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GENERATION STATUS, ETHNIC IDENTITY, COLONIAL MENTALITY, AND ENCULTURATION IN FILIPINO AMERICANS
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Filipino Americans’ psychological experiences pertaining to their generation status, ethnic identity, enculturation, and colonial mentality are rarely studied in counseling psychology due to inconsistent disaggregation of Asian American and Pacific Islander (AA&PI) data (Agbayani-Siewert, 2004; Espiritu, 2003; Nadal et al., 2010; Okamura, 2013). Literature suggests that the study of these constructs related to their mental health can guide more culturally informed care for this historically excluded population (David & Nadal, 2013; Nadal, 2020). The current study used an exploratory design to test six research hypotheses and accomplish the following: examine relationships between the constructs, investigate intergenerational differences, validate a measure of ethnic identity on a Filipino American population, and expand on cross-disciplinary counseling psychology research of Filipino Americans.

Five hundred and ninety-two individuals, who identified as Filipino American, between the ages of 18-83, and currently living in the United States engaged with this study after recruiting from email lists and social media pages of Filipino American-run and/or serving organizations. This sample was split into two subsamples to examine generational differences in ethnic identity, enculturation, and colonial mentality and to examine relationships between these constructs. The instruments used in this study were the Enculturation Scale for Filipino
Americans–Short Form (ESFA-S; del Prado & Church, 2010), Colonial Mentality Scale (CMS; David & Okazaki, 2006), Ethnic Identity Scale (EIS; Umaña-Taylor et al., 2004), and a demographic questionnaire. Primary analyses were conducted via multivariate analysis of variance tests (MANOVA) and canonical correlation analyses.

Results suggested that there are intergenerational differences in ethnic identity Resolution, and Connection with Homeland, and Interpersonal Norms. Intergenerational differences in colonial mentality were not detected and were explained by the possible use of colonial mentality as an adaptive strategy. Three different canonical correlations between the subscale scores for ESFA-S, CMS, and EIS measures yielded 4 interpretable functions explaining relations between subscales from the three measures: Pagmamahal sa Sarili at Kapwa (Love of Self & Kapwa/Interdependence), Pagkakasundo sa Kultura at Sarili (Cultural and Self Harmony), Rebolusioneerong Kaisipan (Revolutionary Thinking), and Nahahati sa Kamalayan (Divided Consciousness). These functions explained at least 40%, 14%, 26.3%, and 23.5% of variance within the sample, respectively. Additional functions, such as Yaman sa Kulturang Pilipino (Filipino Cultural Wealth), Pakikisama Concerns (Interpersonal Harmony Concerns), and Paglalakad sa Sakit (Walking through the Pain), each explained less than 10% of the variance within the sample and were presented to expand nuanced discussions on Filipino American psychological research.

Overall, the current study provided support for relationship(s) between ethnic identity, enculturation, and colonial mentality in Filipino Americans and confirmed literature findings on intergenerational differences in ethnic identity. The study’s main accomplishments include validation of the EIS on a predominantly second generation Filipino American sample and strengthened construct validity of the CMS and ESFA-S.
GENERATION STATUS, ETHNIC IDENTITY, COLONIAL MENTALITY, AND ENCULTURATION IN FILIPINO AMERICANS

by

Kamille P. U. La Rosa

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate College in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
Counselor Education and Counseling Psychology
Western Michigan University
April 2022

Doctoral Committee:

Joseph R. Morris, Ph.D., Chair
Mary Z. Anderson, Ph.D.
Allyson Tintiangco-Cubales, Ph.D.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

No success in this effort is mine alone, and I am honored to have communities that wholeheartedly supported my pursuit of a doctoral degree. This has been a long, challenging, and humbling journey to embark upon, and I am indebted to the people who believed in me when I struggled to believe in myself. Your unwavering support means a lot to me as I look forward to the privileges of being able to pay that forward.

I would like to thank my family for their encouragement and motivation. You’ve taught me to value my education, hard work, and excellence in all my endeavors. While I am the first person in my family to obtain this degree, I do not anticipate being the last. I am honored and inspired by the past and future generations of my family who’ve dared me to chase my dreams with courage and resilience. I am especially grateful to my husband, Tanav, for his unwavering love, support, and encouragement. I would not be here to complete this work without your patience and belief in my strength and perseverance throughout the years. Thank you for sharing your life with me—I am looking forward to where our future will bring us!

To my WMU CECP friends, I owe so much of my success to your wisdom, strength, and bravery over the years. Your successes inspire me, and I am proud of what we’ve accomplished for our communities over the years. You have all watched me struggle, cry, vent, laugh, and complain over the past several years. Thank you for giving me the space to be vulnerable and courageous in advocating for myself and others. I have so many people who’ve planted seeds of hope in me throughout the years: Walter Malone, Anthony Daniel, Maime Butler, Ricky Pope, Dawnielle Simmons, Annette Perales, Jeannette Perales, Sonia Amin, Rebecca Tuinstra, Anné
Stocker, Mike Evitts, Zari Carpenter, Breezie Gibson, Ingrid Rauk, and many others. To some of my most dedicated friends over the years, thank you for your support: Rachel Robinson, Meagan Roche, Elizabeth Karslake, Masroor Hossain, Eva Sola, Jessica Liu, Jacks Cheng, Camille Cielo, Emilie Santos Tumale, and Sylvia Lin.

To my BGSU Internship friends, I am thankful to have your support during some of the most challenging moments of our careers. When the COVID-19 pandemic hit, our mutual support for each other via internet sustained me and inspired me to embrace myself fully, even when I felt discouraged. Lindsey Dollar, Shieka Glenn, Sam Gauvin, Schaad, Mandisa Sherife-Kekulah, Jaime Furda, Carnesca Butler, and Denise Litterer—I will treasure the moments when we’ve laughed, cried, and believed in each other.

Maraming Salamat to my Barangay Group—you’ve helped me remember my “why” when I was ready to give up. Our weekly Zoom meetings and group chats are a perpetual reminder of why kapwa is an integral part of healing within the Filipina/x/o diaspora. Jessica Petalio, Von Torres, Shea Carter, and Louie Cuaderno—thank you for providing a shoulder to lean on and for celebrating the small victories with me. I would also like to extend my thanks to the many members of the Asian American Psychological Association (AAPA) and the Filipino American National Historical Society (FANHS) who have inspired me and contributed directly to the completion of my dissertation. You’ve kept me steadfast in my commitment to serving our communities’ needs and building on our community cultural wealth.

To Mary Ebejer, June Gothberg, and Wessam Abdelazziz, thank you for your writing encouragement and statistical wisdom! You’ve been a sounding board to my ideas and played an
important role in my scholarly process during this dissertation. My weekly check-ins with you have grounded me and provided accountability throughout the dissertation writing process. Your expertise and perspectives on my work motivated me to complete this dissertation and believe in my own expertise. I would also like to thank my doctoral advisor and dissertation chair, Dr. Joseph R. Morris, and my dissertation committee members, Dr. Mary Z. Anderson and Dr. Allyson Tintiangco-Cubales. Thank you for the time and energy in helping me reach this point in my doctoral journey—I will carry the lessons I’ve learned from all of you along the way for many years to come. To my undergraduate mentors, Dr. Siu-Lan Tan and Dr. Paul Sotherland, thank you for inspiring me to begin this journey and believing in my capacity to grow before I was even aware of it. You’ve changed my life forever. Maraming salamat—I am so grateful for the many communities who have held and encouraged me throughout this journey.

Kamille P. U. La Rosa
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ........................................................................................................... ii

LIST OF TABLES ................................................................................................................... xi

LIST OF FIGURES ................................................................................................................ xii

CHAPTER

I. INTRODUCTION .................................................................................................................. 1

Experiences of Filipino Americans ......................................................................................... 3

Filipino American Settlement and Immigration History ...................................................... 6

  First Wave of Filipino American Settlement ................................................................... 6
  Second Wave of Filipino American Immigration ............................................................ 7
  Third Wave of Filipino American Immigration ............................................................... 8
  Fourth Wave of Filipino American Immigration ............................................................. 9
  Fifth Wave of Filipino American Immigration ............................................................... 10
  Sixth Wave of Filipino American Immigration .............................................................. 11
  Seventh Wave of Filipino American Immigration ........................................................... 12

Mental Health and Stigma Among Filipino Americans ......................................................... 13

Statement of the Problem .................................................................................................... 16

  Significance of the Research ......................................................................................... 18

Research Questions ............................................................................................................ 19

Research Hypotheses ......................................................................................................... 20
**Table of Contents—Continued**

CHAPTER

Definition of Terms .................................................................................................................. 21

Outline for the Remainder of the Dissertation ........................................................................ 27

II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE .............................................................................. 28

Generation Status ..................................................................................................................... 28

Generation Status Defined ...................................................................................................... 28

Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders and Generation Status ........................................... 29

Generational Differences in Filipino Americans ................................................................. 31

Ethnic Identity .......................................................................................................................... 36

Ethnic Identity Defined .......................................................................................................... 39

Ethnic Identity Models and Theories ...................................................................................... 40

Social Identity Theory ............................................................................................................. 42

Umaña-Taylor’s Ethnic Identity Model .................................................................................. 45

Ethnic Identity in Filipino Americans ..................................................................................... 48

Colonial Mentality .................................................................................................................. 52

Colonial Mentality and Race ................................................................................................ 56

Colonial Mentality Development .......................................................................................... 58

Colonial Mentality Among Filipinos and *Sikolohiyang Pilipino* ....................................... 59

Enculturation ............................................................................................................................ 62

Enculturation in Diasporic Cultures and Anticolonial Theories ........................................... 64

Mental Health Implications of Acculturation and Enculturation ........................................ 66

Filipino American Enculturation ............................................................................................ 67
Table of Contents—Continued

CHAPTER

Summary ........................................................................................................................................... 69

III. METHOD ....................................................................................................................................... 71

Participants ......................................................................................................................................... 71

Measures ........................................................................................................................................... 74

- Enculturation Scale for Filipino Americans—Short Form .......................................................... 75
- Colonial Mentality Scale ............................................................................................................. 77
- Ethnic Identity Scale ..................................................................................................................... 79
- Demographic Questionnaire ........................................................................................................ 81

Procedures ......................................................................................................................................... 81

Research Design .............................................................................................................................. 83

Statistical Analysis ............................................................................................................................ 85

- Missing Data .................................................................................................................................. 85
- Descriptive Statistics and MANOVA ............................................................................................... 87
- Bivariate Correlations and Linear Regression ............................................................................... 87
- Canonical Correlations .................................................................................................................. 88

Research Question 1 ......................................................................................................................... 88

Research Question 2 ......................................................................................................................... 89

Research Question 3 ......................................................................................................................... 90

Research Question 4 ......................................................................................................................... 91

Research Question 5 ......................................................................................................................... 93

Research Question 6 ......................................................................................................................... 93
Table of Contents—Continued

IV. RESULTS ..................................................................................................................................................94

Preliminary Data Analyses .................................................................................................................................94

Power Analysis ..................................................................................................................................................94

Missing Data ....................................................................................................................................................95

Descriptive Statistics ....................................................................................................................................99

Reliability Estimates .......................................................................................................................................103

Assumptions ..................................................................................................................................................105

Primary Statistical Analyses ............................................................................................................................106

Research Hypothesis 1: Ethnic identity for first- and 1.5-generation Filipino Americans will be higher than that of second- and third/subsequent-generation Filipino Americans ...........................................................................106

Research Hypothesis 2: Lower ethnic identity subscale scores will be related to higher colonial mentality subscale scores in Filipino Americans .......108

Research Hypothesis 3: Higher enculturation subscale scores will be related to higher ethnic identity subscale scores in Filipino Americans ..............111

Research Hypothesis 4: Higher enculturation subscale scores will be related to lower colonial mentality subscale scores in Filipino Americans .......115

Research Hypothesis 5: First- and 1.5-generation Filipino Americans will have higher enculturation scores than second- and third/subsequent-generation Filipino Americans ...........................................................................118

Research Hypothesis 6: First-generation Filipino Americans will have lower colonial mentality scores than 1.5-, second-, and third/subsequent-generation Filipino Americans ...........................................................................122

V. DISCUSSION .................................................................................................................................................124

Purpose of the Research ..................................................................................................................................124

Research Questions ...........................................................................................................................................125

viii
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHAPTER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research Hypotheses .......................................................... 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Hypothesis Testing ...................... 126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Hypothesis 1 .................................. 126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Hypothesis 2 .................................. 128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Hypothesis 3 .................................. 132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Hypothesis 4 .................................. 136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Hypothesis 5 .................................. 140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Hypothesis 6 .................................. 143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Discussion .......................................................... 146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limitations .......................................................... 149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations for Future Research .......... 152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implications of the Study ......................... 155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implications for Mental Health Clinicians and Clinical Practice ....... 156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implications for Researchers .................... 162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implications for Training .......................... 166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion .......................................................... 170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFERENCES .......................................................... 172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDICES .......................................................... 224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. HSIRB Approval and Informed Consent Forms ....................................... 224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Recruitment Materials .......................................................... 227</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDICES

C. Enculturation Scale for Filipino Americans—Short Form.............................................230
D. Colonial Mentality Scale..............................................................................................233
E. Ethnic Identity Scale.....................................................................................................240
F. Demographics Questionnaire......................................................................................242
LIST OF TABLES

1. Dissertation Research Questions and Hypotheses ..................................................20
2. Participant Demographic Information .......................................................................73
3. Psychometric Properties for ESFA-S, CMS, and EIS Scales and Subscales ............101
5. Average Ethnic Identity Subscale Scores Across Filipino American Generation Groups ........................................................................................................106
6. MANOVA Summary Table: Ethnic Identity .................................................................107
7. Canonical Solution for Ethnic Identity Predicting Colonial Mentality for Functions 1 and 2 ........................................................................................................112
8. Canonical Solution for Ethnic Identity Predicting Enculturation for Functions 1 and 2 ........................................................................................................114
9. Canonical Solution for Enculturation Predicting Colonial Mentality for Functions 1, 2, and 3 ........................................................................................................119
10. Average Enculturation Subscale Scores Across Filipino American Generation Groups ........................................................................................................120
11. MANOVA Summary Table: Enculturation .................................................................121
12. Average Colonial Mentality Subscale Scores Across Filipino American Generation Groups ........................................................................................................123
13. MANOVA Summary Table: Colonial Mentality ........................................................123
LIST OF FIGURES

1 Push and Pull Factors of Filipino Migration.................................................................54
2 Meter Model of Assimilation, Acculturation, and Enculturation.................................68
3 Proposed Analysis for Research Question 2 ..................................................................90
4 Proposed Analysis for Research Question 3 .................................................................91
5 Proposed Analysis for Research Question 4 .................................................................92
6 Chart of Missing Value Patterns..................................................................................98
7 Missingness Pattern Frequencies in Dataset..................................................................99
8 Canonical Correlation Analysis for Ethnic Identity and Colonial Mentality............109
9 Canonical Correlation Analysis for Ethnic Identity and Enculturation ......................113
10 Canonical Correlation Analysis for Enculturation and Colonial Mentality..............116
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders (AA&PIs) are the fastest growing panethnic racial group in the United States with many ethnic groups sharing a long history of settling in the United States and confronting experiences of discrimination. Over 20 million AA&PIs are members of diasporic ethnic groups with connections to countries in the Pacific Islands, East, Southeast, and South Asia. Their population is projected to reach over 35 million by 2060 (Budiman & Ruiz, 2021b; Lopez et al., 2017). AA&PIs are frequently perceived as being monolithic despite the high level of diverse ethnicities, religions, languages, and cultural values represented by each of the ethnic groups within this racial category, while sharing a common history of discrimination, oppression, and exclusion from many privileges afforded to people of White racial status due to racism and xenophobia (Lee & Ramakrishnan, 2019; Shih et al., 2019).

Even within the AA&PI panethnic category, Native Hawaiian and Pasifika scholars, educators, and community leaders have critiqued the co-opting and erasure of Pacific Islanders’ (PIs) identity by Asian American (AA) researchers in scholarship by claiming to study AA&PI ethnic groups and exclusively focusing on AA ethnic groups (Hall, 2015; Trask, 1999). While there are individuals and communities of people who identify as both AA&PI, this study moves away from the old nomenclature of the panethnic category of AAPI—a common, harmful error in psychological research on these historically undervalued groups and a consequence of systemic and environmental forms of discrimination (Fujikane & Okamura, 2008; Shimkhada et al., 2021). Indeed, the nuanced discourse on AA&PI has evolved and expanded to encourage the equitable representation and empowerment of narratives that thrive in resistance to White supremacy (Lo, 2019; Marsh & Na’puti, 2017).
In the absence of White racial status and their privileges, many AA&PI ethnic groups have experienced various forms of historical oppression via colonization, discrimination, and prejudice over the years. Within the settler-colonial borders of the United States, various AA&PI ethnic groups have historically been excluded from naturalization, voting, hiring within certain professions and subjected to environmental racism and grave social, legal, or financial consequences by congregating in dance halls (Lee & Ramakrishnan, 2019; Millan & Alvarez, 2014; Teodoro, 1999). AA&PIs have had Indigenous lands exploited by the United States for resources and military bases for geopolitics. They have also been subjected to education endorsing “benevolent assimilation,” victimized by violent riots, forced to leave their homes to reside in internment camps, killed for being wrongfully perceived as terrorists, and, within the past year, brutally attacked due to xenophobic attitudes surrounding COVID-19-related fears and job losses (Ancheta, 2006; Lee et al., 2017; Ruiz et al., 2021; Tapia, 2006). Events like these are likely to have profound effects on their psychological well-being in both overt and covert ways.

The complex, intertwining, and divergent histories of different AA&PI ethnic groups and their experiences with prejudice and discrimination in the United States over the years contributes to signs of psychological distress in individuals belonging to these groups, which may be overlooked by many mental health professionals for various reasons (Tran & Chan, 2017; Wu et al., 2021). Over the past two decades, researchers have found links between experiences of discrimination with increased risks for symptoms of depression, anxiety, and substance use among different AA&PI ethnic groups (Greene et al., 2006; Huynh & Fuligni, 2010; Laus, 2020; Wang et al., 2019; Wei et al., 2010; Yip et al., 2008, 2019). Racialized experiences, such as perceived discrimination, can have an impact on AA&PI individuals’ self-perception, well-being, and messages they receive about their group (Chen et al., 2020; David &
Derthick, 2018; Trieu, 2019). Indeed, it can be distressing for members of minoritized groups, such as AA&PIs, to experience discrimination and to mitigate its effects on their self-perception and daily life.

Given the diversity of experiences within AA&PIs, there have been increasing calls for researchers and policymakers to disaggregate studies and reports on the several ethnic groups within the AA&PI community and to draw more visibility towards coping strategies and resiliencies within each AA&PI ethnic group (Choi et al., 2020; Nadal, 2019; Park, 2017). Interventions for addressing needs related to confronting racialized experiences and mental health within the AA&PI community draw upon an ethnic group’s adaptations to their environment, values for interdependence, shared resources, increased political involvement, and self-advocacy within ethnic communities or with other marginalized, minoritized groups (Leung, 2021; Morey et al., 2020; Tran & Chan, 2017). Currently, however, intragroup variations in AA&PIs are still overlooked and erase the variations across ethnic groups resulting from different histories, languages, and norms, including those of Filipino Americans (Ai et al., 2015; Shih et al., 2019).

**Experiences of Filipino Americans**

Filipino Americans are the third largest AA&PI group and account for 18% or 4.2 million members of the overall AA&PI population, yet their distinct history, concerns, and narratives are still commonly overlooked by a predominantly monolithic view of AA&PIs (Budiman & Ruiz, 2021a, 2021b). Compared to other AA&PI ethnic groups, Filipino Americans have the highest language proficiency at 84%, yet they have lower levels of education compared to East Asians when disaggregated by generation status (Nadal, 2020). In comparison to other AA&PI ethnic groups, Filipino Americans are reported to be more aware of discrimination because of their
relatively higher acculturation rates and understanding of Western culture through their unique history with colonization by Spain and the United States (Ai et al., 2015; Kitano & Daniels, 2001; Ocampo, 2014). Identity terms for Filipino Americans have allowed for ways to decolonize and refuse the colonial, gendered, and settler grammars of Spanish and English imposed by Western empires and to reflect the multitude of intersectional ways Filipino Americans exist and resist (Barrett et al., 2021; Curammeng et al., 2022). For example, Curammeng et al. (2022) have observed conversations and tensions surrounding the use of “o” for cisgender men, “a” for cisgender women, and “x” for Filipinx Americans whose identities transcend the cis-gender male and cis-gender female binary and were celebrated by Indigenous Filipina/x/os. While these conversations about identity and resistance are ongoing within the community, it is important to note that this conversation rapidly evolved during this study, with Filipina/x/o American becoming the more accepted identity term after the completion of a rigorous literature review and data analysis. While this study uses the term, “Filipino American” to include the intersectional experiences of individuals and communities within the diaspora across gender and sexual orientation, it is important to honor and make space for the expansiveness of Filipina/x/o American identity and the various forms of power, innovation, and resistance at its core over time. Given that similar conversations are taking place within different communities of color, it is important to highlight the nuance of identity terms within this population.

In fact, some researchers have provided explanations that Filipino American experiences share more overlaps in racialized experiences with non-AA&PI minoritized groups (e.g., African Americans, Latine Americans, Indigenous peoples) because their identity formation was also forged through subjugation and oppression through colonialism (Abueva, 1976; Ai et al., 2015;
It is important to note, however, that while comparisons may be drawn between some of the mechanisms driving identity formation between Filipino Americans, African Americans, Latine Americans, and Indigenous peoples, the lived experiences by members from each of these groups and their positionality within oppressive systems are distinct from one another. Studies have shown that relative to Chinese Americans and, at times, even to Vietnamese Americans, Filipino Americans experience higher and more distinct forms of “perceived discrimination” (Ai et al., 2015; Chutuape, 2016; Nadal, 2019; Nadal et al., 2012; Shih et al., 2019).

Within recent years, spikes in discrimination that stem from xenophobic and racist ideology have increased the risks for Filipino Americans’ well-being and feelings of safety and belonging within their identity. According to national reports, during the COVID-19 pandemic AA&PIs experienced the largest spike in hate incidents (i.e., verbal harassment, shunning, physical assault, civil rights violations, and online harassment) from March 2020 to February 2021, with Filipino Americans as the fourth largest AA&PI ethnic group affected by these harmful behaviors (Cabral, 2021; Hong et al., 2021; Jeung et al., 2021; Ruiz et al., 2020). Indeed, assumptions of AA&PIs as a monolithic racial group and the relative invisibility of Filipino American experiences has ultimately added to distress levels among Filipino Americans. Additionally, Filipino Americans are experiencing higher levels of risk for contracting COVID-19 due to historical and socioeconomic factors, such as undocumented status, exposure for health workers, preexisting health conditions, and lack of health insurance, which have contributed to increased vulnerability to contracting the virus—accounting for at least 35% of COVID-19 deaths in California’s AA&PI population (Wong, 2020). Filipinos account for 4% of nurses nationwide and 50% of all foreign-educated nurses yet account for 31% of nurse deaths due to
COVID-19 (Choy, 2013; Fadel & Levid, 2020; Jurado & Saria, 2018; National Nurses United, 2020; Shoichet, 2020). Implicit biases and systemic barriers have also contributed to a lower likelihood for Filipino Americans to have professional or managerial positions compared to Whites, which has increased their occupational risk during the pandemic (David, 2020; Lee, 2019). As Filipino Americans live through unprecedented times, it should be noted that they have historically persevered through waves of hardship and discrimination.

**Filipino American Settlement and Immigration History**

The Filipino diaspora has a distinct, 400-year history on lands that are now known as the United States. This history intersects with Western imperialism and describes seven waves of immigration documented by Filipino American historians, sociologists, and researchers in the social sciences. Within each of these waves, Filipino Americans settlers or immigrants faced unique challenges that corresponded with the demands of that time. A summary of these immigration waves is provided in this study to provide context for the experiences of Filipino Americans in the United States and illuminate their distinct history within the AA&PI panethnic group (Cordova, 1983; Mabalon, 2007, 2013).

**First Wave of Filipino American Settlement**

The first wave of Filipino American settlers is frequently left out of AA&PI history or U.S. history due to the hypervisibility of East Asian AA ethnic groups, the relative invisibility of Filipino Americans, and the small number of people within this wave of settlement. Settlers who were *indios* (natives) from what is now known as the Philippine Islands arrived and settled on the shores of Indigenous Chumash and Obispeño lands (now known as Morro Bay, California) in 1587 (Borah, 1995; Francia, 2013; Nadal, 2020; Rodriguez, 2016; Sue, 2013). This wave consisted of shipbuilders, sailors, and slaves during the Spanish colonial period in Mexico and
the Manila Galleon trade from 1587-1898 (Mabalon, 2007). Another documented settlement named St. Maló was established on Indigenous Houma, Chitimacha, and Chahta Yakni (Choctaw) lands (now known as St. Bernard Parish, Louisiana) in 1762 (Aguilar Jr., 2012; Cordova, 1983; Espina, 1988; Fajardo, 2016; Murillo, 2009). These indios were known by English speakers during this time as seafaring “Manilamen” or “Manillas” who escaped working conditions on Spanish galleon ships by jumping ship in the Indigenous Dominion of Yopitzinco province within Méxihcah lands (now known as Acapulco, Mexico). They took up occupations as farmers, craftsmen, fishermen, and, in some cases, as mercenaries after settling on those lands or migrating elsewhere (Aguilar Jr., 2012). This wave occurred during the 16th century, while the Philippine Islands and Mexico were being established as colonies of Spain, which occurred before the colonization of the islands by the United States and was integral to the establishment of a Filipino presence in the lands now known as the United States.

