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This study investigated the relationship between ethnic identity, colonial mentality and parenting style in Filipino-Americans who were also parents. Parenting style was determined by the Parental Authority Questionnaire – Revised (PAQ-R) and participants were categorized into one of three categories based on their mean scores on this measure: authoritarian, authoritative and permissive. Ethnic identity, which was defined as a person’s level of exploration of and commitment to their culture, was measured using the Multi-Ethnic Identity Measure – Revised (MEIM-R). Colonial mentality, which was defined as a form of internalized oppression formed out of a
country’s history of colonization, was measured using the Colonial Mentality Scale (CMS).

The sample consisted of 95 Filipino-American adults who lived in the United States and had at least one child, ranging in age from 28-72 years old. Participants were recruited and measures were administered via the Internet. The relationship between parenting styles and ethnic identity was analyzed using independent samples t-tests. The relationship between colonial mentality and ethnic identity was also analyzed using an independent samples t-test. The effect of colonial mentality on the relationship between ethnic identity and parenting style was analyzed using a multiple regression. In addition, the demographic variable, generation level, was analyzed using non-parametric tests.

Contrary to the hypotheses of this study, there was only one significant relationship between the variables of interest. That is, there was a significant difference in level of ethnic identity among authoritative versus authoritarian parents; specifically authoritative parents demonstrated stronger ethnic identity than authoritarian parents. It was also hypothesized that authoritative parents would have stronger ethnic identity than permissive parents, however this hypothesis was unable to be tested, as the sample did not include any parents who were categorized as permissive, based on the PAQ-R. There was no significant relationship between colonial mentality and ethnic identity. Furthermore, statistical analysis found that colonial mentality did not have an effect on the relationship between parenting style and ethnic identity. No significant differences were found in parenting style based on generation level.
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The paucity of literature on the Filipino-American population, compared to other Asian-American sub-groups (e.g., Korean-American, Chinese-American, Japanese-American), perhaps is related to the uniqueness of Filipino culture and more specifically, the immigration experience of Filipinos to the United States. In addition, due to the uniqueness of Filipino history, it is erroneous for multicultural researchers to classify Filipino-Americans in the “umbrella” group of Asian-Americans, as they are distinct in several aspects including language (i.e., general knowledge of English, which is the Philippine national language) and religion (i.e., the majority of Filipino-Americans are Catholic). Historically, the most significant events defining Filipino culture were the colonization periods by Spain and subsequently, the United States. The effect of these colonizing cultures on the indigenous/traditional Filipino has a defining influence on Filipino-American psychology.

This study aims to examine the relationship between unique aspects of selfhood and the major life experience of parenting among a minority infrequently studied in the literature, Filipino-Americans. For minority individuals, one’s personal identity is tied to ethnic identity. The development of ethnic identity is a process that involves exploration of one’s own culture and commitment, or feelings of belonging, to that culture. Exploration and commitment grow out of life experiences, including family dynamics, milestones such as attending college, and relationships with others. While life experiences contribute to one’s ethnic identity, a phenomenon known as colonial mentality is a unique psychological process that is similar to the notion of internalized
racism. David and Okazaki (2006) developed a scale to measure colonial mentality in Filipino Americans and related this mentality to psychological disorders, such as depression. The authors define colonial mentality as a “specific form of internalized oppression following colonialism” and that this phenomenon can “potentially explain the high rates of mental health problems among Filipino Americans (p. 241).” The Philippines as a nation was colonized multiple times in their history by both Spain and the United States. Based on this colonization, Filipino-Americans may have the potential to develop negative feelings towards their native culture. The idea of colonial mentality may be manifested in several ways including feelings of shame or inferiority about being a person of Filipino heritage, feeling that anything Filipino is inferior to anything American, discrimination against Filipinos who have not embraced the American culture and appear less American, and tolerating oppression (David and Okazaki, 2006).

The literature on ethnic identity establishes that it is a multi-faceted construct that is affected by one’s life experiences. Moreover, it is comprised of aspects of personal identity and group identity. Phinney (2007) describes ethnic identity developing out of two essential processes: exploration (i.e., making the effort to learn and understand the ethnic group to which one belongs) and commitment (i.e., clearly defined feelings of belonging to one’s group, along with positive feelings and pride). She proposes that individuals fall into four categories of ethnic identity status, with varying degrees of exploration and commitment. The least mature status, termed diffuse, involves little or no efforts at exploration and hence, no commitment to one’s ethnic group and the most mature status, termed achieved, is characterized by efforts to explore one’s culture and develop commitment based on those efforts at exploration. The intermediate statuses
include the *foreclosed* status, which is essentially commitment without exploration and the *moratorium* status, which is exploration without commitment.

Ethnic identity is not a static experience. It changes over time and one's life experiences contribute to its development. Most of the research conducted on ethnic identity development has been done with adolescents, while other studies have related ethnic identity to overall adjustment or to the development of depression. An interesting question arises with respect to how ethnic identity affects later life experiences, such as parenting. Parenting styles have been studied extensively in the literature. Baumrind (1971) proposes three distinct parenting styles: Authoritarian, Permissive, and Authoritative. Authoritarian parents typically highly value obedience. Baumrind (1971) characterizes these parents as detached and less warm, and note that their style is mostly directive. Permissive parents are the clear opposite of the authoritarian parent in that they prefer to not control and rarely use punishment. The authoritative parent is perhaps the happy medium between both styles; this parent provides clear guidelines and is able to discipline while still exuding warmth and acceptance. Interestingly, little research has been conducted on the relationship between parenting styles/practices and ethnic identity. It is generally agreed, however, that ethnic identity is transmitted from parent to child, as much of ethnic identity development begins with how a child perceives his parent(s)' level of ethnic identity. Belsky (1984) proposed that parenting style develops out of three factors, parents' psychological resources, child characteristics, and external sources of stress such as, marital relations, social support, occupational growth, etc. While several studies have examined the role of acculturation and parenting style, most focus on the
outcome effects for the child (e.g., academically, emotionally, etc.) and not on how these styles develop in the first place.

In addition, while research has been conducted on the concept of colonial mentality and internalized oppression, it is difficult to separate this variable from one's ethnic identity. Perhaps colonial mentality is a better predictor of parenting style than ethnic identity or perhaps the two concepts are related. Does colonial mentality (i.e., internalized oppression) have an effect on how one parents or the values they attempt to pass on to their children? David and Okazaki (2006) discuss potential correlations between colonial mentality and the concepts of acculturation and collective self-esteem (i.e., how positively one evaluates their social group), such that there is perhaps an inverse relationship between colonial mentality and collective self-esteem, and that colonial mentality is related to or similar to marginalization in the acculturation literature (i.e., not identifying with either the dominant or native culture).

Thus, this study will examine the relationship between both ethnic identity and colonial mentality and parenting style, and ethnic identity and colonial mentality. Furthermore, demographic factors such as religion, generation level, and socio-economic status will also be taken into consideration and explored.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Filipino-Americans

The 2000 United States Census reported 2,364,815 Filipino-Americans in the United States, the second-largest Asian sub-group with only 300,000 less people than the largest, Chinese population. Furthermore, the Filipino population is growing at a faster rate than any other Asian-American group. A once small part of the U.S. population is now becoming a prevalent component of the cultural face of the country. Filipino culture, like its other Asian-American counterparts, is unique and diverse and their large presence in this country demands a closer look at the history, people, and culture.

The Philippine Islands were colonized by Spain in 1521. Thus, while a pacific island nation, Filipino history is rooted in Spanish culture and customs. Consequently, Filipino culture is rich in both traditional island traditions and a European Spanish influence. More recently, because of United States colonization, Filipino culture has evolved into a very Western culture. Yet, because of geography, Filipinos are characterized as Asian. To apply Asian models of culture and identity to Filipinos is erroneous and does not take into account the cultural history of the group. Conversely, applying models of Spanish culture or Latino culture ignore the fact that the Philippines is an Asian country and influenced by Asian culture. Bautista (1988) reports that there are 65 distinct ethnic groups and cultural minorities with the Philippines alone leading many to propose Filipinos be categorized as a separate ethnic group. Pido (1997) compares the three major groups of Asian immigrants to the United States (Chinese, Japanese, and Filipinos) and highlighted several issues specifically relevant to Filipinos.
For example, Filipinos were the only groups that had a long colonial experience, they were the last to immigrate to the United States, and Filipinos had the lowest socioeconomic status, according to the most recent U.S. censuses.

A clear understanding of the Filipino-American experience is essential in understanding mental health problems facing Filipino-Americans today. Prior to being colonized by Spain, historical records demonstrate that Filipinos had their own culture that was influenced by their geographic neighbors (China, Malay, Indonesia, and Asian Indians), including customs, arts, religion, and government (Tompar-Tiu & Sustento-Seneriches, 1995). Chinese influence can be found in Filipino language, cooking, and dress. Asian Indian influences can be found in language, architecture, and dress as well. The early Filipino agricultural society was essentially a caste system divided into three classes: nobles, freemen, and dependents. Prior to colonization, the government was called the barangay, and led by a chieftain. Each barangay was composed of thirty to 100 families. Early religion was based on respect for ancestors, nature, and animals. The most significant result of the Philippines' colonization by Spain in 1521 was the conversion of the natives to Catholicism; the individual barangays were grouped into religious communities. The first Philippine Republic was founded in 1896 following a revolt by the Filipinos against the Spaniards in response to forced labor, unjust taxation, and political suppression (Tomar-Tiu & Sustento-Seneriches, 1995). As a by-product of the Spanish-American war, Spain ceded the Philippines to the United States for $20 million. United States rule brought public education to the Philippines. All citizens, regardless of social class, were given the opportunity to attain higher education. During this time, Filipinos embraced American culture and craved American goods. America
was the land of freedom and the “Filipino dream” of emigrating to the United States was born. During the first wave of Filipino immigration, from 1763-1906, the “Manilamen,” Filipino laborers forced to work on Spanish ships escaped the Spaniards, jumped ship in Acapulco, and settled in Louisiana. It was during this wave that domestic helpers, steamship crew members, stowaways, and mariners immigrated from the Philippines to the United States. In the second wave, from 1906-1934, mostly single, uneducated men from rural areas immigrated and most settled in Hawaii, where they were recruited as sugar plantation laborers. Filipinos also worked on railroads, as miners, cannery workers, and domestic helpers. It was during this wave that the term, “brown monkey” was born. From 1945-1965, the immigrants consisted primarily of war veterans, military personnel and their families, students, and professionals. The fourth wave began in 1965 and continues until today. The number of Filipinos coming into the United States grew almost exponentially and professionals from the medical and dental field, engineers, teachers, and students, as well as family members eager to reunite with one other, entered on student, business, tourist, and fiancé visas.

Spirituality is an important aspect of Filipino culture. In the Philippines, 85% of the population is Roman Catholic, while the remainder of the population is Protestant, Independent Aglipayan (the Philippine Independent Church), Muslim, Iglesia Ni Cristo (Church of Christ), Church of the Latter Day Saints, and Jehovah’s Witnesses (Burgonio-Watson, 1997). Spirituality among Filipinos, however, involves more than religion. In fact, Burgonio-Watson notes, “A spiritual value that is most common to most, if not all, Filipinos is the value of community life. The extended family is the most basic community (p. 328).” The author discusses the issues that Filipino immigrants face when
coming to the United States: the loss of extended family and basic community, hence the loss of an essential spiritual value. One way of coping with the loss of community is the spiritual value of hospitality. Burgonio-Watson (1997) proposes that the ideas of hospitality and generosity stems from Judaic-Christian influence and is another essential component of spirituality among Filipinos. She discusses hospitality as the manifestation of community membership, such that hospitality is “lived out in the community (p. 330).”

