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CHAPTER I - PANETHNICITY, ASSIMILATION, AND SOCIAL BOUNDARIES

“...all of these things come together, [...] it all comes together at this point of understanding the newcomers and providing support. So for all those reasons, [Latino-Jewish collaboration] is a natural, interwoven destiny. And it's important that we should think of it that way.”

In early spring of 2015, the Jewish Federation of a southern city hosted its annual community Seder, with a theme that centered on the intersections of Jewish and Latino histories and identities. The large banquet hall was set up with dozens of circular tables, upon which rested the traditional elements of the Seder plate. Upon each place setting sat the Haggadah, the guide to the Seder that, for this event, was interspersed with Spanish songs and accounts of the historical ties between Latinos and Jews. The room echoed with a chorus of “Let my people go” performed by a band, as the who’s who of the local Latino and Jewish communities mixed and mingled. City politicians, academics, community leaders, and business owners laughed and conversed as they waited for the formal program to begin. The hosts for the evening were two prominent members of the Latino community – one of them also Jewish. They provided a quick introduction to the evening, addressing the audience of more than 200 and expressing to them the great honor it was to celebrate this event with the Jewish community.

The keynote speaker was the honorable Henry Cisneros, former U.S. Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and mayor of San Antonio. After a brief welcome from leaders in the Jewish community, Cisneros was invited to come up and speak. With the ease of a seasoned politician, he thanked the organizers for the invitation and applauded the city for its foresight in encouraging collaboration across the Latino and Jewish communities. Latinos, he explained, had a deep admiration for the American Jewish community and could learn a lot from its struggles and victories. In his address, Cisneros wove a narrative of commonality, referencing the spiritual devotion, importance of family, and history of immigration of both groups. For these
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reasons, he explained, Latinos and Jews share a strong connection. He cited Jewish assimilation as one of the most successful in U.S. history and maintained that Latinos would do well to follow in their footsteps. Cisneros also illuminated the ways in which the success of U.S. Latinos should be of great importance to the Jewish community. He pointed to the statistics, explaining that by 2050, close to a quarter of the population would be Latino. Will this community be integrated, he asked, or will they be marginalized? The answer would be decided by the efforts of both groups.

In this unique interaction between Latinos and Jews, Cisneros’s speech fostered a feeling of collaboration and an excitement derived from breaking down barriers and bridging communities. The evening unfolded with a ceremony led by an Argentinian rabbi and was enriched with Spanish music and a dinner of vegetarian tacos. As the wine flowed, the banquet room buzzed with the excitement of cross-ethnic collaboration and the promise of future cultural exchange.

Cisneros’s speech illustrates that panethnic identities – like Latino and Asian – are more than just categories. Ethnic community leaders utilize and leverage panethnicity to various ends and navigate social boundaries in strategic ways. In a single speech, Cisneros both blurred the lines between Latinos and Jews – using common values and historical similarities as bridging mechanisms – and pointed out the differences between the two groups, relying on markers of Jewish immigrant assimilation to point to the distance Latinos have yet to achieve. This event also illustrates how the social boundaries that define ethnic groups are malleable, contextual, and evolving. When two groups meet, their perceived similarities and differences have implications for how individuals interact and understand one another.
Interactions between ethnic groups have become commonplace in contemporary U.S. society. Making up approximately one-fourth of the population, immigrants and their children have a visible presence in the social landscape (Zong and Batalova 2015). Unlike prior waves of immigrants, recent migrants are increasingly settling in non-traditional immigrant gateways, and the most rapid growth in the foreign-born population has occurred in new destination cities in the South and Midwest (Singer 2004; Donato et al. 2008; Massey 2008). Immigrant newcomers come largely from non-European nations and span the socioeconomic spectrum, with both professional and less skilled migrants arriving in large numbers over the past 50 years. As such, the black-white racial dichotomy that has long dominated U.S. race relations is shifting (O’Brien 2008; Bonilla-Silva 2004; Lee and Bean 2007; Rodriguez 1992).

The categories of white, black, Hispanic, Asian, and Native American are now largely taken for granted, legitimized by individuals, organizations, and the state (Choldin 1986; Hollinger 1995; Hochschild and Powell 2008; Mora 2014a, 2014b). They also often conflate race with ethnicity. Although prior literature distinguishes between race and ethnicity, contemporary researchers call for a conversation that recognizes the racialization of particular ethnic groups while acknowledging the shifting boundaries of racial categories (Golash-Boza & Darity 2008; Valdez & Golash-Boza 2017). As such, panethnic categories are often treated as distinct racial groups (Kao and Joyner 2006; Okamoto 2014).

Panethnicity is “the construction of a new categorical boundary through the consolidation of ethnic, tribal, religious, or national groups […] uniquely defined by an inherent tension derived from maintaining subgroup distinctions while developing a sense of metagroup unity” (Okamoto and Mora 2014: 221). Prior studies trace the emergence of panethnicities (Choldin 1986; Cornell 1988; Espiritu 1992; Gómez 1992; Lien 2010; Mora 2014a, 2014b; Okamoto
Some point to the role of community leaders who constructed these categories during the late 1960s, as organizations and politicians inspired by the Civil Rights Movement advocated for their respective communities and urged government agencies to distribute needed resources (Espiritu 1992; Gómez 1992; Mora 2014a, 2014b). These leaders acted as cultural brokers, granting institutions access to the ethnic community and, in turn, facilitating the assimilation of their more disenfranchised co-ethnics into the mainstream (Zhou and Kim 2001; Okamoto 2014). Such brokering practices continue to this day, as community leaders are often endowed with important forms of capital that grant them influence in most social arenas. Ethnic leaders, in particular, occupy a unique social location. They may straddle a divide that exists between mainstream society and ethnic communities, as disadvantaged by their ethnic and immigrant backgrounds but privileged by high levels of human, social, and/or cultural capital.

Panethnicity is an analytically useful concept to examine for several reasons. First, it is a flexible, layered, and non-competing identity such that – in theory – an individual can identify with both an ethnic and panethnic group without conflict. Second, although panethnic categories may be less intuitive than ethnic or national origin identities, they are important for understanding how people come to arrive at a social boundary and how their perceptions, behaviors, and affiliations may shift as a result. Third, panethnicities are important because they directly challenge the black-white racial dichotomy that has long-defined U.S. race relations. O’Brien (2008) describes the two panethnicities at the center of this dissertation – Asian and Latino – as a “racial middle” that complicates the ethnoracial order by challenging the black-white dichotomy. Fourth, while panethnic categories have increasingly become institutionalized, legitimized, and widely accepted (Espiritu 1992; Okamoto 2014; Mora 2014a, 2014b), some scholars argue that new panethnic groups may still eventually find themselves on either side of
the black-white color line (Lee and Bean 2007, 2010). As such, the eventual location of these
groups remains to be seen.

This dissertation examines the panethnic social boundaries of Asian and Latino
community leaders – under what conditions they begin to take meaning, what consequences
these boundaries have once identified, and what strategies community leaders use to navigate
them. Using a comparative research design that compares two panethnic groups and two
different city contexts, the dissertation offers a nuanced examination of how community leaders
utilize, leverage, and navigate their panethnic identities. In this chapter, I set the context for the
dissertation by reviewing studies about immigrant assimilation, illustrating how it is strongly tied
to the formation of social boundaries, and about panethnicity, describing the emergence and
evolution of Asian and Latino panethnic categories and how community leaders define them.
Afterwards, I outline my research questions and describe my data and research methods. Finally,
I detail the structure of the dissertation and briefly summarize each empirical chapter.

LITERATURE REVIEW

THE NEW ASSIMILATION: PROCESSES OF BOUNDARY MAKING

While early scholars understood assimilation as a process by which immigrants
inevitably adopt the values and behaviors of the core society (Gordon 1964; Thomas and
Znaniecki 1927; Park 1950; Warner and Srole 1945), more recent studies emphasize the
simultaneous and diverse interactions between foreign and native born (Alba and Nee 1997,
2003). The shift away from a simple positive assimilation process to one that encompasses the
ways in which natives shift in response to immigrants and how immigrants adapt to natives is
correlated with important demographic changes that have occurred in the past half-century.
Following the Hart-Cellar Act of 1965, which abolished restrictive immigration quotas based on
national origin, the foreign-born population became substantially more diverse (Keely 1971; Tichenor 2002). The national origins of post-1965 immigrant cohorts were considerably different from earlier migrants, and they spanned the socioeconomic spectrum. Both low and high skilled labor migrants and their families arrived in record numbers from many countries worldwide. Scholars quickly noted that unlike their earlier counterparts, newcomers’ pathways were segmented and shaped by both interpersonal and contextual factors (Portes and Zhou 1993). Brubaker (2001) went so far as to rebuff the entire notion of assimilation, preferring to talk instead about pathways of immigrant incorporation.

Alba and Nee (1997, 2003) argued in support of assimilation. However, they reframe the concept to include the process of convergence, whereby the boundaries between immigrants and natives narrow over time as people take part in a cumulative process of everyday rational decision-making in pursuit of economic mobility. For example, most non-English speaking U.S. immigrants learn English as a necessary strategy for survival and advancement. At the same time, the mainstream itself adopts some cultural elements of its newcomers. In this way, “immigrant ethnicity has affected American society as much as American society has affected it” (Alba 1999: 7). This process of mutual exchange results in a weakening of social boundaries across groups.

Contemporary social scientists now define assimilation as a dynamic process of negotiation in which the boundaries that define particular groups relax and converge and result in some fluidity across ethnic boundaries (Alba and Nee 2003; Wimmer 2008a, 2008b). Zolberg and Woon (1999: 8) emphasize the relational foundations of assimilation and argue that “the process of incorporation can be thought of as the negotiations in which hosts and immigrants engage around [the] boundaries [between ‘us’ and ‘not us’].” Immigrants, they assert, engage in
three distinct processes: boundary crossing, boundary blurring, and boundary shifting. Boundary crossing occurs when individuals change and adopt traits of the host society to move from one side of the boundary to the other. Boundary blurring is a macro-level process whereby identities overlap and make it challenging for individuals to be in an exclusive category. Finally, boundary shifting comes after considerable crossing and blurring, resulting in the move of a complete group from one side of a boundary to the other.

However, boundaries are not all the same and the ease with which they can be traversed depends on their contextual saliency. In a comparison of second-generation minority groups in the United States, Germany, and France, Alba (2005) describes social boundaries as bright or blurred and their implications for assimilation and exclusion. Bright boundaries are those that are especially salient, hard to penetrate, and unambiguous. In contrast, blurred boundaries are less salient, substantially more porous, and ambiguous. For example, for U.S.-born Mexicans, phenotypic appearance is an important determinant of whether race is a bright or blurred boundary. For those who have more indigenous features the boundary looms bright, while for those with lighter skin and/or fewer indigenous features race is a blurred boundary. Among Maghrebins and Turks in France and Germany, respectively, religion, not race, is a bright boundary. Generally speaking, the degree to which boundaries are bright or blurred depends on context and group history, as boundaries are the product of cultural and institutional forces.

Ethnicity is a social boundary that assumes common descent and is defined by both symbolic and social components (Weber 1968). Lamont and Molnár (2002) describe symbolic boundaries as conceptual distinctions that foster feelings of groupness and categorize people and things. Social boundaries are concrete representations of social difference, with implications for the distribution of power, material, and symbolic resources. Symbolic boundaries thus “enforce,
maintain, normalize, or rationalize social boundaries” and often influence resource distribution (Lamont and Molnár 2002:186).

Symbolic boundary making may also result in within-group distinctions that do not immediately result in distinct resource allocation. Waters and Lamont (1999) describe how middle and working-class West Indian immigrants distinguished themselves from native-born blacks by asserting an immigrant identity and de-emphasizing race as an obstacle to mobility (something they feel their U.S.-born peers fail to do). Jiménez (2008) sees similar boundary marking among later-generation Mexican Americans who often fall victim to the same nativist response given to recent Mexican immigrants. To distance themselves from this stigma, Mexican Americans employed a number of strategies including stressing their American nationality, inserting class markers like credit cards or homeownership into conversations with non-Mexicans, and avoiding places that are frequented by Mexican immigrants and their families.

In these examples, symbolic boundary making is a strategy for groups to distinguish themselves from other low status groups as they integrate into dominant society. Historically, there have been several examples of groups aspiring to whiteness because of the privileges, advantages, and power that come with being white. In the antebellum United States, white workers distinguished themselves from slaves and blacks to claim a white identity (Roediger 1991). Later, the Irish, recognizing that “to enter the white race was a strategy to secure an advantage in a competitive society,” earned their white status by showing incredible hostility against blacks (Ignatiev 2009:3). This racial animosity is not exclusive to who we now refer to as white ethnics (Wong 1996). Tired of their children being excluded from the better white schools, Chinese leaders in the Mississippi Delta in the early 20th century forbade their community from engaging with blacks, with which the Chinese had frequently intermarried and conducted
business. So extreme were these distancing practices that Chinese men who were married to black women were strongly pressured to abandon their mixed race families.

Despite these historical examples, many studies of race and ethnic identity do not engage with each other. Recent studies, however, examine how racialization and exclusion are related to the adoption of particular identities and opportunities for minority groups to achieve parity with the dominant group (Cheng 2014; Golash-Boza 2006; Valdez & Golash-Boza 2017). Bridging ethnic and racial paradigms – the former with language of inclusion and latter with exclusion – reveals how racial/ethnic boundaries remain salient among even the most assimilated (Lee and Kye 2016). In fact, contemporary assimilation shifts as people adopt intermediary identities related to race and ethnicity. Some believe that people are “becoming more American through asserting, not discarding, their ethnic boundaries” (Dhingra 2008:45). Alba (2005:25) also notes that groups may exhibit a more complicated and nuanced assimilation pathway:

Assimilation may be eased insofar as the individuals undergoing it do not sense a rupture between participation in mainstream institutions and familiar social and cultural practices and identities; and they are not forced to choose between the mainstream and their group of origin. Assimilation of this type involves intermediate, or hyphenated stages, that allow individuals to feel simultaneously as members of an ethnic minority and of the mainstream.

Although panethnicity may reflect an intermediate or hyphenated stage of assimilation whereby identification occurs with acculturation and acceptance of a unique ethnoracial schema, it remains to be seen whether panethnicity is part of an assimilation trajectory or a destination itself.

PANETHNIC CATEGORIES AND SELF-IDENTIFICATION

Studies of panethnicity are integrally tied to the literatures on social boundaries and assimilation. Quite simply, this research examines how ethnic boundaries are dynamic constructions, contestations, and affirmations derived from a series of negotiations (Espiritu
Recent studies contribute to areas in which ethnic boundaries are of central interest, including marriage and partner selection (Choi and Tienda 2017; Feliciano 2001; Fu 2007; Kibria 1997; Okamoto 2007; Qian and Cobas 2004; Rosenfeld 2001; Telles and Sue 2009), residential segregation (Kim and White 2010), identity (Golash-Boza 2006; Masuoka 2006; Morning 2001; Jones-Correa and Leal 1996; Li 2016; Schachter 2014), and ethnic mobilization (Padilla 1985; Espiritu 1992; Lopez and Espiritu 1990; Okamoto 2003, 2014; Nakano 2013). However, processes of panethnic formation are distinct from other types of boundary construction because they do not simply bring people together. They are informed by the recognition of internal diversity. As Okamoto and Mora (2014:221) recognize, “Rather than force individuals to choose whether they are Mexican or Hispanic, for example, [panethnic leaders] exalt diversity and claim that panethnic identities are complementary to subgroup ones.”

At the center of my dissertation are two populations – Latinos and Asians – which have been viewed as separate groups with separate negotiated panethnic identities (Mora 2014a, 2014b; Okamoto 2003, 2006, 2014). Comparing how these panethnicities emerged reveals a great deal about how new identities are formed, adopted, and institutionalized. Both groups share histories of push and pull migration to the United States, aggressively recruited for their labor at times and quickly pushed out during periods of economic distress during other times. Among Latinos, Mexicans have the longest sustained relationship with the United States given that Mexico-U.S. migration has been the largest sustained out-migration between two countries during the 20th century (Massey et al 2002). However, since the mid-20th century, Puerto Ricans, Colombians, Cubans, and Dominicans have also migrated in large numbers (Levitt 1965; Portes and Bach 1985; Portes and Stepick 1993; Rabe 1996; Riosmena 2010; Tichenor 2002). Among
Asians, the Chinese and Japanese largely dominated migration more than a century ago. As targets of restrictive migration legislation, such as the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 and the Gentlemen’s Agreement of 1907-1908 (Ong, Bonacich and Cheng 1994; Tichenor 2002), Chinese and other Asian migration declined until after the abolition of national origin quotas in 1965. Since then, many Chinese, South Asian Indians, Koreans, Vietnamese, and Filipinos have immigrated to the United States.

Despite their differences, Latino and Asian groups have found themselves at the center of historical debates around race and whiteness. In the early 1900s, whites in the Mississippi Delta differentiated the Chinese from blacks and allowed Chinese children to attend white schools (Wong 1996). For decades, Mexicans were classified as white in the U.S. Census, the result of an agreement between the Mexican and U.S. governments following the Treaty of Guadalupe (Dowling 2014). When the Census Bureau listed Mexicans as their own racial category in 1930, Mexican government and ethnic leaders protested and fought for the reclassification of Mexicans as white in the 1940 census (Foner and Frederickson 2004). Thus, both Latinos and Asians have long occupied a “racial middle” (O’Brien 2008:1) and scholars debate whether they will become absorbed into the white category (similar to earlier European immigrants) or shift the existing racial binary (Bonilla-Silva 2004; Lee and Bean 2007, 2010; O’Brien 2008).

These histories are important because they underlie political battles that have sparked heated debates around race and belonging. In 1964, President Johnson signed the Civil Rights Act, legitimating the rights of racial and ethnic minority groups and barring discrimination based on race, sex, national origin, color or religion. The following year, Johnson also enacted the Voting Rights Act, ensuring that all citizens, regardless of race or ethnicity, had a protected right to vote. Ethnic communities banded together to take advantage of the new legislation, pushing
for recognition as disenfranchised minority groups and demanding better enumeration of their communities by government officials (Espiritu 1992; Lopez and Espiritu 1992; Mora 2014a, 2014b; Okamoto 2003, 2014). This mobilization unfolded in distinct ways for Asians and Latinos.

For Asians, the formation of a panethnic identity began with second-generation Chinese, Japanese, Korean and Filipino college students on the West Coast, recognizing a common racialization across national origin groups (Espiritu 1992; Okamoto 2014). These U.S. born children, removed from the animosities felt by their parents and grandparents, formed pan-national student groups, held conferences, and pushed for the creation of Asian American studies programs in their universities. Asian American panethnic consciousness soon developed at the national government level, particularly when it came to racial classification and Census categories in the 1980s and 90s. Given the choice to operate as single-ethnic groups or to create a panethnic advisory committee, Asian leaders opted for the latter (Okamoto 2014). This effort led to the inclusion of additional national origin options in the 1980 Census, despite a proposal from the Census Bureau to collapse options like Chinese and Japanese into just one Asian category (Espiritu 1992).

Latino panethnicity also originated from the efforts of political and community elites. With the three largest Spanish-speaking groups – Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, and Cubans – largely isolated from one another across the country, there was little opportunity for grassroots mobilizing. Although some examples of cross-ethnic collaboration between Latino groups exist (Padilla 1985), most coalition building began in the 1960s among Hispanic politicians, who strongly advocated for adding a panethnic option in the U.S. Census to increase the visibility of the Spanish-speaking population (Choldin 1986; García 1992; Mora 2014a, 2014b). These
political elites also collaborated with leaders outside of politics. Three organizations – National Council of La Raza, Univision, and the Census Bureau – worked interdependently to legitimate Latinos as a category and shift away from specific concerns of national-origin groups to broad and inclusive panethnic interests (Dávila 2001; Mora 2014a, 2014b). In 1980, the Hispanic question was added to the U.S. Census and national organizations reframed their missions to reflect Latino/Hispanic panethnicity.

These examples illustrate how state and political contexts play crucial roles in the institutionalization of panethnic identities. Demands of blacks for equality during the 1960s and the civil rights policies that resulted from these struggles incentivized Asian and Latino leaders to form cross-ethnic coalitions to more effectively advocate for their communities (Espiritu 1992; Mora 2014a, 2014b; Padilla 1985). However, the role of the state in helping to form panethnic identities is contingent upon historical context and on whether the state is being compensatory or punitive. While Asian and Latino panethnicities were compensated by the state in the 1960s, Bozorgmehr, Ong, and Tosh (2016) consider how the punitive nature of the state in the post 9/11 era contributes to the lack of panethnic formation for people of Middle Eastern and South Asian background, despite both groups being targets of heavy surveillance and discrimination post 9/11. Some groups distance themselves from panethnic labels to avoid the associated stigma being delivered by the state.

Ethnic leaders have historically encouraged and advocated for the formation of a panethnic identity. They are active agents in framing narratives around their community, engaging in boundary brokering, and actively negotiating their identities with mainstream actors (García 1992; Mora 2014a, 2014b; Okamoto 2014). From interviews with Asian Americans, Okamoto (2014) finds that political leaders were pivotal in the construction of a panethnic
narrative that created a unified identity based on shared histories of exclusion and discrimination. In their study of Latin American immigrant women in Queens, Ricourt and Danta (2003) describe how community leaders promote a united pan-Latino organizations and political voice. In both examples, ethnic organizations and political leadership are central to collaboration; they forge trust between distinct communities and reframe issues to reveal commonalities that span across specific ethnic and/or national boundaries. Wimmer (2007: 1038) describes how ethnic leaders “see the privilege of authenticity where others perceived the disgrace of minority status; they are proud of the culture of their forefathers instead of being ashamed of how primitive their customs appeared in the eyes of dominant groups; they re-interpreted historical defeat and subjugation into a heroic struggle against injustice and domination.” Indeed, in uplifting and defending their communities, ethnic leaders actively reinforce and affirm the ethnic and panethnic identities.

Yet the existence of a panethnic category does not guarantee immediate identification. In fact, quantitative studies of Asian and Latino panethnicity reveal how patterns of identification vary. Jones-Correa and Leal (1996) find that Latino panethnic identification increases with more distance from the migration process and with higher levels of education. National origin groups differ in their propensity for these labels, with more Mexicans than Cubans identifying panethnically. Masuoka (2006) finds that high income, Democratic affiliation, and racial discrimination are positively associated with panethnic consciousness among Asians. For Latinos, panethnicity is associated with higher levels of education, perceived discrimination, and being female. Moreover, compared to Hispanics, Asians adolescents are more panethnic in their friendship choices (Kao and Joyner 2006).
Although prior studies offer insights about variation in panethnicity and the external and interpersonal attributes that correlate with it, they tell us little about what these identities mean and the experiences that people have using these labels. As mentioned earlier, panethnic identification is not static or fixed, and the identities may be ignited at different times and for different reasons. Writing about Filipinos, a group that he describes as the “Latinos of Asia,” Ocampo explores the idea of “panethnic moments,” instances in which his respondents “feel a sense of collective identity or ‘we-ness’ with some other group outside of their ethnic community” (2014: 213). These moments reveal a great deal about the contexts under which panethnicity emerges.

Studies find that panethnic options vary by race, ethnicity, skin color, or phenotype (Waters 1990; Kibria 2002; Golash-Boza 2006; Golash-Boza and Darity 2008). The propensity for panethnic identification is higher among those who are phenotypically seen as a racial other (Golash-Boza 2006; Golash-Boza and Darity 2008). Because race is a defining marker in U.S. society, often used to influence social interactions (Omi and Winant 1986), feelings of racialization and shared discrimination are tied to panethnic identification (Golash-Boza and Darity 2008; Valdez and Golash-Boza 2017; Kibria 2002). Golash-Boza (2006:35) reveals interesting in-group distinctions among Latinos in a process she calls “racialized assimilation” by which “racial status plays a key role in immigrant adaptation” and identify formation varies according to perceived race. While Latinos with lighter skin are expected to follow an assimilation pathway similar to white ethnics and become American, those with darker skin and who have experienced discrimination are more likely to develop hyphenated or panethnic identities than their peers. Similarly, Kibria’s (2002) work on second generation Chinese and Korean-Americans suggests racialization as Asians by outsiders results in the adoption of a
panethnic identity. One study of Asian and Latino law students finds that panethnicity informs professional obligations and panethnic burden, even for those for whom panethnicity is not a central identity (Pan 2015).

On the whole, prior studies document the ways in which panethnic categories have been constructed, vary by key social attributes, and how states and communities influence their adoption. However, a number of questions remain unanswered. My dissertation asks the following questions. First, when and under what conditions do community leaders become panethnic? Second, how do community leaders leverage these identities in pursuit of upward social mobility and community empowerment? Third, how does a sense of belonging to a panethnic group inform the ways in which individuals navigate these social boundaries?

ASIAN AND LATINO PANEThNICITIES

While the terms Asian and Latino are now commonly used and appear straightforward to many, the boundaries around these identities are complex. People can choose to identify by national origin, panethnicity, both or neither. Much of the complexity has to do with the inherent diversity within the groups. The categories of Asian and Latino embody individuals from a wide array of national origins, languages, religions, immigration histories, and racial identities.

In the United States, people of Latin American or Spanish descent are often classified under one of two terms: Hispanic or Latino. The U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB), the entity charged with enumeration, uses standard definitions for racial and ethnic categories. The OMB defines someone who is Hispanic/Latino as a person of Cuban, Mexican, Puerto Rican, South or Central American, or other Spanish culture, regardless of race. Research shows that these categories do not always reflect how people identify. A nationwide survey of Latinos found that just a quarter (24 percent) prefers a panethnic identity. Half (51 percent) of
Latinos prefer to identify by their family’s country of origin (Taylor et al. 2012). Nationally, half of Latinos indicate no preference for either term but of those that do, more than double prefer Hispanic to Latino – 33 percent vs 14 percent (Taylor et al. 2012). For simplicity’s sake, I use Latino to refer to people who identify as either Hispanic and Latino.¹

Asian panethnicity is no less diverse. The OMB defines someone who is Asian as a person with origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East, Southeast Asia, or the Indian subcontinent including Cambodia, China, India, Japan, Korea, Malaysia, Pakistan, the Philippine Islands, Thailand, and Vietnam. Like their Hispanic/Latino counterparts, most Asians prefer to identify by their country origin. Only one-fifth of Asians nationally describe themselves as Asian-American or Asian (Pew Research Center 2012). For simplicity’s sake, I use the term Asian to describe all respondents of Asian background, with the understanding that some identify strongly as Asian-American.

Latinos and Asians often appear in comparative projects (see Jones-Correa and Leal 1996; Kao and Joyner 2006; Masuoka 2006; Pan 2015) because they are the largest and fastest-growing minority groups in the United States, respectively. Demographically, both groups have rapidly outpaced predictions about growth in the 21st century. Between 2000 and 2010, the number of Latinos increased by approximately 43 percent; 2016 estimates put them at 17.8 percent of the total U.S. population, or 57.4 million people (Stepler and Brown 2016; U.S. Census Bureau 2016). Despite a recent decline in U.S. immigration, which has slowed growth of the Latino population, Latinos still represent nearly one-third (31 percent) of all newcomers

¹ The term Latino, although widely utilized, has gendered implications. As a result, scholars, media, and institutions of higher education have started using the gender-neutral alternative Latinx (see Salinas and Lozano 2017). I use Latino because I used it with my respondents in interviews.
(Passel, Cohn, and Lopez 2011; Zong and Batalova 2015). Mexicans make up by far the largest group (64 percent of all Latinos), followed by Puerto Ricans (9.6 percent), Salvadorans (3.8 percent), Cubans (3.7 percent), and Dominicans (3.2 percent). Additionally, nearly 35 percent of Latinos are foreign born, meaning most Latinos are born in the United States.

Asians make up slightly more than five percent of the U.S. population (5.2 percent), or 18.2 million people. Between 2000 and 2010, the Asian share of all new immigrants leaped from 19 to 36 percent. As with Latinos, those classified as Asian come from a wide array of national origins; the largest groups are Chinese (22 percent), Filipinos (18.8 percent), Indians (17.5 percent), Vietnamese (9.5 percent), Koreans (9.4 percent), and Japanese (7.2 percent). Unlike Latinos, nearly three-quarters of Asian adults (age 18 and older) were born outside of the states (Pew Research Center 2017).

DATA AND RESEARCH METHODS

This study examines social boundaries through the lens of panethnicity. It begins by asking what panethnic labels like Latino and Asian mean to community leaders and examines the conditions under which their panethnic consciousness emerged. The analysis also reveals how panethnic leaders leverage this identity for upward mobility and then considers how belonging to a panethnic group is associated with the strategies that community leaders use to navigate social boundaries. The data for this study derive from interviews with 94 Asian and Latino community leaders in two U.S. cities – one a traditional immigrant gateway, the other a new destination city. This two-fold comparison between Asians and Latinos in new vs. traditional gateways offers important analytical leverage for unpacking processes of boundary making between groups and across research sites. I build on existing studies to interrogate the specific personal and
contextual factors that lead to panethnic identification, determine the pathways that result from panethnicity, and describe distinct navigational strategies that are based on strength of ties to a panethnic group.

RESEARCH SITES

My dissertation relies on interviews I conducted in two large U.S. cities, each representing a distinct socio-political context. Differences across the two research sites are characterized by striking variations in migration patterns, demographic landscapes, and racial histories. As Alba (2005: 41) explains, “boundaries do not have the same character everywhere; and though invariably they do allow for some assimilation to occur, the terms under which this happens vary from one societal context to another.” Thus, one strength of the dissertation is its attention to differences across the two cities.

