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Abstract

Racial categories continue to persist in present day multi-ethnic and cultural societies such as the U.S. The lack of an agreement between science and public opinion on how to account for human variation has resulted in the continued racialization of folk taxonomy that emerged at the turn of the late 19th century into the 20th century. Its persistence in the scientific and socio-political arenas can be attributed to its ambiguity and its application to a number of other social factors used to identify and marginalize minorities and outlier groups from mainstream society.

This thesis reviews historical physical anthropological and Latino studies literature along with original ethnographic field research in an effort to understand if ethnic categories are taking on racial distinctions. Field interviews of Hispanics and Latinos in the Boston metro area reveal a blurring between race and ethnicity through new socially constructed ideologies and the racialization of terms such as Hispanic and Latino. A counter response by subjects is evident in either their rejection of or modification of imposed ideologies and categories in favor of an idealized identity founded on learned and lived experiences. Alternatives to the continued use of racialized concepts are presented as a means of furthering an understanding of the cognitive and cultural aspects of these marginalized groups’ adaptive responses to imposed ideologies.
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Chapter I

Introduction

How would you respond, if I asked you to define your race and ethnicity? I for example, self-identify my race as “white” and my ethnicity as “Hispanic”. However, some would argue that I am mixing up or confusing race and ethnicity. Possibly, but at present, this sort of popular confusion is what inspires my thesis. I will ask, by researching academic sources and interviewing minorities in the U.S., what these terms currently define and equally important, what all of this says about society at large. Could it be that we…I and other minorities… in the U.S. are beginning to see the application of ethnic categories within the sphere of what were previously racial distinctions? If so, what effect does this distinction have on members of ethnic groups and does it represent an altered, but nonetheless stigmatizing version of late 19th and early 20th century racialization of social differences. As the world’s multi-racial and multi-ethnic societies have evolved, so have perceptions and uses of these distinctions, both being social constructs but with “race” carrying a heavier social weight. In many instances the understanding and use of these terms is leading to a blending or blurring of the lines that distinguish race and ethnicity. In other cases, however, simple ethnic distinctions are becoming racialized, social re-constructions, so to speak. So the questions become “why?” and “how?” and “what does it mean?”
Attempting to address issues of race and ethnicity in their entirety would require an expansive analysis of various fields such as anthropology, physical anthropology, law, sociology, psychology, and race studies among others. This analysis is unfortunately beyond the scope of this master’s thesis. Instead, this thesis presents original ethnographic field research, inspired by earlier study of physical anthropological methodologies and theories as applied to race studies. It is not the purpose of this thesis to attempt to link or bridge ethnographic and physical anthropological approaches but rather to illustrate my own curiosity, inspired by earlier works in these fields but concerned with their current application. This ethnographic research is also supplemented with a brief overview, analysis and interpretation from Latino studies to include; a historical review of U.S. involvement in Latin America, immigration policies, and discrimination and marginalization as a byproduct of racialized ideologies, imposed on Latin Americans.

This research was conducted in a two-fold manner, consisting of a brief literature review of race studies in the field of physical anthropology, highlighting and emphasizing key events and concepts that emerged in the late 19th century into the early 20th century leading up to the present. As we will see, many of the concepts put forth by physical anthropology will be visible in the analysis and interpretation of the research in question. In conjunction, a brief history review of Latino studies provides contextual background on the subject group of the ethnographic research as well as perspective on the effects of racialized ideologies on this group. These reviews thus lay the groundwork for the second portion of the thesis, an original ethnographic study focusing on Hispanics and
Latinos/Latin Americans in the Boston metro area. Interviews examine subjects understanding of race and ethnicity and consequently how they self-identified when presented with ethnic and racial categories. The interviews examined the potential coalescing of race and ethnicity, along with any resultant stigmatization associated with the racializing of ethnic categories. The interviews also discuss those external forces motivating the continued application of racist ideologies and how subjects have adapted and/or embraced these imposed ideologies. Are racist ideologies as prevalent and obvious in society as they once were and are we seeing a culturally based adaptation by multi-cultural and ethnic groups in the U.S. in response to these imposed racist ideologies.
Chapter II

Review of Race Studies in Physical Anthropology

While anthropology as a whole and more specifically physical anthropology cannot take sole credit for the emergence and propagation of racial ideologies in Europe, in the U.S. and to a lesser extent on a global scale, anthropologists have played a significant role. The following presents a brief historical review of race studies within the field dating back to the end of the 19th century into the early 20th century leading up to present day. As early as the late 18th century, the U.S., a nation defined by its constitutional values of freedom, equality and diversity has found itself gripped in an unending debate spanning socio-political and scientific circles over the use of racialized ideologies and categories for identifying and defining certain groups within its populous. The opening paragraph of the American Association of Physical Anthropology statement on biological aspect of race in 1996, reads,

“Popular conceptualizations of race are derived from 19th and early 20th century scientific formulations...these categories of race are rooted in the scientific traditions of the 19th century, and in even earlier philosophical traditions which presumed that immutable visible traits can predict the measure of all other traits in an individual or population. Such notions have often been used to support racist doctrines” (AAPA, 1996, p. 714).
Early origins of race and ethnicity concepts: From “We/They” to “Us vs Them”

History provides, from early on, examples of humankind’s innate nature to self-identify and ascription, (identifying others). This inherent nature to identify these traits or qualities that distinguish an individual or group from another represent the very foundation of the “race problem” that the U.S. has been dealing with since the better part of the 19th century till the present. As early as the classical period, we see references to “them”. The Greek historian, Herodotus, makes reference to the number of various states and ethnic groups involved in the Persian war. The descriptions provided my Herodotus make reference to physical variations as well as cultural ones such as his description of the Chichians as having Egyptian origins due to their black skins and wooly hair (cited in Smedley, 2012, p. 311). The Roman historian, Tacitus in his work, *Histories*, described the perception of Jews during Roman times stating,

“Among the Jews all things are profane that we hold sacred; on the other hand, they permit all that we abhor…the other customs of the Jews are base and abominable, and owe their persistence to their depravity… For the worst rascals among other peoples…but toward every other people they feel only hate and enmity” (5.1-13).

Descriptions like these can be found throughout historical accounts by various explorers such as Marco Polo, Christopher Columbus, Fransisco Pizarro and others as they came in contact with people of different cultures, basing their perceptions and identifications of “them” based on their own establish cultural beliefs.
Throughout time, such encounters have led to the identification and labeling of individuals and groups on the basis of such factors as cultural beliefs, religion and socio-political motivations. Ultimately these factors took on tangible characteristics, evident through the perceptions and descriptions of the physical features and attributes of these groups. Imperialist expansion and colonialism during the age of exploration led to a shrinking world, as no corner of the globe was left untouched by European explores. In the process, peoples of varying cultures would come into contact resulting in the continued use of these notions of “us/them”. But only later do such distinctions become “racialized” in the current sense. In a statement presented by the American Association of Physical Anthropologists in 1996 on biological aspects of race, they stated,

“These old racial categories were based on externally visible traits, primarily skin color, features of the face, and the shape and size of the head and body, and the underlying skeleton. They were often imbued with nonbiological attributes, based on social constructions of race” (AAPA, 1996, p. 714).

The defining transitional period between these notions of “us/them”, and current ones regarding race and ethnicity took shape during the late 19th century and early 20th century with influences from the late 17th and 18th centuries.

Antecedents to Late 19th and Early 20th century racial ideologies

Scientific movements associated with the Scientific Revolution (16th-18th century) and the Enlightenment (17th-18th century) introduced various new scientific methods for aiding in the exploration of the natural world outside the bounds of established theological doctrine. One outcome of these advances was the introduction of
methodologies for the systematic cataloging and categorization of all things. During these movements, naturalists (early scientists) emerged, who among other interests, sought answers to humankind’s origins and their expanding “varieties” (like-races) of humans encountered during the age of exploration. Europeans found themselves motivated to self-identify themselves and others in an effort to cement their place in the world with respect to they're newly conquered people.

By the year 1735, the Swedish botanist, Carolus Linnaeus would publish his well-known and still relevant System Naturae, in which he placed humans into the order Anthropomorpha and divided the genus Homo into four groups consisting of Europeans, Americans, Asiaticus and Africans (Smedley, 2012, p. 218). Linnaeus described his human groups as displaying, “indiscriminately mixed physical features with supposed traits of character, disposition, and behaviors… (Smedley, 2012, p. 218). In going a step beyond the taxonomic definitions of Linnaeus for the genus Homo, the naturalist, Johann Blumenbach, a German professor of medicine proposed in 1779, a new division of the genus consisting of four and later five “varieties” (Smedley, 2012, p. 220). These “varieties” were founded on the major regions of the earth and labeled, Caucasian, Mongolian, Ethiopian, American and Malay, divisions that became popular and persisted into fairly recent times (Smedley, 2012, p. 220). Naturalists such as Linnaeus and Blumenbach, while cognizant of human variation, still held on to monogenetic perspectives of humankind, based on their Christian doctrinal beliefs. Over time, the comparative sciences would transition to notions of progress that emphasized essentialism (notions of distinct ideal types), biological determinism (biology served as
determinant factor, influencing cultural differences) and the idea of the great chain of being (or orthogenetic evolution, an ideal, in which various forms are arranged into a ladder or chain from least complex to most complex or perfect) (Caspari, 2003; Park, 2001). Around this time, various fields within the sciences found themselves mirroring society’s sentiments regarding perceived differences among humans.

Imperialism and colonialism in Europe and slavery in the United States would serve as catalysts for the emergence of racist ideologies and the inception of scientific racism that dominated the late 19th century into the early 20th century. This was no more evident than in the U.S. as, “Differences among the racial categories were projected to their greatest extreme when the argument was posed that Africans, Indians and Europeans were separate species with Africans the least human and closest taxonomically to apes” (AAA, 1999, p. 712; Smedley & Smedley, 2007, p. 7). Still, acceptance and support of racist ideologies would not prove universal within all social and scientific circles. Overtime, movements to abolish slavery and decolonization would lead to a re-evaluation of these ideologies in the 19th and 20th century but not necessarily their extinction.

In many ways, physical anthropology contributed strongly to the continued advancement of racial ideologies during the late 19th and early 20th century. At the inception of the American Anthropological Association (AAA) in 1902, most anthropologists considered “race” to represent the way human species were internally subdivided (Caspari, 2003, p. 65). Physical anthropology focused on race studies and applied other fields like taxonomy, anthropometry and craniometrics, which gave further scientific credence to these ideologies. Continued use of 18th century notions of progress, polygenism and differential degrees of advancement among racial groups influenced cultural anthropologists like L.H. Morgan and E.B. Tylor to work in tandem with physical anthropologists to “scientifically” reconstruct humankind’s evolutionary history on the basis of a unilinear path from “savagery” to “civilization” (Mukhopadhyay & Yolanda, 1997, p. 517-518). A group’s “evolutionary progressiveness” was determined by their mental development (intellect and morality) as well as other physiological markers (Mukhopadhyay & Yolanda, 1997, p. 518). These studies would become known as scientific racism and would dominate anthropology up to the end of WWII. The ramifications of these studies are best captured by Casperi (2003), as she states, “They provided justification for ‘interracial competition’, the basis for claims of biological inferiority of social classes, and supported unjust social institutions ranging from slavery to various eugenic policies and the applied biology of Nazism” (p. 67). However, acceptance of racist ideologies and their scientific backing would come under scrutiny as
early as the end of the 19th century and set in motion an eventual break between scientific racism and physical anthropology.

Boas, The Four Field Approach to Anthropology and a Break from Scientific Racism

The German physicist, who later turned anthropologist, Franz Boaz would raise the most significant counter argument against race studies with his four field approach to anthropology, which dramatically altered U.S. anthropology moving forward. Boas questioned and outright rejected many prevailing notions of scientific racism, such as orthogenesis, determinism and presumed correlations between language, culture and biology as a result of a group's biological traits (Caspari, 2003, p. 68, Mukhopadhyay and Yolanda, 1997, p. 518). In particular, Boas disagreed with the notion of biologically fixed, homogenous races that could be ranked by their level of progressiveness (Mukhopadhyay and Yolanda, 1997, p. 518). In one of his seminal works, Changes in Bodily Form of Descendants of Immigrants (1912), Boas was able to demonstrate that previously static racial indicators like head shape displayed significant levels of plasticity over only a single generation of American immigrants and their children. Boas was able to attribute this plasticity to such external factors as nutrition, surrounding environment, and cultural factors. Influenced by the continued work of Boas' and his students, scientific racism would eventually collapse around the mid 20th century. Even though scientific racism would fall out of favor within many scientific and socio-political circles, many of the racist ideologies that emerged from it would persist.
The Decline of Scientific Racism and Increased Social Awareness (1930s through 1970s)

The 1930s through the 1970s would bring about great social and scholarly change as many pseudosciences in support of racial studies and the legitimizing of racist ideologies fell out of favor. A new found social consciousness would emerge out of the ashes of two world wars, the Holocaust, the decolonization of Asia, Africa and South America along with the Great Depression and mass waves of immigration. This was no more evident than in the fall out of the Nazi backed field of eugenics. A pseudoscience based on the elimination of presumed inferior or deleterious traits from populations through selective breeding and prohibition of child bearing, eugenics, would serve as the foundation of Nazism and its effects were displayed during the Holocaust (Lieberman, Kirk, & Corcoran, 2003; Smedley & Smedley, Biology 2005; Smedley & Smedley, 2012). Antiracist sentiment continued to gain momentum as the midcentury approached. On the socio-political front, movements and judicial rulings like the Civil Rights Movement, the Brown vs. Board of Education ruling, and the Voting Rights Acts would fuel this change. In physical anthropology this period would bring about a paradigm shift in methodology and practices as they related to racist ideologies that would parallel those on the social front.

During the 1940s and 1950s, the physical anthropologist, Sherwood Washburn would usher in a new physical anthropology that incorporated the new synthesis. Washburn pushed for a physical anthropology that no longer focused on racial studies but
focused on modern evolutionary biology, population genetics, primatology and human origins. Washburn’s new physical anthropology led to new generations of physical anthropologists to become focused on biology and culture without the need for determinism and began studying “populations” instead of “races” or how individual traits were distributed in clinal studies (gradual change in certain characteristics displayed by populations of the same species) (Caspari, 2003, p. 71).

What had begun as a questioning of scientific racism early on during Boas’ time had by the 1960s become a publicized rejection by the majority of the scientific community in main-stream society. Still, support of scientific racism remained and on the social front its voice had an audience listening intently. One such supporter was the renowned physical anthropologist, Carleton Coon. Coon supported notions of polygenism and race ranking and in 1962 would publish his controversial work, *The Origin of Races*. In his work, Coon suggested the parallel evolution of five major races from Homo *erectus* that he believed had crossed the “sapiens” threshold at differing times in history and was reflected in their “cultural achievements”. Coon’s work proved the tipping point that led to a divide within physical anthropology. Physical anthropologists like Washburn and Ashley Montagu along with supporters from other fields like geneticist Theodosius Dobzhansky publicly rejected Coon’s claims and racist brand of science. What followed were debates leading to resolutions put forth in 1961 by the AAA and in 1962 by the AAPA. These resolutions denounced works, such as, Coon’s as not representative of anthropology and anthropological science, nor recognized the authors as professional anthropologists by the AAA (Caspari, 2003, p. 72). Race, no longer
considered a unifying concept within physical anthropology, was gradually replaced by population studies, modern genetics and clinal studies.

Contemporary anthropology and society: The Search for Alternatives to the Race Concept

Contemporary social/cultural anthropology and physical anthropology continues to point out the inability of racial concepts to explain human variation, yet finds itself at odds to present viable alternatives that, are not themselves susceptible to criticisms and racialized interpretations. Billinger (2007) points out, “Despite the conceptual inadequacy of race, the anthropological enterprise has yet to move beyond it as an explanatory tool for understanding human biological variation because of the lack of a conceptual and/or methodological replacement” (p. 5). In many respects racial classifications have failed to explain population variation because they are predicated on the notion of human groups as being static and discrete both at the phenotypic and genotypic level. The resultant push for conceptual alternatives yielded the suggested use of “populations”. This term was originally put forth by G. W. Martin in the mid-20th century and found only marginal acceptance and success as an alternative. As Caspari (2003) would state, “racial concepts persist in physical anthropology. The use of populations has only served as a replacement term for race, but like races, are regarded as isolated breeding populations, implying past typological notions” (p. 73). Around the same time frame, a push for the use of “ethnic groups” was also spearheaded by Ashley Montagu (Brues, 1993, p. 75; Billinger, 2007, p. 6). As we will see, the use of “ethnic
“groups” has become a mainstay in anthropology and physical anthropology as well as in everyday vernacular within U.S. society but has not always served as a suitable replacement for race concepts.

Montagu’s insistence on the use of “ethnic groups” as a replacement for race was founded on the notion that the term served as a non-committal description that took into account the variation evident in human populations. The term also served as a means of accounting for the effects of culture and society on biological systems. Montagu would define “ethnic groups” as,

“One of a number of populations comprising the single species Homo sapiens, which individually maintain their differences, physical and cultural, by means of isolating mechanisms such as geographic and social barriers. These differences will vary as the power of the geographic and social barriers, acting upon the original genetic differences, vary. Where these barriers are low power neighboring groups will intergrade, or hybridize, with one another. Where these barriers are of high power such ethnic groups will tend to remain distinct or replace each other geographically or ecologically” (cited in Billinger, 2007, p. 15).

