Race and Justice

Being Fearless and Fearsome : Colonial Legacies, Racial Constructions, and Male Adolescent Violence

Katherine Irwin and Karen Umemoto

Published by:

$SAGE

http://www.sagepublications.com

On behalf of:

Official Journal of the American Society of Criminology, Division on People on Color and Crime

Additional services and information for *Race and Justice* can be found at:

Email Alerts: http://raj.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts

Subscriptions: http://raj.sagepub.com/subscriptions

Reprints: http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav

Permissions: http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav

Citations: http://raj.sagepub.com/content/2/1/3.refs.html

>> Version of Record - Feb 24, 2012

What is This?

Being Fearless and Fearsome: Colonial Legacies, Racial Constructions, and Male Adolescent Violence

Katherine Irwin[1] and Karen Umemoto[2]

Abstract
Violence and masculinity, as many criminologists have argued, are tightly coupled in the United States. According to the current masculinity and crime perspectives, men who confront multiple oppressions (e.g., class, race, and political) are particularly apt to use violence because, while marginalized men lack economic power, they possess power in terms of their gender, especially through the use or threat of violence. While many scholars acknowledge that racial oppression can contribute to the development of violent masculine identities, the authors argue that race remains undertheorized in prevailing explanations of masculine identities and violence. In this study, the authors argue for further advancement of the colonial criminology framework to deepen our understanding of the race-based inequalities leading up to violence. More specifically, the authors analyze data collected from a 6-year ethnographic study of youth violence among Pacific Islander adolescents to illustrate the effects of the lasting legacy of colonialism as well as the continuing salience of racial and ethnic identity formation in explanations of violence, primarily involving Native Hawaiian and Samoan youths in Hawai'i.

[1] Department of Sociology, University of Hawai'i at Manoa, Honolulu, HI, USA
[2] Department of Urban and Regional Planning, University of Hawai'i at Manoa, Honolulu, HI, USA

Corresponding Author:
Katherine Irwin, Department of Sociology, University of Hawai'i at Manoa, Saunders Hall 247, Honolulu, HI 96822, USA.
Email: Kirwin@hawaii.edu

Introduction

The connection between men, male identities, and violence has been a historic theme underlining much of the seminal criminological work focusing on male gang members and street corner boys since the mid-20th century (Cloward & Ohlin, 1960; Cohen, 1955; Merton, 1957; Miller, 1958; Shaw, 1930; Shaw & McKay, 1942). Despite a long history of interest in marginalized men and their violence, it was not until Messerschmidt's (1986, 1991, 1993) publications that criminologists began to carefully articulate the link between masculine identity formation and larger inequalities. Borrowing heavily from Gidden's (1984) structuration theory and West and Zimmerman's (1987) statements about the situational accomplishments of gender (i.e., doing gender), Messerschmidt (1991, p. 63) argued that "class, race, and gender relations are constituted by a variety of social structures and, therefore, structured action" and, more importantly, that "in the process of 'doing gender ... men may simultaneously construct forms of criminality."

Violence is of particular importance in Messerschmidt's (1986, p. 59) work, and he argues that violence is a tool to achieve a masculine identity because in "U.S. society ... both masculinity and power are linked with aggression/violence ... as a result most young males come to identify the connection between masculinity-power-aggression-violence." Masculinity and violence are closely coupled among marginalized men because, while marginalized men are "*economically* powerless, they remain *powerful* in terms of gender" (Messerschmidt, 1986, p. 58; emphasis in original). Here, violence or the threat of violence is one way for men to establish their dominance, control, and autonomy in worlds where they have few legitimate avenues by which to take on traditional male identities such as family provider, head of the household, and leader in civic life.

While many criminologists argue that race-based inequalities and racial oppression contribute to the structural vulnerabilities and violence among some men, the effects of race on masculine violent identity formation remain underdeveloped. In fact, in most research, race-based oppression has been overlooked, conflated with class oppression, or explained in overly vague terms. For example, in some research, lower class Black and White men are seen as cleaving to similar types of violent masculine identities (Katz, 1988; Miller, 1958). Indeed, researchers note that both Black and White lower class men project a similar toughness (Miller, 1958) and cleave to a "badass" (Katz, 1988) persona. Also, the writings about lower class male toughness and the "badass" persona are similar to images of violence that some lower class men of color are said to use to "pay back" anyone who publicly disrespects them (Mullins, Wright, & Jacobs, 2004) or the "juice" (Anderson, 1999) individuals use to demonstrate that they are able to "hold their own" and are not "punks," "herbs," or "chumps" (Anderson, 1999; Wilkinson, 2001). Although much of the literature suggests that violent masculinities expressed by lower class Whites and men of color living in different distressed locations are similar, it is highly probable that there are variations across contexts as well as across ethnic and racial groups. Such variations deserve further explanation.

In many cases, race-based oppression is often conflated with class inequalities. On this point, De Coster and Heimer (2006, p. 152) argued that "the question of whether race *itself* affects the negotiation of violence, above and beyond the effects of extreme economic disadvantage and social isolation, remains unanswered." For example, Oliver's (1984, p. 199) thesis about compulsive masculinity and violence among some African American males promises to theorize race-based oppression, but instead Oliver (1984) focuses closely on men's "vulnerability to systematic deprivation of equal educational and employment opportunities." Similarly, Anderson (1999) asserts that African Americans are interested in disabusing "whites of their often negative views of black people" (Anderson, 1999, p. 180). Combating such negative images, however, is difficult in economically devastated areas where African American men are set up to fail in their quest to earn respect through legitimate means because "a man's success is profoundly linked to his financial wherewithal" (Anderson, 1999, p. 182).

A few scholars have attempted to outline the role of racism in violent masculinities. For example, Katz (1988, pp. 263–264) argues that African Americans are overrepresented in robbery arrests and notes that embracing the hard edge of the "stick up man" was a way for some men to confront "historic oppression among blacks by white society." Similarly, Messerschmidt (1986, pp. 60–61) states that "Black–White relations," "White hatred," or "racial violence" by police and White citizens contributes to violence by men of color. How exactly robbery, violence, or being "the hardman" helps Black men respond to the negative imagery promulgated by Whites, "Black–White" relations, and White hatred of and violence against Blacks remains unclear in this scholarship.

In this article, we fill a gap in the male violence literature by focusing closely on the role of race-based control in the construction of violent male identities. During an ethnographic study including Pacific Islander boys in Hawai'i, the majority of whom were of Native Hawaiian and Samoan ancestry, we found that many youths in the study expressed an acute awareness of historic injustices and race-based mythologies about their ethnic group. Many of the mythologies that participants mentioned were racialized stereotypes circulating during Western imperial expansion in the Pacific. In fact, Native Hawaiian and Samoan boys, while sharing a racial designation as Pacific Islanders, described slightly different interpretations of violent masculine identities. Moreover, boys' construction of tough masculine identities varied along with the different histories of colonial control and historic race-based constructions of their particular ethnic group. We draw on colonial criminology to explain how violent masculine identities can form in response to systems of racial control deployed in contemporary "postcolonial" contexts. Also, by examining how boys' violence may both reflect and shape the formation of their racial or ethnic identities, we also suggest ways in which colonial criminology frameworks may be strengthened in the future.

Colonial Criminology

Since the 1990s, a handful of criminologists have argued for a colonial theory of crime (Austin, 1993; Gabbidon, 2007, 2010; Hawkins, 2011; Tatum 2000a, 2000b, 2002).

Colonial criminology locates the cause of crime as an outcrop of oppression, alienation, and inequalities that exist in a colonial society. In traditional understandings, colonization occurs when a foreign power enters and takes control over sovereign lands. Foreign powers also deploy oppressive systems and institutions to maintain dominance over indigenous peoples. Such a system results in rampant conflict, competition, and alienation among and within groups in a colonial society as individuals struggle for moral, cultural, and physical survival. Crime is one response to these oppressive conditions, and violence specifically results from alienation (Tatum, 2002). Moreover, violence under colonialism is usually expressed in a horizontal fashion (Freire, 1970/1993), meaning that individuals take out their frustrations on similarly situated individuals rather than on those who benefit from the colonial society (usually Whites).

