads as: “from the time you first came to and started living in Britain, up to now”
implicitly) recognises their ‘British/ English background’ as their other side. As will be shown in Chapters 5 and 6, ethnic and cultural belonging were clear trajectories in their narration. Their narration is also layered by the various roles they have assumed such as that of a son, a daughter, a sibling, a child, an adult, a professional, or that of a parent.

As I listened to their narration and gave ‘emotional support and pro-narrative nudges’ (Wengraf and Chamberlayne, 2006, p.20), I also wrote in a note pad particular events and other key phrases that indicate some form of relevance to the informant (L6). Emotional attentiveness to story-telling and to informants was maintained by eye contact and momentary ‘Mmm…hmm’. These minimal utterances and nodding were systematically deployed as ‘acknowledgement tokens’ and expressions of ‘passive recipiency’ (Jefferson, 1983, p.4) during the listening and note-taking tasks. The gestures signal and affirm the interviewee’s extended turn at story-telling.

**Getting further narratives**

Once the informant has finished the main narration, I began *Subsession 2* where I elicited further narratives using my written notes. Whilst not all of the key phrases were used the BNIM procedure argues to maintain the gestalt of the narration by asking the ‘selected’ key phrases in sequential manner i.e. in the order that they were mentioned in the main narrative. I again wrote down key phrases as they provided further narratives. Whenever necessary I pursued these key phrases from session 2, again using narrative-pointed questions. A general format (for other versions, see Rosenthal, 2004, p.52; Wengraf, 2001) I used was:

> You said [XXX]. Can you remember that particular [XXX] in more detail?
> How it started, how it all happened?
I closed the session by asking them about any other things that they wish to share, their expected but unasked questions, thoughts about the interview in general, and questions they wanted to ask of me. The interview visit ended by again expressing my gratitude32 for the time they gave in sharing their story.

**Preparation for analysis**

Riessman (2008) argues that transcription can be seen as a form of interpretation in itself. Depending on transcription rules employed different aspects of the actual interview may be lost (e.g. para-linguistic utterances, pauses, etc.) or highlighted (e.g. informant’s words arranged into sentences). For this research, all audio-files were transcribed using a template where there are heading styles for the interviewer and the informant’s names in order to lend itself more useful for importing and analysing in NVivo (a qualitative data analysis software). The template also included line numbers and a wider right side margin in anticipation of by-hand or manual analysis. At Stage 1 texts were typed as heard. To check for accuracy, at Stage 2, a second round of listening to the audio file was done as the preliminary transcript was read. During these stages comments and thoughts were inserted in any section of the transcript’s soft copy. These notes were duly noted and created as analytical memos in NVivo for later reference. In Stage 3 all personal information were anonymised.

### 3.2.3 Narrative analysis

Narratives – both long and short – in the form of typed transcripts are the primary data produced through the interviews conducted for Phase 2 of the study. In general, narratives are stories wherein ‘a speaker connects events into a sequence that is consequential for later

---

32 I gave them a University of Birmingham mug as a token of gratitude.
action and for the meanings that the speaker wants the listener to take away from the story. Events perceived by the speaker as important are selected, organized, connected and evaluated as meaningful for a particular audience’ (Riessman, 2008, p.3). In the context of the present study the events that are woven are drawn from an entire range of lived experiences and are told in the context of the research interview. Using BNIM, as described above, the resulting life stories are examples of classical narratives. Wengraf (2001, p.115) explains that:

classical narratives has(i) a kernel of a Central Event Sequence. Prior to this core narration, I find (ii) a description of background in order to orient the listener for the narration to follow, and after the completion of the (iii) central event sequence, (iv) a further description of the new situation that has arisen as a result of the narrated action (which might be restoration of the status quo), and finally, (v) then an evaluation or explicit theory of significance of the events narrated, its ‘moral’.

Put another way: there is an expectation that life stories will be well-formed (Frank, 2012) canonical narratives (Georgakopoulou, 2006) which are event-centred and text-centred re-telling of past events (Patterson, 2008). Whilst the resulting narration of study participants can be classified as event centred—which therefore makes it possible to conduct event-centred forms of reading such as the Labovian approach (Labov and Waletzky, 1967)—it also observed that throughout the research interview, participants also included ‘asides, flash forwards and backwards’ (Riessman, 2008, p.93). Whilst the interview method ‘pushed’ for gathering further narratives, they, in addition to event stories, also included utterances where they described, argued, augmented or theorized about their lived experiences (McCormack, 2000). The co-constructed account was more complex than what was expected because it included ‘extended, nonlinear segment of oral discourse’ (Riessman, 2008, p.138). In the course of telling the participants shifted back and forth and combined speaker roles in speech events in life story-telling. They became: (a) interlocutor in a conversation; (b) a narrator in a
narrating event; (c) a character in a narrated speech event (Koven, 2012), or a combination thereof.

Table 4 Pluralistic narrative analysis employed in Phase 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Set</th>
<th>Thematic analysis</th>
<th>Poetic analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIM</td>
<td>Interview transcripts of 20 participants</td>
<td>Full transcript of four select participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRATEGIES</td>
<td>Theme identification techniques (Ryan and Bernard, 2003)</td>
<td>Biographic data chronology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cross-case analysis</td>
<td>• I-poem analysis (Edwards and Weller, 2012; Gilligan et al., 2003; Mauthner and Doucet, 1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Search for ‘patterned response or meaning within the data set’ (Braun and Clarke, 2006, p.82) that has ‘substantive significance’ (Patton, 2002, p.467) to understanding belonging in a transnational context</td>
<td>• We-poem analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Case-oriented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘trace how participants represent themselves in interviews through attention to first person statements – to look at change and continuity in young people’s sense of self over time’ (Edwards and Weller, 2012, p.203).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data corpus composed of biographic narratives from 20 participants call for an analytic strategy that attends to both canonical and non-canonical aspects of the narrative account, the content of stories, and the organisation of telling. Depending on interest and analytic angle, narrative researchers draw from a wide variety of approaches to analysing narratives (for detailed discussion, see the following volumes Cortazzi, 1993; Holstein and Gubrium, 2012; 2008; Riessman, 2008). Broadly, researchers either focus on themes (e.g. Ewick and Silbey, 2003), structure of telling (e.g. Robichaux and Clark, 2006), the performance (e.g. Riessman, 2004) or the visual dimension (e.g. Bell, 2002) of narratives. My approach, as summarised in Table 4, conducts a pluralistic narrative analysis (Frost, 2009) that gives attention to commonalities amongst participants whilst giving the same attention to particularities of cases.
The narrative data gathered from interviews were analysed in two ways: (a) through thematic analysis to access ‘recurring, arising and evolving issues’ in life stories of 20 informants communicate; and (b) through poetic analysis to access key participants’ ‘stream of consciousness – how they understand and speak about themselves’ (Edwards and Weller, 2012, p.215).

**Thematic Analysis**

Thematic analysis is one of the most common strategies for ‘seeing, making sense, analyzing, systematically observing and converting qualitative information’ (Boyatzis, 1998, p.4-5) across an array of data. As already mentioned, each participant was given a general guideline before their main narration. After which a sub-session on gathering of further narratives followed. Each of the 20 interviews was transcribed and interview transcripts ranged from 15 to 51 single-spaced pages (or 31 pages on the average). Given that all of them were asked to ‘tell all the events and experiences that were important for them as a person with Filipino background’ it is of interest to examine patterns in their narratives in order to reflect on how belonging is negotiated in a transnational context. Owing to the volume of data at hand there is a need to conduct the two-pronged tasks of coding: (a) reduction; and (b) complication. Coffey and Atkinson (1996, p.28) explain that coding of data for simplification or reduction involves ‘identification of simple conceptual schema…for the retrieval of data segments categorized under the same codes; a process of indexing data texts’. Data reduction means decontextualisation wherein transcripts are segmented, sliced and culled for examples of relevant phenomena, similarities, and differences. In contrast, data complication aims to ‘expand, transform, reconceptualise data, opening up for more diverse analytical possibilities’ (ibid., p.29). Data complication means reorganising codes according to what is ‘identified or
constructed from prior material, theoretical frameworks, research questions, or data themselves’ (ibid., p.31).

The tasks of data reduction and complication were easily managed using NVivo. Using this software I was able to ‘take segments of data apart, name them into concise terms, and propose an analytic handle to develop abstract ideas for interpreting each segment of data’ (Charmaz, 2006, p.45). As a result the volume of data from 20 interviews was effectively reduced. The code-and-retrieve function of the software also afforded the analysis a level of ‘closeness for familiarity and appreciation of subtle differences, but [also] distance for abstraction and synthesis’ (Bazeley, 2007, p.8). The code-and-retrieve function also aided in recontextualising coded transcript fragments because NVivo has a function to quickly revert to the original document from where the segment was taken and therefore keeping context in perspective whilst doing an analysis. By having all ‘data slices’ for a particular theme in one place, the task of writing analytic memos became more manageable.

I applied the following coding procedures. The first stage was an initial coding of passages from the interview transcript into broad descriptive categories. Each segment is assigned a ‘node’ that answers the question, ‘What is happening here? What is the text about?’ In reading interview transcripts, I was also guided by the strategies suggested by Ryan and Bernard (2003) in identifying themes (see Table 4). ‘Themes are recurrent and distinctive features of participants’ accounts, characterising particular perceptions and/or experiences, which the researcher sees as relevant to the research question’ (Nigel King and Horrocks, 2010, p.150).

The succeeding transcripts were read and I appropriately assigned text segments into existing nodes or create new ones if they do not fit with previously created descriptive nodes. A sub-
stage within initial coding was reflecting on the emergent codes which resulted into grouping several nodes that ‘hang’ together or transferring nodes from one cluster to another. Initial coding was provisional and remained open to theoretical possibilities, and more accurately was not done using an established theoretical framework.

The second analytic stage was a theoretical coding that connects emergent themes to theories of belonging specifically those advanced by Yuval-Davis (2006) and Antonsich (2010). At this stage text segments from initial coding were read in light of theorising on contributing factors that lead to sense of belonging and politics of belonging. Results of initial coding showed three emergent themes around which their life stories revolved: (a) temporality of life events; (b) spatiality in negotiating belonging, and (c) relationality with significant and generalised others in making sense of who they are (see Chapter 5). It is important to mention that these broad themes coincided with Miller’s (2003) spheres of belonging. He suggests ‘locality’ whereas I suggest ‘spatiality’ to refer territorial contexts. He talks of community where I discuss ‘relationality’ to refer to significant individuals. He uses the term ‘history’ to refer to cultural elements whereas I conceptualise the term ‘temporality’ to suggest the time-scaling of experience according to generations and the life course.

Poetic analysis

In contrast to thematic analysis which analyses content of 20 biographic narratives, poetic analysis offers a case-oriented approach to understanding senses of selves of four illustrative examples. A key departure of poetic analysis is that rather than splicing an interview transcript into data segments and coding them under a theme, the analyst listens to voices or selves from which the narrator is speaking. If this is a study which problematises a sense of
(social) location in a transnational context then it is logical to also problematise how a sense of self is constructed and deployed in biographic narratives.

Although there is another poetic approach to narrative analysis originated by Gee (1991) the version that I am referring to draws from the voice-centred relational method (VCRM), also known as the Listening Guide, developed by Carol Gilligan (2003) and her colleagues and later used by other narrative researchers (see Doucet and Mauthner, 2008; Edwards and Weller, 2012). Depending on research purposes, the Listening Guide suggests four or more types of reading in order to analyse various facets of an interview transcript. The **first reading** is reading for narrative and is aimed at establishing plot or story whilst noting the reader’s emotional and cognitive response to the narrative. The **second reading** is reading for subjectivity focused on listening for the specific voices/selves assumed in telling the story. Specifically this second reading is about creating an I-poem from the interview transcript. An I-poem is created by cutting and combining in lines and stanzas all the statements that has the pronoun ‘I’ and the ‘immediate verb or seemingly important accompanying text’ (Edwards and Weller, 2012, p.205). The **third reading** is reading for relationality aimed at examining the speaker’s narrated relationship to other people. The **fourth reading** is reading for public discourses to demonstrate the embeddedness of stories within the socio-cultural contexts.

Whilst it is an imperative to actually read interview transcripts more than four times throughout the analysis I present in Chapter 6 results of readings which focused on subjectivity (2\textsuperscript{nd} reading) and relationality (3\textsuperscript{rd} reading). In each of the four cases that I analysed three important outputs were constructed: (a) a biographical sketch that summarises the key events and themes as narrated by the participant; (b) an I-poem that gathered all
phrases in the main narration with references to pronoun ‘I’; and (c) a *We-poem* that gathered all phrases throughout the transcript that mention pronoun ‘We’.

Three methodological points about the creation of I-poems and We-poems are in order. First: the premise of this poetic analysis is that ‘contained in any person’s narrative is not one story or one voice but rather multiplicity of voices that can emerge from a single respondent’s story’ (Hesse-Biber, 2008, p.361). It is by reflecting on the logical placement of first person pronoun ‘I’ that can expose these multiple voices. The Listening Guide was first used in a longitudinal qualitative study that aimed to compare changes in voices of particular individuals they followed over time. Although I am using the same strategy in a one-off qualitative interview, I argue that multiple voices can still be exposed because respondents were asked to narrate their life story which essentially covers their entire life. Thus it can be expected that there will be changes in how they speak of themselves. In relation to the study’s research question, I-poems, and We-poems can provide an avenue to examine how these selves move about in and through spheres of belonging. Gilligan explains that an I-poem ‘picks up an associative stream of consciousness carried by first person voice, cutting across or running through a narrative rather than being contained by the structure of full sentence’ (Gilligan et al., 2003, p.163). Nuances in subjectivities can then be appreciated as transitions in rhythm and cadence which are given attention by focusing on the immediate verb and associated words with ‘I’ or ‘We’.

Second, this analytic step adds yet another layer of data simplification and complication emphasized by Coffey and Atkinson (1996). Similar to procedures in thematic analysis described earlier, the categorizing step in I-poem analysis is done by of collecting segments of text that begin with first person pronoun and associated verb and minus other extraneous
words. The connecting step, a clear departure from thematic analysis, is shown when statements are arranged into lines and stanzas in order to keep the chronological sequence of how these segments appeared on the transcript.

The steps involved in creating the poems were done using features of MS Word and not NVivo. Using the ‘find and replace’ option (Ctrl + G) I searched the interview transcript for terms ‘I’ (or ‘We’). Only the initial main narration was used for the creation of I-poem in order to: (a); focus the analysis; and (b) because the initial main narration is the most direct and expansive extract in the whole transcript that exposes possibilities for different voices or selves. This main narration is the participant’s attempt for a ‘capsule biography’ of lived experiences of an individual with Filipino background. The voices that are heard in the remainder of the transcript only function to amplify the voice that is shown in the main narration.

At every instance of a relevant term, I used the ‘highlight’ function to colour the term including the associated words for easy identification. I then copied and pasted these statements in a new document to create the poem lines. I read the resulting sequence of I-statements (or We-statements) alongside the transcript to facilitate combining lines into stanzas.

Third, studies which have used the Listening Guide as an analytic strategy focused on the creation of I-poems as a result of reading for subjectivity. As Edwards and Weller (2012) argue it is equally insightful to examine other pronouns (you, me, we) that invoke and indicate a sense of self. Despite this, no other studies have applied the analytic affordance of constructing We-poems to understand self and belonging. It is to this end that the present study wishes to provide a methodological contribution. If I-poems can be described as tools
for analysing subjectivity (2nd reading) then We-poems can be described as tools for analysing relationality (3rd reading).

Theories on belonging argue that belonging is built around relationships with people that generate a sense of ease. Developing We-poems allow for an empirical examination of this embeddedness in relationships. The use of the first person plural pronoun ‘we’ is crucial in reading/listening for relationality because:

The talk of ‘we’ and ‘our’ is not to be interpreted as accidental. This use of this pronoun and its possessive form in both important and unavoidable, not merely because of the universality of the topic... but also because it is the ‘we’ and the ‘us’ that are fundamentally at stake here. The question also involves what the meaning of ‘we’ and ‘us’ might be, since to use these pronouns is already to assume an identity and a belonging – and such an assumption cannot be avoided, but it can be questioned, interrogated and explored (Miller, 2003, p.217).

Applying the same procedures used in creating an I-poem I scanned the whole transcript and not just the initial and main narration. The rationale for this is that I noticed that the pronoun ‘we’ appeared largely on the further narratives during the second sub-session.

To summarise, Section 3.2 of this chapter discussed data collection and analysis for Phase 2 of the study which sought to examine narrative representations of belonging through life stories of second-generation participants. Specifically, before explaining BNIM as a specific interview style employed in data collection, I examined the ontology of life stories and epistemology of life story interviewing. Then I discussed the affordances of using a pluralistic narrative analysis via thematic and poetic approaches.

**Summary and Conclusion**

In order to account for the external and internal representations of belonging of the second-generation in a transnational context, I designed a study composed of two phases. Phase 1
took a macro-perspective of the Filipino diaspora and the second-generation using official statistics from the governments of the Philippines and the UK. The procedures outlined in collating records could set up a database that may be useful particularly to the Philippine Embassy in keeping track of empirically verifiable information about ‘Filipinos’ in the UK. The aim was to narrate the ‘story’ of migration, settlement, and citizenship acquisition alongside the ‘surfacing’ of the second-generation through the use of numbers. Phase 2 takes micro-perspective by turning to life stories of the ‘older’ second-generation. The two paths of analysis outlined here, i.e. the thematic analysis and the poetic model recognise the importance of paying attention to commonalities amongst cases and uniqueness within collected life stories vis-à-vis the analytic tasks of reduction and complication of data. The aim was to gather narratives of lived experiences using BNIM as an interviewing style.

The next three chapters present the findings of these analytic strategies. Chapter 4 present statistical narratives on migration, settlement and citizenship acquisition. Chapter 5 presents three organising themes – time, actors and space – to understand transnationalised belonging. Chapter 6 presents a reading for subjectivity through I-poems and a reading for relationality through We-poems.
CHAPTER 4
‘SI PINOY SA BAYAN NI BITOY\textsuperscript{33}’: A STATISTICAL NARRATIVE\textsuperscript{34}

Extract 3: The Filipino community in the UK

1. There is a significant Filipino population in the United Kingdom.
2. Over the past twenty years
3. the number of Filipinos living and working in the UK
4. has increased by more than 833% from roughly 18,000 in 1986 to about 250,000 in 2009.
5. Of this number about 70% live in Greater London area.
6. A survey conducted amongst a limited sample of Filipinos (British-Filipinos) yielded some interesting findings:
7. 65% of Filipinos are nurses and/or in the allied medical fields
8. Less than 10% are in domestic service
9. A growing number of entrepreneurs of about 5%
10. 10-20% are second-generation youths and
11. many of whom are finishing university courses. ...

Introduction

Statistical narratives are ‘stories that reside within quantitative information’ (Few, 2009, p.1). In general statistical narratives are important because they ‘provide general awareness/perspective/context’ or ‘inform debate on specific issues’ (UNECE, 2009, p.1). Statistical story is a form of narrative aided by numbers. As used in this study, the story of Filipinos in the UK is told using official statistics. The key events around which the story revolves include almost 50 years of migration, settlement and citizenship acquisition. The

\textsuperscript{33}Translation: Pinoy in Bitoy’s town. Pinoy is demonym for the Filipino people referring to both males and females. Pinay is feminine version of the term. In one of my conversations with a leader of a Filipino organisation in Birmingham, he used the term “Bitoy” to refer to Britons.

\textsuperscript{34} Earlier versions of this chapter were presented in two public presentations. The first one was in June 2010 were preliminary findings were shown as a poster paper titled Filipinos in Britain: migration, settlement and citizenship. The poster won College (of Social Sciences) First Prize at the 4\textsuperscript{th} Graduate School Poster Conference, University of Birmingham. The second presentation was through a talk in an open forum in September 2010 at the Kapihan sa London sponsored by the Philippine Embassy.

linking of these events is visually illustrated through tables and figures. The significant points, transition from one event to the next, overall trends and even insights are described in textual account. By collating these numbers it is possible to describe the trend and growth of Filipino population in the UK. The characters of a simple story that started with first-generation women and men in search of opportunities abroad have now diversified to include second-generation sons and daughters. The plot in general is this: the population has grown but whilst they have settled ‘here’ they also belong (to a certain extent) ‘there’.

One example of such narrative is the passage above which was taken from a section of a webpage that seeks to provide information about the ‘Filipino community’ in the UK. Yet the content and storytelling are, to my assessment, problematic.

Although Extract 3 seems to picture an unprecedented demographic increase of the Filipino population in the UK over the years, the brief narrative fails to consider the ‘twists and turns’ within the time period considered. It painted a wide snapshot of the diaspora but a closer examination of its content raises several concerns. The passage begins with a claim that the Filipino population in the UK is sizeable (L-1). Even though it reported a staggering 800% increase from its 1986 estimate to its most recent 2009 estimate (L-4) the amount of information is still low and masks important changes within the time period covered. The statistic implies a demographic accounting of Filipinos in contemporary times by summarising more than two decades of international migration (L-2). Whilst a twenty-year timescale is probably appropriate as a historical context, it could also be asked whether there is evidence to prove that Filipinos have had presence in the UK earlier than 20 years ago.

Although sources were not cited L-6 made another claim that a great majority of Filipinos are believed to be residing in the Greater London Area. The second half of the passage (L7-13)
reported some findings from a ‘limited survey’ which again casts doubt on the validity (Who is included and excluded in the group ‘Filipino’?) and reliability (How limited is the sample? Are the results generalizable over the Filipino diaspora in the UK?) of claimed information. Background information (When did the survey happen? How was the sample generated?) around the survey was not mentioned.

In L-8 the purported group includes a qualification/clarification of ‘British-Filipinos’ which is another term loaded with several questions. Does this term refer exclusively to naturalised British citizens? Or does it broadly refer to Filipino nationals who are currently living and working in the UK? Does this term also include descendants of Filipino (im)migrants who are UK residents? The term may also imply an ideological choice and primacy of identification of one category over another. Filipinos in the US are often referred to as ‘Filipino-Americans’ and very rarely as ‘American-Filipinos’. In contrast the term introduced in L-8 seem to suggest the primacy of ‘British’ over ‘Filipino’. Arguably the sequencing of the two labels can simply be a matter of preference but because this appeared on a governmental website its use is a crucial forms part of an official narrative that serves an identity-work function.

Nevertheless L-9 to 11 indicate that this present population aggregate was largely a result of labour migration as more than half of ‘the sample’ was working in the health sector and 1 in 10 are engaged in domestic work. Interestingly it also vaguely estimates that 1-2 in 10 Filipinos in the UK can be termed as ‘second-generation youth’. It is unclear around the criterion for defining second-generation. In general the figures are sweeping but not warranting.

The aim of this chapter is to offer an alternative statistical narrative whose claims are verifiable. In order to accomplish this goal this chapter presents a macro-structural account of
overseas Filipinos in Britain by drawing from key statistical sources produced by the governments of the UK and the Philippines.

The term ‘overseas Filipinos’ broadly refers to Filipino nationals outside the Philippines. Specifically these are composed of:

a) migrant workers
b) permanent residents or immigrants
c) former Filipino citizens
d) holders of non-immigrant visas like tourists/visitors, students, medical patients, and those on official mission and others
e) descendants of Filipino nationals overseas

(Castro, 2006, p.16)

The term ‘overseas Filipinos’ evolved from the term Overseas Contract Workers (OCWs) and Overseas Filipino Workers (OFWs). The terms OCWs and OFWs is limited as they may exclusively refer to labour migrants whereas the term OF is more inclusive because it subsumes different legal statuses and blood relations.

This chapter will demonstrate that Filipinos have not only travelled overseas but also moved back and forth from homeland Philippines and hostlands all over the world particularly the UK. They go from being labour migrants to immigrants to citizens in their countries of destination. Most importantly they usher the birth of succeeding generations of Filipinos. For a nation whose most expansive export is its people there is a need for better statistics to provide better public information and policy (Perrin and Poulain, 2007). This is especially true for the Filipino diaspora in the UK since,

No one has ever attempted a full survey of Filipinos in the United Kingdom. . . [A basic and important data which] will lead to a better understanding of the features and characteristics, needs and requirements, aspirations and concerns of Filipinos as well as . . . to provide statistics for anyone interested in the community. (Alcantara, 2007, p. 265-266)
Whilst a representative survey is still unlikely a public information page on the Filipino diaspora in the UK is still fundamental. The statistical narrative that opened this chapter may be improved by not just having a snapshot of the community but also showing its growth over time particularly the flow of labour migration-driven contemporary Filipino populace in the UK. It is important that estimates are not only closer-to-reality but also evidence-based. The task then is to harness the available databases in order to arrive at an accurate and updated information.

I will provide evidence-based estimates gathered from statistical data sources from the governments of both the Philippines and the UK. The statistical narrative presented is based on official classification i.e., how governments identify people based on current country of citizenship, previous nationality, or country of birth. In the context of this study, I describe official classifications as external representations of belonging. In contrast, I view biographic narratives, examined in Chapters 5 and 6, as internal representations of belonging.

In addition to describing the size, characteristics and trends over time – either as emigrant population of the Philippines or an immigrant population of the UK – I will also comment on the advantages and limitations of these data sources. A special emphasis is given in mining from these records what can be termed as the ‘second-generation’ especially by examining data on grants of settlement and British citizenship.

The rest of the chapter is organised around three topics. Section 4.1 introduces a brief history of the international migration Filipinos, its value, and its spread particularly in Europe. Section 4.2 focuses on corporeal mobilities of Filipinos in the UK as passengers and migrants. In contrast to Section 4.2, Section 4.3 focuses on fixities i.e., situations where people become settled or attain citizenship in the hostland.
4.1 From Manila to the rest of the world

4.1.1 Migration as a history and a culture

It should be noted that Filipinos, as contributor to Britain’s super-diversity, have a history and a culture of international migration. Historically, Filipinos’ more than a century the global migration is claimed to have happened in three waves (CMA, 2006). During its first wave (in the 1900’s) Filipinos became agricultural workers in Hawaii and mainland United States of America (USA). In the 1960’s the migration of Filipino medical professionals to the USA, Canada, and some European countries marked the second wave. The third wave of Filipino migration happened in the 1970’s when the Philippine government institutionalized overseas labour employment as a strategy to address local employment problems (Añonuevo and Añonuevo, 2008).

The last 40 years of planned labour migration have also been wide in scope and diverse in trend (Asis, 2008a). In the 1970’s, majority of overseas contract workers were males who were hired to work in infrastructure projects in the Middle East. In the 1980’s whilst the demand for male workers in the Middle East decreased the demand for women workers increased. Most Filipina migrants found employment as domestic workers in Hong Kong, Malaysia, Singapore, and Taiwan; and as entertainers in Japan – a flow which significantly declined by 2005 after implementation of stricter rules. Towards the end of the 1990’s the migration of Filipino nurses (especially to UK) grew and continues up to the present (RCN, 2003). As a result, the Philippines is ‘the world’s labour exporter par excellence’ (Castles and Miller, 2008b) with Filipinos having significant global presence in seafaring, domestic help, and nursing (Asis, 2008a). In the Philippines the number of Filipinos, both adults and young, contemplating living and working abroad is also increasing (ibid.).
4.1.2 Value of a large diaspora

Table 5 Estimated number of overseas Filipinos (2009) and amount of remittance (2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>2010 Estimated Population</th>
<th>2010 Remittance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WORLD</td>
<td>9,453</td>
<td>18.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americas/ Trust Territories</td>
<td>3,883</td>
<td>8.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia, West</td>
<td>2,851</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia, East and South</td>
<td>1,233</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea-based</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a in thousands.

*b in billion US dollars.

Source: CFO (2010) for population estimate; Bangko Sentral ng Pilipinas (2011) for remittance data.

Filipinos are arguably among the most dispersed people with a presence in 217 destinations all over the world (CFO, 2011). It is a question of numbers as it is a question of economic value. All too often overseas work is sought by Filipinos seeking ‘greener pastures’ or with a goal of uplifting the conditions back in the native land. Given the long history and continuing migration, three questions are often asked: How many overseas Filipinos are we talking about? Where do they go? How much remittance do they send back to the Philippines?