**Second Wave of Filipino American Immigration**

The second wave of Filipino immigration to the United States occurred between 1898-1906, which overlapped Filipino efforts towards independence from Spain, the Philippine-American War, and U.S. imperial efforts to quell the Filipino “Indian” resistance to U.S. colonization with attempts at “benevolent assimilation” that resembled North American residential schools and education programs (Dunbar-Ortiz, 2014; Gealogo, 2018; Rodriguez, 2016; Teodoro, 1999). U.S. capitalism had a profound impact on Filipinos. The United States denigrated Filipinos and justified the exploitation of Filipino land and labor through claims of wanting to save their “little brown brothers” (Halagao, 2010; Ignacio et al., 2001). The passage of Law No.852 allowed the use of public funds to support the academic endeavors of Filipinos from mostly ilustrado (rich, influential, elite families in Philippine society) at American
institutions (Hernandez, 2016; Teodoro, 1999). These individuals, who became known as "pensionados," were selected, in part, because of their potential to pass on Americanized ways to Philippine locals and to establish a new class of elites more amenable to U.S. political and economic interests within Philippine municipalities after completing their studies and returning to the Philippines. Some pensionados were unable to complete their education for various reasons and did not return to the Philippines due to financial reasons or shame (Nadal, 2020). Many of these pensionados completed bachelor’s, master’s, and doctoral degrees and were able to read and write in English upon completing their education—further advancing U.S. cultural colonization (Mabalon, 2007). The pensionado program ended by the mid-1910s, and, despite the brevity of this immigration wave, it had an impact on relations between the United States and the Philippines.

**Third Wave of Filipino American Immigration**

The third wave of immigration occurred between 1906 and 1934 in response to immigration restrictions on Chinese laborers along the West Coast (e.g., CA, HI, AK) and labor demands in farming and fishing industries (Guyotte & Posadas, 2013). Approximately 100,000 Filipinos arrived and resided in the United States, including the thousands of predominantly Ilocano and Visayan sakada workers who were recruited by the Hawaiian Sugar Planters Association (HSPA) and settled in Hawaii (Mabalon, 2007, 2013). Within AA&PI history and ethnic studies literature, this wave of Filipino American immigrants is known as the manong (older brother figure) generation. Even though this wave of immigration overlapped chronologically with the second wave, they were predominantly male, differed in social and economic backgrounds compared to pensionados, and were recruited more to fill labor demands as opposed to influencing Philippine bureaucracy (Hernandez, 2016). While many of these
laborers migrated across the West Coast according to seasonal labor availability and demands in farming or fishing industries, others worked in factories, service jobs, domestic work, or even managed to enlist officially or unofficially in the U.S. Navy (Cordova, 1983; Espiritu, 2003b; Mabalon, 2013). These laborers, commonly known as manongs, endured intense stoop labor conditions for low pay in addition to racial discrimination and prejudice.

During this time, members of the manong generation withstood intense levels of anti-Asian sentiment likened to current-day, media narratives on AA&PIs, while jumpstarting community organizing efforts for improved labor conditions. Businesses and establishments on the West Coast often prohibited entry and services to Filipino Americans by posting “Positively no Filipinos allowed” signs and using rhetoric that described Filipino Americans as the “brown menace,” “hypersexual,” or “brown monkeys” based on racially prejudiced assumptions of criminality and deviance (Balce, 2006; Nadal, 2020; Okamura, 2010; Tapia, 2006). The heightened anti-Filipino sentiment resulted in various hate crimes and violent riots in which White rioters “hunted” Filipino Americans out of towns, which led to loss of livelihoods, homes, or even their lives (Dosono, 2013; Millan & Alvarez, 2014; Nadal, 2019; Teodoro, 1999). Yet, even amid these encounters, many of these manongs led and participated in the monumental labor and farmworkers movement alongside Mexican Americans in the Delano Grape Strike to create the United Farm Workers (UFW) labor union through the 1960s (Mabalon, 2013).

Fourth Wave of Filipino American Immigration

This period of Filipino immigration occurred between 1934-1946 and is characterized by three key developments: the exclusion of Filipinos and the change in their status from “national” to “alien,” the onset of World War II, and the coming of age of American-born or -raised children of the pre-war immigrants (Mabalon, 2007, 2013). In 1934, the Tydings-McDuffie Act cut off
immigration from the Philippines, drastically reducing routes to immigration outside of U.S. Navy enlistment or marriage to military personnel and causing a gap between immigration waves (Guyotte, 1997). Filipinos’ status as “aliens” during this period meant that many individuals could no longer move freely between the Philippines and the United States.

During this period, World War II devastated the Philippines as the United States left the islands, which were then seized and occupied by Japan. Given the increased restrictions on Filipino immigration during this time, some Filipino immigrants in the United States found opportunities to become naturalized citizens after fighting in the Philippines within the Army’s First and Second Filipino Infantry Regiments. Many Filipino American families in the United States and the children from these families began to create a unique Filipino American identity and ethnic culture as they matured into adolescence during the 1930s and 1940s (Mabalon, 2007).

**Fifth Wave of Filipino Immigration**

The fifth wave of Filipino immigration occurred between 1946-1965 as the end of World War II and the Cold War brought more changes for Filipino immigrants and Filipino American families (Mabalon, 2007). This wave was characterized by four main events: the arrival of war brides, family reunification, the establishment of navy families, and citizenship rights. Many Filipino American soldiers brought back well-educated brides from the Philippines to settle and establish families in the United States after their service. The passing of the Luce-Cellar Act in 1946 relaxed Philippine immigration restrictions from the previous wave by increasing the immigrant quota from 50 to 100 per year, providing opportunities for naturalization, and allowing for family reunification and petitions for spouses, children, and parents. In addition, naturalized Filipino Americans could purchase land and vote. The Military Bases Agreement was
passed in 1947 because of Cold War policies and U.S.-Philippines neocolonial relations, allowing for Filipinos to join the U.S. Navy and become naturalized citizens (Espiritu, 2003b). Given these circumstances, there was a growing Filipino American baby boom and trend towards suburbanization that paralleled developments in other U.S. communities during this time.

**Sixth Wave of Filipino Immigration**

Immigration to the United States from the Philippines between 1965-1986 was characterized by changes in immigration law and unrest and division in the Philippines and the United States over the regime of U.S.-backed dictator Ferdinand Marcos (Mabalon, 2007). The 1965 Immigration and Naturalization Act was passed, which repealed the Asian Exclusion Act of 1924, the Tydings-McDuffie Act of 1934, and the Walter-McCarran Immigration and Naturalization Act of 1952 to loosen and eliminate nation-based immigration quotas (Choy, 2013; Espiritu, 2007; Guyotte, 1997). Filipino immigrants established large suburban and urban communities in Daly City, Union City, Fremont, Chicago, New York, Jersey City, and the Hampton Roads region of Virginia. Most Filipino immigrants filled U.S. employment gaps as professionals, technicians, and skilled workers (Choy, 2013; Espiritu, 2007). Racial preferences in immigration law were abolished and permitted a 20,000 annual quota of immigrants to every country, including the Philippines. U.S. imperialism did little to improve rampant unemployment or develop the Philippine economy and created the conditions for a brain drain of educated, English-speaking Filipino workers to immigrate to the United States (Alonso-Garbayo & Maben, 2009; Ocampo, 2014).

When dictator Ferdinand Marcos declared martial law in 1972, the Philippines experienced an explosion of conflict and unrest (Mabalon, 2007). Policies enacted by then-dictator Ferdinand Marcos created a labor-brokerage state in which the Philippines’ exported
labor to pay off debts and build infrastructure (Ocampo, 2014; Rodriguez, 2016). Many individuals and groups from the Anti-Martial Law Movement in the United States challenged Filipino Americans and the U.S. government on their support of the Marcos dictatorship. This movement lasted until the end of the Marcos dictatorship when he was peacefully ousted by the People Power Revolution and Corazon Aquino’s election as president of the Philippines.

**Seventh Wave of Filipino Immigration**

This wave is known for generating the largest increase in the Filipino American population—many of whom continued to settle along the West Coast and other regions of the United States, such as the Midwest, East Coast, and the South (Nadal, 2020). The seventh wave of Filipino American immigration began in 1986 and last through the present day. The immigration Reform and Control Act’s passage granted amnesty to undocumented Filipinos, though it also signaled a growing opposition to immigration that increased in the 1990s (Mabalon, 2007). At the same time, the grandchildren of pioneer Filipino American generations and post-1965 Filipino immigrants experienced their coming of age and contributed to the establishment of an ever-evolving Filipino American ethnic identity.

Like previous immigration waves, many Filipino professionals immigrating from this wave received college degrees in the Philippines only to experience language discrimination and racism in the job market in the form of occupational downgrading. This means that their jobs were lacking parity with their training, which affected their licensing, credentialing, opportunities for career advancement, and long-term earning potential or financial stability (Buenavista, 2010; Espiritu, 2003a; Kitano & Daniels, 2001). Occupational downgrading affects many undocumented Filipino American individuals, known as *tago ng tago* (“TNT’s” or “to keep on hiding”), who may need to pursue employment “under the table,” are less likely to seek social
services out of fear of persecution or deportation, and are subjected to many negative stereotypes about their undocumented status (Department of Homeland Security, 2018; Montoya, 1997; Nadal, 2020; Rodriguez, 2016).

Though their per capita income is higher compared to other Asian Americans, Filipino Americans experience higher rates of HIV/AIDS, poverty, and gang violence (Mabalon, 2007; Nadal, 2020). Indeed, first-generation Filipino American immigrants and their U.S.-born/raised children continue to have nuanced experiences in the United States across these various waves of settlement and immigration, which can impact their mental health and well-being.

**Mental Health and Stigma Among Filipino Americans**

Even with the continual growth of Filipino immigration to the United States, existing literature on AA&PI mental health neither sufficiently addresses the mental health needs nor reduces stigma about mental health issues among Filipino Americans—a rapidly growing AA&PI ethnic group with unique needs and concerns relative to other AA&PIs. Psychology researchers have found various risks for, predictors of, and correlations with depression, anxiety, and substance abuse for Filipino Americans in different age groups and genders. For example, Filipino American youth have reported more symptoms of the following mental health disorders compared to Japanese American and White youths: depression, anxiety, panic disorder, agoraphobia, and obsessive-compulsive disorder (OCD) (Okamura et al., 2016). Researchers also found a positive relationship between age and depression symptoms in Filipino American youth and relatively higher risks for suicidal ideation for Filipino American adolescents and young adults among AA&PIs, despite having culturally religious beliefs discouraging suicide as a sin (Javier, 2018; Park, 2017).
Compared to Chinese American and Vietnamese American ethnic groups, depression was positively correlated with discrimination and negatively correlated with racial and ethnic identity in Filipino Americans, which means that depression increased with discrimination and decreased with increases in Filipino racial and ethnic identity (Ai et al., 2015). Relative to other AA&PI women, researchers have found that Filipino American women have increased levels of resilience despite higher rates for depression, postpartum depression, substance use, and higher avoidance of public shame, which prevents many Filipino American women, especially first-generation immigrants, from disclosing intimate partner abuse (Reyes et al., 2019). So far, some research has highlighted concerns of Filipino Americans, but concerns about providing services to address those needs remain.

The small but growing body of research on Filipino American mental health also illuminates current barriers and remedies to preventing and treating mental illness in Filipino American communities. Many studies unanimously note that underutilization of mental health services, low representation of Filipino Americans among mental healthcare providers, and the lack of culturally responsive treatments developed for Filipino Americans are barriers to improving mental health access and outcomes for this population (Abe-Kim et al., 2004; Nadal, 2020; Sanchez & Gaw, 2007). Given that mental illness is commonly seen as a source of shame or stigma within Filipino American communities, individuals who are less likely to seek help from family, friends, religious clergy, and/or Indigenous healers may resort to internalizing their symptoms. An increase in some American cultural tendencies is related to increases in mental health help-seeking in Filipino Americans. This is important to consider, given that access to Filipino cultural practices and communities provides effective coping, increases social support, and bolsters mental health help-seeking in Filipino Americans across gender, age, or immigrant
generation status (Ferrera, 2017; Reyes et al., 2020; Tintiangco-Cubales, 2013; Tuazon et al., 2019). When colonial mentality (i.e., a form of internalized oppression under which a person seeks to emulate qualities of the colonizer) was increased, it was more likely to predict decreased levels of mental health help-seeking in Filipino Americans, which indicates that historical forms of trauma have some influence on Filipino American mental health and ethnic identity (Tuazon et al., 2019).

What does it mean to be a Filipino American living in a culturally plural, settler-state nation like the United States? The social structure in the United States has maintained the oppressed, minoritized status of Indigenous peoples by oppressive attitudes based in White supremacy in the United States and abroad. As many racial and ethnic groups migrate and settle on lands belonging to Indigenous peoples and occupied by Western, European colonists (and their descendants), members of these diasporic, immigrant, minority groups begin to build awareness of their own identities and histories through interactions with people from both similar and different backgrounds. Through these cultural exchanges, immigrant racial and ethnic groups undergo various processes of reflexively learning about the core of their cultural identities and histories while writing a new diasporic narrative. The history of the United States and the Philippines share complex themes of imperialism and colonialism, forming an important backdrop for the origin stories of Filipino Americans to carve out the essential foundations of their ever-growing collective identity and the values, practices, and attitudes that guide Filipino American communities to collective liberation and empowerment (Bhatia & Ram, 2001; David et al., 2017; Dunbar-Ortiz, 2014; Hufana & Consoli, 2020).
Statement of the Problem

Counseling psychology literature still has a limited availability of quantitative research on Filipino Americans. This gap within counseling psychology literature is currently being addressed with increased visibility, interest, and advocacy by Filipino American counseling psychologists over the past twenty years. While Filipinos have historically been underrepresented and face environmental forms of discrimination due to invisibility within the Asian American community, a growing sense of *kapwa* (or “one’s unity, connection, and oneness with other people—regardless of ‘blood’ connection, SES, educational level, place of origin or other factors”) and *bayanihan* (or “community”) within a new generation of Filipino American scholars and clinicians ushers in a new movement towards interdisciplinary and decolonizing efforts to claim space in an otherwise predominantly White field (David et al., 2017; Hufana & Consoli, 2020; Maramba & Nadal, 2013). There are 3.98 million Americans of Filipino descent residing in the United States, which, according to the U.S. Census Bureau’s projections makes Filipino Americans one of the largest, fastest-growing Asian American ethnic groups behind Chinese and South Asian Indian ethnic groups (Budiman & Ruiz, 2021a, 2021b; Lopez et al., 2017). As Filipino Americans grow increasingly aware of their overall presence and influence within the United States, they begin to empower themselves through challenging the “Model Minority Myth” and the invalidating, systemic effects of racial assignment (Cherng & Liu, 2017; Lee & Ramakrishnan, 2019; Nadal et al., 2010; Park et al., 2018). Internalization of the “Model Minority Myth” hinders development of sociopolitical awareness, increases self-stereotyping, and is associated with greater anti-Black attitudes—all of which uphold White supremacy and minimize opportunities for solidarity between Black, Latine, Indigenous, and AA&PIs (Yi & Todd, 2021).
Most studies in Asian American and Pacific Islander (AA&PI) psychological research do not differentiate and disaggregate Filipino American data from other AA groups (Agbayani-Siewert, 2004; Espiritu, 2003; Nadal et al., 2010; Okamura, 2013). Without additional consideration of generation status in psychological research on, education for, and clinical practice with Filipino Americans, the likelihood of invalidation could result in greater mistrust of and collaboration with psychologists by Filipino Americans. Considering the recent effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on this population, who are more likely than other Asian ethnic groups to be at risk for infection and death due to workplace exposure, disaggregation and visibility of Filipino Americans could mean more opportunities to meet their specific mental health needs during times of distress and recent increases in anti-Asian hate crimes (Wong, 2020). Overall, Filipino Americans reported higher mental health concerns related to the COVID-19 pandemic than Asian Americans as a collective (Constante, 2021). Given the emergence of mental health risk factors associated with second- and third-generation Filipino Americans, researchers should consider including generation status as a variable in psychological research (Austin & Chorpita, 2004; del Prado & Church, 2010; Liu & Suyemoto, 2016; Tompar-Tiu & Sustento-Seneriches, 1995; Tuason et al., 2007).

Filipino Americans’ psychological experiences pertaining to their ethnic identity, enculturation, and colonial mentality are rarely studied in counseling psychology, even though literature suggests that the study of constructs that are salient to minoritized groups (e.g., ethnic identity and enculturation) and are related to their mental health can guide more “culturally responsive” and “trauma informed” care for this historically excluded population (David & Nadal, 2013; Nadal, 2020). There is still a need for Filipinos and other AA&PI ethnic groups with histories of colonialism to develop or adapt and utilize multidimensional mental health
models that contextualize the psychological effects of past and contemporary oppression (Tran & Chan, 2017). Contextualizing the history behind one’s social identity while analyzing an individual’s presenting concerns and traits (e.g., generation status) may help with developing more specific clinical and educational interventions for use with Filipino Americans (Cordisco Tsai & Seballos-Llena, 2020; David, 2013; Feliciano & Rumbaut, 2019; Halagao, 2010; Heras, 2007; Nadal, 2008; Pe-Pua & Protacio-Marcelino, 2000; Sanchez & Gaw, 2007; Tuazon et al., 2019). The effects of different generation statuses on these experiences within the Filipino American community are also rarely examined as a variable alongside important relationships between ethnic identity, enculturation, and colonial mentality processes. The present study addresses a gap in the counseling psychology literature in examining and predicting relationships between these processes and ethnic identity in Filipino Americans.

**Significance of the Research**

The purpose of the present study was to investigate the relationships among enculturation, colonial mentality, generation status, and ethnic identity in Filipino Americans. Furthermore, the study explored connections between these variables—generation status, ethnic identity, enculturation, and colonial mentality—and how they may have shaped the ways that members of this population perceive their Filipino culture and internalized oppression. The value of the current study is derived from its exploration of these variables by its:

- integration of Asian American studies, postcolonial studies, and ethnic studies topics into multicultural, counseling psychology research;

- focus on measuring developmental and psychological phenomena (e.g., ethnic identity and enculturation) with measures that are not commonly used together in an understudied population (e.g., Filipino Americans);
• identification of generation status as a specific variable of interest in analyzing ethnic identity; and

• use of social identity theory as a lens to describe patterns of enculturation and internalized oppression in Filipino Americans.

The use of the Ethnic Identity Scale (EIS; Umaña-Taylor, Yazedjian, & Bamaca-Gomez, 2004) in conjunction with two measures developed and validated for specific use with Filipino Americans is what distinguishes the current study from existing literature on ethnic identity, enculturation of Filipino culture, and experience of colonial mentality. Previous studies with this population have used the Multiethnic Identity Measure (MEIM; Phinney, 1992), which operationalizes the components of ethnic identity differently than the original and brief forms of the EIS. Qualitative studies have investigated different aspects of Filipino American ethnic identity and the effects of enculturation, colonial mentality, and generation status, but few quantitative studies have explored the nature and strength of their connections through the lens of social identity theory.

**Research Questions**

1. Does Filipino American ethnic identity vary among generations?

2. Are ethnic identity subscale scores related to colonial mentality subscale scores among Filipino Americans?

3. Does a relationship exist between ethnic identity subscale scores and enculturation subscale scores in Filipino Americans?

4. Are enculturation subscale scores related to colonial mentality subscale scores in Filipino Americans?

5. Does Filipino American enculturation vary among generations?
6. Will generation status affect colonial mentality?

**Research Hypotheses**

1. Ethnic identity for first- and 1.5-generation Filipino Americans will be higher than second- and third/subsequent-generation Filipino Americans.

2. Lower ethnic identity subscale scores will be related to higher colonial mentality subscale scores in Filipino Americans.

3. Higher enculturation subscale scores will be related to higher ethnic identity subscale scores in Filipino Americans.

4. Higher enculturation subscale scores will be related to lower colonial mentality subscale scores in Filipino Americans.

5. First- and 1.5-generation Filipino Americans will have higher enculturation scores than second- and third/subsequent-generation Filipino Americans.

6. First-generation Filipino Americans will have a lower colonial mentality than 1.5-, second-, and third/subsequent-generation Filipino Americans.

**Table 1.**

*Dissertation Research Questions, Data Sources, and Hypotheses*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
<th>Research Question Elements (Hypothesis)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Does Filipino American ethnic identity vary among generations?</td>
<td>Multivariate Analysis of variance (MANOVA) statistical test for differences between generation groups' Ethnic Identity Scale (EIS) subscale scores from participants' web survey responses; Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) Post-Hoc tests</td>
<td>Ethnic identity for first and 1.5 generation Filipino Americans will be higher than second, and third/subsequent generation Filipino Americans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Are ethnic identity subscale scores related to colonial mentality subscale scores among Filipino Americans?</td>
<td>Canonical Correlation Analysis (CCA) of EIS subscales with Colonial Mentality Scale (CMS) subscales from participants' web survey responses</td>
<td>Filipino Americans with lower ethnic identity subscale scores will be related to higher colonial mentality subscale scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Does a relationship exist between ethnic identity subscale scores and enculturation subscale scores in Filipino Americans?</td>
<td>CCA of EIS subscales with Enculturation Scale for Filipino Americans (ESFA) subscales from participants' web survey responses</td>
<td>Filipino Americans with higher enculturation subscale scores will be related to higher ethnic identity scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Are enculturation subscale scores related to colonial mentality subscale scores in Filipino Americans?</td>
<td>CCA of ESFA subscales with CMS subscales from participants web survey responses</td>
<td>Filipino Americans with higher enculturation subscale scores will be related to lower colonial mentality subscale scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Does Filipino American enculturation vary among generations?</td>
<td>MANOVA statistical test for differences between generation groups' ESFA subscale scores from participants web survey responses; MANOVA Post-Hoc tests</td>
<td>First and 1.5 generation Filipino Americans will have higher enculturation scores than second, and third/subsequent generation Filipino Americans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Will generation status affect colonial mentality?</td>
<td>MANOVA statistical test for differences between generation groups' CMS subscale scores from participants web survey responses; MANOVA Post-Hoc tests</td>
<td>First generation Filipino Americans will have a lower colonial mentality than 1.5, second, and third/subsequent generation Filipino Americans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Definition of Terms

The specific terms below, which are organized for simplicity, are used throughout the current study and serve as a quick reference guide.
Acculturation is commonly defined as the process and degree to which an individual from an immigrant background takes on and immerses themselves in the host country’s culture (Berry, 2005; Gibson, 2001; Redfield et al., 1936; Telzer et al., 2016; Yoon et al., 2011).

Assimilation is the linear process by which individuals from immigrant backgrounds discard their immigrant cultural values in exchange for the cultural values of their host country to engage in acculturation processes and seek acceptance among people who are native-born to the host country (Gordon, 1964; Harker, 2001; LaFromboise et al., 1993; Portes & Rumbaut, 2001; Rumbaut, 1995).

Barangay refers to a precolonial group of people traditionally governed by a datu (chief) (Murillo, 2009; Reyes, 2015). This basic societal structure for community remains intact in the Philippines for local governance and administration and is informally replicated within Filipino American communities and organizations across the United States. At its core, the barangay serves multiple roles as a community forum for the expression and consideration of collective views, a place for engaging in discourse on contentious issues, and a primary unit of activism or organizing for the implementation of various plans, programs, projects, and activities within the community (Department of Interior and Local Government, 2016).

Bayanihan is a traditional cultural value describing a spirit of collective responsibility and caring for one another and emphasizes collectivism and the placement of one’s family or community before anyone else (Constante, 2021; Hufana & Consoli, 2020). This value is a known contributor to strong family values, help-seeking, and help-providing within a person’s family or communities (Hufana & Consoli, 2020; Nadal, 2020).

“Brown Asian American” is a panethnic term referring to Asian Americans of Filipino, South Asian (e.g., Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi, Nepalese, and Sri Lankan), and/or Southeast
Asian (e.g., Vietnamese, Hmong, Lao, Malaysian, Cambodian, and Thai) descent. Historically, this term was developed as part of efforts to increase advocacy for and reduce marginalization of Filipino, South Asian, and Southeast Asian Americans within broader Asian American movements (David, 2016a, 2020; Nadal, 2019).

**Colonialism** is the practice of control involving the domination of a group of people by another group, which typically involves the transfer of permanent settlers to the new, stolen territory originally belonging to an Indigenous group of people. Colonial practices include domination over and dispossession of land, customs, and traditional history belonging to Indigenous groups by Europeans and/or Americans (Césaire, 1972; David, 2013; Kohn & Reddy, 2017). In this study, colonialism will refer to the subjugation of Filipinos by Spain for over 300 years and then by the United States for 50 years.

**Colonial Mentality (CM)** is a specific form of internalized oppression among members of an ethnic or racial group who were previously colonized by Europeans and/or Americans (David et al., 2019; David & Okazaki, 2006). In this study, CM is characterized by perceptions of ethnic or cultural inferiority tied to the Philippines’ centuries-long history of colonization under Spain and the United States. CM is a multifaceted construct involving automatic and uncritical rejection of all things Filipino and an automatic and uncritical rejection preference for anything European or American (David & Okazaki, 2010).

**Cultural values** are a set of ideals, beliefs, values, and principles defining an ethnic community.

**Decolonization** is a process of confronting settler colonial states, structures of domination, and institutions to bring about the repatriation of indigenous land and life (Tiongson, 2019; Tuck & Yang, 2012). Within Filipino diasporic communities (i.e., Filipinos in the
Philippines and outside of the Philippines) and the parameters of this study, decolonization is a process of building cultural reconnections to indigenous Filipino culture as a source of grounding and reclaiming humanity in the presence of internalized oppression (Ferrera, 2016; Halagao, 2010; Strobel, 1997).

**East Asian** is a panethnic term describing Asian cultural and ethnic identities from China, Japan, and Korea (Lee & Ramakrishnan, 2019).

**Enculturation** is commonly defined as the process and degree to which an individual from an immigrant background maintains and adheres to the norms and behaviors of their indigenous culture (Cotas, 2017; del Prado & Church, 2010; Yoon et al., 2011).