As one struggles with issues of acculturation and immigration, the idea of being hospitable to those around you becomes unclear and the potential for generosity and hospitality may become cut-off, or the opportunities for hospitality to be given or taken in the community are few and far between.

Because of the important role spirituality plays in the lives of Filipino-Americans, they often turn to their spiritual communities for guidance, rather than seeking professional mental health services. Cimmarusti (1996) conducted a survey of Filipino-American adults in Chicago and found that 39% of the respondents had experienced some sort of problem assimilating into American culture, 32% had problems communicating with their children, 25% experienced a drug or alcohol problem with their children, 20% had a child drop out of school, and 33% experienced a clash between American and Filipino values which resulted in family conflict (p. 205). However, there is a disparity between the mental health problems reported and Filipino-Americans use of mental health services. Area agencies reported few or no Filipino-American clients yet 80% of the respondents in this study reported that they would seek help provided by the Filipino-American community or by clinicians sensitive to Filipino culture.
In 1990, a study was conducted to obtain information on the depressive symptomatology and psychosocial profiles of clinical depressed and non-depressed Filipino-Americans (Tompar-Tiu & Sustento-Senriches, 1995). According to Sue and Morishima (1982), Filipino-Americans are one of the high-risk groups for mental disorders because their social indicators (e.g., socio-economic status) are lower than Japanese or Chinese Americans. Participants (n = 345) were recruited from inpatient and outpatient clinics in the San Francisco Bay Area. Assignment into the “depressed” group was based on meeting the criteria for Major Depressive Disorder according to the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders Third Edition, Revised (American Psychiatric Association, 1987). The study’s initial findings indicated that the prevalence rate in the San Francisco Bay area Filipino community (27.3%) was higher that in the U.S. general adult population (16.2%) (Tompar-Tiu & Sustento-Seneriches, 1995). Upon examination, the participants were separated into clinical depressed (n = 110) and non-depressed (n = 78). Various stressors were divided into nine categories and identified as significantly different between the clinically depressed and non-depressed groups. The most common stressors that the authors found to be causes of depression were geographical separation or alienation from family and financial problems.

Ethnic Identity

Ethnic identity is a type of group identity that involves the sense of belonging to an ethnic group. According to Phinney and Ong (2007), ethnic identity is a continuous phenomenon that is not static; rather, its development begins in adolescence and changes over time based on one’s life experiences. The components of ethnic identity are varied and may include one’s feelings of belonging, cultural values and heritage, as well as
traditions such as language. Phinney and Ong (2007) distinguish the study of ethnic identity from racial identity by noting that in the literature, racial identity has focused primarily on responses to racism and that the research on the subject has focused primarily on Black and White samples (usually college students), while ethnic identity studies have focused on a variety of ethnic groups, usually in adolescence.

In their research, Phinney and Ong (2007) explored the components that contribute to one’s ethnic identity in order to develop a reliable and valid measure to assess this phenomenon. The first component of ethnic identity is labeling oneself and represents the foundation for a sense of belonging. For example, a Filipino-American may label herself as Filipina, Filipina-American, Pacific Islander, or even Asian-American. One’s “label” is influenced by the environmental context as well as by the perceptions of others, and this label can change over time and according to different situations. Phinney and Ong (2007) also state, “The category or label itself is of less importance psychologically than the meaning of the category for the individual (p. 272).”

According to Phinney and Ong (2007), the most important component of ethnic identity is known as commitment or a sense of belonging. Commitment refers to attachment to ethnic identity and can be influenced by identification with parents or friends. Commitment does not necessarily relate to a well-developed ethnic identity or mature worldviews. There are different types of commitment, with the ideal form relating to one’s actual understanding of self and overall achievement of an identity that is informed by self-awareness and exploration versus a “foreclosed” commitment which indicates a “blind” commitment to one’s identity without fully understanding its roots or the consequences of the commitment. Related to the notion of commitment is that of
exploration. In the development of ethnic identity, a great deal of exploration occurs in the form of learning about culture (e.g., attending family events, cultural experiences, reading books, etc.). Phinney and Ong (2007) assert that without exploration, one’s commitment may be “less secure and more subject to change with new experiences (p. 272).”

Other components of ethnic identity include values and beliefs as well as ethnic behaviors. Values/beliefs and ethnic behaviors vary across cultures and according to Phinney and Ong (2007), may be best understood as separate constructs from ethnic identity. The authors state, “Greater clarity can be obtained by assessing separately one’s values and one’s sense of belonging...Research results are likely to be parsimonious if ethnic behaviors are included as discrete measures in studies of ethnic identity, so that results can be analyzed separately, to distinguish the implications of identity per se and the associated behaviors (p. 272-3).” That is, one’s ethnic behaviors or ethnic values, while related to ethnic identity, may not contribute to ethnic identity development. Other influential factors include evaluation and in-group attitudes, importance and salience, and national (American) identity. Evaluation and in-group attitudes refer to one’s positive or negative feelings about the ethnic group to which they belong. In addition, although most people have achieved some form of ethnic identity in adulthood, continuous exploration can continue to occur.

**Ethnic Identity Development**

Based on the components discussed above and using a developmental model of ego identity formation developed by Marcia (1980), Phinney (2007) describes two essential processes of ethnic identity development (exploration and commitment) and
using these processes, has outlined four statuses of ethnic identity, each with varying degrees of both exploration and commitment. As discussed, exploration involves efforts to learn about a group’s history, beliefs, values and “the implications of ethnic group membership, such as positive and negative aspects of one’s group (p. 479).” The other essential process, commitment, describes one’s feelings of belonging to one’s ethnic group and includes positive attitudes and pride. A sense of commitment, involves an understanding that commitment carries with it a set of problems, such as discrimination, yet still feeling comfortable being a group member.

The least mature status of ethnic identity is known as the diffuse status, and is characterized by a lack of both commitment and exploration. That is, a person who lives with a diffuse status does not demonstrate an understanding of his/her ethnicity and furthermore, makes little to no effort to explore it further (through reading, attending cultural events, etc.). Hence, this person also lacks commitment in that he/she demonstrates little to no positive feelings of belonging or pride in their ethnic group. The next identity status is known as the foreclosed status. At this level, an individual demonstrates a sense of commitment, however this commitment is not achieved through exploration or efforts at gaining understanding about one’s ethnic group. Usually, individuals who fall into this category acquire their sense of commitment from parents or other authority figures in their lives. The next stage is somewhat the opposite of the foreclosed status, and is what Phinney (2007) terms the moratorium status [also derived from Marcia’s (1980) ego identity development statuses]. Individuals who operate at this status demonstrate exploration, but have not yet achieved commitment. They are making efforts to understand their ethnicity, however they have not yet developed a sense of
belonging to their group or other positive feelings such as pride. As Phinney (2007) states, individuals who are in the moratorium status “remain unclear about it [ethnicity] or express ambivalence about belonging to the group (p. 479).” Lastly, the most mature status of ethnic identity is simply known as achieved, implying that one has achieved the highest level of ethnic identity through a combination of both exploration and commitment. At this level, individuals have made an effort to both learn about and understand what it means to belong to their ethnic group and using that knowledge, have developed a solid sense of commitment to their group.

Numerous authors have developed models of Asian-American identity development. However two of the most widely used models of identity include one model based on Japanese-American women (Kim, 1981) and the other based on a sample of Asian-American college students, with no differentiation between specific ethnic groups (Suinn, Ahuna, & Khoo, 1992). Nadal (2004) proposed a F/Pilipino American Identity Development Model that takes into account the complexity of Filipino Americans with the hypothesis that “F/Pilipino Americans will experience a different ethnic identity development than their Asian counterparts. An ethnic identity model must be applied that is distinct from that used with any other ethnic group (p. 52).” This six-stage model starts with Stage 1 (Ethnic Awareness) which is usually long-lasting and positive in terms of attitudes toward one’s self and others. Stage 2 (Assimilation to Dominant Culture) is characterized by negative and deprecating attitudes towards one’s self, ethnic, and racial group and positive appreciative attitudes toward the dominant/White group. Stages 3 (Social Political Awakening) and 4 (Panethnic Asian American Consciousness) are both characterized by positive attitudes ranging from
appreciation to acceptance to one’s self, Filipinos, other Asians, and other minority
groups while having negative and discriminatory attitudes towards the dominant/White
group. Stage 5 (Ethnocentric Realization) is the stage in which Filipino-Americans
realize their marginalization. This stage is usually triggered by a positive or negative
event, which leads to Stage 6 (Incorporation) in which the White culture ceases to be
blamed and the individual achieves “ethnocentric realization (p. 53, Nadal, 2004).” The
model emphasizes attitudes towards other Asian Americans as well as other minorities as
unique to the development of a Filipino American’s ethnic identity.

Kim (1981) proposed similar stages of ethnic identity development in Japanese-
Americans. Her model starts in childhood with the ethnic awareness stage, which comes
out of the child’s family members serving as the salient ethnic group model. In the next
stage, the White Identification stage, school-aged children begin to be influenced by their
peers and the child begins to understand his/her difference from the dominant culture,
leading to a desire to identify more with White culture. The next stage in Kim’s model
(1981) is known as the Awakening to Social Political Consciousness stage, and arises out
of increased political awareness and consequently an understanding of oppression and
oppressed groups. In the Redirection stage, one develops a renewed connection with
one’s Asian American culture. In this stage, Kim states that this renewed connection is
often followed by the realization that White oppression is responsible for one’s negative
experiences of racism. Concurrently, there is an increase in group pride. The most
advanced stage in this model, which correlates with Phinney’s Achieved status discussed
above, is termed the Incorporation stage and includes development of positive Asian-
American identity as well as respect for other cultures. Most importantly, in this stage, identification with or against White culture is no longer a prevailing issue.