Colonial criminology is a useful tool to explain the complex and multidimensional role of racism and racial control in crime as distinct from (though related to) the effects of economic and political marginalization. Hawkins (2011) asserts, when considering race, criminologists too often ignore the holistic, historical, and process-oriented dynamics of racial control. In contrast to most criminological theories, colonial criminology is able to capture the myriad of influences on crime, from the macrostructural to the microbehavioral, in a historically informed framework of analysis amenable to the unique histories of each racial or ethnic group. Colonial theories of crime also allow a historical perspective of racism to be developed within criminology that does not "focus almost exclusively on the deficits of minorities . . . " but explores the "full contours of White advantage as it relates to the etiology of crime" (Hawkins, 2011, p. 17). Colonial criminology theories emphasize the dynamic relationships between different groups (along racial, ethnic, class, and other dimensions of difference) within historically colonized locations. At the same time, colonial theories recognize power differentials that mediate among the many dimensions of difference. They recognize the toll of a colonial history and of institutions of social control on subjugated groups as potential sources of violent behavior, including inwardly directed acts upon members of one's own ethnic or racial group.

While there are different versions of the colonial model of crime offered in the literature (for review, see Gabbidon, 2010), the activities of the United States in various areas in the Pacific reflect the classic colonial paradigm, where foreigners traveled to and took control over sovereign nations. Relying on Fanon's (1963, 1967) thesis about the alienating effect of colonialism for indigenous peoples, Tatum (2000a, 2000b, 2002) offers a four-phase model to explain how colonial oppression leads to crime and violence. The first phase of most colonial projects involves the forced invasion of "a small minority of outsiders" to a country for the primary objective to obtain "valuable economic resources" (Tatum, 2002, p. 310). This economic goal is linked with racist systems of control deployed in subsequent phases. In Phase 2, the colonizers launch systematic assaults on native cultures, where indigenous languages, religions, worldviews, and ways of life are destroyed, distorted, and generally denounced as being primitive, evil, and savage. In this phase, native peoples are often constructed in zoological terms as being more like animals than civilized people. During Phase 3, a

government by a racial or ethnic minority (i.e., foreigners) is established and is premised on the belief that the indigenous people lack a decent, moral, and civilized society. In this phase, indigenous people are cast as needing governing and control by members of a superior culture (i.e., foreigners). During Phase 4, a rigid social caste system is developed in which foreigners receive the lion's share of privileges within the colonial society. In this phase, members of indigenous groups are shunned, denounced, and alienated from symbolic and material resources.

Hawkin's (2011) arguments about colonial criminology and White privilege expand Tatum's (2002) analysis of Phase 4. Within colonized sites, racial elites (i.e., colonizers, often Whites) received much of their privileged identity specifically by demoralizing and marginalizing people of color, who, in turn, had very few options to cope with hegemonic and racial or ethnic imaginaries thrust on them. In response to this colonial reality, Tatum (2002) argues that indigenous peoples experience a deep sense of alienation and can adapt to this alienation in three ways, consisting of assimilation, protest, or crime.

Colonial Background of Hawai'i and American Samoa

Tatum's (2002) phase model of colonial and racial control conforms in broad strokes to the history of Western imperial expansion in Hawai'i and Samoa, the ancestral lands of the two groups included in this study. The United States took control over both Hawai'i and American Samoa by the turn of the 19th century. The United States was complicit in the overthrow of the sovereign Hawaiian nation, and soon after in 1889 annexed the Hawaiian Islands; it was incorporated as the 50th state in 1959. The eastern part of the Samoan archipelago was taken by the United States in 1899 and remains an unincorporated U.S. territory, with American Samoans considered U.S. nationals, but not citizens. The processes of dispossession and forced assimilation varied greatly between the two countries. In Hawai'i, the vast majority of Native Hawaiians were dispossessed of their lands, a process that began with the Great Mahele of 1848 and the Kuleana Act of 1850, and worsened as foreigners and foreign companies bought land that became privatized. In Hawai'i, colonists launched assimilation campaigns designed to strip Native Hawaiians and immigrant groups to Hawai'i of much of their language, traditional knowledge, and cultural practices, and inculcating an American "identity and way of life" that was touted as superior[1] (see Merry, 2001; Silva, 2004; Trask, 1999).

Colonial control unfolded in a different pattern in what became American Samoa where land was not privatized to such an extent, and the village-based system of governance, land tenure, subsistence economy, and traditional practices remained largely intact. Samoans remained heavily influenced by American politics and culture, with more American Samoans living in the United States than in American Samoa (U.S. Census, 2004). Most Samoans immigrated to the U.S. mainland and Hawai'i beginning in 1920, and in greater numbers after 1950.

Despite the differences in the unfolding of colonialism in American Samoa and Hawai'i, both Samoan and Native Hawaiian families cluster in the lower rungs of

Hawai'i's socioeconomic ladder. Both groups have high mortality and morbidity rates and are disproportionately represented in the criminal justice system. Native Hawaiians and Samoans make up approximately 19% and 1.3% (respectively) of Hawai'i's population (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000a, 2000b), but represent 39% and 5% of Hawai'i's prison population (Department of Public Safety, 2008). It is important to note that many youths in Hawai'i are of mixed ancestry, especially Native Hawaiians; less than 3% of Native Hawaiians are of full Hawaiian ancestry, while the vast majority is of mixed racial and ethnic heritage, which includes Chinese, Portuguese, Caucasian, Japanese, Puerto Rican, Filipino, various Pacific Island groups, and others.

While Hawai'i is often referred to as a successful "melting pot" of cultural groups relative to other U.S. states, there are in fact marked social inequalities along with socially defined stereotypes that continue to reinforce inequalities (Okamura, 2008). These ethnic and racial stereotypes can be traced to colonial tropes that justified and reinforced the maltreatment of indigenous peoples in both countries. Gross generalizations whose genealogy can be found in early writings by historians portray stereotypes of Native Hawaiians, Samoans, and other Pacific Islanders as happy and hospitable, but lazy, unintelligent, hot-tempered, or prone to violence (see Dougherty, 1992; Kame'eleihiwa, 1992; Keahiolalo-Karasuda, 2010; Linnekin, 1991). These narratives are also found in contemporary popular discourse, which continue to shape attitudes toward Native Hawaiians, Samoans, and other Pacific Islanders within private and public institutions. Negative stereotypes are felt in schools, where Samoan youths tell of being labeled as "uneducated, troublemakers, unable to communicate, and successful only in sports" (Mayeda, Pasko, & Chesney-Lind, 2006, p. 76). Native Hawaiian men have been associated with what is called the "ills of colonization" and lasting problems such as high rates of domestic violence, suicide, substance abuse, and low rates of inclusion in higher education and professional employment (Blaisdell & Mokuau, 1994; Cook, Tarallo-Jensen, & Withy, 2005; Crabbe, 1997; Kamau'u, 1998).

Meanwhile, there are many important efforts, particularly among Native Hawaiians, to assert more authentic, self-defined cultural identities. Such decolonizing efforts counter damaging stereotypes and appropriate indigenous knowledge in daily life as well as in calls for self-determination. While Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander youth in contemporary Hawai'i confront the challenge of fighting subordinating stereotypes, they do so in a period following a cultural renaissance and increasing recognition of their sovereign histories.[2]

Sources of violent action cannot be seen simply as inculcated from external sources but are best studied in the interplay of historically formed relations and temporal change. As Kamau'u (cited in Tengan, 2008, p. 11) noted, some actions that may have been seen as honorable in the past are those that are often criminalized in the modern era, including the periodic use of violence to resolve disputes or discipline family members. This is not to condone traditional acts of violence but to acknowledge temporal changes in the exercise and meanings of violent actions associated with cultural notions of masculinity (see, e.g., Tengan, 2008) or authority (see, e.g., Bond & Soli, 2011).