**Ethnic identity** is a sense of belonging involving the cultural traditions, beliefs, and behaviors that are passed down through generations of an ethnic group and is formed by an individual’s ethnic heritage and their lived experiences within a social, historical context (Umaña-Taylor, 2018; Umaña-Taylor et al., 2004). This process is described and experienced as being dynamic, multidimensional, and developmental (Syed, 2015; Umaña-Taylor et al., 2014).

**Filipino Americans** are people who have Filipino ancestry and are represented under the following panethnic categories: Asian American and Pacific Islanders (AA&PI), Brown Asian American, and Southeast Asian American (Budiman & Ruiz, 2021a, 2021b; Lee & Ramakrishnan, 2019; Lopez et al., 2017; Tran & Chan, 2017).

**Generation status** is used in this study to classify the experiences of people from immigrant backgrounds. Generation status can be categorized as follows: (a) first generation immigrant individuals who are born and raised outside of the United States whose parents were also born overseas; (b) 1.5 generation individuals who immigrated to the United States as children or adolescents to parents born and raised outside of the United States; (c) second
generation individuals born and raised in the United States to one or both parents born overseas; and (d) third and subsequent generation individuals refer to those who are born and raised in the United States to second generation individuals and have grandparents or great grandparents who immigrated to the United States.

**Immigration** refers to the process by which an individual or group of people move to a new country for permanent residency.

**Indigenous** describes peoples or characteristics that are native to or originate from a particular region or country.

**Intergenerational trauma**, or historical trauma, refers to the transmission of trauma experiences and stress responses across generations, affecting the children and grandchildren of those who were directly victimized (Bombay et al., 2009). In this study, it refers to experiences of Filipino survivors of collective or historical forms of trauma (i.e., U.S. occupation, authoritarian dictator regimes, war, natural disasters, pandemics), coping strategies, and stress responses related to those traumatic events that are transmitted and expressed in subsequent generations (Chan & Litam, 2021). When the souls or cultures of people are oppressed, they are wounded and in need of healing and liberation (Durán et al., 2008; Durán & Durán, 1995). Within oppressed communities, the erasure or invisibility of historical soul wounding perpetuates various forms of spiritual, mental, and emotional suffering (Durán, 1990).

**Internalized oppression** is described in this study as a form of learned self-hatred when members of an oppressed, minoritized group start to believe that they are not as good as their oppressors (Strobel, 1997). Internalized oppression is a major psychological effect of colonialism in which individuals may learn to attach feelings of inferiority to their indigenous identity and
value assimilation to emulate their colonizers (Césaire, 1972; David & Derthick, 2018; Fanon, 1967; Friere, 2014).

*Kapwa* is a Filipino core value of one’s unity, connection, and oneness with other people, regardless of “blood” connection, SES, educational level, place of origin, or other factors (David et al., 2017; Enriquez, 1992; Pe-Pua & Protacio-Marcelino, 2000; Reyes, 2015; Tintiangco-Cubales & Curammeng, 2018).

**The Model Minority Myth** is a negative stereotype that portrays all Asian Americans as a monolithic group that experiences few hardships due to racism because of their hard work towards occupational and academic success (Tran & Chan, 2017). This stereotype was used to minimize and erase Asian American and Pacific Islanders experiences of racism and oppression, while driving a wedge between members of this racial category and other minoritized racial groups from Black, Indigenous, and Latine communities (Museus & Maramba, 2011).

*Pakikisama* is a Filipino core value of social acceptance, cooperation, and interpersonal/relational accommodation with members of a group (Cordisco Tsai & Seballos-Llena, 2020; David et al., 2017; Enriquez, 1992; Hufana & Consoli, 2020).

**Panethnic** or **panethnicity** is a term used to describe multiple ethnic groups who are grouped together based on similarities in cultural values, geographic origins, language, or religion. In this study, Asian Americans are considered a panethnic racial category because this category includes multiple ethnicities with some similarities in geographic origins.

**Social Identity Theory** is a theory of intergroup relations proposing that social identity is part of a person’s self-concept and originates from membership within a social group (Tajfel, 1974; Thibeault et al., 2018; Turner & Tajfel, 1979; Umaña-Taylor et al., 2014). Identity
management strategies are used to restore or improve an individual’s sense of belonging or satisfaction with their social group membership (Bourhis & Montreuil, 2015; Meca et al., 2017).

**Southeast Asian** is a panethnic category within the broader Asian panethnic racial category describing individuals with ethnic origins from countries geographically located in Southeast Asia (e.g., Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, Thailand, Philippines, Indonesia, Burma/Myanmar) who share some cultural and ethnolinguistic similarities (Tran & Chan, 2017).

**Outline for the Remainder of the Dissertation**

Chapter two provides an overview of the literature on immigrant generation status and how it has been used to differentiate various experiences among AA&PIs, particularly Filipino Americans, in the United States. The second chapter also provides a review of related literature on ethnic identity models and past studies on Filipino American ethnic identity and enculturation. Colonial mentality literature among Filipino Americans is also reviewed in the second chapter.

Chapter three describes the participants who completed the study, recruitment procedures, and the instruments used in the study. This chapter also includes a summary of the instruments’ psychometric properties, strengths and limitations, selection criteria for subjects, procedures for the data collection method, design of the study, and methods for statistical analysis.

Chapter four presents results from the data analysis of the six research questions.

Chapter five includes a discussion of results reported in chapter four, the study’s limitations, implications for research, training/education implications, clinical implications, and future directions for research.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This study investigated the relationships between enculturation, colonial mentality, and generation status in Filipino American adults’ ethnic identity. In addition, a related purpose of the current study was to contribute to the scarce but growing body of research and literature that exists on Filipino American ethnic identity. More specifically, research from a perspective that acknowledges this population’s historical context and related cultural processes is needed within the field of counseling psychology. Within this study is a review of literature on generation status, ethnic identity models, social identity theory, colonial mentality, and enculturation as related to Filipino Americans.

Generation Status

When studying the lived experiences of individuals from immigrant backgrounds, a common language on generation status is required by researchers to understand literature findings and observations from the data collection process for a panethnic racial category (e.g., Asian Americans) and more specific ethnic subgroups (e.g., Filipino Americans).

Generation Status Defined

The following generation status categories are commonly known and delineated from studies on immigrant assimilation and acculturation: first generation, 1.5 generation, second generation, and third generation (Bui, 2013; Harker, 2001; Ryabov, 2009, 2015). Though Western psychology tends to focus on individual differences and groups Asian American ethnic groups into a panethnic racial category, the field should also investigate the variation of experiences within different generation groups and consider more dynamic relationships between the individuals and their social groups (Meca et al., 2017; Rogers et al., 2020). Previous
researchers have indicated that the process of immigrating may influence the motivations, actions, values, and beliefs of each immigrant generation (Morey et al., 2020; Portes & Zhou, 1993; Zhou, 2014). Among some generations, for example, distinctive life experiences that differentiate one immigrant generation from another are the place of an individual’s birth and/or the immigration process from a home country, if applicable (Rumbaut, 1994; Yap et al., 2016). In this study, first-generation immigrants are defined as individuals born outside of the United States who immigrate during emerging, middle, or late adulthood.

Immigrants who are classified as 1.5 generation are born outside of the United States and immigrate during childhood or adolescence. Most studies will typically collapse data from the 1.5 generation into either the first generation or the second generation in their analysis because the years of exposure to mainstream U.S. culture, as defined by age of arrival to the United States, may affect their socialization (Poon, 2014; Sirin et al., 2013).

The second generation are American-born children of the first and/or 1.5 generation who did not emigrate from their parents’ homeland and spend the formative years of their life in the United States (Lopez et al., 2017; Portes et al., 2005; Portes & Rumbaut, 2001). Lastly, the proposed study defines the third generation as the American-born children of second-generation individuals and the grandchildren of first-generation immigrants.

**Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders and Generation Status**

Over a decade ago, current literature on AA&PIs and generation status offered limited information on the second and subsequent generations. A recent PsycINFO database search of peer-reviewed articles between 2014-2020 for “second generation” AND “Asian American” generated 47 results to suggest that there is some interest in disaggregating data by generation status within the literature. The *Asian American Journal of Psychology* published 20 of the
articles included in those search results. While the rapid growth of this research niche provides hope and direction for psychologists working with AA&PIs, many inconsistencies still exist in how these generation subgroups are defined and studied. The terms “second generation,” “immigrant second generation,” and “new immigrant second generation” are interchangeably used for both American-born children of immigrants (i.e., second-generation Americans) and immigrants who arrived in the United States as young children (i.e., 1.5 generation), thus, contributing to the relative invisibility of this variable in AA&PI psychological research (Chirkov, 2009b, 2009a; Poon, 2014). More recent studies have observed and critiqued this practice and advocated for more consistent use of generation status in future research (Liu & Suyemoto, 2016).

Liu and Suyemoto’s (2016) study tested whether generational status moderated relationships between racism-related stress (RRS) and depression as mediated by interpersonal sensitivity (IS). They hypothesized that generation status moderated the mediating relationship between RRS and depression. This relationship was explained by anxiety and IS operating as mediators for second-generation participants. In developing a literature review for their study, they found some research to suggest that acculturation and generation status may be related to mental health and the ways in which Asian Americans experience discrimination in the United States. Their design was unique from past studies because they identified generation status as a predictor variable. For participants across all generation statuses, RRS was related to mental health in AA&PIs and supported literature findings that used aggregated AA&PI samples (Lau et al., 2009; Liu & Suyemoto, 2016; Young et al., 2010). In first-generation participants’ responses, generation status moderated the relationship between RRS and depression (as mediated by IS). This relationship was stronger in first-generation participants than in 1.5- and second-generation
participants, which suggested a difference in racial or ethnic socialization between these generations due to latter generations’ acclimation to U.S. race relations during their formative years. Ultimately, the authors made strong recommendations to disaggregate future findings on Asian Americans by generation status to prevent inaccurate overgeneralizations of experiences in the literature given the rich diversity within the AA&PI population.

Literature suggests that, for the second generation, group identification weakens with a growing lack of familiarity with the country of origin (Heras, 2007; Sue, 2013). Some studies have found that greater acculturation or exposure to acculturative stress predicted more somatic manifestations of psychological distress in first-generation immigrants, while second-generation participants in other studies had higher rates of psychological disorders and reports of perceived discrimination (Cherng & Liu, 2017; Goto et al., 2002; Lau et al., 2009; Sirin et al., 2013; Takeuchi et al., 2007). The weakened connection with one’s country of origin leads to an increased cultural distance and a decreased sense of belonging to one’s ethnic group, which may contribute to family conflict and psychological distress (Farver et al., 2002; Liu et al., 2019; Portes & Rumbaut, 2001; Szapocznik & Kurtines, 1993).

**Generational Differences in Filipino Americans**

Filipino American families may experience dynamics similar to other Asian ethnic groups who battle the effects of assimilation and acculturation in a host country as they navigate their identity formation and resolution (Buenavista, 2010; Chutuape, 2016; Kiang & Witkow, 2015; Maramba, 2008; San Juan, 1994; Teranishi, 2002). While these experiences are shared among many Asian ethnic groups, these phenomena may be intensified among Filipino Americans by the following factors: (a) the colonial relationship between the United States and the Philippines, (b) second-generation Filipino Americans’ family indebtedness to first-generation parents, (c)
internalized oppression in the form of colonial mentality, and (d) the navigation of racial and ethnic identities in a largely Black-White society (Agbayani-Siewert, 1994, 1997; David & Nadal, 2013; Enrile & Agbayani, 2007; Ferrera, 2016; Ocampo, 2014). To date, most studies on Filipino immigrants and U.S. acculturation either focus on the experiences of the first generation (i.e., born in the Philippines) or aggregate the first and second generations (i.e., born in the United States to one or more Philippine-born parents) (Cordova, 1983). Only a few studies have attempted to conduct either quantitative or qualitative inquiry into the different experiences of Filipino American generations (Ferrera, 2017; Kiang et al., 2013; Kiang & Fuligni, 2009; Ocampo, 2013).

The unique aspects of U.S.-Philippines post-colonial relations and their long-term effects on the racial and ethnic socialization of Filipino Americans across generations are not frequently addressed in most psychological studies focusing on panethnic (and predominantly East Asian) research on AA&PIs. Though Filipino Americans, when grouped with Asian Americans, are often positively stereotyped as a “model minority,” the erasure of their historical background with the United States fails to add context and nuance to this group’s unique experiences and narratives of influence by American imperialism and Spanish colonialism (Feliciano & Rumbaut, 2019; Lee et al., 2017; Rodriguez-Operana et al., 2017). After the Spanish-American and Filipino-American Wars and through current times, many Filipinos emigrated to the United States due to environmental, social, political, and economic “push” factors from their home country that were a result of occupation by these foreign sovereign powers (e.g., poverty, disasters, unemployment) (Alonso-Garbayo & Maben, 2009).

While this history and its effects on acculturation and racial/ethnic socialization of youth are frequently discussed within the Filipino American community, many non-Filipino researchers
and journal editors in psychology may lack the intimate knowledge or confidence in Filipino American studies to recognize or explain Filipino American racial/ethnic socialization relative to other groups, due to persistent adoption of the White gaze in many predominantly White institutions and fields (Pailey, 2020; Paris, 2019; Sin, 2007). Because of his strong ties to his ethnic identity and expertise within the field of psychology, Nadal (2019) can provide a historical background to the American Movement, the positionality of Filipino Americans within the Asian American Movement relative to East Asian Americans, and the implications for advocacy on contemporary issues affecting Filipino Americans. As the Yellow Power Movement gained traction alongside the Black Power Movement and the Brown Power Movement in the 1960s and 1970s, many Filipino Americans challenged the East Asian exclusivity of the Yellow Power Movement. This was because of Filipino Americans’ identification as “brown” and their lived experiences of discrimination from other Asian Americans (i.e., of East Asian descent) as being “not Asian enough,” invisible, inferior, and uncivilized within the AA&PI community (Ignacio, 1976; Nadal, 2019, 2020; Nadal et al., 2012). In fact, Filipino Americans and Pacific Islanders (i.e., Native Hawaiians, Samoans, and Chamorros) met during a Brown Asian Caucus at a National Conference on Asian American Mental Health to discuss the internal conflicts of successful advocacy from a critical mass of Asian Americans (when in coalition with other Asian Americans), even though these coalitions did not serve Filipino American and Pacific Islanders’ interests, include Filipino American narratives in Asian American Studies, or provide accurate representations of Filipino Americans (Cordova, 1983; Espiritu, 1992; Mabalon, 2013; Nadal, 2019; Rondilla, 2002). This history is unique to the Filipino American narrative and may benefit future analyses and study design in research about generational differences in acculturation or enculturation within this population.
For example, in a study by Okamura and colleagues (2016) on internalizing symptoms across Chinese American, Filipino American, Japanese American, Native Hawaiian, and White youth, it was found that Filipino American parents reported more symptoms of anxiety and depression than White parents from their children. While their findings confirmed previous research on the well-being of AA&PI youth, particularly Filipino American youth (Austin & Chorpita, 2004; Javier et al., 2010), it did not (a) collect data on the generation status of the parents and children, (b) acknowledge or reference the potential macro-level, long-term influence(s) or role(s) of Filipino Americans’ and Native Hawaiians history of oppression and colonization by White, European empires on opportunities for parental education and SES mobility, nor (c) measure participants’ ethnic identity.

Emic approaches that acknowledge these macro-level influences are emerging in the literature and serve to expand on previous findings. In a study by Filipino American researcher Agbayani-Siewert (2004) on Chinese, Filipino, Latine and White undergraduate students’ attitudes, perceptions, and beliefs related to dating violence, the researchers’ findings disputed conventional assumptions that Filipino students are more similar to Chinese students and less like Hispanic and White students. Unlike previous studies, which grouped Filipino Americans with other Asian American ethnic groups and assumed strong similarities among Filipino Americans and East Asians, Agbayani-Siewert’s (2004) study approached comparisons between these groups with an interpretation that advocated for a deeper understanding of Filipino Americans’ unique perspectives and contextualization of their history within the field. The study’s statistical findings and implications indicated that conventional models comparing Asian and White racial categories only would not have uncovered similarities and differences between
Filipino and Chinese students nor elaborated upon the potential influences behind them—a key difference that may be more salient to a researcher who is also a member of this community.

Others have also explored Filipino experiences from this in-group perspective. A more recent study highlighting the importance of family (within Filipino communities) in understanding adolescent behavioral health needs is an example of an emic approach to research designed for understanding the unmet mental health needs of Filipino Americans (Javier et al., 2018). Two of the researchers in the study, including the primary author, identified as Filipino/Filipino American and interviewed participants from community-based settings (e.g., high schools, primary care settings, churches) and via word-of-mouth for phase 1 of the study. While a non-Filipino American may be trained in using predetermined probes, the benefit of having a trained, Filipino American interviewer is their ability to elicit relevant opinions related to this community’s perception of mental health among youth for the first phase. Given the researchers’ background as a mental healthcare provider, their perspective also facilitated a complex, nuanced way to collect data from caregivers in phase 2 of the study and for analysis of results from both phases. The results from the study facilitated the dissemination of observations about the role(s) and importance of family cohesion in Filipino youths’ behavioral health to members within this ethnic group and healthcare providers hoping to increase service utilization and design culturally adapted interventions.

Many second-generation Filipino Americans may experience feelings of indebtedness to their first-generation family members due to cultural norms of reciprocity and deference to elders, as well as a sense of deep appreciation for the first generation’s resilience and sacrifice for the “American Dream.” While these sentiments reflect cultural norms of deferring to elders acquired through socialization, these feelings of deference may often parallel or mirror first-
generation members’ feelings of indebtedness and gratitude for what they perceive to be their host country’s hospitality and provision of increased opportunities for economic stability upon immigration (Berry, 2007; Kang & Raffaelli, 2014; Marin & Gamba, 2003). Despite individual differences in the intensity of these feelings, these sentiments and experiences contribute to second-generation Filipino Americans’ meaning-making processes and their potential motivations for resolving their individual ethnic identity, while accommodating collective values and beliefs.

In an article focusing on therapeutic work with second-generation Filipino women, Heras (2007) highlights the importance of family matters, intergenerational conflict, and ethnic identity, which are all themes emphasized in existing multicultural psychology research on Filipino Americans. Given the importance of family closeness and harmony in Filipino culture, a lack of connection to one’s country of origin may expose second-generation Filipinos to various risk factors and stressors associated with being a racial or ethnic minority in the United States. For example, some studies have found that generation status and use of English in the home predicts a greater likelihood of marijuana use and delinquency rates in AA&PI youth, particularly with Filipino or Pacific Islander youth (Nagasawa et al., 2001). When second-generation Filipino American youth struggle with a sense of belonging to their host and native cultures, opportunities for an ethnic identity crisis may begin to manifest themselves.

**Ethnic Identity**

Ethnic and racial identity is a nested, psychosocial process of self and society that operates longitudinally and across multiple contexts and frequently refers to one’s self-image, understanding, and positioning within their social groups (Cross et al., 1991; Rogers, 2018; Rogers et al., 2020; Sellers et al., 1998). According to Phinney and Ong (2007), self-
categorization is an important component of measuring ethnic identity, especially given that previous research has confirmed that individuals or groups may identify at varying degrees with their social identities at different times (Portes & Rumbaut, 2001). Over the years, ethnic identity has been studied in many fields to explore its influence on wellness, self-esteem, and adjustment to reflect the lived realities of minoritized individuals and groups. Many prominent Black scholars in the 1970s and 1980s laid the groundwork for Black identity research, which positioned identity development processes within societies that upheld anti-Black and White supremacist attitudes, influencing the course of ethnic and racial identity psychology research for other minoritized ethnic and racial groups for years to come (Cross et al., 1991; Parham & Helms, 1985; Thomas, 1970; White, 1984).

Since the 1970s and 80s, many psychology researchers have studied ethnic and racial identity experiences of Latine, Black, and AA&PI ethnic and racial groups extensively to examine between- and within-group differences (Balidemaj & Small, 2019; Phinney et al., 1997). More common and recent examinations of ethnic and racial identity within the literature use quantitative approaches among adolescents and emerging adults—surveying their self-identification with their ethnic group(s), as well as their self-esteem, ethnic-racial socialization, attitudes towards other groups, and various predictors for mental health and educational outcomes (Maiya et al., 2021; Rivas-Drake et al., 2020). Within predominantly White institutions and fields, the study of ethnic and racial identity has provided a space for scholars and communities from ethnic and racially minoritized populations to gain visibility and rewrite narratives that previously presumed deficits among individuals who self-identified as Black, Latine, Indigenous, and/or AA&PI (Rogers et al., 2020; Syed et al., 2018).
Ethnic identity serves as an important concept for individuals from minoritized populations living in the United States, given that many studies have described its influence and interactions with well-being and resilience (Ai et al., 2015; Gartner et al., 2014; Lam & Tran, 2020; Teppang et al., 2017). Despite the importance of this concept, researchers, such as Syed et al. (2018) and Jensen et al. (2021), have observed that existing research on ethnic and racial identity is decades behind the literature on other forms of identity in psychology and developmental sciences. Since most early developmental theories center the experiences of Western, White, heterosexual, Christian, educated, male individuals with more privileged identities, this has created and sustained benchmarks of success and wellness that deemed these psychosocial and developmental pathways as superior to those with oppressed, minoritized identities (Rogers et al., 2020; Syed et al., 2018). Psychology as a predominantly White discipline is defined by its focus on individual organisms as a product of its earliest White, Eurocentric, forerunners and historical exclusion of scholars from non-White, collectivist cultures who describe development as more transactional and interdependent (Kiang & Fuligni, 2009; Phinney et al., 2001; Rogers, 2018). To combat the detrimental effects of White-centric theorizing and research, many researchers have answered the calls to decolonize identity research through the use of critical theories, integrative models, and acknowledgement of the relevance of historical and sociopolitical contexts (in ethnic identity) as an important mechanism for identity development (Carter & Constantine, 2000; Coll & Marks, 2012; Martinez-Fuentes et al., 2020; Syed et al., 2018; Umaña-Taylor et al., 2014). Over the years, several theories and models were used to explore and explain ethnic and racial identity, particularly its mechanisms and manifestations in various individuals who have lived experiences as ethnic or racial minorities within the United States (Phinney & Ong, 2007; Schwartz et al., 2014; Syed, 2015).
Ethnic Identity Defined

Within this current study, ethnic identity is defined as a sense of belonging that involves the cultural traditions, beliefs, and behaviors that are passed down through generations of an ethnic group (Umaña-Taylor, Yazedjian, & Bamaca-Gomez, 2004). It is also defined by the extent of an individual’s exploration into their own ethnic background and the resolution of meaning(s) for their own general self-concept. Ethnic identity is informed by an individual’s ethnic heritage and one’s racialized experiences in each sociohistorical context (Umaña-Taylor, 2018). The basis for ethnic identity is a dynamic, evolving developmental process that manages the identification with an ethnic group along cognitive, affective, and behavioral dimensions within the field of psychology (Syed, 2015; Umaña-Taylor et al., 2014).

In general, ethnic identity development is a continuous and dynamic phenomenon beginning in adolescence for individuals who are exploring, affirming, and/or resolving different aspects of their ethnicity. According to Erikson’s (1994) psychosocial theory of development, ego development occurs within the context of resolving crises that are social and cultural in nature, especially with regard to identity in the psychological research of multicultural populations. This has become the basis of both social identity theory and, most importantly, ethnic identity. Within psychology research, racial identity and ethnic identity are defined as concepts that are independent from one another; however, these identity categories can be described with significant overlaps, particularly among Filipino Americans whose experiences “break the rules of race” (Jensen et al., 2021; Ocampo, 2016). In the case of Filipino Americans, members of this group encountering marginalization must ultimately resolve conflicts between maintaining their Filipino identity and healthy ego development while being devalued by their colonizer’s culture—meaning that they engage in a transactional or bidirectional process that
balances accommodation and resistance strategies for thriving, despite existing power disparities caused by White supremacy (Masta, 2018; Rogers, 2018).

**Ethnic Identity Models and Theories**

According to a literature review by Balidemaj and Small (2019), most research on ethnic identity follows the main theoretical approaches of developmental theory and social identity theory. Both developmental and social identity models have remained influential within the field of psychology, with more attention in current research being drawn towards models grounded in developmental theories, lifespan models, and more current, integrative models (Syed et al., 2018; Williams et al., 2020). Balidemaj and Small (2019) noted that, among most studies operating from developmental theoretical approaches, ethnic identity consisted of multiple components referring to an individual’s self-identification as a member of an ethnic group, belonging to that group, attitudes towards the group, shared beliefs, and specific ethnic practices. These components were also observed to function on a group level, particularly among collectivist cultures, and followed a progression over time that is attributed to an individual’s experiences, actions, and sense of association with that group.

The most popular developmental model for ethnic identity was developed by Phinney, who applied Marcia’s individual identity statuses and Erikson’s psychosocial development stages to develop the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM)—the most widely used ethnic identity measure, which has since undergone a revision following its development (Balidemaj & Small, 2019; Phinney, 1992; Phinney & Ong, 2007). These developmental theories highlight the importance of context, reflection, and observation, and particularly the opportunities for ethnic identity to develop, which often leads to predictions that individuals living in environments with more people from a similar ethnic group would develop a stronger ethnic identity (Erikson,
Within the past decade or so, critiques of Erikson have arisen to call psychology researchers, particularly developmental psychologists, towards returning to concepts of bidirectionality and “psychosocial relativity” (Erikson, 1994; Rogers et al., 2020). Consistent themes were named within Erikson’s original writings on identity as a transactional, co-constructed process between self and society, intertwined and nested within a sociohistorical and cultural context (Erikson, 1994; Rogers, 2018; Rogers et al., 2020). To illustrate a need to revisit Erikson’s concepts, particularly on identity and psychosocial relativity, Rogers (2018) challenged current interpretations of Erikson’s “negative identity” construct, which placed excessive, unidirectional emphasis on individuals, rather than a critical, bidirectional perspective that roots identity in systems of power and privilege within relationships, communities, and cultures.