Although most Asians and Latinos live in a handful of U.S. states – California, Hawaii, Texas, Florida, New York, New Jersey, and Illinois – demographers and journalists have documented rapid growth of the two groups in cities located in the South and Midwest. These new immigrant destinations have seen an unprecedented growth in their immigrant population as a result of changes to U.S. immigration policy and strong economic growth. Immigration policy passed in 1986 offered opportunities for three million immigrants to become legal permanent residents and pursue job opportunities in non-traditional immigrant gateways (Donato and Massey 1992; Massey, Durand and Malone 2002; Singer 2009).

My first research site is a new immigrant destination city, which I call New South. Politically, New South is neither distinctly conservative nor liberal; it is a relatively progressive city in an otherwise conservative state (Bay Area Center for Voter Research 2005). At the time of my interviews in 2015, Census data placed New South’s population at approximately 648,000
people. Between 1980 and 2000, the city experienced a 74 percent increase in the number of immigrants. This growth continued into the 21st century, when the foreign-born population doubled from approximately 58,000 to 124,000 between 2000 and 2010. In 2014, immigrants made up 8.5 percent of New South’s total metropolitan population (Donato 2014). Latinos and Asians (both native and foreign born) made up 10 percent and 3 percent of the city’s population, respectively (U.S. Census Bureau 2013a).

My second research site, a city I call Gateway Coast, represents a traditional immigrant gateway distinct from New South in several ways. First, it is a larger city, with census estimates placing the city’s population at around 840,000 residents (U.S. Census 2015b). Second, the foreign born made up a much larger percentage of the population in Gateway Coast; more than one in three people (35.1 percent) were born outside the United States (U.S. Census Bureau 2015c). Third, Latino and Asian populations represented a substantially greater proportion of the total population in Gateway Coast. It was one of only a few in which Asians constituted a majority, outnumbering Latinos by more than 2:1. Asians represented 34.5 percent of the city’s population, while Latinos made up 15.2 percent (U.S. Census Bureau 2015c). So striking is this context that respondents themselves (particularly those who had grown up outside of Gateway Coast) commented on how distinct this setting was from other cities. Finally, Gateway Coast has a long history of panethnic organizing and is known for being a largely progressive city (Bay Area Center for Voting Research 2005; Nakano 2013).

THE INTERVIEWS

I conducted open-ended interviews with 94 Asian and Latino community leaders. I focused on community leaders for a number of reasons. First, ethnic leaders have a great deal of influence and often develop the social boundary narratives for their particular communities. Second, community leaders are often knowledgeable about the social and political landscape in
which they find themselves and provide a great deal of history and context. Third, from a feasibility standpoint, community leaders are often easy to connect with via email or on professional social media platforms, such as LinkedIn. To be eligible for interviews, leaders needed to fulfill three criteria: (1) they identified as, or were identified by others as, Asian or Latino; (2) they lived and/or worked in either of the two cities; and (3) they were identified as community leaders or considered themselves leaders in some capacity. Such criteria created a sample of respondents from a variety of backgrounds, including politics, academia, government, business, and the non-profit sector.

I created my initial pool of respondents by searching (pan)ethnic organizations, community recognitions, and local media personalities in each of the two research sites. In New South, where there were fewer organizations, I also reached out to local churches to ask them to identify individuals who met my criteria. I communicated primarily by email and from there used a snowball sampling method to build my pool of potential interviewees, asking respondents at the conclusion of each interview to recommend someone they thought met the three criteria and whom they thought would contribute to the study.

Interviews lasted between 45-75 minutes and were held in locations specified by respondents. Several were conducted by phone. The interviews were recorded with the consent of participants and later transcribed by me or by a contracted third-party. I took an inductive approach, asking respondents about panethnic identification, the relationship between their panethnic and ethnic identities, and what role panethnicity played in their lives. I used an unstructured interview guide that contained questions focused on groups, panethnic identity, and its influence on their lives. In addition to the interviews, respondents also completed a short
demographic survey. The appendix contains the structured interview guides and the demographic surveys.

**ANALYSIS**

To examine the transcribed interview data, I first created memos that outlined various themes related to demographic information, identity, boundary work, and context. The memos helped organize the interviews into three groups: panethnic identification, group affiliation, and boundary strategies.

Using an inductive approach, I analyzed the transcripts using Atlas ti, coding key terms and phrases related to each of the three thematic areas. Under the area of panethnic identification, I began by coding the words “prefer”, “identify”, “label,” and “term”. I followed with a second round of coding, in which I became interested in when individuals become panethnic and used the phrase “first time” to search for these narratives.

I then coded group affiliation with the terms “belong”, “community”, “group,” and “other” to capture ties to a particular community. I went back a second time to search for “organization,” “association,” and “group.” While these codes were useful, I also went through individual memos and transcripts to try to understand how respondents were framing their group affiliation because some narratives did not utilize any key search words.

The third area, boundary strategies, was more difficult to capture with search terms. I began with “work” and “profession” but these did not return as much information as expected. The concept of boundary strategies was often buried in the narrative and defied simple searches. However, there were a few codes that returned relevant narrative during a second round of searching such as “start,” “create,” and “organize.” This initial analysis then allowed me to identify new recurrent themes and lines of inquiry. For example, leadership pathways emerged as
a theme because of patterns I noticed in the interviews when we discussed boundary strategies and group affiliation. Throughout this process, patterns often directly emerged from the interview transcripts and memos rather than use of only key terms.

INTERVIEW SAMPLE

Table 1 presents selected characteristics about the 94 respondents in my study. Latinos represented slightly more than half (58.5 percent), and Asians comprised 41.5 percent of the sample. Men made up 53.2 percent and women 46.8 percent. The total sample was split equally between immigrants and U.S. born natives.

Table 1. Key Characteristics of Asian and Latino Community Leaders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Gateway Coast</th>
<th>New South</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of Sample</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>56.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Asian</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>39.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Latino</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>60.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Men</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>54.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Women</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>45.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% U.S. Born</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Foreign Born</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>69.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Other demographic characteristics for the sample appear in the appendix
Although the share of Gateway Coast respondents was smaller than that for New South interviewees, there were notable differences across the two research sites. Asians comprised a larger share in Gateway Coast than in New South (43.9 vs. 39.6 percent, respectively). Similarly, the proportion of women was larger in the Gateway Coast sample compared to New South (48.8 vs 45.3 percent, respectively). The most striking difference between the two sites is respondent nativity. Although the total sample is evenly split between foreign and native-born respondents, three-quarters of those in Gateway Coast were U.S. born natives, double the 30.2 percent share in New South. The opposite is true for immigrant respondents. In Gateway Coast, the foreign born made up nearly one-quarter (24.4 percent); in New South, foreign-born respondents represented more than two-third (69.8 percent).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2. Panethnic Group Demographic Differences, by Interview Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gateway Coast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% U.S. Born</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Foreign Born</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 shows important spatial differences in panethnic groups, most strikingly by nativity. In Gateway Coast, 55.6 percent of Asian respondents were U.S. born compared to New South, where less than 19 percent of Asians were U.S. natives. Latinos follow a similar pattern, with 87 percent of Gateway Coast respondents being U.S. born compared to 37.5 percent in New South. In addition, across both sites, shares of respondents who are foreign born are higher among Asians than Latinos, consistent with national data that reveal a larger proportion of foreign-born adults among Asians than among Latinos (Pew Research Center 2017).

With respect to gender, Asian respondents in Gateway Coast were evenly split between men and women, while Latinos reflected a slight majority of men (52.2 vs. 47.8 percent female, respectively). In New South, women made up a slight majority among Asian respondents (52.4 vs. 47.6 percent for men). The opposite is true for Latinos, where men represented 59.4 percent compared to 40.6 percent of women.

CHAPTER OUTLINE

This dissertation begins with the premise that panethnicity is mutable, flexible, and layered and can be used and leveraged in a variety of ways. Exactly how these identities are utilized is explored in the three empirical chapters of this dissertation. Ultimately, I reveal how panethnicity is embedded in the experiences of Asian and Latino community leaders, showing how they utilize, leverage, and navigate their identity and how the processes are conditioned by contextual and personal factors. Below, I offer a brief outline for each chapter.
Chapter Two asks community leaders when they first experienced panethnic consciousness and began to classify themselves under a broader panethnic group. I describe the processes that led respondents to first recognize themselves as panethnic and how this identity emerged for them. Respondents describe the emergence of a panethnic consciousness using four distinct narratives related to education, occupation, immigrant experience, and context. These narratives show how community leaders become panethnic under a variety of conditions influenced by their personal characteristics and local context.

Chapter Three asks how panethnicity is leveraged in pursuit of upward mobility and community empowerment. I identify two distinct leadership pathways—facilitated and entrepreneurial—and show how each provides different types of opportunities for respondents to leverage their panethnicity. In some cases, community leaders leveraged their panethnicity to access existing resources, information, and people. In other cases, respondents leveraged their panethnicity to create their own entrée into leadership based on their own human, social, or economic capital. The opportunities I describe are driven primarily by the unique incentives in each context.

Chapter Four asks how a sense of belonging to a panethnic community informs how community leaders navigate this boundary. This chapter introduces groupness ranges, defined as “the sense of belonging to a distinctive, bounded, solidary group” (Brubaker and Cooper 2000:20) and shows how different types of groupness are linked to unique boundary strategies. I identify and describe five distinct groupness ranges—committed panethnics, strategic identifiers, loyal ethnics, supra-ethnics, and world citizens—and outline the boundary strategies that each leverages in pursuit of community or individual advancement. I make explicit differences across
contexts and within panethnic groups and show how these differences contour respondents’ sense of belonging with particular communities, panethnic or otherwise.

Finally, Chapter Five summarizes the findings from Chapters Two through Five and outlines the overarching contributions of the dissertation. My findings are consistent with those of Espiritu (1992, 2016), Mora (2014), and Okamoto (2003, 2014), showing how flexible panethnic boundaries allow individuals to create their own meaning and define their own ties with a panethnic community. However, my findings also suggest there are important contextual factors shape how Latino and Asian community leaders express, experience, and navigate panethnicity. I end with a discussion of the limitations of my study and its implications for future research.
CHAPTER II - “A REAL AWAKENING”: NARRATIVES OF PANETHNIC CONSCIOUSNESS

Panethnic identities have become much more common and accessible. Scholars write that while these identities are “commonplace and accepted,” they are also highly contested in part because “racial group formation and identity do not occur naturally” (Okamoto 2014: 2-3). In other words, the very existence of a category does not ensure complete and rapid adoption. In fact, much of the work on panethnicity illustrates how it has emerged, through top-down bureaucratic processes of enumeration (Espiritu 1992; Mora 2014a, 2014b), and grassroots-level work by advocates and community activists who organize around the common struggles of ethnic groups (Okamoto 2014; Padilla 1986). As such, the manner by which people come to see themselves as panethnic is far from singular.

In addition, identities are not static or inflexible (Jones-Correa and Leal 1996; Lien, Conway & Wong 2003; Masuoka 2006; Okamoto & Mora 2014). Prior work has found that panethnicity varies by ethnic background, immigration status, education, income, and gender (Correa-Jones and Leal 1996; Lien, Conway & Wong 2003; Masuoka 2006), often resonating in some meaningful way before a person makes an intentional choice to identify with that particular group. To date, no studies examine when individuals first begin to experience panethnic consciousness, which is the awareness of being included in a broader ethnoracial group or category beyond their specific ethnicity or national origin.

This chapter examines how Asian and Latino leaders first come to see themselves as part of a panethnic group and the conditions under which this panethnic consciousness emerges. My respondents describe their panethnic consciousness through four narratives related to education,

---

3 While ethnicity and race are often treated as separate analytic categories (and this idea is institutionalized within enumeration projects, like the U.S. Census), scholars have increasingly called for the two to be understood in tandem (Golash-Boza & Darity 2008; Valdez & Golash-Boza 2017).
occupation, immigration, and context shifts. Some community leaders offered an education narrative, whereby they first came to see themselves as panethnic when they were undergraduate or professional students. For other leaders, their panethnic consciousness emerged as they experienced career advantages related to panethnicity. Others were awakened to panethnicity through their immigration experience, when they first confronted an ethnoracial hierarchy distinct from that of their country of origin. Finally, some community leaders experienced panethnic consciousness during context shifts, described as either a move to a new city or changes over time, that offer new opportunities for self-identification.

EDUCATION

Approximately one-third (35 percent) of community leaders became panethnic in the context of higher education. These community leaders attributed the emergence of their panethnic consciousness to the panethnic student organizations and ethnic studies programs in their universities, which played an instrumental role in introducing, affirming, and encouraging panethnicity. This is consistent with many studies, which often situate early panethnic communities within university settings and among second-generation college students (Jones-Correa and Leal 1996; Espiritu 1992; Masuoka 2006). Indeed, two-thirds of these respondents were native born and most (64 percent) lived in Gateway Coast.

College campuses were spaces that offered my respondents the opportunity to meet, interact, and discover commonalities with students of different ethnic backgrounds. Veronica Mana is a Mexican-American who grew up in Los Angeles and went to an Ivy League college on the East Coast. She now lives in Gateway Coast. Veronica outlines when she first began to think of herself as Latina,

I think part of it was in college and it just got reinforced when I joined Teach for America. So in college, I think it was [that] I was with a lot of Mexicans. I was president
of the organization for Mexican Americans, but it was also the first time that I got to know Nuyoricans, like, Puerto Ricans in New York...[and] Dominican people and just realized there’s so many of us and we’re so diverse, and it’s important we recognize how different we are, but also – I mean, we experienced on our campus several times where as a Latino community we had to come together [...] I remember that same year on campus, Latinos were organizing to have some sort of like immigration reform narrative -- let’s be welcoming of immigrants on our campus. Those were some of the formative experiences for me myself as like part of a bigger group of Latinos.

While Veronica had a strong Mexican identity (as evident by her leadership in the Mexican-American student group), it was her experiences in college that marked an awakening of her panethnic consciousness. It was the first time she connected with Puerto Ricans and Dominicans and recognized the size and diversity of the Latino population – supporting the idea that panethnicity is characterized simultaneously by its internal tensions as well as the bridges across ethnic differences (Okamoto & Mora 2014). In addition, Veronica attended college during a time when immigration policy became a major issue for Latinos of all backgrounds. As such, the Latino students at her university came together to rally around a common narrative of immigration reform and this further ignited Veronica’s panethnic consciousness.

Karen Zheng, an attorney in Gateway Coast, suggests that colleges are a natural place for the formation of a panethnic identity,

*I think I started saying Asian-American probably around the time that I was in college, and I think that comes from learning more about history and movements and like, understanding your identity outside of your family and your immediate family, and just sort of how other people see you [...] even if you weren’t thinking about your identity, it kind of gets shined on you anyway, so you kind of naturally have to go through a process where you’re not only having to think about it but sort of actively figuring out where you belong.*

Karen underwent a process of self-discovery in college that led to the emergence of an Asian-American identity. She explained that understanding “how other people see you” is central to the development of a group identity when “actively figuring out where you belong.” She also referenced the classroom learning related to history and social movements that influenced how
she understood her place in a larger historical trajectory and intensified her sense of attachment to a particular group.

For some respondents, universities were important for the emergence of panethnic consciousness because of the opportunities available to participate in ethnic groups. Universities host a variety of extracurricular and professional organizations in which students can voluntarily participate. Okamoto (2006) writes that “participation in a panethnic organization can lead an individual to develop a panethnic consciousness – seeing himself or herself as part of a larger group whose members have similar interpretations of personal experiences and the larger society” (3). Prior work suggests that participation in such organizations has a specific effect on the ethnic identities of college students (Garcia, Huerta, Ramirez and Patrón 2017; Inkelas 2004; Kibria 1999; Ocampo 2013; Rhoads, Lee and Yamada 2002; Trieu 2017). Trieu (2017), in her study of 1.5 and second generation Chinese and Chinese-Vietnamese students, finds that students who were involved in student organizations and in ethnic studies programs adopted a contextual panethnic identity by which they saw themselves as part of a larger historical trajectory in the United States and recognized the ongoing racialization and marginalization of Asians. In contrast, students who did not engage with these organizations or programs often viewed their own identity through a color-blind framework.

Ryan Kapoor, a lawyer in Gateway Coast, illustrates how his involvement in affinity groups during college led him to identify as South Asian. When asked when he first started to identify panethnically, he responds,

*College. It was a distinctly college change. You know, all through high school, I would definitely only refer to myself as Indian American. In fact, my parents – as many South Asian parents are – are slightly racist, and actually they might even be offended to some degree if I, in their presence, called myself South Asian, they might actually be slightly offended. They would call themselves Indian. So in college, I was sort of awakened to the general concept behind unified South Asia and also the concept of what it is to be a South*
Asian-American. The affinity groups in college were all South Asian based, they were not Indian based, even though the vast majority of the members were Indian, and so it just sort of took on a life from there.

Ryan’s response is interesting because it shows that the groups in which he participated in college were inclusive in name even if the majority of members were of one ethnicity (i.e. Indian). He also references a generational difference in panethnic identity. While he is comfortable identifying as South Asian, his parents would be offended by the term. His declaration that his parents are “slightly racist” is also telling, in that he illustrates the tension between U.S. racial schemas and those outside the United States. While in the United States, individuals from different South Asian countries are often classified under one panethnic or racial category, many immigrants, like Ryan’s Indian parents, see themselves as racially distinct from other South Asian groups.

While Ryan recalled how his university affirmed a broader South Asian identity, Paloma Villega, a science professor in Gateway Coast, recognizes that both her panethnic and ethnic consciousness were awakened when she was an undergraduate student. As someone who had pronounced her name with an American accent during much of her upbringing, Paloma explained that college offered her an opportunity to reclaim her name and her identity. She describes an evolution in her identity,

*I was really Chicana [in college] because of the whole Chicano theory and we studied it and all that kind of stuff. So that was freshman year and [my residential hall] was really formative in that way. I became more Latina as I recognized that there was more of [...] the whole struggle. I’m like, come on, they all see us as them, so why can’t we all be the same thing?*
Paloma’s panethnic consciousness happened inside and outside the classroom. In her classes, she learned about Chicano\(^4\) theory. Outside of class, she was assigned to a residential hall in which she was exposed to new ideas and mentors who taught her about Chicano culture. She described being “really Chicana” in her freshman year but eventually adopted a broader self-concept as she recognized that there was a “whole struggle” that encompassed the various ethnic groups from Latin America and that “they all see us as them.” This echoes Karen’s earlier assertion that the perception of others influences your identity and sense of affiliation with a given group. For both Karen and Paloma, it was the partly the understanding that others see them as part of a broader collective that ignited panethnic consciousness.

Panethnicities are also reinforced in university settings by faculty and administrators. Eloisa Camacho of New South recalls when she first became aware of belonging to a particular Hispanic community,

\[
\text{I remember being invited to a lunch where they brought all the Hispanic students, which was like six of us, and they asked us if we were comfortable and if we thought it was diverse and stuff. And then after that meeting, it kind of like made me think, oh wow, I am part of this other subsection of this community. And so I kind of started exploring that and I think that was the first time I had met people, because a lot of the Hispanics were from Texas, so it kind of was interesting to get to know people who were so... Hispanic, I guess. You know? It's not that I've ever hidden it, but I just don't think of it as my first identity [...] So that was interesting to meet people who were very open and loud and proud...}
\]

Eloisa participated in conversations with administrators who asked about the experiences of Hispanic students at their university. This initial interaction with administrators created a panethnic consciousness by which Eloisa saw herself as part of a broader subgroup of students.

She interacted with Hispanic students who were “very open and loud and proud” of their

---

\(^4\) Young Mexican-Americans reclaimed the term Chicano in the 1960s as “a self-conscious appropriation of a negative term as a declaration of pride and [working] class consciousness” (Alcoff 2005: 398; Sánchez 1995).
heritage, which was a striking contrast to her own experience where Hispanic was not her “first identity.”

Thus, many of the community leaders in my sample credit university campuses as the source of their panethnic consciousness. Interactions with people of different backgrounds offered students an opportunity to reconsider their own sense of identity, particularly in relation to others. Respondents recalled how panethnic outsiders often classified them as part of broader collectives, shifting their own thinking as they saw themselves through the eyes of their peers. In addition, universities through classes, residential housing, and student organizations provided formal avenues for exposure to the struggles and histories of different groups. Faculty and administrators also affirmed panethnic identities and sought out the diverse perspectives of students. Respondents describe these as catalysts for a budding sense of panethnic identity.

OCCUPATIONAL OUTCOME

Panethnic identity also informs and influences the experience of work. Thirteen percent of community leaders described their career and occupation as the source of their panethnic consciousness. Prior research shows that panethnicity comes into play in different ways for professionals. For example, Valdez’s (2009) interviews with 12 Latino business owners in Texas revealed that they primarily identified by their national origin and used panethnic terms to stereotype or disparage Latinos and to distance their national origin group from other Latinos, particularly in the context of their business. Other work finds evidence that a panethnic identity can shape career trajectories. For example, Pan’s (2015) study of Asian and Latino law students finds that managing dual identities (panethnic and that of being a law student) creates a sense of panethnic duty, even among those students who are not strongly connected to these communities.
Some respondents spoke of panethnicity as if it were a job requirement. Originally from Cuba, Patricia Montes was a media personality in New South who believed it was critically important to adopt a panethnic identity. Though she could not recall when she first used the term Latina to describe herself, she explained that it was likely around the time that she was building her own business. She believed strongly that she could not simply speak for the interests of her own national origin group because her audience is composed of a diverse Spanish-speaking community.

*When I started the business, I started learning all these [panethnic] terms and what [they] meant. When people talk about us [Latinos], I don’t want to say that I’m Cuban only. I have to say that I’m Latina because I’m trying to represent my community...I don’t want to say, oh I’m just talking for me and my Cuban people. No – I want to say, I’m trying to talk for my community.*

Despite the fact that she was new to the United States and that she was still learning “all these terms,” Patricia realized how important it was for her to be seen as more than just Cuban. She was appealing to a broader audience and did not want to be seen as a representative only for Cubans but for all Latinos in New South. Perhaps even more interesting is the way in which she repeatedly refers to Latinos as “my community” and as Cubans as “my people.” Patricia’s efforts appeared to have paid off. She laughed as she recounted an invitation she received to emcee El Grito for a Mexican Independence Day event taking place in New South, something she knew little about before then. She explained, “I wasn’t Mexican but they asked me to host it and I was like, yeah sure. What do I have to say? What is it about? You know I had to read and educate myself – what was it about and why they were celebrating and what I needed to say.”

Because she was something of a local celebrity in the Spanish-speaking, predominantly Mexican community in New South, she was invited to host this event, despite not being Mexican and

---

5 “El Grito de Dolores is the pronouncement of the start of the Mexican War of Independence by Miguel Hidalgo y Costilla. It is commonly reenacted during Mexican Independence Day celebrations.
having very little background knowledge of Mexican independence. Nonetheless, she accepted the invitation to emcee and read up on the history of El Grito to do the job.

Other Latinos who worked for media outlets expressed a similar need to represent the broader community and report on issues that affect all Latinos, not simply one national origin group. German Galindo was originally from Colombia and realized just how beneficial it was to affiliate himself with a larger group in New South. When asked if Hispanic was an identity he adopted quickly, he thought back to when he first began using the term,

*Maybe because I was in journalism and the newspaper, I think I adopted the term more easily because that was the term we used when we are talking. We don’t want to talk about Mexicans and Colombians and Puerto Ricans. We try to get everybody into a package and one of the situations with that was the term Latino and the term Hispanic. Being in journalism, you have to put the term in the way it has to be...*

German had no reservations about adopting the Latino/Hispanic identity. In fact, he felt it was “the way it has to be” because his journalism career required representing the views of the community, of the “package.” Like Patricia, he felt strongly that he could not simply speak to particular national origin groups and the panethnic terminology allowed him to be inclusive of all groups.

Similarly, Nina Li from Gateway Coast recalls that her panethnic consciousness came about as a result of her work as a journalist with an interest in Asia. After spending some time working abroad, Nina’s perspective on her own identity changed upon return. She recounts,

*I guess my transformation had more to do with the fact that I was coming back to the U.S. as a journalist having all this Asia experience under my belt, and wanting to write or produce broadcast stories about Asia or about China here in the U.S. and really finding that all my pitches were just going nowhere, and my realization was that the U.S. didn’t really care that much (laughs) about Asia, or I guess the general public – I just found it very difficult, and I ended up having much more success getting my stories into Asian American media, and that’s when I started to see that ethnic media was important, and then it sort of allowed me to dive more into kind of my own identity, you know, my own community’s history, specifically as Asian-Americans in this country.*
Nina believed that mainstream U.S. media sources “didn’t really care that much” about the types of global stories she wanted to tell. She found ethnic media sources – specifically Asian-American media – were much more receptive and she valued these outlets for representing voices not considered part of the mainstream. Most importantly, however, these media sources allowed her to more deeply explore her own panethnic identity and the history of her Asian-American community.

Respondents in other occupational fields also saw panethnicity as a necessary outcome of their work. Like universities, the workplace presents an opportunity for individuals to meet and interact with people of diverse backgrounds. Bianca Alvarez is of Chilean origin and lives in Gateway Coast. She recalled the first time she identified as Latina,

I used to work for a Latin American beauty company here four years ago and that’s when I started using it a little more – “I’m Latina,” you know, instead of Chilean. The company that I used to work for was Peruvian, so there were a lot of people from different places like Mexico, Peru, Chile – so yeah, it was easier to say we’re Latinas and we’re a Latin American beauty company.

Bianca’s panethnic consciousness emerged when she began working with a Latin American beauty company whose employees were from all over Latin America. The company brand and the diversity of its employees created a culture conducive to panethnicity.

In other situations, panethnic consciousness was ignited through interactions with clients, rather than colleagues. Mike Lima of Gateway Coast was born and raised in the Midwest, in a town that had few ethnic or racial groups outside of white and black. When asked when he first began using a term like Latino to describe himself, Mike recalls,

After college, I became a banker [...] It was my job to interface with a lot of employees who lived in and were originally from South America -- true South Americans. From countries like Chile, Bolivia, Argentina, Brazil, and others. I presented a little bit of a confusing character to them because I look and have the name of someone that seems very familiar to people in Spanish speaking countries but I’m not fluent in Spanish because I grew up in Michigan. So they were always a little puzzled but of course they
were all very friendly and very professional. But it certainly presented to me, in a very stark way, that I had a nationality -- a very visible and prominently visible nationality, a very prominently visible heritage and ethnicity that people made assumptions about. Since many of the employees at the bank actually were from countries other than the U.S., when they looked like me and had names like mine, many of them assumed I might be from another South American country or Central American country and things like that[...] it certainly brought home to me very emphatically the way I come across, the way my appearance presents to people, the way my name and my appearance combined to present something to people. It was a real awakening for me. Not in a bad way, just in an educational way.

Mike’s career led him to interact with South American employees. Many assumed he could speak Spanish because last name and appearance were stereotypically Latino. This brought to the forefront a “prominently visible heritage and ethnicity.” As such, Mike’s consciousness is less about his ownership of a panethnic identity than it is about the realization that others see him as part of this group.

Unlike respondents who were largely adapting to an existing panethnic identity in their work or community, Clara Nuñez of Gateway Coast was busy filling a void when she first began to develop a panethnic consciousness. She recalls,

\[In\] my entire educational professional experience, I’m usually one of, maybe the only, maybe one of two people that speak Spanish. So [as a teacher], kids sort of gravitated toward me and eventually I asked if I could teach a course on Latino culture – probably wasn’t great but it was fun! And so, I would say while I was [there], I developed that consciousness.

Though she grew up in a Spanish-speaking household, Clara did not view herself as Latina until her professional career began. When she became a teacher at a school that was experiencing a steady increase of Latino students, Clara became a resource for these students, and eventually sought permission to teach a class on Latino culture. Her panethnic consciousness was sparked as she became a resource for Latino students.

Whether it was an initial job requirement or an unexpected outcome, many respondents gained a panethnic consciousness in their professional careers. In certain fields, it is
advantageous to cater one’s work or product to a broader panethnic audience. This was especially true for the Latinos in my sample who relied on a common language and perceptions of cultural similarities to appeal to a larger community. What is clear is that panethnicity is tied to the professional responsibilities and obligations of these community leaders.

IMMIGRANT EXPERIENCE

When immigrants arrive in the United States, they are often confronted with ethnoracial schemas distinct from those in their country of origin (Itzigsohn and Dore-Cabral 2000). This was the case for nearly 30 percent of community leaders in my sample, almost all of whom were from New South (96.3 percent). Scholars have documented the experiences of immigrants as they make sense of these often-dichotomous classifications in their new contexts. For example, Itzigsohn and Dore-Cabral (2000) write about the experience of Dominican immigrants who attempt to navigate the racial landscape despite the fact that in their country of origin race is better understood as a continuum of racial mixture rather than separate categories. Moreover, immigrants also have to make sense of the hierarchy of whites at the top, blacks at the bottom, and all other groups somewhere in the “racial middle” (O’Brien 2008). It is thus no surprise that panethnicity emerges during processes of assimilation, as immigrants adopt new identities that align with the existing ethnoracial schema.

Indeed, many immigrant respondents acquired a panethnic consciousness when they first arrived confronting terms like Latino and Asian. In some cases, respondents initially resisted because they perceived these panethnic labels had lower social status. This was the case for Allegra Cortez, who remembers moving to New South from Costa Rica nearly 20 years ago and being absorbed into a Latino category. When asked if she could recall the first time she understood that people saw her as Latino or Hispanic, she explains,
Yes. I do and it was shocking and was offensive. It was offensive because I felt that I was put into a category rather than, you know, being equal so I was kind of being destitute. I was being lowered on my rank, right? So you're less than because now you're an object and you're going to fit into this box. And you don't belong anymore so that's the other part that came from it. You no longer are part of this big group. You're now an outsider and even though it really hard moving and trying to adapt to new social norms and everything, to add that on top of that it weighs heavy on you. So I struggled a little bit with that...