Data and Method

We collected data for this study from 2005 to 2011, as affiliates of the Asian and Pacific Islander Youth Violence Prevention Center (the API Center) at the University of Hawai'i, John A. Burns School of Medicine. The API Center represents a collaborative partnership between University of Hawai'i researchers, leaders from several community organizations, and principals and key staff members in several public high schools on Oahu, Hawai'i. Noting that Samoan and Native Hawaiian teens in Hawai'i are disproportionately arrested for violence and are, along with Filipinos, disproportionately in the juvenile justice system because of violence (Kassebaum et al., 1995a, 1995b), researchers' and community members' primary focus during the project was to initiate research- and community-based violence prevention initiatives for Samoan, Native Hawaiian, and Filipino adolescents.

This qualitative study was a small part of the larger university–community collaboration. We specifically designed this ethnographic study to allow adolescents and adults in two communities on Oahu to define and discuss youth violence in their own terms. Regarding definitions, there was considerable agreement among study participants that violence included physical fights and occasions when individuals physically hurt someone else on purpose.[3]

To capture community members' perspectives regarding youth violence, we collected three types of data during this study, including 16 focus group interviews, participant observations with 10 students, and in-depth interviews with 11 high school staff members and 25 high school students. Using all three of these methods, we collected data with 132 participants, 80 of who were high school students (see Table 1).

Study Setting

This qualitative study primarily focused on two neighborhoods—Stevens Heights and Northward—and the two high schools on Oahu that served these neighborhoods—Cleveland and Seaside. Stevens Heights was one of the most ethnically heterogeneous and poorest neighborhoods on Oahu. Stevens Heights is a high-density, diverse, and low-income neighborhood resting on the edge of downtown Honolulu. A little more than half of Stevens Heights's residents were Filipino, and approximately 10% were Pacific Islander. The majority of the Pacific Islanders in Stevens Heights were Native Hawaiian and Samoan[4] (U.S. Census 2000c, Summary File 1). Stevens Heights's crime rate was 3 times higher than Honolulu's in 2007 (Fuatagavi & Perrone, 2008). In contrast to Stevens Heights, Northward is a rural-, working-class community, with a relatively large number of Native Hawaiian families. Despite its bucolic character, Northward contained "pockets of poverty" or locations with high rates of poverty. Northward's violent crime rate was twice as high as Honolulu's in 2007 (Fuatagavi & Perrone, 2008).

The public high schools serving Stevens Heights and Northward reflect these two communities in terms of diversity, poverty rates, and crime. Cleveland High School in Stevens Heights was ethnically diverse and enrolled over 1,500 students and had a mix

Table 1. Data Sources and Participants' Demographic Characteristics

Data Type	Number of Participants	Gender	Ethnicities
6 Adult focus groups[a]	41	18 Women 23 Men	20 Native Hawaiian; 21 Samoan
10 Student focus groups[a]	45	21 Girls 24 Boys	18 Native Hawaiian; 16 Samoan; 11 Filipino
Student interviews	25	10 Girls 15 Boys	15 Native Hawaiian; 3 Samoan; 3 Mixed Asian; 2 Caucasian; 1 Latino; 1 Mixed Pacific Islander
High school staff interviews	11	5 Women 6 Men	5 Native Hawaiian; 1 Portuguese; 1 Mixed Asian; 4 Caucasian
Observations of students	10	6 Girls 4 Boys	7 Native Hawaiian; 2 Samoan; 1 Other Pacific Islander
Total students	80	37 Girls 43 Boys	40 Native Hawaiian; 21 Samoan; 11 Filipino; 3 Mixed Asian; 2 Caucasian; 1 Latino; 1 Mixed Pacific Islander; 1 Other Pacific Islander
Total participants	132	60 Female 72 Male	65 Native Hawaiian; 42 Samoan; 11 Filipino; 4 Mixed Asian; 6 Caucasian; 1 Latino; 1 Portuguese; 1 Mixed Pacific Islander; 1 Other Pacific Islander

Note. [a]Focus group participant were split equally between Northward and Stevens Heights.

of Filipino (approximately 50%) and Pacific Islander (24%) students (Hawai'i State Department of Education, 2008). Northward's Seaside High School was a little more than half of the size of Cleveland during the 2006–2007 school year, and approximately half the Seaside student body was full- or part-Native Hawaiian (Hawai'i State Department of Education, 2008). Filipino and Samoan students (combined) made up approximately 10% of Seaside's enrollment[5] (Hawai'i State Department of Education, 2008). At both Cleveland and Seaside High Schools, approximately half the students received free or reduced-cost lunches in 2006–2007 (Hawai'i State Department of Education, 2008). There were, on average, 10 student suspensions per week at Cleveland High School and 7 suspensions per week at Seaside High School during the 2006–2007 school year (Hawai'i State Department of Education, 2008).

Data Collection and Analysis

During the initial phase of the study (2005–2007), a graduate student[6] and the first author conducted 16 focus groups with community leaders, parents, and high school students.[7] Although we did not target violent students for focus group participation, during group discussions at least 90% of students noted being friends with another student who had been in a fight, and nearly 50% of students self-reported having been in at least one fight during high school.

Starting in 2007, high school counselors invited the authors to join weekly group counseling meetings for at-risk high school students.[8] Forty-two students participated in these groups, with a new group of seven girls and seven boys participating each year. Approximately 90% of the counseling group students had been in fights on campus and/or reported struggling with "acting out" and other anger management problems at school. We also helped organize and attended dozens of field trips, camping excursions, and other counseling group activities with these students.

Regarding interviews and observations, we conducted in-depth interviews with 11 high school staff members and 25 students from the counselor-led groups. We identified the staff members who encountered and interacted with violent students and asked if they were interested in participating in interviews. Similarly, we recruited students from the counselor-led groups by asking if they wanted to participate in the study. There were 10 students whom we received permission to observe but who did not participate in interviews.[9]

Focus groups and interviews were similar in that they lasted an average of 1 hr, although they ranged from 50 to 90 min. In the focus groups and interviews, we used a similar interview guide with open-ended questions about the nature and meaning of youth violence in the high schools as well as in their ethnic and geographic communities. Questions also focused specifically on the history of fights and conflict among and between students at school, the background of students who engage in fights, and what can help students to avoid fights and resolve conflicts. Although a guide was used, interviews and focus groups evolved in a conversational format, allowing participants to bring up facets of violence that were not included in the guide. All of the

focus groups and in-depth interviews conducted during the study were tape-recorded and later transcribed verbatim.

Data Analysis

To analyze the data, we borrowed aspects of grounded theory techniques (Charmaz, 2006; Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Strauss, 1987; Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Given recent developments in urban (Anderson, 1999; Burawoy, 1991; Jones, 2010; Wacquant, 2004), feminist (Wuest, 1995), critical (Fine, 1991, 1994; Fine & Weis, 2005; Foley & Valenzuela, 2005), and indigenous ethnography (Smith, 1999; 2005; Tengan, 2008), we also wanted to stay attuned to the ways in which relations of power impinged on the everyday experiences of study members. Therefore, we also borrowed analysis techniques of critical ethnographers to link situational social processes with larger structural forces surrounding these two communities and schools.

In the first stages of analysis, the first author used initial and, later, focused coding (Charmaz, 2006) to inductively locate themes in the data. During the coding phase, it became clear that boys in the study described a uniquely male experience with challenges to their masculine- and ethnic-based identities. Interestingly, although boys, and not girls, often described fighting for the honor of their ethnic group (see also Adler, 2007), the girls were frequently the most articulate adolescents when it came to explaining the ethnic-based motivations of boys' fights. We attribute this to what Collins (1986) calls having the "outsider within standpoint." Collins (1986, p. 25) explains that those (e.g., girls) who are outsiders to a particular experience (e.g., male violence) develop a rich critical perspective of a phenomenon because, as outsiders, they question the "taken for granted assumptions" within a particular context.

After initial coding, the authors engaged in analytic memo writing (Charmaz, 2006) to explain the connections among the study themes and larger structural conditions. Two types of violent and masculine motivations emerged in the study: being fearless for Native Hawaiian boys and being fearsome for Samoan boys. In a series of analytic memos, the authors traced how these different types of masculine and violent expressions seemed to map onto contemporary and historic stereotypes about different Pacific Islander ethnic groups in Hawai'i, the formation of ethnic group identity, and the legacies of colonial control in the Pacific Islands. Here, the authors borrowed especially from critical ethnographic traditions to view study participants' everyday interactions within a larger explanatory framework (see Fine, 1991, 1994; Fine & Weis, 2005; Foley & Valenzuela, 2005).