In her overview of suggested approaches to make identity research from Eriksonian perspectives more culturally inclusive, Rogers (2018) provides concrete examples, practices, and theoretical evidence for needed shifts to empower individuals and communities with oppressed, minoritized identities. The following types of transactional approaches were summarized by Rogers (2018) as effective strategies for examining transactions between self and society in identity development more thoroughly and critically to affect systemic changes socially and politically: (a) historical, political, and master narratives (Hammack, 2008; Hammack & Toolis, 2016; McLean et al., 2018); (b) accommodation and resistance (Genovese, 1974; Gilligan, 2011; Hurtado, 1997; Masta, 2018); and (c) intersectionality (Crenshaw, 1989, 1995). Concluding an overview of approaches, the following recommendations were provided by Rogers (2018): (a) integration of history (Hammack & Cohler, 2011); (b) adoption of intergeneration or relational lens (McLean, 2015; Ocampo, 2014; Popescu, 2019; Suyemoto & Liu, 2018); and (c) assessment
of societal-level outcomes related to identity—all of which are considerations taken by this
current study and overlap with recommendations by other fields and professionals serving
minoritized groups, including Filipino Americans (Ai et al., 2015; Chan & Litam, 2021; Devos &
Sadler, 2019; Irwin et al., 2017). Rogers’ explanation and rationale for transactional approaches
echoes similar themes that are evolving within ethnic identity research that stems from social
identity theory, psychology research on immigrant populations, and more clinical and counseling
psychology research that moves from deficit-based perspectives towards emphasizing cultural
values and community cultural wealth (Syed et al., 2018; Syed et al., 2018; Yosso, 2005).

Both developmental and social identity theories have complemented each other within
the research on historically excluded and minoritized groups; however, there has been an
increasing need to bridge these approaches to account for lifespan development, institutionalized
discrimination, and internalized oppression (Jensen et al., 2021). Historically, within the
literature, there have been divides across fields within psychology (e.g., social, counseling,
health, clinical community), outside of psychology (e.g., education, social work, ethnic studies),
and even between these two theoretical approaches that are currently being addressed in the most
recent research on ethnic and racial identity (Williams et al., 2020). While this current study
operates from a predominantly social identity theoretical perspective, it attempts to continue this
new legacy of bridging theories and fields by exploring with a measure that uses developmental
perspectives and contextualizing the influence using concepts relevant to Filipino Americans,
such as colonial mentality and enculturation.

Social Identity Theory

While social categorization theory is commonly used with social identity theory in a
social identity approach, this current study will primarily focus on social identity theory. Within
ethnic identity research, social identity theory has provided a complementary lens to developmental theory in that it considered social identity groups in settings that demanded more situational awareness due to unequal power structures and different types of intergroup relations (due to these power differentials) in society (Sellers et al., 1998; Syed et al., 2018). Social identity theory was originally formulated by Tajfel and Turner (1979) to describe intergroup behaviors and perceived group status differences; they argued that intergroup relations were influenced by interactions with cognitive, motivational, and sociohistorical factors (Hornsey, 2008). Within the theory, social identity is defined as part of an individual’s self-concept, which derives from an individual’s knowledge of their social group membership combined with the emotional significance attached to that membership (Bourhis & Montreuil, 2015; Tajfel, 1974). Both Tajfel and Turner (1979) argued that most human interactions fall along a continuum of interpersonal interactions (e.g., people relating as individuals) and intergroup interactions (e.g., people relating as representatives of their groups), resulting in dynamic shifts in the ways humans see themselves and each other (Hornsey, 2008).

According to the theory, an individual’s social identity is based on three general assumptions: (a) individuals strive for the maintenance or enhancement of a positive self-concept, (b) social groups and the membership of them are associated with positive or negative valuations, and (c) the evaluation of one’s own group is mostly determined by other groups through social comparison (Atkin & Tran, 2020; Bourhis & Montreuil, 2015). Categorization plays a key role as people are theorized to shift between a self-concept that comprises their own personal identity as individuals and their social identity with the desire for a positive and secure self-concept as a primary motivating principle (Hornsey, 2008; Turner & Tajfel, 1979). A group identity is mostly salient during interactions with other groups when comparisons are made with
outgroups, leading to opportunities for a negative social identity to develop for one or more groups. Thus, the current study examines ethnic identity exploration, affirmation, and resolution as an indicator of Filipino Americans’ positive feelings towards their group and colonial mentality as an indicator of negative comparisons held by Filipino Americans and imposed by White European colonizers (Atkin & Tran, 2020; David et al., 2019; Phinney & Ong, 2007).

Social identity theory gained popularity in the field of social psychology, group dynamics, and ethnic identity formation because of how it can be experienced by groups and individuals in the context of stereotypes based in systematic discrimination. Theorists have outlined the following identity management strategies as ways that a marginalized group member may attempt to carve out a more positive social identity: (a) physically or psychologically leaving their membership group, (b) making downward intergroup comparisons towards the outgroup that flatters the membership group, (c) maintaining exclusive focus on aspects that elevate the membership group’s status, (d) devaluing aspects that may detract from the membership group’s status, and (e) engaging in social change to overturn status hierarchy among groups (Atkin & Tran, 2020; Hornsey, 2008; Tajfel, 1974; Turner & Tajfel, 1979). Based on its theoretical assumptions, individuals with a more positive social identity make more favorable comparisons or identified positive differentiations of their membership group relative to non-membership groups. Conversely, an individual’s unsatisfactory social identity may motivate an individual towards leaving their membership group and joining another with a more positive valuation or pressure them to improve the valuation of their membership group. In recent decades, however, the theory’s emphasis on the internalization of group membership as an aspect of an individual’s self-concept has broadened its popularity and usage in the psychological research of ethnic and racial minority identity.
According to a historical review by Hornsey (2008, p. 207), social identity theory was “the first social psychological theory to acknowledge that groups occupy different levels of a hierarchy of status and power, and that intergroup behavior is driven by people’s ability to be critical of, and to see alternatives to, the status quo.” Incorporation of theoretical approaches that acknowledge status and power differentials that systematically oppress Black, Indigenous, Latine, and AA&PI groups in the United States is conducive to developing inclusive, progressive research. Since its development in the 1970s, this theory of social identity and change has been used within various fields of psychology to explain current events, intergroup relations, and possible motivators for actions and attitudes at both the individual and group levels (Hornsey, 2008; Radke et al., 2020).

_Umaña-Taylor’s Ethnic Identity Model_

Umaña-Taylor et al.’s (2004) ethnic identity model draws upon theoretical conceptualizations of identity and developmental psychology by Erikson (1994), Phinney (1992), Marcia (1980), and Tajfel (1974; 1979). Based on these theories, Umaña-Taylor presents ethnic identity as a normative developmental process deriving from an individual’s basic need and drive for identity cohesion (Umaña-Taylor, 2016, 2018). Empirical work using this ethnic identity model and its corresponding measure assumes that ethnic identity is comprised of three distinct components: (a) degree of ethnic identity exploration in an individual, (b) degree to which an individual has resolved what their ethnic identity means to them, and (c) the (positive or negative) affect associated with that resolution (Umaña-Taylor et. al., 2004). Over time, Umaña-Taylor et al.’s model and EIS have reliably and consistently fit with social identity theory constructs, thus contributing to its use with Black, Indigenous, Latine, and AA&PI communities who are historically excluded from psychology research. A positive or negative valuation was
added as a third dimension to mirror Marcia’s four identity statuses, thus, creating a model that allowed for greater heterogeneity and clarity.

The utility of this ethnic identity model captures the experiences of individuals who have explored their ethnic identity and maintained a meaning of group membership regardless of the positive or negative feelings they ascribe towards their reference group (Umaña-Taylor et al., 2004). By allowing for multiple distinct components, a multidimensional model of ethnic identity captures different perspectives of people who engage in exploration, resolution, and affirmation processes. Historically, this model and its corresponding measure is most frequently used among Latine adolescents, and more recently, there is interest in using this measure with AA&PI ethnic groups (Martinez-Fuentes et al., 2020; Rivas-Drake et al., 2020).

Despite the popularity of this model, most studies on AA&PI ethnic identity have used Phinney’s model and scales, specifically the MEIM and MEIM-R (Phinney, 1992; Phinney et al., 1997, 2001; Phinney & Ong, 2007). Thus, the current study aims to use Umaña-Taylor et al.’s (2004) model to address a gap within the literature with AA&PIs, and, more specifically, with Filipino Americans. Most recently, Atkin and Tran (2020) used a subscale of the MEIM-R and a social identity theoretical approach to investigate links between ethnic identity, racial discrimination, psychological distress, and metastereotype awareness (MSA; the awareness one has regarding stereotypes others hold of their group) at Predominantly White Institutions (PWIs). This quantitative study was administered after the authors reviewed ethnic identity literature on Asian Americans and addressed mixed findings on the protective effects of ethnic identity by introducing MSA.

Within their study, Atkin and Tran (2020) argued the plausibility of MSA being a protective mechanism for Asian American emerging adults because it involves constructs similar
to public regard and preparation for bias, which helps them to comprehend and navigate negative intergroup social interactions because they have been primed to recognize stereotypes as false, negative generalizations about their membership group (Atkin et al., 2019; Hughes et al., 2006; Sellers et al., 1998). After administering a survey to a sample of Asian American emerging adults at PWIs, Atkin and Tran (2020) found that high levels of ethnic identity commitment and MSA or high levels of MSA with lower levels of ethnic identity commitment had a buffering effect on psychological distress in the face of racial discrimination, which explains why, in some studies, ethnic identity alone could not serve as a buffer. To advance this line of research, both Atkin and Tran (2020) acknowledged limitations caused by the aggregation of AA&PI ethnic groups and not accounting for stereotype internalization. Using an alternative model and measure, such as Umaña-Taylor et al.’s (2004) EIS in future research with more specific focus on Filipino Americans, can help with updating the literature on ethnic identity. The utility of this model may be helpful in Filipino culture and the historical influence of colonization by multiple countries and in measuring the affective component as distinct from internalized oppression or shame.

Few studies have explored Filipino ethnic identity in line with Umaña-Taylor’s model, which has been frequently used with Mexican American participants who share historical and cultural experiences and perspectives with Filipino Americans (Douglass & Umaña-Taylor, 2015; Umaña-Taylor et al., 2006). Currently, the use of the Multiethnic Identity Measure (MEIM) or Multiethnic Identity Measure–Revised (MEIM-R) is more widely practiced when exploring ethnic identity in Filipino Americans (Cotas, 2017; de Dios, 2015; Morente, 2015; Murillo, 2009; Tuazon et al., 2019). A possible limitation to use of the MEIM-R is that this measure still retains a two-factor structure (from the original measure) that merges the three distinct constructs of affirmation, belonging, and commitment into one factor, potentially
complicating the analysis and/or implications of how Filipino Americans incorporate colonial mentality into their ethnic identity resolution (Ponterotto & Park-Taylor, 2007; Schwartz et al., 2014). In contrast, the EIS measures constructs of ethnic identity exploration, affirmation, and resolution as distinct from one another and may correlate better with measures of colonial mentality and/or enculturation, even though it is not developed and validated as a Filipino-specific measure. Existing research has found that there are significant, positive relationships between ethnic identity, self-esteem, and well-being in youth from immigrant families, including Filipino Americans (Meca et al., 2020; Rivas-Drake et al., 2014; Umaña-Taylor et al., 2014). Literature findings support Umaña-Taylor’s model in emphasizing the importance of family in the development of ethnic identity and socialization, which are also important components in the ethnic identity development and well-being of Filipino American youth (Javier, 2018; Javier et al., 2018; Kiang & Witkow, 2018; Nadal, 2020; Tuason et al., 2014; Umaña-Taylor, 2016; Umaña-Taylor et al., 2006, 2014).

**Ethnic Identity in Filipino Americans**

There is a growing interest in Asian American studies and psychology to study Filipinos’ ethnic identity from a perspective that acknowledges the significant historical and psychological impact of being under both Spanish and U.S. rule. Filipino Americans may have historical and cultural experience that are more like Latino ethnic groups with the same colonial history than with other AA&PI ethnicities who have not been colonized by both Spain and the United States (Agbayani-Siewert, 2004; Nadal et al., 2012; Ocampo, 2016; Root, 1997).

Given the prevalence of ethnic identity research on disaggregated Latine ethnic groups and their overlapping colonial histories, it may be beneficial to continue addressing Filipino Americans’ lived experiences of exploring and committing to their ethnic identity.
Mossakowski’s (2003) study on Filipino American adults found that ethnic identity is a vital stress buffer that aids in coping with discrimination and reduces depressive symptoms. In other words, Filipino Americans’ membership and sense of belonging (to their ethnic group) may be protective to their ego development, much of which occurs in connection with family, friends, and communities. Given that many Filipino Americans value kapwa and have an interdependent self-concept that dynamically balances their personal identity with their social identity as Filipinos, it becomes important to continue disaggregating Asian American panethnic research to focus on Filipino Americans and their unique history from a social identity theoretical approach. Thoughts or behaviors that increase Filipino Americans’ ethnic identity (e.g., engaging in cultural practices) are examples of one way in which a negative social identity may be resolved, thus, aligning with social identity theory principles. However, from previous research approaches rooted in developmental perspectives, colonial mentality may be described as an alternative ego defense mechanism that motivates a Filipino American towards eschewing their ethnic identity. Results from Murillo’s (2009) dissertation study found that a person may still manifest colonial mentality regardless of how strongly he or she identifies with their Filipino ethnicity.

To investigate the relationship between ethnic identity, colonial mentality, and parenting style among Filipino American parents, Murillo did not find a statistically significant relationship between colonial mentality, as measured by the Colonial Mentality Scale (CMS; David & Okazaki, 2006), and ethnic identity, as measured by the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure–Revised (MEIM-R; Phinney & Ong, 2007). Murillo (2009) had explained that colonial mentality and ethnic identity are different constructs, with ethnic identity requiring effort on the individual to maintain or build, and colonial mentality requiring effort to contain or dismantle. While this finding is surprising at first glance, it supports findings that Filipinos may not exhibit a linear
pattern of acculturation/enculturation in comparison to other AA&PI ethnicities (Enrile & Agbayani, 2007) and that their colonial mentality is not correlated with acculturation (David and Okazaki, 2006). However, aspects of Murillo’s study have yet to be replicated with a measure that uses a three-factor structure to fit with ethnic identity constructs in the literature, such as the EIS.

Since Murillo’s (2009) study, two recent studies on Filipino American ethnic identity by Teppang et al. (2019) and Tuazon et al. (2019) provided support and future directions for both quantitative and qualitative research within this ethnic group that informed various aspects of the current study. Both studies highlighted existing research on the importance of ethnic identity among Filipino Americans within their literature reviews and echoed concerns among scholars about the lack of ethnic identity development research after adolescence, disaggregated ethnic identity research focusing on Filipino Americans, and inclusion of historical context within Filipino Americans’ ethnic identity (Kiang et al., 2010; Kim & Lee, 2011; Smith & Silva, 2011; Teppang et al., 2019; Tuazon et al., 2019). And while Teppang et al. (2019) and Tuazon et al. (2019) used different methodology and theoretical approaches from each other, they ultimately contributed to directions for ongoing research on Filipino American ethnic identity.

Teppang and her colleagues (2019) adopted a qualitative, exploratory approach based in social identity theory to address a gap in ethnic identity formation among Filipino American young adults with a primarily 1.5- and second-generation immigrant population. The following themes were presented by Teppang et al. (2019) as important considerations for the ethnic identity processes of Filipino Americans: (a) ethnic identity formation as process, (b) pride in being Filipino American, (c) family values and dynamics, and (d) acceptance through participation in ethnic groups. The researchers found substantial support for previous literature
on the adaptivity of developing a bicultural identity for Filipino Americans and the need for relational, participatory, and cultural opportunities to increase self-concept and ethnic identity affirmation (Choi et al., 2018; Ferrera, 2017; LaFromboise et al., 1993; Mossakowski, 2003; Mossakowski & Zhang, 2014; Rudmin et al., 2016; Schmidt et al., 2014). Their research strengthened arguments that ethnic identity in Filipino Americans is influenced by fulfilling social interactions and relationships, while implementing Rogers’ (2018) recommendation to conduct research informed by historical context and a relational lens (Nadal, 2020; Tomaneng, 2015). Teppang et al. (2019) made further recommendations for quantitative approaches to investigate ethnic identity among Filipino American adults, which were addressed by Tuazon et al. (2019) and the current study.

As a complement to Teppang et al.’s (2019) research, Tuazon et al. (2019) addressed a gap in the literature by examining assessments of social support, ethnic identity, and colonial mentality of Filipino Americans from developmental perspectives, including Marcia’s (1980) identity statuses. Their quantitative study on colonial mentality and mental health help-seeking of Filipino Americans used David and Okazaki’s (2006) colonial mentality scale to measure colonial mentality and Phinney and Ong’s (2007) MEIM-R to measure ethnic identity along two subscales of exploration and commitment. Tuazon et al. (2019) found a negative correlation between colonial mentality and ethnic identity, as measured by the MEIM-R; and study participants with an ethnic identity achievement status reported lower colonial mentality levels than other ethnic identity statuses to confirm past research on the importance of ethnic identity as a buffer to discrimination, including internalized discrimination among Filipino Americans (de Dios, 2015; Mossakowski, 2003; Mossakowski & Zhang, 2014; Smith & Silva, 2011; Tuason et al., 2007; Woo et al., 2020). Like Teppang and her colleagues (2019), Tuazon and his colleagues
(2019) also addressed directions for future research provided by Rogers (2018) to integrate historical perspectives, utilize a relational lens, and assess societal-level outcomes. To complement the latest research on Filipino American ethnic identity and implement ethnic identity research recommendations by ethnic identity scholars within the past three years, this current quantitative study integrated historical contexts and utilized Umaña-Taylor et al.’s (2004) EIS with David and Okazaki’s (2006) from a social identity theoretical lens.

**Colonial Mentality**

Alongside a growing literature base on concepts of racial and/or ethnic identity and acculturation in AA&PI communities is psychology’s need for more disaggregated research (on AA&PI ethnic groups) on the process, role, and potential consequences of internalized racial oppression. Colonial mentality is a specific process based on broader concepts of “double-consciousness,” “internalized racial oppression,” and “internalized racism”—a reflexive process in which racially oppressed groups come to accept, believe, and internalize the negative views, images, and behaviors produced by the dominant group’s upholding of oppressive colonial relationships and systems of power (Choi et al., 2017; David et al., 2019; David & Derthick, 2018; Du Bois, 1909; Pyke, 2010; Trieu, 2019). According to reviews of literature on internalized racism in sociology, education, and psychology on AA&PIs by Trieu (2019) and David et al. (2019), scholarship on topics related to internalized racism (including colonial mentality) on specific AA&PI ethnic groups are sparse yet have attracted more attention within recent years. Given that colonial mentality is an important concept within the current study, it is important to briefly consider and acknowledge the historical and psychological impact of colonialism, imperialism, and oppressive power structures as it pertains to Black, Latine, Indigenous, and AA&PI communities’ lived experiences as racialized beings.
Colonialism is the practice of control involving the domination of an Indigenous group of people, their lands, governments, customs, and history by another group (e.g., newcomers, colonizers, settlers) for exploitation of land and advancement of imperialism (Arvin et al., 2013; Césaire, 1972; David, 2013; Kohn & Reddy, 2017). Dunbar-Ortiz (2014) recounts a thorough, accurate history of the United States from an Indigenous perspective and attributes the colonization of the non-European world by Europeans to the “Doctrine of Discovery,” which originated in 1455 to permit Portugal’s monarchy to seize West Africa and was later used by Christian, European monarchy nations to justify the devastating subjugation of other Indigenous nations for centuries to come. While her book focused on the United States, Pacific Islands, and the Philippines, Dunbar-Ortiz (2014) presented this doctrine as a backdrop for European nations who upheld this doctrine to justify the destruction and removal of Indigenous peoples and the plundering of Indigenous peoples’ lands in Africa, North America, South America, Southeast Asia, the Middle East, the Pacific Islands, and Australia (Bradley, 2009; Fanon, 1967). The effects of this “Doctrine of Discovery” are reshaped and reiterated even in contemporary times, with the U.S. colonization of the Philippines, Puerto Rico, Mexico, and Hawaii in 1898 and current-day interrogations into China’s presence in Africa (Campomanes, 1999; Ignacio et al., 2004; Jackson, 2012; Rimonte, 1997). Once “discovered,” the Indigenous groups of these lands found themselves actively engaged in struggles for survival and resistance to the erasure of their cultures; some were even pushed towards migrating from their homelands and living in diasporic communities (Alonso-Garbayo & Maben, 2009; Okamura, 2013; Rondilla, 2002; Tolentino, 2019).

Among diasporic communities, especially Black, Latine, and Asian, it is important to acknowledge colonialism’s and imperialism’s role in creating the push and pull factors for
Voluntary immigration and the cultural, psychological ramifications for involuntary immigration and displacement on the stolen lands of Indigenous peoples in North America (Alonso-Garbayo & Maben, 2009; Kim, 2006; Ogbo & Simons, 1998; Pyke, 2010; Tolentino, 2019; Tuck & Yang, 2012). To summarize the positionality of Filipinos, especially Filipino Americans, in their migration to Western countries, an infographic of Alonso-Garbayo and Maben’s (2009) factors is provided by Dr. Therapinay (2020) in Figure 1.

Figure 1. Push and Pull Factors of Filipino Migration


It is important to note that all waves of Filipino settlement and immigration to the United States were affected by these push and pull factors (Choy, 2013; Rodriguez, 2016). Within the original article by Alonso-Garbayo & Maben (2009) and in Dr. Therapinay’s (Dr. Therapinay
[@The.DrTherapinay], 2020) social media infographic in Figure 1, the consequences of subjugation to colonial, imperial structures ultimately draw individuals towards relocation, re-settlement, reconciliation, and reclamation. Among Latine and Filipinos from all waves of settlement/immigration and their descendants, the invasion, control, and imperial powers of Spain and the United States created a system that forcibly pushed individuals from their home countries to settle on stolen Indigenous North American and Pacific Islanders’ lands in hopes of finding avenues for survival (Alonso-Garbayo & Maben, 2009; Tolentino, 2019).

In the midst of increasing calls for reconciliation and reckoning for the Indigenous lives lost over centuries due to colonialism, including Native American residential schools in North America at the hands of settler-colonial governments and the Roman Catholic church, it is important to acknowledge the core goals of decolonization scholarship and activism: to eliminate settler property rights and sovereignty to uphold the sovereignty and self-determination of Native peoples and repatriation of their lands (Austen, 2021; Dunbar-Ortiz, 2014; Tuck & Yang, 2012). Within Filipino/Filipino American psychology research on colonialism, colonial mentality, and decolonization, this emphasis is sometimes lost and leads to the morphing of decolonization into a metaphor and an avoidance of Filipinos’ and Filipino Americans’ participation in settler colonial structures that continue to harm Indigenous peoples despite a shared history with colonization (Arvin et al., 2013; Césaire, 1972; Fujikane, 2005; Fujikane & Okamura, 2008; Lo, 2019; Tiongson, 2019; Tuck & Yang, 2012). Within Tintiangco-Cubales and Curammeng’s (2018) chapter from Education at War on resisting the inheritance of American schooling, the authors informed readers with critical, historical perspectives on the ways that Filipino Americans experienced colonial coercion, maintained White supremacy and imperialism, and more importantly, exerted collective resistance towards the (Neo)Colonial ideology within
education systems—an institution largely responsible for carrying out and sustaining colonial oppression that can be confronted by collective resistance and solidarity among Filipino Americans and other minoritized groups (Campomanes, 1999; Grosfoguel, 2016). While cultivating critical consciousness to challenge colonial mentality is an important step, scholars are recommending that all efforts towards decolonizing the psyche among Filipinos and Filipino Americans should also translate into praxis and direct engagement with Indigenous self-determination (Arvin et al., 2013; Lo, 2019; Masta, 2018; Rogers et al., 2020; Tintiangco-Cubales & Curammeng, 2018; Tiongson, 2019).

**Colonial Mentality and Race**

Historically, colonial mentality was first studied by a few Black, Indigenous, Latine anticolonialist scholars in the mid-20th century who explored the relationship between colonial oppression and its psychological effects on groups colonized by White European countries and the United States (Césaire, 1972; Fanon, 1967; Friere, 2014; Trieu, 2019). Aimé Césaire, a Francophone Martinican poet and politician, defined colonization as a “bridgehead in a campaign to civilize barbarism, from which there may emerge at any moment the negation of civilization” (1972, p. 5). In fact, global colonization of so-called “Third World” nations and non-Western civilizations by Europeans marks the most significant event of institutionalizing White privilege to sustain their power on a massive scale (Bhatia & Ram, 2001; Hunter, 2005; Jones, 2013; Ryabov, 2016). The phenotypic, color-based social hierarchy was established to put White Europeans in the dominant position and dark-skinned natives at the bottom leading to their native cultures being eradicated, ancestral lands confiscated, and existing institutions undermined (Césaire, 1972; Hunter, 2005; Leong, 2006). In Kempf’s (2009) seminal work on anti-colonialism in the United States and Canada, he describes colonization as “the globalization of
whiteness.” Over time, natives subjugated by this system were faced with total annihilation of their communities or imitating whiteness economically, culturally, and aesthetically for survival in colonial societies (David, 2013; Fanon, 1967; Hall, 2008, 2010; Okamura, 2008; Ryabov, 2016; Saperstein & Gullickson, 2013). In the case of South, Southeast Asian, and Pacific Islander countries once ruled by Europeans, the residual effects of colonization remain as a preference for whiteness and its representation of social mobility (Leong, 2006; Rondilla & Spickard, 2007; Tran & Chan, 2017).