In 2010, the Commission on Filipinos Overseas (CFO) estimated that 9.5 million Filipinos are either living or working in more than 200 destinations all over the world (see Table 5). This is on top of Philippines’ household population of 92.3 million in 2010 (NSO36). In terms of regional destination, CFO data indicate that for every 100 Filipinos outside the Philippines 41

---

are in the Americas\textsuperscript{37} and other Trust Territories\textsuperscript{38}, 30 are in West Asia, 13 are in East and South Asia, 7 are in Europe, 5 are in Oceania, 1 in Africa and 4 are sea-based. In 2010 alone, overseas Filipinos sent remittance to the Philippines amounting to more than US$ 18 billion. Undoubtedly, land-based migration dominates the trajectory of overseas Filipinos but the presence of about 347,000 sea-based workers indicate an ethnic niche for Filipinos in seafaring (McKay, 2007) especially cargo and cruise ships.
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Figure 1 Land-based Filipinos by region, 1997-2009
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\caption{Land-based Filipinos by region, 1997-2009}
\end{figure}

Note: Calculated from CFO data on population estimates.

\textsuperscript{37} This collectively refers to North and South America. As will be shown the largest stock of Filipinos is in Canada and the US in North America.

\textsuperscript{38} This refer to ‘Any of the territories formerly under a League of Nations mandate, which after 1945 were placed under the trusteeship of the United Nations until ready for independence. All trust territories are now independent states.’ (Oxford Dictionary of Law, 2009). An example of these places would be Micronesia, Marshall Island, Mariana Islands and Palau which where previously under the trust of the US [see http://www.un.org/en/decolonization/nonselfgov.shtml, accessed on 27 September 2012].
Whilst the state-enhanced international labour-migration of Filipinos has been on-going since the 1970’s (Rodriguez, 2010), time series data show that several interesting changes have happened to aggregate population size in regions over the last 13 years. Figure 1 shows the changes in numbers of land-based Filipinos from 1997 to 2010 in six regions across the world.

The most dominant regional destination of overseas Filipinos is the Americas (North and South). The bulk of population are living or working in the USA and in Canada in North America. There are always more than 3 million Filipinos across the Americas at any point in the time-period considered.

Over the last decade, the Filipino population in the Middle East (West Asia) has steadily increased from more than 1 million in 1997 to an estimated 2.9 million individuals in 2010. In comparison, the number of overseas Filipinos in countries in East and South Asia (collectively) slightly drop from 1.6 million in 1997 to over 1.2 million in 2010. Between 2001 to 2004 there are as many Filipinos in the Middle East as there are in East Asian countries.

Fourth in regional destinations is Europe. The Filipino population in Europe continually grew from 1997 until 2007 when the population peaked at an estimated 1 million individuals. The population slightly dropped to 693,000 in 2008 and continued to increase thereafter. Finally, although the overall population was increasing over a decade, there were less than 500,000 Filipinos in Oceania or Africa from 1997 to 2010.

Economists agree that remittances from overseas Filipinos have kept the economy afloat (Ang, 2009; Balisacan et al., 2010). Figure 2 compares the remittances sent by sea-based and land-based overseas Filipinos from 2003 to 2010. The Bangko Sentral ng Pilipinas (BSP)
estimated that OFs have sent an accumulated total remittance of US$ 106.6 billion over the previous eight years. From 2003 to 2010 sea-based Filipinos contributed about US$ 18.8 billion (or 18% of total remittance) whilst the land-based sent a composite amount of US$ 87.8 billion (or 82%). Sea-based Filipinos have increased their remittance by 192% in less than a decade with only US$ 1.3 billion in 2003 to an estimated US$ 3.8 billion in 2010. On the other hand, remittances of land-based Filipinos have increased by 138% - from US$ 6.3 in 2003 to US$ 15.0 in 2010. Overall, total remittance from overseas Filipinos is increasing by at least US$ 1.6 billion annually – from only US$ 7.6 billion in 2003 to US$ 18.8 billion in 2010.

**Figure 2 Remittance of Overseas Filipinos, 2003-10**

![Figure 2 Remittance of Overseas Filipinos, 2003-10](image)

Source: Bangko Sentral ng Pilipinas, 2011

Whilst overseas Filipinos are found in hundreds of destinations all over the world a great majority are concentrated in key places. By and large, overseas Filipinos in these places are
also the top remittance-senders. Table 6 shows the most recent available data on the top 15 countries\(^{39}\) where Filipinos are located. In addition to total remittance and aggregate population estimate per country of current location, figures are also disaggregated according to their migration status.

By presenting further information on population estimates of overseas Filipinos vis-à-vis remittance data, top locations can then be described according to composition – countries where there are more permanent residents than contract workers or vice versa – and relative economic contribution. Not only are permanent residents more likely to engage in diaspora philanthropy to homeland (Añonuevo and Añonuevo, 2008) but they are also more likely to stay and build families in the ‘new homeland’/ hostland.

The second and later generations emerge from those who have permanently settled. Moreover the temporary and irregular migrants are unlikely to bring their children to the UK due to financial constraints and legal impediments. It is cheaper and more practical to leave their children in the Philippines than to raise them in the UK especially when their stay is limited or illegal.

\(^{39}\) For reasons of comparison, note that Table 2 only includes land-based and excludes sea-based Filipinos. BSP reports disaggregated sea-based Filipinos according to their flags of carrier but the CFO data on stock estimate do not present this detail.
Table 6  Top 15 locations of land-based Filipinos (2010) and estimated remittance (2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Permanent</th>
<th>Temporary</th>
<th>Irregular</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WORLD</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,453</td>
<td>4,424</td>
<td>4,324</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>14,957</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3,166</td>
<td>2,882</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>5,927</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,513</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>1,482</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1,543</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2,010</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qatar</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,237</td>
<td>4,172</td>
<td>3,531</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>13,641</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Percentage of world total per column) 87% 94% 82% 78% 91%

* in thousands.

** in million US dollars.

* Immigrants or legal permanent residents abroad whose stay do not depend on work contracts.

* Persons whose stay overseas is employment related and who are expected to return at the end of their work contracts.

* Those not properly documented or without valid residence or work permits or who are overstaying in a foreign country.

Source: CFO (2010) for population estimate data; BSP (2011) for remittance data.
The top 15 countries listed in Table 6 account for 87% (or 8.2 million) of the total population of overseas Filipinos in 2010 and shared about 91% (or US$ 13.6 billion) of total remittance sent by land-based Filipinos in the same year. Four of the 15 countries have a larger proportion of permanent residents than contract workers or irregular migrants. These are the US, Canada, Australia and Japan. Malaysia is an exception because the majority of the Filipinos there are largely on irregular status. All other countries in the list, as estimated in 2009, have more temporary migrants than permanent residents or undocumented migrants. Out of the top 15 locations with land-based Filipinos, two countries are in the continent of America, five are in East and Southeast Asia, two are in Europe, one is Oceania, and no country is from Africa.

The USA and Canada ranked highest in terms of number of people and amount of remittance. As expected the USA, being one of the oldest (im)migration country, is now a place of home and work to more than 3.2 million Filipinos in which 2.8 million (or 87%) are already permanent residents. In 2010, their total accumulated remittance of Filipinos in the US amounted to US$5.9 billion (or 14% of total remittance sent that year) – the biggest aggregated amount from a single country. It is also estimated that, at 156,000 individuals, the second highest number of undocumented Filipino migrants are in the US. Canada ranked third in population size with 667,000 overseas Filipinos in which 581,000 are already on residency status. Filipinos in Canada sent the second biggest remittance amounting to more than US$2 billion (or 13% of total remittance in 2010).

Large numbers of Filipinos are also found in Middle Eastern countries of Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Qatar, and Kuwait. Next to the USA, the second largest overseas Filipino population is in Saudi Arabia where 1.5 million Filipinos (or 16% of overall overseas
Filipino population in 2010) currently live and work. Filipinos in Saudi Arabia ranked third in amount of remittance sent at US$1.5 billion (or 10% of total remittance in 2010).

Interestingly, the highest number of overseas Filipinos who are currently bound by their work contracts are found in Middle Eastern countries. Ranking first is Saudi Arabia with 1.5 million workers, followed by United Arab Emirates with more than 606,000 workers, and then Qatar with 290,000 workers.

There is also a concentration of land-based Filipinos in cities of Asian countries such as Malaysia, Japan, Hong Kong, Singapore, Taiwan and South Korea. The largest aggregate of irregular Filipino migrants are believed to be in Malaysia numbering to about 200,000. As a result a great number end up being detained for illegal stay and other offences (see for example Fernandez, 2011). It is estimated that there are 290,000 Filipinos in Japan and about 52% of them are already permanent residents. This situation is reversed with the composition of Filipinos in Hong Kong where 83% of the estimated 170,000 Filipinos are contract workers.

Two European countries ‘host’ large numbers of Filipinos: the UK and Italy. In 2010, Filipinos in Italy stood at about 123,000 – they ranked 13th in population size but sent US$524 million which ranked 8th in volume of remittance in 2010. Meanwhile it was estimated that there were about 196,000 Filipinos in the UK. Whilst they ranked 9th in size of population, Filipinos in the UK had an estimated US$626 million in remittances in the same year making then the fifth biggest remittance sender. Although not shown in Table 2 a significantly large population of Filipinos are also found in Germany (56,000), Spain (53,000) and France (50,000).
There are about 346,000 Filipinos in Australia and 87% of them are permanent residents. Whilst they rank 5th in population size, Filipinos in Australia only ranked 12th in the amount of remittance sent. In 2010, their aggregated sending amounted to US$192 billion.

The relationship between population size and remittance data of overseas Filipinos showed that Filipinos have, to a certain extent, contributed to peopling of key countries in the world through labour migration. Although their population size is relatively very small compared to other migrant and the native populations of hostlands where they are, the amount of remittance they have sent over the years is a testament to their undeniable importance to their immediate families and the Philippine economy.

After providing an overall picture of Filipino emigration to various parts of the world, the next subsection directs attention to land-based Filipinos in Europe. I begin by examining estimates overseas Filipino population over the last 14 years and then compare the changes relative to the composition of Filipino diaspora in four European countries. As a focus, I also highlight the Filipinos in the UK to illustrate the locale of my study.

### 4.1.3 Filipinos in Europe

Figure 3 shows the population estimates of Filipinos in Europe from 1997 to 2010. It is estimated that there are fewer Filipinos now all over Europe than there were 14 years ago\(^40\). In 2010 the population size of Filipinos in Europe was about 664,000 (lower by at least 77,000 from the 1997 estimate of 741,000). Between 2003 and 2007 the Filipino population in Europe was increasing at 6% annually or adding about 46,000 every year. The population

---

\(^40\) Although not shown in the charts CFO records show that the percentage share of Filipinos in Europe relative to the total population of overseas Filipinos has changed over the last 14 years. In 1997 about 10.6% of overseas Filipinos are found in Europe. In 2010, 7.0% of overseas Filipinos are living in Europe.
estimate in 2003 was 768,000 and peaked at 954,000 in 2007. After which it declined again in the last three years, from 2008 to 2010.

Figure 3 Population estimate of Filipinos in Europe, 1997-2010

Note: Calculated from CFO data on overseas Filipinos.

To further examine the dynamics of growth and decline of the Filipino population in Europe Figure 4 compares population estimates for the UK, Germany, Italy, and Greece. In 2010 these countries were the top four European countries with the largest Filipino population.

Over the course of only a decade the aggregate population of Filipinos in Europe has taken several shifts: this is largely due to changes in Filipino population in particular countries. In 1997 the largest Filipino population was in Italy followed by those in Greece, the UK, and Germany. After 14 years (2010) the largest population of Filipinos in Europe is now in the
UK. Italy ranks second and is followed by Germany and Greece (in third and fourth place respectively).

**Figure 4 Comparison of Filipino Population in Four European Countries, 1997-2010**

![Population comparison graph](image)

Note: Calculated from CFO data on population estimates.

Let us examine trends per country. In 1997, there were about 156,000 Filipinos in Italy. Since then, the population fluctuated showing an increase in 1998 but declining sharply in 1999. It gradually increased reaching a plateau of about 150,000 from 2001 to 2002. The population continued to decline until it reached a low point of 120,000 in 2009 before a slight increase again in 2010.

The population estimate of Filipinos in Greece remained steady at 71,000 from 1997 to 2000 before a steep drop in 2001 where the number declined to only about 25,000. The population fluctuated and began to gradually increase at the beginning of 2003 until it reached an estimated 52,000 in 2009. In 2010 the population dropped to its lowest at 11,100.
The most static (with the least growth rate) Filipino population in Europe was seen in the case of Germany. The population remained unchanged at 43,000 from 1997 to 1998 before it suddenly dropped to its lowest of only 27,000 persons in 1999. The population rose gradually in the next two years (1999 to 2001) before reaching a plateau population of about 55,000 individuals which was sustained for nine years between 2001 and 2010.

Of the four countries compared the Filipino population in the UK showed the highest growth rate at 294% over the 14 year period. The population grew from roughly 50,000 in 1997 to about 197,000 in 2010 (which equates to an annual addition of about 11,000 individuals). The number of Filipinos in the UK remained at about 50,000 for the first three years (1997-99) before its continued dramatic growth for six years (2000-07). Filipino population reached its peak in 2007 at 203,000 persons and stayed at that level until 2009. As of 2010 the population is estimated at 197,000. Combining the information from Figures 3 and 4 it shows that the growth in overall population estimate in Europe starting in the year 2000 is largely due to increasing in-migration of Filipinos in the UK. In addition, the Filipino population in the UK remained highest between 2008 and 2010 (even though the overall Filipino population in Europe suddenly dropped). Although not shown in the charts, the percentage share of Filipinos in the UK relative to the total population of overseas Filipinos in Europe grew from only 7% in 1997 to 30% in 2010 (calculations from CFO data).

This section paid a closer look at the changes of the Filipino population in Europe. Specifically, it showed the demographic importance of Filipinos in the UK: The biggest Filipino population in Europe is found in the UK and its growth in number over the years is largely the reason why the Filipino population in Europe remained significantly large even though the Filipino population in other European countries have already declined.
The next section examines more closely how the Filipino population in the UK has changed over the years. I will begin by describing the pattern of passenger journeys since 1976 and the changes in composition of the Filipino population in recent years (Section 4.2). The key for the emergence and growth of the second-generation is the growing number of Filipinos who have become permanent residents or have become British citizens: these patterns will also be examined in Section 4.3.

4.2 Mobilities: Filipinos as . . .

4.2.1 . . . passengers to UK border

Figure 5 Filipinos entering the UK border by purpose of journey, 1972-2009

Note: Gathered and calculated from Home Office statistical bulletins on “Control of Immigration” published from 1977 to 2010.
People cross international borders for different reasons. Some may just be visiting and staying for no more than 6 months whilst others stay longer to conduct business. A great number migrate to either study or work. Others may be dependants of travellers already mentioned or maybe returning from a temporary sojourn elsewhere (National Statistics, 2009). Across the board these corporeal mobilities over the globe are made possible by international transport systems (Elliot and Urry, 2010). Whilst there are other purposes by which a person may enter the UK border Figure 5 compares only four general types of passengers (i.e. visitors, returning passengers, students, workers and their dependants) and the patterns thereof spanning 33 years.

Over three decades more than 1.7 million Filipino passengers entered the UK border. One-third (585,000) of the total number of journeys entered the UK ports for a visit. Another one-third (559,000) of the journeys were returning passengers which are composed mainly of permanent residents who have been outside the UK for not more than two years and all other persons who are returning within the validity of their visas. A further 27,000 journeys were made by Filipinos on students visas. And almost 92,000 journeys were done by passengers who were on work permits and their dependants.

It must be clear that those journeys are counted based the number of passengers per arrival and therefore do not equate to number of individuals who have migrated to the UK. Statistics on passenger journeys are drawn from the International Passenger Survey (IPS) which sample people arriving to and departing from UK borders (Cangiano, 2010) and therefore not a complete enumeration of journeys for a particular year. A person may have left and re-entered the UK port several times in a particular year and the number of arrivals are counted each time. In this regard, counts on journeys (from the Home Office) are always greater than
population estimates (from the CFO). Nevertheless, both statistics indicate the extent of ‘migration moves’ from the Philippines to the UK.

Visual inspection of Figure 5 shows that the increased ‘arrivals’ of Filipinos in the UK is a recent event. Sixty one percent (1.1 million) of the total number of journeys happened only in the last 11 years (between 1999 and 2009). Since the number of Filipinos who are now on indefinite leave to remain in the UK have accumulated throughout the years it is not surprising that 73% of the total number of returning passengers have travelled back and forth in the last decade.

Another interesting trend is the increase in the number of Filipinos on student visas. Whilst passenger students only compose 2% of total journeys in 33 years, 21,000 out of 27,000 (or 77%) arrivals by those with student visas happened in the last decade. This statistic should not be interpreted as the number of Filipinos who are actually studying in the UK as student visas may also be seen as an alternative route to working visas when entering the UK – the prime goal being to work and not to study (Alcantara, 2007).

The number of journeys done by work permit holders and their dependants has also dramatically increased. About 87% (80,000) of the 92,000 journeys on work permits and their family members happened in between 1999 to 2009.

4.2.2 . . . persons living in the UK

By birth and by nationality. As already illustrated a great number of Filipino passengers who enter the UK are sojourners or people in transit who are not staying for more than six months (National Statistics, 2009). The heightened movement of Filipinos who are returning passengers, students, contract workers, and their relatives in recent years is indicative of an
increase in the size of Filipino population in the UK. However multiple counting is expected since journeys are counted instead of particular individuals. In effect the resulting figures are likely to be overestimates.

An alternative means to see the 'big picture' of Filipinos in the UK is through national survey estimates such as the Labour Force Survey (LFS)\textsuperscript{41} or the Annual Population Survey (APS). In these surveys the Filipino population may be estimated by counting the number of individuals living in Britain: (a) whose country of birth; or (b) country of citizenship is the Philippines. Table 7 shows these statistics from APS data sets from 2004 to 2010.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Philippine-born \textsuperscript{a}</th>
<th>Filipino citizen \textsuperscript{a}</th>
<th>Difference \textsuperscript{a}</th>
<th>Non-Filipino citizens as percentage of the Philippine-born (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008\textsuperscript{c}</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009\textsuperscript{c}</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010\textsuperscript{c}</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Annual Populations Survey data sets
\textsuperscript{a} Values rounded off to the nearest thousands.
\textsuperscript{b} Based on APS data set for the year.
\textsuperscript{c} Based on APS data round from July of the previous year to June of the current year.

Calculations drawn from the APS data sets revealed that Filipinos rank among the top 25 origins of Britain’s foreign-born and foreign-national population. With acceptable confidence

\textsuperscript{41} According to the UK Data Service: ‘The Labour Force Survey (LFS) is a survey of the employment circumstances of the UK population. It is the largest survey with a consistent design and provides the official measures of employment and unemployment.’ [Source: http://ukdataservice.ac.uk/get-data/key-data.aspx#tab-uk-surveys, Date accessed: 14 May 2013]
intervals (between +/- 9 to +/- 14), estimates show that the number of Philippine-born individuals living in the UK have increased by 81% from about 62,000 in 2004 to about 112,000 in 2010. Meanwhile the number of Filipino nationals registered a slightly lower growth rate of 52%. In 2004 there were estimated to be only about 48,000 holders of Philippine passports but this number increased to about 73,000 in 2010. Statistics on Philippine-born and Filipino citizens in Britain both peaked in 2009 reaching around 118,000 and 86,000, respectively.

There are a number of reasons for the difference in statistical estimates based on country of birth and country of nationality. Country of nationality may change over a lifetime but country of birth cannot. When country of birth statistics are greater than country of nationality of statistics, then this strongly indicates a high rate of naturalisation (Salt, 2010) or the relinquishing of Filipino citizenship and the subsequent acquisition of British citizenship. Commonly, the trend is for Filipinos to become permanent residents and then later become naturalised British citizens. Another possible trend is the case of Philippine-born individuals who have already acquired citizenship in a country from the European Union (EU) who were petitioned their children once they have formally settled in the UK; or the case of Filipinas who have married EU-nationals and have petitioned other family members as dependants (Alcantara, 2007).

The key advantage of using the APS is that it yields more robust estimates for immigrants groups and smaller geographical areas (Cangiano, 2010). Tables showing population estimates by country of birth and nationality from several APS rounds beginning 2004 to 2010 are easily accessible because they available online. Full data sets also have potential of identifying and describing children in Filipino families and households. However, only the
summary statistics provided on the website were used to describe the changes in number of individuals in the UK who hold Philippine passport or were formerly Filipino citizens.

**By migration status.** Another source of information for estimating the number of Filipinos living in the UK is through the population estimates or, ‘the aggregate of all Philippine-born Filipinos residing or working overseas at a given time’ (Castro, 2006, p.8). The CFO releases annual population estimates annually in which overseas Filipinos are broadly categorised into permanent, temporary, and irregular migrants.

As described in Section 4.1.3, the growth of the overseas Filipinos in Europe was driven by the increase in number of Filipinos in the UK beginning in 2000. Unlike the previous section which broadly described the changes in the Filipino diaspora in the UK, Figure 6 depicts the changes more closely by disaggregating trends according to status of overseas Filipinos.

Between 1997 and 2003 there were always more permanent residents than temporary migrants. From 2004 onwards, those with temporary status begin to outnumber the permanent residents. It could be argued that the demographic changes in the population size are due to three reasons. Firstly is the decrease in the number of irregular migrants. From more than 40,000 individuals in 1997 and 1998 the number of irregular migrants went down to only 2,500 individuals in 1999 and 2000. Since then their estimated number has not been more than 10,000 individuals. The decrease may be attributed to stricter implementation of immigration laws and apprehension of irregular migrants.
Secondly, there is the continued increase in the number of permanent residents. From only about 5,000 permanent residents between 1997 and 1998 their number dramatically grew to more than 45,000 individuals in 1999 and peaked at 92,000 in 2009. The rate of increase on the number of permanent residents is highly dependent on the volume of labour migrants who meet the requirement for continued work via work permits before they can apply for permanent residency. For example, as of May 2013, skilled workers may apply for an indefinite leave to remain in the UK if they have had a ‘continuous period of 5 years in an
eligible immigration category’. Others may also apply for permanent residency because of long residence in the UK, i.e. they have at least ‘10 years continuous lawful residence’.

Finally, there was the continued increase in the number of temporary migrants who compose the bulk and most recent additions to the population aggregate. Before 2000 there were only about 2,000 registered Filipino workers in the UK: this number has dramatically increased over the last decade. CFO data show that the number of contract-bound or working visa-limited Filipinos in the UK grew at a rate of 222% annually from 2000 to 2008 (which equates to around 12,000 workers every year). In 2010 the number of temporary migrants totalled to 97,000 workers. One reason for the rapid growth on the number of temporary migrants is the UKs sustained international recruitment of nurses in the 2000’s who were mainly sourced from the Philippines, Australia, and South Africa (RCN, 2003).

CFO population estimates are often quoted when describing the size, spatial distribution in terms of destination countries, and legal status of overseas Filipinos (Opiniano, 2007). Annual estimates are available online in the CFO website but covers only the period from 2000 onwards. Population estimates from 1997 to 1999 were accessed after a formal request. As a result, data on annual estimates from 1997 to 2010 were used in Figures 2 to 6 and Tables 5 and 6.

At best population estimates of overseas Filipinos from the Philippine government are ‘educated approximations’ (Asis, 2008b, p.359) drawing from varied sources such as

- Emigrant registration from the CFO
- Statistics on legally deployed overseas Filipino workers from the Philippine Overseas Employment Administration (POEA)

Source: [http://www.ukba.homeoffice.gov.uk/visas-immigration/working/tier2/general/settlement/#header2](http://www.ukba.homeoffice.gov.uk/visas-immigration/working/tier2/general/settlement/#header2)
Accuracy in using population estimates is difficult to establish not only because the figures are drawn from multiple sources but also because of variation in procedures of data collection. For example, double counting may occur between Embassy and CFO registrations. It is likely that figures were drawn from summary reports of different offices and therefore lists are not linked to individual’s unique records. Estimates on undocumented migrants are also difficult to arrive at given the fact that they are on illegal status and would therefore evade any encounter with governmental offices. Even though the Batas Pambansa Bilang 79,\(^{43}\) the enabling law which created the CFO in the 1980’s, specifically identifies the descendants of overseas Filipinos as one of their key concerns, annual population estimates do not provide information about second and later generations. Thus there is a need to complement the Philippine government’s emigration statistics with the UK government’s immigration statistics in order to account for migration flows and diaspora population to provide a comparable and more accurate picture. Settlement and citizenship statistics, presented in the next section, are alternative and complementary sources to visualise the growth trends of Filipino population in the UK.

4.3 Fixities: Filipinos as . . .

In between the mobilities of people and their relocation between countries of origin and destination they also seek to establish a sense of emplacement. The next set of statistics describes different accounts of fixities of Filipinos in the UK. I present a consolidated data set relating to successful grants of settlement and British citizenship using Home Office publications over the years. In addition I also highlight the Philippine Embassy’s records on registered Filipino organisations and individuals who retained or re-acquired their Filipino citizenship.

4.3.1 . . . permanent residents

‘Grant of settlement is a grant of indefinite leave to enter (on arrival) or indefinite leave to remain (after entry) to a non-EEA national’ (National Statistics, 2009, p.132). In a span of 33 years, published reports from the Home Office show that almost 95,000 Filipinos were granted indefinite leave to remain in the UK (see Figure 7). Seventy one percent of all grants (68,000 persons) of settlement since 1976 were granted from 2000 to 2009. In fact 51,000 (or 54%) of all settlement grants were given in the years between 2005-2009. The highest total number of annual grants peaked at almost 15,000 for the year 2005.

Settlement statistics produced by the Home Office contain two important characteristics in estimating the Filipino population. First, they only include individuals on legal statuses; and second, it is indicative of number of families, including children, who are currently living in the UK. The number of potential families in which the second (and later generations) are born can be estimated by adding the number of grants to husbands and wives (i.e. on the assumption that this union is between fathers and mothers who can later bear children). This advantage may also pose some limitations. These statistics will necessarily exclude (a)
individuals with irregular legal status (e.g. undocumented and illegal-staying); (b) and those siblings who are both work permit holders who technically constitute a family. The resulting statistics are also conservative as it can only include those whose parents were born in the Philippines and therefore exclude descendants in third and later generations.

Figure 7 Filipinos who were granted settlement in the UK, 1976-2009

Note: Gathered and calculated from Home Office statistical bulletins on “Control of Immigration” published from 1977 to 2010.

Figure 7 shows the number of permanent residents by category. Almost half (45% or 43,000) of all settlement grants were given to individuals who have completed the requirement to hold a working visa for four or five years. Like the overall-trend, and responding to the intensified state-managed migration of health professionals in the late 1990s and the beginning of 2000s, settlement of workers’ spouses also increased. One-third (33%) of all settlement grants to Filipinos, from 1976 to 2009, were given on the basis that they were the husband (19% or 18,000 persons) or the wife (13% or 13,000 persons) of a permanent resident. It is also
important to mention that from 1976 to 2003 there were always more settlement grants to wives than to husbands.

But there was an unprecedented increase in the number of grants to husbands in recent years. From 2004 to 2009 some 10,000 husbands became permanent residents compared to 6,000 grants of settlement to wives. This is probably the result of huge recruitment of Filipino nurses in the late 1990s and early 2000s. By 2005, most of the Filipino nurses have already completed the five year requirement for permanent residency. As soon as they have been granted settlement their husbands/wives who have legally stayed in the UK for two years, may be eligible to apply for permanent residency as a spouse.

Overall 22 out of every 100 Filipinos was below 18 years of age when they were given the grant of settlement. In other words, from 1976 to 2009, some 21,000 sons and daughters of Filipino emigrants were granted permanent leave to stay in the UK. By implication this group of young people may be categorised as belonging to the 1.25, 1.5 and 1.75 generations depending on their age of migration or settlement to the UK. They were all Philippine-born but migrated to or were granted permanent residency in the UK at different ages.

4.3.2 . . . naturalised British citizens

The next logical step after securing permanent residency status is gaining British citizenship. Citizenship statistics show that even in the 1960’s there were already Filipinos who became naturalised British citizens. Historically a bulk of Filipino labour migrants to the UK arrived in the 1980’s, but a number of Filipinas began working as chambermaids after World War II (Asis, 2008b; Padilla, 2007).

