

PREFACE

We had planned on devoting this entire issue of the *Philippine Sociological Review* to migration studies, owing to the still continuing interest on the topic. For various reasons, however, we were unable to put together enough articles on it for an issue. Nevertheless, four of the seven papers that comprise this volume deal with migration. The first of these, Andrea Soco's *Changing Discourse on Return Migration: Cosmopolitanism and the Reintegration of Return Filipino Migrant Domestic Workers* was first presented at the Philippine Sociological Society Annual Conference held at the Philippine Social Science Center in October this year. The next three papers, Jorge V. Tigno's *Negotiated Homelands and Long-Distance Nationalism: Serialized Filipino Identity in Japan*, Gisela M. Reiterer's *Filipino Austrians: Transforming Identities and Changing Selfhood under Conditions of Migration*, and Joson A. Lorenzana's *Being Indian in Post-Colonial Metro Manila: Ethnic Identities, Class, Race and the Media* were all presented at the 8th International Conference on Philippine Studies held at the Philippine Social Science Center in July, also this year.

Andrea Soco focuses on migrant domestic workers who have stayed in Britain, Australia, and Hong Kong for over eight years and have returned to, and are attempting to re-integrate with, their (largely rural) households and communities in the Philippines. Based on interviews with domestic workers in Singapore, Soco finds that Filipino domestic workers have acquired and have been able to practice cosmopolitan sensibilities in the countries where they work. This cosmopolitanism, albeit subaltern, are manifested in their consumption of developed-country or urban cultural products, their participation in (middle) class-based leisure activities, and their acquisition of new knowledge and sophisticated skills. They, thus, return to the home country, communities, and culture with, to a certain extent, a transformed identity. But they find that there are limitations to their practice of cosmopolitanism in the home country which, to some extent, has also changed. Soco, thus, analyzes the concept of cosmopolitanism based on how domestic workers themselves construct their experiences, how they express their agency. She argues and finds that cosmopolitan behavior cannot be fully practiced, nor cosmopolitan identities be easily transplanted, in the home country; constrained by place, cosmopolitanism has to be negotiated. In this process, they employ cosmopolitan skills, suggesting that they are

incorporating knowledge they have acquired from the countries where they worked in their attempt to reintegrate with their community. Soco concludes then that cosmopolitanism is a conceptual tool that could be “a key in understanding the migrants’ construction of self and their reconstruction of relationships upon returning to the home country.”

While Soco deals with re-making home after some home-making abroad, **Jorge V. Tigno** focuses on “making home away from home.” In particular, he looks at how long-term Filipino migrants or permanent residents in Japan “replicate the habits and practices in their home country” and how they negotiate “what it means to be Filipino in the new country.” He terms this process of negotiation “long-distance nationalism” whereby Filipinos are able to maintain “meaningful connections with the home country.” On the other hand, he refers to “the reproduction of myths and national memories” of the homeland “outside the ‘homeland,’” *serialization of identity*. He describes and analyzes “four areas of practical and everyday social and political life ... which are reproduced and serialized in Japan” by Filipinos. These are “Catholic religiosity, *sari-sari* commerce, Tagalog discourse and attitudes toward Filipino citizenship . . .” The serialization and reproduction of Filipino identity in religious terms is manifested in attendance (albeit irregular) at performances of church rituals (e.g., mass). “Going through the motions of . . . ceremonies . . . becomes the *sine qua non* of being Filipino.” Filipino religiosity can also be observed at special Filipino group activities such as Independence Day celebrations which are marked by prayers and/or the celebration of a mass. Finally, the *manang*, an icon of Filipino religiosity, is reproduced in Japan, although now she is dressed not in drab brown but in designer clothes and accessories, and dyed blonde hair. Filipino identity in Japan is also serialized through *sari-sari* commerce, although the *sari-sari* store is now located inside buildings with air-conditioning, cushioned seats, and, where customers, rather than serving themselves, are waited on. But other features are reproduced as they are in the home country: food selections are made by pointing, “credit is selectively extended,” and customers are not issued receipts for their purchases.