Atkinson, Morten, and Sue (1989) discuss a similar model of racial/cultural identity development. The authors note, "In the past several decades, Asian Americans, Hispanics, and American Indians have experienced sociopolitical identity transformations so that a Third World consciousness has emerged, with cultural oppression as the common unifying force (p. 345)." Based on this, Atkinson et. al. (1989) developed a model that incorporates this issue into development of ethnic identity. Each of the five stages is characterized by attitudes towards the following: self, others of the same minority, others of a different minority, and the dominant (White) group. Briefly, the first stage of this model is known as the conformity stage. In this stage, individuals are depreciating towards themselves (i.e., negative feelings) possibly based on the dominant perception of their physical and cultural characteristics as inferior or a minority, and towards others of the same minority. They are appreciating of the dominant group, as this stage is often defined by the desire to be part of the dominant group because it is perceived as superior, and have discriminatory and/or neutral feelings towards others of a different minority, because usually individuals in this stage want to align themselves with the dominant society. In the second stage, known as dissonance and appreciating, conflict arises towards all the areas (appreciating and depreciating feelings), including self, others of the same minority, others of a different minority, as well as the dominant group. During this time, individuals begin to become aware of the existence of racism, and may also begin to realize the positive aspects of their culture. In the third stage, labeled resistance and immersion, one begins to appreciate him/herself as well as towards
others of the same minority group. In discussion of this model, Sue and Sue (2008) state, “The minority individual at this stage is oriented toward self-discovery of one’s own history and culture (p. 222).” In this stage, one begins to develop feelings of culturocentrism, and they are conflicted between feelings of empathy for other minority groups. Lastly, it is in this stage that one develops group-depreciating feelings towards the dominant group, and begins to view it as the oppressor. In the introspection stage, Atkinson et. al. (1998) note that one begins to look inward at the basis for self-appreciating feelings towards one’s own group and group-depreciating feelings for the dominant group. Sue and Sue (2008) state, “The individual begins to discover that this level of intensity of feelings (anger directed toward White society) is psychologically draining and does not permit one to really devote more crucial energies to understanding themselves or to their own racial-cultural group (p. 224).” In the final stage, integrative awareness, one integrates the feelings that have developed and changed over time, resolves the conflicts between feelings, and begins to develop feelings of self-worth and self-confidence. Tolerance and empathy towards one’s own minority group as well as to others take place, and the dominant group is viewed as selectively flawed and that “White people are also victims who are also in need of help (Sue and Sue, 2008).”

Similar to other theories of ethnic identity, Atkinson et. al.’s (2008) emphasizes that development of ethnic identity is a process that involves self-awareness and the ability to sift through one’s experiences of discovery, racism, and basic day-to-day interactions in order to discover where one fits in the world.
Parenting

Baumrind (1971) in her developmental research identified three prototypes of parental authority: permissiveness, authoritarianism, and authoritativeness. She proposed that permissive parents make fewer demands on their children and allow them to regulate their own activities as much as possible. They are non-controlling and use minimal levels of punishment. Permissive parents are low in control and maturity demands and high in communication and responsiveness. Authoritarian parents are highly directive and value obedience. She identifies these parents as detached and less warm. They control their children’s behavior through punitive measures. The parent is high in control and maturity demands and low in responsiveness and communication. Lastly, authoritative parents are essentially the middle ground between the two aforementioned styles. They provide clear and firm direction for their children. They discipline, but this discipline is characterized by warmth, reason, flexibility, and verbal give and take. Authoritative parents are high in control and maturity demands and high in communication and responsiveness (Baumrind, 1971). Buri (1991) developed the Parental Authority Questionnaire (PAQ) in order to measure Baumrind’s prototypes; it is a Likert-type scale designed to measure the permissive, authoritarian, and authoritative parenting provided by both mothers and fathers (Buri, p. 111). The scale was developed for children to evaluate the perceived parenting style of their own parents. It was found to have good internal consistency and good test-retest reliability. Reithman, Rhode, Hupp, and Altobello (2002) developed the Parental Authority Questionnaire – Revised (PAQ-R), a parent self-report measure based on Buri’s (1991) original measure.
Little research has been done on Filipino parenting styles, however studies related to parenting and this population are presented here. In addition, criticisms of Baumrind’s conceptualization of parenting styles and the application of his theory to collectivist cultures (such as Filipino and Latino) are also discussed.

Bornstein and Cheah (2006) view parenting from an ecological perspective. They believe child development and parenting take place in a variety of systems with the parent-child relationship as the center microsystem, surrounded by immediate mesosystems including family, peers, and neighborhood, exosystems including extended family, workplace, and mass media, and finally the larger macrosystem of social class, laws, and most importantly, culture (p. 4). This “contextual ecological” view of development emphasizes the effect of each system on the other and how parenting and child development is affected by each system or context. In discussing culture, the authors note, “Cultural prescriptions therefore shape and determine, to a great extent, the immediate contexts experienced by children, the short- and long-term goals parents have for their children, and the practices parents employ in attempting to meet those goals (p. 3).” Through their studies of various parenting practices across cultures, Bornstein and Cheah (2006) emphasize the importance of considering culture in parenting style. Thus, while Baumrind’s categories of parenting are useful, Bornstein and Cheah (2006) argue that cultural perspective must be taken into account.

Bornstein and Cote (2006) looked at whether mothers’ acculturation levels predicted later parenting cognitions and practices. The authors define parenting cognitions as beliefs, attitudes goals and knowledge and are key to understanding parents’ sense of self and their role as parents. In addition, parenting cognitions are
believed to vary across cultures. Bornstein and Cote (2006) note, “In a larger sense, parenting cognitions and practices contribute to the ‘continuity of culture’ by helping to define culture and the transmission of culture across generations (p. 173).” Eighty-one Japanese-American and South-American mothers of 20-month-old children were recruited from a sample of 317 mothers the authors worked with in previous studies. They constructed a 21-item acculturation scale adapted from both the Suinn-Lew Asian Self-Identity Acculturation Scale (Suinn-Lew, 1987) and the Acculturation Rating Scale for Mexican Americans (Cuellar, Harris, & Jasso, 1980). Eighteen cognitions that represented four types of parenting cognitions were examined at the individual and group levels including, attributions for parenting behavior, self-perceptions of parenting, parenting knowledge, and parenting style.

Bornstein and Cote (2006) found that mothers’ acculturation levels were highly stable from when their children were 5 months old to 20 months old, thus indicating relatively no change in acculturation. The authors hypothesize that this time period may have been too short to measure any significant change, or perhaps their scale measured “behavioral acculturation” rather than “value acculturation.” After controlling for covariates, results also showed only one significant relationship between mothers’ acculturation when their children were 5 months old and parenting cognitions when their children were 20 months old; these findings were only found with Japanese-American mothers. The authors found that with Japanese-American mothers, level of acculturation covaried with and predicted their knowledge of parenting. No significant findings were found between parents’ acculturation level and parenting cognitions for South American mothers. In summary, acculturation did not predict parenting cognitions. Based on these
results at the individual level, the researchers conducted further comparisons at the group level (Bornstein & Cote, 2006).

Group differences were investigated by comparing the original sample with counterparts from their countries of origin (i.e., Japanese-American mothers compared to Japanese mothers and South-American mothers compared to Argentine mothers) as well as mothers from their “culture of destination” (i.e., United States mothers) (Bornstein & Cote, 2006). Results indicated that both Japanese and South American immigrant mothers differed significantly from similar mothers from their countries of origin as well as mothers from their country of destination. Different patterns were found with both Japanese American and South American mothers. More specifically, Japanese American mothers’ cognitions were more similar to mothers in Japan; their cognitions were less similar to mothers from the United States. South American mothers’ cognitions were more similar to mothers’ cognitions in the United States and different from mothers in Argentina (Bornstein & Cote, 2006). The authors hypothesized that this difference could perhaps be attributed to the fact that South America shares more Western traditions with the United States than Japan. The authors comment:

Regardless of why these patterns of differences for the Japanese and South American comparisons obtain, their existence highlights the inadequacy of simply taking generation level into account when attempting to understand the psychology of immigrant parents from different lands. Nor can one assume equality across immigrant groups, or across different parenting cognitions for that matter. It will certainly be the case that future research in the acculturation of parenting needs to be more differentiated and nuanced (p. 187).

Perreira, Chapman, and Stein (2006) developed a model of risk and resiliency for Latino Americans based on analyzing ways in which Latino Americans describe their
acculturation experiences in relation to their roles as parents. This model was based on interviews with 18 first-generation Latino immigrant parents in North Carolina, the fastest growing Latino immigrant community in the United States according to the 2000 United States Census. Based on several recurring themes, the model illustrates the progression of the Latino parenting experience.

This process starts with the decision to migrate as a parenting decision, which is inconsistent with other theories of migration as a primarily economic decision (Perreira et. al., 2006). The major recurring themes found in the interviews included obtaining a better education for their children, securing a better economic future for their children, growing up in a safer environment, and reconnecting with family.

Upon arrival in the United States, recurring themes of overcoming challenges were identified by the respondents in the study (Perreira et. al. 2006). All respondents identified navigating new social contexts as a challenge to overcome, specifically learning English, building a community, coping with the school system, health care, and balancing work and family (p. 1395). These challenges within the larger social context were framed as part of their role as parents. The authors comment, “In helping their children navigate a new world, parents must first overcome the language barrier. Without the ability to communicate, parents felt helpless, alienated, and unable to advocate on behalf of their children (p. 1396).” Another challenge shared by the respondents was coping with loss and family change. Losing connections with family members as they struggle to make a new life while the lives of their family in their homeland continues as before caused grief among the respondents. In addition, many of them coped with changes in their family in terms of roles and responsibilities and often
times, social status. They reported that changes in relationships between spouses affected their children as well as changes in parent-child relationships. For example, some respondents reported that their children developed a new assertiveness and independence that was characterized as rebellion. Parents also reported fear of their children adopting American values and losing their cultural heritage, as well as fears of temptations in the new environment (Perreira et al., 2006). “Despite seeing the United States as a land of better opportunities and futures for their children, many parents also viewed the United States as a potentially toxic environment (p. 1401).” The most reported concern was having American friends, leading to becoming “too independent (p. 1401).” The final recurring theme related to overcoming challenges in this model was encountering and confronting racism.

A countless number of studies have demonstrated that individuals belonging to collectivist cultures exercise higher control over their children, emphasize obedience, and are more restrained during play, when compared to individuals belonging to individualistic cultures (Rudy & Grusec, 2006). Chao (1994) found these same authoritarian characteristics in Chinese parents. Some characteristics of a collectivist culture include valuing interdependence over independence and viewing one’s identity as not lying within the individual, but within the family or group (Pederson, 2000). Hofstede (1983) describes one characteristic of collectivist cultures as deference to authority, which may perhaps explain why the authoritarian parenting style is found among collectivist cultures. Sue and Sue (2008) also note that Asian cultures, which are primarily defined as collectivist, do not view decision-making as an individual decision. Because one’s identity is viewed as lying within the group, the decision-making process
is seen as a family decision and carries with it a weight of responsibility for the group.
Interestingly, Rudy and Grusec (2006) note, “Aside from promoting collectivist values,
parents from collectivist groups may use authoritarian parenting because they see it as
normative and necessary for the promotion of optimal development in children (p. 69).”