Figure 8 charts the number of Filipinos who became British citizens for almost five decades (1962-2009). Over the last 48 years the UK government has granted British citizenship to almost
66,000 Filipinos. Seventy-nine out of every 100 grants were adults when they acquired their British citizenship. Fifty percent (or 33,000 persons) of total grants were based on residence requirement; and 29% (or 19,000 persons) were based on marriage to a British citizen.

There are two possibilities with those who became British citizens on account of marriage – either they were a spouse of a (a) Filipino by birth or (b) a non-Filipino. Both the Home Office publications on British Citizenship and the CFO data do not disaggregate by gender per previous nationality of individuals who gained British citizenship on account of marriage.

**Figure 8 Filipinos who were granted British Citizenship, 1962-2009**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Minor</th>
<th>Marriage</th>
<th>Residence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1962-89</td>
<td>2,975</td>
<td>4,624</td>
<td>4,832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-99</td>
<td>3,301</td>
<td>4,832</td>
<td>1,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-04</td>
<td>3,909</td>
<td>2,842</td>
<td>945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-09</td>
<td>11,445</td>
<td>6,680</td>
<td>22,470</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Gathered and calculated from Home Office statistical bulletins on “British Citizenship” published from 1963 to 2010.

A limitation of these statistics is that it is difficult to ascertain which of these marriages are with a former Filipino or a native British. If such disaggregation is available then the number of second-generation Filipinos from mixed-race families can be counted. However, even if these unions are in fact intermarriages it is of course not correct to say that all these unions
will have children. Moreover, from 2005 onwards, statistics on grants of British citizenship may include individuals in same-sex civil partnerships.\footnote{Under the \textit{Civil Partnership Act of 2004}, civil partners have similar rights (e.g. property rights, parental responsibility, social security, etc.) and responsibilities as opposite-sex married couples.}

Marriages between a Filipina and White British men have been relatively popular since the 1980s (CFO, 2012). For example the documentary film \textit{Filipina Dream Girls} aired in 1991 narrated the story of five Welsh men who joined an arranged trip to the Philippines to meet and find a wife. Records from the CFO indicate that UK citizens are one of the top 10 nationalities with whom most Filipinas tend to partner with. Between 1989 and 2010 more than 8,000 persons (presumably female) emigrated to the UK as spouse or other partners of a British national (CFO, 2012).

Perhaps the most important information that statistics on British citizenships generate are the number of persons who at the time of grant were minors. Twenty-one out of every 100 (or 14,000 persons) citizenship grants from 1962 to 2009 were to minors. Similar to the patterns observed on statistics on settlement and component categories, there was a dramatic increase in number of young Filipino who became British citizens in recent years. From 1962 to 1989, a span of 27 years, there were 480 Filipino minors who became British citizens. In contrast, record shows that in a matter of only four years, from 2005 to 2009, there were 11,000 grants of citizenship to young people of Filipino background. Before 2003 these individuals would have visited the Philippines a number of times but their stay would be limited because they would be legally seen as foreigners. Under Philippine laws, British citizens are allowed to stay in the Philippines no more than 21 days without a visa. The situation changed after the implementation of a law on dual citizenship.
4.3.3 . . . citizens of two countries

Figure 9 Acquisition of dual citizenship (British and Filipino), 2003-09

Source: Philippine Embassy in London

The Republic Act 9225 or the Citizenship Retention and Re-acquisition Act of 2003 became a Philippine law on August 29, 2003. This law grants dual citizens the right to own real property in the Philippines, engage in business, practice profession, acquire a Philippine passport, and vote in the elections.

Records from the Philippine Embassy in London show that there are now more than 8,000 individuals who are both legally British and Filipino. Within only 7 years of implementation of the dual citizenship law the number of British-Filipinos has increased momentum beginning 2006 where more than 1,000 persons successfully retained or re-acquired their Filipino citizenship.
4.3.4 . . . organised groups

The presence of different voluntary organisations formed by Filipinos themselves is another form of evidence indicating the presence of Filipinos in the UK.

Figure 10 Filipino Organisations in the UK, 2010

Source: Philippine Embassy in London

Since 2010, 165 Filipino organisations have been registered with the Philippine Embassy in London. Seventy-nine of these organisations are named after their current residence in the UK (e.g. Filipino Association of Birmingham, Filipino-Welsh Community, Liverpool Filipino Association, etc.). Others choose to organise based on their provincial or regional origin in the Philippines (e.g. Aguman Kapampangan UK and the Batangas Association). As most of Filipinos in the UK are also workers they chose to form occupational associations (e.g. Filipino Nurses Association UK). Whilst the number of these organisations indicates a presence variation in types may also indicate fragmentation within the diaspora. For example it is common to find at least two socio-civic Filipino organisations in one city and usually
these organisations are not on good terms with each other. They begin with one organisation until such a time when a rift divides them and one group decides to set up a new organisation.

**Conclusion**

I began this chapter by commenting on the information contained in a particular webpage about the Filipino community in the UK observing its limited amount of information and quality of data. I also inquired whether there were alternative data sources that can improve and complement official releases in aid of public information. Apparently several data sources are available but they are left unanalysed and unharnessed. Even the findings presented in this chapter were gathered from only four sources (CFO population estimates, APS data sets, settlement and citizenship statistics) leaving several others untapped (e.g. UK census and other administrative sources).

The Philippines is perhaps an exceptional case among migrant sending countries in its efforts in collecting and generating emigration statistics through its various agencies such as the CFO, DFA, and POEA. The very fluid nature of international migration makes it very difficult to capture and thus no one data source will be completely sufficient, reliable, and accurate. Whilst the actions to harmonise international migration statistics are still underway, the use and dissemination of findings from data sources identified in this chapter should be promoted.

The aim of this chapter was to create an impact on public information relating to estimates about the Filipino population in the UK. This chapter provided evidenced-based as well as closer-to-reality / time series quantitative data of the Filipino population in the UK which has been previously documented. Thus far the statistical narrative introduced here covers a longer
time period extending back to the 1960’s. The ‘local trends’ (population estimate in the UK) are also made meaningful in locating, comparing and contrasting them within regional (European) and global context. Liberal estimates (e.g. CFO data) are also balanced with more conservative ones (e.g. Home Office time series data on settlement and citizenship). In contrast to a ‘limited sample’ referenced at the opening extract of this chapter, robust estimates from national surveys (i.e. APS) and other administrative sources were used throughout the discussion. Most importantly this chapter contributes to public information by demonstrating an identifiable second-generation that can now be administratively validated. Given the availability of these findings it is high-time to update the ‘Filipino community’ section of the embassy's website.

The narrative presented in this chapter can be described as both macro and quantitative. It showed the wider backdrop of the international migration of Filipinos to situate the first and second-generation Filipino population in the UK. This story of migration, settlement, citizenship acquisition, and formation of socio-civic organisations were told using numbers. The next two chapters take a micro and qualitative approach. Chapter 5 simplifies and complicates the content of biographic narratives according to three themes: temporal, spatial and relational belonging.
CHAPTER 5
‘Battle of Heritages’: Locating the Second-Generation in Their Spheres of Belonging

**Extract 4:** Martin, 29, 2.0 generation describes the family situation of a fellow second-generation

1 When I look at that family, it is a prime example of a battle that goes on with heritage. Because James was the eldest and he was a mummy’s boy.
2 So, when meet James he is all Filipino.
3 If you ask him where he is from he says Philippines.
4 He very rarely talks about the fact that he is half-Portuguese unless it suits him.
5 So, growing up, his friends are Filipino.
6 He hangs out with Filipinos.
7 He just wants to go to Filipino websites.
8 He eats Filipino [food]. He is all very Filipino.
9 He only dates Filipinos.
10 Now his younger brother, Fred, he was a Daddy’s boy.
11 He doesn’t eat pansit palabok[^45] for example.
12 And he does football.
13 Paul loves basketball ‘cos he is Filipino…
14 David loves Portugal and everything Portuguese.
15 And the youngest kid was a girl, and she went the total opposite.
16 She doesn’t do Portuguese or Filipino,
17 she is almost like she is English.

**Extract 5:** Camille, 26, 2.0 generation reflects on her self-identity

1 [in terms of] Nationality, I’m British.
2 But at first glance I am Filipino.
3 And I know that is such a racial thing to say. But it’s true.
4 That is where my bloodline is from.
5 And again I am not gonna say that I am not British,
6 because I am. I speak English.
7 That is where I grew up.

**Introduction**

The two extracts above showed a glimpse of the ‘battle of heritages’ that goes on in the lives of the second-generation. In simple terms the ‘tug of war,’ in the case of mixed-race second-

[^45]: A Filipino noodle dish.
generation may just be between the influences of a Filipina mother and British father. To others, it may be a ‘competition’ between identification with a largely Filipino household and the wider English/British heritage in London. This chapter presents a thematic analysis of how the second-generation participants narrated their belonging as a kind of battle within different spheres of belonging.

Extract 4 describes how a London-based family formed by a Portuguese father and a Filipina mother resulted in three different ethnic practices amongst their offspring. James, the eldest, referred to himself as Filipino and de-emphasized his Portuguese heritage. His brother Fred took the opposite end and classed himself as Portuguese. Surprisingly their youngest sibling, a female, dis-identified with both the Filipino and the Portuguese sides. She found comfort in thinking of herself as English in her daily life orientation. In thinking about these outcomes three key factors were consequential for their identification trajectories: the influence of either parent in cultural socialization, the reinforcement provided by peers, and the importance of a place where a person grows up.

Extract 5 foregrounds four means by which identity can be constructed. Firstly identity can be determined by the passport that one carries. Identity is equated with citizenship. Secondly ethnic identity in particular can also constructed on the basis of physiognomy or the physical features that mark seemingly typical characteristics of a people coming from a specific place of origin such as the Philippines. Skin colour can be used as a visual and physical marker to assign a body to a particular ethno-racial category. By seeking to naturalise these racial types a third means of creating an identity can be illustrated. A person’s identity can also be a matter of ‘blood’ (that is the ‘mix’ that you have from your parents and the ethnicity to which they belong define who you are). Camille recognized this as ‘truth’: that she is ‘Filipino’
because her parents were both from the Philippines and she ‘looks’ Filipino at first sight. However, Camille reasserted a fourth way by which to construct identity: she stated that alongside being Filipino she is also undeniably British given her English language ability and the fact that she was born and raised in London.

This chapter centres on three spheres of belonging: the temporal, the spatial, and the relational. It is important to mention that these spheres are not always mutually exclusive but for purposes of discussion are conceptually separated in this chapter. In practice, there are confluences between time and space and the people who act in these contexts. People throughout their lives are emplaced in particular locales where they encounter others. The discussion highlights the tensions and combinations of situating a dual or bifocal belonging in each of these spheres.

This chapter is organised as follows. Section 5.1 focuses on the temporal belonging of the second-generation by elaborating the notions of generation and life course. Section 5.2 presents how belonging is spatially organised between the Philippines and the UK. Section 5.3 discusses how belonging is negotiated through sociality with others. In Section 5.4, these three broad themes are re-contextualised through a discussion of a perspective on sense and politics of belonging. Each section is introduced by key points about each main theme.

### 5.1 Temporal sphere

#### 5.1.1 Children of first-generation labour-migrant parents

A crucial reference point invoked by the study participants when they told their life stories during the research interview was the migration narrative of their Filipino parent. Their narrated life stories almost always included an account of how their mother braved the UK ‘in
search of a better life’. In general the informants described how their parents worked very hard by taking on one job after another. Their mother’s initial plan was just to work abroad so that she could support the family of orientation she left in the Philippines. During that time she regularly sent remittance money back home to augment the economic needs of relatives. Camille described this theme in the following manner:

Also, their history as to how they came here. That made me realise what they went through... imagine coming to a new country and having to live how other people live. You know they worked very hard...before it was just all about working, going back to Philippines, sending money to Philippines.46

Billy and Marie’s mothers were Philippine-trained nurses before they came to England to work in hospitals. The jobs they had were commensurate to what they were trained for; and they were definitely earning higher incomes compared to when they worked as professional nurses in the Philippines. But not everyone is ‘lucky’. It was also common to find Filipinos working at jobs that did not match their educational qualifications. Kyle described the case of his mother:

So, my mom was a maths teacher and [also took] psychology. She was the [only] one in her family who came here to work. Her whole career did not happen because she had to earn money and send it home, send it back. Then, she had me and that ended... She is a dressmaker, a chef, a cake-maker, a hair-dresser, a maths teacher, a psychologist – she has done lots of things... So for the past 30 years, she has been making cakes for people in the community. My mom [also] used to do the cloak room [of the Filipino Friendship club], take the tickets and welcome people in and let them go upstairs...

After working for several years, the first-generation labour migrants formed their family of procreation where their second-generation children were born. The first-generation needed to

46 Note: Throughout the discussion, extracts from participants’ narratives appear in Arial 12 to differentiate from quotations from published works. Some parts of participant extracts are in bold typeface to emphasize an idea or argument built.
work even harder to continue supporting relatives in the Philippines and their newly formed families in the hostland.

The migration narratives of the first-generation – how and why they came to the UK – not only served as a point of reference to orient the participants’ narrated life story but, more importantly, these migration narratives, as heard by members of the second-generation whilst growing up, served to inculcate the values of appreciating the privilege of living in London (versus the ‘hard life’ in the Philippines) and recognising the sacrifice the first-generation has to go through to provide a ‘better life’ for their family and children. Ben illustrated this narrative function when he said:

Mom came over [to the UK] really to help her family back home [in the Philippines] …You come here, you work, send money back home. That’s all they came down to, to be honest. It is quite funny when they all lived in a hostel like all of them young women. And then my dad and my uncle came across. My mum was here for a few years before my dad came over and she got him a job in the same hotel. They always tell me, obviously before they have their kids, they are here for their families…My mom never went back to teaching when she came here. She did just hotel work to be honest… I always assumed that it was a sacrifice for them to leave home for us to come here. And now that my brother and my sister, you know we are all doing good to ourselves then they may go back there… Yeah, Philippines is home.

Ben describes the migration story of his parents and what it meant to him as a son. He links the personal story of his mother to a larger cohort of Filipino labour migrants who took low-skilled job positions in the hotel industry in the 1970’s. The account suggests a tied migration pattern where female relatives became an ‘initial batch’ and are later joined by their male relatives (husbands, uncles). The first-generation could be said to be underemployed as most were university educated and already professionals in the Philippines but the low-skilled overseas job offered a higher income and therefore a better means to support the family. The first-generation’s labour migration was a ‘personal sacrifice’ in order to provide for a better life. Working in the UK meant working far from family and in a significantly lower job status.
with sometimes less than ideal conditions. Ben holds a debt of gratitude for his parents’ sacrifice: it is because of his parents that he is now ‘doing well’ (he has already bought a house and lot in the Philippines for his parents’ retirement). Ben’s action to buy a retirement house for his parents to express his gratefulness simultaneously constructs an image of the first-generation who long to be home to their original homeland the Philippines and a second-generation who seem to be at home in the hostland. I will return to this notion on home amongst the first and second-generation in the second part of this chapter.

Potency and saliency of pre-migration stories can be understood as postmemories for the second-generation. According to Hirsch (1997, p.22) a postmemory ‘characterizes the experiences of those who grow up dominated by narratives that preceded their birth, whose own belated stories are evacuated by the stories of the previous generation’. The (pre)migration account is a memory not of the second-generation but of their first-generation parents. To a certain extent these stories may just be treated as emotionally neutral historical facts about the first-generation. To the second-generation, this narrative is a ‘powerful and very particular form of memory precisely because its connection to its object or source is mediated not through recollection but through an imaginative investment and creation’ (p.22).

I will argue that this postmemory is further strengthened (if not solidified) once the second-generation visits and encounters life back home (see Section 5.4). After situating the second-generation as a consequence of a first-generation who went to the UK as labour migrants the next subsection locates the second-generation as a biological and as a historical generation.

5.1.2 Bloodlines, migration and generation

The operational definitions of the term second-generation reviewed in Chapter 2 called for attentiveness to a variety of ‘second-generation cases’ that can be expected in the field. In the
same chapter I suggested that the contemporary Filipino labour migration to the UK may be broadly divided into two phases (i.e. 1960-1999 and 2000 onwards). By implication different biological generations (parent-children) can be subsumed into two broad time periods. Having made the distinction I emphasised that the study focuses on earlier/older second- (historical) generation of Filipinos – those who were born or migrated to the UK before 2000. Methodologically this means that the participants approached for study were already adults (18 years old and above) at the time of the interview in order to assure that the older second-generation was reached. Whilst a particular segment became a target group the need to be sensitive to how study cases are chosen remained crucially important: the sample should ‘address the diversity, sources of similarity and difference among our informants in the field in contemporary ways’ (Gilad, 2012, p.17).

Although the sample for Phase 2 of the study was generated through a snow-ball sampling via referrals, each case was assessed according to their theoretical relevance and how its contribution to building an overall sample that captures the diversity of cases. The balance between a theoretical sample and what can be accessed in the field is reflected in Table 3 p. 73. The 20 participants were characterised according to five biographical dimensions: (a) gender; (b) parentage; (c) place of birth; (d) place of socialization, and (e) age at migration. In this section I argue that temporal belonging of the second-generation members can be understood by locating them within a notion of a biological generation and a historical generation. In this context, biological generation is related with parentage and the manner by which a ‘proportion’ of Filipino/British ‘blood’ is taken into account, whereas historical generation is explained using the notion of decimal generations.
Biological generation and the proportion of ‘Filipino’ blood

Table 8 Key informants by generation, gender and ethnicity of parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Both parents are Filipino</td>
<td>Filipina mother, Non-Filipino father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>Drew</td>
<td>Anne, Kate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Ben, Jesse</td>
<td>Billy, Chris, Martin, Kyle, James</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Mike, Ted</td>
<td>Mike, Ted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Dave</td>
<td>Dave</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in table above male and female participants were further categorised into two parentage groups— either ‘both of their parents are Filipino’ or ‘only their mother or father is Filipino’. It can be noted that the table did not include participants whose father is Filipino and the mother is non-Filipino. Although this combination is also possible there is reason to believe that this is an atypical case given the feminised Filipino labour migration to the UK and that none of the participants of study actually fits the category. With the exception of Sophie whose mother is half-English, Table 3 (p.73) showed that 19 of the participants have Filipina mothers. Whilst most of them also have Filipino fathers seven have non-Filipino fathers (see table above). The term ‘non-Filipino’ father was preferred to signal that not all of these fathers are ‘white British’. James’ father is Portuguese whilst Kyle’s birth father is Pakistani. Moreover the use of the term was consistent in the use of ‘Filipino-ness’ as a point of reference. In other words: the point of similarity amongst the participants was their Filipino background as indicated by one or both of their parents being Filipino.

In other studies (see Aspinall, 2003; Root 1999), individuals whose parents are of different ethnicities are referred to as ‘mixed-race’ or ‘mixed-heritage,’ to be more politically appropriate. The term implies biological/genetic mixing which results into having children who may phenotypically differ from one of the parents. Although the theory of ethnic
background as a biologically distinct genetic group of people has already been discredited the salience of ‘race’ as a category of practice remains to be a social fact (Bruce and Yearly, 2006). For people in general (and for the study participants in particular) ‘race’ relates to skin colour, facial features, mother tongue, and geographical territory. Following this narrow conceptualisation of ‘race’ a Filipina mother is originally from the Philippines, Tagalog is her first language and her skin is brown. By contrast an English father is born and raised in England, a native English-speaker and who is also white.

Amongst the participants, indigenous categorisations based on the proportion of ‘Filipino’ blood were also functional means to identify second-generation types. Both Billy and Martin’s fathers were White British and their mothers were from the Philippines. Billy, during the interview, referred to himself as ‘half-Filipino’. To Billy a second-generation if half-Filipino if only one of the parents (usually the mother) is Filipino. A second-generation is full-Filipino if both parents are originally from the Philippines. Martin, whenever appropriate, has emphasised his being half-Filipino, half-English. Martin also used the terms mix-breed or cross-breed for second-generation individuals whose parents are not from the same racial background (e.g. Filipino and British). By contrast, he called those whose parents are both Filipinos as pure Filipino. He argued that this classification was readily visible amongst his peers. For example, early in our conversation, he described that,

...you could tell the difference. You had Pauline who is pure Filipino, second-generation with regards to blood. Both her parents are Filipino.

The visible differentiation that Billy and Martin reported can be traced not only through marriage of parents who have different racial backgrounds. These differences have physical manifestation too, that is, their physiognomy fit neither the typical Filipino nor British characteristics. Martin mentioned that his new acquaintances would always know that he is of
‘mixed race’ because he is fair-skinned but his hair is black. Such situations often resulted to him being asked of his ‘origin’ or his ‘mix’. I shall return to this theme when I discuss the different factors that influence sense belonging in Section 5.3.2. The important point to remember is that when considering biological generation of second-generation participants, they can be further subdivided into a group of similar ‘race’ parents (both parents are Filipino, ‘full-Filipino’, ‘pure Filipino’) and a group of different ‘race’ parents (only one of the parents is Filipino, ‘half-Filipino’, ‘mix-breed’).

For purposes of comparison it can be argued that the academic term mixed heritage may also broadly apply to second-generation who have similar ‘race’ parents (both parents were Filipino). Even if members of the ‘pure Filipino’ second-generation (e.g. Mike, Ted, Sarah, and Marie) were born in the UK and were practically schooled and socialised in London it can be argued that these individuals also drew from a mixed heritage through the Filipino culture practiced in their households. They were influenced/enforced by their parents and through the British social life they have outside their homes. If only the ‘pure’ and ‘mixed’ groups are heard through their accent or read through their English writing skills and not seen through visual markers such as skin colour and facial features it is likely that the racial divide will not be apparent. They will be heard and read as ‘English’.

Once they are seen and information about the ‘race’ of their parents are known it becomes more evident that they are ‘mixed’ or more appropriately dual in their possible source of heritage – there is a Filipino and an English aspect to their identity (see Section 5.4.2). Similar to this position is Werbner’s (2013, p.41) notion of ‘double consciousness, an awareness of competing rules, expectations and a doubling up of a subject’s sense of belonging and alienation’. For example, whether ‘pure’ or ‘mixed’ second-generation, they
are aware of their ‘Filipino-ness’ when in England and their ‘English-ness’ when in the Philippines. In both contexts, they need to be aware of ‘the rules’ in order to negotiate belonging (see Section 5.2.2 and 5.2.3).

**Decimal second-generation**

After taking into account gender and parentage Table 8 categorises the participants based on their historical generation. This strategy organised the 20 participants into groupings of decimal generations. As mentioned in Chapter 2, Rumbaut (1997) introduced the notion of a decimal generations to differentiate subgroups of foreign-born children of immigrants. These subgroups were categorised based on age of migration or arrival to the hostland.

The principle of decimal generation, based on a threshold age of immigration, is applicable only when children took a single movement migration (that is, if they moved from parental homeland and then settled and spent the rest of their childhood years in the hostland). In other words, after being born and spending a few years in the Philippines they were transplanted to the UK. Initially, they may be viewed as being ‘uprooted’ from the social and physical place of birth. As they settle to the parent’s hostland at a young age, they are able to ‘grow new roots’ and thereby learn to consider the parental homeland as a ‘new homeland’.

Rumbaut’s principle of decimal generation does not include those who may be born in the hostland but for some reasons were raised in the homeland. For example, Jesse was born in the UK but was sent to the Philippines from age one to three because his mother could not simultaneously handle work and childcare. Moreover it does not also capture the cyclical mobilities of the children of immigrants who may have an extended stay in either the hostland or the homeland throughout their childhood. Ben, also UK-born, spent a part of his childhood
in the Philippines (from age three to eight) when his parents decided that it was important for him and his siblings to learn about their roots in the Philippines. A final example is Drew. Although he was born in London, he was raised and schooled in the Philippines and would just visit the UK during Christmas and summer holidays.

I introduced in Table 8 (p.138) a slightly different way of conceptualising the decimal generation. The parents are referred to as the *1.0 generation* (born and raised in the Philippines) and the technical second-generation as *2.0 generation* (born and raised in the UK). The criteria for defining the 1.0, and 2.0 generation still follow Rumbaut’s classification. However instead of using a threshold age for immigration to define the 1.25, 1.5, and 1.75 generations, I suggest that the person’s length of stay in the parental hostland during childhood be used as a criteria. As a principle: the longer the childhood years spent in the UK then the greater the decimal grouping. The decimal grouping is based on their temporal distance from the homeland – the more years they spent in the Philippines during childhood then the greater their social similarity to the first-generation migrants (i.e. exposure and familiarity with Filipino cultural life) and the closer their decimal place is to 1.0. The placing of individuals to a specific decimal group relaxes criteria on place of birth but highlights the importance of childhood years spent in the hostland (or parental homeland). This is a proxy measure of similarity to an ideal type 2.0 generation who were born and raised in the hostland and never lived or visited in the parental homeland.

By applying this revised criteria, the majority of the participants such as ‘similar-race parents’ Ted (31) and Corrine (25) and ‘different-race parents’ Billy (19) and Ellie (26) are all grouped under 2.0 generation as they were born and raised in London. Except for short visits to the Philippines (lasting for no more than three months) the 2.0 generation spent most of their
years in the UK. Even though Ben (26) and Jesse, (27) are UK-born they are classified under 1.75 generation as they spent a portion of their childhood in the Philippines (see Chapter 2, Table 1). Following Rumbaut’s age criterion, Anne (26) and Sophie (30), having been both born and raised in the Philippines and migrated to England at age 14, were grouped as ‘1.5 generation’. Drew (23), whilst UK-born, was classified as 1.25 generation because he was a ‘resident’ of the Philippines and a ‘visitor’ to England in the first 17 years of his life. He only permanently stayed in England in the last six years for his university education. Dave (18) is the only 3.0 generation among the participants. By definition a 3.0 generation is supposedly the child of any of the decimal or the 2.0 generation. Dave’s mother is a 1.5 generation who migrated to England at in early 1980s at age 12. His father was born and raised in the Philippines and was a labour migrant (a 1.0 generation). It is important to note that the criterion on taking into account length of stay in the UK only applied to unique cases of Drew, Jesse, and Ben. To the rest of the participants, Rumbaut’s criteria on place of birth and threshold age of migration remained operative.

Having described the second-generation in relation to broad categories of biological and historical generation I also argue that temporal belonging can also be located by paying attention to particular life stages, events, transitions, and trajectories that compose an individual life course.

5.1.3 Negotiating belonging across a life course

Each particular life stage that compose a life course involves ‘unique relationships, roles, and responsibilities, and the transition from one life stage to another [that] marks a qualitative shift in these’ (Lauer and Wong, 2010, p.1055) stages. Although I am using the concept of life course to elaborate a layer of temporal belonging it must be understood that it is difficult to
disentangle life course from what is spatial and what is relational. For example: age-related schooling (primary, secondary, university) always assume a particular locale and the relevance of particular individuals. Moreover whilst members of second-generation may undergo similar educational transitions each life course is differentially impacted by unique events and experiences that may in turn influence how transnational belonging is negotiated.

**Age and Filipino-ness**

The difference between Filipino-ness and British-ness only become distinctive when members of second-generation encounter unfamiliar others outside the (Filipino) household to whom they are accustomed. This is particularly true amongst those whose parents were both Filipinos – Filipino-ness as pervasive and permanent characteristics of their everyday life made such identity practice unnoticed. Moreover some parents chose to bring their children to schools where there were other second-generation. Situations of having to account about one’s ethnic background occurred at particular educational stages Camille described one example:

> In my school, I have a lot of Filipino friends. But also English, ... loads of different cultures, loads of different colours, lots of different people. But at that age, you don't really think about that. Because when you come home, we are all Filipino. Our friends and family are Filipino, you know. **Up until I started secondary school that's when I started you know you realise where you are from.** Because again, we will have loads of courses to tell about our culture. You know project works telling about the Philippines. [Emphasis added]

Camille reported that ethnic identity was not an issue when they were at primary school (even though their school can be described as multicultural). They started coming to terms with ethnicity through school projects that sought to inform cultural differences.
Recognition of one’s Filipino background is also related to one’s maturity. The extracts below illustrate how two participants at the same age resulted in different trajectories:

I was at that point 16 going on 17 and I was going a bit older. And I thought I noticed there are a lot of Filipinos here so maybe I should start getting a bit of my own. **My own culture, my own people if you like.** So finally, my friend Raymond contacted me after 2 years. And I just agreed to play with his basketball team. And from that moment on, all my friends went from being Black, white or whatever then within the space of a few months they all turned out to be Filipinos. And I kinda never looked back since then. So I would say that **from age 16 onwards is the time when I get really heavily involved in the Filipino community and I got to know it and its culture and stuff and a bit more.** But prior to that, I wasn’t really into it that much. [Jesse]

To be honest, the point that I would have researched it was the point that I drifted apart socially. Between the ages 5 to 16 is just about school and about playing football and doing sports. You rarely think about studying [about the Filipino] ‘cos you don’t have to. **And the when you get to age when you went to university, for example, it wasn’t really at the forefront of your mind ‘cos we moved from West London with my mum. At the age when I would have researched it, it wasn’t at the forefront of my mind so I didn’t do it.** [Martin]

Jesse and Martin both attended primary and secondary schools where there were very few second-generation Filipinos to befriend. During his childhood Jesse admitted that he had very limited interactions with other ‘Filipino’ kids apart from the children he meets at weekend Filipino parties. In fact he did not want to be associated with Filipino kids in their neighbourhood because of their ‘gangster clothing style’ which he disliked. This changed when a critical mass of second-generation settled in their neighbourhood and he reached a point of understanding that they are his ‘own culture and people’. Another crucial influence to his decision to move out of his comfort zone and engage with his Filipino-side was basketball (as well-loved in the Philippines as football is in the UK).