The historical and psychological impact of European and American colonialism/imperialism has lasting effects, which span across nation-state borders and time when applied to the current experiences of Brown Asian Americans. In the case of Filipino, South, Southeast Asian, and Pacific Islander Americans living in the United States, individual members from these groups may be navigating multiple, simultaneous processes of ethnic identity exploration or resolution, acculturation/enculturation, colonial mentality, and/or challenging settler colonialism—all which compound stress onto an individual’s overall well-being and self-concept over time. While Brown Asian Americans of first or second generations navigate enculturation and acculturation processes in the United States, they may also be navigating or resolving attitudes and behaviors that endorse colonial mentality. Internalization of negative images or stereotypes crafted by colonizers from the homeland can occur over generations within an ethnic group as a form of intergenerational trauma—meaning that the transnational ideology of White supremacy can travel with immigrants and migrants before they even begin to acculturate to their host country’s culture (Trieu, 2019).
Colonial Mentality Development

The development of colonial mentality may also be conceptualized through the context of social identity theory, which describes the internalization and valuation of group membership by an individual through their self-concept. In stratified colonial societies, an unequal division of accessibility to power, education, or wealth can lead to a negative valuation towards an individual’s ethnic group if they are systematically oppressed and marginalized. Tajfel (1979) began to describe a phenomenon among “deprived groups” of derogating their membership group and displaying positive attitudes toward the dominant out-group, even going so far as internalizing a broader social evaluation as “inferior.” Similarly, Erikson (1994) described a “negative identity” affecting individuals who were confronting negative perceptions of themselves. While the observation of a marginalized group’s self-derogation and admiration of a dominant out-group was considered unusual by the authors at the time of publication, they did manage to raise questions about the psychological effects of internalized oppression that socially oppressed groups have endured at the hands of colonialism for centuries.

Frantz Fanon, a Martinican psychiatrist and philosopher, is among the first to apply psychoanalytic and historical perspectives to describe the divided self-perception of colonized natives that results from generations of colonial oppression. In Black Skin, White Masks he details the psychological process of lactification, or racial whitening, through the eyes of a colonized Black male:

For him there is only one way out, and it leads to the white world. Hence his constant preoccupation with attracting the white world, his concern with being as powerful as the white man… The withdrawal of the ego as a successful defense mechanism is impossible for the black man. He needs white approval. (Fanon, 1967, p. 34)
The psychological phenomenon of internalizing the oppressive, prejudiced attitudes of colonization and its effects on mental health is now coined by Fanon’s contemporaries in the social sciences as “colonial mentality” (David, 2013; Root, 1997; Nadal, 2013). It corresponds with generationally transmitted perceptions of the colonizer’s values, socioeconomic institutions, and skin color as inherently superior to indigenous values and culture (David & Okazaki, 2006). According to Trieu (2019), “Acknowledging the impact of this oppressive colonial history is critical to the understanding of the mentality and behaviors of the oppressed” (p. 4).

Though this generational-wounds or trauma-lens perspective is not the only way to educate and challenge colonial mentality, examining and launching new trajectories of research from this perspective still possesses value in helping researchers, educators, and clinicians with unlearning problematic histories inherited from mostly White, Eurocentric narratives. David and Derthick (2018, p. 8) explain that “experiencing oppression over lifetimes and generations can lead individuals to internalize the messages of inferiority they receive about their group membership” which means that people with lived experiences of colonial oppression can “internalize the negative stereotypes” as an “unconscious [and] involuntary response.” In the case of Filipinos, colonial mentality describes a psychological form of internalized oppression resulting from 370 years of Spanish colonization and 50 years of U.S. colonization (Ocampo, 2016).

**Colonial Mentality Among Filipinos and Sikolohiyang Pilipino**

Like many ethnic groups historically affected by colonization, Filipinos still face daily internal conflicts and tensions that embattle their traditional, indigenous values with the Western values of their Spanish and U.S. colonizers (Abe-Kim et al., 2004; David et al., 2017; Enrile & Agbayani, 2007; Flores, 1998; Museus & Maramba, 2011; Napholz & Mo, 2010). When one
reviews historical examples of colonial oppression by the United States or Spain, the reduction of Filipinos to “otherness” or dehumanization becomes apparent. For example, Gealogo (2018) traced how representations, nomenclature, and categorization of the Philippine population in the 1903 Philippine Census by the United States had lasting effects on justifying colonial projects and depicting Filipino individual groups as “defective” or “wild,” which was based on body size, skin color, facial features, levels of “sanity,” and acquiescence to colonial authority figures and Christian religion, even after centuries of enduring similar treatment by Spanish colonial administration. This form of classification, enforced within various institutions for the duration of the Philippines’ colonial rule by Spain and the United States, determined which individuals could elect representatives or which groups were presumed to be inferior, “uncivilized,” or criminal. When racialized frames, such as the ones described by Gealogo (2018), are internalized, they begin to influence intragroup relationships and even an individual’s own self-perception (Césaire, 1972; David et al., 2019; Fanon, 1967). In the case of Filipinos and Filipino Americans, “experiencing racism over lifetimes and generations can lead individuals to internalize the messages” and to “develop animosity toward others of the same race or ethnicity, or toward other oppressed racial or ethnic groups” (David et al., 2019, p. 1060; Friere, 2014).

When Filipinos or other colonized ethnic groups display attitudinal or behavioral manifestations of colonial mentality, they may not be consciously aware of its role in psychological distress. Conflicts and distress are created within Filipino families by the contrasting values of their indigenous culture and the values of the dominant, American culture (Agbayani-Siewert, 1994; David et al., 2017; Maramba, 2008; Sanchez & Gaw, 2007). Over time, the insidious legacy of colonialism manifests itself in Filipinos eschewing their indigenous, collectivistic value of kapwa (i.e., an individual’s personhood, connection, or oneness that is
shared with and inseparable from others) for cultural assimilation and individualistic values (Enriquez, 1992; Pe-Pua & Protacio-Marcelino, 2000; Reyes, 2015; Root, 1997). This divided self-perception reinforces psychological denigration of the Filipino ethnicity and culture, thus, enforcing Spain’s and the United States’ colonial legacy of cultural hegemony in the Philippines.

Colonial mentality’s manifestation in Filipino Americans is described and operationalized by David and Okazaki (2006) in four different ways: (a) denigration of the Filipino self, (b) denigration of the Filipino culture or body, (c) discrimination against less-Americanized Filipinos, and (d) toleration of historical oppression via “colonial debt” or a sense of gratitude towards the Spanish and Americans for colonization. These manifestations may be identified as covert or overt in nature, with covert manifestations describing internalized perceptions and feelings of shame and overt manifestations as behaviors that emulate Western values or distance the self from Filipino characteristics (Clemente et al., 2017; Cotas, 2017; David, 2008; Gambol, 2016).

Overall, this legacy of colonialism weighs heavily on Filipino Americans’ mental health by increasing the conditions that make low self-esteem, isolation, and shame more prevalent in daily life. In a report and interview by a Los Angeles Times journalist with Filipino American psychologists, lower self-esteem related to colonial mentality increases an individual’s chances of engaging in high-risk behaviors, which include substance abuse, anxiety, depression, and low life satisfaction (Constante, 2021). Furthermore, while interviewing Filipino American psychology scholar E. J. R. David on Filipino American mental health needs, Constante noted that for first- or 1.5-generation Filipino Americans, losing the ability to speak Tagalog or other Filipino languages can lead to a profound sense of loss or grief. While grief is a normal, emotional process for individuals coping with loss, the loss of connection with a culture is
complicated by Western psychopathology and its limitations in supporting liberatory healing practices for approaching cultural soul wounds, such as internalized oppression, created by systemic racism and colonialism (Durán, 1990; Durán et al., 2008). To address these soul wounds, many healers, researchers, and educators from historically excluded and minoritized groups have centered on their native cultural knowledge and practices.

Enculturation

Enculturation research stems from movements within the field of psychology to describe the cultural processes of immigrant groups and individuals in less deficit-focused ways after several scholars provided impactful, critical perspectives on acculturation research (Bhatia & Ram, 2001; Rudmin et al., 2016; Weinreich, 2009). Most cross-cultural, psychological research on immigrant or diasporic identity is studied in terms of *acculturation*, or the degree to which an individual takes on and immerses themselves in the host culture (Gibson, 2001; Redfield et al., 1936; Telzer, 2011; Yoon et al., 2011). Over time, acculturation research has moved from linear models to multidimensional, nonlinear models that encompass a dynamic interplay of social identity processes and adaptation strategies (Berry, 1980; Gordon, 1964; Hall, 1976; Szapocznik et al., 1978; Telzer et al., 2016; Wang et al., 2019). Acculturation research is commonly used in studies about immigrant ethnic and racial groups in the United States, particularly among Latine and AA&PIs, despite its troubling history as a Eurocentric concept that upholds hierarchical statuses and views (Chirkov, 2009a; Rudmin et al., 2016).

In 2009, the *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* published a special issue on Critical Acculturation Psychology, calling attention to acculturation research’s shortcomings as a culturally imposing, reductionist field of study and its lack of implementing helpful and meaningful changes for immigrant communities. Despite these calls for reexamination of
acculturation research and movement towards enculturation research or community, strengths-based research, many scholars still complete and publish acculturation studies without accounting for or naming acculturation’s background. As a popular topic within the *Asian American Journal of Psychology*, a recent PsycINFO database search of peer-reviewed articles for “acculturation” generated 84 publications and 23 publications for “enculturation” between 2009 to 2021—meaning that more research on enculturation is needed to inform research, education, and practices based on enhancing cultural wealth within immigrant populations as opposed to cultural deficits.

Within the 2009 special issue, Chirkov (2009) and Weinrich (2009) each provided a summary of critiques about acculturation research and recommended directions for enculturation research. Chirkov (2009) identified the following groupings of criticism on acculturation research within psychology: (a) problems with the definition of acculturation, (b) problems with understanding the nature of acculturation processes, specifically deficiencies of its modern, conceptual framing, (c) epistemological issues, (d) methodological problems, and (e) problems with application for immigrant communities. To address some of these critiques, Weinrich (2009) suggested a more intentional pursuit of enculturation research and his rationale for doing so. He provided a critical examination of Berry’s (1980) model of acculturation, stating that this commonly used acculturation model depended on assumptions of “congenial” relations between immigrant and host cultural groups—an assumption that is widely contested given that most ethnic and racial minority immigrant groups have continued to experience both oppression within their homelands and host countries due to racism, colonialism, and xenophobia (Bhatia, 2018; Bhatia & Ram, 2001; Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus (CAPAC), 2020; Macleod et al., 2017; Weinreich, 2009). Furthermore, Weinrich (2009) has argued that pursuing
research on acculturation processes often absolves immigrant groups of their agency as individuals engaging in various socialization processes and, instead, puts them in a unilateral position to submissively “receive” culture without taking on a situational or transactional approach, summarized within previous portions of this current study’s literature review.

Rudmin et al. (2016) provided an in-depth history on the problematic origins of acculturation research and concerning trends among acculturation studies. According to Rudmin and his colleagues (2016), the construct was developed from a place of Eurocentric superiority over other cultures, particularly with regard to imperial colonization of Indigenous societies. Initially, the term was coined in the late 1800s to describe the “cultural changes of native peoples” colonized by European nations, who were stereotyped as being unintelligent and inferior (Rudmin, 2009, 2010; Rudmin et al., 2016). Rudmin et al. (2016) contended that, when empirical research on acculturation began in the early 1920s on Eastern European immigrants, some of these ethnocentric superiority views were still retained and reflected in the development of acculturation models and its history of colonialism, xenophobia, and racism was erased in definitions informing later models during the 1970s, including Berry’s (1980) model, which are still used today. This indicates an unconscious contamination of 21st-century acculturation research by 19th-century constructs (Rudmin, 2009). As a troubling trend, Rudmin et al. (2016, p. 14) observed that most contemporary acculturation research, including research on panethnic Latine and AA&PI groups, “seems to be marching in a conformist, confirmation-bias bandwagon.”

**Enculturation in Diasporic Cultures and Anticolonial Theories**

Acculturation’s complementary development process, enculturation, is defined as the degree to which individuals maintain and adhere to the norms of the indigenous culture (Yoon et
al., 2011; Cotas, 2017). Current research defines the processes of acculturation and enculturation as independent from one another (Abe-Kim et al., 2001). The field of psychology has only recently begun to include anticolonial and diasporic theories in cross-cultural psychology scholarship (Bhatia, 2018; Bhatia & Ram, 2001; David et al., 2019; David & Nadal, 2013; Hermans & Kempen, 1998). As previously discussed, Bhatia and Ram (2001) provided earlier challenges to acculturation research in cross-cultural psychology towards research that excluded imperial, colonial histories within diasporic ethnic and racial groups commonly studied within psychology.

In a critical review of cross-cultural psychology, Bhatia and Ram (2001) argue that current acculturation research problematically conflates culture with a fixed, geographical space, explaining acculturation processes only in terms of individuals’ most recent point of cultural contact (i.e., immigration to a host country). Territorial-linked concepts of culture are problematic for second- and third-generation progeny of immigrants because it erases the negotiations this population makes between their country of birth (e.g., United States) and a so-called “homeland” with which they have little or no contact. Furthermore, existing models narrowly consider immigration as the only point of cultural contact with the host nation, erasing historical contact points that occur vis-à-vis colonization (Bhatia, 2018; Macleod et al., 2017). To enhance the heterogeneity of cross-cultural psychology research, the authors made two interconnected suggestions for future research: to pay attention to postcolonial concepts and theories of migrant identity and to adapt a more process-oriented notion of acculturation and enculturation that includes the painful experiences of “living in between” cultures (2001).

In contrast to psychological models of acculturation, in-depth study of enculturation fits with calls to look beyond past, problematic models of immigrant experiences towards more
agentic perspectives of a diasporic community of immigrants. By viewing Latine and AA&PI ethnic groups as part of diasporic communities, researchers can begin to decolonize their perspectives from enculturation towards viewing these ethnic groups as communities who make connections and commitments to their homeland (Bhatia & Ram, 2009). Adopting a diasporic perspective and leaning towards more intentional use of enculturation allows for researchers to better understand the interdependent self-construal of individuals from Filipino cultures in a way that contextualizes their colonial history.

**Mental Health Implications of Acculturation and Enculturation**

The processes of acculturation and enculturation are examined in the literature for their varying effects on the mental health and interpersonal relationships in AA&PI ethnic groups, especially on immigrant families (Kim et al., 2014; Miller, 2007; Phinney & Ong, 2007; van der Ham et al., 2014). There are 55 published articles in the *Asian American Journal of Psychology* between 2009 and 2017 on enculturation, as correlates or predictors of psychological distress, help-seeking behaviors and attitudes, family socialization, parenting, conflicts, and coping in various AA&PI ethnic groups. In fact, many studies describe acculturation and enculturation processes as important predictors for immigrants’ adaptation and as major influences on individual health and wellness (Ho & Birman, 2010; LaFromboise, Coleman, & Gerton, 1993; Park et al., 2010; Phinney et al., 2001; Portes & Hao, 2002; Weinreich, 2009). AA&PI acculturation and enculturation research mirrors ethnic/racial identity research on AA&PIs, with more studies focusing on predominantly East Asian ethnic groups or aggregated samples, which leads to conflicted findings in the literature and a paucity of research on Filipino Americans. There is a growing need to disaggregate AA&PI enculturation research and utilize ethnic-specific measures with groups, such as Filipino Americans, to mitigate an oversight of within-group
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Conducting research specific to Filipino Americans’ experience of enculturation enhances the generalizability and diversity of findings on this topic, while addressing the fundamental cultural differences among AA&PI ethnic groups (David, 2016b; Espiritu, 1992; Nadal, 2020; Sanchez & Gaw, 2007). This recommendation aligns with Chirkov’s (2009b) suggestion to adjust research approaches on acculturation and enculturation with each ethnic group based on contextual factors to improve explanatory power and applicability. Figure 2 presents the definitions of assimilation, acculturation, and enculturation, as well as some of the critiques and implications of these processes on minoritized groups, including Filipino Americans. Within this figure, assimilation, acculturation, and enculturation concepts are presented as if they are on a gauge, like a moisture meter or speedometer, to serve as a metaphor for how individuals and communities might navigate different environments and situations. With this type of metaphor, individuals and communities are provided with a framework to compare and understand their identity management processes. Within this model, the spaces closer to the borders between processes represent more overlap in use of assimilation and acculturation or acculturation and enculturation strategies. Within this Meter Model, minoritized individuals and communities are given flexibility and agency to compare, decide, and choose how they may utilize these processes in both self- and community-care for overall empowerment and wellness.

While Chirkov’s (2009) recommendation is reiterated in multiple studies, a need for more ethnic specific empirical research exists, especially on Filipino Americans (Nadal, 2020). Studies on ethnic and generational differences in early adolescents’ risk behaviors described patterns of
concern for second-generation Filipino Americans struggling with their ethnic identity. For example, second-generation Filipino Americans were more likely to initiate smoking, engage in sexual activity, and experience depressive symptoms than second-generation Chinese Americans, as they integrated more fully into American culture through adolescence and adulthood (Chen & Unger, 1999; Coll & Marks, 2012; Farrelly et al., 2001; Faryna & Morales, 2000; James et al., 1997; Nadal, 2020; Park, 2017; Willgerodt & Thompson, 2006).

Figure 2. Meter Model for Assimilation, Acculturation, and Enculturation

*Note.* This model shows and compares concepts of assimilation, acculturation, and enculturation along a gauge. It includes past studies, critiques, and implications of these processes in the outer edges of the meter and the definition(s) of the processes in the inner circle of the meter. The arrow represents the individual’s or communities’ flexibility and agency in using these processes to navigate different environments and situations.

Even though current research supports findings that Filipino American enculturation may be a source of protection against mental health issues, there are few studies that utilize the ESFA to measure adherence to Filipino culture in the fields of counseling psychology, clinical
psychology, and community psychology (Mossakowski & Zhang, 2014; Okamura, 2010; Tuliao et al., 2016). To date, there are only two validated measures of acculturation and enculturation developed for use with Filipino samples: the unidimensional ASASFA (A Short Acculturation Scale for Filipino Americans; dela Cruz, Padilla, & Agustin, 2000) and the multidimensional ESFA (del Prado & Church, 2010).

The ESFA was developed to include both values and behaviors of Filipino Americans in its assessment of Filipino enculturation to address this gap in the literature. del Prado and Church (2010) found in their initial development and validation of the ESFA that enculturated Filipino Americans typically do not identify strongly with a panethnic Asian American culture, which suggests that the use of non-Filipino specific enculturation measures could obfuscate significant results with this subsample. Only three dissertations have used this Filipino-specific enculturation measure, and no peer-reviewed studies using the ESFA have been published since its initial development and validation in 2010. Through consistent and systematic use of a multidimensional, Filipino-specific measure of enculturation, future research on Filipino Americans can hopefully provide greater clarity on how Filipino Americans adhere to their cultural norms.

**Summary**

Filipino Americans are shaped by their cultural experiences, which includes how they interact with various attitudes, values, and traditions in their lives. When researching the ethnic identity of Filipino Americans, it is crucial to think about how (a) generation status (Ferrera, 2017; Javier et al., 2018; Ocampo, 2014), (b) enculturation (Cotas, 2017; De Luna & Kawabata, 2020; del Prado & Church, 2010; Hufana & Consoli, 2020; Murillo, 2009), and (c) colonial mentality (David et al., 2017; Felipe, 2016; Tuazon et al., 2019) play a role in how they resolve,
affirm, or explore different aspects of their ethnic identity. Filipino Americans may have different experiences with internalized oppression and with their cultural values, which may shape the way they perceive their ethnic identity. As a result, they may encounter a range of experiences that either affirm or invalidate their sense of belonging and connection to Filipino culture, which can provide various risks and benefits for their self-concept and collective self-esteem.

Current literature has some inconsistent findings with regard to the influence of generation status on ethnic identity in Filipino Americans; though, most studies find that enculturation may serve as a buffer to different aspects of colonial mentality, which affect mental well-being or various attitudes/behaviors towards Filipino culture. These findings are further constrained by a lack of disaggregated research on AA&PI ethnic groups by generation status and limited use of different theoretical models or approaches to studying ethnic identity among Filipino Americans. The existing literature on Filipino American ethnic identity and generational differences has yet to explore influences on this concept from a social identity theory framework and bridge it with constructs related to internalized racism in Filipino Americans, such as colonial mentality. The present study addresses these constraints in the literature and expands scholarship on generation status, enculturation, colonial mentality, and ethnic identity in the Filipino American population. The results from this study will help mental health professionals, educators, researchers, and community members understand how generation status, enculturation, and colonial mentality may correlate with or influence various dimensions of ethnic identity in Filipino Americans.
CHAPTER III

METHOD

The purpose of this study was to examine generation status, enculturation, and colonial mentality on Filipino Americans’ ethnic identity. In this chapter, the methods used to conduct and analyze the data obtained in this study will be discussed. The sections in this chapter will describe the following: (a) participants, (b) procedures, (c) measures, (d) research design, (e) statistical analyses, and (f) limitations.

Participants

Five hundred and ninety-four participants started and engaged with the survey. Of those participants, one was removed after they did not provide consent to participate in the study and another one was removed due to not meeting the study’s inclusion criteria. Of the remaining participants, 222 had random missing responses, including 209 who did not provide information on their generation status. While many of these participants with missing responses did not provide enough information to be included in analyses for research questions investigating differences between generation statuses, they did provide enough survey responses and information about participant response styles needed to explore relationships between colonial mentality, ethnic identity, and enculturation subscales, while meeting the minimum percentage of responses for each measure, 85-90%, needed to complete an analysis. Due to the study’s overall emphasis on theory and concepts relating to the broader category of Filipino American ethnic identity, splitting the sample to address the two different types of research questions allowed for the researcher to investigate and validate these theoretical concepts in an exploratory manner to inform more detailed, experimental research designs. Previous researchers on colonial mentality and enculturation have utilized subsamples or split a larger sample in their research to validate
measures relating to these concepts and inform more experimental designs with their broader, conceptual findings (David & Okazaki, 2006; del Prado & Church, 2010). Retaining the remaining responses from participants who did not complete the entire survey due to skipped responses still provided useful information for specific aspects of the current study exploring colonial mentality, ethnic identity, and enculturation as more universal, theoretical concepts affecting the broader group of Filipino Americans.

As a result, the participant count for portions of the current study addressing generation group differences \( (n = 383) \) is smaller than the participant count for portions of the study examining relationships among colonial mentality, ethnic identity, and enculturation subscales \( (n = 592) \). Participants were between 18-83 years of age, and the average age was 33 years. Participants from 36 states engaged with the survey, though most of the sample resided in the Pacific West Coast region of the United States. Most participants (72.4%) identified as female and 75.7% of participants identified their sexual orientation as heterosexual or straight.

To accurately identify Filipino Americans by immigrant generation status as discussed in the literature, self-reports of generation status were checked against participants’ reporting of their birth country and age of immigration (if applicable). Participants who reported their birth country as the Philippines or a country outside of the United States, provided an age of immigration of at least 18 years old or did not provide an age of immigration, and self-identified as first generation were coded as first generation in the analysis. For participants who reported their birth country as the Philippines or a country outside of the United States, provided an age of immigration between 0-17 years, and self-identified as first or second generation, their responses were coded as 1.5 generation in the analysis. Participants who reported being born outside of the United States, provided an age of immigration between 0-17 years, and self-identified as 1.5
generation were coded as 1.5 generation. Participants who reported their birth country as the United States and self-identified as second or subsequent generations were coded second or subsequent generation in the analysis. Participants who reported their birth country as the United States and self-identified as first generation were coded as second-generation Filipino American, as their native-born status did not meet the study’s requirements for coding as first generation in the data analysis. After accounting for birth country and age of immigration, 9.9% of participants were identified as first generation, 67.4% were identified as second generation, and 18.7% were identified as 1.5 generation. See Table 2 for the full range of participants’ demographic characteristics in the study.

Table 2.
Participant Demographic Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categorical Variables</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Generation Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>67.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd or subsequent</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing*</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female, Woman, Femme</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>72.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male, Man, Masc</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agender, Nonbinary, Nonconforming</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Questioning, Genderfluid, Genderqueer, Queer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trans Male/Female/Nonbinary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing*</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sexual Orientation</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual, Straight</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>75.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual, Pansexual</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asexual, Aromantic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay, Lesbian, Homosexual</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queer, Questioning, or Fluid</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, NA, Prefer not to say</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing*</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographic Region</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northeast (CT, DE, DC, MA, MD, NH, NJ, NY, PA, RI)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South (AL, FL, GA, KY, NC, TN, TX, VA)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8.43</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest (IL, IN, MI, MN, MO, NB, OH, WI)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocky Mountain (AZ, CO, MT, NV, NM)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific West Coast (AK, CA, HI, OR, WA)</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing*</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Denotes participants from the full sample only. While these participants’ data and responses were not included in the 383 subsamples, they were included in the full sample CCA.

**Measures**

Three measures and a demographics questionnaire were used in this study to examine generation status, enculturation, colonial mentality, and ethnic identity in the Filipino American sample. These measures were: (a) Enculturation Scale for Filipino Americans–Short Form
Enculturation Scale for Filipino Americans—Short Form (ESFA-S)

The ESFA-S is a 30-item scale that measures enculturation in Filipino Americans using three subscales: (a) Connection with Homeland, (b) Interpersonal Norms, and (c) Conservatism (del Prado & Church, 2010). The scale measures the degree to which a person adheres to the values and behaviors of their Filipino culture. Each subscale consists of ten items (Appendix C) that are averaged to create a subscale score. Connection with Homeland describes an individual’s contact with the Philippines, other Filipinos, adherence to cultural customs, and use, preference, and knowledge of Tagalog, the primary language of the Philippines (Cajilog, 2018). Sample items include: “I am in regular contact with my family in the Philippines through telephone calls, email, mail, or texting” (Connection with Homeland). Interpersonal Norms describe culturally accepted social values and interactions relating to hiya (i.e., humility or shame), pakikisama (i.e., smooth interpersonal relations), utang na loob (i.e., reciprocity), hospitality, and personalism. Conservatism is used to refer to socially conservative attitudes and behavior regarding authority figures, religious morality, and education (Cajilog, 2018; del Prado & Church, 2010). Examples of items for both subscales include: “My behavior is determined by what others will say, think, or do” (Interpersonal Norms), and “I leave things to God’s will” (Conservatism).