Sorkhabi (2005) reviewed the research studies that explored whether Baumrind’s
parenting styles are applicable to cultures that value independence versus
interdependence. However, Sorkhabi (2005) reviewed the literature in terms of child
outcome measures (e.g., school performance, etc.), rather than parent outcome measures.
Sorkhabi concludes that “Baumrind’s parenting styles have similar function in both
collectivist and individualist cultures p. 552).” The author reviews several cross-
cultural studies that demonstrate that Baumrind’s parenting styles and parenting
dimensions, such as warmth and control, are similarly differentiated in cultures that value
interdependence as well as those that value independence (p. 553). Sorkhabi further cites
a study that found similarities between the basic structure of authoritarian and
authoritative parenting in United States and Chinese parents. Furthermore, this study also
found that parenting dimensions typically found in Chinese culture (e.g., encouragement
of modesty, maternal involvement, protection) were also applicable to United States
parenting styles (Wu et. al. 2002). Based on analysis of several cross-cultural parenting
studies, the author poses the question, “What are some of the reasons or plausible
explanations for the findings of studies reported herein, that authoritative parenting, in
contrast to authoritarian and permissive parenting, is similarly related to academic and
psychosocial adjustment in certain cultures that have been described as collectivist and
individualist?” A proposed answer to this question is that the authoritative parent may
have an ability to integrate competing goals of parenting, such as social and group goals and individual goals. The author also posits that authoritative parents may use more effective means to help their children achieve these goals by employing a steady balance of responsiveness and demand, or flexibility and reason, as also noted by Baumrind (p. 559). Thus, she describes authoritative parenting as "distinguished by reciprocity, mutual understanding, and flexibility, which enable the parent to effectively account for, coordinate, and balance communal needs or collective goals of society and family with the capabilities, needs, and goals of the child (p. 559)." In contrast, authoritarian parenting is inflexible and unilateral in its social and individual expectations, and permissive parenting Conversely focuses on "child-determined goals" and lacks the integration inherent in authoritative parenting.

Filipino-Americans, like many of their Asian-American/Pacific Islander counterparts, generally adhere to a collectivistic orientation. That is, Filipino-Americans value the needs of their family and larger group over personal and individual needs. Sue and Sue (2008) note that Asian-American parents "tend to show little interest in a child's viewpoint regarding family members (p. 362)." An important task for a child is to maintain and/or contribute to family harmony and adhere to values pre-established by the family. In general, Sue and Sue (2008) describe Asian-American parenting styles as "more authoritarian and directive (than in Euro-American families) (p. 364)."

Colonial Mentality

David and Okazaki (2006) discuss colonial mentality, a form of internalized oppression that follows a culture's colonization. They posit that the idea of colonial mentality explains high rates of mental health problems among Filipino Americans. The
authors describe this process as ranging from “automatic and uncritical rejection of anything Filipino and an automatic and uncritical preference for anything American (p. 241).” Furthermore, colonial mentality is reportedly manifested in a variety of ways: denigration of the Filipino self (feelings of embarrassment about being a person of Filipino heritage), denigration of the Filipino culture or body (idea that Filipino culture is inferior to White/American culture, preference for “Made in the USA”), discriminating against less-Americanized Filipinos (avoiding perceived inferior characteristics related to being Filipino in the hopes of becoming as American as possible), and tolerating historical and contemporary oppression of Filipinos and Filipino Americans (rationalizing it as an appropriate cost of civilization) (David and Okazaki, 2006). The authors propose that colonial mentality may be an adaptive strategy that protects Filipino-Americans from the negative effects of cultural oppression. That is, those who normalize oppression may experience less overall stress. David and Okazaki (2006) also propose that colonial mentality may be related to acculturation such that colonial mentality generally implies assimilation or marginalization, perhaps leading to increased psychological stress.

In their development of a Colonial Mentality Scale (CMS), the authors recruited 603 Filipino Americans via the internet. The average age was 28.9 years. Most participants were second generation immigrants, with the remainder of the sample being first generation and few third and fourth generation. They found that colonial mentality in Filipino Americans is best conceptualized as five correlated factors, including (a) internalized cultural and ethnic inferiority, (b) cultural shame and embarrassment, (c) within-group discrimination, (d) physical characteristics, and (e) colonial debt. One
interesting finding as the scale was developed was that the subscales discussed above were not correlated strongly with acculturation, suggesting that although some Filipino-Americans are embarrassed by their heritage, it does not mean that they necessarily want to adopt the dominant culture. In fact, colonial debt, within-group discrimination, and physical characteristics were better predictors of acculturation into the mainstream.

Using the CMS, David developed a cultural model of depression for Filipino-Americans (2008). In development of this model, the authors attempted to replicate previous studies that found relationships between colonial mentality (CM) and acculturation, as well as self-esteem (both individual and collective), and depression. Interestingly, they also explored the relationship between CM and ethnic identity, which they noted was a relationship for which there was no previous empirical evidence. Results indicated that CM was associated with lower levels of enculturation, negative evaluations of personal and ethnic group characteristics, negative sense of belonging in and attitude toward one’s ethnic group, and more depression symptoms (p. 123). In order to study the relationship between CM and depression specifically, the author tested two models of depression: a cultural model that incorporated colonial mentality and one that did not. While the non-CM model appeared to be an appropriate fit to explain Filipino-Americans, the authors found that “the model that included the effects of historical and contemporary oppression (i.e., CM) produced better fit to the data (e.g., lower RMSEA value and $\chi^2/df$ ratio) and improved the model’s ability to etiologically explain depression (p. 124).” Interestingly, in development of this model, the authors found that other cultural variables such as, enculturation and ethnic identity, did not have a significant effect on depression. The author found that enculturation and ethnic identity did not have
a direct effect on depression, rather their effects were mediated by other variables not accounted for in the model (the author posited that some possible mediating variables were religiosity or social support).

Purpose of the Study

Parenting is a cultural experience. A parent draws from his or her cultural history and experiences in order to make parenting decisions, and eventually develop a parenting style based on these experiences. Culture, however, is multi-faceted and complex. Minority individuals balance, integrate, accept, embrace, reject, and even separate the multiple cultures they are a part of, with the ultimate goal of developing an identity or sense of self about one’s culture or ethnicity. The development of ethnic identity is said to occur throughout life, especially in early adulthood, but that significant life experiences throughout life may contribute to its development. The purpose of this study is to examine if there is a relationship between ethnic identity and the significant life experience of becoming a parent or parenting itself. Parenting is unique in that, for most people, it brings to the forefront one’s heritage, values, and beliefs as one attempts to pass these on to another human being. This study examines the parenting style of a specific ethnic group that research shows experiences a unique cultural phenomenon that may contribute to ethnic identity development.

Filipino-Americans are a steadily growing ethnic group in the United States. The history of the Filipino people is unique in comparison to other Asian-American subgroups. The Philippines was colonized by both Spain and the United States, resulting in an Asian culture heavily influenced by Western society. In the area of parenting, little research has been done on the specific parenting styles of Filipino-American parents that
specifically take into consideration the history of colonization. This study will examine the relationship between colonial mentality (i.e., a form of internalized oppression resulting from colonization) and parenting style, as well as ethnic identity and parenting style. Lastly, this study aims to examine whether colonial mentality has a moderating effect on the relationship between ethnic identity and parenting style. If one is experiencing feelings of internalized oppression, does that affect the relationship between ethnic identity and parenting style?

Clinical/Professional Applications

Filipino-Americans are often classified in the literature as Asian-American. As clinicians, it is important to consider the unique history of the Filipino people, specifically the history of colonization, and take this into account in clinical work. This study may be applied in the field of family therapy and working with Filipino-American parents and children. Understanding how parenting style develops and how one's identity and cultural experiences contribute to parenting will assist clinician's work with the parent-child relationship in the family setting. Clinicians would be able to help an individual work through ethnic identity and internalized oppression issues with the goal of becoming a better parent.

Comas-Diaz (2006) discusses the importance of practitioners integrating ethnic psychology with traditional psychotherapy practices in Latino-Americans. She discusses the collectivistic characteristics of Latino cultures including preferring communal goals over individual ones, valuing harmony among members of their group, and the preference for indirect communication to minimize conflict. She stresses the importance of moving away from individualistic psychotherapy that devalues collectivistic traditions. For
example, a traditional psychotherapist might label a family’s interconnectedness as enmeshment and identify that as a pathological trait. Comas-Diaz (2006) uses the term Latino ethnic psychology “to designate the application of cultural traditions and practices into healing and liberation (p. 440).” She stresses the importance of taking the unique ethnic traditions and beliefs of culture and integrating them into the therapeutic setting. Ideas of healing and spirituality should be part of a mental health professional’s therapeutic intervention when working with Latino clients (Comas-Diaz, 2006). This notion of integrating ethnic psychology may be applied to working with Filipino-Americans as well. The idea of colonial mentality has been studied specifically in Filipino-Americans, and healing and spirituality are also important aspects of Filipino culture. It is impossible to separate these ethnic characteristics when doing psychotherapeutic work. Comas-Diaz and Jacobsen (1991) also emphasize the importance of professionals being aware of ethnocultural transference issues when working with ethnic minorities.

David (2008) in his development of a colonial mentality model of depression for Filipino-Americans found that besides colonial mentality, other cultural factors such as ethnic identity did not have a direct effect on depression. This study would also contribute to the study of colonial mentality by attempting to determine the relationship between colonial mentality and ethnic identity. While ethnic identity did not contribute to David’s colonial mentality depression model (2008), perhaps in looking at parenting style, ethnic identity and colonial mentality may have a significant effect.

According the literature, ethnic identity is primarily formed in adulthood. This study would also contribute to the literature on ethnic identity by determining whether a
significant experience, such as becoming a parent or parenting, can change or affect one’s ethnic identity.

Definition of Terms

*Parenting Styles*

Parenting styles is defined for the purposes of this study as scores on the Parental Authority Questionnaire – Revised (PAQ-R).

*Colonial Mentality*

Colonial mentality is defined for the purposes of this study as scores on the Colonial Mentality Scale (CMS).

*Ethnic Identity*

Ethnic identity is defined for the purposes of this study as scores on the Multi-Ethnic Identity Measure – Revised (MEIM-R).
CHAPTER III

METHODS

Participants

The sample included 95 participants after participants were eliminated for missing data. Participants included Filipino-Americans who were parents of at least one child. Filipino-Americans were defined as an individual of Filipino descent of any generation level. Bi-racial participants were included in the sample, if they identified themselves as Filipino-American (via self-report). The study was limited to English-speaking participants, as reliability and validity of instruments used were not determined with translated versions. Participants were recruited online, from across the United States, using SurveyMonkey.com. Convenience sampling was employed by sending an e-mail of the study link to the Filipino-American community organizations across the United States. Additionally, snowball sampling was utilized by inviting study participants to forward the study link to their family members, friends, and colleagues who may be eligible to participate.

Instrumentation

Three instruments were administered for the study: the Parental Authority Questionnaire, Revised (PAQ-R; Reitman, et. al., 2002), the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure, Revised (MEIM-R; Phinney & Ong, 2007), and the Colonial Mentality Scale (CMS; David & Okazaki, 2006). In addition, a demographic questionnaire was used.

Demographic Questionnaire

Demographic information was gathered from each participant using a questionnaire developed by the researcher. It gathered information on each participant's
age, gender, religion, level of education, socio-economic status, and marital status. In addition, information was gathered regarding the number of children as well as their age and gender. Lastly, the demographic questionnaire obtained information regarding the participant's generation level.