The serialization of Filipino identity in Japan, according to Tigno, is also expressed through the use of a Filipino language, primarily Tagalog or Taglish. Thus, Filipino migrants speak Tagalog and Taglish in Japan “even as they are also able to speak and understand pure English and Japanese.” Thus, majority of “adult Filipinos in Japan are able to reassert their Filipinoness by retaining

their facility at least with Tagalog.” However, many “younger Filipino-Japanese children are excluded from this linguistic discourse.” Consequently, they “are excluded from the social and cultural terrain that knowledge of Tagalog would allow,” including “participation in Filipino congregation activities.”

Finally, Filipinos in Japan assert their Filipinoness by retaining their Philippine citizenship, although they may for various reasons possess a second or even a third passport. It is interesting to note that, unlike Filipino migrants to countries in the global north, Filipinos in Japan do not actively seek the acquisition of Japanese citizenship, for which Tigno offers three reasons. The first is that Filipinos are in Japan for economic reasons and it is not in their best interest “to seek out official political membership.” “Stringent immigration and naturalization procedures” also discourage Filipinos from acquiring Japanese citizenship. Finally, retention of their citizenship is a way Filipinos by which they re-assert their Filipinoness. Tigno concludes his paper by arguing that Filipinos have internalized “a social program . . . in their place of origin. This internal program is what eventually impacts upon their lives as they stay in their new places of residence.”

Similar to Tigno’s exploration of how Filipinos negotiate their Filipinoness in Japan, **Gisela M. Reiterer** analyzes how Filipinos deal with the everyday realities of living as migrants in Austria – in the paper *Filipino Austrians: Transforming Identities and Changing Selfhood under Conditions of Migration*. Reiterer begins by contrasting two “waves” of Filipino migration to Austria: the first wave in the late 1960s/early 1970s and the second wave consisting of Filipinos who left for Austria more recently, i.e., from the mid-1970s. Reiterer notes that the first wave of Philippine migration to Austria was a response to the need of Austria for workers. However, unlike workers from other countries, those recruited from the Philippines were skilled – primarily health personnel such as nurses and therefore – gendered. As there were few Filipino men in Austria at this time, many of these Filipino nurses married native Austrians. They adapted well to Austrian life and acquired Austrian citizenship. Although the recruitment of skilled health personnel continued until the mid-1980s, starting in the mid-1970s Filipino migration to Austria became more diverse. And less favorable labor market conditions force more recent migrants to take up employment far below their expectations. Thus, even if they possessed university degrees, they often land in menial occupations. They however, Reiterer notes, “face more favorable social conditions” compared to the early migrants as they now have these

early migrant relatives who can provide them with “emotional security.” There now too are Filipino associations that offer spaces for socializing as well and Filipino priests and religious functionaries who attend to their spiritual needs. Still, Reiterer rightly observes, migration always poses a challenge to individual persons and she presents case studies that describe in detail the migration experiences of four Filipinos from the different “waves” and from different generations. The challenge posed by migration is particularly acute among second generation immigrants. For, “while the first generation immigrants still talk about *their* Philippines and identify much more with the Philippines than with Austria, for the second generation it is already *their* Austria.”

The fourth paper dealing with migration in this volume focuses not on Filipinos who have returned to the home country nor with Filipinos living in other countries, but on foreigners who have come to live in this country. **Jozon A. Lorenzana**, in *Being Indian in Post-Colonial Metro Manila: Ethnic Identities, Class, Race and the Media*, looks at the experiences of people of Indian origin, particularly on the identity formations of young people or second and even third generation members of the Indian diaspora, not in a country of the global north but in the south – that is, as indicated in the paper’s title, Metro Manila. Lorenzana asks two major questions: “What does it mean to be Indian in Metro Manila?” and “How do the media . . . contribute to the meanings of being Indian?” Much of the data for his study come from interviews with five males and five females aged 19 to 24 who are children of first generation Indian or have Indian-Filipino parents and belong to middle- or upper-class households. Lorenzana argues—and finds—that these young adult Indians claim multiple affiliations (Filipino, Punjabi, Sikh, half-Filipino, half-Indian, one-fourth-Spanish, etc.) but they “tend to position themselves based on class and gender. . . ethnic affiliations intersect with class and gender positions.” Joson also asserts that the symbolic context in which these identities are formed are influenced by commercial media. “Local entertainment media reinforce stereotypical images of Indian men”—e.g. *bumbay*—that promote distinctions between members of the diaspora” – Sindhis, Punjabis, etc. On the other hand, global entertainment media that broadcast shows such as beauty pageants, can make inclusion particularly of women of the diaspora into Philippine society easier. Lorenzana cites how the airing of the Miss Universe beauty pageant where an Indian (Bengali) won the title resulted in a positive change in the Filipino’s perception of Indian women. Finally, Lorenzana suggests that in addition to the intersections among ethnicity, class, and gender, the way young adult Indians in Metro Manila locate their identities

are influenced by several other “contextual factors like class dynamics in the homeland and Philippine society, historical processes like colonization, the migration histories and trajectories of Indian immigrants, and class/gendered nature of the Indian diaspora” itself.