Being Fearless and Fearsome

In many ways, boys in this study explained youth violence in terms no different from studies elsewhere. In their description of fights, boys valued physical strength and competition. Some mythologized past fights by lingering over the details of combat, discussing who said what to whom to start the fight, and who threw the hardest or

fastest punches. Boys who desired recognition through violence often nurtured a reputation for being physically imposing. Anderson (1999) identified a similar phenomenon and called it ''having or displaying juice,'' meaning that a person bases his identity on his potential for violence.

In the present study, we found Native Hawaiian and Samoan boys who were interviewed focused, respectively, on being fearless and fearsome. However, these traits were different than displaying their ''juice'' (Anderson, 1999) and ''nerve'' (Katz, 1988) or to demonstrate that they were not ''punks,'' ''herbs,'' or ''chumps'' (Anderson, 1999; Wilkinson, 2001). Instead, cultivating fearlessness and fearsomeness were specific identity management processes that emerged, in part, from an effort to confront or manipulate racial stereotypes about their ethnic group. The process of being fearless and fearsome can be traced to youths' acute awareness of their subordinated position in the racial hierarchies in Hawai'i. Among Native Hawaiians, boys were also aware of their colonial history in their homeland, especially the loss of ancestral lands.

The process of being fearless and fearsome included two components among the Native Hawaiian and Samoan boys who participated in the study. When constructing their identities through violence, boys first expressed a critical awareness of the larger power arrangements surrounding them. Their critical awareness included being attuned to how men and boys in their ethnic group have been viewed and treated historically and the perceived persistence of discriminatory or prejudicial treatment in the present. Second, boys referred to this critical awareness in explaining their efforts to protect their reputation and in their demands for respect through violence.

Critical Awareness of History and Social Status

Many developmental psychologists note that establishing a positive sense of one's ethnic identity is a key component of healthy adolescent development for youths from ethnic minority groups (see Roberts et al., 1999). This process for Native Hawaiian and Samoan adolescents is confounded by the fact that their histories, cultures, and traditional knowledge and practices were suppressed and distorted by colonial institutions. In Hawai'i, for example, there were periods when the Hawaiian language was forbidden in public schools and, even earlier, the practice of hula was banned. Despite these dislocations, which varied across colonized nations, there was nevertheless the formation of strong ethnic identities among youth in Hawai'i as among many youth of color elsewhere.

Part of the youths' ethnic identity formation was the development of a sophisticated understanding of contemporary conditions, inequalities, and power arrangements confronting members of their group. In addition, youths' critical awareness meant that they did not view themselves or their ethnic group through the eyes of members of dominant groups. Instead, Pacific Islander boys in this study were foremost concerned with presenting themselves as powerful and deserving of respect.

Evidence of adolescents' critical awareness was students' specific interpretation of historical events. For example, all of the Native Hawaiian youths in the study were

well aware of the events leading to the annexation of Hawai'i, the overthrow of the Hawaiian Kingdom, and the taking of Hawaiian lands. While Samoans, Tongans, and other Pacific Islanders were as aware of these historic facts as Native Hawaiians were, Native Hawaiian youth tended to include the unjust taking of their lands as central to a collective identity. For example, Mara, Chevonne, and Junior,[10] three Native Hawaiian youths, discussed how the loss of land framed their impressions of what it meant to be a Native Hawaiian:

> Mara: That's another thing about Hawaiians. You have to stand up for your culture because they just took over our land, yeah? So it's like, "Oh, this is our land still. You know, still fight for it. Don't let nobody take it." And that's your place, don't let nobody take over it and stuff. That's just how Hawaiians, I guess, or Polynesian people just are. Like, "don't let them take."
>
> Junior: As a Hawaiian, you just feel like, oh, they came to my land, they took over my land, you know. It just makes you feel like they're better than you are. And in actuality, they're not better than us, they're just . . .
>
> Chevonne: They have more power.

As this quote indicates, boys and girls were equally aware of and articulate when discussing power arrangements and lasting injustices that members of their ethnic group confronted. Interestingly, while girls like Mara and Chevonne could explain how historic events framed their identities as Pacific Islanders, none of the girls in this study described fighting as a way to restore ethnic pride (see also Adler, 2007). Rather, fighting for ethnic honor was usually a male enterprise in the two communities in this study.

In addition to being aware of past injustices, Native Hawaiian adolescents were cognizant of many stereotypes about them. Native Hawaiians consistently noted not wanting to appear stupid, foolish, or easily duped. Keith, a Native Hawaiian student, said, "as a Hawaiian, you know how our land and our culture and how it ends up to be. It's all jacked up. The States is jacked up, the whole United States system itself is jacked up and if you cannot see that, you're dumb and you're stupid." For Keith, being "stupid" or "dumb" meant not being aware that the U.S. system was "jacked up," or otherwise oppressive, particularly against Native Hawaiians. To Keith, being stupid and unaware was also among the worst things a person could be.

Samoan youths in this study pointed to different themes in the demonizing images circulated about Pacific Islanders. Storied events in Samoan history have contributed to a lasting Western mythology about Samoans' ferocity, violence, and dangerousness (see Linnekin, 1991). Samoan participants in this study frequently described the perception of Samoan men as being large and powerful physical combatants, a stereotype that they felt overshadowed their intellectual gifts. Jason and Cynthia, two members of a Samoan leadership organization, lamented these images:

> Jason: We're barely ever represented as intellectual people.
>
> Cynthia: He's right, he's definitely right. And I guess that's why Samoans stick to that, the physical side, because we are known to be athletic people. We have a higher rate of

> our men getting into the football teams, you know the NFL . . . But, my sister went out
> with a guy who was palagi [White] who was told by his other friends that Samoans are
> not so bright. So he perceived her to be stupid, to be like illiterate.

Samoan adults were particularly critical of the construction of Samoans as being physical, large, and narrowly talented in contact sports. This concern, as Cynthia described, emerged because some adults viewed a rigid dichotomy between being physical and being intellectual. To adults, therefore, the perception that Samoans were physically strong translated into a feeling that they were not perceived as also intelligent.

Interestingly, younger Samoans, especially adolescent boys, in this study did not bemoan these prevailing stereotypes. Instead, some viewed common beliefs about Samoan males as opportunities to solicit a fear-based brand of respect from others. Palo and Jules, two Samoan high school students, said:

> Palo: Stereotypes, you know when they make assumptions about you without knowing you.
> Jules: There's a lot at my school.
> Palo: They think that Samoans are violent punks.
> Question: Is it a good stereotype if people are afraid?
> Jules: Yeah.
> Palo: It makes ourselves look good by showing their respect.

The narratives circulating about Pacific Islanders were in some ways unified and, in other ways, varied by ethnic group and historic context. As targets of Western imperial projects, indigenous Pacific Islanders in this study generally struggled against negative images of their ethnic group as being somehow uncivilized, savage, or debased. Despite these similarities, there were variations in these Western notions. For example, Native Hawaiian youth in this study described struggling against stereotypes of their group as being ignorant and ineffective against "those who try to take." On the other hand, Samoan adults and youths in this study described confronting images of themselves as being physically imposing, tough, and violent.

Reputations and Demands for Respect: Being Fearless and Fearsome

The colonial legacy involves both the contemporary manifestations of a lasting political hegemony as well as the incorporation of traditional or indigenous knowledge and ways of knowing within its fold. There are dual and dueling strands at play. On one hand, there is an expressed need among boys to demonstrate toughness in the face of a broader colonial history. On the other hand, there is the need to be the steadfast "warrior" in an authentic expression of that concept (see Tengan, 2008). Within a colonial or postcolonial milieu, however, the boundaries between traditional influences and those of modernity blur. As a result, demonstrating that they were critically aware of the context surrounding them was one aspect of boys' quest to gain respect in the face of colonial demoralization. Violent actions, however, were also

conditioned by contemporary constructions of masculinity in the United States (see Messerschmidt, 1986, 1991, 1993).