Over time, the concept of “ethnic groups,” put forth by Montagu became distorted both in scholarly and social circles. It came to be understood as a group of individuals that identify with each other based on shared cultural values, a common language and interaction, a membership which identifies itself and can be identified by others and is largely biologically self-perpetuating (Barth, 1969, p. 10). In many respects this interpretation mirrors that of race and demonstrates a long standing and skewed interpretation of ethnic groups. The social anthropologist, Fredrik Barth would reject this notion of ethnicity and ethnic groups and would further add to the concept put forth by Montagu of ethnic groups in his now classic introduction to his work, *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries* (1969). Barth pointed out that these criteria imply racial, cultural, social and language barriers that create boundaries between ethnic groups that appear fixed and
unchanging (Barth, 1969, p. 11). What Barth points out is that ethnicity and ethnic
groups are not fixed and that while certain boundaries are created between ethnic groups
they are not a result of some physical or geographical boundary that prohibits interaction
and exchange. These perceived boundaries are products of social processes which
channel social interaction. Ethnicity can, but does not necessarily or always, lead to the
exclusion or incorporation of defined traits that are maintained even if the group has a
continuous change in participation and membership. These ethnic groups are subject to
change over time and this level of change or adaptation and incorporation is applicable to
the group as a whole or to a singular individual within the group.

Current research (Billinger 2007) continues to stress further study and analysis of
Montagu’s “ethnic groups” as a replacement for race concepts within the context of a bio-
cultural approach to addressing human variation. Within this framework, Billinger
discusses the non-exclusive relationship between biology and culture along with the
potential “cognitive role of human ethnic categories…” as a means of explaining the
perpetual use of folk taxonomies that mirror systematic taxonomies. Billinger (2007)
argues,

“It would, however, be fruitless to pursue a non-racial method for explaining human
variation if it could be demonstrated that – regardless of whether biological races can be
shown to exist or not – the human mind will inevitably categorize the world based on the
assumption that groups are discrete social or biological entities. Races would then be
real, at least in a cognitive sense” (p. 27).

Further interpretations by anthropologists Atran and Hirschfeld hold that, “race is not an
innate concept, but rather the result of an interaction between culture and
cognition” (Billinger, 2007, p. 28). Furthermore, Atran notes, “Humans, therefore,
commonly classify living kinds according to type, and apparent morphological distinction
between human groups may be conceived as natural biological divisions, from which social hierarchies develop” (cited in Billinger, 2007, p. 28). Billinger further declares when assessing J.R. Gil-Whites perspective on this cognitive argument, “… suggests that the identification and order of natural human kinds results in an attachment of putative essences. With these putative essences comes the mistaking of race and ethnic group: … we essentialize races because we mistakenly ‘think’ they are ethnic groups” (cited in Billinger, 2007, p. 29). This common misinterpretation or lack of understanding of the social construction of “ethnic groups” within the context of a bio-cultural sphere becomes evident not only on a theoretical level in scientific circles but is evident within socio-political circles.

In having reviewed physical anthropology’s role in substantiating and perpetuating the racist paradigm that currently exists in the U.S., we must keep in mind the relationship between physical anthropology and society. In many ways, physical anthropology, like other fields in race studies has found itself influencing and/or mirroring the U.S. socio-political apparatus in its attempts to understand and engage an ever expanding, multi-ethnic population at odds with it's understanding of self-identification in regard to the use of terms that at times have racialized implications.

As will become evident in the following brief history review of Hispanics/Latinos in the U.S. and subsequent ethnographic study, many of the established concepts in physical anthropology regarding the misuse of taxonomy, the push for replacement terminology for racially charged terms and the relationship between cognition and bio-cultural ideologies is apparent in these socially marginalized groups. Their ability to take
on and adapt to these racially imposed ideologies sheds light on the possible direction both the sciences and society could, perhaps should move towards in its pursuit of doing away with such ideologies.
Chapter III

Brief Historical Review of Hispanics/Latinos in the U.S.

Do you find it easy to identify a Hispanic or Latino? When you do identify one, how is it that you identify them? As a Hispanic male, I find it difficult at times to identify myself given the criteria that society has already deemed as representative of me. I must admit that I have also been guilty of assuming an individual’s identity. I have used terms like Hispanic, Latino or Mexican just to list a few of the more common place labels used in U.S. society to identify individuals that, “look” Hispanic or Latino. This type of stereotyped and imposed identity is regional, as individuals living in New York, might identify Hispanics or Latinos as Puerto Rican or Dominican, while in LA they might be assumed to be Chicano or Mexican and in Florida, their response would most likely change to Cuban. The point being, your responses, like those of any other individual may prove quite different. These differences hint at the ambiguity of these terms and of the great variability existent within this group. Still we readily encounter the use of Hispanic and/or Latino as an all encompassing label for such a varied group of individuals that find themselves being placed under the same categorical umbrella.

Any attempt to understand the dynamics inherent in this categorization must begin with a review of the history and factors that have led us to the current status quo that defines Hispanics and Latinos in the U.S. I look to present in this section the
historical ties that Hispanics and Latinos have to the U.S. and vice versa. In doing so, I draw extensively from the work of Juan Gonzalez, *A History of Latinos in America: Harvest of Empire*, which provides a closer look at the diversity of Latinos while chronicling the individual interactions between the U.S. and these varied groups as they have made their way into this country and become categorized and identified under these terms. Along these lines, I explore the cultural terminology that is Hispanic and Latino and how these terms along with the individuals they identify undergo a transition into racialization upon entering the U.S. In conclusion, I present and discuss specific groups with the purpose of demonstrating the diversity existent within this presumed larger Hispanic/Latino group. In the process, I address such factors as nationality, socio-economic status, class, language, immigrant status, gender and finally race and color and their contributions to the lumping together of these individuals through the use of vaguely defined terminology infused with racial undertones.

A Legacy of Persuasion and Manipulation: U.S. and Latin American Relations

A history of U.S. interactions with Hispanics and Latinos tends to spur images of waves of immigrants attempting to illegally cross the border or washing up on the shores off the Florida coast seeking asylum. This along with other stereotypical images is inaccurate. Some of the revisionist history taught in the U.S., fails to adequately represent the influence that some Hispanics and Latinos have had in the U.S.
conquistadors entered and established a Spanish claim to much of the southern and western U.S. nearly a century prior to the establishment of the first English colonies (Gonzalez, 2000, p. 8). As Gonzalez points out, “…early expeditions, however, led to permanent Spanish outposts through North America, to the founding of our earliest cities, Saint Augustine and Santa Fe, and to the naming of hundreds of U.S. rivers, mountains, towns, and even several states.” (Gonzalez, 2000, p. 8). What spawned from these early explorations of the U.S. was a permanent Spanish speaking population of Latinos and mestizos that have persisted to a certain extent till current times. U.S. historians often fail to acknowledge this populations influence in U.S. history nor their stories which in many respects are similar to that of the Native American Indians, one of displacement, forcible relocation and assimilation into a new nationhood.

Of even further consequence in this revisionist history is the role and impact that U.S. expansionist efforts played in Latin America. By the 1800s the Spanish empire had begun to fragment, losing its grip on its New World holdings. The fledgling nations that emerged, while blessed with vast resources, struggled to establish themselves due to a combination of a lack of international recognition and support as well as internal strife (Gonzalez, 2000, p. 27). Moreover, U.S. expansionist efforts would only further cripple the development of these Latin American nations. While many of these fledging nations had looked at the U.S. and its independence as a model for their own cause, the U.S. would not provide the support anticipated by many of the revolutionary leaders of these nations (Gonzalez, 2000, p. 34). In turn the U.S. harbored expansionist visions that extended west and south of its borders. The Spanish-speaking nations closest to the U.S.
would suffer great territorial losses and weakening but the effects of U.S. expansion would be far reaching, leaving a long lasting imprint across Latin America. The U.S.’s first demonstration of its lack of support and expansionist agenda came with the Adams-Onis Treaty of 1819 that saw Spain concede the territory of Florida, while the U.S. renounced any further claims to Spanish territories (Gonzalez, 2000, pp. 36-37). The next two waves of U.S. expansion, saw the annexation of Texas, California and the Southwest territories by 1855 and concluded with Central America and the Caribbean throughout the second half of the 19th century. Two major factors facilitating these territorial advancements was the tactic of filibustering (sacking of towns by anglo settlers) and the declaration of the Monroe Doctrine in 1823 (Gonzalaz, 2000, pp. 36-37).

The Monroe Doctrine, in principal issued an edict that European colonization efforts in the North and South American continents were no longer allowed and would be considered an act of aggression, necessitating retaliation by the U.S. On the surface, the Monroe Doctrine represented an acknowledgement and support of all Latin American nations but in reality served as a means of allowing the U.S. sole access to impose its economic, political and military influence within these nations. Coined by such phrases as, “America for the Americans,” and “Manifest Destiny,” the Monroe Doctrine legitimized a notion of divine right for U.S. expansion and would be used countless times in the coming century to justify U.S. military occupation of Latin American nations (Gonzalez, 2000, p. 39).

The turn of the century would only strengthen the sphere of political and socioeconomic influence the U.S. swayed over Latin America. With the Monroe
Doctrines edict in mind, the Spanish-American War that ensued in 1898 brought Cuba, Puerto Rico, Guam and the Philippine Islands under the primary control of the U.S. The U.S. occupied the islands of Puerto Rico and Cuba with the former eventually becoming a U.S. territory and the latter a protectorate. What ensued was an outright rush of U.S. cooperate businesses, bankers and financiers to these nations. Support by the U.S. government along with the backing of U.S. installed puppet governments would eventually lead to the control of the majority of economic commodities produced by these nations. In line with this, was the regulating of cheap wage labor through the use of native populous and sanctioned immigration of other Latin American nations lower class labor forces to work on U.S. business owned lands (Gonzalez, 2000, pp. 57-66). The U.S.’s next major incursion into Latin America came with the creation of the Panama Canal between 1904-1914.

The creation of a transcontinental canal allowed for the linking of Atlantic and Pacific oceanic trading routes that only furthered the economic power the U.S. held. Both Nicaragua and Colombia were in the running to take on this U.S. sanctioned and Teddy Roosevelt spear-headed project. Colombia would prove the better fit, given its president’s willingness to concede to the U.S.’s request for sovereignty over a ten-kilometer zone on both sides of the canal route (Gonzalez, 2000, p. 67). At the last minute, opponents of the president in the Columbian congress rejected the deal, which in turn angered Roosevelt. The result was a U.S. planned and supported armed secession of the province. On November 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 1903, a rebel band with support from US troops would take over the port towns of Panama City and Colon. Shortly after, a new Panamanian...

The next Latin American country to suffer at the hands of U.S. intervention was the Dominican Republic. The young island nation had suffered through seventy-two years’ worth of political instability and violence at the hands of corrupt leaders as evident by its twenty-nine coups and forty-eight presidents during that time (Gonzalez, 2000, p. 69). At the turn of the century, the Dominican Republic found itself saddled with a massive foreign debt, the result of corrupt dealings by the government in place and facing harsher times with the financial crisis that hit in 1905 (Gonzalez, 2000, p. 69). An inability to manage its foreign debt and the potential of European intervention to collect that debt prompted U.S. involvement. In an effort to prevent European intervention but primarily motivated by its desire to safe guard its routes to the Panama Canal, the U.S. intervened by offering aid in the form of a consolidated new loan along with stipulations that the Dominican government turn over all customs revenues and give the U.S. final say over the raising of government spending and increasing of taxes (Gonzalez, 2000, p. 69). What ensued was the enactment of legal reforms benefiting foreign investors along with continued tax exemptions on sugar exports. Further efforts to strengthen their hold of the young nation’s economy along with its infrastructure was met with resistance and resulted in the military occupation of the island in May of 1916. An eight year long occupation of the country would follow, and while many military led reforms took place that benefited the country, it also left the country dependent on U.S. support. Following U.S. withdrawal from the island in 1924, the country would soon come under the iron-
fisted and ruthless rule of Rafael Leonidas Trujillo. For thirty years, Trujillo’s dictatorship would be founded on corruption, torturing and human atrocities highlighted by the Haitian massacre of 1937 (Gonzalez, 2000, pp. 72-73). The U.S. would notably stand by during Trujillo’s reign up until the point at which he attempted to have the Venezuelan president assassinated, an action that went against U.S. interests and resulted in his assassination in 1961 at the hands of some of his officers with backing from the CIA (Gonzalez, 2000, p. 73).

Other Latin American countries would suffer similar fates at the hands of U.S. intervention and influence in their socio-political and economic infrastructures. What would come of these actions was massive internal strife and instability within these governments, promptings civil war and the mass immigration of natives to other Latin American countries but primarily the U.S.. While immigration from various Latin American countries had been occurring since the early 20th century, what took place between the 1960s through the 1980s was an explosion of Latin American immigration into the U.S. This dramatic increase in immigration spurred an attention and awareness towards this group of racially and ethnically diverse individuals who did not seem to quite fit into a very black and white structured socio-political and economic U.S.

The response to the uptake in Latin American immigration to the U.S. was received in various forms. In some instances, the immigration was not only allowed without questions but encouraged, specifically by the U.S. government. In other instances, the response was a mixed bag of feelings depending on a number of factors
such as race and color, class, socio-economic and educational status as well as cultural practices and language. As we will see in the next few examples, Latin Americans did not always immigrate to the U.S. for the same reasons nor were they received in the same fashion in the U.S. What becomes evident, is how various Latin American immigrants initial experiences in the U.S. were unique, while their experiences with discrimination were not. As the American psyche (U.S. society) began no longer differentiating among Latin Americans, no longer were they excluded from the black and white racialization that many immigrant classes had been met with, less we forget the histories of the Irish and Italians whose experiences with discrimination at times became racialized.

“Mexican-Americans” Foreign and Native: A Struggle to Identity

In many respects, the first Latin American group I have chosen to discuss is quite unique in that they claim a native ancestry within U.S. borders while also, boasting one of the largest immigrant classes into the U.S. Since the mid-18th century, portions of what became the U.S., specifically, Texas, California and the Southwest have been inhabited by Amerindian families along with a mix of criollo, mestizo and Ladinos that emerged with the arrival of the Spanish to these lands. These populations flourished and struck deep roots in these territories that have lasted to present day. By the early 19th century though, U.S. encroachment into these territories began to threaten their way of life. The Annexation of Texas and the eventual Mexican-American War of 1846 would
lead to the cession of all of Mexico’s territories north of the Rio Grande in the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo (Gonzalez, 2000, p. 99). The result was an established Mexican population that now found itself separated from its family and ancestral ties to Mexico and faced with the reality of being governed by a completely foreign entity. This new Mexican-American population found out quickly that under U.S. rule, new laws, taxes, land registrations and inheritance of their land holdings were siphoned, forcing them into smaller, segregated lands over time. While some Mexicans resisted and attempted to reclaim their losses, the U.S. continued siphoning off land and wealth and by the early 20th century, areas like the Rio Grande Valley were completely segregated with Mexicans comprising more than 90 percent of the population, while a small contingent of whites controlled the majority of the land holdings and all the political power. Along with continued Mexican immigration into the U.S., these established Mexican-American populations continued to persevere in the face of continued discrimination. Following WWII and leadings into the 1950s and 60s, they organized and looked to seek further recognition for their contributions and ties to the formation and growth of the U.S. Gonzalez does a wonderful job of summarizing the Mexican experience in the U.S. stating,

“It is both native-born and immigrants, pioneers and aliens, patriots and rebels: no matter how far back some may trace their ancestry on our soil, they are still battling to emerge from the obscure margins of official U.S. history, still clamoring to be fully recognized and understood…” (Gonzalez, 2000, p.98)
The experience for many of these Mexican Americans has been one of struggle and resilience as they seek recognition of their rights and land claims to go along with their refusal to accept labels as “immigrants” or “newcomers” (Trueba, 1999, p. 2).

From Welcomed to Unwanted: A Tale of Cuban Immigration

Like many other Latin American countries during the revolutionary wars, Cuba experienced a large migration to the U.S. during the late 19th century. These early Cuban immigrants were primarily unemployed tobacco workers seeking employment in the cigar factories established on the south-eastern coast of the U.S. by Cuban and Spanish manufacturers (Gonzalez, 2000, p. 111). The flourishing cigar industry created strong ties between Cuba and the U.S. and while Cuba suffered internal conflict through the dictatorships of Machado and Batista, those small Cuban elite amassed great wealth and lived lavishly. The second great wave of Cuban immigration into the U.S. would occur in 1959 with the onset of the Cuban revolution. These first immigrants were primarily composed of the Cuban wealthy and elite who were welcomed into the U.S. with a number of government assistance programs. These refugees were immediately eligible for public assistance, Medicaid, food stamps, free English courses, scholarships, business credit, and start up loans along with additional assistance for aiding the CIA in its efforts to overthrow the Communist Castro regime in Cuba (Gonzalez, 2000, pp. 110-111). These benefits coupled with a highly educated immigrant class led to the growth of
Cuban communities in Miami and other cities throughout the country. For two decades, Cubans were welcomed in the U.S., but as the Cold War came to a close and the U.S. phobia with communism subsided, the country turned its attention to its newest dilemma, immigration. This would be highlighted in 1980 with the fourth wave of Cuban migrants, dubbed the Mariel boat people. Over a 125,000 Cubans no longer consisting of the Cuban elite class but of largely poor, black, unskilled, and in some cases either mentally ill or felons. A combination of factors would affect a less than hospitable welcome into the U.S. for these migrants. At the time, the U.S. was dealing with a high unemployment rate which coupled with such a large influx of immigrants created some resentment on the part of Americans. This resentment was only heightened by the unrest and protests of these new immigrants as they were dispersed to several army bases/detention centers throughout the country (Gonzalez, 2000, p. 112). The events of the Mariel boat people marked a major shift in how Americans viewed immigration and in the decade that was to come, this shift would take shape in the form of amended and new immigration policies. This shift in immigration policy occurred in 1994 as a response to the final large wave of Cuban immigrants along with a large contingent of Haitians that had landed off the Florida coast (Gonzalez, 2000, p. 108). President Clinton would suspend the special treatment which Cubans had been accustomed to for the past thirty years. No longer would Cubans illegally attempting to enter the U.S. be granted asylum. Instead they would be subject to the same immigration standards that all other immigrants were subject to. Two years later, in 1996 the U.S. would pass the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act (PRWOA) and the Illegal Immigrant Reform
and Immigrant Responsibility Act (IIRIRA). Both of these immigration policies countered the Immigration and Nationality Act Amendment of 1965 (Suarez-Orozco and Paez, 2002, p. 190).