In contrast, Martin narrated that his childhood up until he was 16 years old was the ‘most Filipino’ he has ever been. Martin grew up and spent most of his time with his Filipino cousins and ‘other relatives’. His contact hours with Filipino relatives were significantly
reduced when he started his university degree. He reasoned that in university there were more people of different backgrounds to mingle with and there were not really many Filipinos at his campus. Although he maintained a strong connection with his ethnic background (claiming he is half-Filipino), attending university meant having to explore more his British side. Even though he has the maturity as an adult to understand Filipinos beyond what he has been familiar with as a child he could no longer do spend as much time as he wanted due to demands of university studies as a specific life stage.

**Events and experiences across a life course**

Each life course is peppered with unique experiences that in one way or another influence the negotiation of transnational belonging. Examples include divorce of parents, experiences of being excluded or included in social situations on the basis of perceived differences according to ethnicity, and visits to the Philippines where crucial events may favour stronger identification with a Filipino identity.

Drew, Kyle, Sophie, and Martin all had divorced or separated parents. Drew’s Israeli-descent father and Filipina mother separated before he was born. His parents decided that it would be in his best interest to be raised in the Philippines under the care of his maternal grandparents. Drew’s mother, although already a British citizen at that time, moved to Riyadh to work as a nurse. Drew was also the first mixed-race child in the family and the grandparents thought that it was important to instil in him Filipino values. Their initial plan was for Drew to finish primary school in the Philippines and attend a boarding school in London. As he was able to develop a close network of friends Drew asked his mother to finish secondary school in the Philippines before returning to the UK. In the end Drew spent his childhood years in the
Philippines under the care of relatives (first his grandparents then later his spinster aunt).

Drew moved to London at age 18 to attend university.

After Kyle was born, his biological father left his mother. All Kyle knew of his father was that he was a Muslim Pakistani who treated his mother badly. Kyle was raised by his mother as a single parent. And since his mother was a native of Ilocos province in northern Philippines, he grew up understanding the Ilocano language. Kyle narrated that as a child he disliked meeting South Asians because they reminded him of his absent father. This situation pushed him to become more active in the Filipino community. Drew later had a younger brother when his mother married a White British man.

Sophie was born and raised in the Philippines but her parents decided to separate when she was five years old. Realising the difficulties of becoming a single parent with three kids her English grandfather advised her mother to try exploring work opportunities in the UK. As Sophie’s mother was half-English under the law she would have a claim to citizenship rights. As a result Sophie’s mother went the UK to work whilst Sophie and her siblings were left in the Philippines. They were not able to see their mother for five straight years. At age 14, Sophie (together with her siblings) were reunited with her mother in London and have stayed in the UK since then.

One final example is that of Martin. His Filipina mother and White British father were divorced when Martin was eight years old. Martin, being the only child of his parents, lived with his mother and on Sundays his father would visit and bring him to a football club. Being raised by his mother meant being raised in a Filipino way: spending time with cousins and other relatives in London, going to weekend gatherings, and being accustomed to Filipino
cooking. His father later remarried but his mother stayed single. Over the years Martin became comfortable in thinking of himself as a ‘mommy’s boy’.

Separation or divorce of parents as a key biographic event was instrumental in ‘pushing’ the participants toward identification with the Filipino identity. Divorce eventually led to the decision that brought Drew to grow up in the Philippines. For Martin and Kyle being separated from the father meant having to invest more time with Filipino relatives in London. For Sophie, her parents’ divorce eventually paved the way for her mother to work in London.

Personal experiences of exclusion were also significant moments in a life course and can impact constructions of belonging. In an extreme case, Kyle mentioned an incident when he thought he was denied a chance to compete for a scholarship:

When I was ten, basically if you do well on those tests the school can put you forward for scholarships and go to better schools. And my mom asked about it ‘cos I did so well. And they said, “Oh don’t worry about those kind of things.” And it was quite strange why they did say that to my mom. So, I was a bit angry with the school when I found out about that when I was older. ‘Cos perhaps I could have gotten to a better school and had a better education. But it was a different time; it was the 80s and 90s…. Maybe they thought, “What is the point of giving opportunity to these people”… Um, in those days, especially if you are on benefits, no one really cared about what you did. My mom, she didn’t work ‘cos she was looking after us.

Kyle emphasized that what he perceived as ‘discrimination’ was based on their economic status and not necessarily their being from an ethnic minority. Nevertheless he returned to this event a number of times, during the interview, as a motivation to improve their social standing. In another example Martin, reported being excluded by a group that he thought would have been more welcoming because he is half-Filipino. Martin narrated:

When I used to work in the Bar with him, they were all Filipinos. That was the first time that I felt like a bit awkward. ‘Cos they would be joking and also, I was different. There were all pure Filipinos. And I clearly
wasn't. So, I'd go in and…. At some point I did feel a little bit of an outsider.

Martin’s narration showed that there was subtle differentiation amongst subgroups even the Filipino community – that a battle for acceptance was concomitant to a battle of heritage. Parental divorce and personal experiences of exclusion were events that did not occur by themselves. Each of these events involved people who have a relationship with the second-generation participant and a spatial context where it happened. These events are subsumed under a major theme of temporal belonging which indicates that such events occur at specific life stages in a life course and (depending on the maturity and reception of the person) will result in particular outcomes of transnational (non) belonging.

Visits to the Philippines were also the most significant and consequential events to shape the second-generation’s appreciation of the pre-migration life of their parents and formed identification with ethnic identity and the practice of transnational activities. The next section discusses negotiations of belonging through notions of home and community in Filipino and English spaces.

5.2 Spatial sphere

5.2.1 Conceptualising community

The term community was used in the informants’ narratives in eight different senses. These communities varied in level of intimacy and formality. The level of connectedness in these communities ranged from every day and face-to-face spaces of families and neighbourhoods, to the technology-mediated online communities, and the broadly identifiable diaspora population. In the same manner these communities also ranged from the non-formal groups of friends to impersonal and formally organised groups or associations. The succeeding
section briefly discusses these eight community conceptualisations that can be used as tools to spatially situate the second-generation’s transnational belonging.

**Community as immediate family/household and friends.** The family and the household are the first groups where a sense of community can be developed. The family or household involves the people that you grew up with and a space where one feels a strong sense of belonging. Participants’ narratives show that it was common to find several families living in the same household (especially so if the first-generation parents were relatively new in London or had no means of renting a place of their own). This behaviour of ‘staying together’ may be seen not only as an economic strategy to pull resources but this also served as a social-cultural buffer where one can practice Filipino-ness. Claire illustrated this sense of community in this account:

*It was a shared household with another Filipino family.* That woman is now who I know is my ninang\(^{47}\), my godmother.... I was never part of ... a typical family structure of mother, father, brothers, sisters... For the first two years I was pretty much born and raised with my mother as the only parent and my ninang and her husband and her daughter, who was pretty much my god sister, akin to a sister in a way. From the outset we’ve always known that even though we are not blood related, close friends and family of the same culture as Filipino, we are very important to each other. We relied on each other’s support system. Once my mom would go to work, my ninang would look after me and vice versa. It was until when my dad came down when my mom moved out and set up our own family together.

Household-sharing enabled the second-generation participants to introduce the children they grew up with as their cousins even if they are not actually blood-related. As a sign of respect, children were taught to call every person who is of the same age as their parents as Tito (Uncle) or Tita (Auntie). For a Christian family these ties were somehow formalised when

---

\(^{47}\) In Tagalog, female godparents are called *ninang* while males are called *ninong*. 
these adults become their godparents during baptism. I will elaborate on these significant relationships in Section 5.3.1.

**Community as neighbourhood.** As an extension of the grouping behaviour stated above Filipinos also commonly set up household in areas with an established Filipino presence. In most cases the neighbourhood was multicultural (in the sense that many other ethnic groups lived there). Starting from when the time her mother began working in the early 1970’s, Claire witnessed the transformation of the neighbourhood where they lived:

It is more diverse than it was when she came – a lot of whites, and English living in East London during that time with a handful of ethnic minorities and packets around. **Now, in East London where we are, the majority is gone. There are not many English around. They all moved out.** (laughs)

The change in ethnic landscape of a neighbourhood was not a neutral and easy process. It took time for Filipinos to be integrated or at least to be seen as members of the community. Belonging in neighbourhoods was actively earned rather than automatically given by the locals or the ‘original settlers’. In some instances Filipinos, along with other immigrant groups, were seen as ‘invaders’ by original settlers. For example Kyle shared how they were received in a predominantly white-black neighbourhood:

Growing up, it was really strange. **I was the foreigner with all the friends in the estate.** In the estate it was only white people and black people. I was a foreigner because I didn’t fit in their little boxes. And then suddenly, when all the Arabs started moving in, um they used to talk to me and my mom and say, “**Look at these foreigners coming in.**” And my mom will be like, “**Five years ago, you were saying that to us. Now, you’re saying it to the Arabs.**” It’s really weird how now we are accepted but the Muslims [aren’t] and there is someone else for them to hate.

In his life course Kyle witnessed the transformation of the social landscape of his neighbourhood. Through the years the neighbourhood had a succession of ‘immigrant others’ that the original settlers did not initially welcome. The Filipinos, the Middle Eastern,
Muslims, and more recently the Eastern Europeans have successively moved in to the originally white-black community.

**Community as formal group.** Community in this usage refers to a relatively formal and organised character and assumed personality through names that are anchored on a Filipino identity. For example a community is named after their: (a) current place of residence in London or UK (e.g. East London Filipino Federation, Association of Filipinos in Bristol); (b) their provincial or ethno-linguistic origin in the Philippines (e.g. the *Aguman Kapampangan* for those who come from Pampanga and speak the Kapampangan language; or the *Batangas Association* for those originating from the Tagalog-speaking province of Batangas); (c) or their interests/ occupations (e.g. the religious group *Banal na Pag-aaral/ Holy Study*). The Philippine Embassy is the most formalised of these groups. Also included in these spaces are the schools and the church. The socio-civic organisations cited were clearly ‘Filipino’ in their orientation whereas schools and churches were not exclusively ‘Filipinos’.

**Community as the aggregate of Filipinos in London.** Unlike the families and neighbours to whom the informants were exposed in their everyday lives, the aggregate community does not have a direct personal relationship with the participants. Nevertheless, the aggregate Filipino community remain to be ‘facially’ and audibly recognisable (especially on streets and on Sundays inside the church). Parents (particularly mothers) would often initiate greeting to a fellow Filipino who passes within their range of vision. Interactions with this community range from a glance and a smile as a token recognition or an utterance of ‘*Kumusta po?’* (How are you?) in passing.

**Community as Filipino population in the UK-at-large.** An extension of the immediate local neighbourhood or city is the knowledge that there are Filipinos all over the UK. Taken
together this may be called the diaspora population – a loosely organised social formation that (in one way or another) connects with and reproduces a Filipino consciousness and culture (Vertovec, 2006a). Although purported members of the diaspora may not necessarily meet in their entire life they however imagine the community by virtue of the Philippines as a place of origin (particularly among the first-generation).

**Community as composed of Filipinos in the Philippines.** This sense of community invokes a broader imaginative identification with Filipinos in the Philippines as fellows by referring to them as ‘my people’. This community, or more appropriately the nation, may at some point be a distant, faceless, and simply cognitive construct (especially when members of the second-generation have only been acquainted to it through the personal stories of their parents). This conceptualisation is transformed once the person finally travels to the parental homeland. The Philippines as a place and the people as a community assume a face when the members of the second-generation finally meet the immediate and the extended relatives, visit to various places in the Philippines (specifically the hometown of their parents), and gain experiences that involve ‘coming-and-staying-home’ with newly met relatives.

**A historically-situated community.** The character of the Filipino community also varies historically. The neighbourhoods where the ‘older’ second-generation grew up is different from the neighbourhood where the ‘younger’ second-generation now live. Kyle, as illustrated in an extract in Section 5.1.3, p.148, spoke of the Filipino community in the 1980’s - a time when the Filipino community has not yet reached a critical mass. He was a child back then and opportunities and reception to immigrant families in general are markedly different from the more tolerant and equitable present times.
**Community as a virtual site.** Belonging can be also negotiated via the computer-technology-mediated spaces of online communities that people turn to as an alternative to or alongside real face-to-face spaces. Study participants reported examples of social networking sites (e.g. http://www.asianave.com/) where people of similar backgrounds group together or organisations that maintain virtual presence (e.g. http://philippinegenerations.blogspot.com/).

After giving an overview of the eight senses of community I now pay close attention to two geographical locations that denote ‘here and there’ – the Philippines and the UK – of transnational belonging.

### 5.2.2 The Philippines and Filipino spaces

**Philippines as second home?**

**Vivid contrasts of Manila and London.** For most of the informants their first visit to the Philippines happened when they were a child. It was a time for them to meet their grandparents, uncles, aunties, and cousins from both sides of the family. If the parents were from different provinces, the first-generation would make it a point to visit both sides of the family to introduce to the clan (and to the rest of the community) their UK-born child.

For first-time visitors, Manila (and most especially the provinces) stands in stark contrast to London: from street beggars to children selling sampaguita garlands; from having more *jeepneys* [48] and *tri-cycles* [49] on roads than buses; from *ipis* [50], *butiki* [51], *gagamba* [52] and *lamok* [53]

---


[49] Motorized tri-cycles are common transport vehicles in towns and rural areas in the Philippines.

[50] Cockroach

[51] Lizard

[52] Spider
that roam around the wooden house; to kalabaw\textsuperscript{54}, pigs, goats and chickens in the backyard farm. For these first time visitors it was a surprise that almost all signages around the metro are in English and there were KFCs and McDonald’s all over.

**Tagalog, English or sign language?** Perhaps the biggest challenge faced during the visit to the Philippines was communicating with relatives. With English as their first and only language most of the participants felt frustrated for not having the ability to converse in Tagalog or another Philippine language (e.g. Ilokano, Kapampangan). The adjustment was not really expected from the UK-born / raised child of the Balikbayan\textsuperscript{55} but rather on the Philippine Filipinos who can accommodate by speaking English. Billy shared his first and only visit to his relatives in the Philippines:

> In the Philippines, I thought everyone will be completely speaking Tagalog. But there is a lot of English. **There is a lot of English writing, speaking English like around and everywhere. A lot of people there speak English quite really well.** My mom’s family they all spoke English as well. It is quite easy for me. Her mom didn’t but I **never felt there was a language barrier. I feel that we are still connected.** And we just speak as we manage to connect. It is quite easy to adapt and feel comfortable around them.

Beyond the challenges of linguistic communication the first journey to the Philippines was also a chance to discover an emotional connection they never thought they had. Billy, who at that time was 10, recounted meeting the brothers and sisters of his mother for the first time during their arrival at the airport:

> I just looked to them and then I looked at their face, how much love they have in their face. I don’t know what happened, I don’t know if they have ever seen my picture but I just felt like they are family. **My heart just**

\textsuperscript{53} Mosquito

\textsuperscript{54} Water buffalo

\textsuperscript{55} Overseas Filipino Workers (OFWs) are called Balikbayan (literally, return home) when they return home for a visit or for good after many years of working abroad.
went, and I felt really excited and emotional at the same time. I ran out to them as well. (laughs) I just jumped and gave them a hug and everything. It is quite nice because you don't see that in an English family. There is a lot of difference. And it is nice for the Filipino family to show that amount of love when they see me. And I felt like it was a proper family.

**Diasporic recreation of Philippine culture**

The household and the neighbourhood are not exclusive domains where the imported Philippine culture is learnt and practiced. The growing number of Filipino migrants to the UK, and the consequent emergence of succeeding generations, allowed for a critical mass of individuals to collectively identify as a Filipino community and make manifest a way of life.

**Non-material culture.** Indications of continuity of Filipino culture in the lives of the second-generation are seen in the family values that they practice and intend to uphold, the language, and the Catholic religion. The description of Filipinos as a family-orientated people was a running theme from informants’ stories. On one hand they hail this as a characteristic that differentiated Filipino families from others. Informants who have non-Filipino fathers reported that they were not as close to their English or non-Filipino cousins than they were to their Filipino relatives. This is perhaps because they regularly interact with Filipino ‘relatives’ from their mother’s side rather than their relatives from their father’s side of the family. For example, Martin and Ellie reported that they socialised with Filipino relatives during weekends or at birthdays or when attending church. In contrast they only get to meet their ‘English’ relatives at least twice a year – during Christmas or when there are special events such as anniversaries or weddings.

Although a tightly-knit family meant a greater likelihood of passing on Filipino values, this also meant that members of the second-generation had to contend with others with differing
values. Tensions sometimes ensue when a growing up child encounters peers who are from non-Filipino background.

Whilst none of the informants can converse in straight Tagalog the best alternative bargain was a second-generation whose first language is English with a London accent but understands one or two Philippine languages. Some parents, such as Marie’s, always spoke to their children in English even at home. Dave on the other hand grew up hearing three languages at home – his father talked in Tagalog, his grandparents often spoke in Kapampangan, and his siblings always conversed to him in English. Camille, Dave’s aunt, was the only UK-born child among siblings. Camille’s three other sisters (including Dave’s mother) were all born in the Philippines and emigrated to the UK before they were 12. Camille recounted a significant moment when she was 17 when she approached her parents to tell them:

> I consider myself quite spoiled when I was very young, ‘cos I was the bunso\(^{56}\). I was the only one born here. One thing that I did realise is, “How come you speak to my older sisters in Kapampangan\(^{57}\) or Tagalog\(^{58}\) and to me in English?” And that made me think. **Why don't you treat me like you treat them?** You know I am the bunso, I understand I am English, not why not talk to me.” You know that really pulled a cord in me, **I want to learn. If they can, why can't I?**

Another significant social institution facilitating the continuation of Filipino culture in the UK is the Catholic religion to which most Filipinos adhere. The Philippines is of course not a completely Catholic nation – a significant proportion of the population are Muslims (especially those in the southern region). Nevertheless a great majority of the population are

---

\(^{56}\) In Tagalog, the lastborn called *bunso* and is usually thought of being pampered amongst the siblings to the point of being spoiled.

\(^{57}\) *Kapampangan* is the language in the province of Pampanga.

\(^{58}\) *Tagalog* is the base language of the Philippine national language. Tagalog is spoken in Southern Luzon provinces such as Cavite, Laguna, Batangas, Rizal and Quezon.
Roman Catholics. The first-generation brought this with them when they migrated and indoctrinated their children. Claire shared her case:

I do have those traditional materials and I think it has something to do with my religion as opposed to being Filipino. I am a Catholic. But I am not a strong practicing Catholic. But I am Catholic and that is something that has not wavered throughout my entire life. You know, strong Catholic beliefs. I do believe in the Sacraments. I do believe in the communion, confirmation, the institution of marriage. They are all there, I have respect for it..., I do have respect for God and the values.

**Material culture.** The visibility of a recreated Philippine culture is perhaps most observable in the objects found inside their homes. For example Claire shared what she keeps in her own flat:

The items themselves do not play such a significant bearing. The only thing in my house, at the moment, I have the *Last Supper* above my dining table. I have my little altar. I have a rosary in every single room that has been blessed. Um, even the bathroom has a rosary. I know it is unusual but I think I have a *mumu* in my house. I think I do.

At a glance the objects appear trivial but such articles are not only common features of the house they grew up in but, more importantly, these are articles mark an identification and continuation of Philippine culture. More specifically, this means the passing on of a Roman Catholic faith.

Perhaps, the most visible and popular importation of Filipino culture to the UK is the presence of *The Filipino Channel* or TFC into the TV screens of Filipino households. Through TFC they can watch all the news and entertainment shows by ABS-CBN Channel 2 TV network in the Philippines. Asked about what aspects of his life remain to be Filipino, Dave replied:

---

59 *Mumu* is the term used to introduce the idea of a ghost to a child.

“Me myself, the food I eat, my mom and dad, the language we speak at home, TFC (laughs). Yeah, that’s it. My mom watch all the shows! Impostor, Rubi, Agua Bendita61, everything.”

A visible public attempt to recreate Filipino culture was the Barrio Fiesta. This annual event for Filipinos (usually from across the Greater London area) gather at Hounslow Park to feast over stalls selling Filipino food, socialise, and enjoy a weekend of shows that present Filipino celebrities and other home-grown British-Filipino talents. In the past, more traditional events were held in the Barrio Fiesta to relive festivities in a rural Philippine barrio such as the santacruzan and the Sto. Nino parade (amongst others). The Barrio Fiesta started in 1984 has been going on for more than two decades now. Several participants commented that it has transformed from being traditional to a very commercial event with over-priced goods and entertainment shows that are quite different from the olden ways of the barrio. Despite this for the participants, the Barrio Fiesta evokes memories that collectively manifest Filipino-ness in food, songs, dance and number. Claire explained this in the following manner:

My parents used to take us to Barrio every year. That is always a fun experience - sharing the food, barbecue sticks, the halo-halo. You always go to Barrio for halo-halo. Um, meeting friends and family that you haven't seen for years. Like a little gathering really of friends as opposed to our house, it's in a big field.

5.2.3 The UK and British/English spaces

Settling-in in a neighbourhood and in schools

Although the current Filipino population take residence across Greater London area several respondents have identified specific places such as Edgware near Central London and Plaistow in the East London as areas where Filipinos mostly settled in the 1970’s and 1980’s. As mentioned in Section 5.2.1, p.148, Filipinos were amongst other ethnic minorities who

61 Example of telenovelas shown in TFC.
settled in these neighbourhoods over time. Most of the respondents described the places where they grew up as multicultural with people from different backgrounds (Arabs, South Asians, Chinese, Polish etc.). The chances that Filipino families set up residences near each other was high and this eventually created a seemingly ‘Filipino street’ in those areas.

Since population is concentrated on specific areas, parents of the second-generation also sent children to similar schools. By late 1980’s, there was already a critical mass of Filipino second-generation such that Camille, Marie and Kyle described their schools having ‘loads of Filipinos’. The situation amongst the eldest informants (27 and above) was different because there were few Filipino children when they began attending school. In case of children from mixed-race families the opinion of the non-Filipino parent also mattered in the choice of school. For example, James’ Portuguese father and Filipina mother were both Catholics so he and his siblings were educated in Catholic schools. He explained:

The school I went to in primary school was a Catholic school in Kilburn. There were obviously changes since then but at that time a lot of Irish settlement were based in that area. So the teachers teach Irish heritage and almost all kids have the background…And in secondary school was … not very many ethnic people there and a Catholic school again.

School choice can reinforce or limit interactions with second-generation Filipinos. Given the religious orientation of most Filipinos, Catholic schools were preferred over others. Yet the Catholic primary school where James went also adapted to the ethnic landscape of the local community and introduced lessons on Irish heritage. Unlike other second-generation Filipinos, James and his siblings studied in areas where students were mostly white.
London as place of privilege and opportunity

For the second-generation being in London was seen as a privilege and an opportunity for betterment. They come to understand that life in the Philippines is difficult through the pre-migration narratives of the first-generation parents. These stories were further reinforced during their personal visits in the Philippines. Camille appreciated that in the UK, apart from snow, there are no other extreme geological or ecological conditions. The Philippines is within the Pacific Ring of Fire where earthquakes and volcanic eruptions are common. Moreover the Philippines also experiences on average 20 annual tropical storms. Dave believes that he is lucky to have been born and raised in London where free primary and secondary education is perceived to be better than what is available in the Philippines.

Jesse expressed identification with the economically challenging situation of some Filipinos in the Philippines, and by contrast, gratefulness for the life he has in London.

I am very thankful. Some people take that for granted but I am very much aware of what my parents had to do to come here. I remember when I was in Philippines, I saw a lola\footnote{Tagalog term for elderly woman.}. She must have been more than 70 years old and she is begging on the streets of Manila. My gosh! You know, if not for my parents coming out here, you know maybe that would have been them or someone I know. It is quite hard to see that. We all live our lives here, we might not earn a lot or my parents might not earn a lot but once she converts that money over there, they are millionaires over there. And then you just see people struggling. And I think, \textbf{you are not related to them, but they are your people aren't they? They are your country and so you identify with that}. You sympathize with that probably more than any other person. And yeah \textbf{it just makes me feel lucky that I am here}. It would have been nice if it’s America or hot all the time but London would do.

To Jesse the beggars on the streets of Manila are the epitome of the hard life his labour migrant parents saved him from experiencing. Jesse does identify with the Filipino poor and feels for them as his ‘country and people there’. This taught him to count his blessings
knowing that he is in London and therefore ‘lucky to be here’. The same gratefulness is experienced by Sophie who migrated to the UK at age 14 through her half-British mother.

For a Filipino, there is a difference when you lived there [in the Philippines] but then I realised that London has become my home. But it doesn't mean that I have abandoned Manila or anything. London is my home 'cos it is where my heart is. The person that I have chosen to become or that I am happy with is here. I'd still recommend [the Philippines]. I still want the best for the country. But it is being appreciated of the fact that I was born into this family.

To a certain extent, Sophie positioned her reasoning in defence of Filipinos who left the Philippines ‘to escape the hard life’. She argued that despite considering London as her home now because the place allows her to dream bigger and enjoy life more, this should not be equated as a form of abandonment of her links to her place of birth. She maintained, ‘I can be Filipino and I can be Londoner’ simultaneously. In other words, ‘living the dream’ in London is not necessarily conflicting with a genuine concern for the Philippines and the Filipino people. As indicated by Jesse and Sophie’s account, the second-generation traces their ‘roots’ in the Philippines but it is in the UK where they choose to remain and flourish.

5.3 Relational sphere

5.3.1 Significant others

Family dynamics in a Filipino home

Households as sites for learning culture. The family space is commonly the site of childhood socialisation where one learns the culture of a people (particularly language and values). The adults in the family, usually the mother or the father and sometimes other adults in the household, act as both ‘cultural bearers and enforcers’ that teach a Filipino way of life.
Billy, for example, developed an appetite for Filipino foods by always watching his mother cook in the kitchen when he was still young.

The learning of Filipino culture is not straightforward in mixed-race families where the father is non-Filipino. There are non-negotiable (such as speaking the English language) and negotiable (such as food) aspects of family life. Kyle and Billy explained:

My mom is Filipino. My dad isn’t. So it is difficult growing up even with just the family dynamics and not necessarily the Filipino side. But my mom was a single mom until I was five. So everything I knew was Filipino. I had a Filipino accent when I went to school. So I spoke Ilocano and Tagalog, which is why I understand both... And it was only until maybe [when] my mom found a husband who was British that the British side of me came up really. And that is when my accent changed completely, speaking English in the house. There was a massive difference and being in a house of our own...When my mom was a single parent we were in a house with other Filipinos. [Kyle]

It’s quite formal ‘cos my dad’s English. A lot of English people are not used to those sort of food. They are used to fish and chips and all that is British food. But he has grown to eating rice everyday now. From the start obviously he is not quite...but I’ve grown up in rice. When I was little I used to eating that every day. [Billy]

Socially extended families. The family spirit stretches out not only to blood relatives but also to other families whom Filipinos have considered as hindi-ibang-tao (no different from them). (Pe-Pua and Protacio-Marcelino, 2000). Such connectedness translates to frequent and sustained gatherings over food that has become a common feature of their childhood years.