*Parental Authority Questionnaire – Revised (PAQ-R)*

The Parental Authority Questionnaire – Revised (PAQ-R) was developed by Reitman et. al. (2002). The scale was developed using three samples: a primarily Caucasian sample that included married mothers with a high SES (sample size = 87), a predominantly African-American sample, that included single, lower SES mothers (sample size = 102), and children aged 3-5 along with their caregivers who were enrolled in a Head Start program (sample size = 171). The questionnaire contains 30 items scored on a Likert-type scale, with anchors ranging from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree. Items on the scale loaded into three factors: Authoritarian, Authoritative, and Permissive. Internal consistency reliability ranged from .72 to .76 across all samples for the Authoritarian and Permissive scales and .56 to .77 for the Authoritative scale (Sample A = .77, Sample B = .56, Sample C = .66). The researchers also measured convergent validity with subscales on the PAQ-R with similar scales on other parenting measures, specifically the Parenting Scale (PS; Arnold, O'Leary, Wolff, & Acker, 1993) and the Parent-Child Relationship Inventory (PCRI; Gerard, 1994). The authors reported moderate convergent validity with scales on the PS and PCRI. Authoritative parenting was associated with effective parent-child communication, authoritative parenting was associated with overreactivity, and permissive parenting was correlated with lax discipline.
Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure - Revised (MEIM-R)

The Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure, Revised (MEIM-R) was developed by Phinney and Ong (2007). The original Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM) contained 15 items. It was originally conducted with a large sample of adolescents (n = 5,423) of varying ethnic groups. Following further research, the authors developed the revised scale, which includes 6 items scored on a Likert-type scale, with anchors ranging from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree. A confirmatory factor analysis was conducted on a sample of 271 college students of varying ethnic groups. Items load into two factors, which the authors suggest are the primary components of Ethnic Identity: exploration and commitment. The two subscales of exploration and commitment within the MEIM-R yielded good internal reliability with Cronbach’s alpha scores of .76 and .78, respectively. The alpha score for both subscales combined was .81. The authors note that a score can be obtained within each subscale (i.e., exploration and commitment) as well as an overall Ethnic Identity score by combining scores from both subscales.

Colonial Mentality Scale (CMS)

The Colonial Mentality Scale (CMS) was developed by David and Okazaki (2006) using a sample of 603 Filipino-Americans with a mean age of 28.9 years. Participants were primarily second generation (n = 371). First generation (n = 220), third generation (n = 6), and fourth generation (n = 1) participants were also included. Following development of a 53-item CMS, the authors found that 36 items loaded into five factors including Within-Group Discrimination, Physical Characteristics, Colonial Debt, Cultural Shame and Embarrassment, and Internalized Cultural/Ethnic Inferiority. The 36 items are scored on a Likert-type scale with anchors ranging from Strongly Agree.
to Strongly Disagree. Cronbach's alpha scores for each subscale are as follows: Within-Group Discrimination = .87, Physical Characteristics = .88, Colonial Debt = .83, Cultural Shame = .71, and Internalized Inferiority = .79. Guttman split-half reliability was .78. In addition, concurrent and discriminant validity were determined by comparing subscale scores on the CMS with the Collective Self-Esteem Scale (CSES) and the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSES). Based on prior research, the authors predict a negative correlation between CMS subscales and both self-esteem measures. As predicted, statistically significant negative correlations were found between all subscales of the CMS and the RSES, with the exception of Colonial Debt (CD). Subscales of the CMS negatively correlated with the CSES subscales with the exception of Internalized Inferiority on the CMS and importance to identity (on the CSES). The researchers also correlated the CMS with the Center for Epidemiological Studies – Depression Scale (CES-D). As expected, the CES-D positively correlated with all CMS subscales.

Procedure

Participants were recruited via postings on community organization message boards online and in community-based organizations. In addition, participants were invited to forward the URL link for the study to their friends, family members, and colleagues.

Each online post or e-mail provided a brief description of the current research, along with the URL link to the study’s online homepage at SurveyMonkey.com. The study’s website included a brief description of the research in clear, basic language, as well as the requirements for participation and a description of confidentiality procedures, followed by the testing instruments. Participants were required to read and endorse an
informed consent statement, which explained that participation in the study is completely voluntary, and that participants are able to discontinue participation at any time before submitting their completed survey. Participants were also told that their responses to the questionnaires would remain anonymous and confidential to the full extent allowed by law. Finally, within the informed consent, participants were asked to confirm that they read and understood the information provided, agreed to participate in the study, and the researcher’s supervisor’s contact information was provided should the participant have had any questions.

After endorsing the informed consent, participants were forwarded to the research instruments. The participants completed the PAQ-R (Reitman et. al., 2002), CMS (David & Okazaki, 2006), MEIM-R (Phinney & Ong, 2007) and a brief demographic questionnaire. Participants were told that participation in this study would take approximately 30-45 minutes. On the last page of the web survey, participants were prompted to agree to submit their answers, at which point the data was electronically sent directly to the principal researcher.

Gosling, Vazire, Srivastava, and John (2004) conducted a comparative analysis of six pre-conceptions regarding Internet questionnaires. These preconceptions were based on previous studies and posited the following about internet research: the samples are not diverse, the samples are maladjusted, socially isolated or depressed, data do not generalize across presentations, participants are unmotivated, data are compromised by participant anonymity and findings differ from those obtained with other methods (p. 95). In investigation of sample diversity, the authors found that while Internet samples are not representative of the population at large, they are generally more diverse when compared
to samples published in a highly selective psychology journal. In addition, the study found that Internet samples were more representative with respect to socioeconomic status, geographic location, gender, and age. The authors also found little evidence that Internet users are more maladjusted, socially isolated or depressed. Their comparisons found no differences between Internet users and traditional respondents in social isolation or depression. In order to evaluate the generalization of presentations, the authors administered the Big Five Inventory in two different presentations. One presentation drew more women than men and the participants on average were 2 years older. However, the results were successfully replicated thus indicating that different presentations do not have an effect on the results. In terms of the pre-conception that internet respondents are unmotivated, the authors found that internet methods may provide a means for motivating participants, by providing them with immediate feedback. While it is true that the Internet cannot provide true anonymity, the authors propose strategies to avoid potential problems such as repeat respondents (p. 101). Finally, the authors note, "Evidence so far suggests that Internet-based findings are consistent with findings based on traditional methods (e.g., on self-esteem, personality) but more data are needed (p. 95)."

**Research Design**

This study utilized a non-experimental, correlational design. The variables under study were parenting style (categorical variable), level of ethnic identity (categorical variable), and level of colonial mentality, as measured by score on five factors (continuous variable).
Hypotheses

1a. It is hypothesized that individuals who are categorized as having a predominantly authoritative parenting style will demonstrate stronger or more secure ethnic identity than those who are categorized as having a predominantly authoritarian parenting style.

1b. It is hypothesized that individuals who are categorized as having a predominantly authoritative parenting style will demonstrate stronger or more secure ethnic identity than those categorized as having a predominantly permissive parenting style.

2. It is hypothesized colonial mentality will be inversely correlated with ethnic identity, such that those experiencing colonial mentality will demonstrate weaker or less secure ethnic identity.

3. It is hypothesized that individuals who are categorized as having a predominantly permissive parenting style will demonstrate colonial mentality.

4. It is hypothesized that colonial mentality will moderate the relationship between ethnic identity and parenting style, such that the presence of colonial mentality and strong or secure ethnic identity will be associated with a predominantly authoritative parenting style.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS

This chapter reviews the results of the analyses addressing the relationship between parenting style, ethnic identity, and colonial mentality among Filipino-Americans. After a discussion of the demographics of the sample, results for each hypothesis test will be discussed in turn. Lastly, additional analyses with demographic variables will be discussed.

Information from 95 participants was reviewed for this study. The original sample included 103 participants, however eight cases were eliminated from analysis due to missing data.

Demographics

Descriptive statistics were generated for all demographic variables and are summarized in Table 1. Participants ranged in age from 28 to 72 years ($M = 45.6$, $SD = 11.4$ years). Females comprised 61.1% of the sample and males comprised 38.9% ($N = 95$). As expected, the majority of the respondents (87.4%) were married, 4% were single and 6% reported as divorced ($N = 95$). First-generation participants (i.e., those who reported as immigrating to the United States) comprised 50.5% of the sample, second-generation immigrants (i.e., those who reported one or both of their parents immigrated to the United States) comprised 38.9% of the sample, and third-generation immigrants (i.e., those who reported one or both of their grandparents immigrated to the United States) comprised 4.2% of the sample ($N = 95$).

In terms of religion, 83.2% of the sample was Catholic. Christian, Protestant and Lutheran respondents comprised 12.7% of the sample, while other religions comprised
Table 1

Demographic Characteristics of Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>% of sample</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>87.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-Generation</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second-Generation</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third-Generation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>83.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutheran</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baha’i</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Level of Education</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>% of sample</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School Diploma</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate’s Degree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Degree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate Degree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Household Income</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>% of sample</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26,000-40,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41,000-60,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61,000-80,000</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81,000-100,000</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101,000-150,000</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151,000-200,000</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200,000+</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N = 95*
4.1% of the sample (other religions reported include Baha'i, Buddhist, Jewish and Muslim). The sample was diverse in terms of the number of children the participants had, with 45.3% reporting they had two children, 20% had one child, 26.3% had three children, and 8.4% had four or more children \((N = 95)\). Participants reported a wide range in terms of highest level of education, with 8.4% having a high school diploma, 11.6% having an Associate’s degree, 60.0% having a Bachelor’s degree, 15.8% having a Master’s degree and 4.2% with a Doctoral level degree \((N = 95)\). The sample was also skewed in terms of socio-economic status. Those who reported a combined household income of $101,000 to over $200,000 comprised 56.8% of the sample. An annual income range of $61,000-80,000 comprised 14.7% of the sample and $81,000-100,000 made up an additional 11.6% of the sample. Incomes of $41,000-60,000 comprised 7.4% of the sample and $26,000-40,000 comprised another 7.4% of the sample. Two participants declined to report their income.

Results of Hypotheses Tests

Based on the sample described above, three of the five hypotheses were analyzed. Two of the five hypotheses discussed below were unable to be analyzed because of the nature of the sample. One’s parenting style was categorized into authoritarian, authoritative, and permissive categories based on one’s mean scores on the Parental Authority Questionnaire – Revised (PAQ-R). The highest mean score indicated the participant’s predominant parenting style. However, the sample was significantly skewed in terms of parenting style such that the majority of the sample was categorized as authoritative \((n = 87)\), a small portion of the sample was categorized as authoritarian \((n = 8)\), and no participants were categorized as permissive parents (see Table 2). Proposed
Table 2

Summary of Parenting Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parenting Style</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritative</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>91.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permissive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
hypotheses for the resulting skewness in parenting style data will be discussed in Chapter 5.

*Hypothesis 1a: Authoritative Parenting Style will have Stronger Ethnic Identity than Authoritarian Parenting Style*

Hypothesis 1a predicted that individuals categorized as having a predominantly authoritative parenting style will demonstrate stronger ethnic identity than those who are categorized as having a predominantly authoritarian parenting style. For this hypothesis, the independent (predictor) variable was parenting style (as depicted by the PAQ-R) and the dependent variable (criterion) variable was ethnic identity (as depicted by the MEIM-R). The independent variable was computed from scores on the PAQ-R, such that the highest mean score in each parenting category predicted parenting style, and the dependent variable was computed from scores on the MEIM-R, such that a higher mean score indicated stronger ethnic identity.