Dominicans: Not Purely Black or White But Still Discriminated

The third and final Latin American group that I look to discuss is that of Dominicans. Like many other Latin Americans during the 60s and 70s, the Dominican Republic experienced a large scale exodus of its population that immigrated to the U.S. as refugees. These migrants left their native land for political reasons as a bloody civil war broke out in 1965. That year, a revolt broke out, that was spurred by a social movement looking to place back in power, Juan Bosch, the first democratically elected president in the country’s history. The U.S., fearing the rise of another communist regime, immediately intervened, sending in 26,000 troops that would occupy the country, dissolve the revolt and remove Bosch from power (Gonzalez, 2000, p. 118). One year later, the U.S. army would finally negotiate their withdrawal from the country following supervised elections that saw Joaquin Balaguer win. Balaguer had been a long time aid of Trujillo and his presidency was marked by massive acts of human rights violations and violence as his administration looked to eliminate any potential leftist or communist supporters. The acts of violence administered on supporters of Bosch prompted the U.S. to aid in the large scale immigration of these supporters to the U.S. These immigrants
would not be recognized as refugees though and thus received no federal aid. The majority of these Dominican immigrants proved to be highly educated, more urbanized and politically active as well as business savvy, setting up their bodegas and establishing major Dominican centers in New York City (Gonzalez, 2000, p. 118). While these immigrants’ small business ventures and communities flourished, the majority of these immigrants were mulato or black and as a result soon experienced firsthand racial discrimination in the U.S., which included from other Hispanics (Gonzalez, 2000, p. 119).

Hispanics and Latinos in an Evolving U.S. Society

The three Hispanic/Latino nationalities described, provide a more in-depth view into the immigrant experiences that many, if not all of the subjects interviewed in this study have experienced, either first hand or indirectly through their families experiences in the U.S. While either first generation or native born in the U.S., these individuals and their families immigrant experiences have been fairly different. Still they have all been subjected to similar instances of racialization founded on race concepts of physiology and skin tone. It has become apparent that the checkered history that the U.S. and Latin America have shared has greatly influenced how Hispanics and Latinos are viewed and accepted in the U.S. The degree to and influence wielded by the U.S. in these nations socio-political and economic spheres set the stage for the destabilizing of these nations
and the mass exoduses that would follow. In many ways, the factors that influenced both U.S. involvement and the subsequent immigrations have influenced the reception that Latin Americans received upon entering the U.S. We also must keep in mind the social climate in which these immigrants arrived into and how their presence within that climate altered it and affected how they were viewed in respect to their position within that social climate.

First and foremost, the social climate during the 60s, 70s and 80s was one of great change in the U.S. The Civil Rights movement was in full swing, the Sexual Revolution was beginning and feminist movements were gaining momentum as women and minorities fought for equality and their legal rights under the Constitution. The Cold War was ongoing and the political climate centered on the eradication of communist sentiments in favor of a “democratic” and capitalist form. Lastly, the economic growth and expansion that the U.S. had experienced during WWII and after had started to wane and by the late 70s into the 80s had led to increasing economic stagnation and high unemployment rates. Overtime these socio-political and economic issues would come to affect in various ways how Americans viewed Hispanics and Latinos and the notion of a unifying Latino community/identity.

While established communities of Latin Americans had been living in New York City, Miami, Texas and the South west since the turn of the century, the influx of Latin American immigrants during these decades led to their spread across the nation, their further integration into American society along with their occupation of large numbers of
menial and entry level jobs at an increasing rate. Once a smaller social group, somewhat unnoticed by the masses of larger American society, Latin Americans were now coming out of the shadows. The new waves of Latin Americans soon found themselves caught in the cross fire of an ongoing struggle between blacks and whites and the moral quandary that gripped U.S. society as it dealt with discrimination, racism and segregation. As some Latin Americans would find out on very personal levels, their skin tone and physical appearance influenced greatly how they were perceived and treated in American society. Many Dominicans, Cubans and Puerto Ricans of African ancestry and darker skin, were in many instances assumed to be Black or African American and as a result suffered much of the racism and discrimination that African Americans were undergoing. This racialization was extremely demarcated as some families with darker skinned members would suffer mistreatment while their fairer skinned family members managed to avoid the same treatment. In his book, Juan Gonzalez (2000) recounts an exchange his grandmother had with a friend as she warned him, “‘Be careful out on those streets,’… “The Italians on this block know us, but you’re a stranger” She didn’t say what she was thinking, that the Gonzalez family was so light-skinned most of us could easily pass for Italian, but not Eugenio with his chocolate complexion.” (p. 88). This imposed color barrier affect was unique to Latin Americans who did not fall into the clear cut delineation of this barrier, but in turn spanned the full range of the color spectrum. The effects of this color based racialization has continued to affect generations of U.S. born and immigrant Latin Americans in subsequent years, even resulting in racial discrimination arising among themselves.
As the 60s and 70s gave way to the 80s, the open immigration policy of the U.S. began to change. The 80s brought about the gradual decline in communist zeal and the eventual end of the Cold War in the early 90s. A lull in the economic growth within the U.S. during this time led to an increasing unemployment rate that, coupled with the loss of large business and industry to cheaper labor in third world countries led to growing anti-immigration sentiment. The large masses of Latin Americans immigrating to the U.S. would experience this anti-immigrant sentiment first hand in a racialized form early on. Americans, concerned with increasing unemployment, the usurping of lower wage jobs and the perceived abuse of welfare benefits by Latin Americans created an increasing resentment that would take on discriminatory forms. Suarez-Orozco argues that, “in this country a general discontent of the American people based primarily on economic and political crises and the resulting pervasive sense of anxiety about the future have contributed to the public xenophobia and anti-immigrant sentiment” (cited in Trueba 1999, p. 7). Gonzalez would further add,

“on the economic front, U.S. companies in search of cheap labor began relocating industrial jobs to the Third World. Faced with rising unemployment and a declining standard of living, white workers searched for someone to blame, so African Americans and Hispanics became the convenient scapegoats” (Gonzalez, 2000, pp. 176-178).
The anti-immigrant sentiment aimed primarily at Latin Americans and Asians also took root in Americans’ concerns about their “traditional” way of life and the onset of increasing cultural, ethnic and linguistic diversity and it’s undermining of this way of life. As wave after wave of immigrants entered the U.S., an increasing concern formed among native born Americans whose, “state and local communities affected by heavy immigration are increasingly concerned about the potential of migrants from Latin American and the Caribbean to shift the ethnic, cultural and linguistic balance within their communities” (Suarez-Orozco and Paez, 2002, pp. 165-166). This concern shifted over time from an economic basis to that of a demographic one as the irreversible trend towards increasing Latin American and Asian immigrants has influenced a “ideological current that pushes ethnic and cultural purity… and defends it even through violent expressions of hatred for immigrants of color” (Trueba, 1999, p.11). In response to these ethic and cultural encroachments, the American socio-political apparatus (government, media and society) has created and/or supported the use of racialization tactics against Latin Americans as well as other immigrant minorities. An outcome of this tactic has been the creation and dissemination of a Hispanic and Latino identity and image that has become rooted in American society.
The creation of a Hispanic and Latino identity in the U.S. can in many ways be attributed to a combination of Latin American groups’ raising awareness and shedding further light on their identities as a counter response to their cultural assimilation into U.S. society and the altered fabrication of these identities in the form of racial ones by the U.S. government (Gracia & De Greiff, 2000, p. 27). What emerges is this notion of a “pan-Latino identity” (Gracia & De Greiff, 2000, p. 27). An all-encompassing, imposed identity in which all Latin Americans are neatly lumped into, allowing the individual the ability to self-identify by means of a predetermined and understood identity set forth by society. This concept of a pan-Latino identity is not new, Simon Bolivar pushed for it during the revolutionary wars of independence as a means of raising anti-colonialism and unification amongst these new peoples of South America (Gracia & De Greiff, 2000, p. 27). This pan-Latino identity is pushed onto the various Latin American communities along with U.S. society through the media, entertainment and advertising industries that have uncovered its valuable marketing potential (Gracia & De Greiff, 2000, p. 28). This pan-Latino identity created a singular false homogenizing identity that was founded on racial and ethnic concepts with little or no meaning to the individuals who were being told to identify by it. An example of this comes from the 1960s when U.S. State agencies began using the ethnic label “Hispanic” as a means of identifying all individuals from
Latin America and Spanish descent. Alcoff, attests to this in her essay, by noting, “…this generic identity category feels especially socially constructed to many of the people named by it, given that it is not how they self-identified previously” (Gracia & De Greiff, 2000, p. 29). We also find out from Suarez-Orozco and Paez (2002) that Latino is a “new and ambiguous invention. It is a cultural category that has no precise racial signification… Yet …upon entering the United States, Latinos undergo a rapid regime of racialization” (p. 3). They further point out that the term Latino, “lacks the specificity regarding national origin that terms such as Irish American and Italian American convey” (Suarez-Orozco and Paez, 2002, p. 4). We end up presented with two terms that have no clear definition and hover in ambiguity. In similar regards, the pan-Latino identity also fails to fully identify anyone Latin American nation, group or individual in their entirety, nor does it truly succeed in justifying a singular homogeneous identity.

Latin Americans, whether born in the U.S. or abroad represent a heterogenous collection of individuals, groups and nations. As Trueba (1999) notes they, “are racially, socially, and economically highly diversified; but they share culture, language, history, values, world-view, and ideals” (p. 31). The pan-Latino identity that has been placed upon Latin Americans represents the U.S. government’s efforts at categorizing, controlling and marginalizing these individuals based on a number of external factors. This broad notion of a pan-Latino identity along with the use of imposed labels like Latino and Hispanic reinforce the misuse of socially constructed concepts like race and ethnicity. As Alcoff alludes to, “factors influencing racial categories and their expression result from the specific social relations and historical context in which they originate
from — these categories are constantly facing resistance that alters and influences their impact and effective meaning (Gracia & De Greiff, 2000, p. 28). Various outlets like social media, entertainment, advertisement and corporate America have played keys roles in selling this fabricated image of Latinos and Hispanics to the broader American public.

What we have begun to see at the end of the 20th century and leading into the 21st century is a Latin American response to this imposed image. Latin Americans both here and abroad, have to varying degrees, embraced this pan-Latino identity, but on their own terms. As we will see in the following research, Latin Americans have in many instances taken the pan-Latino identity and the mis-use of terms like Latino and Hispanic and molded them into an image representative of what they feel identifies them. As Alcoff points out, "Racial categories and the meanings of race are given concrete expression by the specific social relations and historical context in which they are embedded. Moreover, these categories are constantly facing forms of resistance and contestations that transform both their impact and their effective meaning” (Gracia & De Greiff, 2000, p. 28). What once represented a state-created image of Latin Americans, founded on racialized principles, is now changing and evolving in the hands of those same groups the terminology looked to subdue, discriminate, objectify and oppress.
Chapter IV

Materials and Methods

The first part of the research involved a brief historical review of past and current source material on the subjects of race and ethnicity. A historical review of physical anthropology served as the primary source with the addition of source material from other fields were presented to provide additional context and provide an overall view of how concepts of race and ethnicity developed. Review of the source material looked to elucidate how early concepts of “us vs them” and ethnocentrism gave way to racial ideologies, the justification of racial slavery and the emergence of scientific racism and their eventual breakdown and debunking respectively. A review of source material on Hispanics and Latinos in the U.S. was done to provide background and context for the subject group being used in the study. The historical review will conclude with a look at the debate over how racial ideologies have persisted in main stream U.S. society through racialization, the use of concepts of ethnicity and the combining or blending of ethnicity and race on both a socio-political level.

The second portion of the research consists of an ethnographic study involving the use of human subjects to provide a context for race and ethnicity as perceived by a social group in present day U.S. society. The research focused specifically on the social group identified as Hispanics and Latinos or Latin Americans in the Boston metro area. The
researched looked at addressing issues of self-identification within the categories of race and ethnicity. Field interviews raised questions regarding how subjects, categorized as Hispanics/Latinos in U.S. society viewed themselves under these physical/socio-cultural imposed categories.