There are a lot of Filipinos that I have known since I was very young who the parents would gather together for meals, for birthdays and for general meet-and-greet practically every week. We found ourselves in a regular family which we’ve learned to be our family although we are not blood related. Our family section is known as the Bernabes my family, the Bernardos, and the Arcadios. [Marie]

In the diaspora, the notion of an extended family is usually based on familiarity instead of blood. Their peers during childhood are introduced to others as cousins. In order to show respect the parents of their cousins are referred to as Uncles/Tito and Aunts/Tita. Martin for
example further explained that the category cousins may be differentiated into two: (a) *blood-cousins* (relatives whom they share common descent other than the parent) and (b) *cousins-out-there* (children that who they grew up with who they treat as some sort of sibling or cousins by blood).

**High value for education.** The stress on the importance of ‘finishing with flying colours’ (or at the very least completing university education) becomes more pronounced when seen in light of the first-generation’s ‘hard life’ discourse on how they lived in the Philippines and the risks they took after migrating to the UK in search for a better life. They view education as the most valuable inheritance they can pass on to their children. To Billy, putting a premium on education is another characteristic that differentiates the Filipino family from others. Camille, for example, shared how this valuation has turned into a family and a generational rule:

It’s a big issue, ‘**Study hard, work hard.**’ And then you will benefit from that,’ whereas to some of my friends, they are lazy in school, always skipping a class. Whereas to me, ‘No. I can’t do that!’ I am scared because of my parents.... and if you get a really bad report, they will see it. And the thing is, the standards parents set, and Filipino parents set and I see it and is still true – my mom, dad, my sisters with their kids, you know, **the higher the grade, the better. And there is no space for Bs...**

**Conforming to expectations.** Parents communicated to their children the necessity to conform to certain expectations – not only during childhood when young boys and girls are learning Filipino values but more pronouncedly when one reaches a particular age and status. Although he was not really expected to financially help his relatives in the Philippines, Dave took the initiative to share in the remittance they send. He reported:
I used to have a job. Whenever my dad would send money I'd put some money in 2000 pesos if anything, at least a something. And yeah so whenever dad did that, I give him something to send over to help. And just pay for everything like electric, food, education and everything. And yeah, that is what I try to do now and then.

In another case Marie, who is now 32 years old, found herself repeatedly caught with marital and child-bearing expectations that come alongside women aged 25 and above:

I have put my own house now. Much to the reluctance, I would say, of my parents that I am not married yet, but I've moved in and living with my boyfriend. Practicality-wise, in this economy, it is extremely difficult to get your own house without having to share it with somebody. So, they appreciated that but obviously put us on notice, “We would like you to have kids, within wedlock, please.”

As a daughter Marie has fulfilled what any Filipino parent would dream for her child – to finish school and establish a career. Working as a lawyer she now lives in a house she owns. However she has also ‘defied’ some social expectations. Since she has acquired the house Claire has been living with her boyfriend of 11 years now but they are not yet married.

Equivalent rules apply to male members of the second-generation. Martin for example narrated that only one of the girlfriends that he has had has met his mother. This is because Martin knew that he could not introduce a girl to his mother if he is not serious about the relationship. By implication, no female friend (girlfriend or otherwise) can stay in their house beyond certain hours. No girlfriend has ever stayed overnight in his home. Martin elaborated other further expectations:

My mum goes to church every Sunday and prays for my grandma. She hasn't gone with me now because I rarely go to church. ‘When was the last time you went to church?’ I say, ‘Oh I can't remember.’ So she is upset that I don’t go to Church. My mum is a strong Catholic and when I was younger, she didn’t want me to have sex... But she has changed. As soon as she has found out that I have had sex, my mum wouldn’t believe that if I have a child now. My mum would say, ‘You know you can only do it when you are married.’

---

63 PhP2,000 is about £30.
Network of friends

Multicultural links, Filipino core. Outside the family, to which a person automatically belongs, a sense of belonging is next negotiated in networks of friends. Given that London is multicultural the informants grew up developing a multi-ethnic group of friends. On one hand this mixing may indicate blending of cultures but may also function to further emphasize and value their ethnic background. Kyle explained:

And because of where I live is so multicultural I’ve got friends who are not just Filipinos. For instance, my best friend, who is my oldest friend probably and we’ve been hanging around really close, is an English guy and that is my daughter’s god father. I think, she had four godfathers and three of them aren’t Filipino. So it just shows the diversity of our generation. Even though we are all very Filipino and our circle of friends aren’t and that is good for us. It keeps us balanced. It keeps us aware of who we are really.

In comparison, Marie and Camille narrated that whilst they maintain a multi-ethnic group of friends, those they feel closest are Filipino. Camille said:

When I was in high school, most of my friends were black. Or I would have some Muslim friends or Spanish, or English friends. And now, most of my closest friends are Filipino. And that is not free choice. It is just the morals as well, how people are. And I think that is what structured me to learn from different cultures.

Ambassadors of culture. Due to invisibility of Filipinos as a people in the UK (see next subsection) the informants devised several strategies to educate their friends about Filipino culture. The techniques were always personal and involved their friends or co-workers. For example Camille has the habit of inserting a few Tagalog terms in her conversation with non-Filipino friends in order to familiarise them with the language. Oftentimes, she brings tokens from her visits in the Philippines with the hope that someone will take notice and she takes that opportunity to further inform them about the Philippines. Billy, on the other hand, invites
his friends over to their house once in a while so they can taste Filipino food particularly \textit{lumpia},\textsuperscript{64} a dish which he claims his mother cooks best.

A challenging aspect of ‘educating’ the wider public about where the Philippines is and who the Filipinos are is dealing with stereotypes such as Filipinas being domestic helpers. Instead of distancing from these negative connotations Sophie’s strategy was to accept the partial truth embedded in these statements but simultaneously seizing the opportunity to challenge (if not undo) these stereotypes by presenting a positive and modern personality. In doing so public perception, according to Sophie, is changed one person at a time.:

So I have this list of friends who are non-Filipino, they all know about certain stereotypes about Filipinos. They will know about Imelda Marcos\textsuperscript{65} and her shoes... Or they will say, ‘Ah Filipinos! Maids right?’. It is fine by me. There are certain truths about these stories and I don’t have to be ashamed of that. \textbf{But by being me and having whatever kind of personality I have become, they will still associate that with being Filipino.} ‘Oh yeah Sophie, she is Filipina.’ I don’t always say Filipino things all the time…. I go see films or I just go bowling. You know cultural things. When I socialize with them I will raise questions like that, ‘Oh yeah Philippine jokes and all that stuff. \textbf{They will definitely know that though I have a Filipino culture I also have changed their perspectives or their opinions about who Filipinos are.} Someone might say, ‘But they are all maids.’ ‘Yeah. But I have a friend who isn’t.’

\textbf{5.3.2 Generalised others}

A reading of how the second-generation negotiated a Filipino identity in their biographic narratives can also be approached by examining: (a) the term ‘Filipino’ as a category of identification; and (b) and ‘Filipino-ness’ as a form of practice. I argue that the second-generation faces two challenges in negotiating a Filipino identity. First, as Filipinos, they may be invisible in the ‘eyes’ of both Filipinos and non-Filipinos. Secondly, the process of identity

\textsuperscript{64} Vegetable spring rolls

\textsuperscript{65} Imelda Marcos is the Philippines First Lady during the presidency of Ferdinand Marcos from 1965 to 1986. She was famous for her extravagant life and her collection of almost 3,000 pairs of shoes.
negotiation is complex and situated such that some may have claimed such identity and emphasized its salience whilst others choose to deny or downplay its relevance. The latter is a challenge about agency whilst the former is about representation.

**Identity as a category: invisibility to whom?**

A crude way of estimating the Filipino population in the UK, such as in the surveys and national censuses, is to identify members of a purported population according to: (a) country of birth; and (b) country of citizenship. In this way those who were born in the Philippines and carry a Philippine passport are classified as Filipinos. As shown in Chapter 4 these criteria were however problematic in the case of the 2.0 generation. Assuming that they are born and raised in the UK, only the parents of the 2.0 generation are counted as Filipinos (following the country-of-birth criterion). The citizenship criterion is also problematic because it is likely that they (by birth and by ancestry) and their parents (by naturalisation, residence or marriage) are now British citizens. The question on ethnicity group seems promising, but unless they write-in ‘Filipino’ or ‘Filipino-British’ (for mixed-background persons) they remain to be invisible and unaccounted in official statistics.

**Invisible in British society?**

The issue of the invisibility of Filipinos in UK society is both demographic and structural. It is understandable that there is not much information about Filipinos in the 1960’s and 1970’s given that Filipino labour migration to the UK was still gaining momentum at that time. The aggregate population of individuals working and living in the UK and are Philippine-born had not yet reached a critical number to be readily identifiable. As mentioned in Chapter 4, the category ‘Philippines’ only formally appeared in the Home Office reports on settlement in
1976. Before that year every Filipino who was given a leave to permanently stay in the UK was perhaps included under the category ‘All other nationalities.’ An evidence to corroborate this claim can be seen in official reports on British citizenships. Records show that as early as 1962 there were individuals who became British citizens and were previously Filipino nationals – they could not have been granted citizenship if they have not yet been permanent residents first.

Whilst all first-generation Filipinos can technically be accounted in these enumeration strategies the issue becomes even more complicated with the growing number of second-generation Filipinos. Kyle explained this point:

Ten per cent [of the Philippine population is] abroad but a further 25% who are us is the second-generation. I mean if you take my family and who is Filipino. So you’ve got my mom – born in the Philippines, Filipino. Me and my brother, so we are not Filipino [based on country of birth]. My two children, they are here, they are not [counted as] Filipino [on account of birth]. So in one family, you’ve got six people and only one is [officially counted as] a Filipino. That is just one family. There are hundreds and thousands of families and so you know there could be and even say that there are 250,000 Filipinos in the UK and you can times that by four at least.

The lack of familiarity with Filipinos is not just statistical but also social. Because of the British occupation of the Indian subcontinent and the longer immigration of people originating from such region the term ‘Asian’ is readily associated with Indians, Pakistani, Bangladeshi, Sri Lankans. Those from other Asian countries, with the exception of those from China, are rendered invisible. Again, returning to the census questionnaire example, there are tick boxes for Indians, Pakistanis, Bangladeshis, Chinese and an all-inclusive ‘Other’ under the Asian, Asian-British category.

It is common amongst the second-generation, particularly those with both Filipino parents, to be mistaken to belong to another ethnicity. Charlene shared an example:
It actually happened a few times in high school. A typical thing that they would say is, ‘Oh she is Chinese.’ And what they know of Chinese is you know, chopsticks and whatever. And I remember myself saying, ‘Actually, no. I am not Chinese. I am Filipina. There is a big difference.’ However in trying to educate ..., I was like...how I can show you I am a Filipina. ‘I can show you a map, this is where I am from and this is China. They are two different places. **Yes we are from Asia but these are two different people.**’ I would always proudly say, ‘I am Filipina. I am Filipino. I am from a country called the Philippines. It is very different from China or wherever else you want to say.’

**Invisible to fellow Filipinos?**

Identification with Filipino-ness is also interactional as it is technical. For the first-generation identifying a fellow Filipino is rather easy as they are **visible** to each other by looking at skin tone and other facial features. They also become **audible** when English language with a Filipino accent, and the Tagalog language are heard. These interactional cues proved to be difficult to apply to the second-generation. In general they do not always ‘transmit’ the same audible cues because English is their first language and they do not ‘sound’ like their parents. They speak with a British or London accent. This difficulty becomes even more pronounced in the case of second-generation Filipinos who come from ‘mixed race’ marriages because people (Filipinos and others) cannot place what their other half is. Billy, whose biological father is White British, and Kyle, whose biological father is Pakistani, shared the following experiences:

*And then it's easier to distinguish a Filipino when they are fully, like they are from the Philippines. If they are half then its kind of people question like Oriental, you know Thailand, or whatever but never the Philippines. And I find that really annoying. I still get that now, today. People say, 'You are half something. You are half English and you are half Chinese..., or Malaysian, Japanese, or Filipino. And it is quite annoying.[Billy]*

*So the Filipino side of me, you wouldn't know unless you actually saw me. But even then, because my real father was Pakistani... I*
don't even look Filipino. So it was difficult for me because I wasn't British enough to be British and I wasn't Filipino enough to be Filipino. So, I really don't fit in anywhere... It was difficult in people not understanding who I was. So, even now, people do not know where I am from. [Kyle]

Another layer of this issue is the invisibility of the second-generation from the sight of the Philippines Embassy. It is only very recently that the Embassy (and thus the Philippine government), has begun engaging the second-generation organisations in building the Filipino community in the UK. Kyle commented on how the embassy has engaged with them as the case of the children of immigrants:

And then [I] went there in [the Philippine Embassy] in 2007 and heard what they are saying. They said that there is this problem – they don't know how to engage with the youth. ‘What can we do with the youth? Can we set up a yahoo group?’ And I was thinking, “They are so out of touch. They don't even know what they are talking about.” I told them straight, 'We've been ignored. The children of migrant workers have been ignored for 30 years. Why are you trying to talk to us now? Is it because that you've realised that we are not going to send money back home?'

Manifesting visibility

There are several ways to respond to invisibility and misrecognition by others. Some simply ignored the issue and did not bother to engage. Some, like Billy, would get annoyed. Others, like Kyle when he was still young, resort to an argument with anyone who inquires about who he is and where he is originally from.

So, the way I reacted to people was very rude and very angry. And so I challenge them back if they said, ‘Where are you from?’ ‘Where do you think I am from?’ Or if they said, ‘Are you Filipino?’ I'd say, ‘Yeah. Why do you need to ask?’ or something. Or I'd say, ‘Why? Do you think I'm a Paki?’ And they don't know how to react to that. It wasn't nice. [Kyle]
It may be argued that Kyle’s response actually concerned his ‘Pakistani’ side and not about his ‘Filipino’ side. Alternatively others have chosen to patiently explain their side and inform others where they come from. This involved illustrating to the inquirer the geographical location of the Philippines on the globe and differentiating Filipinos from other Oriental people (especially Chinese or Thais such as what Charlene did in the above quote ). Another strategy is to cite popular sports and entertainment celebrities who are Filipinos or have Filipino blood. Billy would handle a misrecognition or non-recognition in the following manner:

> Sometimes you just laugh and say, ‘I am not. I am from the Philippines.’ But a lot of people are, ‘What is that? Where is that?’... I say, it’s a beautiful country. I say it’s at the other side of the world, like Asia. Above Australia. And its quite far. And I’d always say someone famous. ‘He is half-Filipino’. Like Enrique Iglesias. I will say someone famous and then they will know.

### 5.4 Theorising belonging: a discussion

The first three sections of this chapter presented key findings on how study participants narrated a transnationalised belonging vis-à-vis dimensions of temporality, spatiality, and sociality. First, drawing from life stories, I argued that a nuanced understanding of the temporal location of the second-generation Filipinos requires viewing them both as a biological and a historical generation whilst simultaneously taking into consideration the significant biographic events that impacted how they negotiate their subjectivity in a transnational context. Secondly, belonging is made to be transnational by situating the person within various ‘communities’ (e.g. family, town, school, city, diaspora) that compose the Philippines and the UK. Finally, the second-generation may be socially located within a network of significant and generalised others that directly or indirectly create experiences of belonging and non-belonging. In this section, I re-contextualise these findings by returning to
notions of place-belongingness and politics of belonging (Antonsich, 2010; Yuval-Davis, 2006).

### 5.4.1 Sense of belonging and ‘Being-at-home’

A sense of belonging invokes a sense of emplacement: that is a person feels at home in a territorial and symbolic place of ‘familiarity, comfort and attachment’ (Antonsich, 2010, p.646). The term ‘home’ in this context is understood as ‘a repository for complex, interrelated, and at times contradictory socio-cultural ideas about people’s relationship with one another, especially family, and with places, spaces, and things’ (Mallett, 2004, p.84). Having said that, what are the characteristics of the second-generation’s negotiated home where they belong? The second-generation participants narrated a sense of home with the following characteristics adapted from a criteria described by Marlett (2004, p.84).

(a) Home ‘can be a dwelling place of a lived space of interaction between people, places and things or both.’ House as a home has been highlighted in the narratives as a key site for cultural socialization. The house was a venue to keep both material and non-material culture alive. As discussed earlier weekend birthday parties were common events during childhood. This notion of home extends to the immediate neighbourhood, town, and city where your blood cousins and cousins-out-there live.

(b) ‘The boundaries of home can be permeable.’ Individuals such as cousins-out-there and significant friends from one’s network of friends the can be treated as members of (c) family. Second-generation will over their life course maintain a wide network of friends but in the end maintain a core of Filipino friends they want to keep.
This extended version of family becomes a (d) home ‘associated with feelings of comfort, ease intimacy, relaxation and security’. Food was a central component in producing home as space of comfort, intimacy, and identity. Ritual eating (e.g. weekend gatherings over food) functions to initiate and strengthen bonds with visible others. Moreover the ubiquity of Filipino cuisine in all their gatherings and special occasions establish a concrete manifestation and transference of ethnic identity (Mintz and Bois, 2002).

(e) Home ‘can be an expression of one’s (possibly fluid) identity and sense of self’. Identifications with the Filipino identity can change over a life course. Speaking at a present time, all second-generation participants demonstrated a strong value for identifying with the Filipino side – they highlight the importance of recognising their roots in the Philippines, their wider network of extended family, but at the same time recognising their settled-ness in London. The research interview provided a venue for the narrative construction of identity and belonging as an adult. In narrating significant events from their childhood up to the present we have identified particular life stages that positively (e.g. attending weekend parties as a child) or negatively (e.g. attending university) impact identification with and practice of Filipino traditions.

(f) Home can ‘constitute belonging and/or create a sense of marginalisation and estrangement’. The intimate spaces families and network of friends have created a place of comfort for the second-generation participants. Yet the Embassy as an institutional extension of a national home has initially overlooked the importance of the second-generation as a specific segment of the Filipino diaspora in the UK.

(g) Home can be ‘made, familiar and/or strange, an atmosphere and/or an activity, a relevant and/or irrelevant concept.’ This sense of home is best illustrated during the visits to the
Philippines. According to Mason (2004) these visits are key means of maintaining transnational kin relationships. As already illustrated, a visit to the parental homeland is an accomplishment to make familiar and create an atmosphere to establish a notion of relatives (extended family in the Philippines). These journeys as practices function to generate co-present interaction with relatives and the locality where the first-generation grew. Although the first and second-generation are often treated with utmost hospitality these initiated relationships are maintained over long distances via periodic and anticipated visits and are mediated by modern technologies of the mobile phones and the internet (e.g. social networking sites and online video calls).

(h) Home ‘can be fundamental to existence.’ The centrality of family to social life is a running theme across all the life stories covered in this study. At any point of their life course the family has been an important source of joy, encouragement, and even sanction. As children the people that compose the extended family are constant companion at school, on weekdays, and at various gatherings on weekends. As teenagers, the family was instrumental in reinforcing values for education and moral behaviour. As adults, the family is a constant reminder of pride and sometimes obligation.

(i) Home can be ‘an ideological construct and/or an experience of being in the world’. The bifocal orientation of home narrated by the informants suggests a mode of being in the world framed by the axes of Filipino-ness and British-ness and the physical and symbolic territories of the Philippines and the UK. They argue that that ethnic identity is compatible with being cosmopolitan in a world city such as London.

(j) It can be ‘a crucial site for examining relations of production and consumption, globalisation and nationalism, citizenship, and the role of government’. The previous section
has outlined the emergence of a second-generation through first-generation migrants from the Philippines who decided to work in the UK in search of a better life. Although the first-generation are now British citizens they are still viewed by their children as ‘essentially Filipinos’ who long to return to the homeland. The second-generation on the other hand are under/mis/unrepresented in government statistical records. Unlike their parents the second-generation view the Philippines as a far-away home of where their roots are but the UK remains their choice of home for settled-ness. After summarizing the factors that create a sense of being at-home I now turn to contingencies of place-belongingness.

5.4.2 Politics of belonging:

The various social locations (e.g. generation, gender, age, nation, etc.) occupied by the participants were constitutive of the narrative construction of identity and belonging. Each of these social locations assumes hierarchical power relations. Identification and emotional attachment to Filipino and/or British identity are produced by the interplay of civic/nation-state, ethnic, cultural, and racial dimensions: that is how boundaries are defined and organised. Consider these last two examples:

Am I proud of being a Filipino? Yes. Why? It is because of certain set of values that I’ve learned. There is that respect for the elders. There is this family kind of structure when it works well. There are other aspects in the culture that I find that doesn’t suit me personally. But I am also proud of being British because I was born here. So, there is dual kind of pride. However I cannot consider myself English, ‘cos I am not English and I am always reminded that I am not. And at the same time if I go to Philippines, I can’t speak the language. I am not native-born so I won’t ever be classed as truly Filipino. So it is quite odd and that oddity that exists with me. But because I cannot get approval from either side, I must approve of myself. [Ted]

And they were like, ‘You like adobo66?’ ‘Yes, I love adobo.’ Every time they give me a food they are shocked to know that, ‘Yes, I liked it.’ And

66 A dish and style of cooking typically involving chicken/pork marinated in soy sauce, vinegar, garlic and bay leaves.
they are looking at me and say, ‘You are lying.’ **They don’t believe that I have eaten all that food.** … Various trips to the Philippines, for me, confirm the fact that I am half-Filipino but I am not Filipino. Because **when I go there, I don’t speak the language.** But they might say something to my mum and I kind of understand and I will say something back. ‘My god he understands that!’ So, that further confirms that I am half-Filipino. I think it kind of defines you are both. You can never try and cross there, ‘I am Filipino.’ Because when they look at me, ‘Don’t try to fit. You are not Filipino.’ [Martin]

Both Ted and Martin were born and raised in the UK and therefore are members of the 2.0 generation. Ted’s parents were both originally from the Philippines whereas Martin was the only child of an English father and a Filipina mother. Ted claims that he is proud of being Filipino and being British however he is also ‘constantly reminded’ that he is not British and he is not truly Filipino. To Ted it is impossible to get complete approval from either the British or Filipino side thus he resorts to creating a third space where he is the one giving approval of himself.

Similarly, to the surprise of his relatives in the Philippines, Martin is culturally proficient when it comes to food and understanding (but not speaking) the language. Despite this, in their eyes, Martin is still viewed as British. Back in London, Martin’s friends see him as ‘very Filipino’. To Martin his half-ness leads him to conclude that whilst he is ‘sitting in the middle’ he can still have the best of both worlds.

These identity claims may be read in different ways. Initially these statements can be viewed as indications of shifting identifications depending on where you are. Elsewhere in the chapter other forms of identity claims have been made visible: (a) the first-generation remained to be seen as essentially ‘Filipinos’ despite acquisition of citizenship and living in the UK for almost four decades; (b) Marie’s boyfriend and James’s sister feel most identified with an English identity; or the more fluid and flexible ‘sitting-in-the-middle’ position Martin illustrated. Vassenden (2010) suggested that these identity claims should not be thought of as
a single continuum and he also warned against an over emphasis on fluidity. He argues that one should be more careful in explaining these statements because they may not be talking about the same thing. Moreover the civic, ethnic, cultural and racial aspects of Filipino-ness (or British-ness) also differ in logics of ‘fluidity, elasticity and stability’ (p.749).

A useful way to think about the relational process and differential logics/politics of social identification is through Bucholtz and Hall’s (2004) framework on tactics of intersubjectivity. As individuals navigate aspects of Filipino-ness/British-ness they tactically traverse boundaries of ‘sameness versus difference, genuineness versus artifice, and institutional recognition and marginalisation’ (p.494). Whether as agents or as subjects, claims to identity or belonging are affirmed (through adequation, authentication and authorization) or negated (through distinction, denaturalization and illegitimation).

When Ted and Martin invoked an agency of ‘being British’ they were referring to them being UK citizens that include the status and entitlements that come with the civic aspect of belonging. Both of them are unambiguously British citizens on account of birth and parentage – the boundaries of citizenship and rights in this context are clear cut and well defined. British identity is affirmed and legitimated through authorisation of the state that recognized the subject’s citizenship. When Ted said that he is ‘not English’ he was relating to English-ness in racial terms. Whilst his passport says that he is British he does not however claim to be English. Note that he shifted from using the term ‘British to ‘English’. Being born and raised in the UK is sufficient basis (a form of adequation) to claim for civic aspect of Britishness. However his brown skin denaturalises any claim for being English because, to Ted’s understanding, English-ness is intimately tied to being white. Adequation as a strategy is again used when Ted pronounced pride in Filipino values around respect for the elderly and
family centred-ness. This pride affords him adequate similarity with the other Filipinos. When he visited the Philippines, Martin was successful in using an authentication strategy through food as cultural aspects of Filipino-ness. He demonstrated love for adobo and even balut which foreigners might find too exotic or bizarre. Yet Martin and Ted both fail the most important test of authentication of Filipino-ness in ethnic terms which is the ability to speak the language fluently. As a result they both concluded that they are not completely Filipino.

In summary the final section of this chapter argues that transnational belonging is actively produced temporally, spatially and relationally through different symbolic and physical conceptions of home. The seemingly contradictory identity claims described by the participants can be clarified when examined in light of the civic, cultural, ethnic and racial aspects of belonging and the associated tactics of intersubjectivity deployed in constructing boundaries of Filipino-ness and British-ness.

Broadly this chapter has paid attention to a cross-case thematic analysis to unpack transnationalised belonging. Whilst this analysis has been useful in identifying patterns that run through the biographic narratives it somehow removes text segments from the overall biographical construct and loses touch on the dynamics narrative identity construction. To address these concerns the next chapter focuses attention on individual case poetic analyses to trace the continuity and transformation of voices/selves within narrated life stories for four analytic cases.

---

67 Boiled fertilized duck embryo which is a popular street food in the Philippines.
CHAPTER 6
VOICES OF TRANSNATIONALISED BELONGING: FOUR ANALYTIC EXAMPLES

Introduction

This chapter provides a response Research Question 2a which asked: What influences continuity, discontinuity and change of self-positioning over the course of a person’s life? Using a poetic model of analysis (The Listening Guide / VCRM) I present a detailed scrutiny of four biographic narratives to systematically unpack how a sense of self/other and surroundings are transformed along spatial, relational, and temporal axes of lived experiences in a transnational context.

Taking into consideration interview length (at least an hour each), theoretical relevance of gender (male and female participants), the importance of generation (technical 2.0, decimal 1.75) and parentage (both Filipino parents, mixed-race parents) as biographic dimensions four cases were chosen: Ellie, Jesse, Martin and Marie. Their life stories seek to explicate variation in second-generation lives. Marie and Jesse’s parents were Philippine-born. The two participants were both born in London with Jesse spending the first three years of his life in the Philippines. Ellie and Martin were born of Filipina mothers and White British fathers. Martin was born and raised in London. Ellie was born in Hong Kong, spent two years in Singapore, and began living in London at age three. Technically, Marie and Martin should be classified as 2.0 generation whilst Jesse and Ellie (who were mobile for the first three years of their lives) are to be grouped as 1.75 generation (see Table 8, p.131).
The key analytic frame in doing poetic analysis is this: each telling of a life story is a telling of selves/voices and how these selves/voices are in relation to others. In each life story the self speaks in different voices. Statements where ‘I’ is embedded can be used as entrances to trace changes in voice/self from which the narrator speaks. Given that in the research interview the participants were asked to reflect about significant lived experiences (from past to immediate present) then it can be expected that there will be changes in the voices/subjectivities when moving through different life phases. Statements with embedded ‘we’ are entrances to examine ‘others’ to which ‘I’ is affiliated. The term ‘we’ implies a group of which the person is socially, cognitively and affectively a part.

This chapter is divided into five sections. The first four sections provide a micro analysis of biographic narratives. Each section is introduced by a biographical sketch that summarises the lived life of the participant according to told events and general themes. Following the Listening Guide this condensed account of the participants’ narrated life events corresponds to a reading for plot. An analysis of individual ‘I-poem’ and ‘We-poem’ is then presented. These poems are constructed from the transcripts to facilitate the tracing of continuities and discontinuities of how self is positioned relative to events, relationships, and places with which they engage and negotiate belonging. The constructed I-poems and We-poems are presented in Appendix 3 and 4, respectively. To facilitate the discussion I summarise: (a) the voices of self; and (b) invoked others in tables. Section 5 compares and contrasts these readings/listenings and links the discussion to a sense of and politics of belonging in transnational context.