The mean scores of the two groups on ethnic identity were higher for authoritative parents ($M = 3.82, SD = .65$) than for authoritarian parents ($M = 2.92, SD = .99$). An independent samples t-test was conducted to determine whether the two variables, parenting style and ethnic identity, were significantly related. The results indicated that this hypothesis was supported [$t(95) = 2.52, p = .038$]. Thus, despite the skewed nature of the sample in terms of parenting style, a significant relationship was still found between parenting style and ethnic identity, such that authoritative parents demonstrated stronger ethnic identity than authoritarian parents. Table 3 summarizes these results.
Table 3

*Relationship Between Parenting Style and Ethnic Identity*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parenting Style</th>
<th>Ethnic Identity</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoritative ( (n = 87) )</td>
<td>( M = 3.82 )</td>
<td>( SD = .65 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian ( (n = 8) )</td>
<td>( M = 2.92 )</td>
<td>( SD = .99 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( *t(95) = 2.52, p = .038 \)
Hypothesis 1b: Authoritative Parents will have Stronger Ethnic Identity than Permissive Parents

As discussed previously, hypothesis 1b was unable to be tested, as the sample did not include participants who were categorized as predominantly permissive parents.

Hypothesis 2: Participants with Colonial Mentality will Demonstrate Weaker Ethnic Identity

Hypothesis two proposed that participants who were experiencing colonial mentality will demonstrate less secure or weaker ethnic identity. For this hypothesis, the independent (predictor) variable was colonial mentality (as depicted by the CMS) and the dependent (criterion) variable was ethnic identity (as depicted by the MEIM-R). The independent variable was determined by calculating mean scores on each of the five factors of colonial mentality, namely Within-Group Discrimination, Physical Characteristics, Colonial Debt, Cultural Shame, and Internalized Cultural and Ethnic Inferiority. High scores ($M \geq 3.5$) on any one of the subscales indicates the presence of colonial mentality. Sixty-one percent of participants ($n = 58$) did not have colonial mentality and 39% of participants ($n = 37$) did have colonial mentality. The dependent variable was determined by calculating mean scores on the MEIM-R.

The mean scores for the two groups on ethnic identity for those with colonial mentality was slightly lower ($M = 3.61, SD = .69$) than for those without colonial mentality ($M = 3.83, SD = .74$). In other words, those with colonial mentality demonstrated slightly lower ethnic identity scores (less secure ethnic identity) than those without colonial mentality. An independent samples t-test was conducted to determine whether the two variables, colonial mentality and ethnic identity, were related. The
results indicated that this hypothesis was not supported. Thus, there is no significant difference in mean level of ethnic identity between those who do and do not have colonial mentality [t(95) = -1.42, \( p = .16 \)]. Table 4 summarizes these results.

**Hypothesis 3: Permissive Parenting Styles will Demonstrate Colonial Mentality**

As discussed previously, hypothesis three was unable to be tested, as the sample did not include participants who were categorized as predominantly permissive parents.

**Hypothesis 4: The Interaction between Colonial Mentality and Ethnic Identity will be associated with Predominantly Authoritative Parenting Style.**

In order to test hypothesis four, a multiple regression was conducted to determine the relationship between ethnic identity, colonial mentality and authoritative parenting. Because scoring of the CMS involved analyzing each of the five factors contributing to colonial mentality in order to determine whether it was either present or absent in a participant, the presence or absence of colonial mentality was dummy coded in order to transform it into a continuous variable. In addition, level of authoritative parenting was calculated by each participant's score on the authoritative parenting portion of the PAQ-R. Level of ethnic identity remained a continuous variable, with higher mean scores on the MEIM-R indicating stronger ethnic identity and lower scores indicating lower ethnic identity. As the hypothesis states, colonial mentality will have an effect on the relationship between ethnic identity and authoritative parenting style, thus a new variable was created to represent the interaction between ethnic identity and colonial mentality (EI x CM) and order to determine its effect on authoritative parenting. Results of the multiple regression analysis did not support the hypothesis. Pearson's \( r \) was first calculated to determine the relationship between each of the independent variables.
### Table 4

*Relationship Between Presence of Colonial Mentality and Ethnic Identity*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colonial Mentality (CM)</th>
<th>Ethnic Identity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presence of CM ($n = 37$)</td>
<td>$M = 3.61$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of CM ($n = 58$)</td>
<td>$M = 3.83$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $t(95) = -1.42, p = .16$
(ethnic identity, colonial mentality, EI x CM) and authoritative parenting (dependent variable). Individual correlations were low for ethnic identity ($r = .033$), moderate for colonial mentality ($r = .28$) and low to moderate for colonial mentality x ethnic identity ($r = .23$). Further analysis showed that the model that included ethnic identity, colonial mentality, and ethnic identity x colonial mentality only accounted for approximately 5% of the variance in authoritative parenting (Adjusted $R^2 = .047$, $p = .06$). Upon further analysis of the model, it appears that colonial mentality alone accounts for the majority of the variance and contributes the most to the dependent variable of authoritative parenting ($\beta = .451$). However, this contribution was not statistically significant ($p = .41$).

Therefore, it can be concluded that the hypothesis was not supported, and that colonial mentality does not moderate the relationship between ethnic identity and authoritative parenting style.

Additional Statistical Analyses

Additional statistical analyses were conducted in order to test the relationship of some demographic variables to the variables of interest as well as to test additional relationships not proposed in the original hypotheses.

Because colonial mentality is comprised of five factors, an independent samples t-test was conducted to compare the means for parenting style (independent variable) on each of the five factors of colonial mentality (Within-Group Discrimination, Physical Characteristics, Colonial Debt, Cultural Shame, and Internalized Cultural and Ethnic Inferiority). Within the area of Physical Characteristics, the mean scores of the two groups were lower for authoritative parents ($M = 1.95, SD = .95$) than for authoritarian
parents ($M = 2.91, SD = 1.06$). This relationship was the only statistically significant relationship when each of the five factors of colonial mentality were analyzed [$t(95) = -2.47, p = .04$]. Thus, this indicates that authoritative parents scored lower on items that included desirable physical characteristics, as they pertain to colonial mentality. In other words, authoritative parents compared to authoritarian parents demonstrated less colonial mentality, as it relates to physical characteristics. See Table 5 for complete results.

The relationship between the demographic variable, generation level, was also tested with each of the variables of interest, namely ethnic identity, colonial mentality, and parenting style. Forty-eight participants reported as first-generation immigrants, 37 reported as second-generation immigrants, and four reported as third-generation immigrants. Participants were separated into two groups based on generation level: first-generation immigrants ($n = 48$) and second- and third-generation immigrants combined ($n = 41$). First, non-parametric tests were conducted to determine the relationship between parenting style (authoritative or authoritarian) and generation level (first-generation or second- and third-generation). Results indicated that 85.7% of authoritarian parents were second- or third-generation and 14.3% of authoritarian parents were first-generation ($n = 7$). Second- or third-generation immigrants comprised 42.7% of authoritative parents and first-generation immigrants comprised 57.3% of authoritative participants ($n = 82$). This result was not statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 3.23, p = .07$). The chi-squared value was adjusted via the Yates’ Correction for Continuity because of the nature of the analysis (2 x 2). Thus, this indicates that there is no association between generation level and parenting style.
Table 5

*Mean Comparisons of Five Factors Contributing to Presence of Colonial Mentality*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colonial Mentality Factor</th>
<th>Parenting Style</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>T score</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within-Group Discrimination</td>
<td>Authoritative</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>-1.88</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Authoritarian</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Characteristics</td>
<td>Authoritative</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Authoritarian</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonial Debt</td>
<td>Authoritative</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>-1.87</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Authoritarian</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Shame</td>
<td>Authoritative</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>-1.90</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Authoritarian</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalized Cultural Inferiority</td>
<td>Authoritative</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>-1.42</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Authoritarian</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Non-parametric analysis was also conducted to determine the relationship between colonial mentality (presence or absence) and generation level. Results indicated that 53.7% of those that had colonial mentality were first-generation immigrants while 46.3% of those that had colonial mentality were second- and third-generation immigrants \((n = 54)\). In addition, 54.3% of those that did not have colonial mentality were first-generation immigrants while 45.7% of those that did not have colonial mentality were second- and third-generation immigrants \((n = 35)\). These results were not significant, indicating that there is no relationship between generation level and colonial mentality \(\chi^2 = .003, p = .957\).

Lastly, an independent samples t-test was conducted to determine the relationship between the independent level, generation level, and the dependent variable, ethnic identity. There was only a small difference between the means for first-generation immigrants \((M = 3.78, SD = .65)\) and second- and third-generation immigrants \((M = 3.64, SD = .80)\) on ethnic identity. This result was not statistically significant \([t(89) = .94, p = .351]\).

Other demographic variables of interest, namely religion and marital status were too skewed for analysis. For example, the majority of the sample (83.2%) reported as being Catholic while 84.7% of the sample reported as being married. Thus, it was predicted that no significant relationships would be found between these demographic variables and the variables of interest.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

This study examined the relationship between parenting style and ethnic identity in Filipino-American parents. It focused on the unique aspects of Filipino culture, most specifically the history of colonization and how this experience is internalized in Filipino-American individuals. These specific experiences of colonization and impressions of the effect of colonization may lead to a form of internalized oppression known as colonial mentality (David & Okazaki, 2006). Thus, this study also discussed the effect of colonial mentality on the relationship between parenting style and ethnic identity. This chapter discusses the hypotheses and empirical findings of this research, provides possible explanations for the findings, and reviews the limitations and clinical implications of the study.

Discussion of Hypotheses

*Relationship between Parenting Style and Ethnic Identity*

Hypothesis one (1a and 1b) predicted that there would be a relationship between parenting style and ethnic identity. Specifically, hypothesis 1a predicted that authoritative parents would demonstrate stronger ethnic identity than authoritarian parents, and hypothesis 1b predicted that authoritative parents would demonstrate stronger ethnic identity than permissive parents.

As discussed, the total sample did not include parents who identified as predominantly permissive, thus the second part of this hypothesis was unable to be analyzed. The permissive parent is described as one who is low in control and maturity demands and high in communication and responsiveness (Baumrind, 1971). In order to
propose a possible explanation for this skewed aspect of the sample, one should perhaps examine the interaction between acculturation and parenting, especially in collectivistic cultures. In Bornstein and Cote's (2006) comparison of Japanese-American and South-American mothers, they found that Japanese-American mothers' parenting cognitions (i.e., thoughts, attitudes, and beliefs about their parenting role) covaried with their level of acculturation. Perriera et. al. (2006) discussed the cultural experience of first-generation Latino mothers. During their interviews with these mothers, the authors found that the respondent’s roles as parents were framed within the larger social context they had to navigate as immigrants. For these mothers, the most difficult aspects of parenting involved loss change – changes in language, customs, relationships with children and spouses, as well as loss of family, friends, and connections.

Since half the sample included first-generation immigrants (50.5%), perhaps the experience of parenting was similar to the respondents in the study by Perriera et. al. (2006). A parent who is adjusting to a new society and attempting to acculturate perhaps may not perhaps develop a highly communicative style that is characteristic of permissive parents. Another interesting finding by Perriera et. al. (2006) found that mothers feared that their children would develop independence and assertiveness that they characterized as rebellion. If a parent feared rebellion by their children, perhaps he/she exercised high levels of control and demanded more maturity. Permissive parents conversely have low control and maturity demands. Studies have also showed that authoritarian parenting styles are effective and adaptive in high-risk situations (Kelley, Power and Wimbush, 1992), and that parenting values are still internalized by children in these situations.
Perhaps under the stress of developing an ethnic identity and the acculturation experience, developing a permissive parenting style is not adaptive.