Focus group selection

Subjects recruited for the research study consisted exclusively of individuals residing in the Boston metro area, that self-identified at some level as Hispanic / Latino or Latin American. A total of twenty-five subjects were interviewed. These subjects consisted of 13 females and 12 males of varying sexual preferences who ranged in age between 22 - 66 years old. Gender and sexual preference were not used for any statistical means in this study, but are noted to demonstrate that these factors were not used to rule out subjects for the study. Age was also not used for any statistical means in the study but did provide a basis for the interpretation of individuals responses to the questionnaire based on the generational gaps the subjects fell into. These generational gaps provided some context for how individuals were influenced by the racial ideologies they were exposed to during their formative years up to early adulthood.
All subjects that consented for the study, participated in initial interviews lasting between 45-60 minutes. The initial interviews consisted of subjects being asked to provide responses to a series of questions dealing with race and ethnicity. Subjects were informed of their ability to decline to answer question(s) with no further inquiry made by the researcher as to why they had declined to answer the question(s). The researcher recorded the responses on both handwritten notes and a note taking application on a tablet. At the conclusion of the interview, subjects were approached about setting up a follow-up interview lasting no longer than 30 minutes. Please refer to appendix B for a copy of the questionnaire being used for this research study.
## Summary Table of Results from Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject number</th>
<th>Nationality of Subject</th>
<th>Age Range of Subject</th>
<th>US born or immigrant to US</th>
<th>How subject identifies his/her race</th>
<th>How subject identifies his/her ethnicity</th>
<th>Does the subject consider themselves a mix of races/ethnicities</th>
<th>Does the subject identify differently outside of the US.</th>
<th>Does the subject use Hispanic and/or Latino to identify.</th>
<th>Does subject recognize a blending of race and ethnicity.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject 1</td>
<td>Dominican</td>
<td>50-60 yrs old</td>
<td>immigrant from the Dominican Republic</td>
<td>Hispanic and Dominican</td>
<td>Hispanic and Dominican</td>
<td>Yes - African (Mula) &amp; Amerindian (Mestizo)</td>
<td>Yes - Dominican</td>
<td>Yes - Hispanic</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject 2</td>
<td>Dominican</td>
<td>40-50 yrs old</td>
<td>immigrant from the Dominican Republic</td>
<td>Mestiza - Dominican - Latina</td>
<td>Dominican</td>
<td>Yes - Spanish &amp; African &amp; Amerindian</td>
<td>Yes - Latina</td>
<td>Yes - Latina</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject 3</td>
<td>Dominican</td>
<td>20-30 yrs old</td>
<td>immigrant from the Dominican Republic</td>
<td>Dominican</td>
<td>Dominican? Unsure of meaning of ethnicity</td>
<td>Yes - Spanish &amp; African &amp; Amerindian</td>
<td>Yes - Mestizo in her home country</td>
<td>Yes - Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject 4</td>
<td>Dominican</td>
<td>20-30 yrs old</td>
<td>immigrant from the Dominican Republic</td>
<td>Dominican</td>
<td>Dominican? Unsure of meaning of ethnicity</td>
<td>Yes - Spanish &amp; African &amp; Amerindian</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes - Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject 5</td>
<td>US Citizen</td>
<td>30-40 yrs old</td>
<td>US born</td>
<td>Mexican-American</td>
<td>Mexican-American</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes - Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject 6</td>
<td>US Citizen</td>
<td>20-30 yrs old</td>
<td>US born</td>
<td>Chilean</td>
<td>Chilean-American</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes - Hispanic</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject 7</td>
<td>US Citizen</td>
<td>30-40 yrs old</td>
<td>US born</td>
<td>Venezuelan-Bostonian</td>
<td>Latina-Venezuelian</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes - Latina</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject 8</td>
<td>Dominican</td>
<td>30-40 yrs old</td>
<td>immigrant from the Dominican Republic</td>
<td>Dominican</td>
<td>Dominican-American</td>
<td>Yes - African, Spanish, &amp; pos. Amerindian</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes - Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject 9</td>
<td>Chilean</td>
<td>30-40 yrs old</td>
<td>immigrant from Chile</td>
<td>Chilean-Mestizo</td>
<td>Chilean-Mestizo</td>
<td>Yes - Spanish &amp; Amerindian</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes - Latino</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject 10</td>
<td>Chilean</td>
<td>40-50 yrs old</td>
<td>immigrant from Chile</td>
<td>Chilean, Latina &amp; Hispanic (all part of white race)</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Yes - Spanish &amp; Amerindian</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes - Hispanic &amp; Latina</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Summary Table of Results from Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject number</th>
<th>Nationality of Subject</th>
<th>Age Range of Subject</th>
<th>US born or Immigrant to US</th>
<th>How subject identifies his/her race</th>
<th>How subject identifies his/her ethnicity</th>
<th>Does the subject consider themselves a mix of races/ethnicities</th>
<th>Does Subject identify differently outside of the US.</th>
<th>Does Subject use Hispanic and/or Latino to identify.</th>
<th>Does subject recognize a blending of race and ethnicity.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject 11</td>
<td>Chilean / US Citizen</td>
<td>20-30 yrs old</td>
<td>Immigrant from Chile</td>
<td>Chilean, Hispanic &amp; White</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Yes - White &amp; Amerindian</td>
<td>Yes - Chilean in country of origin, Hispanic everywhere else</td>
<td>Yes - Hispanic</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject 12</td>
<td>Nicaragua / US Citizen</td>
<td>50-60 yrs old</td>
<td>Immigrant from Nicaragua</td>
<td>Latino from Nicaragua</td>
<td>Nicaraguan w/Hispanics. Latino w/ non-Hispanics</td>
<td>Yes - Spanish, German &amp; Amerindian - notes not associating with his ancestral background.</td>
<td>Yes - Nicaraguan in country of origin</td>
<td>Yes - Latino</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject 13</td>
<td>US Citizen</td>
<td>30-40 yrs old</td>
<td>US born</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Hispanic/ Spanish</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes - Hispanic</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject 14</td>
<td>Chilean</td>
<td>60-70 yrs old</td>
<td>Immigrant from Chile</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Hispanic/ Latino</td>
<td>Yes - Spanish, German &amp; Amerindian</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes - only when identifying ethnicity</td>
<td>Yes - only in the US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject 15</td>
<td>Chilean</td>
<td>50-60 yrs old</td>
<td>Immigrant from Chile</td>
<td>Hispanic/ South American</td>
<td>Hispanic/ American</td>
<td>Yes - Amerindian &amp; Spanish (White) - Mestizo</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes - Hispanic</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject 16</td>
<td>US Citizen</td>
<td>20-30 yrs old</td>
<td>US born</td>
<td>Hispanic of Chilean descent</td>
<td>Hispanic/ American of Chilean descent</td>
<td>Yes - American of Chilean descent/ Irish</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes - Hispanic</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject 17</td>
<td>US Citizen</td>
<td>30-40 yrs old</td>
<td>US born</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Peruvian</td>
<td>Yes - Penuvian &amp; Italian</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes - Latino</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject 18</td>
<td>Honduran</td>
<td>50-60 yrs old</td>
<td>Immigrant from Honduras</td>
<td>Hispanic and Honduran</td>
<td>Honduran</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes - Honduran in country of origin</td>
<td>Yes - Hispanic</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject 19</td>
<td>Dominican</td>
<td>50-60 yrs old</td>
<td>Immigrant from the Dominican Republic</td>
<td>Latino and Dominican</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Yes - Spanish, Haitian &amp; Dominican</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes - Latino</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject 20</td>
<td>Chilean</td>
<td>70-80 yrs old</td>
<td>Immigrant from Chile</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Hispanic/ Latino</td>
<td>Yes - Spanish, German &amp; Amerindian</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes - only when identifying ethnicity</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject 21</td>
<td>Chilean</td>
<td>30-40 yrs old</td>
<td>US born</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Yes - Amerindian, Spanish, German, &amp; Italian</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes - Hispanic</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject 22</td>
<td>Chilean</td>
<td>30-40 yrs old</td>
<td>Immigrant from Chile</td>
<td>Chilean, Hispanic or Latina</td>
<td>Chilean</td>
<td>Yes - Amerindian, Spanish, Palestinian</td>
<td>No - with exception of her home country</td>
<td>Yes - Hispanic, Latino</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject number</td>
<td>Nationality of Subject</td>
<td>Age Range of Subject</td>
<td>US born or Immigrant to US</td>
<td>How subject identifies his/her race</td>
<td>How subject identifies his/her ethnicity</td>
<td>Does the subject consider themselves a mix of races/ethnicities</td>
<td>Does Subject identify differently outside of the US.</td>
<td>Does the subject use Hispanic and/or Latino to identify.</td>
<td>Does subject recognize a blending of race and ethnicity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject 23</td>
<td>US Citizen</td>
<td>20-30 yrs old</td>
<td>US Born</td>
<td>Puerto Rican, Mexican,</td>
<td>Hispanic/ Latino</td>
<td>Yes - Puerto Rican, Mexican, (Italian, Greek, Amerindian, Iberian) - DNA results</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes - Hispanic &amp; Latina (reluctantly)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject 24</td>
<td>Dominican/US Citizen</td>
<td>40-50 yrs old</td>
<td>US born</td>
<td>Hispanic/ Dominican - depending on individual/group</td>
<td>Dominican</td>
<td>Yes - Dominican &amp; American</td>
<td>Yes - Dominican</td>
<td>Yes - Hispanic</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject 25</td>
<td>Chilean/Spanish &amp; American</td>
<td>40-50 yrs old</td>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>Italian &amp; Chilean</td>
<td>Italian &amp; Chilea</td>
<td>Yes - Italian, Chile</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unsure how to respond due to lack of understanding definition of terms.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter VI

Summary and Conclusion

What factors define us as individuals? Does our perceived “race”, our ethnic background or the socio-cultural atmosphere that we are born and/or raised in define us? Can humankind’s ability to self-identify be viewed as a changing concept, at times encountering opposition as we look to integrate into new societies and adapt to new cultures. Do we as cognitive beings look not only to define those around us, but also ourselves based on notions as basic as “you vs. me, us vs them, and my superiority vs. your inferiority”? And do some also think/talk about “you and us,” we and they,” which shows ethnic accommodation amongst differences? These and many more are just a few of the questions that my research has led me to ponder as, I looked to conclude my thesis. My research was inspired by the quest of finding concrete answers to what I perceive to be a blending of ethnic categories moving towards racial distinctions. What effect would this blending have on ethnic groups? When examining a marginalized multi-ethnic group, do we see a blending of these categories, and if so, are they being racialized. Are we seeing some of the concepts and theoretical ideologies put forth earlier by anthropology and physical anthropology displayed or verified within these groups? The discussion that follows presents some potential answers as well as many more questions.
Overwhelmingly, data compiled from the ethnographic study revealed that individuals acknowledged a blending of racial and ethnic categories and recognized that at times they struggled to distinguish between one and the other. To say that this was the only information gleaned from the research would be disingenuous on my part and an under selling of the rich information and stories that the research unveiled. When subjects were asked to further expand on their responses regarding their race/ethnicity, a number of interesting and unique responses were given that gave further insight as to how these individuals have either developed or adopted a form of self-identification that was initially imposed on them but has evolved into a unique and personalized one based on life experiences and upbringing. Coincidently, a number of commonalities were also apparent in subjects’ responses to race and ethnicity as well as their interpretations of how Hispanic and Latino are used to identify them as an individual and as a social group.

While the subjects who participated in this research were asked to complete a questionnaire, as shown in the results section, the analysis of their interviews has been broken down and combined into five major themes. The following is a more in-depth review and analysis of these themes.

In many instances subject identify their race/ethnicity by their nationality and secondarily as Hispanic/Latino along with some other geographical distinctions.

Subjects where asked to identify their race and ethnicity in a number of questions that allowed them to respond based on how they would identify in various settings (i.e.
social settings, first encounters with other individuals etc., refer to appendix A for questionnaire). A review of these answers revealed that the majority of subjects tended to describe their race and ethnicity by identifying their nationality i.e., Dominican, Chilean, Puerto Rican, etc. Subjects then tended to list either Hispanic (majority) and/or Latino/Latin American in their description and finally in some instances included a generalized geographic area of origin such as Central or South American. For instance, subject # 7 identified her race and ethnicity as Venezuelan and Bostonian, stating that her response showed her roots from both places and how she identified with certain aspects (language, culture, music, food etc.) from each location.

Responses such as this one present a unique interpretive challenge, as they do not conform to the standard taxonomic categories that anthropology, physical anthropology and even society at large abide by. Not only did this subjects answer not provided the expected response but was founded on new identifying criteria. The subjects answer was representative of many of the responses I would receive from other subjects in that it was an unbiased, natural answer that revealed an individuals conscious choices in self-identifying based on those factors they felt identified them the most accurately.

Other subjects provided similar responses founded on their unique interpretation of these terms. Subject # 11, identified her race and ethnicity as Chilean and Hispanic. She stated that she normally used Hispanic when identifying her race due to feeling that when people asked her about her race, they were actually asking were she was from and how she identified. Subject # 1, in turn identified as Hispanic and Dominican by origin. He explained that he identified as Hispanic based on his roots that were a by-product of
Spanish colonists mixing with Africans (Mulato) and Native American indigenous peoples (Mestizo). He recounted that while growing up and learning about his ethnicity and the community that he grew up in, that his mother would tell him, “Don't forget that we have el negro detrás de la oreja”. Subject # 1 noted that this statement when translated read, “Don’t forget we have black behind our ears” which served as a reminder of their African ancestry and to an extent his families social status based on their physical features, i.e. their skin tone. The responses of both of these subject’s reflect how race and ethnicity are not only mixed in their interpretation but also how individuals are substituting or incorporating a number of other terms and criteria as identifiers of their race and ethnicity.

Interviews revealed that subject’s responses to race and ethnicity were based on multiple learned and lived experiences. For instance, subject # 10, identifies herself as Chilean and Hispanic but notes that she does not identify herself based on her race (skin tone) but based on her perception of race (ones background, birthplace & heritage). She points out that while growing up, she was taught that three major races exist (white, black & Asian) and that Hispanic is considered to fall under the white race. She pointed out that the term Hispanic was representative of ones culture, their use of the Spanish language and their South American origins and thus was another way of identifying herself in a more general way along with her more specific response of Chilean. Subject # 12, chose to identify himself as a Latino from Nicaragua and as a Central American. He acknowledged recognizing his home country of origin, but not associating with his ancestral roots and in turn acknowledged being Americanized after having resided in the
U.S., thirty plus years. He pointed out that his use of the term Latino was situationally specific; identifying as Latino with non-Hispanics and Nicaraguan with Hispanics. He further pointed out that he defined race and ethnicity as, “Where you were born and where your parents are born”. In the case of subject # 13, she identified her race and ethnicity as white and if asked about her background, would state Hispanic. She points out that her use of white when identifying results from a combination of her European roots (both parents are from Spain), and being born in the U.S. and being “Americanized”. She further alluded to her pale skin tone as another factor for her self-identifying as white, given that she is normally assumed to be “white” up until her Spanish surname last is made known. These responses begin to allude to the intricate nature of self-identifying that these subjects experience as they balance how society chooses to see them against how they choose to see themselves in the process of identifying.

In the case of subject # 23, her response proved a bit unique in that she initially identified as Puerto Rican and Mexican given her mother and father are from these countries respectively and her cultural influence from both sides, but primarily her mother’s. She next noted that she had recently decided to have her ancestry checked by having her DNA run. The result of this test showed that she had North American Native Indian, Italian, Greek and Iberian Peninsula ancestry. This surprised her a great deal and has made her rethink to a certain extent how she self-identifies moving forward. When asked to further expand on this and whether she felt that she would stop identifying her race and ethnicity as Puerto Rican and Mexican, she stated that she did not believe that
she would. In turn she felt that she would probably add these additional findings to how she self-identified. She then stated, “Blood is the only true way” to identify oneself and their ancestry, so she could not deny the findings but noted that she was raised primarily in the Puerto Rican culture and to a lesser extent that of the Mexican one and that also identified her. She went on to note that when identifying her ethnicity specifically on documents, she would list herself as Hispanic or Latino or what ever came the closest to those terms and if either Puerto Rican or Mexican are listed as options, that she chooses one of them.

The responses, that subject # 23 gave proved interesting due to the influence of her DNA testing and implications of her ancestry. The ability of the average person to test their DNA, and be able to trace their ancestral family blood lines is a relatively new process. At the same time these tests raise questions that they cannot hope to answer and in many cases make the act of self-identifying that much more difficult and confusing. I found subject # 23’s response that, “Blood is the only true way” of identifying oneself very compelling in that for many individuals, their “blood” serves as an identifier of where their families come originate, and provides an association with their ancestors. At the same time, her response that, given the knowledge of her ancestry, she would continue to identify as Puerto Rican and Mexican as well as Hispanic is very telling of the social and cultural environments that influence individuals experiences and in turn molds and defines how they go about identifying within and outside of those environments. The combination of ones genetic make up and their cultural influences playing an intertwined role in their self-identification brings to mind an argument raised
by the anthropologist, Ashley Montagu, where he argued for the usage of terminology that could account for these various factors while also urging the discontinued use of terms like ‘race’ that did not properly describe humankind. Montagu, would state,

“…man’s cultural activities have introduced elements into the processes of human radiation which have so substantially modified the end-products that one can no longer equate the processes of radiation in lower animals with those which have occurred in the evolution of man… mutation, natural selection, drift, isolation, have all been operative in the evolution of man. but so have such factors as ever-increasing degrees of mobility, hybridization, and social selection , and it is the effects of these and similar factors which,….makes the employment of the term ‘race’ inapplicable to most human populations as we find them today”. (1962: 919) (Cited in Billinger, 2007)

A review of subject, # 24’s response to identifying her race as Hispanic, revealed that she considered race to be a part of her culture, yet encompasses more than just her culture. Her race also encompasses, “…the origin of where my family comes from”. Identifying as Hispanic is also, “…all about the Spanish culture and how it brings you together and what you share in common”. In this instance, she was a native of the Dominican Republic who at an early age moved to the U.S. and recognized becoming Americanized but also points out that she never lost touch with her roots. She states that her family was able to maintain all of their Dominican and Hispanic customs and cultural beliefs as a result of having moved to a highly concentrated Hispanic, predominantly Dominican neighborhood in New York City. The manner in which she identifies is indicative of first and second generation immigrants where the former tends to hold on fiercely to their cultural roots and beliefs and is somewhat resistant to assimilation while the latter is more inclined to assimilate to their new cultural environment and in the process may lose some of those cultural beliefs and practices. One’s cultural environment influencing ones identity is not a new concept and in many respects is a
common outcome of immigration into a new cultural environment. This is specifically the case for second generation immigrants that have grown up in that new cultural environment while also being exposed to their parental and ancestral cultural beliefs. As the philosopher, Linda Martin Alcoff points out, “As the immigrant communities settle in, younger generations develop different identities than their parents, adapting to their cultural surroundings” (Gracia & De Greiff, 2000 p. 28).

A review of subject #25’s response showed that he identified his race as half Italian and Chilean. He stated that he, “…never speaks about race and only speaks about ones place of origin as the main way of identifying oneself”. The subject was then asked to state where he originated from and how he identified himself and he stated, “I am born in Chile with a Chilean mother and Italian father, who grew up in Spain and lives in America (U.S.)”. He then added, that this answer becomes a bit trickier to answer if he includes his feelings in the response. He went on to elaborate that if asked whether he feels more Italian or Spanish, that he acknowledges Spanish, “For some reason, I feel more Spanish. I grew up their (Spain) for ten years and they marked my life. I have a Spanish ascent and cannot get rid of it”. He went on further to state that he also considers himself American and that makes it even more confusing. He states, “I am the prime example of American made,” and expressed a love for this country and a feeling of having given everything to this country. Subject #25, was then asked to identify his ethnicity and he stated that he was half Italian and Chilean. He then paused for a second and rethought his response and stated that he would identify as Native American indian (indigenous to Chile) and European. When asked to expand of this, he stated that he had
learned that race in many instances is based on skin color and that ethnicity is based on one's genetic origins. He further explained that, “If race is based on color then I would identify as Chilean and European based on his lighter skin tone”. He then pointed out that his ethnicity is mestizo due to him being half Native American Indian and half European.

While subject # 25’s responses were similar to other subjects, he alluded to an emotional component that influences how he chooses to identify. It is this factor that peaks the interest as it hints to a more personal and cognitive response to the process of self-identification. It also demonstrates a direct response to social stimulus, in that he is cognizant of how responds in certain social situations. Overall, his response hints at both the combined influence of biological and cultural elements that are both learned and lived, influencing how he chooses to identity himself. It is this interaction along with other factors that offer potential explanations for the tremendous human variation that is evident as well as demonstrating the misuse of racialized taxonomic categorizations such as Hispanic and Latino. We also begin to examples of subjects taking ownership of “the self,” by looking to create their own idealized identity. This process results in either an all out rejection of the socially imposed identity or an altering or modifying of it, that strips away any of its racialized implications and in turn comes to embody those traits that elicit feelings of pride within the individual or group.
Self-identifying in the U.S. vs. outside of the U.S. or in native countries.

Overwhelmingly, subjects acknowledged that a difference existed in how they identified themselves outside of the U.S. as opposed to within the country. This difference was primarily apparent in how they identified in their native countries. This is evident in the statement made by subject #1, who states, “Living in the U.S., such a multi-racial and ethnic country forces one to become more self-aware of their race and ethnicity in relation to those around them. In many instances you learn more about your own race, ethnicity, and culture from others, due to living within U.S. society”. Subject #1’s description of “learning” about one’s race and ethnicity through their exposure and experience within U.S. society brings to mind the notion of the cognitive-culture relationship (Billinger 2007), in which the individual learns to create or redefine their identity based on their exposure to that socio-cultural environment they are exposed to. This cognitive-cultural relationship can also be applied to groups as they evolve a unifying identity based on multiple, but similar experiences and interactions by its individuals. This relationship can result in a number of outcomes, as the individual or group can either adapt or in the process adopt the identity that has been imposed on them by society or they can reconstitute the imposed identity to embody their idealized identity. Another alternative would be a complete rejection of the society imposed identity and the use of an established one that in most instances traces its origins to the individuals or groups country (s) of origin. This is better described by Barth’s (1969)
account of interaction between ethnic groups. This interaction between ethnic groups leads to exchange of cultural beliefs, language, customs, religion etc. Exchange can vary among individuals with some retaining more of “their” customs (original ethnic group) or taking on/assimilation of “foreign” customs (become “Americanized”).