Nine items are reverse scored, and all items are listed at random in the questionnaire. Items are scored on a 6-point Likert-style scale with points of Strongly disagree (1) to Strongly agree (6). Reverse scored items, which change the Likert-style scale points to Strongly disagree (6) to Strongly agree (1), must be computed before computing total or subscale scores. Higher scores describe higher enculturation of Filipino culture in individuals. Total average ESFA-S
scores are calculated by adding the item response scores and dividing by 30. Total average scores range from 1 (low enculturation to Filipino culture) to 6 (high enculturation to Filipino culture).

Two Filipino American samples were utilized to establish validity for the ESFA-S. The first sample consisted of 281 participants whose responses were analyzed using exploratory factor analysis to identify a factor structure and explain the maximum amount of variance. Negative correlations were observed between the first sample’s Suinn-Lew Asian Self-Identity Acculturation Scale (SL-ASIA; Suinn et al., 1992) scores and the total ESFA score, Connection with Homeland subscale score, and Conservatism subscale score. Doing so established construct validity and indicated that participants with higher enculturation generally exhibited less behavioral acculturation (del Prado & Church, 2010). Construct validity was confirmed by moderate, positive correlations with the Asian Values Scale–Revised (AVS-R; Hong et al., 2005), which indicated that participants with higher Filipino enculturation were more likely to exhibit higher enculturation of Asian values. The second sample consisted of 269 participants whose responses were analyzed using confirmatory factor analysis to ensure that the short form of the scale fit with the developer’s expectations for internal consistency and patterns of relationships with less culture-specific acculturation measures. When the factor structure was tested in this sample, results indicated a good fit with the three-factor model.

Reliability estimates for internal consistency are measured by Cronbach’s alpha. Alpha levels of .7 are deemed to be acceptable, estimates of .8 are good, and estimates of .9 and above are deemed to be excellent (Kline, 2000). Reliability estimates for the ESFA-S in a dissertation by Cotas (2017) were acceptable and approached good internal reliability at .79 for the total scale. Reliability estimates of internal consistency for Cotas’ (2017) validation of the ESFA-S constructs are documented as follows for each of the subscales: Connection with Homeland
was .86, Interpersonal Norms was .75, and Conservatism was .86. Test-retest reliability over a time span of two months indicated that the ESFA-S and its subscales had very strong test-retest reliability at a statistically significant level, $r = .958, p < .0001$ (Cajilog, 2018). For the current study, the ESFA-S internal consistency values were either good or acceptable at the following values: .83 for Connection with Homeland, .79 for Interpersonal Norms, .83 for Conservatism, and .84 for total.

**Colonial Mentality Scale (CMS)**

The CMS consists of 36 self-report items that measure the colonial mentality of Filipino Americans in five dimensions: Within-Group Discrimination (WGDiscrimin), Physical Characteristics (PhysChar), Colonial Debt (CD), Cultural Shame and Embarrassment (CulturalShame), and Internalized Cultural/Ethnic Inferiority (IntInferior) (David & Okazaki, 2006) (Appendix D). The Internalized Cultural/Ethnic Inferiority subscale has 5 items; Cultural Shame and Embarrassment subscale has 5 items; Within-Group Discrimination has 11 items; Physical Characteristics has 8 items; and Colonial Debt has 7 items. Colonial mentality’s manifestation in Filipino Americans is described and operationalized by David and Okazaki (2006) in four different ways: (a) denigration of the Filipino self, (b) denigration of the Filipino culture or body, (c) discrimination against less-Americanized Filipinos, and (d) toleration of historical oppression via “colonial debt” or a sense of gratitude towards the Spanish and Americans for colonization. Items are scored on a 6-point Likert-style scale from Strongly disagree (1) to Strongly agree (6). Means for each subscale are calculated, with higher scores denoting higher levels of that colonial mentality manifestation.

Items in this scale are intended to assess various feelings, opinions, attitudes, and behaviors that are believed to be manifestations of colonial mentality among Filipino Americans.
Sample items include: “In general, I do not associate with newly-arrived Filipino immigrants” (WGDiscrimin); “I do not want my children to be dark-skinned” (PhysChar); “Filipinos should be thankful to Spain and the United States for transforming the Filipino ways of life into a White/European American way of life” (CD); “In general, I am embarrassed of the Filipino culture and traditions” (CulturalShame); and “In general, I feel that being a person of my ethnic/cultural background is not as good as being White” (IntInferior).

In the development and validation studies for the CMS, concurrent validity was established through use of negative correlations of colonial mentality with personal self-esteem, collective self-esteem, and acculturation (David & Okazaki, 2006). In their documentation of the scale’s construction and validation, David & Okazaki (2006) used a data sample of 603 Filipino Americans that was split into two subsamples for exploratory \( (n = 292) \) and confirmatory \( (n = 311) \) factor analyses for cross validation. Results from the first subsample were used for the exploratory purposes of examining the measure’s factor structure and establishing reliability and validity constructs. The second subsample was utilized to confirm the validity findings from the first sample and establish fit with the expected theory and factor structure. For the exploratory subsample, split-half reliability analysis produced a correlation of .67 between the initial, 53-item version of the CMS and the final, 36-item version of the CMS, while also producing a Guttman split-half reliability of .80.

Concurrent and discriminant validity of the CMS subscales were established by testing correlations between the CMS subscales and subscales from measures on personal self-esteem, collective self-esteem, and acculturation. Statistically significant, negative correlations were found between colonial mentality and collective self-esteem, ranging from -.1 to -.60 and sharing
about 36% of the variance between both sets of subscales to confirm that, although these concepts are closely related, they are distinct concepts (David & Okazaki, 2006). Construct validity was supported when subscales representing covert and overt colonial mentality correlated negatively with collective self-esteem subscales and correlated positively with acculturation subscales. In the second subsample, estimates of reliability were like the first subsample and established both concurrent and discriminant validity through statistically significant and negative correlations between CMS subscales and personal self-esteem and positive correlations with acculturation.

Internal consistency reliability estimates range from .71 to .90 for CMS subscales (David, 2008; David & Okazaki, 2006, 2010; Felipe, 2016). Previous reliability estimates of CMS subscales were .85 for Within-Group Discrimination, .89 for Physical Characteristics, .80 for Colonial Debt, .77 for Cultural Shame and Embarrassment, .78 for Internalized Ethnic Inferiority, and .93 for Total Scale Score to indicate acceptable or good levels of reliability for the subscales (Tuazon et al., 2019). The internal consistency or alpha estimates from the current study are consistent and within range of previous studies. Reliability estimates from the current study are as follows for the CMS subscales: .79 for Internalized Inferiority, .75 for Cultural Shame and Embarrassment, .86 for Within-Group Discrimination, .89 for Physical Characteristics, .84 for Colonial Debt, and .92 for Total Average Score.

**Ethnic Identity Scale (EIS)**

Ethnic identity was assessed using the 17-item Ethnic Identity Scale (Umaña-Taylor et al., 2004), which includes three subscales that measure exploration (7 items), resolution (4 items), and affirmation (6 items) (Appendix E). Items are scored on a 4-point Likert scale, with end points of *Does not describe me at all* (1) to *Describes me very well* (4). Items from each
subscale are added together, with negatively worded items reverse scored so that higher scores indicated higher levels of affirmation, exploration, and resolution. Sample items include: “I have attended events that have helped me learn more about my ethnicity” (exploration); “I have a clear sense of what my ethnicity means to me” (resolution); and “I wish I were of a different ethnicity” (affirmation, reverse scored). The scale was originally developed and validated using both exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses. Within the EFA sample, examination of the factor loadings and scree plot, using a retention criterion of eigenvalues over 1 and factor loadings higher than .4, yielded a three-factor solution for exploration affirmation and resolution. Goodness of fit was determined to be adequate after removing five items from the resolution subscale in the first model due to their significantly large residuals, resulting in the 17-item scale used today.

To explore construct validity and measure reliability, the scale developers examined the correlations of each subscale with measures of personal self-esteem and familial ethnic socialization. In the scale construction study, the authors’ investigation of construct validity found that exploration and resolution subscales were both positively associated with self-esteem and familial ethnic socialization among ethnic minority group members. Their findings described a positive, modest relationship between ethnic identity and self-esteem, which explains that how much an individual feels or resolves issues relating to ethnicity is more related to self-esteem. The scale developers also found positive relationships between exploration, resolution, and familial ethnic socialization. The subscales of the original EIS have obtained moderately strong coefficient alphas ranging from .84 to .89 with ethnically diverse samples (Umaña-Taylor, Yazedjian, & Bámaca-Gómez, 2004). With a predominantly Mexican-origin adolescent sample, coefficient alphas from a longitudinal study using the EIS ranged from .82 to .88 for
exploration, .83 to .88 for resolution, and .71 to .75 for affirmation (Umaña-Taylor, Vargas-Chanes, Garcia, & Gonzales-Backen, 2008). For the current study, reliability estimates are as follows: .90 for exploration, .80 for affirmation, .91 for resolution, and .88 for total. These estimates indicated that the EIS is a reliable measure for ethnic identity.

Demographic Questionnaire

The researcher created a demographic questionnaire to look at the various demographic features of the Filipino American participants in the sample. Descriptive statistics from this questionnaire help the researcher learn more about the sample’s demographics. The demographic questionnaire provided opportunities for the researcher to examine any variations in the experiences of Filipino Americans who differed in age, gender, sexual orientation, geographic location, generation status, and other factors. Participants were asked to self-report their responses to describe themselves (Appendix F). Participants shared information on the following characteristics: age, gender, race(s), ethnicity/ethnicities, generation status, sexual orientation, religion, education level, country of birth, city of current primary residence, and years spent living in the United States, if applicable.

Procedures

The Institutional Review Board (IRB) through Western Michigan University approved this current study and the informed consent document presented to participants (Appendi A) in August 2018. The study received HSIRB approval to extend the study for one year in August 2019 and again in August 2020 for data analysis. Data for this study was collected using a secure online survey hosted by Qualtrics, which was approved by the HSIRB. Prior to recruitment and posting of digital recruiting materials, the researcher developed (a) a brief description of the study, (b) the inclusion and exclusion criteria for participation, (c) a direct link to the Qualtrics
website on the internet, (d) information on the raffle entry process and prizes, and (e) email letters to targeted organizations to inquire about distribution of the recruitment materials so that recruited participants could have access to information about the study and contact information for the student researcher. Internet flyers, emails, and some printed flyers included the same format and information (Appendix B).

Filipino American adults aged 18 years and up were recruited through various email listservs and social media outlets (e.g., Facebook, Instagram). Some paper flyers were posted in businesses serving Filipino Americans and included the same information as the digital recruitment materials. Recruitment methods involved a combination of purposive, convenience, and snowball sampling from Filipino American community and professional organizations in the United States. Recruitment for the study occurred between January 2019 to July 2019. The study was completed through use of digital, online platforms for recruitment (i.e., Facebook, Instagram, and email listservs) and survey completion (i.e., Qualtrics for surveys and Google Forms for raffle drawing). To be eligible for the study, participants were required to be of Filipino descent, be at least 18 years of age, and reside in the United States. While the recruitment focus was primarily along the West Coast (e.g., California, Washington, and Nevada), efforts to recruit from the Midwest (e.g., Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, and Michigan) attempted to geographically diversify the sample.

Participants were provided a link through a flyer handout, email, or social media posting. Upon clicking on the survey URL or scanning the QR code, participants were provided with the following: a brief description of the study that provided inclusion criteria, risks, and benefits to completion; informed consent; and participant understanding and agreement to accept the terms of participation. Participants agreeing to participation terms proceeded to engage with the online
survey by providing self-reported responses to questionnaires in the following order: Enculturation Scale for Filipino Americans–Short (ESFA-S), Colonial Mentality Scale (CMS), Ethnic Identity Scale (EIS), and the Demographics Questionnaire. They were then given the option to provide their contact information via Google Forms if they wanted to be entered in a raffle for one of three $25 Visa gift cards. Contact information and identifying information was kept separate from their data to ensure confidentiality of their responses.

**Research Design**

An exploratory and non-experimental design is utilized due to a need for describing a deeper theoretical understanding of multidimensional relationships between enculturation, colonial mentality, and ethnic identity in Filipino Americans. While descriptive, exploratory, and non-experimental designs are less common in quantitative studies, they still provide important contributions for producing hypotheses for future research endeavors, identifying important categories of meaning, and documenting phenomena of interest in processes and issues that are important for historically excluded populations (Marshall & Rossman, 2016). For this study, a non-experimental design has utility for advancing theoretical complexity within research on Filipino American ethnic identity, creating opportunities for future researchers and clinicians to engage in liberatory practices with Filipino American communities, and documenting subscale intercorrelations for further scale validation and experimental research that is impactful (Brough & Hawkes, 2018).

Given that the EIS has not yet been validated on a Filipino sample, a descriptive design using Canonical Correlation Analysis (CCA) is appropriate for exploring and documenting the scale’s psychometric properties and piloting data collection methods before proceeding with an appropriate analysis for validation, such as Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA), Principal
Component Analysis (PCA), and Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA), in future studies with this sample and/or population. While scales, such as the ESFA, CMS, and EIS, have been used in some experimental research to hypothesize causality of one outcome variable in Filipino Americans, few research designs explore theoretical alignment in depth or consider the construct validity of scales with Filipino Americans to assess whether current empirical evidence is consistent with expectations (Flora & Flake, 2017). Documenting and observing these psychometric properties are important steps and best practices in scale validation (Flora & Flake, 2017; Watkins, 2018). Indeed, descriptive studies about observations from subscale intercorrelations can provide important information about reliability for further studies documenting a scale’s validity because, without documenting these properties, the use of experimental designs on this population and the generalizability of results may be limited.

To analyze the relationships between enculturation, colonial mentality, ethnic identity, and generation status in Filipino Americans, this study used a non-experimental, descriptive survey methodology design. The survey methodology was used because of the several advantages of this method. Self-administered measures have an advantage over interviews and other experimental design formats in that the participant does not have to directly disclose socially unacceptable behavior or traits that are negatively valued (Fowler, 2014). This consideration was involved in the research design decision-making process because, as reported in the literature, Filipino Americans may feel more comfortable with an indirect communication style with an unfamiliar person due to their concerns about hiya (shame), related to discussing more private behaviors or controversial perspectives on cultural practices (Gong et al., 2003). Filipino Americans tend to avoid open disclosure of perspectives or behaviors that could threaten their self-image and values of pakikisama (belongingness) with other Filipino Americans and
non-Filipino Americans. As a result, a self-administered survey design was chosen because participants would remain anonymous when answering questions about their cultural practices, attitudes, and ethnic identity. An additional advantage to using a self-administered online survey includes improved opportunities to effectively recruit and produce a more representative sample, due to remote administration of the survey to participants (Hewson, 2017).

**Statistical Analysis**

Several statistical analyses were performed using SPSS23 and R, with the results reported in Chapter IV (Results). After handling missing data and testing for patterns of missingness, means were imputed using modern-day missing data techniques. Demographic data of the sample, standard deviations, and reliability statistics for the variables were analyzed. The main variables were analyzed for patterns in missing data and distribution of the data to proceed with the appropriate tests. The following statistical analyses are used for the study to address the six research questions: (a) general descriptive statistics (i.e., mean, median), (b) Pearson’s $r$ correlation test(s), (c) MANOVA, and (d) canonical correlation.

**Missing Data**

To minimize the influence of missing data from 222 participants in the multivariate analysis (i.e., canonical correlation), a missing values analysis across subscales was conducted using SAS and SPSS to test assumptions that data from ESFA-S subscales were missing completely at random (MCAR). The same methods of testing missingness were used across subscales of the CMS and EIS, respectively. When MCAR and missing at random (MAR) assumptions are not violated, missing data were replaced using expectation-maximization (EM) algorithms, given the rigorousness and efficiency of this method and support for its use in the literature (Allison, 2009; Bennett, 2001; van der Heijden et al., 2006). The EM algorithm uses all
available variables as predictors for imputing missing data because it starts with the full covariance matrix and, therefore, avoids some of the difficulties associated with more conventional regression imputation methods (Allison, 2011; Enders, 2003). Furthermore, counseling psychology researchers have found that maximum likelihood methods for handling missing data, such as EM, are suitable for handling missing data with the use of additional steps for standard error and confidence intervals (Schlomer et al., 2010).

The use of EM across subscales instead of across variables in the current study allows for more iterations of expectation and maximizations steps for parameter estimates of means, variances, and covariances that are helpful to the primary multivariate analyses of enculturation, colonial mentality, and ethnic identity constructs. In addition, this method exhibits utility in internal consistency and reliability calculations for the scales used in the current study. Because the current study views the concepts of colonial mentality, enculturation, and ethnic identity as being multivariate, missing data were handled with EM methods to facilitate inferences about the data in the current study’s main analysis. A picture of patterned missingness and a histogram of missing data were generated within statistical software as an additional check for violations of MCAR and MAR to confirm alignment of Little’s MCAR test results.

For research questions using statistical tests that compare mean differences among generation statuses, listwise deletion was utilized to exclude 209 cases with missing generation status data. This approach was used for specific research questions addressing generational differences due to the demographic, categorical, non-imputable nature of generation status. For these research questions, the sample of cases was reduced to 383 and still met the minimum number of 120 cases required by the a priori power analysis.
Descriptive Statistics and MANOVA

The initial analysis determined mean scores in ethnic identity, enculturation, and colonial mentality among first- and subsequent-generation statuses. Mean subscale scores and total scores of continuous variables (ethnic identity, enculturation, and colonial mentality) were calculated for 383 participants and then tested using MANOVA tests. A MANOVA test is known to have greater power than ANOVA in detecting effects by virtue of its ability to account for correlations between the dependent variables (Field, 2013a). Should the MANOVA test for Research Hypotheses 1, 5, and 6 indicate any differences on the multiple dependent variables, the analysis will resume for that respective hypothesis with follow-up univariate ANOVA tests and Fisher’s Least Significant Difference (LSD) post-hoc tests to locate and describe the mean differences. Results from this analysis addressed differences among Filipino American generation status groups in Research Hypothesis 1, Research Hypothesis 5, and Research Hypothesis 6 for ethnic identity, enculturation, and colonial mentality, respectively. Reliability tests for all three measures were established and are described in the Chapter IV (Results).

Bivariate Correlations and Linear Regression

The second proposed analysis, a bivariate Pearson’s $r$ correlation, addressed Research Hypothesis 2, Research Hypothesis 3, and Research Hypothesis 4. For two of these correlational analyses (i.e., Hypothesis 2 and Hypothesis 3), ethnic identity was the criterion variable for colonial mentality and enculturation, respectively. The third correlational analyses attempted to find a relationship between enculturation as a predictor variable and colonial mentality as a criterion variable. These correlations were conducted as a preliminary investigation into relationships between the variables before completing a multivariate correlational analysis using
canonical correlation. They were also completed to further support results obtained from the canonical correlation and draw implications for future studies.

**Canonical Correlations**

A third analysis, a canonical correlation, tested the multivariate, shared relationships between multiple pairs of variable sets. The canonical correlation between the synthetic predictor and criterion variables is analogous to a Pearson $r$ correlation, with variables from either the predictor or criterion sets “loading” onto these synthetic variables to define a function that explains a proportion of the shared variance (Sherry & Henson, 2005). Analysis results measuring shared relationships between ethnic identity and colonial mentality variable sets addressed Research Hypothesis 2. Relationships among variable sets of ethnic identity and enculturation (Research Hypothesis 3) and enculturation with colonial mentality scores (Research Hypothesis 4) were also tested in the study.

**Research Question 1**

Does Filipino American ethnic identity vary among generations?

The first hypothesis for this study expected that ethnic identity (EIS) would differ between Filipino American generation statuses, and, more specifically, that first- and 1.5-generation Filipino Americans will have higher ethnic identity than second- and third/subsequent-generation Filipino Americans. The first research question was analyzed using a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) test to compare mean scores of ethnic identity between responses from Filipino Americans from generation statuses. A MANOVA is a type of statistical method used by researchers to compare the variability in several sets of dependent variables between different groups due to the independent variable (Field, 2013a; Pallant, 2016). Often, the variability within each of the groups is due to chance. For this research question,
generation status will serve as the independent variable. Should the MANOVA test indicate any differences on the multiple dependent variables, the analysis will resume with follow-up univariate ANOVA tests and Fisher’s Least Significant Difference post-hoc tests to locate and describe the mean differences.

**Research Question 2**

Are ethnic identity subscale scores related to colonial mentality subscale scores among Filipino Americans?

The second hypothesis expected correlational relationships between the ethnic identity (EIS) subscales and the colonial mentality (CMS) subscales, as well as some directions for these correlations. It was hypothesized that Filipino Americans with lower ethnic identity subscale scores would be related to higher colonial subscale scores. The three ethnic identity subscales were predicted to correlate negatively with the five colonial mentality subscales, meaning that higher levels of ethnic identity would be related to lower levels of colonial mentality and vice versa.

To test the second hypothesis and address the second research question, a canonical correlation analysis (CCA) statistic technique was used to conduct a multivariate correlational test that would simultaneously explore relationships between two variable sets while minimizing the risk for Type 1 error (Sherry & Henson, 2005). In this research question, the two variable sets include three predictor variables from the ethnic identity subscales and the five criterion variables from the colonial mentality subscales, which are combined into a synthetic or latent variable. A graphic summary depicting the proposed canonical correlation analysis between ethnic identity subscales and colonial mentality subscales is depicted in Figure 3.
Research Question 3

Does a relationship exist between ethnic identity subscale scores and enculturation subscale scores in Filipino Americans?

The hypothesis was that higher ethnic identity subscale scores (EIS) would be related to higher enculturation subscale scores (ESFA-S). More specifically, the current study anticipated that higher enculturation subscale scores would be related to higher ethnic identity subscale scores. A canonical correlation analysis (CCA) statistical technique was used to explore data that addressed the third research question and examine relationships between ethnic identity and enculturation as two variable sets. Given that ethnic identity and enculturation are multidimensional concepts, this statistical technique was appropriate in examining a correlational
relationship over use of multiple, Pearson $r$ bivariate correlations, which would increase the risks for error. In this research question, the two variable sets include three predictor variables from the ethnic identity subscales and the three criterion variables from the enculturation subscales, which are combined into a synthetic or latent variable. A graphic summary depicting the proposed canonical correlation analysis between ethnic identity subscales and enculturation subscales is depicted in Figure 4.

![Figure 4. Proposed Analysis for Research Question 3](image)

*Note.* This model depicts the proposed variable sets and analysis for Research Question 3, with double-headed arrows representing the canonical correlation coefficient, single-headed arrows representing structure coefficients between variable(s), which are depicted by rectangles, and a synthetic/latent variable.

**Research Question 4**

Are enculturation subscale scores related to colonial mentality subscale scores in Filipino Americans?
In this study, it was hypothesized that higher enculturation subscale scores (ESFA-S) would be related to lower colonial mentality (CMS) subscales scores. A canonical correlation analysis (CCA) statistical technique was used to explore data that addressed the third research question and examine relationships between enculturation and colonial mentality as two variable sets representing two multidimensional psychological concepts. In this research question, the two variable sets include three predictor variables from the enculturation subscales and the five criterion variables from the colonial mentality subscales. A graphic summary depicting the proposed canonical correlation analysis between enculturation subscales and colonial mentality subscales is depicted in Figure 5.

**Figure 5. Proposed Analysis for Research Question 4**

*Note.* This model depicts the proposed variable sets and analysis for Research Question 3, with double-headed arrows representing the canonical correlation coefficient, single-headed arrows representing structure coefficients between variable(s), which are depicted by rectangles, and a synthetic/latent variable.
Research Question 5

Does Filipino American enculturation vary among generations?

The fifth hypothesis for this study expected that enculturation (ESFA-S) would differ between Filipino American generation statuses. Data for examining this research question was analyzed using a MANOVA test to compare mean subscale scores of enculturation between responses from Filipino Americans of different generation status groups. Follow-up ANOVA tests and Fisher’s LSD post-hoc tests to locate and compare mean differences were used as needed. For this research question, generation status will serve as the independent variable for comparing enculturation scores among Filipino Americans.

Research Question 6

Will generation status affect colonial mentality?

The sixth hypothesis for this study anticipated that first-generation Filipino Americans would have lower colonial mentality scores than 1.5-, second-, and third/subsequent-generation Filipino Americans. This research question was analyzed with MANOVA to test for statistically significant differences in CMS scores between various generation statuses before proceeding with a follow-up ANOVA and Fisher’s LSD post-hoc tests, as needed, to investigate possible mean differences.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The aim of this study is to explore levels of enculturation, colonial mentality, and ethnic identity among Filipino Americans from various generation statuses. Analyses focused on 592 responses from first-, second- and 1.5-generation Filipino Americans. The purpose of using inferential statistical analyses to examine the data was to determine the following: (a) the demographic characteristics of the participants; (b) reliability estimates of the measures (ESFA-S, CMS, EIS); (c) differences in ethnic identity (EIS), enculturation (ESFA-S), and colonial mentality (CMS) scores across generation statuses; (d) the relationships between ethnic identity (EIS) subscale scores and colonial mentality (CMS) subscale scores; (e) the relationships between ethnic identity (EIS) subscale scores and enculturation (ESFA-S) subscale scores; and (f) relationships between enculturation (ESFA-S) and colonial mentality (CMS) subscale scores. Main analyses examining relationships between variables use subscale scores of the measures and analyses comparing differences across generation statuses use average total scores of the measures.