Children Watching Children: How Filipino Children Represent and Receive News Images of Suffering, is one of the two papers in this volume not dealing with migration. In this piece, **Jonathan C. Ong** explores “how children relate with distant others in the context of mediation, specifically, through the mediation forged by the narrative of news.” He investigates “how children express perceptions of otherness in relation to distant suffering children that they encounter in global and local television news.” And from the images that children drew, he delves into “children’s knowledge about suffering others: how they imagine the problems of children . . . and how they learn about them . . .” Put in another way, Ong investigates selected Filipino children’s perception of “their others,” asking who these others are, “who they consider ‘better’ or ‘more worthy’ . . . and how they develop feelings of trust, care, and fear from watching the news.” In exploring the representations made by children and their “reception of otherness,” Ong uses the concept of *proper distance* whereby he categorizes children’s talk as either *too close*, *too far*, or *both close and far* – that is, respectively, their talk “subsumes the suffering Other and denies their difference . . . sees them beyond care and identification and asserts irreconcilable difference . . . have some elements of both . . .”

For his study, Ong chose a limited, purposively chosen sample of 15 male and female children, aged 9 to 12, from middle-class and working class households. The children were divided into two groups (working-class and middle-class) and interviewed each in a focus group session lasting an hour and fifteen minutes. The children were asked to draw and talk about their drawings and then they were asked “to talk about their representations of suffering children in the news.” Based on the data collected, Ong finds that children “engage with suffering;” that is, suffering is part of their daily life. Their engagement with suffering, however, differs according to class and “proper distance.” Children’s ideas of distant suffering are also varied. “It is nearby and faraway, mediated and immediate, eventful and . . . banal.” Finally, children too have varied ideas about the images of distant suffering presented to them; they can be “utilitarian” . . . “worriers” . . . “combative.” Ong concludes that adults “seem to reinforce among children the despair of

distance." Children acquire their perceptions "from exposure to media representations and . . . from parents' media talk in the heart of home."

The other non-migration paper in this issue is **Chester A. Arcilla's** *If I Were In Her Shoes, I Would Doubtless Be And Talk Like Her: Methodological Reflections on Bourdieu and Testimonio*. As the title itself indicates, is a methodological paper. Testimonio is a form of oral history, a story told from a personal perspective. It is different from other kinds of personal history in that the *testimonio* is always told from a position of subalternity, of marginality. Intellectuals have, however, questioned the historical validity of the method. Thus, from the perspective of traditional historical methodology, the picture that *testimonio* paints is incomplete and insufficient. The paper discusses these debates (validity versus memory and ideology) surrounding the testimonio. It then explores "the possibility of indeed uniting the activist intellectual with the subaltern." Arcilla sees this possibility in Bourdieu's theory on the intellectual and scientific sociology which suggest that "the cultural and symbolic capital of the intellectual (be) lent to the narrator so that the bourgeois public may listen to the silenced voices. " But doing this results in a limitation – objectification, to limit which, "the researcher must reflexively engage the testimonio in a manner that aims to understand rather than evaluate."

Finally, **Virginia A. Miralao's** essay *A Reflection on Social Transformations and Social Institutions*, was delivered as one of the addresses at the plenary session, *Transformation of Social Institutions: Processes, Reflections and Narratives*, which opened the 2008 PSS Annual Conference (at which Andrea Soco also presented her paper). The conference organizers invited noted sociologists—in addition to Dr. Miralao—Gelia T. Castillo, Mercedes B. Concepcion, and Maria Cynthia Rose B. Bautista) to this session to talk about their training, work, and practice as sociologists – from whom the organizers believed younger sociologists could learn much. Thus, in this transcription of her address, Dr. Miralao reflects and presents her views on her work on societal transformations and social institutions, injecting into it a narrative of her own personal journey as a social scientist, over the last forty five years.