Similar to Subject #1, Subject #4 alludes to the unique experience of becoming more cognizant of his race and ethnicity while living in the U.S. Subject #4 notes that in his home country of the Dominican Republic, he is identified as mestizo. He further points out that in the U.S., he is identified as Hispanic and assumed to be Puerto Rican. He then described his experience learning about race, stating that at an early age in his native country, students learned about race, but besides a basic academic introduction to the subject, it was not commonly discussed in social circles. He then pointed out, that the need to discuss so much in the U.S. is probably due to the countries overwhelming diversity. In contrast, his home country had significantly less diversity. He mentioned that the only instances were race is a factor in identification in his home country, relates to Haitians and it has more to do with their language than with skin tone. Subject #4’s example points to the imposed categorization of an individual (Hispanic/Latino) and assumed racialized stereotypes (assumed Puerto Rican) that takes place in the U.S. Much like Montagu suggests, the use of these racialized taxonomic terms, simply infuses prejudiced ideologies onto the individual or group, thus stripping away their own identities and bringing about the creation of social barriers between the individual/group and the rest of society. Subject #4’s response also alludes to the globalization of racial concepts. The U.S. is not the only nation that deals with issues of race or prejudice
towards individuals or groups. The interesting point about Subject #4’s response, is the use of a socio-cultural element (language) to create the racialized identity. The individual or group in this case is subjected to discrimination, not necessarily due to their skin tone, but their language. What we see is the imposed of racist sentiments found in biological (skin tone) elements passed onto socio-cultural ones (language, ethnicity) with the same detrimental affects on that individual/group subjected to them.

In the case of Subject #9, she points out that in her home country (Chile), she grew up thinking that all peoples (races) were the same and unified. It was only when she moved to the U.S. that she came to recognize how different everyone else is from one another (i.e. culture(s), language). She further states, “This country makes you see your differences from other individuals”. While not providing a specific example of self-identifying, Subject #9’s response alludes to the emphasis that the socio-political apparatus in the U.S., places on pushing social awareness of racial and ethnic diversity. In doing so, the creation of a separatist mentality takes shape with the marginalizing of these individuals/groups by society.

In the case of Subject #14, she describes self-identifying in the U.S. as being extremely difficult due to the wide spread “ignorance” of socio-political apparatus in applying misused and understood terminology to individuals/groups. She believes that individuals should be identified by their ethnicity and not their race. She uses herself as an example, and states that she is white and while she is from South America, she is of the same race as an individual from England or France. Yet, her ethnicity is Hispanic/Chilean and so from that stand point, she is different from individuals who are from...
England or France. She then provides another example regarding the use of the term, “American”. She considers that the term “American” encompasses all individuals that live within North and South America, yet, the U.S. has adopted this term and laid claim as an identifier of its citizens. She then stated, “Here in the U.S., they take a determination and make it a universal standard”. In listening to the responses given by this subject, the notion of “established control” through the systematic use of taxonomy, specifically folk taxonomy became apparent. The use of taxonomy and folk taxonomy seems to invoke a sense of control or lack there of. The ability to categorize or identify another on your terms, at some subconscious or conscious level implies your control or superiority over them. In essence, you create an image that you impose on them and that becomes the standard by which they are viewed. Tied into this process lies these notions of “you vs. me”, “us vs. them and “superiority vs. inferiority”. This created identity is based on those biological and socio-cultural traits and characteristics that define the categorizers as well as those that define the individual/group being identified. The assumption in this process is that those traits of the categorizer are better or “superior” to those of the categorized individual/group.

In assessing subjects responses, to identifying in the U.S. as opposed to outside of it, the majority of subject acknowledge identifying differently. In general, subjects would identify themselves by their nationality in their home countries and other foreign countries. Identifying in the U.S., proved to be a much more difficult process. As subject #15 attested to, “When someone arrives in this country, the U.S. society tries to mold you and encapsulate one or identify one into a category”. In addition, Subject #22 admits that
only while living in the U.S. has she had to learn and become accustomed to using terms like Latino and Hispanic to identify herself. This has been difficult for her given that she is used to identifying as white and has had to adjust to identifying as Hispanic on legal documents. Examples like these demonstrate the conscious battle that these subjects have had to deal with, when faced with choosing to identify how they feel comfortable as opposed to what U.S. society dictates they identify as.

How race and ethnicity are viewed and defined.

Understanding how subjects define race and ethnicity provides a window into understanding why they identify themselves the way they do. Subjects provided a number of differing definitions to race, but interestingly enough, their definitions of ethnicity tended to mirror those of race. As Subject # 5 noted, he defined race as, “What your are born as”. He then added, that he learned to understand that race is characterized by the color of one’s skin tone, facial and physical traits as well as their place of origin. He then went on to define ethnicity as, “Where one’s from and where your parents are from”. In essence, this subject alludes to a blurred connection, but none-the-less a connection between race and ethnicity concerning the idea that a defining factor for both is ones place of origin.

In reviewing the responses of subjects #6 and #7, they demonstrated very pointed and parallel perspectives of race. In the case of subject #6, she defined race as, ones culture and the manner in which they were brought up. In turn, subject #7, viewed race a
byproduct of how society defines one’s race and tells them to identify. In the case of subject #6, she acknowledged the influence that culture and one’s personal experiences play in aiding an individual in creating their own identity. In contrary, subject #7 provided a conformist prospective, where in essence the individual loses all sense of “the self” in the creation of their identity. The socio-political apparatus in turn plays the conscious role of defining that individual or groups identity on their terms. Additional subject’s responses tended to mirror these perspectives on defining race and ethnicity.

In the case of subject #12, he defined race as the place where you were born and where your parents are from. He provided the example of being born in Brazil but growing up in the U.S. He acknowledged that he is Brazilian by birth but having grown up in the U.S. for such a long time, he considers himself Americanized and the U.S. his home. His example demonstrated an awareness of self-identifying based on a combination of learned (birth place, upbringing, and parents) experiences and lived (cultures exposed to, society currently in) experiences. In addition, Subject #17 defined race as it relates to him and stated that it meant Latino. He adds, “I think that Latino race is the proper way of saying it and it identifies a melting pot of cultures that share a common language (Spanish). Aside from the language, it’s also the look. That is where it can get tricky because there are many shades of Latinos.” He then noted that having a deeper understanding of one’s history/ancestry aids in allowing a person to self-identify. This subject’s response alludes to the notion of taking ownership or “control” through the rejection of racialized folk taxonomy and in turn, molds that terminology into a pride inducing identifier. In essence the individual infuses the term with their idealized image...
of themselves and what identifies them. In doing so, the individual also indirectly
acknowledges their association with the larger group identified by this term. This larger
group then can be assumed to display or represent a similar idealized image to the
individual, thus creating a shared experienced between the two. The key to this
relationship is the understanding that it is not static but ever changing as both the group
and the individual alter their idealized image.

Similar to responses indicative of an acceptance of U.S. imposed ideologies on
this target group, subject # 22 defined race as all the biological factors that make up a
population (i.e. height, skin tone, facial features and overall physical makeup). She
provided the example of her children being born in the U.S. They are mestizos due to
having Chilean, Spanish, Amerindian and Palestinian blood in them. Their race would
not be considered American because they have no blood ties to America (U.S.). In her
mind, race is tied into ones biological makeup. The perspective that this subject took on
race proved similar, if not spot on with the type of racialized ideologies and
categorization founded on theories and pseudoscience put forth by scientific racism. Of
note, is the deep seeded and long standing effects that scientific racism had within the
U.S. socio-political apparatus. Decades after it’s discrediting, its influence looms ever
present. The extent of its reach is remarkable given that those individuals and groups
(immigrant minorities) that it categorizes and scrutinizes have over time accepted and
incorporated its concepts into their definition of race and racial categorizing.

While race and ethnicity tended to be defined on similar terms by subjects, the
response that subject #8 provided was of particular interest. Subject# 8, defined ethnicity
as constituting a social group that one finds themselves within and associates with. He believes that one’s ability to define their ethnicity is based on their surrounding environment and the ones they have been previously exposed to. In many respects this subject’s response reverberates a similar perspective put forth by Montagu regarding the role of culture and social selection in explaining human variation.

“On the evidence it would seem clear that man’s cultural activities have introduced into the processes of human radiation which have so substantially modified the end-products that one can no longer equate the processes of radiation in lower animals with this which have occurred in the evolution of man. The factors of mutation, natural selection, drift, isolation, have all been operative in the evolution of man. But so have such factors as ever-increasing degrees of mobility, hybridization, and social selection, and it is the effects of these and similar factors which, at least so it has always seemed to me, makes the employment of the term ‘race’ inapplicable to most human populations as we find them today” (qtd. in Billinger 2007, p. 16).

In a similar fashion, this subject’s response provides a view of ethnicity and ethnic groups that falls in line with those put forth by Barth regarding these groups as unfixed and unchanging groups.

“First, it is clear that boundaries persist despite a flow of personnel across them. In other words, categorical ethnic distinctions do not depend on an absence of mobility, contact and information but do entail social processes of exclusion and incorporation whereby discrete categories are maintained despite changing participation and membership in the course of individual life histories” (Barth, 1969, p. 10).

The defining of race and ethnicity does provide insight into how individuals self-identify and more important demonstrates that this process can be unique to the individual while at the same time subject to the influence of a number of external factors. We are left with the reality that defining these terms is not easy process as are the individuals and groups which they are intended to identify.
How the terms Hispanic and Latino are perceived

Understanding how subjects perceive terms like Hispanic and Latino provide some insight into how racialized folk taxonomy becomes either excepted, rejected in favor of individually idealized identities or are modified in an effort to created an idealized identity without the racially charge perceptions. As we can see from the description by subject #5, he views Hispanic as meaning an individual from either Central or South American, “…almost like a geographic heritage”. Regarding the term Latino, he simply considers it another interpretation of Hispanic and notes not having any issues with being labelled by either term. This subjects response is again indicative of how racialized folk taxonomies are not static and can taken on new and modified identities. As we see with this subject he has taken these terms and redefined them based on a set of learned and lived experiences and as a result does not view the terms as representing any negative or stigmatizing implications. It should be noted that while this individual has redefined this term to not view it negatively, its usage by others can taken on those stigmatizing and racialized implications and potentially affect the subject. While this point was not discussed with the subject, the ever increasing ambiguity of racialized taxonomic terms implies that multiple implied identities can result from their usage dependent on the context and setting in which they are used.

While, the existence of racialized folk taxonomic terms such as Hispanic and Latino are known, this notion of these terms as not fixed to those identities allows for
interesting avenues of interpretation of the evolution of racialized thinking and its application and acceptance by mainstream society and my those minorities that are subjected to their imposed identities. Further review of responses to this question revealed in the case of subject #7, that Hispanic was a derogatory term associated with being looked down on and implying a lower class status. In many ways this view of Hispanic, is consistent with it's racially charged interpretation in U.S. society. This implied misuse of the term, much like ethnicity is subject to at times when racialized, is best summoned up by Montagu in his comments on establishing a term that appropriately represents human variability.

“Of course there exist differences, but we want a term by which to describe the existence of these differences. We do not want a prejudiced term which injects meanings which are not there into the differences. We want a term which as nearly mirrors the conditions as a term can, not one which falsifies and obfuscates the issue” (cited. in Billinger (2007, p. 16).

In turn, subject #14 stated that she considers Hispanic and Latino to be representative of an ethnicity and serves as a description of origin. She then proceeds to define the terms with no racialized implications but simply states that she is Hispanic due to part of her families ancestry being traceable to Spain, while being Latina is the result of being born in a South American country where the predominant language spoken is derived from Latin. She does acknowledge that at times terms like Latino can take on negative and marginalizing identities.

Subject #15 provided similar definitions for Hispanic and Latino, and acknowledged that he could use Latino to identify himself but did not because the term only served as a means of identifying the origin of his language but was inadequate to as a means of identifying himself. It is interesting to note that these subjects grew up
predominantly in their native country and later in life immigrated to the U.S. The perspective that they have and how they define these terms is similar to other subjects that also immigrated from their home countries at later ages and had learned of these terms outside of the U.S. These responses were also indicative of, especially for subject # 15, of a rejection of these imposed categorizing terms on the grounds that they implied a fixed and limited description that was unable to adequately describe the individual. In response, the individuals chose to self-identify by a different means that more accurately characterized them.

Another response of particular interest came from subject #22, who defined Hispanic as an individual that speaks Spanish, has descended from South America, Central America, or Spain and has certain physical characteristics and cultural beliefs that are similar. She also stated not giving much thought to Latino, but considered it to be the same as Hispanic. This response, is indicative of how these terms viewed, but allude to much more than the superficial implications of race and fixed traits. As Montagu points out, “Physical (genetic) and cultural evolution are not mutually exclusive processes” (qtd. in Billinger (2007, p.17). This description of Hispanic and Latino in essence sums up Montagu’s point. A bio-cultural component to identifying human variation exists and is just as varied as the individuals and groups that it seeks to identify. Unlike established racialized concepts of fixed and unchanging individuals and groups this concept for identifying these groups through the use of ethnicity allows us to account for this variability without any racialized implications.
Do subjects notice a blending of race and ethnicity

Overwhelmingly, the majority of subjects acknowledge a blending or blurring of the lines between race and ethnicity. In the few instances where subjects were unsure of how to answer this question, a review of their initial responses to identifying their race and ethnicity confirmed the similarities, if not the overlapping of their responses. Without a doubt subjects recognized that they were using racial and ethnic terms interchangeably when they identified themselves but also by the U.S. socio-political apparatus at large. We need look no further for examples of this fusion than in the misuse and misunderstanding of Hispanic and Latino, two ethnic defining terms that have been racially charged. These two terms for all intents and purposes describe an ethnicity or ethnic group that is extremely diverse both physiologically and culturally. Yet time and time again, the continued use of these terms within political circles and mainstream society emphasize an image of a homogenous group characterized by a number of discriminatory, prejudice and marginalizing traits centered not only physical and linguistic premises but also on socio-economic and political ones. The interesting wrinkle emerging from these interviews has been subjects ability to embrace these terms by pushing aside these racially charged implications in favor of a newly created identity that elicits a sense of pride, loyalty and unity within the individual as well as in the larger group.
Given that subjects consistently acknowledged a blending of race and ethnicity, the compelling aspect of their responses was the implication of external forces. Subjects like, #5, #16 and #17 noted that such forces as social media, television and journalism, entertainment and Hollywood played active roles in disseminating these skewed and misrepresented interpretations of race and ethnicity, specifically as it applied to Hispanics and Latinos. What becomes evident is what Trueba (1999) describes, “Ultimately, the interplay between ecological, biological, sociocultural and genetic factors makes it impossible to conceptualize an accurate racial taxonomic system of human groups” (p. 68). In addition to the fallacy that is racialized taxonomy, comes the recognition that human variation has as much to do with the interactions between individuals, groups, societies and nations as it does with our biology. It is this symbiotic relationship between the biological and cultural aspects of our species that influence how we look to identify ourselves and each other.

Conclusion

This thesis raises the question of ethnicity’s use as a racialized taxonomic term in present day US society. It is suggested that a blending or blurring of the lines exists both on an academic and a socio-political level that allows for these terms to become interchangeable and take on imposed idealistic meanings within the context of their use. A review of the historical role and influence of anthropology and physical anthropology has provided a theoretical framework for the analysis of how this relationship between
race and ethnicity comes to be and is manipulated by the socio-political apparatus that
governs but also by those groups that are subjected to its effects. The historical review of
Hispanics and Latinos sets the stage for the emergence of this group within the use and
presents those factors that have influenced the creation of racialized ideologies for this
group still observable in present day U.S. society. The ethnographic study of Hispanics
and Latinos then provides a contemporary and observable picture of how this minority
group has integrated itself into U.S. society through the adaptation and reconditioning of
established racist ideologies and folk taxonomic categorization that have been imposed
on them.

While this thesis does not provide a definitive answer to these questions, it does
raise a series of arguments towards understanding these interactions and provides
potential avenues for further inquiry. It is the opinion of this author that the essence of
the race issue is the notion of control. Such basic interactions as “you vs. me,” “us vs
them” and “superiority vs inferiority” highlight this sense of assumed control by one over
the other. I propose that the use of taxonomic categorization implies this sense of control
by instilling in the categorizer a subconscious sense of control or ownership over that
other individual or group through the act of naming and/or defining them. The results of
this imposed categorization on the individual or group are twofold. In one scenario, the
individual suffers a loss of self-identity through their acceptance and assimilation into
that societies imposed ideologies. The second scenario has the individual or group
embracing and reshaping these imposed ideologies by consciously infusing them with
their perceived notion of the “self” thus eliminating or doing away with any
discriminatory or prejudice implications. These scenarios become apparent on varying degrees within in the ethnographic study. Some subjects admitted their acceptance and use of imposed ideologies as they adapted to U.S. society, acknowledging that it was easier to identify themselves through those impose categorizations than attempt to self-identify differently. Other subjects described their “ownership” of these imposed ideologies and terminology through the infusion of their idealized view of themselves, thus resulting in the stripping away of any negative connotations. Subject’s conscious efforts to reestablish their identities and not succumb to those imposed on them speak volumes towards this constant struggle for “control of the self”. It is through this intertwined relationship between biology and culture that we can hope to truly discuss race and those elements that influence the racializing of individuals and groups.