The sample also consisted of second- and third-generation immigrants. Cross-cultural research shows that parenting styles and cognitions are transmitted from parent to child across both individualist and collectivist cultures (Bornstein & Cote, 2006). Thus, if we assume that first-generation Filipino-American immigrants are not in general permissive parents, than perhaps this style did not transmit to their children who became future parents. Upon examination of the items on the Parental Authority Questionnaire (PAQ-R) (Reitman et. al, 2002) that determined a permissive parenting style, the specific items may also have had an effect on the sample. These items are presented in Table 6. Upon review, these items are highly individualistic in nature and parents from collectivist cultures may not identify with these statements. While collectivist parents may foster independence within the larger societal or cultural context, these items are blatant statements of promoting independence within the family unit. In terms of Filipino culture, two important cultural characteristics discussed are hospitality and spirituality (Burgorio-Watson, 1997). These ideas permeate Filipino-American families and the values of hospitality and spirituality are transmitted across generations. The statements that determine permissive parents do not lend themselves well to the ideas of hospitality and spirituality. They give a sense of disconnectedness and not belonging. Thus, perhaps the Filipino-American respondents viewed the statements negatively because they did not adequately describe the aspects of permissive parents that are communicative and responsive, and focused more on those that are low in control.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>In a well-run home children should have their way as often as parents do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Children need to be free to make their own decisions about activities, even if this disagrees with what a parent might want to do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>My children do not need to obey rules simply because people in authority have told them to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I usually don't set firm guidelines for my children’s behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Most of the time I do what my children want when making family decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Most problems in society would be solved if parents would let their children choose their activities, make their own decisions, and follow their own desires when growing up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>I allow my children to decide most things for themselves without a lot of help from me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>I do not think of myself as responsible for telling my children what to do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>I allow my children to form their own opinions about family matters and let them make their own decisions about these matters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>I do not direct the behaviors, activities or desires of my children.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Reitman et. al., 2002*
Upon further examination of the PAQ-R (Reitman et. al., 2002), the items also appeared to pose questions that were related to the parenting of younger children, and may not be applicable to the sample in this study, whose mean age was 45.6 years. According to the demographic data of the current study, the sample included parents of teenage and adult children. However, the items used the term “children” throughout the scale. The wording of the items may have also contributed to the skewed parenting styles in the sample. That is, parents of teenage or adult children who were completing the survey may not have identified with the questions on the scale, and thus the results did not provide an accurate representation of individual parenting style.

Hypothesis 1a however was supported. Specifically, despite the fact that the sample was skewed, there was a significant difference in ethnic identity scores between authoritative and authoritarian parents. As predicted, authoritative parents scored higher on ethnic identity (i.e., demonstrated stronger or more secure ethnic identity) than authoritarian parents.

In order to explain this result, as well as the high proportion of authoritative parents in this study (91.6%), it is important to examine the unique colonization history of the Philippines and the Filipino people as well as ethnic identity development. Authoritative parents, compared to authoritarian parents, value discipline, but the discipline is characterized by warmth, flexibility, and verbal give and take (Baumrind, 1971). It may be proposed that an authoritative parenting style could develop out of adaptive need as well. Authoritative parents are more effectively able to coordinate and integrate competing goals (societal, individual, and familial goals), and utilize effective strategies to balance being responsive and demanding at the same time, resulting in
flexibility (Sorkhabi, 2005). Developing ethnic identity involves the same type of balance. Ethnic identity development involves having (or not having) feelings about your culture, having those feelings challenged, exploring your culture, and then making a commitment. Commitment however, does not only involve committing to your own culture, but making a different type of commitment to the dominant culture. It involves developing an understanding that the dominant culture contributes to your ethnic identity and an understanding that that relationship, that balance, will ultimately lead to security and (ethnic identity) achievement (Phinney, 1997; Sue and Sue, 2008). Essentially, developing ethnic identity involves finding the ultimate balance, as does effective parenting. The type of balancing that characterizes authoritative parenting may perhaps be related to the balance involved in developing a secure ethnic identity.

Although there was not a hypothesis that predicted the proportion of authoritative parents, they comprised 91% of the sample. Traditional research on Asian-American parenting style has found that it may be authoritarian in nature. However, in this study the majority of the Filipino-American sample was authoritative, not authoritarian. A possible explanation for this result may be related to the Philippine history of colonization. Compared to other Asian immigrant groups, Filipino-Americans are unique because of their long history of colonization by the western countries of Spain and the United States (Pido, 1997). The western influence on Filipinos can be found within all aspects of the culture including language, customs and traditions, and values and beliefs. The influence of western culture on the Filipino-American psyche is highlighted in the theory of colonial mentality, a form of internalized oppression that comes out of colonization (David & Okazaki, 2006). The influence of western colonization has
perhaps also affected parenting values of Filipino-Americans (the effect of colonial mentality specifically on parenting style will be discussed later in this chapter). Western and/or European cultures tend to have more permissive and less authoritarian parenting styles. Theories propose that western cultures strive to foster more independence and autonomy, which leads to a generally more permissive parenting style (Baumrind, 1980; Bornstein, 2006). Perhaps the influence of cultures that value permissive parenting on an Asian culture that in general values authoritarian parenting, led to a more balanced view of parenting with less emphasis placed on discipline and control and more emphasis placed on discipline tempered with warmth, flexibility and balance. In other words, the colonization of Spain and United States perhaps made Filipino-Americans more authoritative parents.

It may also be hypothesized that Baumrind's labels of parenting style may not be applicable to the current cultural experience of this population, Filipino-Americans. Chao (1994) examined the applicability of Baumrind's parenting styles to Asian-Americans and found that while applicable, they needed to be re-conceptualized in order to incorporate Asian-Americans who were recent immigrants. Chao (1994) discusses the concept of "training" among Chinese-American parents that "train" children to be hard-working and self-disciplined and providing them with a "familial investment, concern, and support (p. 1113)." She argues that while this type of "training" may be conceptualized within Baumrind's framework as a characteristic of an authoritarian parent, it is not the typical control exercised by authoritarian parents. Instead, it is a family-based control. In addition, Chao argues that Baumrind's definition of warmth involves physical or verbally demonstrative warmth whereas Asian-American parents
may demonstrate warmth through parental support defined by investment and concern. This notion of re-conceptualizing Baumrind's parenting style labels may also be applied to the current study. The standard definition of an authoritarian parent may not apply to Filipino-Americans. Perhaps the majority of the sample responded to the authoritative items on the PAQ-R because those items best captured the notions of balance, hospitality and parental support. Further research is needed in the area of parenting styles and their applicability to collectivistic and Asian-American cultures.

Relationship between Colonial Mentality and Ethnic Identity

Hypothesis two predicted that those individuals who had colonial mentality would demonstrate less secure (or weaker) ethnic identity. This hypothesis was not supported. That is, there was no significant relationship found between the level of ethnic identity and the presence (or absence) of colonial mentality. In his development of a colonial mentality of depression for Filipino-Americans, David (2008) found that cultural values such as enculturation and ethnic identity did not affect depression. Within this model of depression, colonial mentality accounted for most of the variance with other cultural factors having little to no effect. In the development of the Colonial Mentality Scale (CMS), David and Okazaki (2006), found that colonial mentality correlated with collective self-esteem, but did not correlate with acculturation. They proposed that this suggests that while some Filipino-Americans may feel ashamed of their heritage or regard it as inferior, it does not mean that they want to adopt the dominant culture (p. 249). Colonial mentality and ethnic identity are different constructs. The key difference between these two related ideas is that ethnic identity, unlike colonial mentality, is achieved with a certain level of effort on the part of the individual. Having colonial
mentality involves ingrained beliefs. These beliefs are part of a person's being and eventually become part of their overall view of their culture. As one's ethnic identity develops, perhaps their view of their culture – even one that is tainted by colonial mentality – eventually becomes accepted. There may not be a relationship between colonial mentality and ethnic identity because Filipino-Americans have incorporated their experiences with colonization (and the resulting feelings and beliefs related to this colonization) into their ethnic identity.

Relating Colonial Mentality and Parenting Style

As discussed in Chapter IV, the hypothesis that permissive parents would have colonial mentality was unable to be tested because the sample did not include permissive parents. Reasons for the sample not including permissive parents are proposed earlier in this chapter. Upon secondary analysis of the individual five factors that comprise the CMS, one significant relationship was found between the Physical Characteristics subscale of colonial mentality and parenting style. Specifically, authoritative parents had lower colonial mentality scores than authoritarian parents. The Physical Characteristics subscale includes items that emphasize the preference for White physical characteristics over traditionally Filipino characteristics, such as flat noses versus bridged noses or light skin versus dark skin (David & Okazaki, 2006). Table 7 includes a list of the items that comprise the Physical Characteristics subscale. Upon review of the specific items, the Physical Characteristics subscale items appeared the most benign and less personally offensive than other items on the CMS. In other words, endorsing the items on the Physical Characteristics subscale appeared more like personal preference unrelated to feelings towards Spain and the United States, while some of the other items on the CMS
Table 7

*Items on Physical Characteristics subscale on Colonial Mentality Scale (CMS)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>I feel persons who have bridged noses (like Whites) are more attractive than persons with Filipino (flat) noses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>I would like to have a nose that is more bridged (like Whites) than the nose I have.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>I do not want my children to have Filipino (flat) noses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>I find persons with lighter skin-tones to be more attractive than persons with dark skin-tones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>I would like to have a skin-tone that is lighter than the one I have.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>I would like to have children with light skin-tones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>I do not want my children to be dark-skinned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>I generally think that a person that is part white and part Filipino is more attractive than a full-blooded Filipino.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Items are numbered based on original CMS study (David & Okazaki, 2006). Items were randomly numbered in present study, based on online version of the CMS used with permission from Dr. E.J.R. David.*
implied feelings (and acts) of discrimination or dislike of fellow Filipino-Americans. Some participants may have found these types of questions more difficult to endorse or at least more difficult to answer honestly. Examples of these items include, *In general, I do not associate with newly-arrived (FOBs) Filipino immigrants; I make fun of, tease, or badmouth Filipinos who are not very Americanized in their behaviors; In general, I am embarrassed of the Filipino culture and traditions.* Another reason that this subscale may have been significantly related to parenting style is that only the Physical Characteristics subscale included items relevant to parents – items that were related to hopes for their children. Perhaps authoritative parents feel like they have less control over their children’s appearance than authoritarian parents. Because authoritarian parents are high in control, they may believe they are able to control all aspects of their children’s lives, even their appearance. Authoritative parents, on the other hand, may place less importance on culturally related physical characteristics.

*Effect of Colonial Mentality on Relationship between Ethnic Identity and Parenting Style*

Hypothesis four predicted that colonial mentality would have an effect on the relationship between ethnic identity and parenting style. This hypothesis was also not supported. This study demonstrated that there is no significant relationship between ethnic identity and colonial mentality, and only one significant relationship between a sub-scale of CMS and parenting style. It appears that the presence of colonial mentality has little effect on the type of parent one becomes, and that colonial mentality does not interact in a significant way with ethnic identity to moderate its effect on parenting.