The blending of traditional and Western belief systems bestowing honor on violent men can be seen in many of the ways that youths used violence to establish their reputation and campaign for respect. Adolescents in this study did not necessarily participate in adult-led political movements for sovereignty per se. Instead, they described attempts to reclaim a positive sense of their culture and heritage in everyday situations. Students' version of cultural reclamation specifically involved combating or manipulating the negative beliefs about their ethnic group in the situational contexts of their schools. As a result, boys' fights were often attempts to demonstrate that they possessed traits valued by males among their ethnic peers.

One of the most damaging stereotypes that Native Hawaiian youth tried to combat was the belief that their ancestors were ignorant and naively "gave up" their sovereignty and lands. Native Hawaiian youth struggled against constructions of themselves as being foolish or ineffective against domination and, as Keith described previously, Native Hawaiian students were especially concerned about being considered "stupid" or "dumb." Also attesting to this common sensitivity, Aaron, a Native Hawaiian student, discussed how fights were likely to start on campus: "Yeah, it starts as a racist comment. Yeah, like it takes one to say 'dumb Hawaiian' and all the Hawaiians get nuts."

In addition to assaulting others who made derogatory comments about Native Hawaiians, Native Hawaiian boys' narratives about achieving respect through violence centered on a common construction of what fighting means among Native Hawaiians. Drawing on what they noted as traditional notions of masculinity, toughness meant being fearless, or never being afraid of confrontations, especially physical confrontations with individuals who attempted to dominate and control them. Koa, a Native Hawaiian student, described the many facets of fearlessness:

> Disrespect leads to fights. People don't back down, they usually trying to make others "awk" (act like a chicken) and back down. What really causes problems is that people come and they boss you around—"do this, do that"—and guys take it personally. Then they have one problem. In this neighborhood, they brought up more different, more hard. You don't give respect to get it, you take respect. Boys from the nearby neighborhood just walk out, nothing happens. Not in my neighborhood. All the freshmen, the youngest punks, they try to fight everybody. Freshmen always try to make a name for themselves, sooner or later the upper class men will take care of them. That's what I did my freshman year that got me into all kinds of trouble. I tried to make a name for myself and show people that I can scrap (fight) and that I'm not scared. "Oh boy, he can scrap, he's not scared!" Upper class men would say "oh he thinks he's hard." I fight every day, I come back Tuesday, got suspended. Come back next Wednesday, scrap. High school kicked me out for fighting.

Male violence researchers often note that within the codes governing violence and respect in disadvantaged neighborhoods, "the most fundamental norm is 'never back

down from a fight'" (Matsueda, Drakulich, & Kubrin, 2006, p. 338). Koa's narrative reveals that the same was true in this context. Looking closer, however, Koa also points to the multidimensional meanings of respect in this context, which demonstrates that toughness—"having juice" (Anderson, 1999) or showing "nerve" (Katz, 1988)—means more than just being willing to fight. What is likely to lead to a fight, according to Koa and other boys, was being bossed around and told to "do this, do that." Kyle, another Native Hawaiian student, agreed with Koa and said, "That's what it is, domination. When others try to act up, to dominate you, that's when troubles start."

Boys in the study revealed that being passive in the face of domination was a problem and that being bossed around was a serious form of disrespect. Also, winning a fight was desirable, but not necessary for Native Hawaiian boys to demonstrate their fearlessness. Koa and other Native Hawaiian boys in the study, for example, noted that they occasionally lost fights, especially against older boys, but that they were proud to come back to school ready to fight again. Therefore, gaining respect through violence did not mean being able to win a fight in this study. Boys who lost fights could still earn respect because they showed that they were fearless and willing to confront anyone who tried to dominate them.

Native Hawaiian boys' emphasis of fearlessness and not backing down from conflict seemed to mirror, to a certain degree, long-standing stereotypes that Native Hawaiians were weak, docile, and did not fight for their lands. Fearlessness and symbolically showing that "this is our land still … fight for it," however, were complex. None of the Native Hawaiian boys in the study ever described literally "fighting for their land," though they did say that they would confront anyone who overstepped boundaries "in their land." Keith noted that everyone except Native Hawaiians were "guests" in Hawai'i and should act "accordingly." Predictably, boys who were not Native Hawaiian did not always "act like guests" and were not deferent to Native Hawaiian boys.

Samoan boys in the study were also interested in appearing strong and forceful. In contrast to Native Hawaiian boys, however, they discussed slightly different constructions of their ethnic group. Physical size and physical strength were key points of discussion for Samoan boys who, as noted previously, were well aware of stereotypes about Samoan men being fierce physical combatants. Samoan boys in this study said that they rarely sought out fights, claiming that fights came to them. Marcus, a Samoan student, said, "'cause it's like, like every time we get into a fight, like, we don't start it 'cause other people always want to jump in, they come up to us and they want to fight. But we don't start it." As noted previously, instead of being dismayed by being naturally associated with violence, Samoan youths in this study interpreted common fears about men in their ethnic group as signs of respect. For example, Travis, Erica, and Marcus, three Samoan teens attending the same high school, discussed their responses to perceptions of Samoans:

> Erica: Don't you guys, you hear everywhere, people are like "oh, yeah I got beat up by a big Samoan guy" and they think they're bad, like, and they got beat up!
> Marcus: They think that we're gang people!

Question: What do you guys feel about that?
Travis: I feel pride! Yeah, don't mess with us! We're Samoan!

It is clear in Erica, Marcus, and Travis's conversation that some Samoan boys did not need to seek out fights to earn a tough reputation. While not seeking out fights to prove that they had "nerve" or "juice," some Samoan boys manipulated and played on others' fears of their ethnic group to gain advantages in particular situations. For example, Travis and his male friends frequently capitalized on their thuggish outward personas at school. Calling themselves the "hallway boys," they congregated in the main walkway at school and "stared down" other students who walked by. Travis enjoyed this ritual and described what happened when other students passed his section of the hallway. He said, "Yeah, they like, they'll be with their friends, they all humble. I mean, they come around, they can talk, talk, talk, walk past the aisle, [then] everybody's silent." Stopping their conversations and walking by Travis's peer group in silence was a sign of humility and respect, albeit this type of respect was based on fear of Travis and his social group.

According to Travis and his friends, it was not just students who demonstrated their reverence by walking by their section of the hallway in silence. The "hallway boys" also evoked this type of cowed deference from school administrators:

Marcus: Once in a while, he [the Vice Principal] come around and he say something, and
    we joke back, and then sometime, we take him serious. He irk us out.
Travis: Nah, but when he come by us, he put his head down.
Jonah: Yeah, he jerk his head down.
Marcus: He put his head down and walk right past.

While Travis and his friends admittedly enjoyed it when the Vice Principal walked by their section of the hallway in silence, they also felt targeted by this same school administrator. Whether accurate or not, they believed the targeting was related to their ethnicity. Marcus and Travis explained:

Marcus: We go inside, like, his [the VP's] office, and [the VP] start yelling at us for no
    reason, and he takes, like, the other guys' side. I don't know why? . . . Something
    about us.
Travis: I guess 'cause we Samoan or something.

Travis and his friends believed that the blame and suspicion leveled against them were racially motivated, a perception that can reinforce what Ogbu (1995a, 1995b) termed an "oppositional identity," wherein adolescents can define their identity in juxtaposition to those in established or authority positions. Boys' fearsomeness was indeed a play on stereotypes of their ethnic group and, thus, constituted a type of "oppositional" racial construction in everyday school contexts.

Where the "hallway boys" capitalized on their physical size to "stare down" students and gain respect, other Samoan youths discussed additional means of playing on negative stereotypes of Samoans. As noted previously, some Samoan youths in the

study identified stereotypes that Samoans were ''gang people'' and ''violent punks.'' Consequently, the ''gang people'' and ''violent punk'' labels became a resource to claim a fearsome status for some Samoan boys. Mark and Jonah, who had grown up in a Department of Housing and Urban Development housing project, explained how they capitalized on their association with the ''violence'' and ''gangster'' experiences that mark inner-city or ''ghetto'' life:

> Mark: They [others in school] always think they tough, like in school, walking around, but then, we don't care anymore, 'cause like, where we was growing up and where we grew up and went school, all gangs, and all violent, fighting, people stabbing each other. I grew up in [names housing project].
>
> Jonah: This is nothing compared to what we seen in the ghetto. We were, like, raised in the ghetto.