Continued research into how U.S. minority groups adapt and process imposed racialized ideologies allow for a better understanding of the relationship between cognition and culture. In this study, Hispanics and Latinos displayed a number of different cognitive approaches to dealing with this U.S. imposed notion of a pan-Hispanic/Latino group and culture. Some subjects openly assimilated into U.S. society by accepting these imposed ideologies. Others outright rejected these imposed ideologies by consciously acknowledging their perceived ideal identity. In many examples, this identity consisted of defining their race by their nationality or culture, those factors that maintained their ties to their origins and families ancestry. Still other subjects found themselves embracing certain aspects of these imposed ideologies while infusing certain aspects of their idealized view of themselves. This relationship between cognition and
culture becomes more evident as subjects consciously work towards developing their identity in relation to those that are imposed on them by society. Given that subjects in this study made a conscious choice to reject or reshape imposed racist ideologies on them, could it be that some individuals display a predisposition toward exclusionary habits? These and many other questions regarding the inner workings of cognition present an interesting alternative for the understanding of racist ideologies and their continued persistence in society. While further research in the notion of “control of the self” and the culture-cognition relationship is needed, continued research into the biocultural approach to transitioning out of a racial categorizations towards an ethnocentric view of human variation.

As we have seen, human variation is not a static process. The notion of homogenous groups acting independently of each other without genetic or cultural exchange has rarely occurred through out human history. On the contrary, human variation has been one of the main factors behind the successful adaptability of humans on this planet. This variation has been directly influenced by humans socio-cultural interactions. As humans we are subject to the evolutionary influences of natural selection, mutation, drift and isolation. Unlike the rest of the animal kingdom, humans have added an artificial evolutionary component in the form of culture. As Montagu pointed out,

“Human populations have behaved in uniquely cultural ways, and these cultural ways have produced an amalgam of variability in genetic, morphological, and cultural traits which require far more profound and extended forms of investigation than the simple-minded rubber-stamping approaches of the classifiers of ‘race’ (cited in Billinger, 2007, p. 19).
It is this interaction between biology and culture that becomes quite apparent when looking at an ethnic group as diverse as Hispanics and Latinos. Any attempt to pigeon-hole them into a homogenized categorization based on fixed physical and cultural traits ends up being futile given the extent of variation among them. Another influential factor of culture that is evident in both the literature review and interviews of Hispanics and Latinos is the extension of racially charged folk taxonomy to other socio-political components of society. Specifically, it was observed that subjects either recognized or experienced racialized discrimination based on their socio-economic status, their class status, gender, sexual orientation or political affiliations. Are we seeing the transcendence of the race paradigm beyond the physiological component to that of other socio-cultural components that potentially pit individuals or groups against other individuals or groups?

In conclusion, studies on ethnic groups such as Hispanics and Latinos lend further credence to notions of human variation due to gene flow through continuous interbreeding and consistent migration. This human variation stands in stark contrast to established racial concepts of human evolution and expansion. Further more, the use of taxonomic categorization become difficult if not impossible as a means of accounting for this human variation given its rigid and unchanging conceptual shortcomings. The use of ethnicity and/or ethnic group as a replacement for race is an ongoing process subject to much debate given its potential and at times, established use as a racialized term. Further research into the culture-cognition relationship, the establishing of “control of the self” and the bio-cultural component of human biological and cultural variation offer areas of
potential inquiry in the hopes of continuing to distance ourselves as a scientific field and society from the long standing racist ideologies of times past.
Appendix A

Analysis of Individual Interviews

The following is a more in-depth summary of the key themes discussed in the summary/conclusion. The themes highlighted in the summary/conclusion evolved out of a review of subjects responses looking for commonalities and themes apparent among subjects.

In many instances subjects identify their race/ethnicity by their nationality and secondarily as Hispanic/Latino along with some other geographical distinctions.

In the majority of interviews, when subjects were asked to identify their race, they tended to respond initially by describing their nationality or country of origin. As a secondary identification, the majority of subjects responded that they were Hispanic. In a few instances, the subjects responded that they were Latinos. Some subjects also chose to include the regions they came from in the Americas (South American, Central American etc.) as part of their race.

When subjects were asked to identify their ethnicity, the overwhelming response mirrored those provided for their responses to race. In many instances, the subjects would identify themselves exactly the same way (nationality, Hispanic, South American etc.) When this trend was pointed out to subjects the majority would either acknowledge
at that point that they did not really see a difference between race and ethnicity or that
you did not truly understand how either of the terms was really defined or differentiated.

• **Subject 1.** Identifies as Hispanic and Dominican by origin. He is Hispanic due to
  his roots - Spanish colonization along with African (Mulato) and Native American
  Indigenous peoples (Mestizo).

• **Subject 2.** She identifies herself as mestiza and Dominican. She notes that she was
  born in the Dominican Republic but that her family ancestry derives from Spain
  and Puerto Rico. She also notes that she identifies as Latino and considers that
  Latino is representative of a mix of cultures. She also notes that when identifying
  her race on documents, she lists herself as Latino/Hispanic. She notes that when
  having to identify her ethnicity, she states that she is Dominican. She also notes
  that when having to identify her ethnicity on documents, she puts down either
  Latino or Hispanic depending of what options she has. The subject’s mother would
  stereotype regarding their ethnicity when discussing their “community” - don't
  forget that we have “el negro detrás de la oreja” meaning their African descent.

• **Subject 3.** She identifies as Dominican and her ancestry can be traced back to
  Africans, Spanish and possibly some Native American Indian indigenous to the
  island. She notes that in her home country of the Dominican Republic, she would
  be identified as Meztizo but in this country, you do not really hear of that term. She
  identifies her ethnicity as Dominican but did not truly understand the term.

• **Subject 4.** He identifies as Dominican and his ancestry can be traced back to
  Africans, Spanish and possibly some Native American Indian indigenous to the
island. He identifies her ethnicity as Dominican but did not truly understand the term.

• Subject 5.) He identifies his race as Mexican American. His parents are from Mexico but he’s born in the U.S. He then stated, “I’m American but Hispanic”.

• Subject 7.) Identifies as Venezuelan and Bostonian - shows her roots from both places. She identifies with certain aspects from both.

• Subject 10.) She identifies as Chilean, Latina and Hispanic (part of white race), which means that she is from South America and speaks Spanish.

• Subject 11.) Identifies as Chilean, Hispanic and White. Normally uses Hispanic when identifying race due to feeling that when people ask her about her race, they are asking where she is from and how she identifies.

• Subject 12.) He identifies as Latino from Nicaragua as well as Central American. He does not associate with his ancestral past but while he recognizes his home country of origin, he notes that he is Americanized.

• Subject 13.) She is born in the U.S. and identifies as white (European) due to being “Americanized” but if asked about her background will state that she is Hispanic (Parents are both from Spain). She notes that this is also influenced by her pale skin tone and the that fact that most individuals assume that she is white as a result. Hispanic equals blood lines, she is Hispanic by bloodline, ancestry and genetics. Hispanic is a broad term to define many different races. Her families ancestry does not originate from Latin America so as a result, she does not feel that she can use Latin American or Latino to self identify. Considers that Latin American/Latino
defines individuals from Central and South American. She does note that individuals from Central and South America are Hispanics due to having some influence (cultural, language, heritage i.e. from Spain).

• Subject 14.) She considers her race to be white. Identifies her ethnicity as Hispanic/Latino which represents their culture and language.

• Subject 15.) He identifies as Hispanic due to descending/ancestry (Spanish, Native Indigenous peoples). When asked to identify his race he states Hispanic and more specifically South American.

• Subject 16.) She identifies her race as Hispanic from Chilean descent. She identifies her ethnicity as American of Chilean descent.

• Subject 17.) He identifies his race as Latino and his ethnicity as Peruvian. He notes that when he does identify himself, he state that he is Latino and Peruvian. He notes that he works with college students who have to self identify on documents, they ask him what to put down and he tells them to check off other and list Latino. He identifies his ethnicity as Peruvian.

• Subject 18.) She identifies her race as Hispanic. Occasionally she has used the term Latina to self-identify but that is because it was the “trend”. She also notes that she identifies herself as Honduran. She notes that if asked to identify in a public setting, she would identify as Central American and Honduran.

• Subject 19.) He identifies his race as Latino of Dominican origin. He identifies his ethnicity as Dominican, Latino, Hispanic and as a description of his culture.
• Subject 20.) She considers his race to be white. Identifies her ethnicity as Hispanic/Latino which represents her culture and language.

• Subject 21.) He considers his race white and bases this on his European ancestry that originates from Spain. He notes that when he is in social settings and identifies himself, he bases it more on identifying his ethnicity and states that he is Hispanic. He notes that on census reports, he identifies himself as white. He notes that he only lists something different if ethnicity is listed. In that case, he would identify himself as Hispanic.

• Subject 22.) She considers her race to be a combination of Spanish, Palestinian and Native Indigenous peoples to Chile. She considers herself mestizo. She notes that she considers each of these single groups of individuals as separate races. She notes identifying her race as Chilean in social settings and depending on the individuals she is speaking with, Latinos or non-Latinos with identify herself as Latino or Hispanic first and foremost and then Chilean to make it easier for them to understand her background. She identifies more based on her culture/ethnicity because she feels its easier for other to relate to or understand. She identifies her ethnicity as Chilean, it’s her culture.

• Subject 23.) She identifies as Puerto Rican and Mexican but has recently taken a DNA test that has revealed that she had North American Native Indian, Italian, Greek and Iberian Peninsula ancestry in her. She notes that when identifying her ethnicity, she lists Hispanic or Latino or what ever comes the closest to these terms.
She notes that if Mexican or Puerto Rican are listed, she will check off either of those options.

• Subject 24.) She identifies as Hispanic. She identifies her race as part of her culture. It encompasses more than her culture. It's the origin of where her family comes from. It's all about the Spanish culture and how it brings you together and what you share in common.

• Subject 25.) He identifies his race as half Italian and Chilean. He would also add that he was Spanish (Spain) and American. He notes that his father is Italian but was born and raised in Chile. His mother was born and raised in Chile. He was born in Chile but moved at a young age to Spain and grew up there for a number of years. He moved to the U.S. and had been living here since his late teens, so for the twenty plus years. He notes that sometimes he identifies as Hispanic due to his hispanic heritage (Chilean, Spanish heritage). He sometimes identifies as Latino due to coming from a Latin American country. He notes that he never speaks about race and only speaks about one's place of origin as the main way of identifying oneself. When asked where he is from, he identifies himself as being born in Chile with a Chilean mother and Italian father who grew up in Spain and lives in America (US). He notes that this question gets much more trickier when he has to involve his feelings in his response. He notes that if he is asked if he feels more Italian or Spanish, he acknowledges Spanish. He stated, “For some reason I feel more Spanish. I grew up there (Spain) for then years and they marked my life. I have a Spanish ascent and cannot get rid of it”. He also acknowledges that he is American
and that makes it even more confusing. He is the prime example of American made. He notes a love for this country and considers himself a part of the country. He feels like he had given everything to this country. When asked to identify his ethnicity he stated that he identified it the same way that he does his race. Then he questioned this response and restated it claiming that he is American Indian and European. He sometimes uses mestizo to identify himself and it was a term that he learned from his Philippine friends who used it to self-identify. He points out that he learned that race in many instances is based on skin color and ethnicity is based on ones genetic origins. He pointed out that if race is based on color then he would be identified as Chilean and European based on his lighter skin tone. He further points out that his ethnicity is mestizo due to him being half Native American Indian and half European.

Self-Identifying in the U.S. vs outside of U.S. or in home countries.

The majority of subjects when posed with the question of how they self-identify in the U.S. as opposed to outside of the U.S. or in their native countries acknowledged that their responses were different. The majority of subjects acknowledge that in their countries of origin, race and ethnicity were not mainstream topics nor were they asked to self-identify the way they are in the U.S. whether it be in everyday conversation or with the filling out of legal documents. Subjects noted that in their home countries, they would simply identify as their nationality and at times would include the specific region,
city or neighborhood they grew up in as part of their identification. This was the case when they were speaking with other native individuals from their country or with foreigners to their native country.

When having to self-identify outside of the U.S. but not in their home country, subjects' responses were a bit varied. The majority acknowledged that their response would be the same or similar to how they identified in the U.S. Subjects noted that identifying by their nationality was what felt most comfortable and accurate to them when being asked to identify their race or ethnicity but acknowledged that depending on where they were (country) that it was easier to identify as Hispanic or Latino first and foremost. Subjects noted that identifying as Hispanic or Latino in these instances was easier for foreigners who might not be familiar with their countries of origin. Subjects did not that they would also include their nationalities in these cases as a secondary level of identification if asked for more specifics.

The overwhelming majority of subjects interviewed that immigrated into the U.S. noted that notions of race and ethnicity were foreign concepts to them prior to immigrating to the U.S. In their home countries, topics of race and ethnicity were not so overtly out in the open in politics or in society as a whole as it is in the U.S. Immigrant subjects acknowledge that their first experiences with having to think about how they would self-identify occurred when they were in the U.S. (filling out legal documents, being asked out right their race/ethnicity etc.). Some subjects felt that given the tremendous diversity that exists in the U.S. that, that is why race and ethnicity were such hot topics and considered such important information for identification purposes not only
by the government but also by employers and society at large. Subjects notes that in their native countries, the populations where more homogenous and this could have been an influence as to why topics of self-identification, race and ethnicity were not so prevalent on a mainstream level as they are in the U.S. Others acknowledged that various social factors (i.e. class status, economic status, cultural beliefs and practices) take on racialized overtones.

Still other subjects acknowledged that living in the U.S. and attempting to adapt and integrate oneself into U.S. society forced one to acknowledge their differences and those of other individuals (culture, language etc.). Some subjects noted that upon arriving to the U.S. they felt that U.S. society immediately attempted to define and categorize them. They had no real choice but to adapt and conform to the labels imposed on them as a means of making it easier to identify themselves and accomplish standard tasks or goals (employment, education, taxes, drivers lic etc.).

• Subject 1.) Notes that living in the U.S. which is such a multi-racial and ethnic country forces one to become more self-aware of their race and ethnicity in relation to those around them. In many instances you learn more about your own race, ethnicity, culture from others - due to living in U.S. society and socializing.

• Subject 2.) She notes that she began self-identifying as Latino outside of the U.S. but since she has been living in the U.S., it has taught her that the term Latino is a representative term used for all individuals or groups from Latin America.
Subject 3.) She notes that in her home country of the Dominican Republic, she is identified as mestizo. She notes that issues of race and self identification is much, much more prevalent here in the U.S. She notes that when self-identifying on documents she lists herself as Hispanic and black. She points out that she doesn't feel that she should have to self-identify under these circumstances and for that matter have the color of her skin play a role in that.

Subject 4.) He notes that in his home country of the Dominican Republic, he is identified as mestizo. He notes that here in the U.S., he is identified as Hispanic and assumed to be from. He notes that at an early age in school they learned about race but it is not a common practice to actively discuss in social circles. He notes that the need to discuss race so much in the U.S. is probably a byproduct of so much diversity in the U.S. while back in their home country where there is not so much diversity. He notes that the only instances were race is a factor in identification, relates to the Haitians, and he notes that it has more to do with the language than with skin tone.

Subject 5.) He notes that in his experience, he is normally identified as Hispanic or Latino by other Latinos/Hispanics. He is generally assumed to be Puerto Rican at first glance. He points out that these instances of identification are based on his physical appearance. He notes that when dealing with other ethnicities that are not Hispanic/Latino he is identified as Hispanic/Latino. He notes that when he is filling out documents he fills out the forms based strictly on the options that he is given.
Normally this means that he lists himself as white, and then Hispanic. He notes that Hispanic is normally a secondary option.

• Subject 9.) In her home country (Chile) grew up thinking that all peoples (races) were the same and united. Living in the U.S. has made her recognize how different everyone else is from on another (differences in culture, language ex.). “This country makes you see your differences from other individuals”.

• Subject 10.) She notes that in her home country (Chile), that she is identified as black or dark skinned. In her home country they do not identify by race but by class which is associated with skin tone. Indigenous natives in Chile are discriminated as a result due to their skin tone. It is considered an insult to be called an indian in Chile due to this and she has dealt with being referred to one due to her dark skin tone.

• Subject 14.) She feels that self identifying in the U.S. is extremely different from identifying outside of the U.S. She notes that in the U.S., its ignorance. She believes that one is identified by ones ethnicity, not their race. Her race is white and so while she comes from South America, she is of the same race as an individual from England or France or Sweden. Yet, her ethnicity is Hispanic/Chilean and so from that stand point she is different from individuals who are from England or France or Sweden. She gives the example of Americans as a term that the U.S. adopted and took ownership of as a term of identification for all U.S. citizens and no one else, yet technically, any and all individuals in both the north
and south American continents are “Americans”. Here in the U.S. they take a determination and make it a universal standard

- Subject 15.) The U.S. is where he learned to use terms such as Hispanic and Latino to self identify. In his home country (Chile) he simply identifies as Chilean and has not needed to identify by any other means. “When someone arrives in this country, the U.S. society tries to mold you and incapsulate one or identify one into a category”. He notes that in his home country (Chile), class is more important than race. If one is viewed as white you are associated with a higher class, but if you are dark skinned you are assumed to be poorer and of lower class.