After moving and transitioning to a new country, Allegra felt the additional burden of adapting to a new system of classification. Like many other immigrant respondents from Latin America, she quickly learned that Latino very often translated to Mexican – especially in New South. Allegra was not alone. Other foreign-born respondents and those who had recently moved to New South did not like the assumption that all Latinos were Mexican and they reported being asked if they “spoke Mexican.” Quickly picking up on the fact that Mexicans had a noticeably lower social status and were differentiated from the majority population, Allegra learned to distance herself from them.

I felt moments where, I felt like I was less than because I was a Latina and so I wanted people to know that I was from Costa Rica and not Mexico because of that. And I felt so bad because I was like feeling vulnerable and I am saying that I'm from Costa Rica and I'm not from Mexico – why do I need that entitlement?

Allegra asserted a national origin identity to differentiate herself from Mexicans. As a newly arrived immigrant, she perceived a lower status attached to being Latino, and that it was an “entitlement” to be able to differentiate herself from Mexican. She recalls her early experiences in the United States, hearing others talk about Mexicans.

I remember, yeah, there were certain occasions in the beginning where I didn't know better and just people making jokes and even, like, all these [Mexicans] are coming here and they're undocumented and they don't know what they're doing and all this. And [I was] like, oh my God, yes, why are they breaking the law? Why are they being thieves? Why are they doing this, why are they doing that?
In hindsight, Allegra realizes she contributed to the rhetoric about undocumented immigrants and Mexicans as low ranking citizens. Now, in her work with Latino youth, she is proud of Latino identity explaining, “now it’s like I am Mexican, and now I am from El Salvador, and now I am from Cuba and now I am from the Dominican Republic and if I have to be from Haiti, I’ll be from Haiti too, you know?”

Others in New South confronted the same type of assumptions that Allegra did, albeit without quite the same degree of distress. For Susana Lopez, a native of Argentina, it took a few years for her to realize how she was often assumed to be Mexican,

As the years progressed, I found out that I was, like all Latinos and Hispanics, seen as Mexican. So it was kind of weird to me. People would automatically see me as someone from Mexico and then I had run into people that would ask me, where I'm from and when I said Argentina, they would be like, "oh! So what part of Mexico is Argentina?" You know, like things like that and it was kinda weird, it was shocking. At first, I would feel kind of offended whenever people would treat me as Mexican because I'm Argentinian, obviously. Sometimes I would tell people I'm not from Mexico, but sometimes I would get kind of angry and be like, not all Latinos are from Mexico, so it was kind of weird to be honest with you,

Though offended when encountering these assumptions about her ethnic background, Susana’s derived less from being placed in a lower status category than from the assumption that all Latinos were Mexican. Questions such as “what part of Mexico is Argentina?” were especially troublesome. These experiences, however, did not seem to deter her from adopting a panethnic identity. Now she is quite matter-of-fact about her Hispanic identity, stating “when you come to this country, it’s like you take your side and [that is], obviously, being Hispanic. I’m actually Argentinian so I would identify myself as that but now its like, ok, I’m a Hispanic.” Susana did not describe apprehension around adopting the Hispanic label and instead recognizes that she and other immigrants “take [their] side” or fall into the appropriate category when they arrive in a new country.
These findings are consistent with Valdez (2009), who argues that panethnicity is a process of racialization for Latinos by which they do not benefit from the privileges related to whiteness and they are forced to distance themselves from the disadvantage related to blackness. Latino panethnicity, then, “resolves Latinos’ positioning within the U.S. racial hierarchy” (7). In the United States especially, where race is a fundamental organizing agent, immigrants eventually place themselves into their appropriate category (or come to be sorted by others).

For the most part, foreign-born Latino respondents showed little apprehension in claiming a panethnic identity. After moving to the United States from the Dominican Republic, Marciano Vega quickly embraced a Latino identity. He explains,

\[\text{I have always, since the very first time I came to the US, I identified myself as Latino. Now, again, because of my African or island heritage and other mixes, it was hard sometimes to convey that to people who had already the stereotype of the typical Latino, you know, straight black hair and stocky and things of that nature. I did not fit the pattern to many of them so when I told them I was a Latino, they looked at me, “oh okay, what part of Mexico are you from?” The first thing that came to mind was Mexico. Or what part of whatever...and I had to say, have you heard of the Dominican Republic? Have you heard? And it’s just a matter of educating folks.}\]

Despite prevailing assumptions about Mexicans, Marciano was not bothered by the stereotypes he confronted. Indeed, Marciano’s experience parallels many of the challenges related to panethnicity, particularly in New South. Like Allegra and Susana, he explained that he is not from Mexico (“have you heard of the Dominican Republic?”) and clarified that Latinos come from different countries. On the other hand, he also finds himself having to assert his panethnic identity because he does not fit the phenotypical profile of a Latino (“straight black hair and stocky”). Marciano took no offense and believes “it’s just a matter of educating folks.”

For other immigrants in my sample, particularly those from Asia, the panethnic category was a formality, a box to check on applications and forms. Anika Patel first saw the term Asian on a form, after she arrived to the United States from India. She explains that she “always checks
into the Asian category” but does not give it much thought because it is “just a category.”

Similarly, Danny Zhao, who immigrated from China as a college student, first began to identify himself as Asian when filling out forms. When pressed about whether he ever felt conflicted or confused by the terminology, he states, “I don’t think I thought about it any different. It was fine.” Helen Tsai, from Taiwan, seldom uses the term Asian, but will check the box on a form because “they don’t say Chinese” and because “there is no other choice.” These respondents were familiar with the terminology and readily checked the Asian category, without really giving it any deeper thought.

Some scholars see the emergence of a panethnic consciousness as a part of the assimilation process. When immigrants (with their own classificatory schemas) are confronted with new racial hierarchies, this may lead to distress, particularly if they recognize that places them in a low-status category. Moreover, respondents were frustrated when they asserted their ethnic identity because panethnicity was so strongly associated with a national origin group different from their own. Latino respondents in New South quickly learned that panethnic outsiders commonly thought they were Mexican. As such, the emergence of a panethnic consciousness was an emotional process, requiring respondents to take the time to explain the inherent diversity within a panethnic category to those less informed. However, not all immigrants experienced emotional responses. Many of the foreign-born Asian respondents in my sample were largely indifferent to the panethnic label and to U.S.-based racial schemas, classifying themselves as Asian without giving it further thought.

**CONTEXT SHIFTS**

Context influences the opportunities and available options for identification. Nearly 20 percent of community leaders cite context shifts as the source of their panethnic consciousness.
Eighty percent of these respondents were foreign born and 71 percent were from Gateway Coast. In her study of Asian Americans, Okamoto writes, “local conditions—specifically, racial segregation, ethnic organizing, and active leaders—can facilitated the panethnic organizing process among Asian Americans as they redefine race by creating new communities that span ethnic lines, break down racial stereotypes, and challenge unfair treatment” (2014:6). The same can be applied to other groups. In this case, Latinos, like Asians, are located in communities in which immediate socio-political conditions may encourage and incentivize panethnicity, especially among community leaders. Panethnic consciousness can be tied to mutual benefits and political opportunities for groups with common interests. In his study of Puerto Rican and Mexican workers in Chicago, Padilla (1985) credits the formation of a Latino panethnicity to the conditions under which the groups were able to make political claims based on a common disenfranchisement, such as poverty and racial discrimination. Other scholars suggest that when two groups find themselves in the same occupation or neighborhoods, a type of collective identification serves to unify them and their interests. Therefore, to understand racial boundaries, we focus on the local conditions and processes that shape group interactions (Okamoto 2014).

Zulema White describes how a new context can shift one’s ideas around identity. She recalls her upbringing and her later move to Gateway Coast, explaining how demographic changes in the Latino population helped her feel safe enough to claim a panethnic identity,

_In [Gateway Coast], as opposed to Texas and Chicago, maybe similar to New York, coming from a Mexican background, I had to really learn that Latinos are all different colors, all different racial backgrounds—the idea of being Latino [in Gateway Coast] changed so much for me when I began to meet the Central American immigrants who started coming here in the 70s and 80s. So that really shifted it. My father is Mexican, dark Indian Mexican, and my mother is White, Appalachian pearly, you know, freckled skin. You know, my Spanish was not very good. I wasn’t Mexican. And then on the White side of my family, I wasn’t quite that either. So I grew up, I think, with a strong sense of not being rooted in anything. You know, just sort of like existing between two cultures and two identities. And being very, not uncomfortable, but just not glued to one. And then_
when I moved [to Gateway Coast] it was like, it didn’t matter. None of that mattered because Latinos are all different colors, heights, and you know... I could claim Latino very safely if you will, you know, and be included.

The child of an “Appalachian pearly” mother and “dark Indian Mexican” father, Zulema found peace with her identity after landing in Gateway Coast. In the 1970s and 1980s, the city was experiencing significant demographic shifts, resulting in an increasingly diverse Latino population. Without speaking Spanish or having a strong grounding in her own ethnic identity, shifting contexts allowed her to claim a panethnic identity in her new context of increasingly “different colors, all different racial backgrounds.”

Carlos Guerrero also pointed to how Gateway Coast fostered an environment in which Latino was an inclusive and appropriate term. When asked how he identified, his answer illustrates the influences of his upbringing, parents, and move to Gateway Coast. He starts,

Ideally, I would say I’m American. But then you really drill down and I’m Latino, so I definitely identify as Latino. In the context of, you know, my ethnicity, it’s that [...] I grew up in El Paso, Texas. So I’m technically a Texan. My parents were Mexican [...] so we were raised as Mexican American. That was the terminology, and it’s still very much a part of my identity. You know, I know I’m Mexican American [...] but in [this state], I definitely transitioned to more of feeling a broader identity as Latino, because it has a broader kind of constituency, that it’s not just Mexican. Particularly [in this] area. I sense that there’s a much broader kind of Central American community, whether it’s Salvadorian or from Guatemala, so definitely the term Latino encompasses more of that.

Carlos is American, Latino, Texan, and Mexican American. His move to Gateway Coast was not simply a physical transition, but a cognitive one. He now adopts the Latino label because he sees the “broader kind of Central American community” that extends beyond his own Mexican American identity. When asked about whether he used the term Latino prior to his move, he explains,

No. Actually [...] my early kind of iteration, if you will, when I was younger was Chicano and then it became more Hispanic, but then I’ve been here more than half my life, so [...] I think it’s when I really began that Latino identity because I saw a distinction between Latino and Hispanic, you know? So Latino to me was much more than just a Spanish... it
was much more kind of the Latin American connection, as well. And now I hear Chicano and I read it and I realize, oh, that’s me, but it’s not as comfortable, if you will. I don’t know why, because it’s lost it’s kind of sense of political identity that I had with it sometime back, you know, and now it’s definitely Latino, particularly [here].

Carlos’s narrative illustrates a process that integrates several themes related to identity and panethnic consciousness. When younger, he was Chicano but as he grew older that term lost meaning. He also used the term Hispanic earlier in his life, but adopted Latino after moving. Moreover, he defined Latino as “more than just Spanish.” A native of Texas, he used the term Hispanic because it was more prevalent in Texas. After moving, he opted for Latino.

At times, it was not simply city demographics and regional patterns that explained an emerging panethnic consciousness. Several respondents pointed specifically to pivotal historic changes in the political and social climate that brought forth new racial and ethnic identities. Jiro Miwa’s panethnic consciousness coincides with the ethnic social movements taking place in Gateway Coast in the 1960s. A Japanese-American and longtime Asian American activist, Jiro provides some context for the historical shifts that took place when he began to embrace a panethnic identity,

*I think as the civil rights movement unfolded, as people started to exert their own identity, their own strength in numbers, their discovery that the American history did not include people of color, you know, a number of groups—first blacks and Latinos, then Asians—started to question, you know, why are we excluded, and at that point, it was primarily Chinese and Japanese, [who] were the largest ethnic groups, and so in 1967, they started organizing Asian American identity groups. I had just graduated but I was aware of the movement at the time for identity, because it was the same as the black identity movement, and the same principles, essentially, for the Latino identity. By the time I got to [college] in 1968, the third world strike had just started, and that accelerated the whole process of consciousness towards the history of Asian Americans, and it was an Asian American movement at that time[...] And so when that movement went into full bloom, you know, the whole notions of our common history among the Asian Americans – again, primarily Japanese and Chinese – the common history, the common oppression [...] resonated, and so I started identifying much more with Asian Americans, because all the organizations – or most – a lot of them, the progressive ones, were Asian American. *
Jiro’s primary identity is Asian-American and he traces the origin of this panethnic consciousness to the social movements taking place as he was coming of age. Other identity movements –those of African-Americans and Latinos –influenced the “whole process of consciousness” for Asians who recognized a common history and oppression. Jiro also points to the institutional impact of organizations that became largely panethnic in mission and with whom he began to affiliate.

Triggering events can accelerate political shifts -- rapidly changing the social conversation. Jimmy Zhou from Gateway Coast was relatively young in his home state of Michigan when a Chinese man was murdered by disgruntled autoworkers that mistook him for Japanese. This proved a crucial point in not only his panethnic consciousness but that of his parents as well. He recounts,

> [Before] when my parents saw other people still living as if they were in their former countries that they came from, my parents said, no this is not right. We’re in the U.S. now. We have to be more American, because they faced so much discrimination as graduate students. And I think they’ve always faced discrimination and they just accepted it. And then in Michigan we did the same, especially in Michigan where the automotive industry is and so it is very sensitive -- it was very sensitive especially in the 80s about the Japanese automakers coming into the market. And so there was a lot of hatred towards Asian people, especially Japanese people. And they assumed everyone that was Asian was Japanese. And so we were really careful. My dad always brought sandwiches to work even though he didn’t like sandwiches (laughs), but everything we did was very American. My mom looked around and saw what other kids were wearing. Got us like the newest Reeboks if that was the hot thing then, or Nikes. And made sure our clothes looked the same and we all, you know, fit in really well. But that did change actually. It changed with the murder of Vincent Chin in Detroit. My parents spoke out. [...] And they made signs at our house. They marched. And that was the first time I realized we do need to speak out. And that was when I became a little bit more interested in our cultural background and the significance of it. You know, as a kid, I got made fun of too. Being an Asian-American, like they always said, do you only use chopsticks when you eat or blah, blah, blah, you know, and I mean -- but that comes from their parents too and a lack of cultural diversity in the suburbs of Detroit then. But I think for me, it made me more aware of myself, of who I was. I’m like, I’m different.
Scholars recognize the murder of Vincent Chin as a significant mobilizing trigger within the Asian-American community (Espiritu 1992). It was an event that brought together different ethnicities who became aware that they were racialized as one homogenous group of people. For Jimmy, this event signaled a direct turning point (where before his parents had largely encouraged him to conform to American standards and traditions) in his panethnic consciousness. The events surrounding Chin’s murder, particularly the marches in which his parents participated and the recognition by the broader Asian community that their ethnic differences were irrelevant, made Jimmy more aware of his cultural background and made it clear that he was “different.”

While Jiro and Jimmy describe the influence of grassroots movements and local events in igniting their panethnic consciousness, others shared how top-down messaging and labeling trickled down to inform their identity. Gateway Coast native Vince Castillo recalls the increasing attention given to Hispanics by politicians during the 1980s when he first began to hear panethnic labels, but became quickly aware of some of the contention around terminology,

“I thought Mexican-American was good enough, but then when I got to Harvard, people started talking about Hispanics. And we had a conference—the 1980s, the decade of the Hispanics. And so I come back here and people would say, Oh Hispanic, oh you’re like elite, you’re like—that’s like Spain. So doing my work back and forth between [Gateway Coast] and Washington DC over the years, you’d have the Hispanic Caucus, you’d have a National Hispanic Leadership Agenda—Hispanic was the word. Around here, it’s never really caught on that much.”

Thus, although he previously utilized Mexican-American and found it “good enough,” after his move Vince saw that the term Hispanic was popular among political leaders and organizations such as the Hispanic Caucus and the National Hispanic Leadership Agenda. It was “the word” of the “Decade of the Hispanics.” However, after returning to Gateway Coast, he encountered resistance to the term, which some saw as a symbol of elitism and the glorification of Spanish
heritage. As someone who shifted contexts to and from Washington DC, he learned first-hand how contentious the term Hispanic can be.

Shifts in a socio-political context can awaken new identities and conversations. For some community leaders, a simple change in location prompted the adoption of new identities. Others described specific moments in their lives that served as identity triggers, changing the way they thought of themselves and their relationships to other co-panethnics. Sometimes ethnic movements inspired examination of one’s identity particularly if they highlighted common struggles or a racialized experience. In sum, context shifts can lead to the adoption of new panethnic categories.

CONCLUSION

In this chapter, community leaders describe when they first experienced panethnic consciousness and the conditions under which this identity emerged. My respondents described their emerging recognition of panethnicity by using four distinct narratives related to education, occupation, immigrant experience, and context shifts. Moreover, the critical moments during which respondents began to see themselves as panethnic are also influenced by context (i.e. new destination vs. established gateway) and nativity.

U.S. born community leaders comprised most of the respondents who described the first narrative – education. While they may have been exposed to panethnic categories in the past, respondents reported their consciousness emerged within institutions of higher learning, where panethnicity facilitated belonging, outside the influence of their family. Moreover, the existing structures within university settings (e.g. themed residential halls and panethnic affinity groups) created opportunities to interact with co-panethnics of different national origin backgrounds and
facilitated the development of broader identities. Most community leaders who described an education narrative were from Gateway Coast and U.S. born.

For other community leaders, panethnicity emerged through their professional experiences either as a job requirement or as a set of unexpected consequences. Some respondents found it advantageous to embrace a more inclusive identity because they became spokespeople and journalists who represented the voice of the panethnic community. Others adopted a panethnic identity because of professional demands and because markers like name or appearance made their panethnicity much more salient in the workplace. Most respondents with this narrative were U.S. born, and two-thirds lived in New South and three-quarters were Latino. Many in the new destination city recognized the needs of growing Latino population and began to see themselves as part of this community.

Foreign-born respondents in the study emphasized their immigrant experience. In most cases, panethnicity was different from identities in their home country. Most reported being confronted with the existing categories, albeit with different reactions. Some actively contested their inclusion in a category that they perceived as less advantageous and they attempted to distance themselves from their co-panethnics. Some quickly and easily adopted the panethnic label and saw it as a necessary step in acclimating to their new home. Even when confronted with false assumptions and stereotypes, these respondents indicated a willingness to educate ethnic outsiders about the diverse panethnic community. Keep in mind that almost all (96.7 percent) community leaders with an immigrant experience narrative were in New South, a new destination city for U.S. immigrants.

Lastly, many community leaders cited context shifts as the impetus for their panethnic awakening. Whether it was moving to a new city or witnessing critical changes in identity
politics and social movements, respondents recalled how these shifts incited self-reflection around their own notions of identity. Many respondents spoke to the origins of a Hispanic/Latino or Asian identity, which gained increasing utility when they were younger and coming of age. Others reflected on the way in which their identity changed after moving from one place to another. Most respondents who described a context shift narrative were U.S. born and lived in Gateway Coast. For those who had moved to Gateway Coast, the highly diverse population and political atmosphere shifted the way they understood and utilized panethnicity.

Regardless of whether they readily embraced a panethnic identity, all respondents in this study described their experiences of becoming panethnic using these four narratives. The next chapter examines how community leaders leverage this panethnicity in pursuit of upward mobility and community empowerment.
CHAPTER III - “FROM THEN ON, THAT WAS MY COMMUNITY”:
LEVERAGING OPPORTUNITIES FOR UPWARD MOBILITY

In the previous chapter, Asian and Latino community leaders described the emergence of their panethnic consciousness through four narratives—education, occupations, immigration, and context shifts—that varied across context and nativity. In this chapter, I ask how community leaders leveraged panethnicity as they pursued opportunities for upward social mobility and community empowerment. Prior research associates panethnicity with the potential for downward mobility, given the low social status of minority groups (Portes & Rumbaut 2001; Portes & Zhou 1993; Waters 1999), but other studies find that ethnic identity is of great importance to upwardly-mobile individuals, who find value in contributing in various ways and creating the institutional pipelines that assist their community (Agius Vallejo 2009, 2016). In this chapter, I reveal how community leaders leverage both their ethnic and panethnic identities and show how the ways in which this happens differ between Asians and Latinos and is largely influenced by the available opportunities in each of the two contexts.

Community leaders describe how the formation of a panethnic identity served as an asset and resource, often bringing about different opportunities for leadership and mobility. This is an important perspective, given studies that document how professionals uniquely experience these identities in the workplace (Chávez 2011; Dhingra 2007; Ho 2003; Min and Kim 2000). This is the case even at the earliest stages of one’s career. Pan’s (2015) study on Asian and Latino law students finds that they experience an panethnic burden when thinking about their future in the profession, regardless of whether they feel closely tied to an ethnic or panethnic community. The students manage their professional and panethnic identities through a variety of strategies that reflect their sense of obligation to give back. Professional panethnics must navigate two intersecting identities and find ways to leverage one in support of the other.
Community leaders describe two distinct leadership pathways – *facilitated* and *entrepreneurial*—defined by different opportunities to leverage their ethnicity and panethnicity. For some, this refers to opportunities that grant them access to organizations, resources, and information. For others, their panethnicity grants them the social and human capital to forge their own entrée into leadership positions. These leverage opportunities vary by community leaders’ personal characteristics and the unique incentives that exist in each context. On a *facilitated* pathway, community leaders largely leveraged their panethnicity to join existing panethnic organizations and boards. Most respondents spoke about their experience in voluntary associations. Others also mention the role of mentors and family members who helped them leverage their skills and insider knowledge to bridge the panethnic and mainstream communities. The *entrepreneurial* pathway describes community leaders who crafted ventures to deliver services in their communities or educate others about their panethnic or ethnic group. For both pathways, I show how ethnicity and panethnicity opens up opportunities for community leaders to advance in their careers and to engage with their co-panethnics and the broader local community.

**CONTEXTUALIZING PATHWAYS**

Both types of pathways are influenced by the local context and respondents’ personal characteristics. Table 3 shows demographic characteristics for each leadership pathway. It describes the panethnic group, gender, and nativity information of all respondents, as well as for the two pathway subgroups. It also shows the percentage of respondents from each of the two contexts. The first row shows that approximately two-thirds (63.8 percent) of my sample
reported leveraging panethnicity via a facilitated pathway, and 36.2 percent leveraged via an
entrepreneurial pathway.

Table 3. Demographic Characteristics by Leadership Pathways

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Facilitated</th>
<th>Entrepreneurial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of Sample</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Asian</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Latino</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>64.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Men</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>64.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Women</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% U.S. Born</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Foreign Born</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>67.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Gateway Coast</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% New South</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>82.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where a particular group is overrepresented under each of these demographic and
contextual factors, relative to their share of the overall sample, can reveal how directly these
factors influence a respondent’s leadership trajectory. As it pertains to panethnic group, Table 3
shows that Asians were overrepresented on a facilitated pathway at 45 percent, compared to their
share of the total sample -- 41.5 percent. Latinos were more likely to report leveraging their
panethnicity using entrepreneurial skills than their Asian counterparts (approximately 65 vs. 45
percent, respectively). Although prior studies highlight the entrepreneurial activities of Asian
groups (Fairlie and Robb 2008; Min 1984, 1996, 2008; Min and Bozorgmehr 2000; Raijman and
Tienda 2000; Sanders and Nee 1996), less has been written about Latino entrepreneurs (see
Robles and Cordero-Guzman 2007).

As it relates to gender, men make up a slight majority of respondents at 53 percent of the
total sample, compared to the 47 percent of the sample made up of women. However, women are
the majority of community leaders who reported leveraging panethnicity on the facilitated pathway (53 percent vs 47 percent men). Men were overrepresented in the entrepreneurial pathway, making up nearly two-thirds of these community leaders (65 percent).

While the sample is evenly split between native and foreign-born respondents, community leaders born in the U.S. represent 60 percent of those on a facilitated pathway, while foreign-born respondents were overrepresented on the entrepreneurial pathway (68 percent compared to their share of the total sample – 50 percent), a finding not entirely surprising, given that existing structures (universities, employment in the formal labor market) may be more accessible to those born in the U.S. than those who are foreign-born (Lofstrom 2014; Robles and Cordero-Guzman 2007). Indeed, immigrants are overrepresented as entrepreneurs, owning one out of every six small businesses in the U.S., though they only represent about 13 percent of the total population (Kallick 2012; U.S. Census 2012).

Speaking to differences across context, most of the respondents who leveraged their panethnicity on a facilitated pathway were from Gateway Coast (58 percent), while the vast majority of community leaders on an entrepreneurial pathway were from New South (82 percent). As an established gateway, Gateway Coast had a number of resources already in place to support panethnics, whereas in New South, these resources were just beginning to be made available, some by several of my respondents.

FACILITATED PATHWAY

Nearly two-thirds (63.8 percent) of community leaders described a facilitated pathway, on which they leveraged existing resources and mentors as they pursued advancement opportunities. Many respondents relied upon opportunities for growth and development by using
contacts from ethnic and panethnic organizations in their undergraduate or professional education. Others received encouragement from peers or mentors (both panethnic and non-panethnic) who helped connect them to leadership opportunities within the panethnic community. In addition, a small group of respondents described growing up in households where leadership and community engagement was highly encouraged. In every case, these community leaders were able to leverage their ethnic or pan ethnic identity to capitalize on existing organizations, resources, and people to help them navigate their career.

VOLUNTARY ASSOCIATIONS

Voluntary associations are vehicles for building social capital, such that they bring together individuals with common interests, values, and/or goals. Social capital is an especially critical resource for this pathway. Coleman (1988:S101) writes that “the concept of social capital allows taking […] resources and showing the way they can be combined with other resources to produce different system-level behavior or, in other cases, different outcomes for individuals.” This form of capital operates as an information channel, enforces norms and sanctions, and shapes obligations and expectations. As such, social capital is often touted as a particularly important element for upward mobility.

Previous work has shown that panethnic organizations in institutions of higher learning play a number of important roles. Aside from offering students a sense of cultural affirmation and support (Garcia, Huerta, Ramirez and Patrón 2017; Inkelas 2004; Kibria 1999; Museus 2008; Ocampo 2013; Rhoads, Lee and Yamada 2002; Trieu 2017), these organizations also provide important leadership opportunities for students in institutions of higher learning (Davis 1997). These opportunities can help dispel the perceptions that students of color are not fit for leadership, especially among Asian-Americans who are commonly stereotyped as passive
(Liang, Lee and Ting 2002; Sy et al. 2010). Garcia, Huerta, Ramirez, and Patrón’s (2017) study finds that participation of Latino male students in panethnic organizations is positively correlated with leadership development. Students also develop a panethnic consciousness by forming mentoring relationships, working with others, and coalition building. Other work suggests that the relationship between panethnic identity and membership in panethnic organizations is reciprocal. Not only does participation foster a panethnic consciousness, but panethnic consciousness itself can serve as the impetus for participation in panethnic groups. Liang, Lee and Ting (2002:82) observe that

> the development of a panethnic identity has the effect of moving Asian Americans toward involvement in cultural or racial organizations where leadership skills can be developed and expressed... involvement in these organizations can serve as an entry point to broader campus leadership roles.

On a facilitated pathway, leadership was fostered both by respondents’ developing panethnic identities and by their membership in the available voluntary organizations.

Scholars of education have repeatedly shown that positive mentorship and active role models are crucial for the well-being of young men and women, particularly those with working-class backgrounds (Jarrett 1995; Stanton-Salazar & Spina 2003). Coleman (1988:S109) writes that “often, it is resources in the form of other persons who have obligations in one context that can be called on to aid when one has problems in another context.” Studies also find that mentoring relationships between faculty and undergraduate students improve success markers like GPA and units completed, and reduced college drop out rates (Campbell & Campbell 1997). For individuals who are racially and economically marginalized, these “significant others” can offer compensatory resources, offsetting a lack of social means and modeling the behaviors necessary for upward mobility (Erickson, McDonald, and Elder 2009: 344).
One way in which community leaders leveraged their panethnicity was in taking advantage of existing supports, particularly in higher education settings. Many community leaders credited panethnic student associations for creating safe opportunities for mentoring, professional development, and connecting to others within the field. They described how these organizations offered fellowship with others who shared a common background and intentional supports to help them succeed. Adrian Bautista, the vice president of a Latino business association in Gateway Coast, first became involved in a business association as a college student, when the organization was looking to expand the number of student chapters. He helped with the initial recruiting, made announcements in some of his classes, and held a leadership position in the student chapter. Upon graduating, the organization helped connect him to job opportunities and he stayed active until he was invited to join the executive board of the local professional chapter.

Panethnic student organizations were often described as stepping stones for the professional world. Connie Park, an immigration attorney of Asian background living in Gateway Coast and an executive board member in a local ethnic bar association, thinks back to her initial involvement within panethnic student associations,

*I think in college it was just social. You know, just more like [...] people congregating with like people. Law school, I mean, there was more of a professional, I guess, purpose behind it. So [...] speaking for the [...]Asian Pacific American Law Students Association [...] it was basically a purpose for us to come together and help each other, you know, share resources, mentoring, that kind of thing. It’s very similar to the purpose of the Asian American Bar here...*

While she saw college ethnic groups as largely social organizations, Connie recognized the professional value in her law school student groups. These organizations brought students together to “help each other” and “share resources [and] mentoring.” Like other respondents on a facilitated pathway, Connie initially became a member of an undergraduate student affinity
group, and after recognizing the benefits it afforded her, she later became involved with the larger panethnic professional organization.