For I-poems the main narration (i.e. the initial uninterrupted account of a participant after the guidelines and opening question for the life story interview was given) was used as data text
because this was the organising account to which the elaborative second part of the interview was based. The main narrative is also a commonality among all participants and therefore a point of comparison. Whilst highlighting different life events and positionings these main narratives were direct responses to the same guide question I gave as an interviewer. As expected, the initial and main account of the four participants varied in length. Ellie and Jesse spoke for less than five minutes whilst Martin spoke for 19 minutes. Marie finished telling her main narration after speaking for 50 minutes. As will be demonstrated in the succeeding sections, even short narrations reveal different voices from which the participant speaks to construct belonging.

I proceed with the voices analysis by starting with Ellie’s narration (being the shortest) and finish with Marie’s account (being the longest). Each I-poem summary table provides three linked findings. The table identifies the (a) distinct and sometimes contrasting voices of the narrator, (b) the approximate life stages the voice speak about, and (c) the audit trail of moments as evidence of specific voices. As described in Chapter 3, this stage of analysis is termed as listening for subjectivity, the second form of reading under *The Listening Guide* (Edwards and Weller, 2012; Gilligan et al., 2003). According to Gilligan, this is ‘the creative step in the analysis because the researcher has to distinguish different voices… discover which voices speak to the research question and identify their characteristic features’ (Kiegelmann, 2009, para 39).

For We-poems, the whole interview transcript was used because there were very few references to ‘we’ in the main narration and only when further narratives were prompted that accounts mentioning ‘we’ were uttered. Although researchers who have applied and adapted the VCRM stress the importance of reading for relationships, almost every study exclusively
focused on implementing methodical procedures for I-poem analysis or a reading for subjectivity. Whilst they also suggest that you-poems or they-poems can also be constructed and analysed for particular research purposes, none have actually followed this suggestion.

This chapter addresses such gap in the VCRM approach. Once we-poems have been created from interview transcripts I suggest two further analytic steps. Analysts should be able to identify and differentiate these relationships in which the ‘I-position’ (voice/self) is embedded. To accomplish these tasks I ask two questions during data analysis: (a) Which relationships are invoked? (Identification) (b) To what extent is the ‘I’ emotionally and socially involved in these relationships? (Differentiation). Each summary table for We-poems includes (a) a list of implied others or relationships when the term ‘we’ is mentioned, and (b) the associated practices to this sense of ‘group’.

These relationships are differentiated from each other in a three-by-three matrix (low, medium, high) based on social involvement and emotional attachment. A matrix map of these relationships is presented in Appendix 4 Table 28 (p.246). Note that even when attachment and involvement to these relationships are described as ‘low’ in the text, the relationship or group remain to be salient because ‘the self’ is viewed to belong to this group. In other words, affinity if not membership is invoked through the use of ‘we’. We-poem analysis is a form of listening for relationality, the third form of reading under the Listening Guide. The lines that compose these constructed poems keep the original sequence as they appeared in the transcript in order to maintain the shifts in consciousness throughout the narration.
6.1 Ellie

6.1.1 Biographical Sketch

Ellie, 28, was born in Hong Kong. Her parents met each other through a common friend. Her mother hails from a province south of Manila whilst her father is originally from Newcastle. She is the only child of her parents. Her parents tried having more children but her mother suffered two consecutive miscarriages. She grew up in Wembley and her first encounters with other Filipinos happened during weekend birthday parties. As influenced by her mother Ellie grew up eating and liking Filipino food.

During her primary years there were very few Filipino children attending her school. When she reached secondary school she noticed three basic ‘groupings’ during group activities at school: the South Asians, the Whites and the ‘floating’ groups. She would usually be part of the ‘misfit’ group. One of the members of this group was a half-Greek, half-British girl who later became her best friend and pseudo-sister whom she brings to Filipino gatherings.

Throughout her life she has visited the Philippines many times (particularly for Christmas). A vivid memory is her visit to her mother’s hometown at the age of seven when she met and played with her cousins for the first time. She visited her mother’s hometown again once during high school, and again after she finished her undergraduate degree in biochemistry. Oftentimes, when in the Philippines, people would perceive her as maganda (beautiful). She has maintained contact with her cousins in the Philippines through Facebook and the occasional video calls through skype. Between her Filipino and British relatives Ellie feels emotionally closer to relatives on her mother side. She only sees her cousins from her father’s side during anniversaries.
In 2009, she encountered *Philippine Generations* (an organisation for second-generation Filipinos) at an event about Asian Cuisine. She thought that it would be good for her to volunteer so that she can meet and socialise with other Filipino friends and feel part of the Filipino community. Since then Ellie has been an active member of the organisation. At present she is in a relationship of four years with another second-generation Filipino. Ellie’s goal is to learn more Tagalog words so that she can better communicate with her relatives in the Philippines.

### 6.1.2 I-poem Analysis

**Table 9 Voices in Ellie's I-poem**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voices</th>
<th>Life stages</th>
<th>Moments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘I was little’</td>
<td>Birth up to secondary school</td>
<td>• Awareness of Filipino background (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Limited knowledge/ understanding (6) (e.g. food (10), not knowing history (11), not speaking the language)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘I was old enough’</td>
<td>After university</td>
<td>• Awareness of Filipino background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Willingness to understand (learning the language) and engage (widening circle of friends, volunteering (12-13), communicating with relatives in the Philippines (17))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ellie’s main narration included 17 identifiable I-statements (see Appendix 3 Table 20, p.229) which can be grouped into two voices. The ‘I was little’ voice spoke of a self that is knowledgeable of a Filipino background but limited in scope. Strategically, the ‘I was little’ voice can be better described with what it does not know (language, history) than what it knows (food). This characteristic becomes relevant when juxtaposed with second recognizable voice called ‘I was old enough’.

In contrast to the first voice, the ‘I was old enough’ voice is mature and more active. The ‘I was little’ voice is tied to childhood as a life stage whereas the ‘I was old enough’ is linked to post-university life. This second voice is more engaged as shown by references to
membership to an organisation, decision to volunteer, learning of ‘Filipino ways’ by meeting people, and taking time to communicate with relatives who are in the Philippines.

The presence of these two voices suggests a shift in self-positioning from one that knows but is unprepared to meaningfully engage, to a position that is decisive and willing. The linking of these two voices to particular life stages suggests the importance of maturity for a more active identification if not practice of Filipino-ness. As the ‘I am little’ voice indicates, resources for Filipino identity during childhood were present however, they were simply seen as part of an everyday life and were not highlighted. Moreover the first voice argues that the self was at that time ‘little’ and ‘didn’t take really anything in’. It seems that the turning point was the maturity that comes with being ‘old enough’. Given a wider experience, reason and independence implied on a ‘after university’ status, the self is able to freely decide, begin to ‘take things in’ and meaningfully engage with the ‘Filipino-side’ that in the past has been limited to distanced awareness. Following Miller’s (2003) definition of belonging (see Section 2.3.2), the associated activities of knowing the history, becoming part of a community, and speaking the language are means to immerse the self with the Filipino experience and thereby achieve belonging.

6.1.3 We-poem Analysis

The We-poem constructed from Ellie’s interview transcript is composed of 38 lines (See Appendix 4 Table 24, p.238). Throughout the interview Ellie invoked eight different others when she referred to ‘we’ (see Table 10 below).
Table 10 Significant others in Ellie's We-poem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>We = 'I' + others</th>
<th>Associated practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Nuclear family</td>
<td>• Moving from Hongkong to Singapore to UK (3-4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Companion for Philippine visits (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Communicating with relatives outside UK (23-24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Fellow ‘half’ something</td>
<td>• School activities (13-16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Filipino diaspora in the UK</td>
<td>• Commentary (10, 33-34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Socio-civic organisation</td>
<td>• Charity work (11-12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Relatives from father side</td>
<td>• Gathering once a year, Christmas at grandparents (35-38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Cousins in the Philippines</td>
<td>• Playing games (1-2, 5-8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Grandmother</td>
<td>• Cuddling (32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Filipino relatives elsewhere</td>
<td>• Talk through skype (26-31)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on associated practices described above, it can be seen that Ellie has low emotional attachment and low social activity with (a) fellow mixed-race people and (b) the Filipino diaspora in the UK. Ellie signified medium level of emotional attachment to three of the eight relationships. These three relationships differ on the extent of social activity. Ellie communicates with her Filipino relatives overseas (e.g. US and Canada) more often than her ‘British relatives’ who also live in the UK. Although the members of her civic organisation are not her blood relatives for her to demonstrate high emotional attachment, her social activity with the organisation is high. Volunteering for charity events can be physically demanding at times.

Finally, Ellie showed high emotional attachment to most of her relatives. She has limited social activity with most of her cousins in the Philippines because they can only visit every so often. Moreover most of her cousins are younger than her and all that they can do is play. She remembered that she was able to build a strong bond with her grandmother when she first visited the Philippines. The limited English speaking skills has not deterred her grandmother to be physically affectionate with her granddaughter. As expected, the nuclear family marked high on emotional attachment and social activity. As shown in the I-poems, the self in the
context of an immediate family is often the subject of specific socialization tasks especially during childhood. The self, when very young, is acted upon and a subject of the family’s social action (e.g. moving from one place to another).

6.2 Jesse

6.2.1 Biographical Sketch

Jesse, 27, was born in London to Filipino parents. Jesse’s father, who was working as a contract worker in Saudi Arabia, was not around for the first few years of his life. Jesse’s mother, who was working as a service staff in a hotel in London, found it difficult to juggle work and childcare. They decided that it would be best for Jesse’s interest to send him to the Philippines under the care of his maternal grandparents. When his father finished his work contract in Saudi Arabia the family was reunited, and Jesse was brought back to the UK at age three.

Similar to other members of the second-generation Jesse first encountered the Filipino community through weekend birthday parties. At a young age he was consciously aware of his non-blood relative adults that he calls auntie and uncle. There were only about two other Filipino children in his school when he started primary education. As a child he was aware of the growing number of second-generation Filipinos in their local area but he was admittedly not proud of being associated with them because most children of his age were already into gangs and ‘hip-hop’ clothing style that he never liked. His network of friends at school was very multicultural. It was only when Jesse turned 16 that he started spending more time with the Filipino community. He got actively involved with an all-Filipino basketball team
through an endorsement of a friend. Whilst he has kept some of his friends from school his current core group of friends are second-generation Filipinos.

Since 1986, Jesse has visited the Philippines a further three times. In 1992, he went for a holiday but the nine-year old Jesse found it difficult to communicate because his relatives rarely spoke to him in English. Play was, nevertheless, an effective means of bonding amongst his cousins and did not require much verbal exchange. The family returned to the Philippines in 1997 and 1999 due to the deaths of grandparents on both sides. Although he did not constantly communicate with his grandparents whilst they were still alive he felt a flood of emotions at the funeral.

As an adult Jesse asserts that his British identity is just as important as his Filipino ethnicity. He does not want to identify too much with his Filipino side. Jesse, at the year of the interview, was engaged to be married with Sarah (another second-generation Filipino).

6.2.2 I-poem Analysis

Four different voices can be charted (see Table 11 below) from Jesse’s initial account of his life story. His main narration yielded 39 lines of I-statements (Appendix 3 Table21 p.230). The voices ‘I was little’ and ‘I am aware’ were co-present during childhood whereas the voices ‘I am involved’ and ‘I am proud but’ were expressed beginning teenage years and continued to adulthood. The ‘I was little voice’ spoke of a self that is acted upon by others: ‘I was born’, sent to the Philippines, learned the Ilokano language then came back to London after three years. In contrast to the first voice the ‘I am aware’ voice claims cognizance of Filipinos in the immediate environment (e.g. second-generation children attending the same school, friends of parents who are called uncles and aunties).
Table 11 Voices in Jesse's I-poem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voices</th>
<th>Life stages</th>
<th>Moments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘I was little’</td>
<td>Age 0 to 3</td>
<td>• Birth (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Stay in Philippines (3, 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Learning Ilokano (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Returning to London (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘I am aware’</td>
<td>‘quite young’</td>
<td>• Attending school (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Being surrounded by aunties and uncles (9-10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Recognising other Filipino kids but not engaging (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘I am involved’</td>
<td>‘a bit older’ ‘rest of my life’</td>
<td>• Building close relationship with fellow second-generation (20-21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Getting involved with sports at school (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Joining Filipino basketball league (26-27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Maintaining Filipino close friends (32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘I am proud but’</td>
<td>‘quite young’ ‘rest of my life’</td>
<td>• Awareness of Filipino-ness but not proud (15-16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Not joining fellow second-generation who are into gangs (16-17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• British-ness as salient as Filipino-ness (35-39)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A variant of ‘I am proud but’ voice recognises awareness of Filipino self and others but dissociates self from second-generation teenagers who are gang members. The public image created by this group coupled with the self ‘not being into that’ created a young self that is not proud of being Filipino. The distancing of the self from Filipino others in general and the ‘gang’ members in particular, dissolves when the self is ‘a bit older’ and the ‘I am involved’ voice emerges. The presence of basketball teams in school and in the neighbourhood was crucial for the emergence of a self that engages with Filipino others and realises that some Filipinos can be likeable. Whilst the ‘I am involved’ continued to be relevant in the present time, a fourth voice called ‘I am proud but’ also begin to speak. This fourth voice indicates a qualified affinity with Filipino-ness: ‘I am proud of my [Filipino] heritage but I am also proud of the fact that I was born and raised in this country [the UK]. In other words, the fourth voice
claims that Filipino-ness is just as important as British-ness and advocates a tempered instead of exaggerated pride over ethnic identity.

**6.2.3 We-poem Analysis**

**Table 12 Significant others in Jesse's We-poem**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Associated practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Immediate family</td>
<td>• Moving from one house, neighbourhood to another (1-2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Not having a car (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Close friends (Filipino) - Alfie and Andrew</td>
<td>• Playing basketball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Good boys : not into any trouble (11-12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Other Filipino families</td>
<td>• Regular get-together (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Birth cohort</td>
<td>• Hang out together (12-15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Into sports and not gangs (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Other ethnic minorities</td>
<td>• Affinity on the basis of food, struggles (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) School sports club</td>
<td>• Football, basketball as competitive games (21-22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Filipino basketball league</td>
<td>• Common ground: playing and winning (22-25); hanging out (26)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jesse’s We-poem is composed of 27 lines (Appendix 4 Table 25, p.240) and contain seven relationships that embeds Jesse's selves (see Table 12 above). It can be described that Jesse has affinity to but very little engagement with other ethnic minorities in the UK because according to him they face similar issues of integration that Filipinos do. Jesse also invoked three relationships that may be characterised by medium emotional attachment and medium social activity: co-second-generation in the neighbourhood, basketball sports club in school and in local area. As already indicated, the presence of sports organisations were crucial in his decision to get involved with the Filipino community. Jesse certainly has strong attachment to these groups largely due to the amount of time and experiences shared together. However this is less than what he would feel and do with close Filipino friends and family whom he has a high sense of emotional attachment coupled with intense and regular social activities.
6.3 Martin

6.3.1 Biographical Sketch

Martin, 29, was born in London to a Filipina mother and a English father. His parents met each other in the hotel where they both worked in. At an early age Martin knew that he was half-Filipino and half-English. He grew up with his blood cousins (one is half-Filipino, half-Portuguese) and other non-blood relatives whom he learned to treat as cousins. His being mixed-race has been a significant part of his school, social and work life. Although he does not think it was discriminatory or offensive at least, his high school nickname was ‘Yella’ or ‘Yellow Man’. During social encounters people recognise that he was half-English but cannot distinguish his other half (his skin is white but his hair is black). When he became a team leader in an advertising company Martin’s team was called ‘Yellow Team’.

Martin has come to believe that he is a product of two heritages. Apart from school during the week and football practices on Sundays the majority of his time was largely spent with his ‘Filipino family’ (especially after his parents got divorced when he was eight years old). His father managed to provide financial support and bring him to his sports practice but Martin was generally raised by his mother with some help from other Filipino relatives in London. When Martin started his undergraduate degree in history he started to spend less time with Filipino relatives and then more time with his growing network of multicultural friends.

Martin has visited the Philippines almost every other year. All these journeys were holiday visits and were always joined with his other cousins. Being of mixed-race he stands out in the crowd when in the Philippines. He is commonly perceived as a foreigner (British) but he
surprises people when he understands Kapampangan (but not speak the language) and eats signature Filipino dishes.

Martin considers his mother an influential person in his life who has taught him the importance of family, obedience, and education. All of his previous girlfriends were non-Filipinos and only one of them has met his mother. Martin was never allowed to bring home any of his girlfriends unless he considered the relationship to be serious. None of his previous girlfriends ever stayed overnight in their house. At the time of the interview, Martin owned two properties but he regularly stays at his mother’s house. He feels that it is his duty to look after her as she ages. Martin is currently single and he is aware that he has reached ‘marrying age’. His future wife must accept that the wedding will be Catholic and attended by many.

6.3.2 I-poem Analysis

Martin’s main narration (an I-poem of 113 lines in Appendix 3 Table 22, p.231) has three identifiable voices (Table 13 below). Although his narrated life story can be broadly divided into two distinct life stages in which the ‘While I was growing up voice’ spoke about childhood (0 to 17 years old) and the ‘As I get older voice’ spoke about adulthood (18 onwards), the ‘I am half (Filipino) voice’ can also be heard throughout the narration.

Similar to Ellie and Jesse, Martin’s voices suggest self-knowledge of Filipino-ness. Even though the young Martin is visually ‘mix-breed’ and neither speak Tagalog nor Kapampangan, the ‘While I was growing up voice’ asserts, ‘When I was born until I was 18, I was more Filipino than ever.’ This assertion was largely due to the sheer amount of time spent with Filipinos particularly at parties: ‘Every party I went to tends to be based on Filipino style of food…everyone close to me…was always half-Filipino’. ‘Being more Filipino’ during
childhood may also be due to being ‘raised by (single) Filipina mother’ from eight onwards and going to Philippines at least nine times. In contrast to being raised as a Filipino, the ‘As I get older voice’ described a self that was ‘more English’.

Table 13 Voices in Martin's I-poem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voices</th>
<th>Life stages</th>
<th>Moments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ‘While I was growing up’ | From birth up to 17 | • Raised as a Filipino (24)  
                            • Weekend parties (4-5)  
                            • Visiting Philippines 9 times (26)  
                            • Raised by divorced mum (25)  
                            • Looking mix-breed at school (7-8)  
                            • Not learning Filipino language (27-31) |
| ‘As I get older’     | 18 onwards       | • Growing up English  
                            • Studying in the university, drifting away (32, 37-38)  
                            • Meeting and hanging out with non-Filipinos (34-35)  
                            • Working (46)  
                            • Persistence of nicknames at school (15-19) and at work (44) |
| ‘I am half (Filipino)’ | Childhood and adulthood | • Half-Filipino (half-English) as a claim to identity (10,11,14, 45,48,49,52,66,105)  
                            • Importance of ‘I am mummy’s boy’ voice in life choices (Mom is always a priority 68-83; Family is non-negotiable)  
                            • Identity markers (109-113) |

The shift from the ‘Filipino child’ to ‘English self’ happened when Martin started his university degree. Studying for a degree not only meant moving away from home and significant others but it also meant meeting other ‘non-Filipinos’. Being mixed-race was a constant feature of most social encounters whether during the largely Filipino upbringing during childhood or the more ‘English self’ explored at work and during adulthood. The continued relevance of a mixed-race self throughout Martin’s life stages is illustrated by the shift from past tense (e.g. ‘I was half-Filipino, half-English’ [L-10]) to present tense (e.g. ‘I am really half-Filipino’ [L-45]) when he declares a self-identification. Moreover the term
‘half-Filipino’ was uttered nine times in the I-poem. As already indicated by the first voice, the notion of being mixed-race is intimately tied to being raised by the Filipina mother and consequently the ‘dominance’ of a half-Filipino identity. The salience of a ‘half-Filipino self’ is demonstrated in everyday life preferences (‘I don’t like Shepherd’s pie I like Filipino food’ [L-110-111]) and in values held dear (‘I think… family is more important’ [L-88]).

6.3.3 We-poem Analysis

Martin’s We-poem is composed of 77 lines (Appendix 4 Table 26, p.241) and 17 relationships can be charted (see Table 14 below). Martin can be described to have a low emotional attachment to three of these relationships. During the interview Martin invoked an imaginary who should be accepting of a ‘Filipino’ wedding attended by many and with a feast-like gathering and celebration of food. He also invoked ‘we’ when referring to a momentary encounter with a client in which his being half-Filipino has been a topic and a conversation starter. A medium level of social activity can be attributed to Martin’s relationship with other Filipinos he has worked with in a hotel. In contrast to the client or the future wife, Martin was for an extended time part of such group of workers in the hotel.

Of the 17 significant others identified, Martin can be described as having a middle range emotional attachment to four relationships with varying levels of social activity: limited social activities with (a) school mates and (b) blood relatives from father side, sustained activities with (c) childhood friends, and (d) daily engagement with workmates. Even though Martin signifies high emotional attachment to his Filipino affiliations, these relationships can be further categorised into three.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>We = ‘I’ + others</th>
<th>Associated practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| (1) Mum          | • Visiting (paternal) grandmother  
|                  | • Companion in moving about local areas in the Philippines (63-64)  |
| (2) Blood-cousins and cousins-out-there - Paul | • Playing basketball (with Paul) (16-17)  
|                  | • Being half-Filipino like Paul (68-70)  
|                  | • Love for food (25)  
|                  | • Affinity and recognition as second-generation on the basis of place of birth and socialization (68,77)  |
| (3) Socially ‘extended’ family | • Weekend get-together (18-20)  
|                  | • Expectation of presence in gatherings (46)  
|                  | • Visiting Philippines together (65-67)  |
| (4) Childhood friends  
| • young Filipino friends | • Going to weekend food parties (1)  |
| (5) Close friends (mates)  
| • young English friends | • Going to pubs and house parties; (34-37; 40-42, 81); football (40)  
|                  | • Making jokes on each other (30)  |
| (6) Former girlfriend | • Dating (14)  
|                  | • Meeting when too young, breaking up (7-73)  
|                  | • Companion when visiting father (51)  |
| (7) Future girlfriend/wife | • Getting prepared for a Filipino wedding (15)  |
| (8) Schoolmates | • Making fun of each other (2-3)  |
| (9) Blood relatives from father side | • Loving people, get along but not close (53)  |
| (10) Workmates, team led | • Making nicknames for each other (6-8, 11-13)  |
| (11) Filipinos in general | • Food: not spicy (27-28), rice with everything (29)  
|                  | • Meet together over food and not drinks (43)  
|                  | • Described as nice and good (47-48)  |
| (12) Other ‘half’ persons | • Being ‘half’ as a conversation starter (31-33)  |
| (13) Co-second-generation | • Affinity and recognition as second-generation on the basis of place of birth and socialization (68,77)  |
| (14) Client | • Filipino background as a conversation enhancer (80)  |
| (15) Other Filipinos in a hotel | • Working together, becoming friends (78-79)  |
| (16) Relatives in the Philippines | • Celebrating Christmas eve with ‘lechon’ and not turkey (59-61)  |
| (17) Philippines (as a country) | • Being separated and distinct from other Oriental countries (76)  |

Martin seems to have a regular and intense engagement with his (a) mother, (b) cousins by blood and affinity, (c) other members of socially extend family in London, and (d) former girl
friend. Martin has a semi-permanent interaction with his relatives in the Philippines whenever they were there for holiday. Compared to three other informants for this Chapter, only Martin specifically singled-out his mother as the most significant other invoked in his use of ‘we’. This is because Martin’s parents divorced when he was eight and therefore his immediate family is simply composed of himself and his mother.

Interestingly, Martin also used ‘we’ to refer to (a) Filipinos in general, (b) other mixed-race individuals, (c) other second-generation Filipinos, and (d) the Philippines as a country and its a people. Compared to all other relationships invoked throughout his narration, this final set of relationships can be described as a faceless collective, an imaginary but socially identifiable collection of people that Martin sees himself a part of.

6.4 Marie

6.4.1 Biographical Sketch

Marie, 32, was born in London to Filipino parents. After her parents married in the late 1970’s her mother went to the UK to work as a nurse whilst her father remained in the Philippines to finish his law degree. For the first two years Marie and her mother shared a household with another Filipino family, and together they helped each other in taking care of all the children. Marie met her father at the age of two when he finally moved to London. They decided to live in a separate household until her brother was born. Marie grew up with children from three other Filipino families who met almost every week for birthday parties or gatherings over food. Although they were not blood relatives she would introduce these children as her cousins and she considered their parents as aunties and uncles.
Marie has visited the Philippines three times. She has fond memories of her first visit when she was four years old. Despite her very young age she remembers meeting relatives from both sides of the family. The second trip to the Philippines was enjoyable but she also felt frustrated at not being able to communicate with her relatives in Tagalog. Of all her relatives Marie felt closest to her paternal grandfather (a public school principal). Her grandfather would read to her children’s stories and taught her how to play chess.

Marie’s parents, particularly her father, drummed into them the importance of completing a university education. Tagalog was not spoken at home because her father thought that it might confuse their language learning. Nevertheless their household kept the Filipino culture with respect to food and other material artefacts.

She describes herself as a nerd who never joined any beauty pageants for little girls. As an ‘atypical Filipina girl’ she had a ‘mixed’ group of friends in primary school. Eventually she was able to build friendships with the other children she met at weekend birthday parties. Since Marie was among the eldest she was already starting her law degree when her closest friends were still in college. When Marie successfully finished her law degree, at 22, she decided to return to the Philippines for a three-month stay to visit her relatives from both sides and begin an internship in her uncle’s law firm. At the time of the interview, Marie had been living with her boyfriend (another second-generation Filipino) of 11 years. They chose to prioritize their individual careers and have no plans to marry or have children yet.
### 6.4.2 I-poem Analysis

**Table 15 Voices in Marie's I-poem**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voice</th>
<th>Life stages</th>
<th>Moments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The child</strong></td>
<td>0 to 11</td>
<td>• Raised by mother and extended family (3-5, 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Meeting father at 2 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Weekly gatherings (13-15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Visiting the Philippines at ages 4 and 11 (16, 34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Encountering animals (19, 23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Meeting relatives (20, 23), grandparents (26-32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Frustration on not speaking the language (39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The geek friend</strong></td>
<td>Adolescence</td>
<td>• Not being part of a group (47-50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary and secondary school</td>
<td>• Being young Filipina ‘ugly Betty’ (55-65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Getting stuck with college friends (72-77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Ascertaining talents (85-92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The good daughter/sister</strong></td>
<td>College to university</td>
<td>• Leaving college friends and focusing on university studies (79-82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Finishing law (92-94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Not being spoiled (100-101)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The girlfriend/rebellious daughter</strong></td>
<td>Last 11 years</td>
<td>• Odd relationship with a boyfriend who is not oriented to Filipino values (122-124)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The independent career woman</strong></td>
<td>After university graduation</td>
<td>• Braving the Philippines for 3 months at age 22 despite not knowing the language (104-109)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Worked at a law firm (110), visited relatives from mother’s and father’s side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Starting (129) and pursuing career as lawyer (143)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Living-in, not getting married (137), not having children (138)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Becoming a godmother (150-154)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Leaving a legacy (157-158)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marie’s extended turn at talking, during the research interview, lasted for almost one hour and yielded a constructed I-poem of 163 lines (Appendix 3 Table 23, p.234). Five different voices,
tied to particular social roles, can be charted from this I-poem (see Table  15 above). Marie voiced a ‘child’, ‘a geek friend’, ‘a good sister’, ‘a rebellious daughter’ and an ‘independent career woman’.

‘The child voice’ spoke about earliest memories (a) of being raised by her mother and extended family, and (b) visiting the Philippines for the first time. In speaking about these experiences it was noticeable that the voice repeatedly mentioned ‘I remember’ [L-18, 21] and ‘I think’ [L-12, 14] which indicate that the account was accessing a memory. ‘The geek friend voice’ spoke about Marie’s experiences during adolescence. Her persona was characterised by negating traits socially expected of a typical teenager. The ‘geek friend voice’ said that the adolescent Marie ‘didn’t fit in’ [L-64] because she was initially not part of a [Filipino] group at school and never joined any common Filipino public events (e.g. procession for the Sto. Nino or beauty pageant for adolescent girls called Little Miss Philippines) and traits (e.g. being good at singing or crafts). The ‘geek voice’ reasoned: ‘I was ugly Betty.’