- Subject 16.) She notes that she doesn't feel that she would self identify any differently outside of the U.S. as she does in the U.S. She simply identifies how she wants to and is comfortable doing wherever she is.

- Subject 17.) Identifies his race a Latino on census reports but notes that he feels pressured to list himself as non-Hispanic white based on his skin tone. He also is tempted to put himself down as other. If listing his ethnicity is an option, he would put down Peruvian. He notes becoming aware of self identifying and racism in 5th and 6th grade. He notes being sent to a private school where he was the only non-white student in his class. He experienced oppression and felt stigmatized. He notes being chosen for soccer not based on his athleticism but was openly told that he was selected because he was “Spanish” and could “play soccer”. He also notes having racial slurs said to him. As he transitioned to high school, he was one of only a very few students that would have classified themselves as Latinos. He
notes that in high school, he became more aware of this ancestry and learned of the term Latino. He took the initiative to create a Latino club in high school that consisted of three individuals that did not really work out. He also noted that there was a Spanish club that was geared more for individuals that wanted to learn Spanish and everyone assumed that he would join that club, but he states that there is more to him than just speaking Spanish. As he states, “It's my culture, it's my identity, it's what I eat, it's what I do”. He notes it being hard for him in high school as a result of this. Especially given that the other Latinos in his class, did not embrace openly being Latino. They appeared to hide this and attempted to blend in with the rest. He then notes going to college and being introduced to many different Latinos and was introduced to Casa Latino. This was the pivotal changing point for him in which he became more of an advocate for his specific “race”/Latino by providing specific support for Latino students on campus. He notes that he has not had any issues identifying as Latino/Peruvian outside of the U.S. He specifically recalls going to Canada and identifying as Latino with no issues. He also recalls going to the Dominican Republic and identifying as Peruvian. He acknowledges that in this setting it was a bit trickier for him because of his skin tone and that he did not appear Dominican but would state that he was Peruvian and had not issues. He notes that it was a matter of adapting to his environment. While in the Dominican Republic he did not need to identify as Latino. He would take a step further or go a bit more in depth and state that he was Peruvian, thus acknowledging his ethnicity more. This was different from his experiences in
Canada or the Bahamas were he would identify as Latino and if more specifics were needed would identify as Peruvian. He notes that the terms Hispanic and Latino are primarily used in the U.S. to identify. Outside of the U.S., as it relates to Central and South America, individuals identify by their nationality.

- Subject 18.) When she moved to the U.S. twenty years ago, she became aware of the different races (black, white, asian, Hispanic) but did not see Latino as an option for identifying. By default, she would identify as Hispanic but notes that if someone asked her if she was Latino, she would acknowledge it and say that she was. In her home country, she notes that self identifying by these means did not exist. She was never asked to identify her race. She notes that she was obligated to identify her nationality. She notes that this could have changed since she left her country but does not believe so. She notes that here in the U.S. when filling out census reports she puts down Hispanic. If on these census forms, Hispanic was listed under ethnicity, she would list Hispanic and would list her race as Hispanic non-white. She notes that only since she has lived her in the U.S., has she learned and had to become conscious of race. She has had to learn to adapt to being questioned about race, given that it is something that she has to deal with living in this country. She notes having been approached by African Americans born in the U.S. who would tell her that based on her skin tone, that she should identify her race as black and not as Hispanic. She felt shocked and did not agree with this. She stated that things of this sort did not happen in her home country. She does not
believe that skin tone plays a role in determining race nor does she believe in a biological component that determines race. “In this country, color matters”.

• Subject 19.) He would prefer to identify himself as American over having to use Latino. Based on living within the North American continent. He believes that there is a false concept or understanding that America equals the United States. “The U.S. is only a country within the continent where we all live. I am American”. Made it a point to acknowledge that he would prefer to identify himself as American. He doesn't agree with having to identify himself as Hispanic simply because he speaks Spanish. He notes that he would not identify himself any differently outside of the U.S. He would identify himself as Latin American or Hispanic. He does note that in identifying himself as Latino, that he associates himself with Argentinians and Spaniards and all others that would identify themselves as Latinos. He believes that Latinos should support each other as a unified group representative of their respective countries and regions (Central and South America).

• Subject 20.) He feels that self identifying in the U.S. is quite different from how one would identify outside of the U.S. Believes that a lack of knowledge and proper use of terminology in the U.S. is what confounds individuals when attempting to understand and discern race and ethnicity.

• Subject 21.) He does not feel that he would have the need nor desires to self identify any differently outside of the U.S. than how he does in the U.S.
• Subject 22.) Only while living in the U.S. has she learned to use and felt the need to use terms like Latino and Hispanic to identify herself. In her home country, everyone is Latino and there is no need to identify as such. Everyone identifies by their ethnicity/nationality. She notes that in her home country of Chile she is considered white/Caucasian based on her skin tone. Only here in the U.S. has she had to identify as Hispanic/Latino and not list herself as white/Caucasian. She notes having issues her first year living in the U.S. when she would have to fill out documents were she had to self identify. Her husband who is Chilean by ancestry but born and raised in the U.S. would correct her and tell her that she needed to identify as Hispanic. She notes that outside of the U.S., she would identify as Hispanic/Latino with the exception of her home country.

• Subject 23.) She would probably not identify any differently outside of the U.S. than how she does in the U.S. She notes that in her parent countries that she is automatically assumed to be either Puerto Rican or Mexican depending on the country that she is in. She notes that this is based primarily on her external physical appearance, yet she notes that once they find out that she does not speak Spanish, they reject her and tell her that she is not either Mexican or Puerto Rican. She feels that some in U.S. society classify all Hispanics as individuals who just came over the border and have not resided long in the U.S. as well as assumings that new immigrant Hispanics are less educated or ignorant.

• Subject 24.) She would identify herself differently outside of the U.S. She identifies as an American based on having primarily grown up and been exposed/
assimilated to the culture. She notes that if the questions went a bit deeper and asked her place of origin, she would say that she is Dominican. She noted that she would not say Hispanic. She provided the example of when she had moved to Spain that this question was posed to her and she responded initially as American and then Dominican.

- Subject 25.) He does not feel that he would self-identify any differently outside of the U.S. He then notes that he has never had to identify his race outside of the U.S. The U.S. is the only country that he knows of that asks questions regarding race. In Europe he is asked about his place of origin. He is not asked about his race or his “genetic composition” that he equates with race. He notes that his first experience having to self-identify occurred in the U.S. when he immigrated here and started high school. He notes that identifying on documents is confusing. Normally if he sees Hispanic or Latino listed, he fills this out because it is what he is given to identify himself. He notes that he prefers to list other but if that is not listed then he will fill out Hispanic or Latino. He also notes that he is confused by having the option of Hispanic non-white. He goes on to point out that he feels that race issues are more prevalent in Spain then here in the U.S. or at least that was the case when he moved from Spain to the U.S. When he left Spain, the racial climate was one of hate and antagonism towards all non-Spaniards. Due to him sounding different, looking different and dressing different he was classified as a “Sudaca” which means sudamericano and represented the equivalent of “spic”. Over time, he began learning the customs and ascent and the discrimination subsided somewhat. In the
U.S., he felt differently because he had races that he could relate to. One being Italian and the other Chilean as well as being Spanish by having lived in Spain. He could claim to be Italian and Hispanic. He was looked at as South American and Italian (European). Since he had lived in Spain this only reinforced his ties to being European. In the U.S. he dealt with three major races that welcomed him; Irish, who were initially brutal but they welcomed him because he came from Spain and played soccer. Italians were also initially brutal but they welcomed him because he was part Italian and had an Italian last name. South Americans welcomed him because of the way he physically looked and because he and his mother were born in Chile. He considers himself a double immigrant. He moved from his home country and dealt with issues of classification when he arrived to Spain. When he moved to the U.S., he was prepared for what to expect regarding having to identify himself. The difference lied in that he was able to choose how he wanted to identify somewhat more in the U.S.

How Race and Ethnicity is viewed and defined.

A review of questions regarding the defining of race and ethnicity have shown a diverse range of responses. In most cases, subjects did not know how to concretely define either race or ethnicity. Subjects specifically had a difficult time defining ethnicity, which was a term that they were not as familiar with. While the majority of subjects provided some form of a definition for both race and ethnicity, in most cases, the
subjects had to think about the question(s) and provided responses in the form of a question. The subjects at that point were informed that a definition of the terms could not be provided to them as it could influence their responses to the question in hand and all remaining questions. What became apparent was that depending on how the question was phrased, it influenced the responses they provided.

In both instances, subjects displayed some initial hesitation as they processed the question(s). Many subjects considered race as being defined by one’s place of origin and their cultural and social upbringing. Other subjects defined race as one’s blood ties and acknowledged some form of a biological component such as physiology (skin tone, facial traits) and DNA. When subjected attempted to define ethnicity, many of them stated that it represented one’s ancestry, where their family line traced its roots from.

- **Subject 5.** Race = “what you are born as”. He defines races as (black, white, Asian, Hispanic). He notes that individuals that are of mixed races are defined by their parents’ races. He notes that he has learned to understand that race is defined by the color of one’s skin tone, certain facial and physical traits. Represents the color of one’s skin tone and where they come from.

- **Subject 5.** Ethnicity = “where one is from and where your parents are from”.

- **Subject 6.** Race = defines a culture, how your brought up.

- **Subject 7.** Race = how one identifies based on how society has defined your race and tells you to identify. Views race and nationality as being tied together.

- **Subject 8.** When posed the question of identifying his race he initially was at a loss for what to answer and initially said a human being. When given time to think over
the question, he identified as Dominican. Identifies his race as Dominican because he was born in the Dominican Republic. He notes that when he needs to identify his race, he has a difficult time and sometimes identifies as Hispanic but other times wants to identify as other. He doesn't understand why he can’t simply put down human.

- Subject 8.) He identifies his ethnicity as Dominican and American (because he was raised in the U.S.). Ethnicity = a social group you are in and associate with. He believes that one's ability to define their ethnicity is based on they're surrounding environment and the ones they have been previously exposed to.

- Subject 9.) Race = where you come from, your blood - does not believe in physical distinctions that define race.

- Subject 10.) Race = means your background, birthplace, heritage. She believes in only 3 races (white, black and Asian). She associates Hispanic as being part of the white race.

- Subject 12.) Race = is defined as the place where you were born and where your parents are from. “Just cause you were born in China doesn't mean that your Chinese.” He gives the example of being born in Brazil but growing up in the U.S. He acknowledged that he is Brazilian by birth but having grown up in the U.S. for such a long time that he is Americanized and that the U.S. is what he would consider home. In his situation, he considers himself fully Americanized but not an American but a Nicaraguan.

- Subject 12.) Ethnicity = a physical proof of your family genealogy or bloodline.
- Subject 13.) Ethnicity = Defined by one's family ancestry. Considers it something different from culture. She identifies her ethnicity as Hispanic/Spanish due to her ancestry.

- Subject 14.) She grew up and was taught that there exist 4 major races (white, black, yellow (Asian) and red (Native American Indians)). She thinks that here in the U.S., when race is spoken about, they are referring to race and ethnicity. They talk about them as being either white or Hispanic. They are white and Hispanic. They are Hispanic because of their language and culture. She considers ethnicity representative of one's culture and language, thus she is comfortable with using Hispanic and Latino to identify her ethnicity.

- Subject 16.) Race = skin tone, cultural background. “How you were brought up or raised to feel”.

- Subject 17.) Race = Latino. “I think the Latino race is the proper way of saying it, and it identifies a melting pot of cultures that share a common language (Spanish). Aside from just the language, it’s also the look. That is where it can get tricky because there are many shades of Latinos”. In his opinion, Latino has not been formalized as a race yet, but he feels that there is a movement to get it recognized on the census as a race. If Latino were to make it onto the census list as a race, he would feel proudful. He notes that it would give him options for what to put down. Race is an identifier of one’s culture and ancestry (He notes that having a deeper understanding of one’s history/ancestry aids in allowing a person to self-identify. He presents the example of a father who is black and a mother who is Latino, what is the
race of the child… in actuality the child’s race is both). In his opinion, race has always been based on skin color. He notes that there could be a biological component to it along with a more in-depth look at what’s beyond skin color. He also feels that language gets used or applied as an identifier. He thinks that currently race is based off of skin color and where one comes from. His thinking is that if where you come from is a category, then why isn't Latino given that we come from Latin America.

• Subject 17.) Ethnicity = Peruvian. Considers it something very specific to a persons identity. To him, the term means where he was born, his ethnic background.

• Subject 18.) Race = Hispanic/nationality (Honduran)

• Subject 18.) Ethnicity = nationality, where you are from, your culture, language, customs and foods.

• Subject 19.) Race = an identification based on ones origin, language, and culture.

• Subject 19.) Ethnicity = considered a description of ones culture.

• Subject 20.) He grew up and was taught that there exist 4 major races (white, black, yellow (Asian), and red (Native American Indians). He considers ethnicity representative of ones culture and language, thus he is comfortable with using Hispanic and Latino to identify his ethnicity.

• Subject 21.) Race = where your from/born - family origins.

• Subject 21.) Ethnicity = culture, language, where family is from.

• Subject 22.) Race = all the biological factors that make up a population (i.e. height, skin tone, facial features and physical makeup). She makes the point of stating that
her children are born in the U.S., are mestizo due to having Chilean, Spanish, Native indigenous and Palestinian blood in them. Their race would not be American because they have no blood ties to America (U.S.). In her mind, race is tied into ones biological makeup.

• Subject 23.) Race = the way you look, what you were told and the way that you were raised by your family. Now, after DNA testing, believes it should be based off your DNA and what that shows. She believes the general population should stick with this method of identifying race because it is quick and easy and in her opinion, a more accurate reflection of whom one is.

• Subject 23.) Ethnicity = “What everyone else classifies you as”. She gave the example of having seen Puerto Rican listed as an ethnicity on documents and having checked it off as her ethnicity based on how she was raised.

• Subject 25.) Race = notes that he is not clear on what race is. He defines race as consisting of major races: white, Hispanic, black, Chinese, Asian but these last two could be combined into one (Asian). He believes race is, “What they are telling us to believe it is”. Meaning the U.S. government, social media and the “powers that be”. He learned about the major races when he immigrated to the U.S. He notes that sometimes he identifies as Hispanic due to his Hispanic heritage (Chilean, Spanish heritage). He sometimes identifies as Latino due to coming from a Latin American country.
How the terms Hispanic/Latino are perceived.

Subjects responses to questions regarding their race and ethnicity generally included the use of Hispanic or Latino in combination with the subjects nationality and at times a regional distinction. Interestingly, when subjects were asked how they would self identify their race in a public setting or in a setting where they were meeting an individual for the first time, subjects acknowledged that their response might be different depending on the individual(s) asking the question. Subjects noted that when they were in social gatherings with other Hispanics/Latinos or meeting them for the first time, they would identify their race or ethnicity by stating their nationality. Subjects then acknowledged that in social gatherings or instances where they were meeting non Hispanic/Latinos, they would generally identify as Hispanics. Many subjects explained that in these situations, it was easier to simply identify as Hispanic or Latino because those individuals understand that term and it was simpler than having to explain in more detail their country of origin and their background. That being said, some subjects stated that their level of comfort with the individual(s) asking them their race or ethnicity played a large role in how they chose to identify. If they felt that the individual(s) intentions were misguided or negative, they would decline to self-identify. If they felt comfortable they would self-identify as Hispanic/Latino and would follow with a more in-depth description of their background, that included their nationality.
Some subjects acknowledged that they did not like using the term Hispanic or Latino to identify themselves. In some cases, subjects noted that they had been raised to believe that Hispanic was a derogatory term and was associated with being of a lower status and one was looked down upon as a result. Still other subjects noted that a negative connotation or stigma was associated with Hispanic and thus they did not like being referred to as a Hispanic or identifying as one. When asked to expand on these negative stigmas associated with Hispanic, subjects stated such things as drug dealers, “thugs,” “gang bangers,” “Mexicans," Puerto Ricans,” and generally individuals that were lower class, less educated and up to no good. Interestingly, the term Latino did not seem to have these negative stigmas associated with it.

Some subjects did point out that Hispanic and Latino did not mean the same thing nor did it define the same individuals. Some subjects viewed Latino as a term that referred specifically to Mexicans and Central Americans. In this instance, this association was due to subjects having been exposed to the term Latino in the U.S., in association primarily with Mexicans and Central Americans. Still another subject acknowledges Hispanic is a term that defines individuals that are either born or have directly descended from Spain. That same subject noted that Latino was a broader term that was used to identify all individuals from Central and South America. Similarly, another subject acknowledged that Latino was a term used to define individuals that were born or grew up in Latin America. This subject noted that Latino and Latin American were terms that defined an individual/country whose language was derived from Latin. This subject went on to state that Spanish or Castilian was derived from Latin much like
French, Italian and Portuguese meaning that these individuals and countries could technically be called Latinos, yet this term had been adopted and imposed on them in the U.S. This same subject went on to point out that he did not use the term Latino to self-identify because the term itself, only identified the origin of his language but nothing more about him.