Connie and Adrian leveraged their panethnic identities in student professional groups that facilitated their transition from students to professionals. Professional associations are socializing agents that serve both networking and development purposes, especially in occupational fields that rely greatly on interpersonal relationships (Richards, Eberline, & Templin 2016). Minority professional associations address the unique challenges of underrepresented or traditionally disenfranchised groups and serve to bridge gaps in social capital felt by ethnic or racial minorities. Additionally, the professional associations provided respondents with the tools and information necessary to advance their career objectives and, most importantly, helped build essential social capital for the job market. Adrian was not the only respondent to be assisted in his job search by a professional organization. After having her first job offer retracted and moving back home, Laura Rosario explains how it was an ethnic network of lawyers that helped her land her first real job as an attorney,

*What I did was […] I called my law school and told them my [prior job] offer got retracted, they sent me to [another law school] and said use their career services offices, and I did, and there was a woman that worked there, and you know, she was Latina, and when she found out that I was Filipino, she said, you know what, you should look up the Filipino Bar Association. And she gave me the phone number of the guy and the address, and so I called him – he never called me back, but I ended up going to a meeting, because I saw it advertised, and from then on, that was my community, the Filipino Bar Association, and they have helped me.*

Laura credits the professional Filipino network for getting her access to job information; it became the key source of career support and guidance. This assistance proved important to her trajectory; she now sits on the executive boards of two law organizations in Gateway Coast – the Filipino Bar Association and the Asian Bar Association.
Interestingly, there were several differences across panethnic group in the associations respondents joined. Asian respondents in Gateway Coast commonly reported belonging to both an ethnic and a panethnic association. For example, among Asian lawyers, the ethnic bar (i.e., Korean, Chinese) was considered the “baby Bar” or a stepping stone to more high-profile opportunities because these associations tended to be smaller in size and easier to navigate. Latino respondents did not report participation in ethnic associations nor did they reference the existence of such groups. Their participation was exclusively in groups that labeled themselves “Latino” or “La Raza” (“The Race”).

Another difference between Latino and Asian respondents was in their reference to organizational fit. While none of the Latino respondents mentioned a concern about whether a panethnic group was right for them, several Asian professionals shared that they joined organizations that were the closest match. All these respondents belonged to ethnic groups that occupied a more contentious place within the broader Asian category, specifically Filipinos and those of South Asian backgrounds. From their perspective, they were not the typical Asian but Asian organizations were, nonetheless, the most inclusive groups for them.

Although Laura Rosario did not typically claim an Asian identity, she recalled leveraging her panethnicity when it was the closest group that would include her.

So it was very funny, because in college I didn’t seek [ethnic organizations] out, but in law school I did, and I think part of that was because, you know, I moved away from home and I didn’t have any friends, so I had to make a lot of new friends at law school, and going to a graduate school, I think the higher you go up when it comes to education, the more you start seeing the differences in socioeconomics and how it actually kind of breaks down racially, and so what I was seeing was that, at a law school, there were people there that had years and years and generations and generations of people that were lawyers and, you know, professionals and – and then there’s this influx of immigrants, people like me, who we were going to be the first in our family to be in law school and get a professional degree like that, and there was just such a difference, I think, in who we were and like, what our needs were, that that’s why I identified and
looked for Asian groups. There wasn’t a Filipino group at [my law school]. There might be one now, but back then it was just Asians.

What makes the experience of joining professional associations different for ethnic minorities than for their majority peers is it is a place to belong to in institutions and professions that are mostly white and upper-middle class. Laura was frank in her recollection of law school and the feeling of being at a disadvantage compared to her white peers. It became apparent to her that she was a racial minority with different experiences than her peers and she recognized that she and others from immigrant backgrounds were facing unique challenges. Because there was no Filipino student group, she sought out other Asian students who would understand her struggles and who would have similar needs. Laura’s example illustrates how panethnicity is flexible enough to be leveraged, even if she did not feel tied to the identity.

Similarly, Bilal Bajwa, a South Asian lawyer in New South and a member of several ethnic bar associations, was drawn to ethnic organizations because they provided him with a place to belong within the legal field in his city, where ethnic minorities are underrepresented. He explains,

So, you know, it’s a little tough for me. I mean, I think when it comes to... certainly being in the US as a professional or part of professional organizations where there are attorneys from Asia, I identified with those groups because I feel that, okay, well where on the map am I? And, so yeah, Pakistan is part of Asia and so yes I do think that, you know, I will gravitate towards organizations that have Asia, Asia-Pacific because I do feel that that is the broadest grouping that includes me [laughs].

For Bilal, originally from Pakistan and a recent U.S. citizen, it was “tough” to find his professional place. He gravitated toward Asian or Asian-Pacific organizations. Like Laura previously, he explains that it is the “broadest grouping” that was inclusive of his ethnic background. This search for a place to belong was common for respondents who did not see many others like them in their profession. Even if the fit between was not perfect, respondents
could leverage their panethnicity to find and join groups that could offer some sense of belonging.

In addition to employment opportunities and a place to belong, professional associations also provided respondents with access to an established social network, especially after relocation or when just starting out. South Asian lawyer Arnav Verma explains that he immediately sought out a legal community when he moved to Gateway Coast. Because none of his law school friends had shared his panethnic background, he looked to specifically reconnect with an Asian or South Asian community. He recalls,

“So when I came out here, I actually, as a first year, immediately looked for some sort of Asian bar or South Asian bar, and it turns out there was, and I got lucky, because the year I got there, there was actually the South Asian bar’s national convention [...] being held here [...], and so there was just like, a lot of opportunities to get involved, and so I jumped right into that as a first year and got incredibly involved right off the bat. Joined the board of the local chapter the year after and basically have been involved ever since.

Arnav leveraged his panethnicity to find a professional community. When he found a South Asian bar association, Arnav jumped right in and got “incredibly involved” in the upcoming annual convention being held locally. He ascended into leadership, joining the board of his local South Asian bar chapter after just a year of membership. This rapid climb up the leadership ladder was not unusual among respondents. Because ethnic or panethnic professional associations are often smaller than their majority counterparts, respondents found it much easier to join executive boards and quickly take on leadership roles. Respondents’ participation in these smaller panethnic or ethnic associations helped propel them into leadership opportunities within and outside of the ethnic organizations.

This was also true for Michael Tran, a lawyer of Asian background. He stressed the importance of networking as a new professional and described his various efforts to find community after moving to New South,
As somebody who's new professionally, you know, I wanted to reach out to people, first of all, who were in my practice area. I practice immigration law so I reached out to people who are practitioners in that bar. And then as an Asian American, I felt bad, you know I wanted there to be the other Asian American professionals like me, so I Googled and found that there's the [state Asian] Association. I reached out to the guy who was then the president and he invited me to a board meeting and that's how I got involved.

As a freshly-minted lawyer and new to the area, Michael sought networks in his specific field of law and with a panethnic community. After initially reaching out to the association president, he received an invitation to attend a board meeting, which began his ongoing involvement. At the time of the interview, Michael had become a member of the organization’s executive board.

MENTORS

While ethnic and panethnic organizations provided respondents with employment leads, a place to belong, networking circles and leadership opportunities, community leaders also leveraged their panethnicity by way of relationships with more established mentors. Role models served as a critical resource to support respondents along their career pathways. Carlos Guerrero, a government official from Gateway Coast, describes how he became involved in local Latino organizations through the help of the Latina director of a foundation. He explains,

*The head of [a local Latino] Foundation […] is one of my mentors. I mean, when I moved here, I just saw this woman and I said, she’s just a dynamo, right, and so as head of the […] Foundation, I think we – we hit it off, and so she said, you know, I would really relish you being part of the […] Foundation. So she nominated me, and it’s been a great relationship.*

Carlos was a relatively recent arrival to Gateway Coast and was a self-proclaimed “networker,” sharing how he sought out a Latino community soon after relocating. He described having actively sought out the director of a large Latino foundation in the city because he was attracted to her charisma. After an initial meeting, she invited Carlos to join the board of her foundation, helping plug him into the local panethnic network and becoming a mentor. Thus, Carlos was able
to leverage his panethnicity to connect with a more established Latina leader in his new city who introduced him to new leadership opportunities.

Respondents described how panethnic mentors recognized respondents’ potential to contribute to the community and invited them into select circles. Jorge Hernandez was a Latino criminal justice advocate in Gateway Coast who was open about his time as a gang member. He describes a period in his life when he was trying to turn his life around and credits a Latina public health official for helping him realize his aspirations. Jorge explained,

“She was the director of a movement that was really focusing on helping Latinos balance their lives [and] she saw me as I was emerging – I was really involved in nonprofit work. I got taken under the wing of some community agencies, and they were – they were refining me, right? I was a refined homeboy at the time, right? You know, still bald and still walking the walk, but my heart was in the right place at the moment. I didn’t want to fight no more, and so she took an interest in me and she asked me to do a presentation to the Department of Public Health around just sharing my experience of trauma, right, and just – that there’s no such thing as PTSD because there’s no post […] and she appreciated that […] I was an open book, and so she took interest in me. So year after year I went to see her […] and then I applied to school. She’s like, [Jorge] apply and I got the scholarship for you – it’s not a lot, but something will help you. And I go, you know what, just, you know, thank you, and I think that gave me the avenue to pursue my education and – and I always will be grateful to her.

After she invited him to share his story with a group of health professionals, Jorge and the health official established an informal mentoring relationship. While they did not reconnect frequently, they connected every so often to talk about his work. When he was thinking about going back to school, she offered him a small scholarship to help him pursue his degree. For both Carlos and Jorge, panethnic mentors opened doors for them and helped set them on a career pathway.

Panethnic mentors may not always be readily available and established professionals of different racial/ethnic backgrounds come to fill those roles. As some community leaders shared, while these relationships are important, they do not replace the longing for a deeper connection.
based on a common ethnic or panethnic experience. Ryan Kapoor described his experience in the legal profession,

All of us, every single South Asian attorney will point to their mentors generally being a white attorney and there’s absolutely nothing wrong with that, in fact, it’s completely necessary and appropriate. But it would be nice to have also at least an Asian American attorney, let alone a South Asian attorney, who can speak to some of your cultural backgrounds.

Ryan’s assertion that that “every single South Asian attorney” has a mostly white mentorship network reflects the perception that there are few available South Asian mentors. Paradoxically, his interview highlighted both the tension and the flexibility in South Asian and Asian panethnicity. His statement that it would be nice to have “at least an Asian American attorney” implies that an Asian American mentor would be less ideal than a South Asian one, but an improvement over available options. Indeed, he goes on to say that “when you’re scraping about for role models and mentors and you can’t find a South Asian, you might at least be able to find an Asian.” Ryan’s statement also suggests his belief that Asian Americans of different ethnic backgrounds share some cultural understanding and common professional challenges.

Despite the perception of some cultural incongruence, several respondents explained that it was their mentors of different racial/ethnic backgrounds that offered them the opportunities to leverage their panethnicity, skills, and insider knowledge to bridge ethnic and mainstream communities. Eloisa Camacho, a lawyer of Colombian descent, explains that it was a white public defender in New South who became her mentor as she was just starting her career,

*I went to law school [outside of New South] and I remember in 1994, there was a flyer on the bulletin board – because email was just starting back then – and there was a flyer for an internship [...] here [in New South] and they wanted somebody who spoke Spanish. And I thought, oh my gosh, how random is that, you know... that's me. And so I interviewed and got the internship and then later I got a job there. So that was something that [this politician] recognized [...] he had the vision to see that there would be a need for Spanish-speaking attorneys so he would send me to things and --to community things--- and trainings and things like that. So that's where I kind of started to really get into it.
Eloisa was surprised when she first stumbled upon a recruitment flyer seeking a Spanish-speaking intern in her hometown of New South, recalling that when she was growing up, there were few Latino families in the city. However, Eloisa’s mentor recognized that the city’s population was quickly changing and that their law office needed to respond accordingly. He encouraged Eloisa to leverage her bilingualism, familiarity with the Latino community, and newly acquired skillset to outreach to the budding population. She credits this work and her mentor’s encouragement for her initial and ongoing involvement in the Latino community in New South.

Lola Reyes, a Filipina in Gateway Coast, was doing non-profit work when a chance meeting with the mayor resulted in a new opportunity to do education work. She joined the mayor’s staff as his liaison to the school district but was later encouraged to pursue a much more high-profile role.

*I took a position with [a non-profit organization] as their executive director and was there for five years, and just by chance met [the mayor], who had just gotten elected, had created this position here in the city as a liaison between the city and school district. He really wanted to be involved in the schools, but he has no jurisdiction over the school district. You know, they have their own budget, they have their own governance, so there just wasn’t a relationship, and in most large cities, you can get mayoral control, but that wasn’t the way that we wanted to approach this. So I was brought in as the kind of first full time mayor staffer that worked on education issues, and then [the mayor] basically said, look, you know, the only way we’re even going to really infiltrate is if we’re part of the system, so you should run for school board (laughs). Not exactly the strategy I would suggest for others who are in my position, but I ran for school board eight months into my term here, won, which was crazy, and then I’ve been able to be reelected twice since and that actually has enabled us to really, you know, support the school district.*

Lola’s meeting with the mayor resulted on a rapid climb in local politics. Lola’s credentials, experience, and desire to improve local schools led her to the mayor’s office. However, it was with the mayor’s encouragement that she decided to run for the local school board to more
directly make an impact. While Lola did not describe her Filipino background as an explicit asset in her position, she reflects on how it proved helpful in at least one way.

It was interesting to see the Filipino community come out in the way that they did [when I was running for school board]. Like, I had no connection to the Filipino community, for the most part, you know, except for, you know, people that I knew, but I wasn’t [a part of Filipino organizations]. I got invited to things periodically, but I didn’t have a base. But when I ran, I mean, people came out of the woodwork for me in the Filipino community, which I just thought was brilliant.

Even without strong ties to the ethnic community or to ethnic organizations, Lola’s Filipino background helped mobilize a support base for her election run. Inadvertently, Lola was able to leverage her ethnic background as she pursued local office.

FAMILIAL INFLUENCE

A handful of respondents on a facilitated pathway described their community leadership as the result of a family history of civic involvement. All of these respondents were located in Gateway Coast, where Asian and Latino ethnic communities had long existed. Indeed, these respondents could point to generations of leadership, with grandparents or parents who were prominent figures in their communities. For these community leaders, their involvement in the ethnic and/or panethnic community began early in life, usually as part of family-driven activism or civic engagement. Their leadership pathway was so intertwined with that of their parents and grandparents that often these respondents could not separate out their own history of community involvement from that of their family. Respondents explained that civic and community engagement was central to their upbringing and that their families provided the guidance, support, and modeling that led respondents to adopt leadership qualities early in life. These community leaders were able to leverage their ethnicity and panethnicity byway of their familial ties and social capital.
Among Latino respondents, family community engagement was framed through a panethnic lens. Vince Castillo, a dean at a law school in Gateway Coast, described his family’s history of activism and civic engagement within and outside of the Latino community. Both of his parents were highly involved in the panethnic community and engaged their children in high-level discussions about current events. He explained:

\[
\text{Well, [my dad] was in broadcasting and he was a shop steward for the engineers. And he was a very strong union man. My mom was one of the first bilingual teachers in [Gateway Coast]. In '67, she went from [a catholic school] to public schools. And her first year was during the first teacher strike ever. And she just expected that everybody would be out there -- turns out only 3 teachers out of 40 were out there striking. And I remember walking in the picket line with her in front of City Hall. And I remember her talking about the way some of the white administrators would treat the Latino kids. And then she ended up starting a group, which was for all the newcomer kids. Later on, she was vice principal of [a high school for immigrant children] in Gateway Coast. So we got to see -- and particularly later on -- with the Salvadoran civil war. It was both a dinner time conversation and we would know people, see people who had been -- who experienced it directly. So whether it was [university] student demonstrations or the farm worker protests and marches, that was our involvement. And because I was really into the politics, I campaigned for the first Latino on the Board of Supervisors. I did a lot of volunteering for him.}
\]

Vince provides an extensive narrative about his family’s deep ties to the city. He links his early interest in politics directly to his parents’ early involvement in the Latino community. Though he was of Mexican origins, Vince spoke of his parents’ community work in panethnic terms (“Latino kids”). He also shared that they talked openly about the Salvadoran civil war over dinner and brought him along to the various political protests taking place during the 1960s and 1970s. In fact, he referred to volunteering for political campaigns as “the biggest hobby” for him and for his sister as they were growing up.

Nelson Vargas also described his parents’ involvement as panethnic, albeit using a term typically used to refer just to Mexican-Americans. Nelson described his parents’ early work in the Chicano community. He recalls, “[my father] got a grant to essentially distribute Chicano
literature all across the Southwest [as part of this La Raza study project at Stanford], but that’s always been kind of their mission together, to empower consciousness about Chicanos.” His parents’ interest in identity politics fueled his later interest in college courses focused on Latino politics and Chicano studies. When pressed about what he meant by Chicano, he explains

Chicano is one of those that you make it and I feel it has been incorporated to a lot of people, and I’ve been proud to hear Salvadorians use it and I’m proud to hear Nicaraguans use it, because it is I feel more of a pan[ethnicity] because it’s self identified, and if we can’t set the criteria for a self identified name, (laughs) then we’re not doing it right.

Both Vince and Nelson described their parents’ involvement in the community as broader than their Mexican American communities. In their interviews, both men referenced Gateway Coast’s changing demographics as they were growing up, particularly the influx of Central Americans to the city during the 70s and 80s. Thus, their reflections upon their childhood experiences in civic engagement are framed through a more inclusive, panethnic lens.

Most Asian respondents who credited familial influences grew up well-integrated into a community based on national origin but later branched out into other communities. Grace Ng was a life-long resident of Gateway Coast and during the interview, she described going to various board meetings that her parents and grandfather attended in Chinatown. She spoke extensively about her grandfather’s involvement in the Chinese community and credits this role modeling to her early civic engagement. She explained,

My grandfather was one of the cofounders of the [local Chinese Alliance]. That was formed by American-born Chinese to make sure people were involved in civic engagement, made sure they went out and voted, but always in our household, we always talked about City Hall things, and current events, and I think that’s really important. As soon as kids can understand or accompany their parents to the polls, I think it’s important to just have that discussion at home.

Civic engagement and leadership played a central role in Grace’s upbringing. She was first exposed to leadership through Chinese associations then started serving on a variety of different
youth boards at a very young age. Eventually, these positions led to different roles within and outside of city politics, including her current appointment as a director of a government commission. Grace was able to leverage her ethnic identity and her family’s history of involvement in the Chinese community on her leadership pathway.

Al Duran immigrated to the U.S. from the Philippines in the 1970s. When asked whether there was an established Filipino community when he first moved to Gateway Coast, he recalled, “There were a few organizations. The oldest ones were formed by fraternal organizations, lodges. Like, there were two or three of them that were prominent… my dad formed a couple of organizations from his towns, from his province.” Al points to his dad’s leadership as an example of his family’s activism in Gateway Coast. Interestingly, their work fell less along national origin line and was more focused on regional (towns, province) interests. Al himself expressed some early resistance to the Asian American label, describing how he, as a Filipino, felt distinct from other Asian groups. Though much of his current work was ethnic-based (e.g. Filipino Chamber of Commerce), he provided examples of some cross-ethnic collaboration.

Community leaders on a facilitated pathway to leadership leveraged their ethnicity or panethnicity byway of voluntary associations, mentors, and family members. Most of these respondents lived in Gateway Coast (58.3 percent), a city with a long history of ethnic mobilization with many opportunities. Leveraging their ethnicity or panethnicity in pursuit of upward mobility, these community leaders plugged into existing organizations and connected with established mentors without the additional work of creating many of these resources themselves. Respondents revealed interesting differences by panethnic group. More often than their Latino counterparts, Asian community leaders described their affiliation with both ethnic and panethnic associations (e.g., membership in both the Korean and the Asian American bar
association). Latino leaders made no reference to belonging to ethnic-specific organizations outside of their panethnic associations. Additionally, some South Asian and Filipino respondents considered the panethnic fit for both organizations and among mentors. Panethnic organizations were not always seen as the perfect match, just the best available option. Likewise, respondents sought out mentors who were “at least” Asian, because there were few established professionals that shared their ethnic background and they resigned themselves to mentors who, at minimum, had a common panethnicity. These differences suggest a greater tension in Asian panethnicity than in Latino panethnicity, despite a flexibility that allows them to continue to leverage panethnic resources to their advantage.

ENTREPRENEURIAL PATHWAY

In contrast to those with a facilitated pathway to leadership, community leaders on an entrepreneurial pathway relied primarily upon their own human capital to pursue innovative ways to empower themselves and their communities. Many benefitted from high levels of human and social capital and held graduate or professional degrees either from the U.S. or from their country of origin. Their motivations varied and overlapped, both personal and altruistic. Many respondents mentioned professional aspirations as the source of motivation and they described how their ambitions were a strong impetus for connecting with other high capital (ethnic and non-ethnic) individuals; others explained that it was a strong desire to educate the majority population about their ethnic or panethnic community. In some cases, the motivation was emotional, guided by a longing for connectedness or fueled by national or local events that threatened the ethnic or panethnic community. Not all entrepreneurial respondents created something from the ground up. Some helped to expand or improve the services offered to their
community. Most community leaders on an entrepreneurial pathway lived in New South (82.4 percent), which as a new destination city, was in the process of developing the infrastructure and supports to address the needs of its immigrant groups. As the following examples illustrate, these respondents took it upon themselves to build the organizations, networks, and resources to assist their communities.

Prior studies show that ethnic entrepreneurs have historically filled gaps in services and provided for the needs of their communities. For example, in the early 19th century, when immigration from China was largely unrestricted, Chinese community leaders (mostly merchants and labor brokers with strong connections to China) were able to import goods and bring news from the homeland (Zhou and Kim 2001). After the 1882 Chinese Exclusion Act that barred Chinese migration, community leaders redirected their focus from maintaining ties to their home country to establishing their communities in the U.S. through family, district, and merchant associations located in Chinatowns.

Ethnic and panethnic entrepreneurs continue to be important to the prosperity of their communities. Studies by Agius Vallejo (2009, 2013) find that Latino entrepreneurs engage in community work within low-income ethnic communities, with the hope of improving opportunities for upward mobility. In her study of entrepreneurs in Los Angeles, Agius Vallejo (2013) finds that both middle and upper class Latinos engage in philanthropic activities, but with substantial differences across class lines. Middle class Latinos informally give back by volunteering their time and serving as mentors in the communities where they grew up, while upper class Latinos assist in institutional ways, constructing Latino-owned banks or charter schools that grant co-ethnics greater access to economic and educational opportunities. In another study, Agius Vallejo (2009) also finds that Latina professionals in Los Angeles maintain
committed to the socioeconomic advancement of their communities and establish professional resources to capitalize on middle-class ethnic capital.

Thus, entrepreneurship is an avenue for ethnic and panethnic leadership and immigrant groups are more likely than native groups to pursue this type of economic integration (Lofstrom 2014; Zhou & Sye 2013). Entrepreneurship yields both economic and social benefits for entrepreneurs and their communities. Entrepreneurs benefit from an “alternative means to social status recognition” that elevate them in prominent positions within the community (Zhou and Sye 2013). However, not all ethnic entrepreneurs are the same and the sociological literature notes at least two distinct types.

Middleman minority entrepreneurs often navigate between the ethnic and mainstream communities and primarily serve non-ethnics. One example of a middleman minority entrepreneur, Daniela Suarez created a business that borrowed from her own cultural background with that hope that it would be used to educate the broader (i.e., whiter) New South community. In her interview, Daniela explained that she wanted a concept that would appeal to a wide market without defaulting to what she referred to as the usual restaurant or taco stand. Once she found her idea, she and her sister began to set up shop. Their specialty shop found success relatively quickly and was featured in the food sections of local magazines. This local celebrity inadvertently led to an event with the mayor where she explains that a single interaction with the city official got her placed as the only Latina on a government board.

In contrast, ethnic enclave entrepreneurs conduct their business within ethnic neighborhoods and mostly serve co-ethnics. Salvador Nuñez is one such example, having focused his business on the needs of a budding Latino community. Arriving in New South in the early 1990s, he began doing radio and television and recalls his efforts to bring Spanish-language
musical artists into town to perform when Latinos numbered just about 10,000 people. This work led him from his media and entertainment background into the political world. He was eventually involved in pushing for state legislation that would grant driver licenses to undocumented immigrants. Both examples of entrepreneurship—middleman minority and ethnic enclave—demonstrate how ties to the Latino community resulted in leadership opportunities for both Daniela and Salvador within and outside of their panethnic community.

PROFESSIONAL AMBITIONS

For some respondents, their professional ambitions were fulfilled within the panethnic community. A non-profit leader with a background in business, Emilio Perales remembers the “pivotal moment” when he had to decide whether to stay in New South or move back to Mexico, a decision guided by whether he was able to figure out how to create a business around the needs of the Latino community. He explains,

“So I said, if I’m going to stay [in New South] I want to do something that connects me with the immigrant community, the Latino community. And at that time, I’m just thinking...surely there’s something that all these folks that are moving here, there’s something that they need. What is that and how to create a business around that? But so it was a process of about 8, 10 months, maybe a year that I was just talking to a lot of people...and so it was in one of those conversations that I had that somebody said, well, have you ever thought about starting a non-profit?

Emilio went on to start one of the largest Latino-serving non-profit organizations in the area, after identifying a significant need within the community. He recognized the lack of social and economic resources available for Latino immigrants in New South and co-founded a non-profit to address these gaps. However, even while his work was concentrated in the Latino community, Emilio found himself needing to engage the broader New South community. Because funding for his organization came largely from non-ethnic sources, he spent a great deal of his time interacting with non-Latino business leaders, convincing them that they should invest in his
organization and support their work within the Latino community. Emilio leveraged his professional background, ties to the panethnic community, and business connections in order to build his organization and his own profile.

A business professional also from New South, Manolo Arenas looked to expand the options available to co-panethnics in his field. Despite there already being an active panethnic chamber in New South, Manolo Arenas did not like the structure of the existing Hispanic chamber and, together with like-minded Latino business owners, built a second one. Manolo and several friends leveraged their business know-how and came together to construct an organization that they felt better reflected their needs as business leaders. Manolo is a middleman minority entrepreneur who used his capacity as an executive member of the chamber to bridge between Latino entrepreneurs and non-Latino business leaders. The chamber made the intentional decision to ensure that approximately fifty percent of their board was made up of non-Latinos.

Interestingly, Manolo was not the only respondent to identify the need for a new chamber of commerce. Danny Zhao was the business manager of a Chinese restaurant in an affluent suburb of New South. After a trip to China with other (white) business leaders from the city’s chamber of commerce, Danny began a local chamber focused exclusively on Chinese business. He recalls,

*So we traveled together and some people asked me, because I’m Chinese [...] do you have any business-related association [related to China] and I said no. And so that drove me to think about you know, why don't we set it up. So after, I came back and talked to a few friends [...] so we decided to set it up [...] I think [the other business leaders] want to know more and understand more, who is doing business in China and maybe you know, get to know each other more easy and finding opportunities together.*

Danny’s interest in Chinese business sparked the idea for a local association that specifically catered to those currently conducting or potentially interested in conducting business in China.
Given his contacts and connections to the country, Danny was able to bring together “a few friends” – most of them Chinese – to create the association. Danny is also middleman minority entrepreneur, leveraging his ethnic resources (i.e., insider knowledge and social networks) to start a business organization that catered to the interest of the mostly white members of the local chamber.

As seen with respondents on a facilitated pathway, Asian entrepreneurs often leveraged their ethnic, not panethnic, identity. They were much more likely to reference and participate exclusively in their ethnic communities than their Latino counterparts. Indeed, while Danny described how he leveraged his ethnic ties and insider knowledge to create a Chinese Chamber of Commerce in New South, Manolo’s Hispanic Chamber was a similar project but one that was broader in scope and identity.

COMMUNITY NEED AND REPRESENTATION

Other entrepreneurial respondents were motivated by broader community needs, such as cultural education or political representation. In New South, some leaders felt an obligation to educate a majority population that had little exposure to their ethnic or panethnic communities. Many of them had previously lived in diverse cities with greater representation of minority groups and were surprised by some comments directed their way. Jay Nguyen, a self-identified entrepreneur of Vietnamese-Chinese background, grew tired of being the only Asian in both his workplace and social life. He describes one particularly uncomfortable interaction with a friend,

*I was driving him home and he asked me, so do you eat dogs? [...] I looked at him, I was confused as to whether he was joking about whether I eat dogs or not or whether he’s being serious. And I realized he was really serious asking me that question so I responded politely back saying, I do not eat dogs personally but probably, in Vietnam, if they’re really hungry, they would eat dogs. And so from that point on [...] I asked myself one question that is: I must not be the only Asian. I did not see many Asians seven years ago in [this city] but I must not be the only Asian that feels the same way. So I went to Google and typed in “Asian organization” and nothing came up but what did come up
was the National Association of Asian American Professionals and then I proceeded by emailing them, asking how do I start a chapter. And the rest, they say, is history.

Jay was able to leverage his panethnicity in several ways. He reached out to a national panethnic organization to begin a local chapter in New South and through this work gain a reputation in the area as someone who could speak to the Asian American experience. Jay’s experience was interesting for another reason – he was one of few Asian respondents in New South that referred to himself as Asian and who worked to create a panethnic, not simply ethnic, organization.

Helen Tsai was another respondent whose entrepreneurial endeavors were motivated by a negative experience due to her ethnicity. A dance instructor from Taiwan, Helen had lived in several U.S. cities prior to moving to New South with her husband. When asked about whether she sees herself as a leader, Helen revealed a pivotal moment in her thinking,

I see myself trying to promote arts to the community and with my heritage. I use a lot of my heritage because when I first came here 20 years ago I have experienced people pointing to my nose and saying, Chinese! Like, as if they'd seen a ghost. So then part of the inspiration that I feel oh, I need to educate people – Chinese are Chinese. It is the same as you and me, you know, and we just have different heritage and different culture and my discipline is in dance. That's why I started to do all these things.