Native Hawaiian and Samoan boys discussed confronting different negative portrayals of their respective ethnic groups. Native Hawaiian students discussed being defined in large part as people who lost their lands. Native Hawaiian boys in this study also said that they were especially concerned with being called ''dumb,'' ''stupid,'' or ''unaware.'' Many of the Native Hawaiian boys interviewed described seeking out violence as a way to portray themselves as being fearless—not frightened to fight for what was theirs and not willing to be dominated. Their goal was not necessarily to win fights, but to show that they were not afraid of physical contests.

In contrast, Samoan youths noted being stereotyped as threatening so that many Samoan boys said that they did not need to seek out fights to appear tough. Violent acts were not attempts to appear fearless. Instead, Samoan boys played on fears that Samoan boys are ''violent punks'' or ''gang people'' as a way to garner respect. This was done even in subtle ways such as congregating in hallways and staring down students and staff, receiving silent deference from others.

Thus, this study of male youth violence offers several empirical insights. In particular, it highlights the ways in which specific ethnic identities and collective memories associated with colonial legacies shape narratives of violence among the boys in this study. Though the active period of colonization may be decades in the past, consciousness about the past remained salient among most of the youths interviewed, and references to the injustices of the past were often woven into boys' retelling of violent incidents or personal confrontations. In addition, boys' narratives about violence in this study did not just focus on past colonial injustices—including the taking of lands—but boys especially highlighted ways in which they used violence or the threat of violence to define and assert their own identities in the face of colonial legacies. For Native Hawaiian students interviewed, violence or the threat of its use was part of a projected identity as ''fearless,'' while for Samoans interviewed, it was part of a projected identity as ''fearsome.'' Both versions of masculinity incorporated and utilized violence in overall efforts to assert a self-defined identity that remains salient and dynamic.

Conclusion

We began this article by positing that racial oppression is important when examining male violence, and we suggested that a colonial criminology framework might facilitate a deeper inquiry into the role of race in masculinity and violence. We surmised that a colonial theoretical lens could help fill some of the gaps in the theoretical literature that tended to underplay the role of racial oppression and their legacies in male violence. Given our goals, there are several theoretical insights regarding race and race-based discourses, violence, and Pacific Islander boys' identities.

The first theoretical insight offered by this study is that race indeed played a key role in violent masculinities among boys in many ways. Efforts to promote fearless and fearsome personas among Pacific Islander boys were traceable to efforts to shed the colonial tropes of the past—tropes placed on Pacific Islanders as generations of people whose lost control (in varying degrees) of the social, political, and economic landscapes of their everyday lives due to Western colonial intrusion. In the case of Native Hawaiians, adolescents' narratives regarding collective memories of a colonial past focused on lost lands and continuing hardships endured in the United States (i.e., the state of affairs that some boys called the jacked up U.S. system). For Samoans, the lasting legacies of colonialism are traceable to immigration patterns among American Samoans as well as to the historic race-based constructions of Samoans as being brawny, dangerous, and more physical than intellectual. As scholars note (Beirne, 2006), in Western philosophical schemes, being physical, driven by sensations and passions, uneducated, and potentially violent are also seen as qualities that make individuals poor or "unenlightened" citizens. Here, we specifically suggest that continued mythologies about Samoans as being violent, "gangsters," and "punks" are artifacts of Samoan immigration from American Samoa to low-income neighborhoods in Western cities (what some Samoan boys described as the ghetto). The discourse about Samoans as dangerous, brawny, and unintelligent can also be seen as a lasting racialized mythology that helps continue the denial of full citizenship rights to American Samoans who, as members of a U.S. territory, are U.S. nationals and not citizens.[11]

Regarding race and violent masculinities, the colonial criminology framework is appropriate for a more thorough understanding of violent behaviors among youths who live in the shadows of a colonial history. Colonial criminology extends inquiry into the historical referents in narratives of violence in order to probe the collective memories that live on in contemporary times. The exhibition of violence in the expression of a fearless or fearsome identity for Native Hawaiian and Samoan boys (respectively) is more clearly understood in the backdrop of this history. In the case of Native Hawaiian youths interviewed, descriptions of fights and explanations of fighting revealed an acute consciousness about adolescents' colonial past and the high degree to which this collective memory shapes their identity and mediates their interactions with others. Their explanations of why they entered fights included descriptions of efforts to protect their dignity, autonomy, and self-respect. For Native Hawaiian boys, many made references to the dispossession of their ancestral lands. While the themes of fighting for dignity, respect, and autonomy can also be said to

exist within a ''code of the streets'' (Anderson, 1999) or as an expression of violent masculinities among structurally vulnerable males, what is distinct in our study is the lens through which these valued items are seen and the meanings they carry within a longer historical memory of colonial control and takings. Samoan youths in Hawai'i differed, as their lens was not as an indigenous people alienated from ancestral lands in Hawai'i, but as a group that was heavily burdened by continuing negative images— images that were akin to the constructions of Samoans deployed throughout Western imperialism in Samoa. Samoan boys, on one hand, struggled to defy these negative images, yet, on the other, manipulated them when they saw it to their advantage in staking a place for themselves in their settled land.

The second theoretical contribution of this study was that racial subordination can be employed both as general *as well as* ethnic-group-specific systems of social control. We specifically found that a tough brand of masculinity can be achieved in similar and contrasting ways across racial or ethnic groups. The history of U.S. involvement in American Samoa and Hawai'i was quite different, though by the early 1900s Hawai'i and American Samoa were colonized by the same nation-state. But with Samoans in Hawai'i being immigrants to Hawai'i rather than the indigenous group to the land, Samoan boys did not emphasize group entitlements or rights to land in Hawai'i, whereas Native Hawaiian youths placed a high degree of importance on the fact that they were wrongful subjects of conquest and dispossession and articulated the relevance of that particular history to their response to affronts and forms of disrespect that they perceived.

The fact that Native Hawaiian and Samoan boys' violent constructions of masculinity differed attests to the variations in race-based constructions and systems of control deployed in the Pacific. Where Native Hawaiians struggled to prove that they possessed an authoritative and fearless type of masculinity, Samoans did not need to fight to prove that they were tough, dominating, or violently authoritative. Instead, Samoan boys' goal was to manipulate, rather than counter, existing stereotypes about them and use these mythologies to their advantage as much as they could. The variations in the racist tropes used by colonizers also suggest that the types of violent masculine identities asserted by structurally vulnerable males will differ according to the particular race-based discourses and historic mythologies that particular ethnic groups confront. At the same time, the common experience among both Samoans and Native Hawaiians in living with the legacies of colonialism caused members of both ethnic groups to battle for the symbolic resources that colonial discourses had historically sought to destroy in both nations, namely, individuals' sense of dignity and self-determination. Colonial criminology theory provides a useful guide to uncover some of the histories and remaining legacies that help explain both the similarities and the variations, given different geographic contexts and systems of social control.

The third theoretical contribution of this study pertains to the expansion of colonial criminology to include indigenous peoples' efforts to assert a self-defined identity and to counter what they saw as demeaning or oppressive treatment. This stands in contrast to colonial criminologists' tendency to theorize violence and other forms of crime as a form of adaptation to *alienation* resulting from colonial oppression. For example,

Tatum (2000a, 2000b, 2002) describes crime as one of the several responses to alienation, alongside assimilation, and protest. This interpretation tends to view individuals as taking to violence mainly out of estrangement. Narratives of violence by youths in this study did not reveal estrangement as much as engagement in efforts to defend against what is seen as demeaning or disrespectful acts by others, including those of their own racial group. The focus of colonial criminology on the etiology of crime tends to place emphasis on lasting structural effects of colonial control with less attention to the ways in which youths themselves may use violence or the threat of violence to define and assert their own identities to counter legacies of colonial history.