- Subject 2.) For her, Latino is a term that is representative of a mixture of cultures.
- Subject 3.) For her, the term Hispanic defines language and culture.
- Subject 4.) For him, the term Hispanic defines, language, the food, lifestyle and culture.
- Subject 5.) He considers that Hispanic means an individual from either Central or South America, “…almost like a geographic heritage”. He considers Latino to simply represent another way of saying Hispanic. He notes not having any issues with being labeled Hispanic or Latino/Latin American.
- Subject 7.) Was raised to believe that Hispanic was a derogatory term that was associated with being looked down on and meant you had a lower status.
- Subject 8. Normally will identify as Dominican, but on occasion identifies as Latino. He considers Latino to be a broad term and can mean many things. He uses Latino in some situations when Dominican is not understood by individuals in the context of the conversation. He notes that is he is in a group setting with other individuals that are Cuban, Puerto Rican, Dominican, they can all identify as Latino. When his is by himself, he identifies as Dominican. He considers that everyone from Central and South America and Spain are considered Latinos. He considers Hispanic to be
similar to Latino. He notes having a hard time attempting to break it down and define it exactly. He associates Hispanic more with a language (Spanish, Castilian) more so than a race. He notes that when he thinks of Latino, he considers Brazilians within that label, yet would not refer to them as Hispanic because of their language. He associates Hispanic more with the Caribbean area, as well as Central America and portions of South America.

• Subject 9.) Hispanic has a negative connotation associated with it.
• Subject 11.) She associates Latino with Mexicans and Central Americans due to them being the predominant cultural groups in the U.S. that she has seen referred to as Latinos. She considers that Hispanic defines ethnicity.
• Subject 12.) Does not have anything against the use of the term Hispanic, but does not feel comfortable using it to describe himself. He feels that Hispanic defines individuals who are from Spain, while Latino is a broader term that can be applied to all individuals from Central and South America.
• Subject 13.) Ethnicity = a physical proof of your family genealogy or bloodline and culture = how you were raised, or what you were raised around and how that affects you as a person, many different cultures. She considers herself biologically as Hispanic and white as a cultural definition due to being Americanized. Provides the example that she is Mormon and has been raised in a Mormon culture as well as having been raised in an American culture. She notes that while she is American, she does not do all the same things that other Americans do.
• Subject 14.) She considers that the terms Hispanic and Latino are representative of an ethnicity. It’s a description of origin. She is Hispanic because part of her families ancestry can be traced back to Spain. She is Latina/Latin American because she was born in South America from a country and a continent that Latin based on the origin of their language that comes from Latin. She feels that at times Latinos are identified as such do to a stigma that has marginalized them and looked down on them. Latino normally is used to identify Central and South Americans but not individuals from Spain. She feels that here in the U.S., the term is misused and not properly applied due to a lack of knowledge of what the term really means and represents.

• Subject 15.) Hispanic means having descended from Spain. He does not use Latino to self identify. He normally uses South American and chooses to identify as such. Latino defines someone who was born or has grown up in Latin America - those countries whose language derives from Latin (Spanish language) being one of them. He goes on to point out other languages like, French, Italian and Portuguese would fall or should fall under Latino and thus Brazilians who speak Portuguese are Latinos. He acknowledges that he could use Latino to identify himself but the only meaning that the term has for him is to identify the origin of his language and nothing else so it is not an adequate description of who he is and how he would identify.

• Subject 16.) For her, the term Hispanic represents what her family is and comes from. She feels that she doesn't look Hispanic, but it’s not about your physical appearance that is the deciding factor. Its deeper, based on how individuals perceive you to be. It's really about how you identify yourself once, individuals are able to see you past
your physical looks and come to know your personality, cultural beliefs and way of life. She defines Latino as a term to describe that you are of Latin decent. Latinos as far as she knows defines Brazilians, while Hispanic represents central and south Americans and Spanish represents individuals that originate from Spain.

• Subject 17.) Latino is an all encompassing term that includes Central, South American, Caribbean, Spain and Portugal. He brings up the political and social issues recently in the Caribbean regarding Haitians and how they identify themselves and are identified. He notes Haiti is part of the island of Hispaniola and that in his opinion they are Latinos given the geographical area they are located in. But what's important is how do they identify themselves? He notes that in college, he always felt that Haitians and individuals from Portugal and Spain were part of the Latino community primarily due to the language even though the languages for some are different. He notes that this may be different now but that was the way it was when he was in college. He notes that while he doesn't associate any negative connotation with the term Hispanic, he is more comfortable using Latino to identify simply because the term Hispanic originate from the word Hispaniola which is that Caribbean area. He feels that, that area and individuals that come from that area are Hispanic. He does note that to him these individuals are still Latinos. He does not see a difference between Hispanics and Latinos. When identifying his mothers race, he would identify her as Peruvian and Latina but notes that he feels that if she were asked to identify her race, she would say Hispanic. He believes this because he feels that back in his youth, it was more common for the term Hispanic to be used then
Latino. He feels that she would identify more as a South American than Latino. He notes that three generations of his family have lived in the U.S. He notes that his grandmother will only identify as Peruvian and would not use Latino. Acknowledges that responses to self identifying by using these terms has a generational component that influences what terms they are familiar with and comfortable using. He notes that the word Hispanic is not used as much as the word Latino is currently. He does not feel that it is used much outside of the U.S. His opinion is that the term Latino originated in the U.S. because it is not used much outside of the U.S. This is based off of his experiences with not hearing that term being used outside of the U.S.

• Subject 19.) Latino for him, defines ones culture and ethnicity as descending from Spain. He believes that in this country with the large diversity that exists that it is extremely important to know how to identify oneself. He also strongly believes that its important to be able to defend ones rights based off of who your are and how they identify themselves. In his case, as Latino. He defines, Hispanic as based off of the Spanish language. That said, he does not believe that ones race can be based off of their language. He believes that Hispanic only defines his language and its origin. His race comes from different cultures that have been blended or merged. Because of the culture that he was born into and his country of birth, he identifies his race as Latino.

• Subject 20.) He considers that Hispanic and Latino are terms that represent an ethnicity and not a race. It represents a generalized denomination of a group of individuals. He considers his ethnicity as Hispanic because of his ancestry that traces
back to Spain. He considers his ethnicity to be Latino/Latin American because he was born in South America, in a country that is considered Latin based on the origin of their language, which comes from Latin.

- Subject 21.) Defines Hispanic as an individual that is from South America and from Spain. Latino defines an individual that comes from Central America/Mexico. He was brought up by his family, being taught that these terms represented individuals directly from or with ancestry from these geographical locations. He feels that he looks Hispanic but has always been told that he does not because of how light skinned he is and because of his light eyes. He doesn't fit the traditional, stereotypical profile of what a Hispanic is (Dark skinned, dark hair, dark eyes.) Does not feel that Hispanic is a race.

- Subject 22.) Defines Hispanic as an individual that speaks Spanish, has descended from South America, Central America, or Spain and has certain physical characteristics and cultural beliefs that are similar. She notes not really having thought about the meaning of Latino and considers that there is no real difference between Hispanic and Latino.

- Subject 23.) She notes that defining Hispanic is difficult for her because she considers those nationalities (Mexican, Puerto Rican, etc.) to be their own individual races. She finds it difficult to lump individuals from Spain, Chile, Mexico, etc under simply Hispanic to identify them. She considers all Central and South American countries/nationalities to being their own individual races. She bases this off of her exposure to the general publics opinion and views that these individuals (nations) are individual
races based on the way they look, their cultural background and their upbringing. She views it somewhat differently now based on her DNA testing because she now realized that you can live anywhere in the world and have blood lines that can be traced to different countries. She views Latina as a very prideful term. She grew up in LA and her experiences with the use of the term normally elicited a sense of pride, unity and served as a defining term of those individuals as a group. She does not find the term offensive but does not like to brag about it. She has never felt the need to use the term and acknowledges feeling forced into having to use either Hispanic or Latino to identify herself in general and more specifically on documents because that is all she has to choose from. She feels that, “legally” she has no other option to pick form and has concerns that filling out something other than Hispanic or Latino on documents might be viewed as an attempt at falsifying information once she is physically seen.

• Subject 24.) Hispanic means that it's coming from a country that speaks Spanish. She specifically comes from the island of Hispaniola. Hispanic is any Spanish speaking country. Latino/Latin American means to her that you mostly come from Latin America. You can still speak Spanish but you come from Latin America. Latino defines more the region where one comes from as well as what they share as a culture. Hispanics are geographically located in Spain and the Caribbean and Latin American are located in Central and South America. She believes that there are many similarities in beliefs shared between Hispanics and Latin Americans. You can share the same language but the cultures have exposed you to different things. Specifically
how the language is different in different Latin and Hispanic countries. In one country, a world can mean one thing and in another country the same word means a completely different thing.

Is a blending of race and ethnicity seen by subjects.

• Subject 5.) He does feel that race and ethnicity is at times mixed. He feels that this is a misconception of the terms that is a byproduct of the influence of media and Hollywood. Subject 8.) He views them as separate but can also see where they would be considered as blended. He views race as defining an individual and ethnicity as defining an environment.

• Subject 13.) She does not see much of a difference between race and ethnicity.

• Subject 16.) She does believe that there is a blending of race and ethnicity at times and she believes it is due to certain stigmas related to race being imposed or associated with ethnicities.

• Subject 17.) He does acknowledge a blending of race and ethnicity because it ends up happening that way. “You are stuck selecting something... you’re figuring out what you’re trying to select and it sort of blends it into something else or for them it may make more sense to put it in their, but for you as the person filling it out, it doesn't make sense”. He gives the example of being upset when he was filling out a census and Latino was listed as an option for ethnicity but not for race. He did not feel that this was correct and he felt forced to list his race as other as a result of this. He feels
that some cultures except this as is because there is not much that they can do about it, but he thinks they are also strong enough to adapt to any new changes that come around. He also notes that this is amplified when it is hyped in the media. His example of this is when Ricky Martin broken into the mainstream with his music and introduced the U.S. to Latin music as it was termed instead of specifically being termed salsa or bachata or reggaeton. Latin artists such as Jennifer Lopez, Mark Anthony, etc. really pivoted off of this. He notes that it is interesting how it blends in through specific media outlets and how the media has power to influence others to believe that this is the “new thing,” when it really is not new except for them. The blending ends up being filtered in by the media, specifically tv, the news, movies and then other outlets of media such as social media.

• Subject 18.) She does acknowledge a blending of race and ethnicity. She feels it's a way of adding to or defining race better. She acknowledges that in all her years living in the U.S., she is still at a loss as to why race is so important in this country.

• Subject 19.) He does believe that a blending of race and ethnicity does exist. He defined ethnicity as being a mixture, while race was identified by mixture but marked by the place where you were raised. When he identifies his race, he states Dominican, When asked his ethnicity, he states Latino because it describes the combination of the cultures that he was brought up in (Spanish and Haitian). His response was interesting because it seemed to contradict his responses to how he identified his race and ethnicity but at the same time made sense as these two terms
are viewed as interchangeable in his mind and that mindset is a byproduct of the society that he has been exposed to here in the U.S.

- Subject 21.) He does feel that there is a blending of race and ethnicity. He feels that it happens a lot in the U.S. Doesn't feel that it happens as much in informal settings as it does when one is completing documents or in a formal setting.

- Subject 22.) She does believe that there is a blending of race and ethnicity at times.

- Subject 23.) She does not believe that she falls under any specific category of race because she is a mix of many races, but had identified as Hispanic her whole life because that's what she felt was her only option and what was expected of her. It's her understanding that if she wanted to identify as one of the “other” races identified on her DNA test, that she would have to demonstrate historical records tracing her ancestry to those races. Since she is unable to provide documentation of this with the exception of Puerto Rican and Mexican, so that is what she lists and identifies them overall by listing herself as Hispanic. She does find that race and ethnicity is being blended in the U.S. She relates it to how African-Americans deal with issues of race. She does feel that terms such as Hispanic and Latino are being used incorrectly but does not agree with the reason why they are misused. She finds that individuals from various countries cannot be lumped under a single term identifying their race or ethnicity based on similarities in their language.

- Subject 25.) He was not sure how to respond to the question due to a lack of understanding of the differences between race and ethnicity. In reviewing his
responses to previous questions, it appears that he unknowingly acknowledges that at times race and ethnicity are blended and are perceived to be one and the same.
Appendix B

Questionnaire

The following appendix presents the questionnaire used during interviews.

Self Identifying in the 21st Century: Race and Ethnicity Reconsidered

Interview Questionnaire

Date _____________

Name of Researcher: _______________________

Name of Participant: _______________________  

Contact information of Participant: Please provide one of or both means of contacting you for potential scheduling of follow-up interviews

Phone/Cell # ____________________

Email: _________________________

Participation is Voluntary:
It is your choice whether or not to participate in this research. If you choose to participate, you may change your mind and leave the study at any time. Refusal to participate or stopping your participation will involve no penalty. You may withdraw by informing me that you no longer wish to participate. No questions will be asked. You may also skip any question during the interview.

Expectation of Participants:
As a participant, you will be asked to take part in an initial semi formal interview with the potential of one or more follow-up interviews. The extent to which you participate is up to you. You will be asked to respond to several questions. These questions pertain to your perceptions regarding your race and ethnicity. These questions will also pertain to your opinion regarding how society categorizes your race and ethnicity.

Interview Questions:
Self Identification (Race)                      Declined to respond (Y/N)

1. How would you self-identify regarding your race? Why? 

2. How would you classify your parents race? 

3. Do you consider yourself a mix of races? If so, which ones? Do you find that you claim one more so than the other?
4. How do you self-identify regarding your race in public settings (i.e. school, social gatherings)?

5. How do you self-identify your race in settings were you are meeting individuals for the first time? Why?

6. How do you self-identify on state and federal documents (i.e. tax forms, IRS forms, voting ballots)?

7. How many generations of your family have lived in the U.S.? Do you feel that your families longevity living in the U.S. has influenced how you were raised to self-identify your race? If so, why?

8. Were you born and raised in the U.S.? If so, do you feel it has influenced how you self-identify your race?

9. Did you or do you look forward to raising your children with an understanding of yours and their race?

10. Do you or would you self-identify your race differently outside of the U.S.? If so, why?

**Benefits and Disadvantages of Racial Classification**

1. Do you feel that your race affords you an advantage over other races? If so, why?

2. Do you feel that your race puts you at a disadvantage when compared to other races? If so why?

3. When applying for courses, jobs, grants, promotions etc., do you feel that your race has or does play a role in your selection or non-selection?

4. Have you acknowledged a different racial status when applying for a course, program job, etc. in the past? If so, why?

**Self Identification (Ethnicity)**

1. How would you self-identify your ethnicity? Why?

2. How would you classify your parents ethnicities?

3. Do you consider yourself a mix of ethnicities? If so, which ones? Do you find that you claim one more so than the other(s)?

5. How do you self-identify your ethnicity in settings were you are meeting individuals for the first time?

6. How do you self-identify regarding your ethnicity on state and federal documents (i.e. tax forms, IRS forms, voting ballots)? Why?

________

7. How many generations of your family have lived in the U.S.? Do you feel that your families longevity living in the U.S. has influenced how you were raised to self-identify your ethnicity? If so, why?

________

8. Were you born and raised in the U.S.? If so, do you feel it has influenced how you self-identify your ethnicity?

________

9. Did you or do you look forward to raising your children with an understanding of yours and their ethnicity?

________

10. Do you or would you self-identify your ethnicity differently outside of the U.S.? If so, why?

________

**Benefits and Disadvantages of Ethnicity Classification**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Declined to respond (Y/N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Do you feel that your ethnicity affords you an advantage over other ethnicities? If so, why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>__________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Do you feel that your ethnicity puts you at a disadvantage when compared to other ethnicities? If so why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>__________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. When applying for courses, jobs, grants, promotions etc., do you feel that your ethnicity has or does play a role in your selection or non-selection?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>__________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Have you acknowledged a different ethnicity when applying for a course, program, job, etc. in the past? If so, why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>__________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Role of the U.S. government in the portrayal of race and ethnicity in society**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Declined to respond (Y/N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What advantages, if any do you feel acknowledging one race or ethnicity offers an individual in the U.S.? If so, why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>__________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Do you feel that claiming a certain race or ethnicity puts one at a disadvantage in the U.S.? If so, why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>__________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do you feel that U.S. society has created or adopted certain negative stigmas associated with certain races and/or ethnicities? if so which ones and why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>__________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Do you find that there is a blending of how race and ethnicity were perceived and used to classify individuals and groups in the U.S.? If so, why?

Questions, Concerns or Complaints please contact the researcher for this study: Fernando J. Calderon, who can be reached at (617) 224-3311, and Email: fernandocalderon01@fas.harvard.edu.
Human Subjects Recruitment Process

Subjects were recruited from various areas within the Boston metro area known to have large Hispanic and Latin American communities. Sites of recruitment within these communities consisted of businesses and universities. Subjects were initially engaged in an informal setting and offered the opportunity to be informed of the research study and their possible participation and role in the study. An informational sheet was provided to potential subjects describing this same information. Potential subjects that were interested in participating in the study were provided a consent form to complete along with the setting up an initial date and time for the interview. Minors were considered potential candidates for the research study and an appropriate parental/guardian consent form was made available, but none ended up being recruited.

Given the specific focus group being studied and the potential for language barrier issues in both communicating and reading of the consent and questionnaire materials, potential subjects were offered the opportunity to have the recruitment process and interview portion(s) conducted in Spanish. Subjects were also informed of the potential of follow up interviews and their willingness to participate in these additional interviews if requested. All consent forms provided to subjects clearly stated the voluntary nature of the study and the ability of the subjects to end their participation at any time throughout the recruitment process and interview portion(s) or decline to answer any question(s). All
consent forms provided a description of the protocols being implemented for the protection of their privacy.
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