Similar to Jay, the experience of being different was not always positive for Helen. When she first arrived in New South in the early 1990s, she recalls people reacting to her “like as if they’d seen a ghost.” Rather than shrink into the background, Helen felt it was her duty to educate the broader community about Chinese culture. She formed a non-profit organization focused on Chinese art forms, marrying two of her interests – dance and Chinese culture —to counteract the ignorance and educate the broader community.

These types of experiences led both Jay and Helen to seek entrepreneurial avenues for educating the majority population about their respective communities. It was important for Jay to find other Asians, regardless of ethnic background, like himself who were struggling in New
South. The organization he created proved a much-needed educational vehicle and Jay found himself an unintentional spokesperson for the Asian-American experience. Helen was more specific in her intentions, wanting to provide education about the Chinese community through her cultural organization. Her dance troupe includes a diverse array of people (both of Chinese and non-Chinese background) and they routinely perform at local festivals to teach people outside of the Chinese community about the Chinese cultural arts.

Jay and Helen were two of the more explicit examples of leaders who leveraged their experiences and cultural insight to educate the broader New South community. Other respondents also shared moments of cultural insensitivity but dismissed these experiences explaining they did not feel offended when confronted with assumptions or asked strange questions (e.g. if they spoke Mexican). In fact, many respondents were quick to dismiss these interactions as pure ignorance by uneducated individuals.

Compared to their New South counterparts, entrepreneurial community leaders in Gateway Coast described acting less as cultural ambassadors and more as advocates for specific issues. Indeed, many began their professional careers as grassroots activists and were highly invested in protecting their particular communities -ethnic, panethnic, or otherwise. They identified gaps in services and representation to marginalized groups and sought to address them. Doug Wu was a local politician that reflected upon his responsibility to represent the interest of the Chinese and broader Asian communities. He explained,

_I did most of my adult work in the Chinese community in Chinatown. But then as I moved up in positions, I realized that as I went to the mainstream to discuss issues, not only did I have to discuss issues in a general sense, but I had to discuss issues from the Asian perspective, as a community that maybe has less resources, and then you realize that if you don’t make those points, it slips away from people’s minds. So it was constantly having to battle that mainstream image, especially for the Asian community, the Chinese community, because they didn’t know who lived down there, and so the assumption is, you know, we’re the model minority and everybody is doing fine and making a lot of_
money and so forth, which is not true, you know? So I had to sort of get rid of that or add to that image.

In thinking about how he began his work, Doug speaks to his role in representing both the Chinese and the Asian communities within the “mainstream.” While his early work was concentrated in Gateway Coast’s Chinatown, as he moved up in his career, he found himself the representative voice in the room, not only for the Chinese community but for the broader Asian community, as well. Doug leveraged both his ethnicity and panethnicity to counteract assumptions that would lead these communities and their issues to “slip away from people’s mind” because of the belief that they were a model minority and “doing fine.”

Leo Torres, another politician, attributed his political career to the volunteer work he did with a Latino legal organization to campaign against state-level anti-immigration legislation. Through this work, he learned a lot about the political process and considered how it important it was to have people in power who understood the struggles of immigrant and working class communities. He recalled,

I saw who was running for supervisor in 2008 when I chose to run, and [...] I was like, there’s no way that person is going to be (laughs) you know, representing me and representing, you know, all these groups that I’ve been working with, because [...] this guy will completely ignore them and won’t try to advance, you know, the causes of immigrants and working people the way, you know, I know we need to be championing our issues. So I decided to run.

While he explained that politics was not a lifelong ambition, Leo remembered feeling that candidates running for local office did not represent the interests of his communities – “immigrants and working people.” This convinced him that “we need to be championing our issues.” Given his previous political experience, Leo was motivated to run his own campaign. When asked about how his identity as a Chicano and Latino influences his work, Leo shared that he and the only other Latino on Gateway Coast council together work to address issues affecting the panethnic community. He shared,
[The other Latino councilmember and I] are really close so we caucus a lot together. You know, we’ve done work that benefits our community. We’ve both done that. We’ve tag teamed on that. We’ve been very supportive of each other in that. Sometimes we’ve been very conscious of who works on what. On immigrant issues, since he came to the United States as an undocumented youth, I defer to him on immigrant issues. Last year, he deferred to me on [an issue] that I was really excited to work on.

While he and his colleague together leverage their panethnicity to advocate for the Latino community, Leo’s interview also hinted at the diversity among this population. His colleague’s experience as an undocumented immigrant granted him the legitimacy to take the lead on immigration issues and Leo deferred to him in these cases. In other instances, Leo’s working-class background motivated him to take up issues that affected this community.

Not all entrepreneurial respondents created something tangible, like an organization or business. Instead, what defined them as entrepreneurs was a common self-initiation, drive, and a strong reliance on their human capital and insight into their ethnic or panethnic communities. In the previous two examples, Leo and [1.9.15] did not form chambers of commerce, non-profits, or professional organizations but were no less entrepreneurial, having identified a gap in representation and resources to their communities and committing themselves to advocacy work. It is no coincidence that both of those cases were located in Gateway Coast. Unlike new destination cities, infrastructure may be lacking to support the needs of ethnic communities, established gateways often face different obstacles – namely that of representation.

LOCAL AND NATIONAL TRIGGERS

Several respondents cited local and national events as triggers for community involvement and activism. They believed these events posed significant threats to the livelihood and well-being of their communities and felt called to action. It was within these contexts that some entrepreneurial respondents took on greater leadership roles and leveraged their resources, even if they had not been substantially involved in the community before.
A Latino lawyer in New South, Antonio Mendes recounts the story of a coalition that formed when a proposed English only charter was placed on the ballot for a recent election. As he explained, the referendum had little teeth but was a symbolic move by conservatives and reflected growing anti-immigrant sentiment. A longtime resident of New South and someone who had previously advocated on behalf of immigrants, he and others from diverse backgrounds came together to work against the referendum. Antonio leveraged his legal expertise to assist the coalition and explains that he quickly became the go-to voice for the movement – even reaching a sort of local celebrity. He recalls,

*I became kind of the person that the newspapers and the radio and the television people would go to so I would be on television shows and on radio shows and be quoted in the newspaper for that. And I think for whatever reason, I said at the time and I continue to say it’s undeserved, but I kind of became the point person for – at least from the media standpoint in – they wanted to make I think more the movement, the victory of the English only opposition, they wanted to give that prominence and they needed somebody and they just settled on me. And so I [was featured in a local] newspaper.*

While he had previously advocated on behalf of immigrants, it was Antonio’s participation in this coalition that led to a number of different accolades. He became a leading voice of the movement, likely due to his Latino background and his ability to speak on the legal arguments his team was using to push back on the English Only referendum.

Lin Chung, a native of China and an assistant professor at a university in New South, led a life that was largely removed from her ethnic community until national controversy called her into action. She described a popular late-night television show that reflected anti-Chinese sentiment and really affected her. Soon after the segment aired, she became one of two lead organizers for a local protest. She admits that her position as a professor at the university garnered a fair amount of respect, such that she was able to leverage her prestige to ensure that there was a strong showing of the Chinese community at the protest. In addition, she utilized
listservs and websites as mediums for reaching others in the community. Lin felt it was important to humanize the Chinese community as the economic rivalry between the U.S. and China grew.

Local and national events pulled Antonio and Lin into advocacy work. In both cases, respondents were lead organizers in counter-movements aimed to address negative rhetoric against their respective communities. As with previous examples, Latino respondents acted panethnically while Asian respondents advocated on behalf of their ethnic community. Antonio advocated on behalf of the Latino and immigrant communities. Lin brought together the Chinese community to protest anti-Chinese national discourse. Their identification with and personal connection to their panethnic and ethnic communities spurred them into action. Despite a variety of motivations, entrepreneurial respondents were self-starters who created new businesses, started non-profits, represented the interests of their communities, and led local movements. They are distinct from respondents on a facilitated leadership pathway, who leveraged their ethnicity and panethnicity through their associations with organizations and mentors. Instead, entrepreneurial respondents relied primarily upon their own human and social capital. For some of these respondents, their insight into ethnic and panethnic communities enabled them to identify needs or gaps in service delivery or bridge these communities with the “mainstream” (as in the case of 1.9.15).

CONCLUSION

This chapter outlines two leadership pathways –facilitated and entrepreneurial –on which community leaders leveraged their ethnicity and panethnicity in pursuit of upward mobility and community empowerment. Respondents on both pathways described the variety of ways in which their ties to these communities also granted them access to existing resources,
information, and people to guide them to leadership opportunities or how it allowed them to create their own entrée into leadership based on their own human and social capital.

Community leaders on a facilitated leadership pathway leveraged their panethnicity by joining ethnic professional associations, reaching out to available mentors, or capitalizing on existing familial ties. These resources often helped them navigate institutions, like schools or the workplace, in which they were a minority. A small number leveraged their panethnicity through their parents’ or grandparents’ existing ties to an ethnic community, thereby facilitating their path to leadership. In all cases, social capital was a fundamental resource and much of this they gained by taking advantage of existing supports.

In contrast, respondents on an entrepreneurial pathway created businesses, started nonprofits, and initiated social movements. While those on a facilitated pathway leveraged their panethnicity or ethnicity by utilizing existing supports, entrepreneurial community leaders leveraged their own human and social capital and insider knowledge about their panethnic or ethnic communities. Some respondents found that community leadership was beneficial for their own professional aspirations, while others identified gaps in services to their communities and capitalized on this opportunity to advocate for these needs. Another handful was called to action by national and local events that threatened their community.

The types of opportunities available for community leaders are conditioned by the particularities of each of the two research sites and interesting differences between the New South and Gateway Coast emerged. Most community leaders on a facilitated leadership pathway were from Gateway Coast, a finding not altogether surprising given the long history of Asian and Latino migration to the established gateway. The greater availability of ethnic professional organizations and Asian and Latino mentors in Gateway Coast likely made it easier for
respondents to leverage their panethnicity to access these existing supports. The vast majority of respondents on an entrepreneurial pathway lived in New South. Given that New South did not have the same level of support available to Asians and Latinos in Gateway Coast, community leaders took it upon themselves to identify where there were gaps in services and information to their ethnic communities and create opportunities for cultural education for the entire New South community.

Within each context, there were also interesting differences across personal characteristics. In Gateway Coast, Asian and Latinos leveraged their panethnicity in similar ways but Asian respondents were much more likely to mention participation in both ethnic and panethnic organizations. Latinos almost exclusively participated in panethnic voluntary associations and did not mention ethnic organizations. In New South, Asian respondents were more likely than their Latino peers to leverage ties to their national origin community, rather than panethnic community. This was especially true among entrepreneurs. While Latino entrepreneurs started organizations and businesses that were panethnic in name and mission, Asian entrepreneurs instead focused their efforts on initiatives that supported the needs of their national origin group. While nativity likely has a role to play in where community leaders place their loyalty, the majority of both Latinos and Asians in New South were foreign born. This suggests that Latino immigrants more readily utilize and benefit from Latino panethnicity than their Asian counterparts.

In sum, the findings in this chapter reveal that community leaders leverage their ethnicity and panethnicity in distinct ways, influenced by context and panethnic group. The opportunities available in New South were distinct from those in Gateway Coast, likely given their distinct histories, demographic landscapes, and local politics. In addition, there are striking differences
between Asian and Latino respondents on both pathways. Asians often leveraged their ethnicity, even if they also participated in a panethnic community. Entrepreneurial Asians almost exclusively advocated for the ethnic community, while those on a facilitated pathway referenced both ethnicity and panethnicity. On the other hand, Latinos almost exclusively participated in or acted on behalf of the panethnic community, without much mention of the ethnicity. The next chapter will examine how a sense of belonging to a particular group influences how community leaders navigate the panethnic boundary.
CHAPTER IV - “A NEEDED AFFILIATION”: PANETHNICITY, GROUPNESS, AND BOUNDARY STRATEGIES

The two previous chapters show how panethnicity is contextual and can be utilized in a variety of ways. The first chapter unpacked when and how community leaders first experienced panethnic consciousness and the second showed how these leaders leveraged panethnicity as they pursued upward mobility and community empowerment. This chapter examines respondents’ *groupness* or “sense of belonging to a distinctive, bounded, solidary group” (Brubaker and Cooper 2000:20). While all could speak to the emergence of their panethnic consciousness and could describe how they leverage their panethnicity in intentional ways, community leaders varied in their ties to a panethnic community. This is because there is considerable flexibility around categories, their boundaries, and the meanings they take on as “ordinary actors […] are often able to deploy such categories strategically, bending them to their own purposes; or they may adhere nominally to official classificatory schemes while infusing official categories with alternative, unofficial meanings” (Brubaker et al. 2004: 35). Thus, different people can identify panethnically or utilize panethnicity but assign the category distinct meanings. This chapter illustrates how respondents’ sense of groupness better explains the ways in which they navigate social boundaries than self-identification alone.

Boundaries are central to any work on ethnic formation and change (Alba 2005) and sociologists have shown a great deal of interest in social boundaries since anthropologist Frederick Barth (1969) first urged scholars to pay more attention to the boundaries that define ethnic groups rather than the cultural stuff they enclose. Indeed, many scholars now give much more consideration to how and when these boundaries evolve. Brubaker (2004: 8) argues that scholars should avoid groupism – “the tendency to take discrete, bounded groups as basic constituents of social life” – and instead operate through the lens of groupness. He also urges
researchers to shift from understanding race and ethnicity as “things in the world” to “perspectives on the world” (2002: 174). Sanders adds that ethnic boundaries should be “better understood as social mediums through which association transpires rather than as territorial demarcations” (2002: 327). Brubaker and Cooper (2000:21) suggest the need to

\[ \text{... develop an analytic idiom sensitive to the multiple forms and degrees of commonality and connectedness, and to the widely varying ways in which actors (and the cultural idioms, public narratives, and prevailing discourses on which they draw) attribute meaning and significance to them.} \]

Heeding this call, I develop a set of five groupness ranges – loyal ethnic, strategic identifier, committed panethnic, supra-ethnic, and world citizen— that together capture the variation in panethnic association or “degrees of commonality and connectedness” within my sample and describe the specific boundary strategies associated with each range. I also consider how these groupness ranges may differ across the two research sites and how contextual differences influence what strategies may be available.

Panethnicity is an ideal form by which to study boundaries because it is uniquely defined by the tension between a broad solidarity and subgroup distinction (Okamoto & Mora 2014). Panethnicity is rooted in the belief of a common history while also offering an element of optional self-classification as “an identity that can be invoked or set aside in different situations for different cultural and political projects” (Espiritu 2016). While one’s birthplace or lineage may inform a national origin identity, panethnicity requires an additional categorical layer. However, there is still much to be gained from better understanding the scope of panethnic groupness and how this variation informs how community leaders navigate this boundary.

Pan’s (2015) study examined this nuance in panethnic association and identified several distinct strategies that Asian and Latino law students draw on to simultaneously manage their
professional and ethnic identities. Each strategy—in marginal panethnicity, tempered altruism, and instrumental ethnicity—was informed by the extent of their ties to a panethnic community. Students utilizing a marginal panethnicity strategy had a limited interest in panethnic causes, while those who used a strategy of tempered altruism are more proactive in their support of the panethnic community insofar as it relates to particular causes. Students using an instrumental ethnicity strategy were even more closely associated with the panethnic community and saw themselves as cultural brokers. She concludes that while panethnicity matters for all students, even those who do not have close ties to a panethnic community, the nuances in panethnic association produce distinct strategies for the law students in her study.

Pan’s study also has the added value of identifying micro-level strategies for navigating panethnicity. A substantial body of research has identified different types of boundary interactions and specific practices (see Alba 2005; Horowitz 1975; Massey and Sánchez 2010; Zolberg and Woon 1999), but much of this work focuses on case studies and group-level, rather than individual-level, practices. This includes Wimmer (2008), whose set of boundary strategies I use in this chapter to describe how groups and/or individuals navigate social boundaries. Wimmer’s strategies stem from the premise that ethnic boundaries emerge from ongoing negotiations and struggles of different groups. He relies on historical cases to explain group-level boundary strategizing but his higher-level, systems approach does not spend much time examining how individual people navigate social boundaries. Moreover, while his theory speaks to the various outcomes in the formation of ethnic boundaries, Wimmer does not speak to the question of differing boundary strategies within ethnic groups. Despite these limitations to Wimmer’s work, his boundary strategies are comprehensive and I adapt them to describe how my respondents navigate boundaries within each groupness range. His five strategies are
expansion, contraction, equalization, repositioning, and blurring. A visual representation of this typology is found in Appendix F.

BOUNDARY STRATEGIES

EXPANSION
Boundary expansion occurs when actors subsume existing categories into larger more inclusive groupings. Boundary expansion could take the form of a total collapse of categories such that they cease to exist or simply the construction of a more inclusive category that does not change the categories contained within it. For example, Mora (2014a, 2014b) traces the creation of a Hispanic panethnicity from the collective efforts of Mexican, Cuban, and Puerto Rican groups. These ethnic categories still exist but are classified under the broader umbrella of a panethnic label –Hispanic.

CONTRACTION
Boundary contraction does the opposite of expansion. Under this strategy, boundaries narrow in an attempt to create distance between two groups, especially when one group is seen to occupy a lower status. For example, Waters and Lamont’s (1999) study of black West Indian migrants in the workplace found that they attempted to differentiate themselves from native-born blacks, whom they saw as low status, by emphasizing their immigrant background to their employers.

EQUALIZATION
While boundary expansion and contraction strategies serve to either broaden or narrow the gamut of possible options, equalization instead focuses on the value or social location of particular categories. Equalization does not challenge the boundary; rather, it contests the hierarchy. It is the attempt by ethnic groups to reach social parity with the majority group (Alba
2005), as when minority political leaders in the U.S. work to ensure that their communities receive the same opportunities and access that white Americans do.

REPOSITIONING

Whereas equalization strategies work toward social parity, repositioning is defined by individual-level attempts to move up the ladder with no challenge to the hierarchy. The feasibility of these moves are contingent upon consensus from both sides of the boundary. Contemporary immigration scholars identify these practices as boundary crossing (Alba and Nee 1997; Zolberg and Woon 1999). Repositioning strategies could also occur for an entire group. The Chinese in the Mississippi Delta during the 1930s, for example, were able to move from “coloured” – a designation they shared with blacks in the region – to “white” through intentional distancing from other minority groups (Wong 1996). They did not dispute the low status designation of the coloured label, but simply looked to cross over into the higher status category of white.

BLURRING

Boundary blurring involves the intentional move away from using ethnic-based differentiation to instead adopting broader affiliations. In these cases, other identities or inclusive cultures become more salient than ethnic differences. The language can be universalizing, global, and transnational. For example, Lamont (2000) shows how working-class blacks use the language of religion to delegitimize racial hierarchies. Boundary blurring essentially deemphasizes ethnicity as a focal point.

GROUPNESS RANGES

I construct a typology of groupness ranges that are determined by a combination of three factors: (1) self-identification and/or stated affiliation, (2) spheres of community engagement, and (3) social or material investment in a particular community (e.g. time, money, resources). In
their interviews, many respondents referenced their association to communities that were broader than or removed from panethnicity. Therefore, the groupness ranges I develop include a more inclusive understanding of belonging that extends outside of the panethnic community. Below, I analyze my data and carefully articulate the relationship between these groupness ranges and the particular strategies used by respondents to navigate these boundaries.

I identify five groupness ranges – *loyal ethnic, strategic identifier, committed panethnic, supra-ethnic*, and *world citizen*. I describe each in detail, and pay particular attention to their unique boundary strategies and arranged them along a spectrum of narrow community association to broad community association. On the narrow end of the spectrum were loyal ethnics, who engaged primarily with their national group and invested their resources exclusively in this community. On the broadest end of the spectrum were world citizens, who saw themselves as “citizens of the world” and invested their resources outside of any race or ethnic-based community. Committed panethnics were located right in the middle of this spectrum, engaging and investing primarily within an Asian or Latino community. While most of my respondents were easily categorized into a groupness range, some straddled between different ranges because of some incongruence between self-identification and their described community engagement and investment. For example, a respondent may not have used a panethnic term to self-identify but they may nonetheless have described substantial involvement in a panethnic community. Because identity is often mutable and situational, when placing community leaders into groupness ranges I relied upon engagement and investment rather than on their self-identification.

A person’s groupness can be informed by a number of factors and I present demographic characteristics by groupness range. Table 4 below shows the share of the total sample made up
by each groupness range, as well as the percentages by panethnic group, gender, nativity, and context. There were notable differences across different personal and contextual factors and I underline where there is overrepresentation in particular groups, relative to their overall representation in the sample. Overrepresentation suggests that certain characteristics may more directly inform respondents’ groupness. For example, that all world citizens are foreign born suggests that the experience of being an immigrant may result in a global rather than a U.S.-based identity.

Table 4. Demographic Characteristics by Groupness Range

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Loyal Ethnic</th>
<th>Strategic Identifier</th>
<th>Committed Panethnic</th>
<th>Supra-Ethnic</th>
<th>World Citizen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of Sample</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Asian</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Latino</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Men</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Women</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% U.S. Born</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Foreign Born</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Gateway Coast</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% New South</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Community leaders appear normally distributed across the groupness range spectrum. The majority of respondents were located at the center of the spectrum, associated with heavy panethnic engagement and investment. More than one-third of respondents (35 percent) were committed panethnics, while another quarter (25 percent) were strategic identifiers. Supra-
ethnics made up 18 percent of the sample, while loyal ethnics and world citizens, the opposite ends of the spectrum, represented 12 and 7 percent, respectively.

The descriptive statistics show how the groupness ranges differ across personal factors and between contexts. As it pertains to panethnic group, Asians are most strikingly overrepresented at the opposite ends of the groupness spectrum, with nearly all loyal ethnics (91 percent) and the majority of world citizens (57 percent) being Asian. Meanwhile, Latinos were overrepresented at the center of the spectrum, making up 65 percent of strategic identifiers and 79 percent of committed panethnics. Together, this suggests that Asian community leaders’ sense of groupness more aligned with national origin or global communities, with less of an attachment to U.S.-based panethnicities than their Latino counterparts.

Similarly, women respondents were overrepresented at opposite ends of groupness spectrum. Like Asians, women represented the majority of loyal ethnics, suggesting strong ties to a national origin community. On the other end, women were also the majority of supra-ethnics, whose groupness was associated with ethnic-based communities that extended beyond panethnicity (e.g. “people of color” or “New American”). Men were slightly overrepresented as strategic identifiers, committed panethnics, and world citizens.

The most striking differences are a product of nativity. While the sample of respondents is split evenly between native and foreign born, all loyal ethnics and all world citizens were foreign born – a finding that is not altogether surprising considering that immigrants will more strongly identify by national origin than by panethnicity. Additionally, 82 percent of supra-ethnics were U.S. born. Community leaders in this groupness range engaged and invested into a ethnoracial community that was broader than their panethnicity but rooted in U.S.-based commonalities and experiences.
Because most were foreign born (see Chapter 1, Table 1), New South respondents were overrepresented in groupness ranges that aligned with national origin or global identities. They accounted for 100 percent of loyal ethnics and 71 percent of world citizens. They were also overrepresented as strategic panethnics, suggesting that they felt tied to the panethnic community in particular arenas but were not as engaged as committed panethnics. Gateway coast respondents were most strikingly overrepresented as supra-ethnics. As an established gateway, Gateway Coast had witness a long history of cross-ethnic collaboration and coalition building. This history was reflected in how its community leaders aligned themselves with particular communities.

Figure 1 offers a visual depiction of each of the five groupness ranges, showing how groupness and panethnicity align, overlap, or neither for respondents. Each circle (differentiated by the line types shown in the legend below) represents a distinct component: the solid line represents groupness, the shorter bold dash represents panethnicity, the longer bold dash represents ethnicity, and the varied dash represents other alternative identities as introduced by respondents. For certain visualizations, ethnicity does not appear. This is because respondents either did not spend a great deal of time talking about their individual ethnic background or did not distinguish between panethnicity and ethnicity. Many respondents used ethnic and panethnic labels interchangeably, suggesting that the two were seen as one and the same. In these cases, I use panethnicity as the default identity in the visualizations below.
Figure 1. Groupness Ranges
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LOYAL ETHNIC: EXCLUSIVE EQUALIZATION

On the spectrum of groupness range, loyal ethnics showed the narrowest sense of belonging. They maintained strong ties with their ethnic communities but were largely removed from a broader panethnic identity, although they did not challenge their inclusion within panethnic categories. This is highlighted in Figure 2, where groupness aligns with ethnicity but is removed from panethnicity. Most loyal respondents admitted to easily “checking the box” of their respective panethnic group when required and they were willing to collaborate with ethnic groups outside of their own. All loyals were foreign-born and their professional work often rested within the ethnic community. Many were ethnic entrepreneurs, having created careers around promoting and advocating for their ethnic group.

Among loyals, feelings of belonging were directed exclusively to their ethnic group, with panethnicity regarded as largely irrelevant. Their boundary strategy was one of exclusive equalization, where they invested significant time educating others about the history, practices, and traditions specific to their ethnic groups and worked to promote the upward mobility of their community.

Helen Tsai lived in New South for more than 30 years. She identified as Chinese-American, though she spoke a great deal about the heterogeneity within the Chinese community, particularly about the tensions between immigrants from Taiwan and those from mainland...
When Helen referred to “our community,” she was speaking exclusively about the Chinese community. She listed a number of contributions, including transitioning the local Chinese school into a non-profit organization and creating an organization dedicated to the Chinese performing arts. She was familiar with the panethnic category but largely showed no interest or genuine investment in it. In fact, Helen explained that the term Asian only applied to her when she was filling out forms and “there is no other choice.” In other words, she recognized her position within the category but did not illustrate panethnic groupness. Her strategy of exclusive equalization spoke to the educational and cultural needs within the New South community. The Chinese school served to teach the language to children of Chinese and non-Chinese backgrounds, while the Chinese arts organization preserved a cultural form and introduced it to the broader community.

Akari Hano also described a great deal of cultural work in New South. A university professor originally from Japan, Akari shared that she often felt some discomfort whenever she was forced to identify racially. When asked if she ever identified panethnically, she immediately stated that she never did. She later backtracked and explained that she did when filling out forms. This practice of classification was strange to her because it was something she never had to do in Japan. Unsurprisingly, given her feelings about racial identification, Akari focused much of her attention on sharing the Japanese culture and language with the broader community. As the
faculty advisor to the Japanese student group at her university, she encouraged her advisees to share various aspects of Japanese culture (e.g. calligraphy and children’s games) at local cultural festivals. She herself played a traditional Japanese instrument and was invited to regularly play at events across town. Additionally, Akari founded a local Japanese speech contest for language students, bringing in the Consulate and other Japanese organizations in the area. She shared,

_When I founded [the Japanese speech contest], I involved the Consulate of Japan here and also I involved [a local Japanese organization]. That [organization] takes care of the reception part and that Consulate takes care of the judges. The Consulate General becomes one of the judges and then we choose a Japanese professor from another University outside of [the state] because 10 or 11 universities in [this state] are participating... the grand prize winner gets to go to Japan._

Both Helen and Akari occasionally encountered the Asian category but were largely dismissive of it. Instead, their work was deeply intertwined with their ethnic identities. Their exclusive equalization strategies were not about political or economic integration, but were concerned with cultural representation and community education. For both women, it was important that their ethnic cultures were recognized and they were intentional about sharing their traditions throughout New South. Moreover, each found a way to institutionalize cultural elements through the formation of language schools, non-profit arts organizations, or annual competitions.

Danny Zhao also lived in New South and adopted an exclusive equalization strategy that he concentrated on his Chinese community. However, while Helen and Akari focused on language and arts, Danny was a businessman and described how he capitalized on an opportunity that was presented to him during a trip to China spearheaded by New South’s chamber of commerce. He recalls,

_Me and a group of local entrepreneurs, we traveled to China with the former mayor of [New South]. There were 36 members in the delegations and we traveled to several cities in China, like Beijing and Taiwan [...] So we traveled together and some people asked me, because I’m Chinese, do you have any business-related association and I said no. And so that drove me to think, why don’t we set it up? So after, I came back and talked to_
Danny recognized the need for and interest in an organization dedicated to educating the business community about industry and trade opportunities in China. One of few Chinese members of New South’s chamber of commerce, Danny had previously given a presentation about China and had fielded enough questions during his trip to convince him that it would be beneficial to have a chamber focused exclusively on Chinese business. When asked about the potential for a broader Asian chamber, he explained that different ethnic groups were specialized in particular fields (e.g., Vietnamese in nail salons and Koreans in Laundromats), making panethnic collaboration more challenging. This exclusive equalization strategy was undergirded by the belief that Chinese business leaders have needs and interests distinct from those of other Asian groups.

Despite accounting for a small share of respondents (11 percent) loyal ethnics displayed striking variations across panethnic group, nativity, context, and gender. The vast majority (91 percent) of loyal ethnics were of Asian background and all were foreign-born. While many Latinos indicated a preference for ethnic labels that might have suggested they were loyal ethnics, their community engagement was often panethnic in nature. In contrast, Asian loyals demonstrated a dedicated commitment to their ethnic group, in both affiliation and in investment in the community. Additionally, all loyal ethnics lived in New South, where the majority of respondents was foreign-born and were community leaders more attune to the differences within the panethnic category than the similarities across different Asian groups. Perhaps because of the perception of these differences, New South lacked a political, social, and economic infrastructure that reinforced a panethnic Asian identity. This was not true for Latinos, who had the benefit of
several panethnic chambers, non-profit organizations, and community centers. Women were also overrepresented among loyal ethnics (64 percent), one of only two groups in which they were the majority.