The third identifiable voice, ‘the good sister/daughter’, described Marie when she was attending University. At this point of her life story the self that was imaged was that of an obedient daughter who endeavoured to complete law degree and the good sister who kept the values for respect and modesty (not being extravagant, not spending beyond their means). However this ideal daughter/sister is countered by ‘the girlfriend / rebellious daughter voice. The third voice (‘good daughter’) upheld the Filipino values for education and obedience to parents but the fourth voice (‘the girlfriend’) defied social expectations of by living-in with her boyfriend of 11 years but not getting a church or civil wedding and not having children after reaching late 20’s.
The last voice, ‘the independent career woman’, is a counter-voice to what may be perceived as a ‘negative self’ introduced by ‘the rebellious daughter’ voice. The ‘independent woman’ voice redeems the emergent narrative identity by signifying an accomplished self who stayed in the Philippines for three months to rediscover her roots in new light, took the godmother role to several third-generation Filipinos, and co-founded a civic organisation which aims to continue the Filipino legacy in the succeeding generations. Moreover this ‘career woman’ voice explains that the decision to delay marriage and having children may be justified by an engaged practice of one’s profession.

6.4.3 We-poem Analysis

Marie’s We-poem is composed of 117 lines (Appendix 4 Table 27, p. 243) and included 12 relationships (see Table 16 below). Marie has low emotional attachment and low social activity with Filipino diaspora in the UK whom she described as longer as religious as the Filipinos.

Marie signified a middle range emotional attachment (with increasing levels of social activity to three groups). She first started to hang out with a group of Filipina girls when she primary school. This group later expanded to a wider and closer set of friends when she reached secondary school. To this day Marie is in constant communication with this set of friends. At present, Marie has high involvement with the civic organisation for second-generation Filipinos she co-founded.

Similar to the three cases presented, Marie relatives and closest friends occupy the highest emotional attachment. Marie has a limited engagement ‘Filipinos in general’ and remain faceless. In contrast, Marie has a sustained interaction with her Filipino friends in college and
her relatives in the Philippines. At present, Marie devotes the longest interaction time with (a) her nuclear family, (b) her boyfriend and (c) the socially extended family (of cousins, uncles and aunties).

Table 16 Significant others in Marie's We-poem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>We = ‘I’ + others</th>
<th>Associated practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Nuclear family</td>
<td>• Companion when visiting Philippines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Extending invitation to neighbours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Dwelling together (62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Family rituals: eating together (70); Going to church (83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Not physically affectionate (74-76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Supporting/standing by each other (65-70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Family values: modesty (96-117), value for education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Cousins from socially extended family</td>
<td>• Relying on each other for support (1-4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Claiming to be cousins (9-13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Anticipating weekly get together (71-73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Socially extended family</td>
<td>• Weekly gathering for meals (5-8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Brother</td>
<td>• Sending personalised cards to grandparents in the Philippines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Demonstrating family virtues: being thrifty (30) value for education (64), gratefulness (36), not being spoiled (31), respect for parents (37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Living near parents (81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Only going to church on special days (84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Boyfriend</td>
<td>• Living together (40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Total opposites (92-95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Girl schoolmates</td>
<td>• Hanging out together during lunchtime (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Filipino friends in college</td>
<td>• Keeping in touch (55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Michelle as best friend (86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Filipino diaspora in the UK</td>
<td>• No longer religious (82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) Civic organisation</td>
<td>• Encouraging unity amongst community members (50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) Co-second-generation</td>
<td>• Affinity through knowing the same people (38), living on the same streets (39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11) Filipinos in general</td>
<td>• Virtue of hospitality (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12) relatives in the Philippines</td>
<td>• Eating and playing together</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.5 Discussion

Implied and explicit self-definitions, within the context of life-telling in a research interview, are spatially (here and there), temporally (now and then) and relationally (we and they)
framed. Using the voice centred relational method of analysis, particularly through I-poems and We-poems, this chapter has privileged the standpoint of an ‘emerging narrated self’ (Doucet and Mauthner, 2008, p.406) – how the self has transformed throughout the life course and how the self is embedded in network of relationships. This form of analysis generated a number of analytic affordances in understanding transnationalised belonging.

First, the I-poems’ four analytic cases have illustrated that identification with a Filipino self implied a range of things. A practice of Filipino-ness can mean liking and growing up to eat Filipino dishes (e.g. balut, pinakbet, adobo, sinigang), learning a few Tagalog words (even the swear phrases), speaking one or two Philippine languages, attending weekend parties, being enmeshed in an extended family, visiting the parental hometown, meeting the relatives, playing with cousins, and keeping in touch with via mobile phones or the internet. To be Filipino can also mean being obedient to parents, valuing education (completing a university degree), joining an advocacy group for Filipinos, knowing about Philippine history and problematising ‘what will be passed on’ to the next generation of Filipinos in the UK.

Second, the voices charted via I-poems seem to indicate that identification with the Filipino self comes with age or maturity. Jesse started exploring his Filipino-side when he was 16 through sports groups. Ellie actively engaged with the Filipino community when she finished her university education. Martin was more Filipino when he was a child but he maintained that his ‘Filipino-ness’ remains to be a most salient aspect of his adult identity.

Third, whilst the second-generation develops identification as they age, it cannot be over emphasised that these participants have had a wealth of childhood experiences that served as post memories and memories which they can draw from. Chances are, identity outcomes and belonging experiences would have been different had these experiences been absent. Thus, an
important recommendation is for Filipino cultural socialization and practice be present (but not forced) during childhood even if, as Ellie argues, ‘they don’t take things in’ because eventually when they age and become more mature they will be ready to meaningfully engage and align a Filipino self alongside a British self. The two selves do not necessarily contradict each other. In fact, as Martin argues, being a product of two heritages can be advantageous at strategic moments.

Fourth, the transnationalisation of belonging means that the second-generation creates links not just between the geographic spaces of the UK and the Philippines but beyond. As shown in the life stories of the participants, they also maintain links to other Filipino relatives elsewhere. For example, Ellie has relatives in Canada. Jesse and Marie have relatives in the US.

Fifth, We-poems have highlighted the nuclear and extended families (blood-cousins and cousins-out-there) as non-negotiable relationships for second-generation Filipino. Families are always given the highest level of emotional attachment, social and temporal investment. It is also within the context of families that sense of being at home is built and enhanced. However it is also important to underscore the role played voluntary associations such as sports groups and civic groups that particularly reach for second-generation Filipino because they can help create turning point experiences for the second-generation, that is to identify with Filipino-ness and create a sense of belonging. Again, this is in on the assumption that by and large, the Filipino diaspora in the UK and Filipinos elsewhere value the continuation of a Filipino identity and culture.

The implementation of *The Listening Guide* principles and procedures also yielded important methodological insights. First, I have maintained to keep data analysis transparent by
specifically outlining the procedures involved in the production of interpretation such as the biographical sketch and the analysis of I-poems and We-poems. In the end, the use of I-poems and We-poems offered a procedural warrant that connected research interpretation with a chain of evidence from data texts. Through this approach the analytic steps of data simplification and data complication (Coffey and Atkinson, 1996) were empirically operationalised.

Second, the process of analysis involving a series of analytic readings inspired creative ways of data display. For example, the I-poem summary tables showed the different voices uncovered at one glance and a trail of evidence (themes and line numbers) to verify robustness of interpretation.

Third, I have also introduced a systematic reading for and analysis of relationships using We-poems. As shown in the previous sections each relationship identified has particular associated activities. We know that we belong to a group because we do things with them. These activities creates affinity and togetherness and hence a sense of ease in one’s environment. I further complicated this step by suggesting that these relationships are not independent of each other. The intensity of associated activities with each relationship is indicative of the level of attachment to such relationship. We perform particular activities with particular people depending on how emotionally close we are to them. Although I am aware that grading or ranking of emotional attachment to specific groupings is more complex in actual terms, I have chosen to simplify them in three levels (low, medium, him) for purposes of discussion. By cross-tabulating levels of emotional attachment with levels of social activity I created a matrix of relationships that further made the understanding of existing relationships easier (see Appendix 4 Table 25, p.227).
Finally, Edwards and Weller (2012, p.215) put it best when they compared VCRM with thematic analysis:

I-poem analysis draws attention to the research subject’s stream of consciousness – how they understand and speak about themselves – and a thematic analysis focuses on recurring, arising and evolving issues, each also produces a particular, implicit, mode of analytic ontology – how the researcher is placed in relation to their research subject and their social world. We have characterized – and indeed experienced – these as ‘standing alongside’ for I-poems and ‘gazing at’ with thematic analysis.

The broad gaze of thematic analysis appropriated life stories according to emergent conceptual handles and established theoretical framework whereas the intellectual stance of poetic/voice analysis respected the internal organisation and co-construction of narrated life stories. Both approaches produced important insights in understanding the dimensions of transnationalised belonging.
CHAPTER 7
Conclusion

This study was designed to examine constructions of belonging in a transnational context by looking at the case of second-generation Filipinos in England. It began with a premise that whilst Filipino (im)migrants in the UK are taken into account by both the countries of origin (Philippines) and destination (the UK), the second-generation were largely not considered. In the public sphere, the population of first-generation Filipinos in the UK is closely monitored (Salt, 2010; Salt and Millar, 2006) because they are labour migrants of varying legal statuses. The first-generation Filipinos are among the UK’s foreign labour, and a segment of the Philippines’ overseas population. By contrast, statistics on second-generation Filipinos are often guestimates if not hidden in the counting (Teerling, 2011). In the academic literature, there are countless studies on transnational migrants whilst studies on the second-generation are still gaining momentum (see Chapter 2). Although the first-generation is often viewed as inhabiting a transnational space, the negotiations of simultaneity as lived experiences of the second-generation remain under-researched. As pointed out in Chapter 1, we do not know how small or large the population of second-generation Filipinos is, what they have become, and how they are becoming.

Two starting points were considered to address this research gap. Transnational belonging of second-generation Filipinos was problematised through (a) external/objective/official representations in government statistical records, and through (b) internal/subjective/narrative representations expressed in personal experience accounts. Through this design, the (hi)story of second-generation Filipinos was reclaimed and retold. On one hand, the emergence and growth in number of second-generation Filipinos in the UK can be empirically ‘recovered’
from statistical publications. On the other hand, life stories of second-generation members are ‘first person narrative[s], which function as an apparently transparent testimony of experience... that testify to the experience of migration and growing up’ (Weedon, 2004, p.74) in London. Stated differently, published statistical records build a narrative of how the second-generation is positioned by others whereas life stories unpack situational self-positioning of select second-generation participants (Kraus, 2006).

### 7.1 Summary of Key Findings

In this concluding chapter, I provide a distilled account of the second-generation Filipinos in London (and in the UK at-large) by revisiting and answering the research questions outlined in Chapter 1. Research question 1 sought to examine government reports as statistical representations of second-generation Filipinos. Chapter 4 showed the usefulness of large-scale national surveys (i.e. APS data) and governmental population estimates (i.e. summary statistics on overseas Filipinos) in describing the diaspora population in general. Since the APS and CFO’s population estimates are time series statistics, it was also possible to make sense of population changes over time. However, APS data and CFO estimates focus on the ‘first-generation’ and do not explicitly take into account a ‘second-generation’. Fortunately, two other UK statistical sources proved promising in appreciating the second-generation as a growing segment of Filipino diaspora in the UK.

It was argued that guestimates on the population size of second-generation Filipinos can be avoided by using available data from annual statistical bulletins on settlement and citizenship grants. Drawing from bulletins of almost five decades (see Table 17), it can now be said with some certainty that, there are at least 21,000 decimal second-generation Filipinos (i.e.}
Philippine-born and migrated to the UK as child of a permanent resident parent) who have permanently settled in the UK since 1976. Moreover, at least 14,000 other members of the 2.0 generation (including some members of the decimal generation) have been granted British citizenships since 1962.

Table 17 Government records as statistical representation of the second-generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Permanent Residents</th>
<th>British Citizens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First-generation</td>
<td>73,513</td>
<td>51,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second-Generation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second-Generation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second-generation population</td>
<td>21,149</td>
<td>13,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>94,662</td>
<td>65,586</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17 above provides a brief response to RQ1a and RQ1b. Of the five statistical sources used for the first phase of the study, only two publications were useful in estimating the population size of second-generation Filipinos (RQ1a). Results from statistical bulletins on grants of permanent residency and citizenship show that the second-generation is a sizeable segment of Filipino diaspora in the UK. The second-generation compose 22% of the permanent resident population and 21% of the naturalized British citizens.

Research question 2 paid attention to life stories as narrative representations of the second-generation. Thematic analysis of 20 biographic narratives, presented in Chapter 5, highlighted that whilst the participants are all currently living in London, a transnationalised belonging has also to be negotiated in the temporal, spatial and relational contexts that connect the UK
and the Philippines, and notions of English-ness and Filipino-ness (RQ2a). Table 18 below shows a summary of analytic points that characterise negotiations in these spheres of belonging.

**Table 18 Life stories as narrative representations of the second-generation (A)**

RQ2a: How is a sense of self positioned in relation to notions of Filipino-ness and British-ness?

*Transnationalised belonging is positioned within a . . .*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEMPORAL SPHERE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o The (pre)migration story of the first-generation is an important narrative resource activated by the second-generation in orienting their narrated life stories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o The second-generation can be temporally located as a biological and as a historical generation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Members of the second-generation traverse a life course marked by different stages, events and experiences, transitions, and trajectories.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPATIAL SPHERE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o Being members of the second-generation means being enmeshed in different types of communities where a sense of Filipino-ness is negotiated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Belonging amongst the second-generation is transnationalised by having to orient attachments to both the UK and the Philippines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Journey visits to the parental homeland are physical as much as emotional encounters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o In the diaspora, the material and non-material Filipino culture are reproduced</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELATIONAL SPHERE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o Being second-generation means being related to an extended family whether by blood or by affinity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Growing up in a Filipino household means developing a taste for Filipino cuisine and putting a premium on family values, completing university education, and conforming to social expectations with regard to morality and family life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Being a second-generation Filipino may involve becoming relatively invisible to the wider public.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each life story of the 20 participants included migration stories of their first-generation parent. Each narrated life story included different events and experiences (e.g. from weekend Filipino parties to separation of parents to visits to Philippines) that impacted identification towards a Filipino self.
Members of the second-generation are emplaced and seek to build a ‘home’ in communities of belonging that emerge between the symbolic and physical limits of Filipino-ness and British-ness. Families and circles of extended families were important symbolic spaces and actual social relationships that provide a sense of home. Again, this sense of home links both the Philippines and the UK. However, the visibility achieved in this study is just a starting point. There is yet the broader task of wider dissemination of findings to promote collective identification (see next section). Whilst belonging in these ‘homes’ are somehow assured, the second-generation is yet to achieve wider and more meaningful visibility within the diaspora, the UK and the Philippine nation.

Thematic analysis emphasised that a sense of belonging oriented towards Filipino-ness can be observed from the lived experiences narrated by the participants. It was necessary to closely examine four select biographic narratives in order to make sense the mechanism by which a Filipino-oriented sense of self and belonging is continued or discontinued in temporal, spatial and relational spheres. This analytic task was accomplished by subjecting segments of narratives through series of readings and creation of I-poems and We-poems.

Table 19 below shows a cross-tabulation of key findings from I-poem and We-poem analyses. In general, it is argued that there are significant moments and significant others that may influence whether a second-generation individual will associate or dissociate with a Filipino self. Looking at the relational sphere, identification with Filipino-ness is likely when a strong network of Filipino families (both nuclear and extended) is present whilst growing up. Awareness to a ‘Filipino self’ introduced and developed through the recreation of Filipino culture (e.g. attending weekend gatherings over food) in the diaspora is further strengthened through periodic visits to the Philippines.
Table 19. Life stories as a narrative representation of the second-generation (B)

**RQ2b: What influences the continuity, discontinuity, and change of these self-positionings over the course of a person’s life?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructions of a ‘Filipino self’</th>
<th>Continuities/associating</th>
<th>Discontinuities/dissociating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Significant Moments</strong></td>
<td>o Attending weekend parties</td>
<td>o Not teaching/speaking the Tagalog language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Attending school where there are other second-generation Filipinos</td>
<td>o Attending university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Being surrounded with ‘aunties’, ‘uncles’ and ‘cousins’ whilst growing up</td>
<td>o London/UK as a land of opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Maturity at a certain age understand and engage with Filipino others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Separation of parents, staying with mother</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Short visits to the Philippines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Extended stays in the Philippines (e.g. 3 months to several years)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Being born in the Philippines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High social activity, High emotional attachment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Nuclear family (father, mother, sibling)</td>
<td>o (English) workmates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Filipina mother</td>
<td>o Girlfriend/boyfriend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Blood-cousins and cousins-out-there</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Extended family in the UK (blood-aunties, aunties-out-there)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium to low social activity, Medium to low emotional attachment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Relatives in the Philippines (particularly grandparents)</td>
<td>o Members of a Filipino-oriented civic organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Second-generation Filipino friends</td>
<td>o Filipinos in general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Members of a Filipino-oriented civic organisation</td>
<td>o Philippine embassy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Blood relatives from the father side</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By contrast, a ‘Filipino self’ is distanced, if not discontinued (in other words, the construction of an ‘English self’), when there is less familiarity with the Tagalog (or any Philippine language), or when less time is spent with ‘fellow Filipinos’ due to task demands of work or
university. Broadly, a ‘Filipino self’ may also be weakened when the second-generation is rendered invisible by the Philippine Embassy or in the diaspora in general.

The foregrounding of these findings and approaches to belonging, whilst might be a big step in surfacing the narratives of belonging among the second-generation Filipinos, should be qualified. It can be argued that the present work is empirically significant because it explored the linking of subjectivities through life stories and available social identities through official reports. However, statistical records may only superficially monitor the growth of the second-generation but they remain to be invisible as these resources are largely unknown. From an administrative point of view, migration, settlement and citizenship statistics imputes a person’s belonging. Whilst there is usefulness for this approach it does not capture the shifting, multi-layered and sometimes ambivalent sense of belonging that an individual undergoes throughout their life. In contrast to official statistical reports that consolidated these imposed categorizations, life stories presented in this study offered an avenue to examine self-descriptions – how they are transformed from childhood to adulthood, the salient dimensions, and the consequent strategies for making sense of difference and social positionings.

7.2 Pathways to Impact

The study adds to the broad literature on international migration. The study, however, was not about migration per se but instead on the consequences of migration – What happens to children of migrants? In an aim to understand the experiences of children of migrants I particularly focused on the case of the older second-generation Filipinos.

The intention was not to present a homogenised or flattened representation of the second-generation population but instead to advocate a reading that reflects variety and complexity.
The understanding of biographic narratives against a backdrop of a statistical story of first and second-generation Filipinos in the UK encouraged a sociological imagination of transnationalised belonging not just as a private trouble but more importantly as a public issue (Mills, 1959). The negotiation of belonging between Filipino-ness and English-ness, including the opportunities and challenges it presents, was not a trouble faced by four or 20 individuals but instead an issue lived at least 21,000 individuals. The statistical and biographic narratives presented in this study can form part of circulating narrative resources that the current and future second-generation Filipinos may invoke when they construct other representational devices of transnational belonging.

The mixed research approach employed in data collection and data analyses generated important methodological contributions. First, the study established a verifiable population estimate of the second-generation Filipinos in the UK by using 47 years of statistical records – a task that has never been done before.

Second, the simple strategy used in arriving at the population size of the first and second-generation population is replicable. Since the data sources are annual publications of the UK Home Office, the constructed tables may be extended as soon as statistical bulletins are available. Moreover, if this compilation strategy can be useful in manifesting the second-generation Filipinos then the same strategy can be applied to ‘surface’ other second-generation populations who are currently living in the UK. For example, we can ‘recover’ the second-generation Southeast Asian (e.g. Thailand, Malaysia, Indonesia, Vietnam, Cambodia, etc.) who are often regarded as the ‘other Asian’.
Third, the use We-poems, in addition to I-poems of the *The Listening Guide*, was a significant development in narrative analysis. We-poems were used to identify and make sense of web of relationships that mattered to second-generation participants as providers of belonging.

Fourth, the analytic approaches used in this study were complementary and parsimonious. The statistical narratives presented an overview of the Filipino diaspora in the UK and alerted us to the rise of second and later generations of young people with Filipino background. The cross-case thematic analysis presented the dynamics of negotiating belonging by embedding senses and politics of belonging within spatial, relational and temporal realities of the participants. The case-oriented poetic analysis showed attentiveness to emergent subjectivities and respected the internal organisation of narrated life stories.

In the course of doing this research, five knowledge-sharing activities have been conducted. Poster presentations on the statistical story of migration, settlement and citizenship of Filipinos in Britain were shown postgraduate events in Birmingham (June 2010) and in Nottingham (July 2010). Population estimates of the first and second-generation in the UK were presented before a public forum attended by leaders of Filipino organisations in London (September 2010) and leaders of ethnic communities in Cardiff (September 2011). Finally, preliminary results from the thematic analysis of biographic narratives were presented in a postgraduate colloquium on migration in Swansea (June 2012). At the end of the project, a copy of the dissertation will be given to interests groups (e.g. Philippine Embassy and Philippine Generations) to create awareness and to further engage with key stakeholders.
7.3 Directions for Future Research

In view of the empirical findings and methodological contributions of the present study, I sketch in this final section six windows of opportunity for future studies. The first three are methodological and the rest are analytic recommendations.

1. Suggestions for improvement in research design. Technically, none of the study participants was hostile to the idea of being a Filipino. In fact, they all recognised and were adamant in claiming a Filipino identity. There were no negative cases. Nevertheless, the presence of negative outcome in identification was mentioned when some of the participants related a story of somebody they know who denied Filipino-ness (e.g. Camille’s friend who refused to be identified with being Filipino). Future studies may greatly benefit from reaching negative cases. Another possible improvement is the gathering of life stories second-generation participants whose father is Filipino and whose mother is English. Table 8 (p.138) showed that none of the participants fall in this category. These cases are potentially insightful on the role mothers play in developing notions of Filipino-ness and English-ness.

2. Replications and applications of research methods. (a) As already suggested in the previous section, the simple procedures used to generate population estimates of the second-generation may be replicated to describe the second-generation of ‘other Asians’. On one hand, this approach highlights of the power of the state to label, establish and shape identities. However, I also recognise that these administrative categories may well be starting points of research but rarely do they become meaningful in understanding the lives of the second-generation (Bakewell, 2008). The continued compilation of these statistics may aid in the broader tasks of public
information. The Embassy is a key institution for this role. Filipino information and practices should be made available and accessible to members of the second-generation who may be coming of age. Finding such resources can be a turning point for some of them.

The I-poems and We-poems used as narrative analytic approach were constructed from I-phrases and We-phrases mined from relevant segments of narrated life stories. (b) It would be interesting if the same procedures can be applied on life stories spoken in other languages such as Tagalog. For example, ‘ako’ and ‘ko’ is the first-person pronoun for ‘I’ whilst ‘tayo’ and ‘namin’ are the equivalents of ‘We’. Although there are grammatical differences in constructing sentences in Tagalog, the pronoun counterparts and their associated words can be insightful in charting changes in voices and socialities of belonging. If systematically applied this is yet again another methodological advancement in narrative analysis.

3. **How is transnational belonging negotiated in virtual spaces?** The present study recognises that aside from numeric and textualised representations of transnational belonging there are equally important representational devices available from video sharing websites such as YouTube. Similar to published statistical reports used in this study, uploaded videos are publicly available and are just waiting to be analysed. In contrast to biographic narratives produced in the context of a research interview, uploaded videos are more agentic in their genesis, more explicit in doing identity work, and seek to engage with a wider public. These audio-visual materials offer yet another set of data to problematize discourses on second-generation Filipinos from different parts of the world. Table 29 (Appendix 4, p.247) identifies four initial
materials for analysis. These videos present stories of second-generation Filipinos in the UK, in Canada and in the US.

4. *How does the younger second-generation negotiate a transnational belonging?* One significant insight that came from analysing time-series data on estimating the population size of second-generation Filipinos in the UK is the observation that the second-generation can be divided into two historical cohorts of ‘older’ and ‘younger’ generations. Based on study findings (see Table 17), 84 out of every 100 permanent resident second-generation, and 89 out of every 100 British citizen second-generation may be classified as the ‘younger’ cohort. In effect, the ‘younger’ second-generation composes the greater majority of the second-generation population and therefore warrants similar research attention.

5. *Is transnational belonging fractured by other (sub)national identities?* It may be observed that the present study exclusively focused on second-generation Filipinos in England, particularly those in London, and purposely did not include other second-generation Filipinos in Wales, Scotland or Northern Ireland. The reason for this was both practical and methodological. Due to resource limitation there was a need to concentrate on particular locales such as London. In view of the current findings future studies may focus on how a ‘Filipino self’ may emerge vis-à-vis a ‘Welsh’, or a ‘Scottish’ self. In the context of the Philippines, sub-national counterparts of these ‘selves’ may also be pursued. To what extent does the second-generation identify with Filipino regional/ethno-linguistic identities (e.g. Kapampangan, Ilokano, Bisaya, Bicolano etc.)? However, an attempt to include sub-national identities should also be tempered because incorporating multiple identifications can lead to an endless mix of fractured identities.
6. *Is transnational belonging gendered?* Findings from the quantitative and qualitative parts of this study indicated the importance of gender as an analytic angle in making sense of transnational belonging. For example, the rise of settlement grants to Filipino husbands from 2005 to 2009 (see Figure 7 p. 123) was attributed to surge of women health workers who began working in the 1990s. Narrative analysis also highlighted the important role played by mothers in developing a Filipino sense of self (e.g. Marie and Martin) and the differential expectations males (e.g. on not engaging on pre-marital sex) and females (e.g. marriage and motherhood) face at certain ages. The analytic potential of gender lens was not actively pursued in this study but future research may discuss these insights in more depth.
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Passengers Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Categories of passengers (purpose of journey)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Work Permit** | • Employment for 12 months or more  
• Employment for less than 12 months                                                                                                                                                    |
| **Family Members** | • ‘Dependant of work permit holders’ includes spouses and children under 18 years old of work permit holders  
• Admitted as a husband or fiancé  
• Admitted as a wife or fiancée                                                                                           |
| **Students**   | • ‘Students’ include Student visitors but excludes dependants which are included under ’Others given leave to enter.’                                                                                                                      |
| **Returning**  | • ‘Passengers returning after a temporary absence abroad’ which includes both persons who were settled in the UK and who have been absent for less than two years as well as those subject to a limited leave to enter who have returned within the time limit of that leave. |
| **All others** | • Diplomats and dependants  
• Passengers in transit  
• Refugee, exceptional leave cases, and their dependants  
• Others given leave to enter:  
  i. Au pairs  
  ii. Persons of independent means, investors, in business, self-employed persons, writers and those coming for permit free employment  
  iii. Entrants under the Highly Skilled Migrant Programme  
  iv. Dependents of (ii) to (iii) where applicable of UK ancestry cases and NATO forces  
• Passengers refused leave to enter and removed  
• Ordinary visitors  
• Business visitors  
• ‘Refused leave to enter’ which includes non-asylum cases dealt at ports of entry. |
## Settlement Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Basis for settlement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Husband</strong></td>
<td>• Granted settlement on the basis of marriage and granted settlement at the same time as the main applicant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Includes civil and unmarried partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wife</strong></td>
<td>• Granted settlement on the basis of marriage and granted settlement at the same time as the main applicant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Includes civil and unmarried partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Children</strong></td>
<td>• 18 years old and below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other dependants</strong></td>
<td>• Parents and grandparents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Other and unspecified dependants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALL OTHERS</strong></td>
<td>• 4 or 5 years with work permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 4 or 5 years free employment – includes ministers of religion, writers and artists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• ‘Other discretionary’ - Includes persons granted indefinite leave outside the immigration rules under measures aimed at clearing the backlog of outstanding unresolved cases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Category unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Citizenship Statistics

1. RESIDENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>s.6(1)</td>
<td>Naturalisation of an adult by virtue of 5 years residence in the United Kingdom or UK Crown service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Others’</td>
<td>Eligibility not restricted by age of applicant:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s.1(4)</td>
<td>Entitlement to registration of a person in the United Kingdom after 1 January 1983 who spent the first ten years of his/her life in the United Kingdom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s.4(2)</td>
<td>Entitlement to registration of a British overseas territories citizen, a British Overseas citizen, a British National (Overseas), a British subject or a British protected person resident in the United Kingdom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s.4B</td>
<td>Entitlement to registration for British overseas citizens, British subjects and British protected persons who have no other citizenship or nationality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s.4C</td>
<td>Entitlement to registration for certain people born after 7 February 1961 and before 1 January 1983 to mothers who were citizens of the United Kingdom and Colonies at the time of their birth.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. MARRIAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>s.6(2)</td>
<td>Naturalisation of an adult who is married to or civil partner under the terms of the Civil Partnership Act (effective from 5 December, 2005) of a British citizen by virtue of 3 years residence in the United Kingdom.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. MINOR CHILDREN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>s.1(3)</td>
<td>Entitlement to registration of a minor born in the United Kingdom after 1 January 1983 when one of his/her parents later becomes a British citizen or becomes settled in the United Kingdom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s.3(2)</td>
<td>Entitlement to registration of a minor less than one year old born outside the United Kingdom after 1 January 1983 (or outside the United Kingdom and the qualifying territories since 21 May 2002) to a parent who was a British citizen by descent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s.3(5)</td>
<td>Entitlement to registration of a minor born outside the United Kingdom after 1 January 1983 (or outside the United Kingdom and the qualifying territories after 21 May 2002) to a parent who was a British citizen by descent where the minor and parents are resident in the United Kingdom or a qualifying territory. References to &quot;qualifying territory&quot; are references to the British overseas territories except for the Sovereign Base Areas of Akrotiri and Dhekelia (in Cyprus).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s.3(1)</td>
<td>Discretionary registration of a minor as a British citizen.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discretionary:** The success of the application depends, either in whole or in part, on the Secretary of State being satisfied on the basis of all the information at his disposal that it would be appropriate to grant it.
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Participant Information Sheet

1. The study

Title: Second-generation Filipinos in London: narrations of identity and belonging

Investigator: Mark O.S. Llangco
Lead Supervisor: Dr Sin Yi Cheung
Co-Supervisor: Dr Gëzim Alpion

You are asked to participate in this study conducted in partial fulfilment of the requirements in MPhil in Sociology for Mark O.S. Llangco. In order to help you decide, this information sheet outlines why the research is being done and what it will involve. Please read the succeeding sections carefully and feel free to ask for clarifications or questions.