Preliminary Data Analyses

Preliminary analyses were conducted, which included tests for reliability, descriptive statistics, and power analyses. To determine the significance of effect sizes, Cohen’s (Cohen, 1987) guidelines were utilized and described the following criteria for effect sizes, small effect size = .10, medium effect size = .30, and large effect size ≥ .50. Results are presented below.

Power Analysis

A power analysis was completed to determine the appropriate sample size needed for the proposed statistical analyses. An a priori power analysis was conducted using G*Power
statistical software to determine an appropriate sample size for a regression analysis with a medium effect size and 95% confidence interval (Erdfelder et al., 2009). The recommended sample size from this analysis is 120. The subsample used for generational group comparisons of colonial mentality, ethnic identity, and enculturation consisted of 383 participants, and the full sample used for multivariate correlational analyses was 592. Both numbers met the sample size criteria needed for statistical significance as set by the a priori power analysis.

**Missing Data**

After using SAS and SPSS for missing data analysis, missingness was determined overall at 40%, which meant that 222 participants did not complete the survey due to mostly random, incomplete responses. Since items within each subscale of the ESFA-S are assumed to be highly correlated, based on past literature citing its internal consistency and reliability, missing data analysis proceeded with the three subscales (Connection with Homeland, Interpersonal Norms, and Conservatism) and with overall variables/scale items. Similar findings in past literature on the CMS and EIS for internal consistency and reliability meant that missing data analysis could also proceed for each of the five and three subscales for each measure, respectively, and for both scales with overall variables/scale items before merging into a new dataset.

Results from the Missing Completely at Random (MCAR) tests for the overall scale and for each of the ESFA-S subscales in the ESFA-S were not significant and confirmed that the missingness on subscales did not depend on the subscale themselves. Results for MCAR test at the item level for the entire ESFA-S scale were also found to be not significant $\chi^2(539, N = 593) = 563.8, p = .22$. For the Connection with Homeland subscale, percent missingness ranged from 14.5% to 19.9%, and results from Little’s MCAR was not significant, $\chi^2(57, N = 593) = 74.5, p = .06$. Percent missingness for Interpersonal Norms and Conservatism were reported as ranging
from 14.8% to 19.9% and 14.7% to 19.9%, respectively. Little’s MCAR test results for Interpersonal Norms \( \chi^2(79.7, N = 593) = 74.5, p = .20 \) and Conservatism \( \chi^2(87, N = 593) = 78.5, p = .73 \) were not significant. When significant, this test’s results suggest that the null hypothesis, that data are not missing completely at random, can be rejected. In the absence of MCAR violations, missing data analysis proceeded with the iterative processes of the expectation-maximization (EM) algorithm to replace missing data with the algorithm’s “best guess” on the most likely values for the missing data until convergence occurs (Bennett, 2001; Schlomer et al., 2010). After using EM for each ESFA-S subscale to replace the missing values, the three subscales were merged to form a new dataset.

MCAR test results at the item level for the CMS overall were found to be significant, \( \chi^2(381, N = 593) = 469.8, p = .00 \), and confirmed that the missingness on subscales may most likely meet the conditions for Missing at Random (MAR) rather than MCAR. To understand which subscale was driving violation(s) of MCAR in the overall test, results from Little’s MCAR were analyzed for each subscale. Little’s MCAR test for the five subscales produced results that are not significant for 4 out of the 5 subscales. Results from Little’s MCAR for the Internalized Inferiority subscale were not significant, \( \chi^2(10, N = 593) = 9.4, p = .49 \). Little’s MCAR test results for Cultural Shame, \( \chi^2(11, N = 593) = 3.0, p = .99 \), and Within-Group Discrimination, \( \chi^2(62, N = 593) = 38.8, p = .99 \), were not significant. For the Colonial Debt subscale, results from Little’s MCAR were not significant, \( \chi^2(33, N = 593) = 39.2, p = .21 \). For the Physical Characteristics subscale, results from Little’s MCAR were reported to be significant, \( \chi^2(28, N = 593) = 48.4, p = .01 \). To remain consistent with handling of missing data, EM was used for each CMS subscale to replace the missing values. The five subscales were merged to form a new dataset.
MCAR test results at the item level for the EIS were overall found to not be significant, \( \chi^2(140, N = 593) = 152.5, p = .22 \). To understand which subscale was driving violation(s) of MCAR, results from Little’s MCAR were analyzed for each subscale. For the Exploration subscale, results from Little’s MCAR were significant, \( \chi^2(18, N = 593) = 31.3, p = .03 \). Affirmation subscale results for Little’s MCAR were not significant, \( \chi^2(14, N = 593) = 9.5, p = .79 \); and Little’s MCAR test results for Resolution, \( \chi^2(11, N = 554) = 8.2, p = .69 \), were not significant. To remain consistent with the handling of missing data, EM was used for each EIS subscale to replace the missing values. The five subscales were merged to form a new dataset.

A picture of pattern missingness and histogram of pattern missingness was generated in SPSS, as shown in Figures 6 and 7, to examine data for monotonicity. Figure 6 orders analysis variables and patterns to assist in confirming an appropriate imputation method for missing data (e.g., EM). The dataset possesses monotonicity, given that it has no “islands” of non-missing cells in the lower right portion of the chart and few to no “islands” of missing cells in the upper left portion of the chart. The few islands in the upper left portion of the chart confirm the two statistically significant MCAR test subscale results for CM Physical Characteristics and EIS Exploration. Upon examination of the first row in the picture of pattern missingness, this graphic representation establishes alignment with Little’s MCAR tests results in Figure 6 and confirms assumptions that data within the sample are likely to be MAR. Given the high level of monotonicity confirmed by the chart, the MCAR test results, and EM methods of missing values imputation, the researcher was able to proceed with handling missing data with modern techniques.
Figure 6. Chart of Missing Value Patterns

Note. The patterns chart displays missing value patterns for the analysis variables. Analysis variables and patterns are ordered to reveal monotonicity. Variables are ordered from left to right in increasing order of missing values. Patterns are then sorted first from the last variable (non-missing values in white first, then missing values in red) from right to left.

Further examination of the missingness patterns histogram in Figure 7 confirmed Little’s MCAR test results for all subscales as nonsignificant except for the Physical Characteristics subscale and Exploration subscale. The histogram displayed the percentage of cases in the dataset, which fit the patterns described in Figure 5. While pattern 53 indicates cases with many missing values, patterns 23, 41, 35, and 19 represent cases with high proportions of non-missing values. Nearly 60% of the cases in the dataset have Pattern 1, and the missing value patterns chart shows that this is the pattern for cases with no missing values. Enough evidence was gathered from the MCAR tests, the chart of missing values patterns, and the missingness patterns
histogram that most of the missing data within study scales and subscales either met MCAR or MAR criteria and were suitable for handling with EM methods.

![Missingness Pattern Frequencies in Dataset](image)

**Figure 7.** Missingness Pattern Frequencies in Dataset

*Note.* The ten most frequently occurring patterns of missingness are displayed in the chart. The histogram displays the percentage of cases for each pattern. Pattern 1 is the most frequently occurring pattern for cases with no missing values.

**Descriptive Statistics**

Means, standard deviations, kurtosis, skewness, and reliability values for each variable are presented in Table 3. Subscale scores are used in all main analyses that compare variables of ethnic identity, enculturation, and colonial mentality across generation statuses in Filipino Americans. On average, participants’ ESFA-S subscale scores indicated that they slightly disagreed with statements relating to their Connection with Homeland ($M = 2.82$, $SD = 0.94$), Interpersonal Norms ($M = 3.26$, $SD = 0.83$), and Conservatism ($M = 3.39$, $SD = 0.97$). Colonial mentality subscale scores indicated that most participants either strongly disagreed or somewhat
agreed with statements related to Internalized Inferiority ($M = 2.20$, $SD = 0.89$), Cultural Shame and Embarrassment ($M = 1.49$, $SD = 0.48$), Within-Group Discrimination ($M = 1.91$, $SD = 0.58$), Physical Characteristics ($M = 1.94$, $SD = 0.81$), and Colonial Debt ($M = 2.13$, $SD = 0.75$). Ethnic Identity Exploration ($M = 3.22$, $SD = 0.59$), Affirmation ($M = 3.83$, $SD = 0.26$), and Resolution ($M = 3.30$, $SD = 0.63$) subscale scores indicated that, on average, participants thought the statements pertaining to those ethnic identity concepts described them well.

Even though the current study focused on subscale scores, total average scores are presented to observe overall patterns in total average scores for the sample. Total average scores on the EIS ranged from 2.94 to 3.94 ($M = 3.45$, $SD = 0.38$). These results show that participants reported a range of ethnic identity levels and that 75% identified well or very well with their Filipino American ethnic identity. Enculturation (ESFA-S) total scores ranged from 1.49 to 4.43 ($M = 3.30$, $SD = 0.62$) and indicated that 50% of participants agreed slightly, somewhat, or strongly with statements that described maintenance and adherence to Filipino norms and behaviors. Scores for colonial mentality ranged from 1.21 to 3.44 ($M = 1.94$, $SD = 0.51$) and indicated that at least 50% of participants in the sample reported strongly or somewhat disagreed with statements endorsing attitudes, behaviors, and feelings that endorsed automatic rejection of Filipino characteristics and automatic preference for Western, European characteristics.

Bivariate correlations between subscales were obtained to observe possible relationships between these variables prior to the multivariate canonical correlation analysis. Several statistically significant small, medium, and large bivariate correlations were observed between colonial mentality, enculturation, and ethnic identity subscales. See Table 4 for the correlations between study subscale variables and their means and standard deviations. For the ESFA-S, Connection with Homeland was found to have statistically significant, low, positive correlations
with Interpersonal Norms, \( r = .16, p < .001 \), and with Conservatism, \( r = .22, p < .001 \), validating participants’ responses to statements from each of these subscales as three unique components of Filipino American enculturation.

### Table 3.
**Psychometric Properties for ESFA-S, CMS, and EIS Scales and Subscales**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Cronbach’s ( \alpha )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ESFA-S Total Average Score</strong></td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection with Homeland</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Norms</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservatism</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CMS Total Average Score</strong></td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalized Inferiority</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Shame &amp; Embarrassment</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within-Group Discrimination</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Characteristics</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonial Debt</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EIS Total Average Score</strong></td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>-0.84</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploration</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>-0.87</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmation</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-2.82</td>
<td>9.68</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-0.98</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are a few correlations to note between the ESFA-S and the CMS subscales and between the ESFA-S and the EIS subscales from the current study. CMS subscales were observed to have statistically significant, positive correlations with ESFA-S Interpersonal Norms and ESFA-S Conservatism subscales, which indicates a pattern that is mostly different from the study’s research hypothesis, except for statistically significant, negative correlations with the ESFA-S Connection with Homeland subscale. A statistically significant, moderate, and positive correlation was observed between ESFA-S Interpersonal Norms and CMS Internalized Inferiority, $r = .41, p < .001$. The statistically significant, positive correlation between ESFA-S Interpersonal Norms and CMS Physical Characteristics was observed at a level approaching moderate levels, $r = .29, p < .001$, and the statistically significant, positive correlation between ESFA-S Conservatism and CMS Colonial Debt was observed to approach strong levels, $r = .48, p < .001$.

With regard to relationships between the ESFA-S and the EIS subscales, some of the correlations suggested patterns that were moderately consistent with the study’s hypothesis on relationships between ethnic identity and enculturation. A statistically significant, moderate, and positive correlation was observed between ESFA-S Connection with Homeland and EIS Exploration, $r = .35, p < .001$, and a statistically significant, approaching moderate, and positive correlation was observed between ESFA-S Connection with Homeland and EIS Resolution, $r = .28, p < .001$. Within this sample, a connection with the Philippines was related to ethnic identity exploration and resolution.

Several statistically significant correlations were observed between the EIS subscales and the CMS subscales in the current study in the hypothesized direction. EIS Affirmation was moderately and negatively related to CMS Internalized Inferiority, $r = -.40, p < .001$. EIS
Resolution was also negatively related to CMS Internalized Inferiority and approaching moderate levels, $r = -.28$, $p < .001$. EIS Resolution was negatively and moderately related to CMS Cultural Shame and Embarrassment CMS, $r = -.33$, $p < .001$. Cultural Shame and Embarrassment was strongly related to EIS Affirmation, $r = -.58$, $p < .001$. The patterns in these subscale correlations suggest some important, negative relationships between colonial mentality and ethnic identity in the study’s Filipino American sample.

**Reliability Estimates**

Cronbach’s alpha coefficients of reliability were calculated for each scale and subscale in the sample ($N = 592$). Reliability analyses were conducted for the ESFA-S, CMS, and EIS, and their reliabilities for the overall scales were reported as follows: ESFA-S Cronbach alpha coefficient was reported at .84, CMS Cronbach alpha coefficient was .92, and EIS was .88. All scale and subscale scores had strong reliabilities. ESFA subscale Cronbach alpha coefficient scores were reported as .83 for Connection with Homeland, .79 for Interpersonal Norms, and .83 for Conservatism. The Cronbach alpha coefficient scores for CMS subscales had reported values of .75 for Cultural Shame and Embarrassment, .86 for Within-Group Discrimination, .89 for Physical Characteristics, .84 for Colonial Debt, and .79 for Internalized Inferiority. For the EIS subscales the Cronbach alpha coefficient scores were reported as .90 for Exploration, .91 for Resolution, and .80 for Affirmation. Interpretations of reliability scores are based on criteria defined by DeVellis’ (2017) and Field’s (2013) interpretation of alpha coefficients. See Table 3 for reliability scores of the scale and subscales in the study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ESFA-S: CWH</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ESFA-S: IN</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.16***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ESFA-S: Cons.</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.22***</td>
<td>0.15**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. CMS: Int. Inf.</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.41**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. CMS: CSE</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>-0.12**</td>
<td>0.19**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.53***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. CMS: WGD</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.21**</td>
<td>0.15**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.38***</td>
<td>0.45***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. CMS: PC</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>-0.09*</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.40***</td>
<td>0.38***</td>
<td>0.52***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. CMS: CD</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.48**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.12**</td>
<td>0.25***</td>
<td>0.45***</td>
<td>0.46***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. EIS: Exp.</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.35***</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.10*</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.25***</td>
<td>-0.16***</td>
<td>-0.17***</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.21***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. EIS: Aff.</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.09*</td>
<td>-0.12**</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.40***</td>
<td>-0.58***</td>
<td>-0.27***</td>
<td>-0.28***</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.14**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. EIS: Res.</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.28***</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.09*</td>
<td>-0.26***</td>
<td>-0.33***</td>
<td>-0.16***</td>
<td>-0.19***</td>
<td>-0.10*</td>
<td>0.57**</td>
<td>0.24***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assumptions

Prior to conducting statistical analyses to test the hypotheses, the data were examined to determine whether the assumptions for conducting Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) were met. These assumptions include (a) independence of observations, (b) random sampling, (c) multivariate normality, and (d) homogeneity of covariance matrices (Field, 2013a). While the robustness of the MANOVA test reduces the need to meet multivariate normality in all cases, the researcher assessed the following as an added measure: normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity histograms, Q-Q plots, and scatterplots of standardized residuals against predicted residual values. Field (2013) noted that MANOVA is found to work acceptably well with moderately correlated dependent variables, and its power increases if the measures are somewhat different from each other, as supported by the results of bivariate correlations between the subscales. Analysis of the data did not indicate significant violations of the assumptions of independence of observations, random sampling, and multivariate normality. Due to the differences in group size based on generation status, homogeneity of covariance cannot be assumed in the sample. While the MANOVA does retain robustness to moderate violations of the assumptions, both Roy’s Largest Root, the most conservative MANOVA test statistic, and Pillai’s trace, the most used test statistic, were utilized to accommodate the impact of lack of homogeneity of covariance. To address the lack of homogeneity of variance-covariance, the current study used the .005 criteria for evaluating Box’s Test of Equality of Covariance (Huberty & Petoskey, 2000). Results from the primary statistical analyses are presented in the following segments of Chapter IV.
Primary Statistical Analyses

After completion of power analysis, missing values analysis and imputation, descriptive statistics, reliability estimates, and assumptions testing, the study proceeded with primary statistical analyses to test the study’s research questions and their respective hypotheses. Follow-up or post-hoc tests were implemented, as needed, for research questions when the primary multivariate statistical analysis test results indicated statistically significant results.

Research Hypothesis 1: Ethnic identity for first- and 1.5-generation Filipino Americans will be higher than that of second- and third/subsequent-generation Filipino Americans.

A one-way between-groups multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) test was used to investigate generational differences in ethnic identity. The EIS subscale scores, Exploration, Affirmation, and Resolution, were used as three dependent variables. The independent variable was generation status. Table 5 illustrates the means and standard deviations between the four groups examined in the current study.

Table 5. Average Ethnic Identity Subscale Scores Across Filipino American Generation Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EIS Subscale</th>
<th>First Generation</th>
<th>1.5 Generation</th>
<th>Second Generation</th>
<th>Third/Subsequent Generation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIS: Exploration</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIS: Resolution</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIS: Affirmation</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Participant responses were scored as follows: 1 = Does not describe me at all, 2 = Describes me a little, 3 = Describes me well, 4 = Describes me very well.*

Use of the Pillai’s trace criterion indicated that the results were approaching a significant effect of generation status on ethnic identity, $V = .04, F(9, 1137) = 1.87, p = .05$. After
considering the more conservative Roy’s Largest Root criterion, the results confirmed the presence of a statistically significant effect of generation status on ethnic identity, $O = .04, F(3, 379) = 4.64, p = .00$. Separate univariate ANOVAs on the dependent variables revealed significant generation status effects on Resolution, $F(3, 379) = 4.09, p < .001$.; partial $\eta^2 = .03$.

MANOVA results are summarized in Table 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$df$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>$\eta^2$</th>
<th>power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pillai’s Trace</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1137</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks’ Lambda</td>
<td>.957</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling’s Trace</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1127</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy’s Largest Root</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>4.64$^c$</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.891</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $^b$ = Exact statistic. $^c$ = The statistic is an upper bound on $F$ that yields a lower bound on the significance level.

Given the significance of both the MANOVA and the ANOVA test results, a follow-up Fisher’s Least Significant Difference was utilized to compare the four generation groups to locate the generational difference in Resolution for areas of future study. Results indicated statistically significant mean differences in Resolution between first-generation and all other generation groups. First-generation Filipino Americans ($M = 3.64$) had higher scores than 1.5-generation ($M = 3.32$), second-generation ($M = 3.28$), and third/subsequent-generation ($M = 2.88$) Filipino Americans on the Resolution subscale. Resolution refers to the extent that an individual has clarity or understanding of what their ethnic identity means to them. Results suggest that first-generation Filipino Americans are more likely to have clarity on the meaning of their ethnic identity compared to 1.5-, second, and third/subsequent-generation Filipino Americans.
Research Hypothesis 2: Lower ethnic identity subscale scores will be related to higher colonial mentality subscale scores for Filipino Americans.

A canonical correlation analysis was conducted using the three ethnic identity variables as predictors of the five colonial mentality variables to evaluate the multivariate shared relationship between the two variable sets (i.e., ethnic identity and colonial mentality). The overall results were found to be statistically significant using the Wilk’s $\lambda = .564$ criterion, $F(15, 1615.33) = 24.799, p < .001$. The analyses statistical significance holds when considering the more conservative Pillais’ trace criterion $= .459, F(15, 1761.00) = 21.207, p < .001$, to account for any possible bias or error introduced by sampling and missing data. Results of the canonical correlation analysis between these variable sets are provided in Table 7. The analysis yielded three functions with squared canonical correlations ($R_{C2}$) of .402, .051, and .009 for each successive function.

The dimension reduction analysis tested the hierarchical arrangement of functions for statistical significance by analyzing the groups of functions and dropping one function at a time. Collectively, the full model (i.e., Functions 1, 2, and 3) across all functions was statistically significant using the same Wilk’s $\lambda = .564$ criterion, $F(15, 1615.33) = 24.799, p < .001$. Because Wilk’s $\lambda$ represents the variance unexplained by the model, $1 - \lambda$ yields the full model effect size in an $r^2$ metric. Thus, for the set of three canonical functions, the $r^2$ effect size was .436, which indicates that the full model explained about 43.6% of the variance shared between the variable sets. The second grouping of function variables (i.e., Functions 2 and 3) was also statistically significant, $F(8, 1172.00) = 4.390, p < .001$, and contributed 5.7% of the variance. The last grouping, (i.e., Function 3 only) was not statistically significant and did not explain a statistically significant amount of shared variance between the variable sets, $F(3, 587.00) = 1.199, p = .309$. A graphic summary depicting the canonical correlations and structure coefficients equal to or
greater than |.30| between ethnic identity subscales and colonial mentality subscales is depicted in Figure 8.

![Figure 8. Canonical Correlation Analysis for Ethnic Identity and Colonial Mentality](image)

*Note.* Two canonical correlations and their respective synthetic/latent variates are presented with double-headed arrows, connecting variates for Function 1 (*Pagmamahal sa Sarili at Kapwa*) and Function 2 (*Yaman sa Kulturang Pilipino*), respectively. Structure coefficients from variables equal to or greater than |.30| are depicted with dashed lines, and structure coefficients equal to or greater than |.45| are represented with single-headed arrows pointing to the synthetic/latent variate. Both canonical correlations are statistically significant (*p* < .001).

In general, individual functions should account for approximately 10% of the variance to be considered meaningful; however, it is also important to explore and consider smaller, statistically significant functions for informing future research. Given the $R^2_C$ effects for each function, only the first one was considered noteworthy in the context of the study with 40.2% of the shared variance. To advance the exploratory purpose and significance of the current study for future research, individual functions will be labeled and named in Tagalog to highlight important themes in the results that center Filipino Americans’ mental health concerns as individuals and as
a community. The first function was labeled *Pagmamahal sa Sarili at Kapwa* (Love of Self and Interdependence).

In the current study, *Pagmamahal sa Sarili at Kapwa* is defined by structure coefficients \( r_s \) from the following subscales using a cutoff of |.30|: Affirmation, Resolution, Internalized Inferiority, Cultural Shame and Embarrassment, Within-Group Discrimination, and Physical Characteristics. Exploration served as the sole, secondary level contributor to the function. Among these structure coefficients, both EIS variables defining the function have a positive sign, and the four CMS variables defining the function have a negative sign. This means that CMS Internalized Inferiority, Cultural Shame and Embarrassment, Within-Group Discrimination, and Physical Characteristics were negatively related to EIS Affirmation and Resolution. Upon examining the standardized canonical coefficients (\( Coef \)), it was found that Affirmation, Resolution, and Cultural Shame and Embarrassment explained most of the relationship between functions in an inverse direction for *Pagmamahal sa Sarili at Kapwa*. These results are generally supportive of theoretically expected relationships between internalized racism, personal self-esteem, and collective self-esteem for Filipino Americans.

Although Function 2 explained a small amount of the variance, its labeling and characteristics are presented in the current study for consideration in future discussions about upcoming research, teaching, and clinical practices with Filipino Americans. Function 2 is labeled *Yaman sa Kulturang Pilipino* (Filipino Cultural Wealth) and was defined by the following subscales: Exploration, Internalized Inferiority, Within-Group Discrimination, and Colonial Debt. Within this function, Exploration and Colonial Debt are primary contributors to the function and were negatively related to each other. Within-Group Discrimination and Internalized Inferiority served as secondary level contributors, with Within-Group
Discrimination being negatively related to Exploration and the Internalized Inferiority being positively related to Exploration. Examination of the standardized canonical coefficients revealed that Exploration, Internalized Inferiority, and Colonial Debt explained most of the relationship between functions in a mostly inverse direction for Yaman sa Kulturang Pilipino.

**Research Hypothesis 3: Higher enculturation subscale scores will be related to higher ethnic identity subscale scores for Filipino Americans.**

To evaluate the multivariate shared relationship between the ethnic identity and enculturation variables, a canonical correlation analysis was conducted using the ethnic identity variables as predictors of the three enculturation variables. The overall results were found to be statistically significant after examining both Wilk’s $\lambda = .819, F(9, 1428.75) = 13.577, p < .001$, and the more conservative Pillais’ trace $= .187, F(9, 1767.00) = 13.080, p < .001$. Table 8 provides results of the canonical correlation between these variable sets. The analysis yielded three functions with squared canonical correlations ($R_c^2$) of 0.143, 0.043, 0.000 for each successive function.

The full model (i.e., Functions 1, 2, and 3) was statistically significant at $p < .001$, using the same Wilk’s $\lambda = .819, F(9, 1428.75) = 13.577$. The $r^2$ effect size for the full model was 0.181, which shows that the full model explained about 18% of the variance between the variable sets. Functions 2 and 3 were also statistically significant, $F(4, 1176.00) = 6.688, p < .001$ and contributed 4.3% of the variance. The last grouping (i.e., Function 3 only) was not statistically significant and did not explain a statistically significant amount of shared variance between the variable sets, $F(1, 589.00) = 0.999, p = .446$. Given the $R_c^2$ effects for each variable set, only the full model was considered noteworthy in the context of the study with 14% of the shared
Table 7.
Canonical Solution for Ethnic Identity Predicting Colonial Mentality for Functions 1 and 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Function 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Function 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coef</td>
<td>$r_s$</td>
<td>$r_s^2$ (%)</td>
<td>Coef</td>
<td>$r_s$</td>
<td>$r_s^2$ (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIS: Exploration</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>11.90</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>78.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIS: Affirmation</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>28.84</td>
<td>-0.50</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIS: Resolution</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>89.68</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS: Internalized Inferiority</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-0.67</td>
<td>45.56</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>10.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS: Cultural Shame &amp; Embarrassment</td>
<td>-0.85</td>
<td>-0.97</td>
<td>93.32</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS: Within-Group Discrimination</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
<td>21.25</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>9.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS: Physical Characteristics</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>-0.49</td>
<td>23.81</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>8.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS: Colonial Debt</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>-0.86</td>
<td>-0.87</td>
<td>76.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Structure coefficients ($r_s$) greater than |.30| are underlined. Communality coefficients ($h^2$) greater than 30% are underlined. Coef = standardized canonical coefficient; $r_s$ = structure coefficient; $r_s^2$ = squared structure coefficient; and $h^2$ = communality coefficient.
variance; though, the second function may be considered for implications in future research. A graphic summary depicting the canonical correlations and structure coefficients equal to or greater than |.30| between ethnic identity subscales and colonial mentality subscales is depicted in Figure 9.