**STRATEGIC IDENTIFIERS: SPECIFIED EQUALIZATION**

On the spectrum of groupness ranges, strategies were broader in their sense of belonging than loyal ethnics but displayed restrained engagement in the panethnic community. For strategic identifiers, panethnic identity becomes most salient within the context of their work or field of expertise. They exhibit a “marginal panethnicity” in which their interest in panethnic work resides largely within a specific realm in their lives (Pan 2015). As Figure 3 shows, their groupness and panethnicity overlap but do not fully align. Most strategics began to identify with a panethnic community later in their life, by way of panethnic organizations in graduate or professional school. In fact, their efforts to improve opportunities for co-panethnics are concentrated mainly within the arena of their profession, through mentorship and networking. Generally, they describe their panethnic networks as largely concentrated within professional organizations like panethnic bars or business associations. The title of strategic identifier refers primarily to the circumstances under which a sense of belonging is ignited, not necessarily to the way these respondents self-identified. In other words, respondents may consistently identify panethnically (and this was often the case), but may only have this affinity ignited in specific settings.

Many strategics explained that their involvement with a panethnic community outside of professional networks was constrained because of busy work schedules and familial...
commitments. Given this time constraint, these individuals limited their involvement in the community to professional development and service opportunities. Therefore, they employed a strategic equalization strategy, working within their profession to promote and foster the successes of their co-panethnic colleagues and the broader panethnic community at large.

Tomas Medina was a relatively recent arrival in New South but has spent a lifetime in public service. He was the first Hispanic to occupy a particularly high-level federal position and is cognizant of the fact that many in the Latino community look up to him for this accomplishment. While he expressed a great deal of pride in his Hispanic culture, many of his interactions with other Latinos happened in the political arena. He shared that within his own family some of the ethnic traditions were not as present as they were in his childhood.

Nonetheless, Tomas considered what his contribution to the Hispanic community might look like in his adopted hometown,

*[This Hispanic community] is just not very mature here [in New South] and my hope, quite honestly, I want to work with [the governor]. I think it would be a great legacy for him to leave for the Republican Party a vibrant Republican outreach to the Hispanic community because it's growing in [this state]. And I think that would be a great opportunity to leave, that would be a great legacy for him, I think, to outreach and I think the Democratic Party ought to be outreaching to Hispanics as well [...] I've spoken to his staff about it and they believe that he'll be really receptive to it. And I've talked to members of the RNC about, can we get money to help here in that effort and the problem we have nationally, of course, from the RNC is that [this state] is reliably red and they want to spend their money in other swing states. And the Democratic Party, I haven’t contacted them but I suspect they’ll tell me the same thing. Why would we pour money into [this state], it would be a waste of money because it’s reliably red. So, anyway, it’s something...*

Though Tomas was new to the political scene in his new state, he had already initiated conversations with Republican insiders about the potential to increase outreach to the Latino populace, seeing it as “a great legacy” for the sitting governor to leave behind. In his interview, he expressed an interest in identifying the key Latino players in town –by which he largely meant
local politicians and policy brokers. His specified equalization strategy largely fell in the political arena, with the hope to someday help build a legacy of republican outreach to the Latino community.

Outreach was an important strategy for many respondents, particularly if they lived in New South. Nico Juarez was a police officer specializing in outreach to the growing Hispanic community in his city. While he was proud of his Latino roots, he admits that his work with Latinos was primarily for the benefit of the police force. He explains, “First and foremost, we have to look out for the [police] department, okay? Because people look at what we do and they see, well, if [our program] thinks this way, then that must be the way the whole department thinks.” This loyalty to the department is reflected in the intentional programming that Nico employs in his daily work,

> Every year we start off with a [Hispanic] community baby shower. We’re educating mommas-to-be and mommas-that-want-to-be what they need to do to take care of themselves and their babies and their loved ones. We do community health [...] to educate the community on how they need to take care of themselves even when they come from low income or even poverty and they don’t know anything about how to take care of themselves physically. And when they see that you care about them, now they’re seeing that the department is caring. [...] We [also] do a soccer tournament every year that is open to the community and we provide the trophies and the medals to show them that we’re supportive of them [...] So you know, now they’re seeing that we’re not here to try to round them up and send them to homeland or to ICE. Now they see that, hey, they do care.

This specified equalization strategy was enacted with the intent to build trust between the Hispanic community and the police department. As one of few Hispanics in the department, Nico’s sense of groupness was ignited as he served as an ambassador to help the police better connect with Hispanics in the city. However, his language also suggested that he maintained some distance from the broader Hispanic community. Nico believed his programs show that “they”—the police department—do care and they are not trying to round “them”—the Hispanic community—up and deport them. In other words, while he expressed significant pride in his
Latino background, Nico did not necessarily see himself as part of the same Hispanic community to whom he outreaches.

An attorney of Asian origin, Laura Rosario was an interesting case. She was strategic both in her identity and in the work that she did. While she primarily identified as American, she was active in both ethnic and panethnic legal organizations. An immigrant brought to the U.S. as a child, she explained that she identified by national origin when she first arrived, but that she had since embraced a stronger American identity. She actively began to seek out an Asian American community in law school—but only, she explained, because there were few people that shared her same ethnic background - Filipino. Now, in her professional work, her co-ethnic colleagues are family. In fact, after having maintained her American identity throughout the interview, Laura reflected midway through and said, “I identify as a Filipino American lawyer. That’s what I identify with.” However, despite an almost staunch ethnic identity, Laura was highly active in her local panethnic bar association. She explains what led her to the Asian organization,

*I got involved in the Asian Bar because I was again, very highly involved in the Filipino Bar, and back then, in the early 90s, the Asian Bar Association had always held a board seat open for a Filipino. So the former board member that was Filipino was going to step down, and he nominated me to be part of the board, and so I became part of the board, and I really enjoyed it, and I liked a lot of the people. So I was involved, I would say, with the Asian American Bar for about seven years, and rose up through the ranks and ran a bunch of committees and just, you know, made a name for myself through the Asian Bar.*

Laura’s substantial involvement in an Asian community was specifically through professional channels. In her interview, she expressed several times that she often felt annoyed by the pettiness she experienced with some Filipinos and recalled making conscious efforts to stay clear of the drama. However, she came to embrace her co-ethnic network of attorneys as family. Indeed, it was her strategic identity as a Filipino American lawyer in which she takes pride. Although she identified far more strongly by ethnicity than by panethnicity, over time Laura took
on a greater role within the Asian Bar Association, making a name for herself running several committees and rising through the ranks. This reflected a specified equalization strategy in which she worked for the benefit of her co-panethnics exclusively within the realm of her profession.

Elliot Kim, a professor in a field with few other co-panethnics, describes in increasing affiliation with the Asian American community in his university in New South, particularly the undergraduate students. As a faculty member, he had many opportunities to interact with these students and found himself pushing them to form mentoring relationships with Asian professors at the university. He shared one example of this,

There was an event last week put together by [the Asian student association] and, if I may say so, initiated and urged by me because [they are] known for their dumpling parties and Asian New Year Festival, fan dancing and tae kwon do demonstrations. I said, you know, you guys are more than dumplings, you guys are more than a fan, you’re more than a tae kwon do kick. And I asked them, have you had any lectures? Not exactly [they said]. So I said, I get invited to talk about me in different contexts but I hardly ever get invited to [this student group]. In fact, I never get invited […]. Let’s hold an event where it’s going to be sort of a mentoring, networking session so invite professors, Asian-American professors and there were four of us. One from the med school, one from the English department, one from poli sci, one from history and religious studies. We had a lovely time and they found it remarkable in that (1) it had never happened before and (2) that it was really different. It was really different in that, it could’ve been a white professor, African-American professor or any other professor, Latino/Latina professor but to have someone who looks like you, who may speak with a similar... not accent, but you know what I mean, as you. A lot of them found it really, not only encouraging but even empowering.

At Elliot’s urging, the Asian student association at his university expanded their programming beyond cultural displays, like fan dancing and martial arts. He pushed the students to think about the importance of mentorship and networking with faculty members who look and speak like them, insisting that they were “more than a tae kwon do kick.” Elliot did not distinguish between Asian ethnic groups – in fact, he alluded to the fact that many times Asians (regardless of ethnicity) are reduced to cultural markers, such as martial arts or food. In this instance of specified equalization, Elliot looked to empower the Asian community within his university,
particularly undergraduate students, with more substantive programming and mentorship with co-panethnic professionals.

Not all strategics identified panethnically. Despite the fact that her work is guided by a commitment to a broader panethnic community, Maricela Fernandez, a VP in a large philanthropic foundation in Gateway Coast, self-identified as “Mexicano” [sic] and explained that she hardly ever refers to herself as Latina, unless she is “doing the formal stuff” –giving speeches or addressing diverse audiences. Her work would suggest otherwise. Through her networks and position, Maricela managed to direct funding into various programs that support first-generation Latino students. One was a policy fellowship for Latino college students that she helped expand. She described its origins,

*Long story short, I said to [a local organization that brings Latino high school juniors and seniors to do a weeklong program at the state capital], you know, I think we should start a fellowship program. So we started out with four fellows at first, and we’ve increased it now to eight, and these college students [...] come and they’re in their sophomore or junior year, and they get a stipend at the end, of $3,000. We pay for their housing. They stay [at the state capital] for four weeks. They are matched up with a legislative office, they’re matched up with a mentor in the office, plus they have what we call the support familia, and we’ve partnered with [several] public policy schools to develop the curriculum. So what they do is they go and work in the legislative office, their lunch breaks are having lunch briefings with some of the elected officials, like the speaker of the assembly, the senate pro tem – like, leadership folks-- and then after they leave work, they then go and they go pretty much to what we call the college, the curriculum piece of it, and they learn everything having to do from education to health care to reading the budget process, every aspect that you can think of, and then there’s the last component, which I always believe in – you have to give back.*

Maricela’s company helped fund this policy fellowship, which seeks to address the gap in Latino political representation at the state-level. She explained that the foundation trusted her enough to decide what should be a priority. She shared a firm belief in the need for mentorship, explaining that there are not enough pipelines for Latino students. While Marcela was firmly “Mexicano” in identification, her pet projects did not only serve her co-ethnics; they also served a broader
Latino community and exemplified a specified equalization strategy – ensuring the political integration of Latinos in her state. Despite her self-identification, Maricela’s engagement with and level of investment defined her as a strategic identifier.

Strategic identifiers represented nearly a quarter (24.5 percent) of the sample of community leaders. It is perhaps unsurprising that Latinos made up the majority (65.2 percent) of this groupness range. Most respondents in this range were also from New South (60.9 percent) in which there were many more panethnic organizations geared towards the needs of Latinos than towards the Asian community. In this way, it was likely easier for Latino strategics to plug into existing organizations. Additionally, the Latino population was more than three times larger than the Asian count (10 percent vs 3 percent, respectively) and, as such, the perception of need was likely larger. For example, New South’s police department was making intentional efforts to reach out to the Hispanic community (byway of Nico Juarez’s efforts); this was not the case for the Asian population.

COMMITTED PANETHNIC: CATEGORY EXPANSION & PANETHNIC EQUALIZATION

Committed panethnics fall in the center on the spectrum of groupness range. They have strong panethnic identities, are often involved in panethnic organizations, and have active networks of co-panethnics that are similarly committed to advancement efforts. Most hold leadership positions on a variety of boards and commissions and organize events that celebrate, affirm, or educate around panethnicity. Several described long personal and family histories of civic service and commitment to the local and national panethnic community and provided foundational institutional knowledge about the origins of panethnicity within their communities. Their narratives make clear that they see themselves as cultural brokers and dedicate a great deal
of their personal and professional life to assisting the panethnic community. In many ways, they display “instrumental ethnicity” (Pan 2015), using their skills, networks, and resources to serve their co-panethnics. They operated in much the same way as loyal ethnics, widely advocating on behalf of their community, though they focused their attentions more broadly to a panethnic group.

For committeds, their groupness and panethnicity readily align (see Figure 2), as they affiliate themselves most strongly with other co-panethnics, in name and behavior. This manifests itself through their two unique boundary strategies – category expansion and panethnic equalization. Category expansion (in its most common form) was a strategy employed by committeds who could trace the origins of their panethnic involvement to their participation as young adults in early social movements like the Chicano or Asian American student movements and who have remained committed to the community ever since. In this context, category expansion refers to the broadening of a category from single-ethnic to panethnic. As illustrated by the following two cases, category expansion occurs on a number of levels – cognitive, behavioral, and institutional.

Celeste Rios is a self-described cultural entrepreneur in Gateway Coast. On the walls of her home, she displays photographs of herself with notable Latino celebrities and various certificates of appreciation for having served on national commissions dedicated to the representation of Latinos in the U.S. Having been involved as a young woman in the Chicano movement, she recalls the conversations that took place that pushed the movement beyond...
simply discussing issues pertinent to Chicanos to include others who were not Mexican-American.

*I think like, in 1970s – like, especially ’73, ’74 – it was still very strongly a Chicano movement, but we were talking about Latin American and Latino this and Latino that, and so we were using [the panethnic term], but hadn’t quite discovered the importance of it being inclusive, in terms of how we identified the movement [...] when you’re thinking about organizing your community, you realize who’s in the community. You know, there’s Puerto Rican, there’s, like, Cubanos – so it was out of necessity, because [people were saying] you know what, I’m not a Chicana, [but] this stuff applies to us, and we go, good point – [we’ll use] Latino and Latina.

While there were conversations taking place within the movement that focused on Latin American issues and in which panethnic terminology was used, Celeste remembers the movement as “very strongly” Chicano and reflects on how important identification is, particularly when one is attempting to organize a community. It took vocal non-Chicano Latinos and some introspection on the part of the movement to shift the focus of the cause. While Celeste’s account is not directly indicative of institutional change, it does point to cognitive and behavioral levels of category expansion within an active social movement. Celeste and others began to view the goals of her movement through the lens of a wider, panethnic community and adopted the language to reflect this newfound commitment to inclusion.

The second example of category expansion belongs to an Asian American respondent who recalls the institutional changes that took place as a result of protests by students of color when he was an undergraduate. Now a high-profile lawyer known for his work with the Japanese community, Jiro Miwa was hired soon after law school in the early 1970s to help build an Asian American legal group. Though it trailed the creation of Asian American studies programs in a number of colleges and universities in the west coast, the legal group did quite a bit of foundational work in Gateway Coast. Jiro describes,
One of the professors or the coordinators of the Asian American studies program [at my alma mater] had this concept of this community interest law firm [...] to create radical reform, or radical change in the legal system and the socioeconomic system [...] we realized we had limited political power, but our idea was to use law to empower [the Asian American] community, to teach them of their rights, to exercise their rights, because they were pretty nascent and fearful of authority. So many of them were immigrants, too, so they had a hard time asserting themselves and exercising their rights, and we felt that, you know, in a – pretty much in an arrogant way, because we were, you know, third generation – we had the benefit of so much that the immigrants didn’t have, but still felt that if there was some way we could help them speak up and speak out, we would actually be accomplishing something.

While ethnic studies programs are seen as some of the first panethnic institutions (Espiritu 1996), Jiro’s law firm helped to further establish the Asian American identity in Gateway Coast, through its dedication to serving a broader constituency. Their goal was to collectively empower Asians, particularly those who were foreign-born and fearful of authority. Their early cases involved violations of the constitutional rights of Chinese men at the hands of local police and employment discrimination against Filipinas at a large corporation. The law firm’s early work proves an example of category expansion at the organizational level – adopting a panethnic focus on the tails of the recent implementation of Asian American studies programs at local universities.

Given their involvement in panethnic efforts when the terminology was just starting to be adopted, Celeste and Jiro were at the forefront of the expansionary work being done in Gateway Coast. However, other respondents provided more contemporary examples of category expansion strategies. Interestingly, South Asian respondents, who felt left out of the mainstream Asian American narrative, commonly engaged in this type of work.

Ryan Kapoor was heavily involved in South Asian legal and leadership organizations in Gateway Coast. As the president of one such organization, he took seriously the terminology he used.
I’m involved with a number of organizations that are South Asian focused, and part of the reason for utilizing South Asian as the term is to incorporate non-Indians, and I think it’s pretty important to do so, and so I find that too many “South Asian” organizations are actually Indian American centric and I’d like that to change, and I’d like to focus on the American Sri Lankan, American Bangladeshi -- to all feel comfortable in those organizations, and if I’m not referring to myself as a South Asian, how will they feel comfortable referring to themselves as South Asians, right?

Recognizing that inclusion should be expanded to include non-Indians, who may feel left out of organizations that are South Asian in name (if primarily Indian in focus), Ryan is intentional about the inclusionary language he utilizes and about making all South Asians “feel comfortable.” For South Asian respondents like Ryan, panethnicity was more noticeably layered. In terms of panethnic labels, many of these community leaders identified as South Asian first, then as Asian American. Ryan and others in leadership positions within South Asian associations conducted expansionary work on two levels: first, to ensure that non-Indians were included within their South Asian organizations; second, to guarantee that South Asians were represented in broader Asian organizations.

A relatively small share of committeds used a strategy of category expansion. Instead, most embodied strategies of panethnic equalization that revealed a commitment to the political, economic, and social integration of their broader panethnic community. Respondents did not look to change the boundaries that define their panethnic group, but instead worked to challenge the ethnoracial hierarchy that disadvantaged their communities. Equalization strategies took various forms, from hiring fellow co-panethnics to encouraging mentoring relationships, all with the intent to advance the opportunities of their co-panethnics.

Paloma Villegas, a professor in the sciences at a university in Gateway Coast, jokes about the fact that she seems to seek out Latinos everywhere. Paloma is used to being a trailblazer in her profession, having been one of the first Latinas admitted to her graduate program and later
hired in her current position. However, this pioneering came with some feelings of alienation and loneliness. She explains, “everywhere I go, I start organizations. And people say to me, ‘why do you do that?’ I’m like, because I don’t want to be the one and only. I need community.” In this spirit, Paloma is proud to say that she has helped bring more Latinos to her department. She recalls,

> I started in the college of science and engineering as the only Latina, and I sat on the search committee and within two years I had hired my close friend, who is the second Latina in biology, and now she’s the associate chair... and then we really advocated for another Latino, now in biochem.

Aware of the underrepresentation of Latinos in the sciences, Paloma advocated for the hiring of co-panethnics. She did not identify her now-colleagues by their ethnic background but simply described them as Latinos. Paloma was seeking out a panethnic community. She cited research that finds that the hiring of one person of color creates an additive effect, such that diverse representation on a hiring committee betters the chances that a candidate of color will be hired. Paloma believed that she helped changed the culture in her department and laughed at the thought that she no longer needs to be the “watchdog.” This strategy of panethnic equalization served to ensure that other Latinos had an equal chance of getting hired, in part because of the Latino representation she helped bring to the department.

Carlos Guerrero is another respondent that actively sought out a panethnic community. A government official in Gateway Coast, he believed strongly in the need for political support within the Latino community. To this end, he was embedded in a number of Latino networks across different sectors. He shared,

> I’m a board member for [a local Latino foundation]. So that gets me in touch with sort of the philanthropic circle of Latino giving, and certain grantees and communities that represent certain constituencies. So I’m connected there. Whenever you have different positions in organizations, you gravitate to people like yourself. So whenever there’s a new Latino coming in a position of power or whatever, we definitely connect and we
network. So I definitely see myself as a connector of fellow minded individuals. There’s a group [here in Gateway Coast that] grew after the Sonia Sotomayor issue about the “wise Latina.” So there’s a huge network that we go out and have cocktail times and all that. It’s very loose, but it’s a whole list serve or network […] and we just get together and see what’s going on politically and otherwise, and the group is very diverse. I mean, granted, very liberal […] that is a network that you connect to because a lot of times you find yourself needing the political support […] You see opportunities for advancement or you have political turmoil, where [you] feel like, you know, your job is in jeopardy, you’re going to align yourself with a political support group, and the tendency is to immediately go to the people that really value the fact that you’re in a position of power within the organization, within the city. Not to say that it’s used only for that, but it’s just to lend support, because it’s important, you know, and particularly when there’s few Latinos in positions of power, elected or otherwise.

Like Paloma, Carlos’s community was panethnic, albeit much more political. It was important for him to surround himself with other “fellow minded” Latinos, regardless of ethnic background, who can appreciate his position as one of few Latinos in influential roles in the city. However, unlike Paloma, his strategy of panethnic equalization was less about the recruitment of Latinos into desirable positions but more about the support once they have arrived. As a political figure, he was engaged in the national discourse around Latinidad (e.g. Sonia Sotomayor’s statements about “wise Latinas”) and sought out others who might lend their expertise and encouragement. He found this support through diverse networks of similarly situated Latinos.

Nelson Vargas echoed Carlos’s desire to find support among other Latinos and to circle around a Latino identity, particularly within the political arena where he lamented the lack of representation for Latinos. When asked about whether he would ever prefer that others view him outside the lens of his ethnicity, he responded,

There’s a missing perspective about Latinos in our government and in our businesses, and so I think that nowadays, especially in this economic climate with rapid wealth inequality rising – that there is even a stronger need to have a Latino identity, and that’s what I think our [political] club has, and that’s what [my non-profit] has […] That’s a very important part of our role and our identity, and a needed affiliation, because I don’t see equity for Latinos in commissions, I don’t see equity for Latinos in city departments or directorships, and – and I see a disproportionate amount of Latino businesses being evicted and Latino tenants being evicted.
For Nelson, his Latino identity was a “needed affiliation” that could not be removed from the work that he does, in both his day job working in a nonprofit within a historically Latino neighborhood and as a core member of a local panethnic political group. His panethnic equalization strategy focused on advocacy and representation and he pointed to the economic climate, in which wealth disparities have made it harder for Latinos to be able to afford to live in Gateway Coast. This is a significant problem he tackled every day in his job. However, he also tied these economic issues to larger political ones, citing the lack of Latino representation in city commissions and as directors of city departments.

More than a third (35.1 percent) of community leaders fell under the range of committed panethnic, indicating a strong sense of belonging to either the Asian or Latino communities in both New South (54.5 percent of committeds) and Gateway Coast (45.5 percent of committeds). The sample was also nearly evenly split between U.S.- and foreign-born respondents. Indeed, with the exception of the strong Latino majority (78.8 percent) and a larger share of men than women (60.6 percent vs 39.4 percent, respectively), this groupness range was the most evenly distributed across the greatest numbers of factors. This suggests that a panethnic sense of belonging is not only common, but it is exhibited in real, fixed, and tangible ways.

SUPRA-ETHNICS: BLURRED EQUALIZATION

Among supra-ethnics, groupness extended broader than ethnicity or even panethnicity. Figure 5 shows how their sense of belonging aligns with their panethnicity, ethnicity (captured by the panethnicity circle), and an alternative identity. While all supra-ethnics identified panethnically, when discussing their community involvement they expressed a stronger affiliation with other disenfranchised people, usually people of color. In many respects, this
broader groupness emerged as a result of frustrations or struggles that span across ethnic categories. These included gentrification, police brutality, and lack of representation in local politics. They often collaborated with groups and individuals outside of their panethnic group who shared these same concerns. The organizations to which they belonged were often multi-ethnic and diverse and they described participating in events hosted by racial/ethnic groups outside of their own. Supra-ethnics commonly admitted to scanning the room to find other people of color and often felt the need to present their best self on behalf of all communities of color, not just their own panethnic group.

These individuals embodied a *blurred equalization* strategy, diminishing the importance of single ethnic or even panethnic boundaries and instead emphasizing the commonalities among people of color or those who are disenfranchised. They largely believed that empowering one community would have a positive effect for other marginalized groups. This groupness range is theoretically interesting for at least two reasons. First, supras provide support for the idea of white/non-white color line, with much of their work focused on the empowerment of ethnic and racial minorities. They echoed Haney-Lopez’s strong assertion that “claiming a non-white identity commits one to the political goal of ending racial oppression for all” (6). Secondly, they often utilize the “people of color” terminology that came out of the 1980s (Hollinger 2005).

Many supras looked a lot like strategic identifiers, reporting that their panethnic identity was most salient in the workplace, concentrating their community engagement within the professional sphere, and explaining that their limited free time constrained their ability engage with co-panethnics to a greater degree. However, supras were distinct in that many occupied
elected or appointed government positions, requiring them to look beyond the needs of their own panethnic community. Mario Estrada, a Latino health professional in Gateway Coast, had been an active member of several Latino student groups during his secondary education and described having had a great interest Central American issues in the early days of his career. In his current role, however, Mario found that he had to widen his scope. He explained,

_You know, when they ask me to do interviews in Spanish, I’ll do interviews in Spanish. And I’ll participate and I participate in that role as a Latino public health leader. But I’m not involved in sort of in-depth Latino health issues. But I do speak up as a Latino public health leader but not specifically immersed -- and part of the reason is that I feel that right now in my job I have to focus on the biggest problems. And the biggest problems really have to do with African American community. And the issues that are affecting the African American communities are also affecting the Latino communities with the exception of language and immigration._

Although Mario maintained a secure panethnic identity within his profession – doing interviews in Spanish, identifying as a Latino public health leader -- in practice, he represented a diverse pool of constituents, within which his particular community did not appear to have the greatest need. In his personal life, he admitted to having few social ties to a Latino community and his time –both personal and professional –were not spent among other Latinos. When pressed about advocacy for Latinos, he muses, “If I were to advocate something for a Latino group, I would advocate it because I think it’s right for everybody. And it’s just that there may be a disparity or specific gap that they need, right?” As a city official, Mario felt a great sense of responsibility to all constituents. He takes a blurred equalization approach, thinking about health equity as a societal good in which advocacy for one group should represent better outcomes for all. When Mario did advocate on behalf of Latinos specifically, it is with the understanding that it is helping everyone else. As he later stated, he would “go to bat for any group,” not just his own.

Zulema White was another high-level health professional in Gateway Coast that also found herself “going to bat” for disenfranchised groups, particularly women and people of color.
She described how she often walked into rooms and did a quick scan of who was sitting at the table,

My scan of the room is this issue of equity and who is at the table [...] I don’t know that I could stop it. Where I have authority, I will say, this group won’t exist unless half the people at the table are people of color. I won’t say half are Latinos. I will say people of color. I have definitely adopted that as my issue of equity, right? So where I have authority I will either engineer it that way, or I will just up front say it. Any kind of community work that I’m doing, when I’m asked to do something for women -- I’m often asked to do something for pro-feminist kinds of things—and I will say I’m happy to do that but only if the working group is at least half people of color, women of color. And that has, like, really pissed off some people.

Zulema made it a point to ensure diverse voices are included, even if it seemed to rub some people the wrong way. A biracial Latina, Zulema was proud of her panethnic identity but she had “definitely adopted” a broader definition of equity, one that spoke to the widespread inclusion of people of color. Zulema leveraged her influence and authority to bring diverse groups of people to the decision-making table. As she explained, she did not insist that half be exclusively Latino. Zulema’s strategy of blurred equalization was fueled by the question, “how do we get first voice in the decision making process?”

Lola Reyes was an elected school official of Asian descent in Gateway Coast. She maintained that the school board should be nonpartisan and that board members should be called to represent all children and families. However, she recognized that her election as a person of color is meaningful, especially when white officials are overrepresented on the board of a school district in which white students are the minority. Given that she had spent a great deal of time as the only person or woman of color in a room, Lola made it a point to establish a pipeline for others like her. She explained,

My big thing is, I want women of color in my office. So, you know, my first hire was an intern that came to me from the University of Texas. She’s Filipina and now she’s here in my office, and during the summer, it’s all about trying to get more women and women of color exposed to government, you know, sitting in on these meetings where I’m usually
the only, you know, woman of color […] and so a lot of the conversations that I have with the young women that I mentor is oftentimes around that – having the confidence to come in, knowing that you have something to say and share, you know, not being intimidated by those around who may appear as if they know more than you, all of those things. I bring my interns with me to everything. You know, they do press events with me, they do meetings with me, they’ll staff me when I’m with the mayor – so they get a lot of exposure, which is great and fun and eye-opening.

Lola’s strategy of blurred equalization created a pipeline to get women of color into government. She was intentional about including her interns in everything she did, including asking them to sit in on meetings where she is the only woman of color. Like other supras, Lola took a broader approach to empowerment, prioritizing the exposure of women (and particularly women of color) to government rather than simply supporting her ethnic and panethnic communities.

Because civic-minded supras spent much of their time thinking broadly about the constituents they served, many blurred the boundaries between communities of color as they considered how to serve the greater good.

Interestingly, creative leaders from art backgrounds also applied a blurred lens to the issue of equity and inclusion. Several respondents put coalition building and intersectionality front and center in both their personal and professional life. Anita Hayashi had received various accolades celebrating her professional work as an Asian American artist in Gateway Coast. However, Anita was multiracial and embraced the idea of mestizaje, a concept most commonly associated with Latinos. She could trace her family origins to European and Asian countries and saw her diverse background as an asset that allowed her to build bridges across groups. She mused, “I think the one thing about being Mestizo, we know how to work cross culturally. I don’t understand why it’s like, such a big deal [laughs] to most people, but it is.” As an artist, Anita explained that she liked to be at the forefront of new ideas,

*From being a Mestiza person, what I realized is that the most important thing is first voice, your personal experience, because you can be Japanese and have been raised in*
Peru or Brazil, you’re going to identify as being Brazilian, you know, not being Japanese. So it’s your personal experience that counts, so that’s why we named our [performing arts] group [the way that we did], and the mission is for people – the music and stories of people living between worlds, because it’s in the intersections that I think is the most – well, it’s the most exciting, but it’s also – that’s where the peace is, the bridge building, the coalition building is in the intersection.