In studies of colonial mentality (David & Okazaki, 2006; David, 2008), relationships were found between the presence of colonial mentality and psychological
well-being. The authors hypothesized that it was related to mental health issues among Filipino-Americans, such as depression, low self-esteem, and overall negative evaluations of self and one's ethnic group. In fact, the model was developed in part to help explain high rates of mental health issues among Filipino-Americans. David's model of depression for Filipino-Americans (2008) found that a cultural model that included colonial mentality better explained depression in the sample.

These psychological effects of colonial mentality may not directly affect or interact with ethnic identity in a way that would directly affect parenting style. One can develop a parenting style and not necessarily be affected by issues of depression, anxiety, or low self-esteem. As discussed, parenting style is transmitted across generations, and psychological well-being or mental health issues could develop independent of the type of parent one becomes. In addition, ethnic identity and parenting style both develop out of active efforts. These efforts involve balancing, drawing from your past experiences, and working to understand and change your worldviews. Colonial mentality may have little effect on these tasks because it does not require effort. Its presence is built into a person's psyche and eventually is related to psychological issues of self within one's self. While both ethnic identity and colonial mentality are meaningful issues to Filipino-Americans, it appears that there is little interaction between them. David also found this in his depression model (2008) - a model that incorporated colonial mentality and ethnic identity did not better explain depression. Perhaps Filipino-Americans who are experiencing colonial mentality have learned to live with it and not let it affect who they are and their everyday lives.
Limitations of the Current Study and Recommendations for Future Research

This study was conducted to examine the relationship between ethnic identity, colonial mentality and parenting style in Filipino-Americans. There were several limitations to this study and further research is needed to clarify the relationship between these variables.

The sample size of the study was relatively low (N = 95). Although it met the requirements of the original proposal, a larger sample would have been preferred. This may be due to the author's difficulty recruiting participants on the Internet. Thus, this study was also limited in terms of the recruiting and sampling used. Based on the population being studied, Internet as well as in-person recruiting may have been more effective in collecting data. The Internet eliminates respondents less familiar with the computer who would have otherwise participated in the study and the proportion of this type of individual may be higher in the Filipino-American population. Furthermore, because hospitality is so valued in the Filipino-American community, perhaps a face-to-face interaction with the researcher would have yielded more responses and interest in the study.

The sample was also significantly skewed in that not all parenting styles were represented (i.e., no participants were identified as permissive parents). This affected the author’s ability to test all proposed hypotheses, although this limitation is discussed in length in this chapter. A larger sample size may have produced more variety in terms of parenting styles.

Another limitation of this study is related to response bias. Because the items were self-report, participants may have wanted to appear socially desirable, which may
have affected the responses. Also, the researcher identified herself as Filipino-American (or was identified as Filipino-American during the snowball sampling process), which could also have had an effect on participant’s responses. They may have wanted to appear more socially desirable because they knew the researcher was a member of the same ethnic group.

Instrumentation was also a limitation of this study. Upon further analysis, the Parental Authority Questionnaire – Revised (PAQ-R) did not appear to be an effective measure of parenting style for this population. The fact that the sample was so significantly skewed in terms of parenting style may be related to the instrument as well as the nature of the sample. A more culturally sensitive measure or a measure created specifically for Asian-Americans may have yielded more varied results. The Colonial Mentality Scale (CMS), while valid and reliable, may also have limited the study. Because the study focused on parenting style, the items on the CMS may have taken on new meaning for the participants because they may have viewed their responses on the CMS as a reflection on what type of parent they are. This may have resulted in additional response bias.

Future research is needed in the area of parenting with Filipino-Americans. The result that permissive parents were not found in the sample requires further research and explanation. Was the result simply due to limitations of the study or are Filipino-Americans not permissive parents and why? Related to this, instruments in the field to measure parenting style are very limited. Additional research is also needed in order to develop culturally relevant measure to assess parenting style as well as parenting labels or categories.
This study also demonstrates the need for future research on how colonial mentality is developed or formed in Filipino-Americans. Is a process involved and what factors affect whether it is present or absent in an individual? Research is limited in this area and the topic is relevant to many Filipino-Americans, as demonstrated by the proportion of participants in the current study with colonial mentality (39%). The process or the underlying factors involved in its development would be interesting to know and would contribute significantly to this new concept.

Clinical Implications of the Current Study

Ethnic identity has been studied extensively in the field of psychology. The majority of the research has been done with college-aged students and focuses on how ethnic identity is developed (Phinney, 1989). This study demonstrates that there is a relationship between ethnic identity and parenting style. In working with Filipino-American families, ethnic identity is an important cultural consideration in addition to other cultural factors that clinicians may consider, such as acculturation or experiences with discrimination. One's level of commitment to their culture may be related to the type of parent they are, and this may be important to explore within the therapeutic relationship.

Colonial mentality may lead to mental health issues such as depression, anxiety, and low self-esteem (David, 2008). However, this study demonstrates that clinicians should be careful not to overemphasize the effects of colonial mentality when working with clients, especially in working with families or parents. This study shows that while Filipino-Americans do experience colonial mentality, it does not have a significant relationship with parenting style. Individuals may have learned to incorporate colonial
mentality into their sense of self, and it does not have a relationship with the type of parent they are. Parenting style may be transmitted down from past generations and colonial mentality may develop independent of one’s values and beliefs about parenting. Thus, when working with Filipino-Americans who are also parents, clinicians should take into consideration the effects of colonial mentality, however they should not automatically assume that its presence is affecting parenting or family issues.

This study shows that professionals and clinicians have much to consider when working with Filipino-Americans who are parents. While the relationships between ethnic identity, colonial mentality and parenting style are not clear-cut, the results are nonetheless interesting and leave much room for future research. Cordova (1983) calls Filipino-Americans the “forgotten Asian-Americans.” Perhaps it is not so much that they are forgotten, but mysterious, complex and ever changing.
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APPENDIX A

INFORMED CONSENT FORM
I have been informed that this study involves research that will be conducted by Nicole Benedicto Murillo, a student of clinical psychology at the California School of Professional Psychology, Los Angeles (CSPP-LA) at Alliant International University. I understand that this project is designed to study the relationship between ethnic identity (i.e., ethnic identity involves your feelings of belonging to your ethnic group), colonial mentality (i.e., colonial mentality involves your feelings about being Filipino and your experiences with being part of a culture colonized by another country – the United States), and parenting style (i.e., parenting style refers to your beliefs about parenting and the way in which you parent) in Filipino-Americans. I have been asked to participate in this study because I am a Filipino-American parent. I understand that my participation in this study will involve filling out a total of four questionnaires, including a demographic information questionnaire, a parenting style questionnaire (to describe your parenting beliefs and methods), an ethnic identity questionnaire (to describe your feelings of belonging to your ethnic group), and a colonial mentality questionnaire (to describe your feelings about being Filipino and feelings towards the colonizing country of the United States). I am aware that my involvement in this study will take approximately 30-45 minutes.

I understand that I may refuse to participate or withdraw from this study at any time without any penalty or loss of services to which I am entitled to. I understand that at no time will my identity be revealed. My identity will be kept in strict confidence. I understand that no information that identifies me in any way will be released without my separate written approval. I am aware that all information that identifies me will be protected to the limits allowed by law. I have been informed that all individual data collected about me for the purposes of this study will be destroyed by Nicole Benedicto Murillo within five (5) years of the date of signing of this document.

I have been informed that if my participation in this study makes me feel uncomfortable, Nicole Benedicto Murillo may be contacted to discuss my feelings to determine if an appropriate referral for psychological help is necessary. I have been informed that psychological help will be provided at my expense. Referrals will be provided from the American Psychological Association (APA) Psychologist Locator. Referrals from the APA are available via telephone at (800) 964-2000 or online at http://locator.apa.org.

I am aware that although I may not directly benefit from this study, my participation in this project may benefit Nicole Benedicto Murillo or other Filipino-American parents.

I understand that I may contact Nicole Benedicto Murillo at nbenedicto@alliant.edu or Dr. Ellin Bloch, Dissertation Advisor at (626) 270-3337, 1000 S. Fremont Avenue Unit 5, Alhambra, CA 91803 if I have any questions about this project or my participation in this study. I understand that at the end of the study, I may request a summary of results or additional information about the study from Nicole Benedicto Murillo by submitting my email address at the end of the study. I understand that my email address will not be linked to my responses and will be submitted separately.
☐ I have read this form and understand what it says. I hereby agree to participate in this research project.
APPENDIX B

DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE
1. What is your ethnicity?

Filipino/Filipino-American □
Biracial □ Please specify: _______________________

2. What is your gender?

Male □ Female □

3. What is your age? ______

4. What is your marital status?

Single □
Married □
Divorced □
Separated □
Divorced and remarried □

5. If you are married, or have been married, is/was your spouse a Filipino-American?

Yes □ No □

6. Were you born in the U.S.?

Yes □ No □

7. If NO, how many years have you lived in the U.S.? _______ Yrs

8. Which best describes your generation status?

□ Immigrated to the U.S.
□ One of my parents immigrated to the U.S.
□ Both of my parents immigrated to the U.S.
□ One of my grandparents immigrated to the U.S.
□ Two or more grandparents immigrated to the U.S.
□ This question does not apply to me.

9. What is your religion?

Roman Catholic □
Protestant □
Muslim □
Jewish □
Other □ Please specify: _______________________
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10. How many children do you have (please list your child’s gender and age)?

Number of children: _______  Age: _______  Gender (M/F): _______

Age: _______  Gender (M/F): _______
Age: _______  Gender (M/F): _______
Age: _______  Gender (M/F): _______
Age: _______  Gender (M/F): _______
Age: _______  Gender (M/F): _______
Age: _______  Gender (M/F): _______
Age: _______  Gender (M/F): _______

11. What is your annual household income?

☐ 15,000-25,000
☐ 26,000-40,000
☐ 41,000-60,000
☐ 61,000-80,000
☐ 81,000-100,000
☐ 100,000-150,000
☐ 150,000-200,000
☐ over 200,000

12. What is the highest level of education you have completed?

Junior high school
High school graduate
Associate’s degree
Bachelor’s degree
Master’s degree
Doctoral degree
APPENDIX C

PARENTAL AUTHORITY QUESTIONNAIRE – REVISED (PAQ-R)

The Parental Authority Questionnaire – Revised (PAQ-R) was obtained from:

APPENDIX D

MULTIGROUP ETHNIC IDENTITY MEASURE – REVISED (MEIM-R)

To obtain a copy of the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure – Revised (MEIM-R), please contact:

Dr. Jean S. Phinney
California State University, Los Angeles
Department of Psychology - KH C3104
5151 State University Drive
Los Angeles, CA 90032
Phone: (323) 343-2261
Email: jphinne@calstatela.edu
APPENDIX E

COLONIAL MENTALITY SCALE (CMS)

To obtain a copy of the Colonial Mentality Scale (CMS), please contact:

E.J.R. David, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Department of Psychology
University of Alaska Anchorage
3211 Providence Drive, SSB214
Anchorage, Alaska 99508
Email: ejrdavid@uaa.alaska.edu
Phone: (907) 786-6778