Overall, based on this study, we argue for a colonial criminology framework that focuses more equally on the ways in which youths employ violent masculinities to help define their social identities and to control social dynamics within their immediate realms within larger historical narratives. Messerschmidt's (1993) theory of crime as structured social action is useful here in highlighting the significance of our finding that violence did not appear as a single response to oppression but was better understood as part of a more complex series of multiple oppressions that are embedded in relations of power, with race-based stereotypes being a central focus of this study. Youth employed violence as part of a larger effort to assert an individual and collective identity, especially in the face of negative and demeaning images or stereotypes cast upon them. Just as the legacies of colonialism and multiple apparatuses of social control may affect the etiology and forms of violence, these same legacies influence the ways in which some youths may utilize violence within a larger social practice of counterhegemonic identity formation.

Finally, as a practical tool, analyses employing colonial criminology as well as perspectives of individual and collective identity formation in colonial contexts may also point to possible paths for the healing and rebuilding of a more inclusive and just future in colonial contexts. Tengan (2008), for instance, describes efforts among a group of Native Hawaiian men under the name of Hale Mua who are striving to remake Native Hawaiian male masculinity. The men of Hale Mua fully recognize the history that has led to the demoralization and of many Native Hawaiians, particularly men. They are reconnecting to a proud indigenous past and to traditions that they selectively choose to carry into the future. Efforts such as this to remake a culturally defined sense of self and masculinity that counters the demoralizing tropes from the colonial past is an example of the types of directions that colonial criminology may point us toward. Such efforts at the individual, group, and institutional levels may provide more hopeful and fruitful options for youths like those interviewed who may otherwise continue with violent expressions of masculinity that only garner tighter social control.

Acknowledgments

students and counselors, principals of Seaside and Cleveland High Schools, the project officers at the CDC, and the many affiliated researchers at the API Center. In addition, the authors wish to thank the anonymous reviewers for *Race and Justice* who contributed key insights to this article.

Notes

1. This follows a history of loss in which 80% of the indigenous population of Hawai'i died of Western-imported diseases within less than 50 years after initial Western contact.
2. Explanations of violence within a colonial framework take into account this historic context. In the case of Hawai'i, we consider conflicts related to negative stereotyping and to latent resentment about the colonial past as part of the backdrop confronting the Pacific Islander youths in this study. The pervasiveness of violence in popular culture can also be seen to normalize the use of violence as an accepted form of expression or to exert social control while undermining traditional practices. Assimilationist campaigns, for example, undermined customs and rituals, such as the Native Hawaiian practice of ho'oponopono, which is a form of mediation to "right wrongs" and restore relationships back to a just and balanced state, though efforts continue to promote such practices.
3. In a survey administered to students in the high schools in the study, the vast majority of those surveyed noted that violence includes hitting someone, fighting someone, and physically hurting someone on purpose.
4. The remaining population of Stevens Heights included a diverse cross section of East and South Asian ethnic groups, making Stevens Heights an ethnically diverse neighborhood.
5. The remaining portion of students at Cleveland and Seaside were Japanese, Chinese, Korean, and White.
6. The focus group portion of the study was assisted by several research assistants at the API Center. Corey Adler was a Graduate Research Assistant at the API Center from 2005 to 2008 and organized and facilitated many of the focus groups. The first author was the Principal Investigator for the focus group portion of the study and attended most of the focus groups. The authors offer a heartfelt thank you to all of the many API Center researchers, and especially [names API Center researcher], who assisted in this study.
7. The focus groups included fewer than seven individuals because adults often did not have the time to attend groups. Also, students were often absent from school on the day that focus groups were scheduled.
8. "At-risk" was a generic term to refer to students who were struggling with multiple challenges inhibiting these students' ability to graduate. The challenges that students faced

ranged from frequent fighting, to anger management problems, to being preoccupied with family conflicts and upheavals.

9. We developed two parental consent forms, one for observation of students and one for interviewing students. These 10 students had their parents sign only the observation consent form, thinking that it covered interviews as well.

10. The names of people (in addition to neighborhoods and high schools) associated with this research have been changed to protect participants' confidentiality. Also, we purposely do not offer long descriptions of or quotes from participants that are typical in rich ethnographic descriptions. We do not offer these detailed accounts as an additional way to protect participant confidentiality.

11. Here, we are making a similar argument as many contemporary scholars who outline the role of racism, historic racist institutions, and race-based stereotypes in the contemporary disenfranchisement of African Americans (see Alexander, 2010). Unlike in the United States where African Americans lose the right to vote through mass incarceration, in American Samoa, Samoans are disenfranchised because American Samoa is a U.S. territory.

References

Adler, C. T. (2007). *Fighting, self-reliance and being the bigger man: Native Hawaiian and Samoan girls′ experiences and perceptions of peer violence* (Unpublished thesis). University of Hawaii.

Alexander, M. (2010). *The new Jim Crow: Mass incarceration in the age of colorblindness*. New York, NY: The New Press.

Anderson, E. (1999). *Code of the street: Decency, violence, and the moral life of the inner city*. New York, NY: Norton.

Austin, R. (1983). The colonial model, subcultural theory and intragroup violence. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *11*, 93–104.

Beirne, P. (2006). Free will and determinism? Reading Beccaria's of crimes and punishments (1764) as a test of enlightenment. In S. Henry & M. M. Lanier (Eds.), *The essential criminology reader*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Blaisdell, K., & Mokuau, N. (1994). I Hea Nā Kānaka Maoli? [Whither the Hawaiians?]. *Huili*, *2*, 9–18.

Bond, J. R., & Soli, F. M. (2011). The Samoans. In J. F. McDermott & N. N. Andrade (Eds.), *People and cultures of Hawai'i* (pp. 240–262). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Burawoy, M. (1991). The extended case method. In M. Burawoy, et al. (Eds.), *Ethnography unbound: Power and resistance in the modern metropolis* (pp. 271–287). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Cloward, R. A., & Lloyd, E. O. (1960). *Delinquency and opportunity: A theory of delinquent gangs*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

Cohen, A. K. (1955). *Delinquent boys: The culture of the gang*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

Collins, P. H. (1986). Learning from the outsider within: The sociological significance of Black feminist thought. *Social Problems*, *33*, S14–S32.

Cook, B. P., Tarallo-Jensen, K., & Withy, S. B. (2005). Changes in Kanaka Maoli men's roles and health: Healing the warrior self. *International Journal of Men's Health*, *4*, 115–130.

Crabbe, K. M. (1997). *Hui Kū Haʻaheo men's group: A pilot project for adult Native Hawaiian males utilizing a cultural approach towards healing problems of alcohol/substance abuse and family violence* (Conference program). Honolulu: Hale Naʻau Pono and Hoʻomau Ke Ola.

De Coster, S., & Heimer, K. (2006). Crime at the intersections: Race, class, gender and violent offending. In R. D. Peterson, L. J. Krivo, & J. Hagan (Eds.), *The many colors of crime: Inequalities of race, ethnicity, and crime* (pp. 138–156). New York: New York University Press.

Department of Public Safety. (2008). *2008 annual report*. Honolulu: State of Hawaiʻi.

Dougherty, M. (1992). *To steal a kingdom: Probing Hawaiian history*. Waimanalo, HI: Island Style Press.

Fanon, F. (1963). *The wretched of the earth*. New York, NY: Grove Press.

Fanon, F. (1967). *Black skin, White masks*. New York, NY: Grove Press.

Fine, M. (1991). *Framing dropouts: Notes on the politics of an urban high school*. Albany: SUNY Press.

Fine, M. (1994). Working the hyphens: Reinventing self and other in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The handbook of qualitative research* (1st ed., pp. 70–82). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Fine, M., & Weiss, L. (2005). Compositional studies, in two parts: Critical theorizing and analysis on social (in)justice. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 65–84). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Foley, D., & Valenzuela, A. (2005). Critical ethnography: The politics of collaboration. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 217–234). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Freire, P. (1970/1993). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Continuum.

Fuatagavi, L., & Perrone, P. (2008). *Crime in Hawaiʻi, 2007: A Review of Uniform Crime Reports*. Honolulu: Attorney General, State of Hawaiʻi, Research and Statistics Branch, Crime Prevention and Justice Assistance Division.