Anita’s professional work very much reflected her own understanding of complex identities. She emphasized that “it’s your personal experience that counts” and challenged defined notions of self. As an artist and artistic funder, she found that the most “exciting” work was that which blurred the identity boundaries. Through her non-profit arts organization, Anita intentionally sought to support artists, much like herself, who lived “between worlds.” Her blurred equalization strategy used financial means and mentoring relationships to encourage intersectional and complicated work with the intention to build bridges.

Some supras confronted significant resistance in boundary blurring. Take Lucas Zapata, a 20-something Latino, who feels a strong connection to the African American community in Gateway Coast. Having attended public schools with large numbers of black students and grown up in the homes of his black friends, he still remained tied to the community he believes helped raise him. He explained,

*I’ve kind of been thrust into this whole thing with the Black Lives Matter and like, stepping up, and the only non-Black person that’s like, part of the [local] movement to change the policy, I really think that if we can secure the equity for the Black community, then inevitably, we’re helping every other minority, because I personally believe the African American community historically has been the martyr for our country and has always been given the short end of the stick, always been dismissed as less than human, and if we can build their camp up, ours inherently has to be built up, because we just created another level of power within the community. But I don’t know if a lot of people believe that or agree with me… People have the mindset of like, you need to stay in your lane, you need to help your community. Because you’re helping someone else, you’re then taking away from ours."

Like other supras, Lucas’s blurred equalization strategy was grounded in the firm belief that empowering one community of color (in this case, the black community) would serve to
empower other minority groups because “if we can build their camp up, ours inherently has to be built up.” However, in his interview he described some level of pushback from other Latinos directed at his efforts to support the black community. He found that many just want him to “stay in his lane” and advocate on behalf of the Latino community exclusively. He pointed to the perception that community empowerment is a zero-sum game—if one group receives more power, it leaves less for others.

Respondents from Gateway Coast accounted for 71 percent of all supra-ethnics, suggesting substantial differences in the saliency of panethnic boundaries between the two research sites. Gateway Coast respondents often referred to a white/non-white color line and spoke to a long history of cross-cultural activism and collaboration. Supras in New South also blurred these boundaries but emphasized a distinct identity that contextualized their experience as uniquely “New American.” This term was often used among New South respondents to refer to minority communities and included both foreign and native-born individuals. Indeed, groups outside the black-white paradigm were considered immigrant and refugee communities. At the time of the interviews, it was a category that was even institutionalized in local government.

Eloisa Camacho is a long-time resident of New South, having been brought to the U.S. as a child by her parents. Now an attorney, she recalled how she was often invited to work with immigrant and refugee committees, in part because she was Hispanic and spoke Spanish,

*Talk about a door being opened to you. When [a former governor] ran the first time, he named me, I forgot with the title was, but it was basically outreach to New Americans. I think that was the first time I ever heard the term New American. So we worked on that, it was very hard, very hard. It was not as successful as I would have wanted it to but I think we had to chip away at a lot of false expectations by a lot of communities. It was like pulling teeth.*

Eloisa first heard the term New American working on a governor’s campaign. She described how challenging it was, particularly when many of these communities were distrustful of
politicians and were hesitant to participate. This initial work encouraged Eloisa to think about the importance of access to civic engagement. She elaborated on this point, remembering how she approached the Mayor with an idea,

*I pitched to the Mayor this idea of having a class of New Americans to come learn about Metro government. And so we did it once a month for six months and we’d have different themes like infrastructure and schools and, for lack of a better word, government, public safety, all that. And so we would invite the heads of the departments to come speak to them and tell them what they did and they would get phone numbers and whatever materials that department had. And so the idea was, we were inviting the leaders of each one of these [New American] groups so that then they could go back and disseminate this information and this thing turned out to be so awesome. I mean, the networking that they did among each other, was awesome. They would say, I need an interpreter for [a particular] language and one of them would say, oh I know somebody. Just...it is awesome.*

For Eloisa, New Americans shared at least one thing in common: lack of access. The program she pitched to the Mayor was modeled after leadership classes she had participated in before but provided this access to groups that were disenfranchised or nearly absent in government. What she found most rewarding about the program was not simply the dissemination of information into communities, but also the networking opportunities that were present within the cohorts.

Bilal Bajwa is a first-generation immigrant in New South and, like Eloisa, an attorney. He felt a strong desire to use his educational and professional background to contribute to some of the work being done locally to organize immigrant and refugee communities. He shared how he first got involved with a state-wide advocacy organization,

*I met some people [from this organization I used to lead] when I first moved [here] which was about seven or eight years ago and I was impressed with the work that they did and a lot of the immigrant/refugee communities here and there is a need in this part of the country to organize the ethnic community so I just found a lot of the work that [they] did very interesting on the legislative front because I can relate with, you know, being a first-generation immigrant and the issues that people face so I moved towards these organizations because I felt that being educated and being professionally successful, I could use my position to help the communities that need that.*
Bilal, like other community leaders in New South, recognizes the importance of the work being done to advocate for immigrants and refugees, particularly “in this part of the country.” He also relates on a personal level, being an immigrant himself. In fact, Eloisa and Bilal, both of whom are foreign-born, reflect the sentiments of many respondents looking to use their professional status to support other immigrants. Eloisa and Bilal were two of just a few foreign-born supra respondents – most (82.4 percent) were born in the U.S.

The overrepresentation of native-born community leaders under the range of supra-ethnic suggests a groupness grounded in U.S. notions of race, ethnicity, and nativity. This groupness differs across context. In New South (which accounted for 29.4 percent of supras), belonging to a community outside of the black-white racial dichotomy easily labeled someone a New American. In Gateway City, 70.6 percent of my respondents are supras who believed? being? non-white made you a person of color with common challenges and struggles binding the group together. Additionally, Asians and women were overrepresented among supras, at 47.1 percent and 58.8 percent, respectively.

WORLD CITIZENS: COLORBLIND BLURRING

World citizens, like supra-ethnics, embraced a philosophical perspective that extended beyond ethnic or panethnic boundaries. Their range of groupness was the broadest on the spectrum. While panethnicity was central to supra-ethnics’ identification with other people of color, world citizens found ethnic identities largely inconsequential. Figure 6 illustrates how their groupness aligns with an alternative identity and is completely removed from ethnicity. While they expressed appreciation for many of the cultural elements of their ethnic background (i.e. music and food), all world citizens were born outside of the U.S. and enjoyed traveling, learning
about new cultures, did not exclusively associate with individuals of their same racial or ethnic background, and readily adopted a colorblind philosophy. World citizens experienced their ethnicity as symbolic in much the same way that Gans (1979) describes those of Irish or Italian descent. My respondents adopted a strategy of colorblind blurring, whereas they saw themselves working for the greater good, without any particular attention to the issues or concerns of their ethnic group or any other marginalized community.

This was the case with Alvaro Mijaro, self-described as the “true definition of someone who considers himself a citizen of the world.” A developer in Gateway Coast, Alvaro spoke candidly about the tensions he experienced with Latino progressives because he was more conservative economically. When asked about his pan-Latino background, he explained,

> The fact that I was raised in different places and my father was from a different country than my mother, there was almost no identity—just to make it more dramatic, the only time I go back to Ecuador is for funerals. So there was always very little connection in that regard. When I went to [college], the last thing I was thinking about was creating an Ecuadorian study group or something.

Alvaro did not feel connected to his national origin and he dismissed the opportunity to identify as Latino. When asked if he ever identified as a Latino, his response was a “not really.” He shared that he was the “rare immigrant” that knew the United States was going to be his home and became a citizen as soon as he could. Moreover, when asked how he self-identified, he did not utilize ethnic labels; rather, he stated that he was a proud citizen of Gateway Coast.
Alvaro’s strategy of colorblind blurring undergirded the responsibility he felt as a developer to make his city safer and much more walkable. He felt confused about the resistance he encountered to any sort of development. He provided an example,

I was involved in the beautification of [a certain neighborhood in Gateway Coast]. Talk about sketchy stuff. So we were going to widen the sidewalk and put palm trees. The supervisor of the district then says, you know, if you build palm trees and widen the sidewalk, then you’re probably going to bring slightly more affluent tenants on the ground floor. That means that the area will be less affordable -- so that’s a bad thing? So good is bad?

As a developer, Alvaro commonly saw himself painted as a villain, despite his desire to make Gateway Coast more aesthetically beautiful. When he was attempting to add trees and sidewalks to a “sketchy” neighborhood, the district supervisor pushed back, fearing it would make the area less affordable. For Alvaro, attracting affluent tenants to an underdeveloped area was a good thing. His confusion around the resistance to development suggested that he did not necessarily advocate on behalf of any particular group of people; rather, he saw his work as contributing to the overall good of the city.

Like Alvaro, Ishaan Laghari did not identify by ethnicity. In fact, over the course of his interview, he expressed a strong discontent with the Indian community, explaining that his personal politics differed significantly from most of his co-ethnics. Ishaan spoke at length about his background, acknowledging his privileged background and making clear the disdain he felt towards other Indians, particularly those who were “fanatically religious.” He explained to me that being Indian “is not important, at least not explicitly” in large part because of the prejudices he felt many of his co-ethnics held against women and darker-skinned people. When asked how he identified, he offered (after careful consideration), “As a learning scientist, which is what I do. That’s first.” Indeed, Ishaan identified first and foremost by his profession and was highly respected within his New South university. He explained that while he worked or collaborated
with co-ethnics, he did not see them as Indian. This colorblindness stemmed from the distance he intentionally placed between himself and the Indian community. This was further reinforced when Ishaan shared his desire to remove any markers of his class, ethnic, and religious background,

*I have guilt associated with my last name. I want [my wife] to change her last name, I want to change my last name-- we have different last names -- because our last names signify caste and I want to get rid of that and [our current state] prohibits us from doing that to our children so we have to change it first for ourselves so that our children can get a new name. So before we adopt, that's going to happen for sure because I'm not carrying forward a tradition that only reeks of human discrimination.*

While he was acutely aware that discriminatory practices are not exclusive to his native India, Ishaan expressed strong negative feelings about the personal markers (i.e. last names) that signal the high status. His insistence on creating a new name for any future children suggested a desire to transcend ethnic boundaries, and his “bloodlines.”

Unlike Alvaro and Ishaan, Rodolfo Herrera was proud to call himself “100% Mexican.” He worked in a creative profession and had achieved a great deal of fame in New South, given his association with the local music scene. However, his personal philosophy did not neatly align with the way in which he proudly identified. He admitted to adhering to a certain brand of idealism around humanity and explained what he meant,

*I think it's the impossibility to call ourselves the human race. We don't have to be white, green, red, Latina, anything that’s going to distinguish us in a soccer game, on a baseball team, whatever, you know? It's always a distinction, you can't avoid it. But that's the impossibility I talk about, why can't we just be human beings?*

Rodolfo’s question speaks directly to a strategy of colorblind blurring in that he shares the “impossibility” that “we just be human beings.” Rodolfo took a paternal tone when talking specifically about the Latino community. When asked if he ever worked with other Latinos, he stated that he does, but only “when the Mexican community behaves.” Probed a little further,
Rodolfo expressed a strong apprehension about panethnic organizations. He used the example of the different chambers of commerce in New South to illustrate his point,

There’s so many chambers that you say, hey why can’t we have just [one] chamber of commerce without being Hispanic? I mean, can you imagine, [eventually] we’re going to have an Arab [laughs] Chamber of Commerce! That’s called segregation, not integration. And I’m against that.

Rodolfo viewed these panethnic chambers as unnecessary and as a distinct form of segregation. He did not understand why one chamber –inclusive of everyone—was not enough. This was another example of his colorblind philosophy and an extension of his desire to just be a “human race.”

World citizens made up a small share of all respondents – just seven percent –but reiterated some of the patterns seen within other groupness ranges. All world citizens were born outside of the United States. This was also true for loyal ethnics. Similarly, the majority of world citizens and loyal ethnics were of Asian background, the only two groupness types for which this is true. Both of these comparisons signal some level of detachment from U.S. based identities (panethnicities, “people of color,” “New Americans”) among a small share of foreign-born and Asian community leaders, who prefer either ethnic identities tied to their homeland or broader, global labels that rebuff loyalty to any one place.

CONCLUSION

At the beginning of this chapter, I argue that strategies used to navigate panethnic boundaries are more directly influenced by level of groupness –“the sense of belonging to a distinctive, bounded, solidary group” (Brubaker and Cooper 2000:20) than self-identification alone. This premise was driven by findings from earlier chapters suggesting that all respondents self-classify in their respective panethnic group and leverage this panethnicity in a variety of ways, regardless of whether they had a strong sense of belonging to that community and despite
any initial resistance to the terminology. In this chapter, I explicitly link panethnicity, groupness, and boundary strategies and show how context conditions the strategies community leaders use to navigate the panethnic boundary. The different histories, politics, and demographic landscapes associated with each of my two contexts influence the ways in which respondents identify, engage, and invest in a panethnic community.

For the purposes of this chapter, I identified five groupness ranges based on three criteria: (1) self-identification; (2) sphere of engagement; and (3) degree of investment invested in the community. These criteria together allow me to develop a tool for understand the extent of respondents’ panethnic association, ranging from a narrow to broad sense of community association. Because community leaders often described deep affiliations beyond the panethnic community, I developed a more inclusive range of options for a more comprehensive understanding of groupness.

This chapter revealed some distinct patterns at the intersection of context, panethnic group, and nativity within each of the groupness ranges. Distinct demographic patterns, histories, and resources condition the distinct experiences of being panethnic in New South and Gateway Coast. Gateway Coast respondents were overrepresented in the two center ranges on the groupness spectrum – committed panethnic and supra-ethnics. Gateway Coast was a diverse city with a longstanding Asian and Latino presence and these panethnicities were widely utilized. In addition, cross-ethnic collaboration and coalition building was not uncommon and many respondents felt an affinity with ethnic groups outside of their own based on shared experiences, like discrimination or displacement. The majority of respondents in Gateway Coast were also born in the U.S., which likely fosters an affinity for U.S.-based affiliations.
In contrast, community leaders from New South were overrepresented in groupness ranges that were on opposite ends of the spectrum—loyal ethnic and world citizen. These were the groupness ranges that were the narrowest and broadest in community association. New South had a relatively truncated history of immigrant reception and Asian and Latino panethnicities were likely not as developed and established as they were in Gateway Coast. In addition, most respondents from New South were born outside of the United States. It comes as little surprise that foreign born respondents would more closely association with their national origin group than a panethnic one or that they would see themselves as belonging to a global community given their experience of international migration.

Interestingly, there was a notable alignment between context, panethnic group, and nativity. Respondents from New South, those who were Asian, and those who were foreign-born were all highly overrepresented at the opposite ends of the groupness spectrum suggesting some level of distance from a panethnic community. The most striking example is with the loyal ethnic range. All loyal ethnics were foreign-born and all lived in New South. Nearly all (91 percent) were Asian. Gateway Coast respondents, Latinos, and those who were born in the United States were overrepresented in the center of the groupness spectrum, within the ranges of committed panethnic and supra-ethnic. Both of these groupness ranges are based on identities fostered in the United States. This finding is important because it demonstrates how directly personal and contextual factors influence how people both experience panethnicity and associate with a panethnic community.

While interesting for what it reveals about the effect of context, panethnic group, and nativity, this examination of groupness ranges also reveals how community association influences how community leaders navigated the panethnic boundary. I nuanced Wimmer’s
(2008) boundary strategies to more accurately the strategies used by community leaders. Most community leaders did not challenge boundaries themselves, but instead sought to elevate the status of their community within the existing ethnoracial hierarchy. Equalization was the most widely utilized strategy because it is inclusive of the wide array of work that leaders do to ensure their communities have the same access to information, resources, and services as other groups. These equalization strategies vary across groupness ranges. Community leaders with a groupness aligned to a Latino or Asian community (i.e., committed panethnics and strategic Identifiers) employed equalization strategies that center the needs of the panethnic group. Those at the extreme ends of the groupness range (i.e., loyal ethnics, supra-ethnics) utilize equalization strategies that are either narrower or broader in scope.

Community leaders also used strategies that were less common. Category expansion was a strategy unique to committed panethnics—the groupness range that most closely aligned with panethnicity. Respondents who had long been involved in panethnic movements described how panethnic identities were adopted at the cognitive, behavioral, and institutional level. Additionally, several South Asian respondents spoke at length about their efforts to expand the notion of Asian American to include themselves and their co-ethnics. Further down the groupness range spectrum, world citizens engaged in colorblind blurring, a strategy that de-emphasized ethnic identities in favor of a global or humanistic perspective. These community leaders emphasized other aspects of their identity, while minimizing the significance of their own ethnicity.

In sum, this chapter accomplishes several things. First, it reveals widespread variation in groupness range, influenced by nativity, panethnic group, and context. Second, it demonstrates how groupness acts as a critical factor in informing which strategies community leaders used to
navigate social boundaries. Groupness more accurately captures these strategies than self-identification alone because it accounts for direct engagement and investment into a particular community. This work suggests the need to look beyond self-identification to understand how people view themselves, where their sense of belonging lies, and what significance they give to particular social boundaries.
CHAPTER V - DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This dissertation began with the premise that panethnicity is a mutable, layered, and complex social boundary that can be utilized, leveraged, and navigated in ways that are influenced by personal and contextual factors. I focus on panethnicity – “the construction of a new categorical boundary through the consolidation of ethnic, tribal, religious, or national groups […] uniquely defined by an inherent tension derived from maintaining subgroup distinctions while developing a sense of metagroup unity” (Okamoto and Mora 2014: 221) – because of the inherent nuances that come with these identities. Building on the work of established scholars of boundaries (Barth 1964; Brubaker, Loveman, and Stamatov 2004; Wimmer 2007, 2008; Brubaker 2002) and panethnicity (Jones-Correa and Leal 1996; Mora 2014a, 2014b; Ocampo 2006; Okamoto 2014; Espiritu 1992; Golash-Boza 2006; Golash-Boza and Darity 2008; Kibria 1997, 2002), my findings lead me to three conclusions. First, panethnicity is flexible and allows community leaders to employ a range of identity options. Second, panethnicity can be leveraged for upward mobility and community empowerment under particular conditions. Third, context, ethnicity, and other factors influence how community leaders express, experience, and navigate panethnicity.

Over the course of three empirical chapters, I asked a series of questions: (1) When and under what conditions do people become panethnic? (2) What consequences does panethnicity have and how are these identities leveraged in pursuit of upward mobility and community empowerment? (3) How does a sense of belonging to a panethnic group inform the ways in which community leaders navigate these social boundaries? These questions help to unpack how individuals utilize panethnicity and how these are conditioned by context and by personal factors, like nativity and panethnic group.
While the literature on Asian and Latino panethnic category formation at the organizational and institutional level is quite comprehensive (Espiritu 1992; Mora 2014a, 2014b; Okamoto 2014), missing from this discussion is an examination of the conditions that facilitate a panethnic consciousness, that create opportunities for leveraging panethnicity, and that shape how individuals navigate this boundary. Much of the work looking to understand panethnic identity draws from survey data and highlights the sociodemographic characteristics that predict panethnicity, with the assumption that it has already been formed. My dissertation starts at the very beginning, asking community leaders how they understand panethnic labels and examining the narratives that trace the formation of a panethnic consciousness. I then show how this identity is leveraged in a variety of ways in pursuit of upward mobility and community empowerment. Finally, I reveal how a sense of belonging, or groupness, influences how individuals navigate these boundaries. In each empirical chapter, I show how differences across social dimensions such as context and ethnicity inform not only when and how individuals come to identify panethnically, but also how they experience and navigate this identity.

Embedding two distinct contexts of reception into my research design added an additional layer of interest and offered an opportunity to examine contextual variation in panethnic identity. Immigration scholars will appreciate the attention given to time and space because, since the late 1980s, immigrant populations have become less spatially concentrated in traditional gateway cities and are found in many new destinations, especially in the Midwest and South (Singer 2004; Donato et al. 2008; Massey 2008). I interviewed community leaders in both an established gateway city (Gateway Coast) and a new immigrant destination (New South). Together, the two sites add greater depth to the analysis by offering comparative contextual leverage.
The Asian and Latino community leaders in this study represent a variety of backgrounds and perspectives. They were chosen as respondents because of their unique social location – on the one hand, disadvantaged by race and/or ethnicity, but on the other hand, privileged by socioeconomic class. Because of relatively high levels of social, economic, and human capital, they benefit from a wider variety of ethnic options and boundary strategies as they navigate across social spheres than peers with less capital. Moreover, their panethnicity provides them a great deal of flexibility to identify and affiliate in different ways. Community leaders revealed a great deal about how they maneuver their ethnic and/or racial social boundaries in professional worlds, and it is their ease of doing so that is particularly interesting. Of course, this may reflect some selection bias, as respondents were recruited based on their assumed panethnic background, reputation as community leaders, and/or affiliation with panethnic organizations. Moreover, because they often broker between mainstream and ethnic communities, it may be of little surprise that their narratives reflect such ease in transitions. I highlight how these community leaders become panethnic, how they utilize and leverage panethnicity, and how they navigate the panethnic boundary. Many of these differences are rooted in context and ethnicity, but also informed by personal characteristics like nativity and gender.

Native-born respondents display greater flexibility in the terms they use to identify and with the groups with which they affiliated. Compared to their foreign-born peers, U.S. born community leaders more often adopted panethnicity and saw this identity as meaningful and grounded in important commonalities. In contrast, many immigrant respondents viewed the same panethnic categories as instruments of bureaucracy and only placed themselves in these groups when filling out forms that required that they select a racial category. They exhibited a more narrow and instrumental view of panethnicity and preferred to identify by ethnicity.
When it came to how they leveraged their panethnicity, native-born respondents reported taking advantage of resources and mentorship opportunities available for members of their panethnic group, which helped them throughout their post-secondary education and career. In contrast, foreign-born leaders showed higher levels of entrepreneurship, relying primarily on their own ingenuity and human capital, and brokering between ethnic (not necessarily panethnic) and mainstream groups to attain career success.

Variations across nativity are differentiated by context. In Gateway Coast, more than three-quarters of community leaders are second generation or beyond – children or grandchildren of U.S. immigrants. The reverse is true in New South: nearly 70 percent of these leaders are born outside the United States. Respondents from Gateway Coast used panethnic identities more often than their counterparts in New South, but a substantial share of them also identified beyond panethnicity, using broader labels like “person of color” used by my respondents in New South. Those in the new destination who utilized broader terms referred to their nativity, calling themselves “New Americans.” While many community leaders in New South identified panethnically, nearly all respondents who identified primarily by national origin lived in New South.

The combination of nativity and context was also interesting for understanding how respondents leverage panethnicity for upward mobility. The vast majority of those displaying an entrepreneurial pathway were located in new destination city New South, a fact not altogether surprising given that the majority of entrepreneurs and the majority of New South respondents were foreign-born. Thus, most foreign-born and New South community leaders rely upon innovative methods for upward mobility, often working to fill gaps in services or access to their ethnic communities. Conversely, native-born and Gateway Coast respondents used a facilitated
pathway and took advantage of existing resources to help them pursue educational or career opportunities. These resources were more widely available in Gateway Coast – an established gateway – than in New South.

Ethnic background adds further nuance. It was more common for Asian respondents to identify by national origin than for Latinos and almost all those with a strong affiliation to their ethnic (but not panethnic) group were of Asian background. In my sample, most Asian respondents were not born in the United States (62 percent vs. 42 percent of Latinos). In most cases, their panethnic consciousness was a direct result of their U.S. immigration experience. Indeed, Asian respondents were more likely than their Latino counterparts to leverage their ethnicity rather than their panethnicity, particularly those that were on an entrepreneurial leadership pathway. However, even native-born Asians on a facilitated pathway referred to and often participated in an ethnic organization, as well as in a panethnic community. In contrast, Latinos overwhelmingly participated exclusively in panethnic organizations and advocated panethnically.

Each chapter in this dissertation describes the variations that inform how community leaders become panethnic, how they leverage this panethnicity for upward mobility, and how this panethnicity informs the way they navigate social boundaries. I find that these differences lie at the intersection of nativity, gender, context, and panethnic group and inform how respondents experience panethnicity. Indeed, I come away with several key findings. First, community leaders become panethnic under a variety of conditions influenced by their personal characteristics and local context. Second, context matters when it comes to how Asian and Latino leaders are able to leverage their panethnicity. Third, U.S.-born and Latino community
leaders describe a stronger sense of panethnic affiliation than their foreign-born and Asian counterparts, who prefer national origin or global identities.

The first empirical chapter of the dissertation, “‘A Real Awakening’: Narratives of Panethnic Consciousness,” examines when and under what conditions community leaders become panethnic. My findings show that panethnic consciousness happens in a variety of ways and under conditions influenced by personal characteristics and local context. My respondents offered four distinct narratives about the emergence of panethnic consciousness. Many respondents first experienced panethnic consciousness in their educational institutions as undergraduate or graduate/professional students. Respondents were in ethnic studies programs, themed residential housing, and voluntary student associations – organizations that provide a space of belonging to young adults learning to navigate the world outside of their families. Some respondents reported feeling akin to others who shared similar obstacles and experiences as they participated in majority white institutions of higher learning. Others became panethnic during professional and graduate schools where they felt largely alienated or alone. Nativity and context are related to the education narrative. Among respondents, two-thirds were U.S. born (compared to the overall sample in which 50 percent each were U.S. and foreign born) and two-thirds lived in Gateway Coast (compared to the overall sample in which 44 percent were from Gateway Coast and 56 percent lived in New South).

Other community leaders discovered their panethnicity in their professions and jobs. Respondents in media or marketing careers described how it is advantageous to embrace a broader and more inclusive identity in their work. Nearly 70 percent of these respondents lived in New South and created newspapers, radio stations, and TV shows to distribute information to
largely monolingual and isolated communities. Such was the case of Patricia Montes, a media personality originally from Cuba who recalls being invited to emcee a Mexican Independence Day celebration and, as a result, came to see herself as part of a broader Latino collective. Of respondents who described panethnic discovery in their work, three-quarters are Latino and seventy percent are U.S. born.

Foreign-born community leaders who arrived in the United States as adults described how their immigration experience coincided with their first experience with panethnicity. Their reactions varied; for some respondents, the first time they were labeled as panethnic created significant dissonance. Many reported feeling angry at their inclusion in a low situated group in the racial hierarchy, such as when Allegra Cortez, originally from Costa Rica, was offended at being associated with Mexicans. Others saw the new classification as necessary for successful social integration and did not resist, even when confronting false assumptions about their panethnic group. As Marciano Vega, an immigrant from the Dominican Republic, explained, “it’s just a matter of educating folks.” This immigrant experience narrative largely occurred among respondents in New South, a city with a persistent black-white racial dichotomy and where most community leaders were foreign born.

Context shifts also awakened new identities or ignited those that lay dormant as a result of cross-country moves or changing local landscapes. More than three-quarters of respondents with a context shift narrative were U.S. born and just over seventy percent lived in Gateway Coast. Many easily traced the evolution of their identity across time and place, thinking about how a new context influenced their choice in terminology and sense of attachment to particular labels. Others recall how national-level dialogues around such topics as immigration and race trickled down into local conversations and spurred their panethnic consciousness.
Thus, the contributions of Chapter Two lie in identifying when distinct intrapersonal and contextual factors lead to panethnic consciousness. This variation is driven largely by differences across nativity, context, and panethnic group. Building on prior work that shows sociodemographic characteristics predict greater propensity for panethnic identification, this chapter adds to existing scholarship by taking a step back and revealing patterns in when respondents take on panethnic identities and the specific conditions under which this occurs.

Chapter Three, “‘From then on, that was my community’: Pathways to Panethnic Leadership,” traces the consequences of panethnicity and examines how community leaders leverage panethnicity for upward mobility and community empowerment. In the chapter, I outline two leadership pathways that are differentiated by distinct opportunities for Asian and Latino leaders to leverage panethnicity. The opportunities available to respondents strongly depend on whether one lived in New South (new immigrant destination) or in Gateway Coast (established gateway). Additionally, the chapter reveals interesting differences between Asians and Latinos in how they leverage their panethnicity and ethnicity.

I describe the first and most common leadership pathway as facilitated, where community leaders leveraged their panethnicity or ethnicity through membership in voluntary associations, relationships with mentors, and familial ties. Voluntary associations offered an important form of social capital that proved valuable for respondent’s success. The structure of professional organizations ensured that respondents “paid it forward,” and found ways to give back to the community. Respondents also describe important mentorships that and the familial ties that empowered them to leverage their ethnicity or panethnicity as they pursued career advancement. All these things helped respondents navigate institutions in which they were a
minority. Overall, 60 percent of community leaders described a facilitated pathway, and it was more common for women, Asians, those living in Gateway Coast, and U.S. natives (who were likely to be U.S. educated).

Other community leaders describe an entrepreneurial pathway, having paved their own trajectories through self-initiated projects. They leveraged their ethnicity and panethnicity and human capital to guide the creation of businesses and non-profits to address specific needs in the community. Some respondents are spurred into action by national or local events that threatened their communities. Motivations vary – some wanted to use their expertise in a lucrative and beneficial way, others wanted to be more philanthropic – but all are often rooted in their identity and affiliation with a panethnic community. Other respondents have a family history of community involvement and panethnic or ethnic leadership, and draw on intimate role models for leadership and civic engagement. They have the confidence and qualities required of a leader, which originated from parents and grandparents who were themselves leaders and encouraged active community engagement in their children. In New South, more than half of respondents describe an entrepreneurial pathway in which they built infrastructures and supports lacking in their communities. More than two-thirds of those with an entrepreneurial pathway were foreign born. Another two-thirds were Latino. This pathway is also more common among the men in the sample than the women (42 percent compared to 27 percent).