2. What is the research about?

Labour migration of Filipinos to the UK which began in the 1960s has resulted into a sizeable population stock of about 203,000 in 2008 (Commission on Filipinos Overseas, 2009). Filipinos rank 16th in the list of largest foreign-born population in the UK (Kofman et.al., 2009). Statistics further show that a significant number of Filipinos and their family members chose to permanently settle in the UK and acquire British citizenship. Over the last 18 years (1990 to 2008), a total of 68,415 Filipinos were accepted for permanent settlement in the UK. And in almost 30 years (1984 to 2008), the UK Government has granted British citizenship to 51,718 Filipinos.

The study focuses on a particular segment of the Filipino population in the UK called the “second-generation” or the children of immigrants. The second-generation is composed of UK-born youth of Philippine-born parents and Philippine-born youth who joined and lived with their parents in the UK before adolescence. Scholars argue that the second and the later generations are “the most consequential and lasting legacy” of immigrants (Portes and Rumbaut, 2001: 18) because their lives are points of contact that raise issues on identity and belonging; and challenge notions of what is Filipino and what is British.

3. Who are the participants?

The study will involve paired participants of (a) a second-generation/youth and (b) a first-generation/parent. It is assumed that the participants are already permanent residents or have already acquired British citizenship. The first-generation parent first arrived in the UK in the 1970s or 80s. The second-generation youth have the following characteristics: aged 18 to 35, male or female, UK-born or Philippine-born, and either one or both of the parents are Philippine-born. There will be a total of 16 pairs.
4. What will happen if I take part and what is involved?
If you agree to take part in the study, interview visits lasting from one (1) to two (2) hours will be scheduled. Interviews with the second-generation/youth will focus on the following themes: (a) experiences of growing up in Britain (b) meanings of becoming ‘Filipino’ or ‘British’. Interviews with the first-generation/parent will cover the following topics: (a) experiences of raising a son/daughter in the UK; and (b) meanings of becoming ‘Filipino’ or ‘British’. As the need may arise, a follow-up interview/visit may be requested by the investigator.

5. What are the risks involved?
It is estimated that there may be potential minimal risks in the study. You may experience some psychological discomfort when telling about experiences of growing up ‘Filipino’ in British society.

6. What can I benefit from the study?
You may not directly benefit from participating in this research. However, the study findings can (a) help address little academic attention to Filipinos in the UK; and (b) help promote awareness about the concerns and issues faced by second-generation Filipinos, especially those who will be coming of age.

7. Confidentiality and anonymity
Your identity will remain anonymous and information about you will be properly coded. Pseudonyms will be used for all references to your narrative. However, you have the right to keep you name in written outputs and future publications that may arise from this research.

8. Data protection and archiving
All data arising from the interview (i.e. audio files, transcripts, etc) are treated as confidential. These data will only be accessible to the investigator and will be kept in a locked cabinet at home. All files stored in the personal laptop, where data will be stored analysed, will be password and encryption protected. All data, physical or electronic, will be properly destroyed four (4) years after the study ends.

9. Research dissemination
A major written output of the study is an MPhil dissertation. Research findings will also be disseminated in public presentations particularly Filipinos communities in the UK. The study will also be presented in professional conferences and be published in journals.

6. Who is funding and conducting the research?
The research will be solely conducted by Mark O.S. Llangco. He is Ford Foundation International Fellow from the Philippines and a doctoral researcher at the University of Birmingham under the MPhil in Sociology programme. The Ford Foundation and the University of Birmingham are indirect sponsors of the research. A two-year scholarship grant was given through the partnership of the two institutions.

Mark was born and raised in Calamba, Laguna, Philippines.
7. Who has reviewed the study?
The study has been reviewed and approved by the Research Ethics Review Committee of the Department of Sociology, University of Birmingham.

For further information and other concerns, you may reach Mark O.S. Llangco at following contact details:

Thank you for reading this information and for considering taking part in the study.
Consent to Participate in a Research Study

1. The study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Second-generation Filipinos in London: narrations of identity and belonging</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investigator</td>
<td>Mark O.S. Llangco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Supervisor</td>
<td>Dr Sin Yi Cheung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-supervisor</td>
<td>Dr Gëzim Alpion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

You are asked to participate in this study conducted in partial fulfilment of the requirements in MPhil Sociology for Mark O.S. Llangco. Before agreeing to participate, it is important that you read and understand what the study involves. At the end of the document, you will be asked to provide your signature to indicate your informed consent to participate.

Participation to the study is your voluntary and free choice. You have the right to withdraw your participation at any stage without having to explain.

2. Purpose of the study

This study about how second-generation Filipinos in London narrate about their cultural identity and belonging as Filipinos and/or British.

The second-generation is composed of (a) UK-born youth of Philippine-born parent(s) and (b) Philippine-born youth who joined and lived with their parent(s) in the UK before adolescence.

The study will involve paired participants of (a) a second-generation/youth and (b) a first-generation/parent. The first-generation parent first arrived in the UK in the 1970s to 80s or earlier. The second-generation youth have the following characteristics: aged 18 to 35, male or female, UK-born or Philippine-born, and either one or both of the parents are Philippine-born. There will be a total of 16 pairs.

3. Description of procedures

If you agree to take part in the study, interview visits lasting from one (1) to two (2) hours will be scheduled. Interviews with the second-generation/youth will focus on the following themes: (a) experiences of growing up in Britain (b) meanings of becoming ‘Filipino’ or ‘British’.

Interviews with the first-generation/parent will cover the following topics: (a) experiences of raising a son/daughter in the UK; and (b) meanings of becoming ‘Filipino’ or ‘British’.

As the need may arise, a follow-up interview/visit may be requested by the investigator.
4. Risks and discomforts

It is estimated that there may be potential minimal risks in the study. You may experience some psychological discomfort when telling about experiences of growing up ‘Filipino’ in British society.

5. Benefits

You may not directly benefit from participating in this research. However, the study findings can (a) help address little academic attention to Filipinos in the UK; and (b) help promote awareness about the concerns and issues faced by second-generation Filipinos, especially those who will be coming of age.

6. Confidentiality and anonymity

Your identity will remain anonymous and information about you will be properly coded. Pseudonyms will be used for all references to your narrative. However, you have the right to keep your name in written outputs and future publications that may arise from this research.

7. Data protection and archiving

All data arising from the interview (i.e. audio files, transcripts, etc) are treated as confidential. These data will only be accessible to the investigator and will be kept in a locked cabinet at home. All files stored in the personal laptop, where data will be stored analysed, will be password and encryption protected. All data, physical or electronic, will be properly destroyed four (4) years after the study ends.

8. Research dissemination

A major written output of the study is an MPhil dissertation. Research findings will also be disseminated in public presentations particularly Filipinos communities in the UK. The study will also be presented in professional conferences and be published in journals.

9. Signatures of consent

Your signature below indicates that you attest to the following:

*I have read and understood the content of this document. The questions that I have asked were satisfactorily answered. I have been informed of my right to withdraw participation without penalty. My participation to the study “Second-generation Filipinos in London: narrations of identity and belonging” is voluntary. I have received a copy of this document to keep.*

(Signature of PARTICIPANT above printed name)                                     Date

(Signature of WITNESS above printed name)                                      Date

MARKO.S. LLANGCO                                                                 Date

(Signature of INVESTIGATOR above printed name)                                  Date
### Table 20 Ellie's I-poem

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I’ve always been aware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I’ve been to Philippines loads of times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>When I was little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I was in secondary school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>When I was younger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I didn’t take really anything in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I went back when I was 21, after university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I was old enough to take things in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I decided to be a bit more involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I’ve known it is about food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I didn’t know the history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I got involved with [name of organisation]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I thought by volunteering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I could learn for myself and help other people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I’ve got a wider group of friends now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>More Filipinos which I never had before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I make an effort to contact my family back in the Philippines</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 21 Jesse's I-poem

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I will be quite brief I would imagine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I was born here</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I was sent over to Philippines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I came back around 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I spent a few years over there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>First language I learned was Ilokano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I wouldn’t say I have much interaction with Filipino culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I was little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I was quite young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I was aware of a lot of Filipino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I was consciously aware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I went to school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I wasn’t very aware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I don’t know but</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I know I was Filipino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I wasn’t really proud to be one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I wasn’t into that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>I got into basketball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>I think</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>He...asked me if I want to play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>I kind of agreed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>I was... 16 going on 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>I was going a bit older</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>I noticed... a lot of Filipinos here</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>I should start getting a bit of my own.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>I just agreed to play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>I get really heavily involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>I got to know it and its culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>My own culture, my own people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>I wasn’t really into it that much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>I guess up to now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>I mean, the bulk of my friends are Filipino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>I wouldn’t say I am the most pro-Filipino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>I am definitely aware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>And I am proud of my heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>But I am also proud of the fact that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>I was born and raised in this country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>I probably wouldn’t have the opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>I have had in the past</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 22 Martin's I-poem

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I’ve always been aware ever since I can remember</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>While I was growing up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>What I viewed as a birthday party is quite different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Every party I went to tends to be based on Filipino-style food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I went to parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I don’t look</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I was a bit dark-skinned when I was younger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>But I look mixed breed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>But I always used to say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I was half-Filipino, half-English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I mean everyone close to me... was always half-Filipino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Sometimes I just say Filipino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>But then I don’t look pure Filipino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I can’t always say half-Filipino, half-English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I’m trying to think</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I say Oriental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I was called yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>I didn’t really care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>I got tapped on that in nickname</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>As I get older</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>I suppose when you go to university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>I started to move away</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>When I was born until I was 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>I was more Filipino than ever</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>I was basically raised by my mum from 8 onwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>I mean, I’ve been to Philippines 9 or 10 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>I was never taught the language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>I was never taught Tagalog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>When I was younger my dad didn’t want me and my mum to talk in Tagalog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>At age 8,...I was just too busy to really notice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>But I obviously know the swear words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>From age 18, I moved away</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>I went to university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>I am meeting other people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>I was mainly hanging out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>I have people from school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>I started to drift away</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>I went to university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>I just hang around</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>You get nick names that I think you never forget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>I graduated from university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>I did quite well there</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I became a manager of the team
I can get away with I realised that
I am really half-Filipino

I moved to a different company
Where I am from?
I am half-Filipino
I would say I am half-Filipino

If I go to Philippines
I’d say England
I am half-Filipino
I’ve obviously come from England
I wouldn’t be there unless there is something mixed in me

I was at a conversation
Oh god, I couldn’t understand it

I can’t really be bothered to explain
I work now
I work in a sales team
I’d say a come back to them
The jokes that I come back with and say stuff
I’ve noticed quite enough

I run funny pictures of famous people
I just funny it funny and I laugh
I get a little bit frustrated
I am proud to be half-Filipino
I didn’t actually get upset

I genuinely think that it is a massive part of you
I know, no girlfriend has ever met my mum
I went out with her for five years
Seven months before I introduced her
When I was with another girl
I wasn’t a hundred percent about her
Whereas I got to meet her mom
I came to pick her up

I mean if I bring you, it’s going to be a bigger deal

I never had them here
I always had to go to theirs

I do not know
I think the family ties are massively different

When I was younger
When I was a teenager
The older I get the more that I wanna see her

I kind of remember once
I got to go
I knew that they both gonna be very upset
I have to pick which one is
I think it is the whole family which is more important
I should have probably
I should apologise
I should though more about it
I've never been really asked
I think that's massively will always be part of my life
I think I've reach a time when people are getting married
If I meet a girl
I don't know how
I am gonna tell her that it has to be a big church
That is more religion I suppose
I used to hang out with second-generation Filipinos
I thought it worked more the other way
I suppose you are fortunate
I don't look that Filipino
I got the dark hair
I am quite fair skinned
I'm very proud to be Filipino
English, I think, that get's lost
When you are half-Filipino
I do think it kind of dominates
I remember all the parties
I don't really like shepherd's pie
I like Filipino food
I was raised with it really
I just can't think of anything else
### Table 23 Marie's I-poem

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I was going to go quite far back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>As far back as I can remember</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I believe I was four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>This woman who I know is my ninang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I was never part of an insular family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I am the eldest of two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>When I was born my father was in the Philippines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I met my father when I was two years old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I was...born and raised with my mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>A lot of Filipinos I have known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Since I was very young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I think on a weekly basis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I haven’t been to Philippines until</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I think I was four or five</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>First experience I had</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I was about four years old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I remember</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>I do remember going to Quezon City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>I saw the lizard coming around</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>I saw my aunt chop the tail of it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>I also remember sitting on the sofa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>I thought, ‘Why are all these animals running around?’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>I remember my uncle has a little pig pen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>I actually shot a rifle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>I didn’t realise, at that time anyway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>I think of all my grandparents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>I am closest to my dad’s father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>I guess... because he could speak very good English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>I think, they were trying to encourage my cousins speak English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>It was the other way around when I was there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Every time I think of Bani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>I always think fondly of my lolo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>I came back to London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>I didn’t come back to Philippines until I was 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>I am hitting around adolescent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Like what I experience when I was four years old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>I was kinda frustrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>I couldn’t speak the language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>From when I was born until I was 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>I believe it is a testament to a lot of young Filipinos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>That is partly the reason why I can’t speak</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I know adobo
I mean you may say it is cliché
I think those are the core values
While I was growing up
When I was in secondary school
I wasn’t part of a group
I was the only Filipino
I did have an issue about my identity
About where I belong
I could mix-in in anybody and with everybody
I noticed there were a lot of Filipino girl groups
I went to an all-girl school

I began to notice this group of Filipina girls
I was a bit of a geek in school
I wasn’t your typical Filipina girl
I wasn’t involved in any of those
I do remember from pictures
I wasn’t part of that
I never actually fit into that
I was always quite geeky
I was ugly Betty
I probably didn’t fit in
I felt very uncomfortable
I started hanging around with more Filipinos

I think it stems from the kids that you grew up with
The godsiser I was living with before
I remember you from the picture of us
I got stuck into that
I pretty much hanging around with them less and less

I didn’t want that
I was too busy and stuck in my life, in my Filipino life in college
I was one of the oldest
I was one of the first to go to university
I left my friends behind in college
I was quite upset about that
I think that hindered my university studies
I said before, my parents drummed in me the importance of education
I realised that I should stop fooling around
My friends are not gonna give me the job that I want
Not going to secure the career that I want
I pursued not only of respect
I just think
I really don’t know what I wanted to do
I don’t have a creative streak
I am not a designer
I know Filipinos are like really creative
I am not like that at all
I really can’t
I am really bad at singing
I got my thing around
I studies harder
I should have got a first
I have to decide on what do i do
What the hell do I do with my life?
Do I really want to join the world of work?
Do I want to travel
Do I want to see the world?

My brother and I – we were never spoiled
'I want this and the other'
I just decided I just go to the Philippines
I hadn't been back since I was 11
I was 22 when I went
I decided to go on my own this time
I don't know the language
I am really not familiar with the layout
From the last time I was there
But I went and stayed there for three months

I worked in Makati for a month
I didn't bother learning the language
I was there for a month
I visited when I was 4
And when I was 11
I had a bit of money
I gained a little bit more independence
I'd run around on my own
I used to go to Glorietta
I just worked down the road

I came back
I dont know if that is coincidence

I have rather odd relationships
He wasn't instilled the same values I was
I tried cooking sinigang for him
I kind of rebelled
I was really rebellious in that sense
I didn't want to belong anymore
I want to gain independence
I started my career as a lawyer
I was trying to reach out to other communities
I lost a few friends
I didnt agree with their traditional views
I dont want to say that is Filipino
I hit 24 to 30 every just want to get married
I didnt want to follow suit
I have been with my partner
Why am I not getting married yet?
Why am I not having kids yet?
I said, I want to pursue my career
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>I am not gonna waste it now by having kids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>I think that is the downside of...a small community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>I think that is the problem that my family had</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>They encouraged my brother and I to pursue career...education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>My brother and I were left...to do whatever we want</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>I just followed my career</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>I took a step out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>I still have my sense of belonging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>I appreciate the importance of family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>I have many friends who have children now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>I am a godmother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>I am a ninang to 9 children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>I wouldn't be if</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>I didn't appreciate the value of our family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>I could easily say no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>I place a great importance on our family values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>But...I need not to be ingrained in the community all the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>‘What am I passing on to my children?’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>I attended a conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>I am Filipino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>I don’t even know that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>Vincent and I and a couple of other people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>I am proud of my parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>If not, I will just be like my boyfriend</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 24 Ellie's We-poem

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>We used to ride that pedal tricycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>we were just riding around</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>we moved to Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>we came here</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>And yeah we go to church in the Philippines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>we just play games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>We play in silence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>We just play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>We go almost every year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>we can do better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Cos we had the [name iof restaurant] gig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>‘cos we never did that and that is something that we learned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>We are the one who wouldn’t fit in the big white group or the South Asian group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>we are the group that didn’t belong in the big ones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>we weren’t the sort of big group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>we just kind of just grouped together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>we grouped together with people like ourselves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>we get to learn about other people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>She used to come in on events that we do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>‘cos we are able to get to know each other’s cultures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>when we don’t know enough of our own.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>we first saw each other March last year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>we used to have calling cards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>we talk to them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>We talk to someone at least once a week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>we have skype between Canada and Philippines all at the same time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>we got everyone together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>we are just talking about our days really</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>we have something that we need to tell them t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>hen we just text them to go online.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Other times we would just go online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>we can always cuddle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>we get so many communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>we can get the message across</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>we don’t have much to do with each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>We only see other maybe when Christmastime or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>when we go and see our grandparents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>We don’t really know them and speak to them</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 25 Jesse's We-poem

we moved houses and
we moved to this neighbourhood.

We were close and
we did a lot of sports together and stuff.
And we got really close and because
we were Filipinos

we had when we were younger kids with
my new Filipino friends

we didn’t have a car back then. But yeah
we would meet quite a bit.

we could relate to the same kind of things –
food is similar, the struggles

Yeah we were not into that
We never know police, no trouble, nothing
when we were younger
And we all knew this
We could have gotten beaten up
we were never to gangs and stuff

and then we had basketball as one of our lessons
we even won for a tournament
We went to places like France

We were really good like
we won three or four games.
We are all average 16 but
we were competing with 30 and 35 year old men.
we have a common thing that we like. Obviously,
we started hanging out
OK. We are very similar.
Table 26 Martin's We-poem

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>all the parties that we went on were Filipino parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>we’d call him midnight....’cos we were just kids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>in school we got nicknames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I just think it is the way we are brought up. I guess when we are introduced to someone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>we have funny pictures on the board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>We call it Shanghai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>we have different types of things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>that is the only frustration when we sometimes say that we are Filipino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>we have the sales board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>we have this little picture of Michael Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>And we’ve got different ones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>We’ve been going out for over a year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>And we can’t have a sit down meal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>We went to play,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>we travelled all the way to Plaistow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Whenever when we met up during the weekend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>sometimes we would just meet because we haven’t seen each other like a month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>we just all developed a love for food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>we have rice with everything</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>we don’t eat spicy food really.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>We don’t have that spicy food,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>we can like eat anything with rice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>we would just be laughing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>And we would talk about it even though</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>we don’t know each other,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>and we are not saying we are the same.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>when we go out, it is not what we do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>And what we all try to do is to get into pubs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>We go into people’s house parties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>we finish sixth form say like 5 o’clock,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>once we’ve hit 17 we might go in,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>if we can get away we are going to a pub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>We are gonna go watch Arsenal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>we are gonna go stay in a pub and go out all day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>We are gonna go out in London</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
But we don’t drink
if they do drink it is not the same as we do.

we have to go to Auntie Cynthia’s on a Saturday
How long have we not seen each other?
we are just naturally good people
we are naturally quite nice people
cos we moved from West London with my mum
We have a joke
we just go down maybe once a year
we would go and see her
They are lovely, we get on
We would normally go back together.
When we went back
We enjoyed it when you go there
we normally go back Easter
we went back Christmas
we celebrate the Christmas Eve
we don’t have turkey.
We have lechon
we live very near the palengke
we’ve watch them whipping their bodies and
we see the blood
we went to Philippines
this August we are going back to the Philippines
we will be going with Aunt Serena
we are all born and raised here
Paul, we are the same. We aren’t really Filipino
we are half
And we just met when
we were too young
we broke up
we will leave it
we became Yellow Team.
we are further from China
we are all second-generation
we all did work at Marriot
we became good friends
We started to talk about it and I used it to my situation
we are going out, we are drinking
### Table 27 Marie's We-poem

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>we've always known that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>even though we are not blood related,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>we are very important to each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>We relied on each other's support system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>we didn’t stray away from the nuclear system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>We found ourselves in a regular family which</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>we’ve learned to be our family although</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>we are not blood related.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>we have always referred to ourselves as cousins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>even though we weren’t in the sense actual cousins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>we went to school together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>we refer to ourselves to our friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>“We just are!”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>we’d write letters to each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>we’d personalise Christmas cards to our family abroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>we are aware of who our blood relatives are.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>we are not used to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>We then moved to the province.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>we moved to my dad’s town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>we were so close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>We are very open and welcoming to our next door neighbours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Every time we had a party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>we would always extend invitation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>We were very hospitable people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>We were not allowed at lunch time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>we have met over the years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>we all can relate to each other at one point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Things that we can relate to –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>who we know; how are we related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>we always appreciated the value of the pounds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>we were never spoiled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>we always had the essentials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>and we are always happy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>We were grateful for what we got.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>appreciate that, whatever little that we had.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>we are grateful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>We have respects for our parents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>we can relate to each other or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>we lived on the same streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>we’ve been together for 11 years now</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
we share a place together.
we have grown up in the UK,
we found ourselves become more segregated with the whole community.
what other values are we going to pass on to the new generation
we realised that there is a need for people to be aware
We are trying to encourage those living in the UK
What we’ve known, what we’ve experienced
we set up [name of organisation]
we would like to encourage
We are all Filipinos – old, new, young, mixed, half, whatever
'We would like you to have kids, within wedlock, please.'
we can both sustain a good relationship and
we can still invest in our careers
that we do better for ourselves and be self-sufficient
We still keep in touch
we don't know that much
or as much as we thought we did.
we followed his rules – studying first, no nursing about.
paid very particular attention to the way we spoke.
we have to do it appropriately.
We sure to have read the dictionary.
where we are, the majority is gone.
we make sure that
we finish our education while mom works
We don't see anything wrong with it
we welcomed and encouraged.
we are where we are today.
This is the job that we knew he would thrive in.
We support him on that
we just have dinner together
we would always look forward to it.
we see each other at school, we’d ask each other
‘Whose house are we going for dinner this time?’
We are not your typical family
We are not a huge fan of public display of affection.
that we know to what a lot of other people know now.
We had a feast in the back garden of my dad’s house
We also used to play tong-its.
we are active
we are always thinking about something
We always need to make sure that we are near
And it is a stark contrast to what we have here. we only go to church We do go to church on Christmas and Good Friday

the comments that we had from our neighbours

We were best friends throughout secondary school. we went to college we both went to an all-girls school Up to now we are best friends But we dated for a while actually what we callously used, us the second-generation

we don’t have a common ground at all. We are miles apart. We are total opposites. But we made it work for 11 years.

We are very fortunate that every single family that we are close with, that we refer to as our cousins were, we are all very conscious in how we spend our money. We didn’t go on extravagant holidays. We knew of people who go to Philippines We can’t do that. We knew of families who provided their kids with everything We couldn’t have that, all the time. Christmas is a nice time because we get our gifts we get what we want from Santa for Christmas we didn’t have the extravagant clothes, We didn’t have the fancy car. We always have a second hand car.

we couldn’t go abroad We drove to Norfolk. We drove to the Lake District. We drove to Wales. We went to Devon. We’d go to Scotland. We were not spoiled.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Emotional attachment</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ellie</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Cousins in the Philippines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Maternal grandmother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Relatives from the father's side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Filipino relatives elsewhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Fellow half-something</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Filipino diaspora in the UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jesse</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Close (Filipino) friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Nuclear family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Age cohort in the neighbourhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• School sports club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Filipino basketball league</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Other ethnic minorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Martin</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Filipinos in general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Other half persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Other second-generation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Philippines (as a country and a as people)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Relatives in the Philippines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Blood cousins and cousins-out-there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Socially extended family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Former girlfriend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Schoolmates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Blood relatives from father side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Childhood friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Workmates (English mates)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marie</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Filipinos in general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Filipino friends in college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Relatives in the Philippines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Nuclear family (parents + brother)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Socially extended family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Boyfriend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Girl schoolmates in high school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Co-second-generation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Civic organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Filipino diaspora in the UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Between Two Cultures</strong> (2008)</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>12 mins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=E3nyL8itoaE">http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=E3nyL8itoaE</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5Yc02VzFe4c">http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5Yc02VzFe4c</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Two Cultures is a 12 minute video A documentary about two Filipinas: Marcella, a student who has spent most of her life in the UK, and Mildred a nanny working overseas in order help give her siblings and education.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Two Cultures is a community project collaboration between The North Kensington Video and Drama Project, The Centre for Filipinos and Phil-UK.com</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>We are...</strong> (2009)</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>3.5 mins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_OBs5fyGVnU">http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_OBs5fyGVnU</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second-generation Filipinos in London describe their fascinating culture and the issues they face.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Through Our Eyes</strong> (2012)</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>24 mins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-VbUFSq1No4">http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-VbUFSq1No4</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 24-minute documentary on the life of second-generation immigrants. This documentary tells the stories of four Canadian-born individuals with foreign-born parents providing details about their differing experiences growing up in what is sometimes seen as two worlds moving at different speeds. As this piece suggests, this is not a generalized account of the &quot;second-generation immigrant experience&quot;. It's merely the world as we've seen and experienced it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>We are one Filipino</strong> (2010)</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>4.5 mins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9LLjgPHtzdE">http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9LLjgPHtzdE</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBO Def Poet Asia records &quot;We Are One Filipino&quot;, a poem about Philippine pride written for WeAreOneFilipino.com</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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