Gabbidon, S. L. (2007). *Criminological perspectives on race and crime*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Gabbidon, S. L. (2010). *Race, ethnicity, crime and justice: An international dilemma*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Giddens, A. (1984). *The constitution of society: Outline of the theory of structuration*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. (1967). *Discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago, IL: Aldine.

Hawaiʻi State Department of Education. (2008). *School status and improvement report: School year 2006-07*. Honolulu, HI: System Evaluation and Reporting Section, Systems Accountability Office, Office of the Superintendent.

Hawkins, D. F. (2011). Things fall apart: Revisiting race and ethnic differences in criminal violence amidst a crime drop. *Race and Justice*, *1*, 3–48.

Jones, N. (2010). *Between good and ghetto: African American girls and inner city violence*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Kamauʻu, M. [note: kahakoo over first ʻa']. (1998). Host culture (Guava juice on a tray). *ʻŌiwi: A Native Hawaiian Journal*, *1*, 135–136.

Kameʻeleihiwa, L. (1992). *Native land and foreign desires*. Honolulu, HI: Bishop Museum Press.

Kassebaum, G., Lau, C. W. S., Kwack, D., Leverette, J., Allingham, E., & Marker, N. (1995a). *Identifying disproportionate representation of ethnic groups in Hawaii's juvenile justice system: Phase one*. Honolulu, HI: Center for Youth Research.

Kassebaum, G., Lau, C. W. S., Kwack, D., Leverette, J., Allingham, E., & Marker, N. (1995b). *Identifying disproportionate representation of ethnic groups in Hawaii's juvenile justice system: Phase two*. Honolulu, HI: Center for Youth Research.

Katz, J. (1988). *Seductions of crime: Moral and sensual attractions in doing evil*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Keahiolalo-Karasuda, R. (2010). A genealogy of punishment in Hawaiʻi: The public hanging of chief Kamanawa II. *Hulili, Multidisciplinary Research on Hawaiian Well-Being*, *6*, 147–167.

Linnekin, J. (1991). Ignoble savages and other European visions: The La Pérouse affair in Samoan history. *Journal of Pacific History*, *26*, 3–26.

Matsueda, R. L., Drakulich, K., & Kubrin, C. (2006). Race and neighborhood codes of violence. In. R. D. Peterson, L. J. Krivo, & J. Hagan (Eds.), *The many colors of crime: Inequalities of race, ethnicity, and crime in America* (pp. 334–356). New York: New York University Press.

Mayeda, D. T., Pasko, L., & Chesney-Lind, M. (2006). ʻYou got to do so much to actually make it': Gender, ethnicity and Samoan youth in Hawaiʻi. *AAPI Nexus: Asian Americans & Pacific Islanders Policy, Practice and Community*, *4*, 69–93.

Merry, S. E. (2001). *Colonizing Hawaiʻi: The cultural power of law*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Merton, R. K. (1957). *Social theory and social structure*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

Messerschmidt, J. W. (1986). *Capitalism, patriarchy, and crime: Toward a socialist feminist criminology*. Totowa, NJ: Rowman & Littlefield.

Messerschmidt, J. W. (1991). *Crime as structured action: gender, race, class, and crime in the making*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Messerschmidt, J. W. (1993). *Masculinities and crime: Critique and reconceptualization of theory*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Miller, W. B. (1958). Lower class culture as generating milieu of gang delinquency. *Journal of Social Issues*, *14*, 5–14.

Mullins, C. W., Richard, W., & Jacobs, B. A. (2004). Gender, streetlife and criminal retaliation. *Criminology*, *42*, 911–940.

Ogbu, J. U. (1995a). Cultural problems in minority education: Their interpretations and consequences—Part one: Theoretical background. *Urban Review*, *27*, 189–205.

Ogbu, J. U. (1995b). Cultural problems in minority education: Their interpretations and consequences—Part two: Case studies. *Urban Review*, *27*, 271–297.

Okamura, J. (2008). *Ethnicity and inequality in Hawaiʻi*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Oliver, W. (1984). Black makes and the tough guy image: A dysfunctional compensator adaptation. *Western Journal of Black Studies*, *8*, 199–203.

Roberts, R. E., Phinney, J. S., Masse, L. C., Chen, Y. R., Roberts, C. R., & Romero, A. (1999). The structure of ethnic identity of youth adolescents from diverse ethnocultural groups. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, *19*, 301–322.

Shaw, C. R. (1930). *The jack roller: A delinquent boy's own story*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Shaw, C. R., & McKay, H. D. (1942). *Juvenile delinquency in urban areas*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Silva, N. K. (2004). *Aloha betrayed: Native Hawaiian resistance to American colonialism*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. New York, NY: University of Otago Press.

Smith, L. T. (2005). On tricky ground: Researching the native in the age of uncertainty. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 85–108). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Strauss, A. L. (1987). *Qualitative analysis for social scientists*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Strauss, A. L., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Tatum, B. (2000a). Toward a neocolonial model of adolescent crime and violence. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, *21*, 1–30.

Tatum, B. (2000b). *Crime, violence, and minority youths*. Aldershot, England: Ashgate.

Tatum, B. (2002). The colonial model as a theoretical explanation of crime and delinquency. In S. L. Gabbidon, H. T. Greene, & F. D. Young (Eds.), *African American classics in criminology and criminal justice* (pp. 307–322). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Tengan, T. P. K. (2008). *Native men remade: Gender and nation in contemporary Hawai'i*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Trask, H. (1999). *From a native daughter: Colonialism and sovereignty in Hawai'i*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2000a). *U.S. census*. Retrieved February 24, 2009, from http://www.census.gov/main/www/cen2000.html

U.S. Census Bureau. (2000b). *Aloha counts: Census 2000 special tabulations for Native Hawaiians, State of Hawai'i*. Washington, DC: U.S. Census.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2004). *Population and housing profile: 2000: American Samoa*. Washington, DC: U.S. Census.

U.S. Census Bureau, American Factfinder. (2000c). *QT-P3. Race and Hispanic or Latino: 2000 (Census 2000 Summary File 1 (SF 1) 100-Percent Data)*. Retrieved June 25, 2011, from http://factfinder.census.gov/

Wacquant, L. (2004). *Body and soul: Notebooks of an apprentice boxer*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

West, C., & Zimmerman, D. H. (1987). Doing gender. *Gender & Society*, *1*, 125–151.

Wilkinson, D. L. (2001). Violence events and social identity: Specifying the relationship between respect and masculinity in inner-city youth violence. *Sociological Studies of Children and Youth*, *8*, 235–269.

Wuest, J. (1995). Feminist grounded theory: An exploration of the congruency and tensions between two traditions in knowledge discovery. *Qualitative Health Research*, *5*, 125–137.

Bios

Katherine Irwin, PhD, is an associate professor of sociology at the University of Hawai'i at Manoa. Her research has focused on gender, race/ethnicity, and class inequalities in deviance and delinquency. She has specifically published in the areas of women and drug use, deviant subcultures, girls and delinquency, race and punishment in schools, and delinquency-prevention programming. Her research has appeared in *Qualitative Sociology*, *Symbolic Interaction*, *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, *Sociological Spectrum*, *Critical Criminology*, and *Youth and Society* (among other venues). She has also coauthored a book (with Meda Chesney-Lind) exploring girls' violence and girls' status in the juvenile justice system, titled *Beyond Bad Girls: Gender, Violence, and Hype*.

Karen Umemoto, PhD, is a professor of urban studies at the University of Hawai'i at Manoa, Department of Urban and Regional Planning. Her research focuses on the processes of deliberative democracy and communicative planning in multicultural societies. As Participating Investigator and Director of Training of the Asian and Pacific Islander Youth Violence Prevention Center, her current research focuses on youth violence, ethnic tensions, strategies for violence prevention and intervention, and youth participation in community building. She is the author of *The Truce: Lessons from a Los Angeles Gang War* (2006) and winner of the Western Society of Criminology's 2005 W. E. B. Dubois Award.