It is important to note that there were key differences across panethnic group in how they leveraged their ethnicity and panethnicity. Asian respondents on a facilitated pathway commonly reported belonging to both ethnic and a panethnic associations (e.g. the Korean and the Asian bar association). Latino respondents, however, did not report participation in ethnic associations and their interviews suggest that participation was exclusive to panethnic groups. Additionally, some
Asian respondents reflected upon organizational fit. While none of the Latino respondents mentioned a concern about whether a panethnic group was right for them, several Filipino and South Asian professionals shared that they joined panethnic organizations that they described as the closest match, but not a perfect fit.

This chapter shows how community leaders leverage their ethnicity and panethnicity and provides an alternative narrative to the idea that panethnic identification correlates with downward social mobility (Portes and Rumbaut 1996). Instead, the community leaders in my sample capitalize on the opportunities afforded to them because of their panethnicity or ethnicity, either through facilitated or entrepreneurial pathways to leadership and upward mobility. Panethnic associations offered first-generation college students the mentorship, networks, and professional development. For others, their insight into an ethnic or panethnic community allowed them to recognize gaps in services awakening them to new entrepreneurial opportunities. Leaders in Gateway Coast especially benefited from existing resources, organizations, and mentors, while those in New South capitalized from recognizing the existing gaps in service delivery to their communities.

In Chapter 4, “‘A needed affiliation’: Panethnicity, Groupness, and Boundary Making Strategies,” I ask how community leaders’ sense of belonging informs how they navigate panethnic and other boundaries. I make explicit the relationship between panethnicity, groupness, and boundary strategies. The term groupness refers to “the sense of belonging to a distinctive, bounded, solidary group” (Brubaker and Cooper 2000:20) and I identify five groupness ranges, each with its own set of unique boundary strategies: committed panethnics, strategic identifiers, loyal ethnics, supra-ethnics, and world citizens. This chapter illustrates how
groupness better explains the ways in which community leaders navigate social boundaries than self-identification alone. I also make explicit the range in groupness options across both research sites and consider how these contextual differences influence which strategies are available.

The first groupness range, loyal ethnics, are ardent advocates of their ethnic community, but are largely removed from the panethnic community. In this groupness range, leaders feel no strong affiliation with co-panethnics nor do they resent or challenge their inclusion within a panethnic group. Loyal ethnics view their ethnicity as important and affirm it in their social and professional lives. Their work is driven by a mission to bridge the ethnic community with the majority population through educational or cultural endeavors. They utilize an exclusive equalization strategy, whereas they limited their efforts to just their particular ethnic group. Loyal ethnics are a small minority of respondents (11 percent) but show striking variations across nativity, context, gender, and panethnicity. All are foreign-born and lived in New South. Most (91 percent) are of Asian origin. In addition, women comprise 64 percent of loyal ethnics, one of only two groups in which they were the majority (the other being supra-ethnics, see below).

Strategic panethnics also embrace panethnicity but advocate for their communities in more narrow and specific ways. They are strong voices for the promotion and advancement of their panethnic peers in specific professional spheres in which they are heavily invested. Yet, although many respondents occupy leadership roles within panethnic professional organizations, like bar associations, they are less involved in the panethnic community outside of the professional arenas. Therefore, they employed a strategic equalization strategy by which they worked within their profession to promote and foster the successes of their co-panethnic colleagues and the broader panethnic community at large. Strategic panethnics are the second
most common range, representing one-quarter of respondents. While there is proportional representation by gender and context in this range, Latinos and U.S. born respondents are overrepresented. Latinos were 56 percent of the total sample, but 65 percent of strategic panethnics. Likewise, U.S. natives represent 50 percent of the sample but 57 percent of strategic panethnics.

Committed panethnics embrace panethnicity in their professional and personal lives. They primarily identify panethnically and act on behalf of the panethnic community. Leaders embrace panethnicity in two distinct ways, through *category expansion* and *panethnic equalization*. Some spoke about a time in the past when an ethnic category, such as Chicano (which was commonly used to refer to Mexican-Americans), expanded to be more inclusive, and when they debated appropriate terminology and who would be included. Other leaders embrace panethnicity by elevating and/or equalizing the profile of their panethnic community relative to other groups. Committed panethnics represented the most common groupness range in both New South and Gateway Coast, making up more than one-third of respondents in the two sites. However, there were striking variations by gender and by panethnicity, with more men than women (61 vs. 39 percent, respectively) and more Latinos than Asians (79 vs. 21 percent Asian) among committed panethnics.

Supra-ethnics identify beyond ethnicity and panethnicity. Community leaders within this groupness range feel a sense of belonging with their panethnic group but think more broadly about where they fit along the color line. Namely, they view multi-ethnic coalitions as a necessity and engage in work advocating for the advancement of a more inclusive group of people of color. Their strategy is to blur the boundaries that define particular panethnic groups and instead identify common struggles across race and ethnicity. *Blurred equalization* muddles
the boundaries that define particular panethnic groups and instead identifies common struggles across race and ethnicity. This strategy manifests differently across the two contexts. In New South, supra-ethnics emphasize a New American identity, a term used politically and colloquially to refer to immigrant and refugee populations. Respondents in Gateway Coast use inclusive terms such as *people of color* to indicate their solidarity with other marginalized groups. Many people worked in local government and explained their commitment to ensuring equitable access for all constituents, especially groups who were traditionally disenfranchised. Supra-ethnics represented nearly one-fifth (18 percent) of the total sample, but accounted for 29 percent of Gateway Coast respondents (compared to 9 percent in New South). The majority of these leaders (82 percent) were native-born. Women are overrepresented among supra-ethnics (59 vs. 47 percent in total sample).

World citizens are the final groupness range. These community leaders are the least attached to ethnic and racial boundaries. They make up the smallest share of community leaders (7 percent). These respondents spoke of themselves as belonging to the world rather than having one particular affiliation. While proud of their heritage, world citizens describe their ethnicity in ways that suggest it is largely symbolic and inconsequential to the outcomes of their life. They adopt a *colorblind blurring* strategy, whereas they all but reject the existence of the boundary and distance themselves from these distinctions, sometimes to the chagrin of other co-panethnics. All world citizens are foreign born and emphasize their international travel and experiences abroad. The majority live in New South (71 percent) and 57 percent are of Asian background.

This chapter reveals widespread variation in groupness range by nativity and context. Specifically, it shows how U.S.-born and Latino community leaders describe a stronger sense of panethnic association than their foreign-born and Asian counterparts, who gravitate toward
national origin or global identities. That foreign-born and Asian respondents often found themselves in groupness ranges at opposite ends of the spectrum, either the most narrow or most broad, suggests relatively less attachment to U.S. rooted identities than their native born and Latino peers.

This dissertation is not without limitations. While I aimed for equal representation in snowball sampling across context, gender, panethnicity, and nativity, I did not fully achieve this. There were equal shares of native and foreign-born respondents, but there were also more men (53 percent), more Latinos (59 percent), and more interviews conducted in New South (56 percent). Some differences are to be expected based on national-level patterns. Men are overrepresented in leadership positions across many different fields, including as superintendents of schools (Dana and Bourisaw 2006), and CEOs of Fortune 500 companies (Cook and Glass 2015). Additionally, Latinos represent a larger share of the overall U.S. population than do Asians –17.1 vs. 5.1 percent, respectively (U.S. Census Bureau 2015). However, in Gateway Coast, where Asians outnumber Latinos, more than half of respondents (56 percent) were of Latino background.

The recruiting strategy for this project relied heavily on reputational networks. I reached out to respondents based on their organizational affiliations, many of which were panethnic. As such, these organizational leaders likely exhibit higher than average panethnic groupness, especially if the nature of their work is to advocate on behalf of a broader constituency. In addition, I also relied on snowball sampling. At the end of every interview, I asked respondents if there was anyone else they felt I should interview. From these suggestions, I reached out to other potential respondents. Therefore, some of the bias in my sampling could be a result of
social homophily where respondents likely recommended others with whom they shared similar characteristics like education or profession (Smith, McPherson, and Smith-Lovin 2014).

My choice to interview community leaders is both a strength and limitation of the dissertation. Very little sociological research has focused on ethnic leaders, despite the fact that they are often the boundary brokers and serve as the bridge between the ethnic community and majority populations (Massey and Magaly 2010; Okamoto 2014; Vallejo 2009; Zhou and Kim 2001). Therefore, their interviews can provide a great deal of information about individuals who occupy an interesting social location. However, given their reputation or self-identification as leaders and representatives of their respective communities, my respondents may more readily identify and affiliate panethnically than their peers.

One strength of the dissertation is its comparative research design, which offered important points of leverage that reveal differences across context, nativity, panethnic group, and gender. I discovered important differences between Latinos and Asians, and they were especially pronounced in New South where panethnic affiliation was much more prevalent among Latinos than Asians. Indeed, the groupness ranges in which Asians were overrepresented indicated a distancing away from panethnicity toward particular ethnic communities or broad racial boundaries. In addition, I had the distinct advantage of working with a sample that was evenly split between U.S.- and foreign-born respondents. This created the opportunity to closely interrogate differences across nativity in each of the three empirical chapters. In those groupness types in which women and the foreign born made up the majority, I see staunch ethnic affiliations or broad identification with marginalized racial groups.

Panethnic identities are flexible and allow individuals to be strategic in their usage. My study reveals how Latino and Asian community leaders utilize, leverage, and navigate
panethnicity and identifies the contextual and personal factors that condition this experience.

Each of the factors that I highlight – nativity, gender, context, and panethnic group – are important because they determine the opportunities that are available and shape how individuals experience panethnicity. Future work might consider how the groupness ranges I identified and the distinct contexts I examine, rather than panethnic identification alone, might together predict how individuals might vote, affiliate with political parties, fare in the labor market, participate in voluntary organizations, or experience racism or discrimination. Panethnicity is a complex, nuanced, and layered identity and should be treated as such.
APPENDICES

APPENDIX A - INTERVIEW GUIDE: LATINOS

INTRODUCTION
Thank you for agreeing to participate in this interview. My goal today is to learn more about the meaning you give to terms like Latino/Hispanics and also your experiences here in Nashville. Before I begin, I’d like to stress two points. First, everything we discuss will be kept strictly confidential. Second, although I don’t anticipate that these questions will be highly sensitive in nature, if at any point you wish to move on to another question or stop this interview let me know. Feel free to ask for clarification if anything seems unclear. Ready to begin?

IDENTITY
How do you identify? Why not another identity, like American? Do you ever identify as Latino/Hispanic? Do you have a preference for either term? When was the first time you remember using Hispanic/Latino to identify yourself? (probe for example) Are there more similarities or differences among Latinos?

Have you ever been mistaken for belonging to another Latino group? was this the first time it happened? If not, how would you react? OR Have you seen someone react negatively to this type of assumption? Are they right to be upset?

Are there places or times when you are very aware of your ethnicity? Are there places or times when your ethnicity doesn’t matter?

Have you ever had a negative encounter related to your ethnicity? What happened? What did you do? Was this the first time?

What about your race?

LATINO TIES
Are there ways in which you and your family actively stay tied to your ethnicity? Speaking the language? Dancing? Religion? Visiting? Celebrations?

Do you attend events like Hispanic heritage month festivals, Latino film festivals, etc? Do you support these types of projects in your community (e.g. donate time or money)?

Do you feel connected to a Latino community either in Nashville or in the US broadly? If not, why do you think that is? If so, who are they?

Have you ever supported an effort working towards improving opportunities for Latinos? Was this the first time?

Have you ever been asked to be a Latino spokesperson (in your profession or elsewhere)? When was the first/last time this happened? How? Was this something you did voluntarily or did someone have to convince you?
Are you associated with people or organizations in Nashville that are actively engaged in Latino issues? Are you involved with these efforts? Participate in their events, offer financial support, sit on their board?

Are there issues you see as common to most Latinos?

Do Latinos make up a substantial part of your social network? In Nashville?

NASHVILLE?

Originally from Nashville? How did you arrive?

If you were to describe the experience of Latinos in Nashville to someone unfamiliar with the context, how would you describe it? For example, is there a politically active Latino constituency? Is there tension between different Latino groups? Do they all live in one neighborhood?

Since you’ve been in Nashville, have you seen changes to the Latino community? Do you feel that Latinos here have a different experience than those in other places? Examples?

If you were to rate Nashville on its warmth towards Latinos, would you say it is Very Warm, Lukewarm, or Not Very Warm?

Are there Latino leaders in Nashville? Who are they? What makes them leaders? Would you consider yourself one? If there was an issue in Nashville that specifically affected Latinos, who would you pick up the phone to call?

OTHER EXPERIENCES:

I’ve asked all of my questions. Is there anything else you’d like to revisit, anything you forgot to mention before but would like to talk about now? Is there anyone else here in Nashville that you could refer me to? I’m trying to interview 20 Latino professionals/business leaders in Nashville.

SURVEY?

I have this quick survey – could you take a few minutes to fill it out?
INTRODUCTION
Thank you for agreeing to participate in this interview. My goal today is to learn more about the meaning you give to the term Asian and also your experiences here in Nashville. Before I begin, I’d like to stress two points. First, everything we discuss will be kept strictly confidential. Second, although I don’t anticipate that these questions will be highly sensitive in nature, if at any point you wish to move on to another question or stop this interview let me know. Feel free to ask for clarification if anything seems unclear. Ready to begin?

IDENTITY
I want to begin the interview by asking about your identity.

How do you identify?

Do you ever identify as Asian? Under what circumstances?

When was the first time you remember using Asian to identify yourself? (prompt with example)

Can you think of the first time in which you recognized that in certain contexts, you and someone of another Asian background are considered part of the same group?

Are there greater differences among Asians or between Asians and non-Asians in the U.S.? In other words, does someone of Chinese background share more in common with a Korean than he or she does with people of other non-Asian backgrounds?

Have you ever been mistaken for belonging to another Asian group? was this the first time it happened? If not, how would you react? OR Have you seen someone react negatively to this type of assumption? Are they right to be upset?

Do you think broader identities like Asian compete with smaller ones, like Chinese? Does a focus on the larger group take away from the needs of smaller groups? Can you think of a time when you've seen that happen? Or maybe the opposite?

Are there places or times when you are very aware of your ethnicity? Are there places or times when your ethnicity doesn’t seem to matter to you or to the people around you?

Have you ever had a negative encounter related to your ethnicity? What happened? What did you do? Was this the first time?

ASIAN TIES
Now I’d like to ask about your connection to other people of your ethnicity and other Asians.

Have you ever worked with other Asians to achieve a common goal? Was this a group of just Asians or were there people of other backgrounds? What were these interactions like? Was this the first time?

How do you feel when people talk about a common Asian heritage? Tend to agree? Disagree?

Asians are often called a model minority because of their high levels of education and economic success. How do you feel about that term? Is there some truth to it? Are there problems with it?
Have you ever attended events like Asian heritage month festivals, Asian film festivals, etc? Do you support these types of projects in your community (e.g. donate time or money)?

Are there ways in which you and your family actively stay tied to your ethnicity? Speaking the language? Dancing? Religion? Visiting? Celebrations?

Do you ever act as the Asian voice (in your profession or elsewhere)? When was the first/last time this happened? How? Was this something you did voluntarily or did someone have to convince you?

Are you familiar with people or organizations in Nashville that support Asians? Are you involved with them in some way? Participate in their events, offer financial support, sit on their board?

Do you pay much attention to local or national news about Asians? Are there issues common to all Asians?

NASHVILLE

How did you arrive in Nashville? Is your story typical for Asians here?

If you were to describe the experience of Asians in Nashville to someone unfamiliar with the context, how would you describe it? For example, is there a politically active Asian population? Is there tension between different Asian groups? Do they all live in one neighborhood?

Do you feel that Asians here have a different experience than those in other places? Examples?

If you were to rate Nashville on its warmth towards Asians, would you say it is Very Warm, Lukewarm, or Not Very Warm?

Are there things about you that make your experience as an Asian in Nashville different from that of more recent arrivals to the U.S.?

Who is part of your friendship circle here? Would you consider it diverse or largely [ethnic background]?

Are there Asian leaders in Nashville? Who are they? What makes them leaders? Would you consider yourself one?

OTHER EXPERIENCES:

I’ve asked all of my questions. Is there anything else you’d like to revisit, anything you forgot to mention before but would like to talk about now? Is there anyone else here in Nashville that you could refer me to? I’m trying to interview 20 Asian professionals/business leaders in Nashville.

SURVEY

I have this quick survey – could you take a few minutes to fill it out?
APPENDIX C – DEMOGRAPHIC SURVEY FOR LATINOS

STUDY ON ASIAN AND LATINO IDENTITY

Thank you for your participation in this project. Please take a few minutes to fill out this quick questionnaire. All participants and their responses will be kept confidential.

Sociodemographic Information

What year were you born? _______________ What is your gender? _______________

Where were you born? (City, state, country) ________________________________________________________

Are you a citizen of the United States? (Circle one)  YES  NO

List all languages (other than English) that you speak: ________________________________________________

What is your relationship status? (Single, married, cohabitating, divorced, etc.) _____________________________

If married or in domestic partnership, is spouse/partner Latino? (Circle one)  YES  NO

Do you have any children? (Circle one)  YES: (list how many) _________  NO

What is your religion? _________________________________________________________________

Do you attend services at least once a month? (Circle one)  YES  NO

What is your highest level of education completed?

- Less than HS
- High School
- Some College
- BA/BS
- Grad/Prof Degree

If attended college, where did you attend? _______________________________________________________

What was your major? (List all) _________________________________________________________

If attended Graduate/professional School, where did you attend and what were your degrees? (List all) _______________________________________________________

What is your current occupation? ______________________________________________________________

How many years have you lived in San Francisco? _______________

Affiliations

Do you belong to any professional Hispanic/Latino organizations? (Circle one)  YES  NO

If yes, please list all: ______________________________________________________________________

Do you belong to any other Hispanic/Latino organizations? (Circle one)  YES  NO

If yes, please list all: ______________________________________________________________________
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Do you ever read or watch media in a language other than English (newspapers, television, radio, etc.)? (Circle one)

YES: (list language) ____________________   NO

If yes, which newspapers/TV channels/radio stations do you read/watch/listen to? (List all)
______________________________________________________________

Family Background

Where was your mother born? (City, state, country) ________________________________________________

Is your mother: (check all that apply)
  o White
  o Black
  o Asian/Pacific Islander
  o Hispanic/Latino
  o Other (fill in the blank):

_____________________

If mother is U.S. born, please list her parents’ countries of origin: ______________________________________

Where was your father born? (City, state, country) ________________________________________________

Is your father: (check all that apply)
  o White
  o Black
  o Asian/Pacific Islander
  o Hispanic/Latino
  o Other (fill in the blank):

_____________________

If father is U.S. born, please list his parents’ countries of origin: ______________________________________

How many siblings do you have? ______

Where did you go to high school? (City, state, country) ______________________________________________

When you were growing up, were your parents married?  YES   NO

When you were growing up, what was your mother’s occupation(s)? _________________________________

What was your mother’s highest level of education completed?
  o Less than HS
  o High School
  o Some College
  o BA/BS
  o Grad/Prof Degree

When you were growing up, what was your father’s occupation(s)? _________________________________
What was your father’s highest level of education completed?

- Less than HS
- High School
- Some College
- BA/BS
- Grad/Prof Degree

Thank you again for your participation! Please let me know if you have any further questions.

Samantha L Perez
IRB # 141093
Department of Sociology
Vanderbilt University
APPENDIX D – SOCIODEMOGRAPHIC SURVEY FOR ASIANS

STUDY ON ASIAN AND LATINO IDENTITY

Thank you for your participation in this project. Please take a few minutes to fill out this quick questionnaire. All participants and their responses will be kept anonymous and confidential.

Sociodemographic Information

What year were you born? _______________  What is your gender? ________________

Where were you born? (City, state, country) _______________________________________________________

Are you a citizen of the United States? (Circle one) YES  NO

List all languages (other than English) that you speak: ________________________________________________

What is your relationship status? (Single, married, cohabitating, divorced, etc.) _____________________________

If married or in domestic partnership, is spouse/partner Asian? (Circle one) YES  NO

Do you have any children? (Circle one) YES: (list how many) _________  NO

What is your religion? _________________________________________________________________

Do you attend services at least once a month? (Circle one) YES  NO

What is your highest level of education completed?
  o  Less than HS
  o  High School
  o  Some College
  o  BA/BS
  o  Grad/Prof Degree

If attended college, where did you attend? _______________________________________________________

  What was your major? (List all) _______________________________________________________________

If attended Graduate/professional School, where did you attend and what were your degrees? (List all)

What is your current occupation? ______________________________________________________________

How many years have you lived in Nashville? ______________

Affiliations

Do you belong to any professional Asian organizations? (Circle one) YES  NO

If yes, please list all: ________________________________________________________________
Do you belong to any other Asian organizations? (Circle one)  
YES  
NO  
If yes, please list all:  ____________________________________________________________

Do you ever read or watch media in a language other than English (newspapers, television, radio, etc.)? (Circle one)  
YES: (list language)  ___________________________  NO  
If yes, which newspapers/TV channels/radio stations do you read/watch/listen to? (List all)  
___________________________________________________________________________

Family Background  
Where was your mother born? (City, state, country) ________________________________

Is your mother: (check all that apply)  
- White  
- Black  
- Asian/Pacific Islander  
- Hispanic/Latino  
- Other (fill in the blank):  __________________________________________________

If mother is Asian/Pacific Islander or Hispanic/Latino, list country or countries of origin: ____________________

Where was your father born? (City, state, country) ________________________________

Is your father: (check all that apply)  
- White  
- Black  
- Asian/Pacific Islander  
- Hispanic/Latino  
- Other (fill in the blank):  __________________________________________________

If father is Asian/Pacific Islander or Hispanic/Latino, list country or countries of origin: ____________________

How many siblings do you have? ______

Where did you go to high school? (City, state, country) ______________________________

When you were growing up, were your parents married?  
YES  
NO  
When you were growing up, what was your mother’s occupation? ______________________
What was your mother’s highest level of education completed?
  o  Less than HS
  o  High School
  o  Some College
  o  BA/BS
  o  Grad/Prof Degree

When you were growing up, what was your father’s occupation? _______________________________________

What was your father’s highest level of education completed?
  o  Less than HS
  o  High School
  o  Some College
  o  BA/BS
  o  Grad/Prof Degree

Thank you again for your participation! Please let me know if you have any further questions.

Samantha L Perez
IRB # 141093
Department of Sociology
Vanderbilt University
## Appendix E – Table of Respondents’ Demographic Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Panethnic Group</th>
<th>Ethnic Background</th>
<th>Identity Preference</th>
<th>U.S. Born</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>Gateway Coast</td>
<td>Ben Huang</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>Gateway Coast</td>
<td>Frank Le</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>Gateway Coast</td>
<td>Ishara Ranatunga</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Sri Lankan</td>
<td>Sri Lankan, American</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>Gateway Coast</td>
<td>Connie Park</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>Gateway Coast</td>
<td>Laura Rosario</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Filipina</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>Gateway Coast</td>
<td>Pooja Jindal</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>Gateway Coast</td>
<td>Al Duran</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>Filipino American</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>Gateway Coast</td>
<td>Alvaro Mijaro</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Ecuador/Mexico</td>
<td>&quot;enterprising structural engineer&quot;</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>Gateway Coast</td>
<td>Octavio Mendes</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Peruvian</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>Gateway Coast</td>
<td>Bianca Alvarez</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Chilean</td>
<td>Latina</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>Gateway Coast</td>
<td>Grace Ng</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>Chinese American</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>Gateway Coast</td>
<td>Jimmy Zhou</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>Gateway Coast</td>
<td>Doug Wu</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>Gateway Coast</td>
<td>Jiro Miwa</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>Gateway Coast</td>
<td>Teresa Sandoval</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>Latina</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>Gateway Coast</td>
<td>Rosie Diaz</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>Chicana</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>Gateway Coast</td>
<td>Jo Sanchez</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>Chicana</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>Gateway Coast</td>
<td>Zulema White</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Mexican/White</td>
<td>Lat/Chicana</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>Gateway Coast</td>
<td>Celeste Rios</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>&quot;an artist&quot;</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>Gateway Coast</td>
<td>Carlos Guerrero</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>Gateway Coast</td>
<td>Anita Hayashi</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Japanese, Chinese,</td>
<td>Japanese, Chinese, Spanish, Spanish</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>Gateway Coast</td>
<td>Karen Zheng</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>ChinAmer/Asian Amer</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>Gateway Coast</td>
<td>Ryan Kapoor</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>Indian American, South Asian, Asian</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>Gateway Coast</td>
<td>Scott Shimoda</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Japanese, Caucasian</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>Gateway Coast</td>
<td>Maricela Fernandez</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>&quot;Mexicano&quot;</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>Gateway Coast</td>
<td>Veronica Mana</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>Chicana, Mestiza, Mex-Amer, Latina</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Race</td>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>Gateway Coast</td>
<td>Norma Pinto</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>Gateway Coast</td>
<td>Paloma Villegas</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>Chicana</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>Gateway Coast</td>
<td>Hilda Cruz</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Salvadoran</td>
<td>Latina</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>Gateway Coast</td>
<td>Nelson Vargas</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>Gateway Coast</td>
<td>Jorge Hernandez</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Puerto Rican/Salvadoran</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>Gateway Coast</td>
<td>Vince Castillo</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>Gateway Coast</td>
<td>Omar Pedraza</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>Gateway Coast</td>
<td>Leo Torres</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>Mexican American, Latino</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>Gateway Coast</td>
<td>Mario Estrada</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Nicaraguan</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>Gateway Coast</td>
<td>Nina Li</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>Chinese American, Asian American</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>Gateway Coast</td>
<td>Lola Reyes</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Filipina</td>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>Gateway Coast</td>
<td>Mike Lima</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Mexican/White</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>Gateway Coast</td>
<td>Jaime Coronado</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>Gateway Coast</td>
<td>Lucas Zapata</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Nicaraguan</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>Gateway Coast</td>
<td>Arnav Verma</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>Indian American, South Asian American</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>New South</td>
<td>Ishaan Laghari</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>&quot;Learning Scientist&quot;</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>New South</td>
<td>Jay Nguyen</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Vietnamese/Chinese</td>
<td>Vietnamese, Chinese</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>New South</td>
<td>Manolo Arenas</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Venezuelan</td>
<td>Venezuelan</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>New South</td>
<td>Bilal Bajwa</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>South Asian</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>New South</td>
<td>Pitam Saha</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>New South</td>
<td>Eloisa Camacho</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Colombian</td>
<td>Colombian</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>New South</td>
<td>Ulises Rocha</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>New South</td>
<td>Franco Chávez</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Peruvian-Brazilian</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>New South</td>
<td>Lin Chung</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>New South</td>
<td>Akari Hano</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>New South</td>
<td>Helen Tsai</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>Chinese-American</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>New South</td>
<td>An Yang</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>New South</td>
<td>Kaori Watanabe</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>New South</td>
<td>Anika Patel</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>New South</td>
<td>Min Yoon</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>New South</td>
<td>Noor Cheema</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>Additional Ethnicities</td>
<td>US Citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>New South</td>
<td>Badri Adhikari</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Nepalese</td>
<td>Nepalese</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>New South</td>
<td>Harry Duong</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>New South</td>
<td>Danny Zhao</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>New South</td>
<td>Kelvin Yi</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>New South</td>
<td>Yolanda Silva</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Peruvian-Bolivian</td>
<td>Hispanic/Latina</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>New South</td>
<td>Susana Lopez</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>New South</td>
<td>Clara Vidal</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>New South</td>
<td>Allegra Cortez</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Costa Rican</td>
<td>&quot;Person&quot;</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>New South</td>
<td>Daniela Suarez</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>Mexican-American</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>New South</td>
<td>Marciano Vega</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Dominican</td>
<td>Dominican American</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>New South</td>
<td>Cristobal Alcantara</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>New South</td>
<td>Xavier Maldonado</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Bolivian</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>New South</td>
<td>Ignacio Molina</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>New South</td>
<td>Alex Sosa</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>&quot;myself&quot;</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>New South</td>
<td>Gustavo Rojas</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>New South</td>
<td>Emilio Perales</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>New South</td>
<td>Hilario Acosta</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Caucasian-Hispanic</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>New South</td>
<td>Rodolfo Herrera</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>New South</td>
<td>Elliot Kim</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Peruvian</td>
<td>Peruvian</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>New South</td>
<td>Patricia Montes</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Cuban</td>
<td>Latina</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>New South</td>
<td>German Galindo</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Colombian</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>New South</td>
<td>Erica Wan</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>American, Asian-American</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>New South</td>
<td>Reyna Macias</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Puerto Rican</td>
<td>Puerto Rican</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>New South</td>
<td>Adrian Bautista</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>Mexican-American</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>New South</td>
<td>Julie Endo</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Japanese, European</td>
<td>Japanese-American</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>New South</td>
<td>Wendy Rhee</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>Korean-American</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>New South</td>
<td>Michael Tran</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>Asian American, Vietnamese American</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>New South</td>
<td>Daya Andere</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Cuban/Irish</td>
<td>Cuban-American, Latina</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>New South</td>
<td>Olivia O'Connell</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Cuban/Irish</td>
<td>Cuban-American</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>New South</td>
<td>Wilfredo Leon</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>New South</td>
<td>Freddy Hurtado</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Cuban</td>
<td>Cuban-American, Latino</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>New South</td>
<td>Clara Nunez</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Cuban</td>
<td>Latina</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>New South</td>
<td>Vicky Tello</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>American, Hispanic-American</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>New South</td>
<td>Salvador Nunez</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>New South</td>
<td>Nico Juarez</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Puerto Rican, Filipino</td>
<td>Puerto Rican</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>New South</td>
<td>Tomas Medina</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>&quot;Human Being&quot;, Hispanic</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>New South</td>
<td>Inez Mayorga</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Cuban/Mexican</td>
<td>Cuban-Mexican</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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