![Canonical Correlation Analysis](image)

**Figure 9. Canonical Correlation Analysis for Ethnic Identity and Enculturation**

*Note.* Two canonical correlations and their respective synthetic/latent variates are presented with double-headed arrows, connecting variates for Function 1 (*Pagkakasundo sa Kultura at Sarili*) and Function 2 (*Pakikisama Concerns*), respectively. Structure coefficients from variables equal to or greater than |.30| are depicted with dashed lines, and structure coefficients equal to or greater than |.45| are represented with single-headed arrows pointing to the synthetic/latent variate. Both canonical correlations are statistically significant (*p* < .001).

The function for the full model was labeled as *Pagkakasundo sa Kultura at Sarili* (Cultural and Self Harmony) and defined by the following variables with signs in the same, positive direction: Exploration, Affirmation, and Connection with Homeland. This means that Connection with Homeland was positively related to both Exploration and Affirmation. The variables explaining the direct relationship between functions for *Pagkakasundo sa Kultura at*
Sarili include Exploration, Affirmation, Resolution, and Connection with Homeland. These results are generally supportive of theoretical expectations and previous studies about the importance of ethnic socialization in developing a person’s ethnic identity.

The second function was labeled as *Pakiksama Concerns* and defined by the following variables: Affirmation, Resolution, Interpersonal Norms, and Conservatism. While the second function did not explain more than 10% of the variance, it is labeled and presented in the current study for consideration in future counseling psychology research, education, and clinical practices. Interpersonal Norms and Resolution were the primary contributors of the function and were negatively related to each other, while Conservatism and Affirmation served as secondary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8.</th>
</tr>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canonical Solution for Ethnic Identity Predicting Enculturation for Functions 1 and 2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Function 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Function 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coef</td>
<td>(r_s)</td>
<td>(r_s^2) (%)</td>
<td>Coef</td>
<td>(r_s)</td>
<td>(r_s^2) (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIS: Exploration</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>92.90</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIS: Affirmation</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>58.19</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>17.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIS: Resolution</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>-0.76</td>
<td>-0.81</td>
<td>65.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R^2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESFA-S: Connection with Homeland</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>94.73</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESFA-S: Interpersonal Norms</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>68.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESFA-S: Conservatism</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
<td>18.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Structure coefficients \((r_s)\) greater than \(|.30|\) are underlined. Communality coefficients \((h^2)\) greater than 30% are underlined. \(Coef =\) standardized canonical coefficient; \(r_s =\) structure coefficient; \(r_s^2 =\) squared structure coefficient; and \(h^2 =\) communality coefficient.
contributors. Unlike Interpersonal Norms, Conservatism’s structure coefficient had a negative sign, indicating that it was positively related to Affirmation and Resolution. Examination of the standardized canonical coefficients showed that Exploration, Internalized Inferiority, and Colonial Debt accounted for most of the relationship between functions in a mostly inverse direction for Pakikisama Concerns.

**Research Hypothesis 4: Higher enculturation scores will be related to lower colonial mentality subscale scores for Filipino Americans.**

A third canonical correlation analysis was conducted using the enculturation variables as predictors of the colonial mentality variables to evaluate the multivariate shared relationship between the two sets of subscales. Results of the canonical correlation analysis between these variable sets were statistically significant when examining both the standard Wilk’s $\lambda = .538$, $F(15, 1615.33) = 27.101, p < .001$, and the more conservative Pillais’ trace $= .543$, $F(15, 1761.00) = 25.966, p < .001$. These results are provided in Table 9. The squared canonical correlations ($R_c^2$) for the three functions yielded by the analysis were 0.263, 0.235, and 0.044, respectively.

The dimension reduction analysis tested the hierarchical arrangement of functions for statistical significance by analyzing the groups of functions and dropping one function at a time. Using the same Wilk’s $\lambda = .538$, $F(15, 1615.33) = 27.101, p < .001$, the full model’s (i.e., Functions 1, 2, and 3) $r^2$ effect size was 0.462, which shows that this grouping of functions explained about 46.2% of the variance between the variable sets. The second set of variables (i.e., Functions 2 and 3) and the third set of variables (i.e., Function 3) were also statistically significant after considering Wilk’s criteria for each of those sets, $F(8, 1172) = 24.908, p < .001$ and $F(3, 587.00) = 9.145, p < .001$. Given the $R_c^2$ effects for each function, the first and second sets of functions were considered noteworthy in the context of the study with 26.3% and 23.5% of the shared variance, respectively. A graphic summary depicting the canonical correlations and
structure coefficients equal to or greater than |.30| between enculturation subscales and colonial mentality subscales is depicted in Figure 10.

**Figure 10. Canonical Correlation Analysis for Enculturation and Colonial Mentality**

*Note.* Three canonical correlations and their respective synthetic/latent variates are presented with double-headed arrows, connecting variates for Function 1 (*Rebolusionaryong Kaisipan*), Function 2 (*Nahahati sa Kamalayan*), and Function 3 (*Paglalakad sa Sakit*), respectively. Structure coefficients from variables equal to or greater than |.30| are depicted with dashed lines, and structure coefficients equal to or greater than |.45| are represented with single-headed arrows pointing to the synthetic/latent variate. Both canonical correlations are statistically significant (*p* < .001).

The first function was labeled as *Rebolusionaryong Kaisipan* (Revolutionary Thinking), and the second function was labeled as *Nahahati sa Kamalayan* (Divided in Consciousness). A third function accounted for 4.4% of the shared variance and was labeled as *Paglalakad sa Sakit* (Walking Through the Pain) for consideration in future research. *Rebolusionaryong Kaisipan* was defined by structure coefficients from the following variables: Conservatism, Colonial Debt, and Physical Characteristics. Conservatism and Colonial Debt served as the primary contributors
to the function, and both had negative signs in their structure coefficients, indicating that they were positively related to each other. Physical Characteristics served as the sole secondary contributor to the function and had a negative sign in its structure coefficient, indicating that it was also positively related to the primary contributor variables. Examination of the standardized canonical coefficients showed that Colonial Debt and Conservatism accounted for most of the direct relationship between functions in *Rebolusionaryong Kaisipan*.

*Nahahati sa Kamalayan* was defined by structure coefficients from the following variables with negative signs: Interpersonal Norms, Internalized Inferiority, Cultural Shame and Embarrassment, Within-Group Discrimination, and Physical Characteristics. All these variables for this function shared the same sign, indicating that they were positively related to each other. After considering the standardized canonical coefficients for this function, it was determined that Connection with Homeland, Interpersonal Norms, Internalized Inferiority, Within-Group Discrimination, and Physical Characteristics explained most of the mostly direct relationship with the function. Of these standardized canonical coefficients, Connection to Homeland was the only variable with a positive sign, indicating that it was the only variable inversely related.

The *Paglalakad sa Sakit* function was defined by the Connection with Homeland, Interpersonal Norms, and Within-Group Discrimination variables. While this function did not meet the standard threshold for being a significant function, its labeling and characteristics are presented in the current, exploratory study to continue discussions on future counseling psychology research, education, and clinical practice that is responsive to the Filipino American communities’ needs. Connection with Homeland and Within-Group Discrimination served as the primary contributors to the function, and each had opposite signs within their structure coefficients, indicating that they were negatively related to each other. Interpersonal Norms
served as a secondary contributor and shared a negative sign with Connection with Homeland, showing that it was also negatively related to Within-Group Discrimination. The standardized coefficients explaining most of the relationship between functions included: Connection with Homeland, Internalized Inferiority, Within-Group Discrimination, and Physical Characteristics. When considering the signs of the standardized coefficients, the relationship explained by Connection with Homeland and Within-Group Discrimination is inverse despite the direct relationships between Connection with Homeland, Internalized Inferiority, and Physical Characteristics. These results may suggest that, for some Filipino Americans, a sense of connection with the Philippines may reduce within-group discrimination yet may increase some levels of self-consciousness related to their physical characteristics and internalized inferiority. This finding suggests a push-pull dynamic outlined in theoretical explanations for bicultural development in second-generation Filipino Americans.

**Research Hypothesis 5: First- and 1.5-generation Filipino Americans will have higher enculturation scores than second- and third/subsequent-generation Filipino Americans.**

A one-way between-groups multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) test was used to investigate generational differences in enculturation. The ESFA-S subscale scores, Connection with Homeland, Interpersonal Norms, and Conservatism, were used as three dependent variables. The independent variable was generation status. Table 10 illustrates the means and standard deviations between the four groups examined in the current study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Function 1 Coef</th>
<th>Function 2 Coef</th>
<th>Function 3 Coef</th>
<th>$r_s^2$ (%)</th>
<th>$r_{s}'^2$ (%)</th>
<th>$h^2$ (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESFA-S: Connection with Homeland</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-1.03</td>
<td>-0.98</td>
<td>95.65</td>
<td>90.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESFA-S: Interpersonal Norms</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>95.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESFA-S: Conservatism</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>82.61</td>
<td>100.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESFA-S: Internalized Inferiority</td>
<td>-0.97</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>-0.48</td>
<td>-0.62</td>
<td>-0.88</td>
<td>86.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS: Internalized Shame &amp; Embarrassment</td>
<td>-0.69</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>77.09</td>
<td>95.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS: Within-Group Discrimination</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>22.85</td>
<td>66.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS: Physical Characteristics</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>77.09</td>
<td>95.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS: Colonial Debt</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>22.85</td>
<td>66.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note. Structure coefficients ($r$) greater than</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recall coefficients ($r_{s}'$) greater than 30% are underlined. Coef = standardized canonical coefficient; $r_s$ = structure coefficient; and $h^2$ = communality coefficient.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10. 
*Average Enculturation Subscale Scores Across Filipino American Generation Groups*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESFA-S Subscale</th>
<th>First Generation</th>
<th>1.5 Generation</th>
<th>Second Generation</th>
<th>Third/Subsequent Generation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>M</em></td>
<td><em>SD</em></td>
<td><em>M</em></td>
<td><em>SD</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESFA-S: Connection with Homeland</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESFA-S: Interpersonal Norms</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESFA-S: Conservatism</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Participant responses were scored as follows: 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Somewhat Disagree, 3 = Slightly Disagree, 4 = Slightly Agree, 5 = Somewhat Agree, and 6 = Strongly Agree.*

Use of the Pillai’s trace criterion indicated that the results had a significant effect of generation status on enculturation, $V = .19, F(9, 1137) = 8.53, p < .001$. After considering the more conservative Roy’s Largest Root criterion, the results confirmed the presence of a statistically significant effect of generation status on enculturation, $Q = .21, F(3, 379) = 26.15, p < .001$. Separate univariate ANOVAs on the dependent variables revealed statistically significant effects of generation status on Connection with Homeland, $F(3, 379) = 12.05, p < .001$; partial $\eta^2 = .09$ and on Interpersonal Norms, $F(3, 379) = 6.70, p < .001$; partial $\eta^2 = .05$. MANOVA results are provided in Table 11. Given the significance of both the MANOVA and the ANOVA test results, a follow-up Fisher’s Least Significant Difference was utilized to compare the four generation groups to locate the generational differences in Connection with Homeland and in Interpersonal Norms for areas of future study.
Results indicated statistically significant mean differences in Connection with Homeland between first generation and all other generation groups. First-generation Filipino Americans ($M = 3.63$) had higher scores than 1.5-generation ($M = 2.97$), second-generation ($M = 2.72$), and third/subsequent-generation ($M = 2.25$) Filipino Americans in Connection with Homeland subscale scores. 1.5-generation Filipino Americans also had a statistically significant mean difference in Connection with Homeland when compared to third/subsequent-generation Filipino Americans. Connection with Homeland describes an individual’s contact with the Philippines, other Filipinos, adherence to cultural customs, and use, preference, and knowledge of Tagalog, the primary language of the Philippines. These results suggest that first-generation Filipino Americans are more likely to have a stronger connection to the Philippines as compared to 1.5-, second-, and third/subsequent-generation Filipino Americans. Results also suggest that 1.5-generation Filipino Americans are more likely to have a stronger connection to the homeland than third/subsequent-generation Filipino Americans.

Like Connection with Homeland, results for Interpersonal Norms indicated statistically significant differences between first generation and all other generation groups. First-generation Filipino Americans ($M = 2.69$) had lower scores than 1.5-generation ($M = 3.15$), second-
generation \( (M = 3.32) \), and third/subsequent-generation \( (M = 3.71) \) Filipino Americans in Interpersonal Norms subscale scores. Interestingly, 1.5-generation Filipino Americans also had a statistically significant mean difference in Interpersonal Norms when compared to third/subsequent-generation Filipino Americans. Interpersonal Norms are culturally accepted social values and interactions relating to *hiya* (i.e., humility or shame), *pakikisama* (i.e., smooth interpersonal relations), *utang na loob* (i.e., reciprocity), hospitality, and personalism. These results suggest that first-generation Filipino Americans were more likely to adhere to Filipino interpersonal styles and customs as compared to 1.5-, second-, and third/subsequent-generation Filipino Americans. Results also suggest that 1.5-generation Filipino Americans are less likely to adhere to Filipino interpersonal styles than third/subsequent-generation Filipino Americans.

**Research Hypothesis 6: First-generation Filipino Americans will have lower colonial mentality than 1.5-, second-, and third/subsequent-generation Filipino Americans.**

A one-way between-groups multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) test was used to investigate generational differences in colonial mentality. The CMS subscale scores, *Internalized Inferiority*, *Cultural Shame and Embarrassment*, *Within-Group Discrimination*, *Physical Characteristics*, and *Colonial Debt* were used as five dependent variables. The independent variable was generation status. Table 12 illustrates the means and standard deviations between the four generation groups examined in the current study.

Use of the Pillai’s trace criterion indicated that the results did not have any significant effect of generation status on colonial mentality, \( V = .19, F(15, 113) = 1.30, p = .19 \). Even though Roy’s Largest Root criterion was found to be statistically significant, \( \Theta = .04, F(5, 377) = 3.03, p = .01 \), follow-up ANOVAs for each of the dependent variables did not find statistically significant differences among different generation groups across all colonial mentality subscales. Results for the MANOVA test are summarized in Table 13.
### Table 12.
**Average Colonial Mentality Subscale Scores Across Filipino American Generation Groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CMS Subscale</th>
<th>First Generation</th>
<th>1.5 Generation</th>
<th>Second Generation</th>
<th>Third/Subsequent Generation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMS: Internalized Inferiority</td>
<td>M 1.87 SD 0.95</td>
<td>M 2.22 SD 1.13</td>
<td>M 2.25 SD 0.97</td>
<td>M 2.10 SD 0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS: Cultural Shame &amp; Embarrassment</td>
<td>M 1.45 SD 0.48</td>
<td>M 1.45 SD 0.51</td>
<td>M 1.50 SD 0.61</td>
<td>M 1.45 SD 0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS: Within-Group Discrimination</td>
<td>M 1.65 SD 0.57</td>
<td>M 1.87 SD 0.61</td>
<td>M 1.93 SD 0.69</td>
<td>M 1.72 SD 0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS: Physical Characteristics</td>
<td>M 1.87 SD 0.90</td>
<td>M 1.89 SD 0.82</td>
<td>M 1.90 SD 0.93</td>
<td>M 1.44 SD 0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS: Colonial Debt</td>
<td>M 2.14 SD 0.72</td>
<td>M 2.09 SD 0.82</td>
<td>M 2.07 SD 0.87</td>
<td>M 1.91 SD 0.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Participant responses were scored as follows: 1 = *Strongly Disagree*, 2 = *Somewhat Disagree*, 3 = *Slightly Disagree*, 4 = *Slightly Agree*, 5 = *Somewhat Agree*, and 6 = *Strongly Agree*.

### Table 13.
**MANOVA Summary Table: Colonial Mentality**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>ηp²</th>
<th>power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pillai’s Trace</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1131</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks’ Lambda</td>
<td>.950</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1036</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling’s Trace</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1121</td>
<td>.190</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy’s Largest Root</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>3.03c</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.865</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* *b* = Exact statistic. *c* = The statistic is an upper bound on F that yields a lower bound on the significance level.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

The final chapter of this dissertation provides an overview of the study’s purpose, research questions, and the hypotheses tested. A portion of the chapter is devoted to summarizing and providing discussion of the study results as they relate to the role of generation status, colonial mentality, and enculturation on Filipino American individuals’ ethnic identity. Ultimately, six hypotheses were tested, and the findings provided mixed support. In this section, the discussion and limitations provide an understanding of the study’s implications for future research, education, and practice of the information learned for individuals and institutions who serve the Filipino American community. The chapter is then summarized, including highlights of the study’s significance.

Purpose of the Research

The present study investigated relationships between enculturation, colonial mentality, and generation status on ethnic identity in Filipino Americans to provide observations and inferences on the connections between these four variables. The study’s use of Ethnic Identity Scale (EIS; Umaña-Taylor, Yazedjian, & Bamaca-Gomez, 2004) in conjunction with two measures developed and validated for specific use with Filipino Americans is what distinguishes the current study from existing literature on ethnic identity, enculturation of Filipino culture, and experience of colonial mentality. Research questions were posed to expand on findings from previous studies with this population that have used the Multiethnic Identity Measure (MEIM; Phinney, 1992), which operationalizes the components of ethnic identity differently than the EIS. In addition, the current study attempted to explain implications of findings and possible
connections between ethnic identity, enculturation, generation status, and colonial mentality using social identity theory.

**Research Questions**

This study explored six research questions, stated as follows:

1. Does Filipino American ethnic identity vary among generations?
2. Are ethnic identity subscale scores related to colonial mentality subscale scores among Filipino Americans?
3. Does a relationship exist between ethnic identity subscale scores and enculturation subscale scores in Filipino Americans?
4. Are enculturation subscale scores related to colonial mentality subscale scores in Filipino Americans?
5. Does Filipino American enculturation vary among generations?
6. How will generation status affect colonial mentality?

**Research Hypotheses**

Six hypotheses were formulated based on the study’s research questions and are stated as follows:

1. Ethnic identity for first- and 1.5-generation Filipino Americans will be higher than second- and third/subsequent-generation Filipino Americans.
2. Lower ethnic identity subscale scores will be related to higher colonial mentality subscale scores for Filipino Americans.
3. Higher enculturation subscale scores will be related to higher ethnic identity subscale scores for Filipino Americans.
4. Higher enculturation subscale scores will be related to lower colonial mentality subscale scores for Filipino Americans.

5. First- and 1.5-generation Filipino Americans will have higher enculturation scores than second- and third/subsequent-generation Filipino Americans.

6. First-generation Filipino Americans will have a lower colonial mentality than 1.5-, second-, and third/subsequent-generation Filipino Americans.

**Research Hypothesis Testing**

Results from the current study were interpreted for each research hypothesis to determine evidence for support, possible limitations, factors affecting results, and implications for future research. Within the current study, canonical correlation functions that explained a significant amount of variance or opened a new window of opportunity for future research were labeled in Tagalog to enhance the richness of psychology discussions on Filipino American psychological research and the ways that communities may experience ethnic identity, enculturation, and colonial mentality. The use of Tagalog, a language seldomly used to name psychological phenomena in the United States, was emphasized to enhance the strengths of Filipino culture, center Filipino American communities, and move away from deficit-based perspectives on historically excluded groups in counseling psychology.

**Research Hypothesis 1**

To answer the research question, *Does Filipino American ethnic identity vary among generations?* The following hypothesis was developed: *Ethnic identity for first- and 1.5-generation Filipino Americans will be higher than second- and third/subsequent-generation Filipino Americans.*
Results from the current study indicate support for ethnic identity differences between first and subsequent generation groups, especially with regard to the resolution of ethnic identity. While some differences were observed in Affirmation and Exploration, Resolution was the only subscale with substantial strength to support the hypothesis. Overall, this means that first-generation Filipino Americans are more likely to have clarity and understanding of what their Filipino ethnic identity means to them when compared to 1.5, second, and third generations. This finding fits with previous studies that suggest more complex experiences with bicultural identities and dual consciousness for 1.5, second, and third/subsequent generations who are navigating different social contexts throughout their development (Choi et al., 2018; de Dios, 2015; Ferrera, 2017; Teppang et al., 2019).

Multiple explanations for the lack of consistent evidence to support generational differences in Exploration and Affirmation include the following: (a) shared or learned participation among generations in Exploration activities/events due to socialization, (b) a need for more nuanced response types to describe Filipino Americans’ ethnic identity Affirmation processes, and (c) a higher representation of second-generation Filipino American participants with differing levels of accessibility to Filipino events in their daily lives. Given the nature of racial/ethnic socialization of minoritized populations with a more collective focus in the United States, participants might have scored similarly on ethnic identity Exploration items due to family ethnic/racial socialization and shared relational or geographic proximity to events or activities in ethnic communities (Feliciano & Rumbaut, 2019; Ocampo, 2016; Woo et al., 2020). Items for the EIS Exploration subscale are written in the past tense, meaning that participants only reported on past Exploration behaviors rather than plans or intent to engage in future events or activities. The lack of differences between generation groups in Affirmation may be due to the
overrepresentation of second-generation Filipino Americans in the sample as compared with other generation groups. With more representation of first-, 1.5-, and third/subsequent-generation Filipino Americans in a sample, the more likely that variance within each of those groups will be adequately observed in group comparisons.

Overall, the results suggest that the Resolution, or the sense of meaning or clarity behind an individual’s identity, may be the most important, differentiating factor between generations in Filipino Americans. Support for generational differences in ethnic identity Resolution may be due to more nuanced patterns in outcome expectations, personal goals, or self-concept beliefs that are connected to lived experiences by each generation’s status. For the first generation, perhaps the unique experiences contributing to their increased resolve behind their ethnic identity are connected to specific memories of living in the Philippines and/or immigrating to the United States—experiences that 1.5, second, and third/subsequent generations are less likely to experience vividly within their lifetimes. Based on this sample, the significance or meaning of an ethnic identity may play a more important role in Filipino Americans’ overall ethnic identity than how positively they feel about their ethnic identity or how much they explore it.

**Research Hypothesis 2**

Research Hypothesis 2 was developed to investigate the multivariate relationship between ethnic identity and colonial mentality in Filipino Americans. The hypothesis read as follows: *Lower ethnic identity subscale scores will be related to higher colonial mentality subscale scores for Filipino Americans.* The current study’s results provide strong evidence for (or suggestions of possible) correlations and/or associations between ethnic identity and colonial mentality in Filipino Americans in the predicted directions.
Evidence from the current study provide strong support for a unique set of associations between ethnic identity Affirmation and Resolution with most of the colonial mentality variables among Filipino Americans. The source of association, labeled as *Pagmamahal sa Sarili at Kapwa* (Love of Self and Kapwa or interdependence), contributed to 40.2% of the shared variance among Filipino American adults in the sample. Results showed that, when Filipino Americans are experiencing high levels of encouragement, support, happiness, a sense of meaning, and clarity with their ethnic identity, they may be experiencing low levels of shame/embarrassment and inferiority towards their Filipino culture, physical traits, and discrimination towards people within their ethnic group, which confirms David et al.’s (2017) conceptualization of connections between ethnic identity, colonial mentality, and indigenous Filipino values of *kapwa*. In other words, immersing Filipino Americans with positive attitudes about their culture and encouragement towards this pursuit in their daily life can buffer the negative effects of colonial mentality and racial or ethnic discrimination on Filipino American individuals and their communities’ mental health. This important finding considers and confirms the decades of research on the effects of racial socialization and racial discrimination on the mental health outcomes of minoritized groups, such as Filipino Americans.

The associations described within this function may also describe how participants feel when they encounter opportunities to challenge covert or overt experiences of colonial mentality, while in the process of affirming themselves or creating meaning(s) from their Filipino American identity. Given that the sample within the current study consists of predominantly second-generation female Filipino Americans, this finding about *Pagmamahal sa Sarili at Kapwa* is most generalizable to that subgroup and can inform future research on this subgroup’s process of navigating ethnic identity Affirmation and Resolution from their specific intersection of
identities. Findings about Pagmamahal sa Sarili at Kapwa align with literature findings on Filipino American women that have studied the additive effects of racism and sexism from multiple, marginalized identities on their self-esteem and mental health, which requires many clinicians to be culturally responsive in addressing unhealthy fluctuations in self-perceptions and to enhance resilience through more strengths-based approaches (Del-Mundo & Quek, 2017; Reyes et al., 2019; Tintiangco-Cubales, 2004). Given that these studies have cited gender as playing an important role in retaining Filipino identity, learning Pagmamahal sa Sarili at Kapwa from family and community members can help Filipino American women, who are often the recipients of dehumanizing sexism and racism, from embodying negative colonial stereotypes imposed upon them and from accepting false notions of insignificance (Enrile & Agbayani, 2007; Espiritu, 2001; Felipe, 2016). Active engagement in practices that increase affirmation and resolution in Filipino American identity for Filipino American women can decrease shame/embarrassment and inferiority towards their Filipino culture, physical traits, and discrimination towards people within their ethnic group. Conversely, when Filipino American individuals struggle to gain clarity and/or feel positively about their ethnic identity group, it is advisable to consider the various sources of shame, negativity, or embarrassment towards their culture.

Even though Function 2, Yaman sa Kulturang Pilipino (Filipino Cultural Wealth), was observed to be statistically significant, it contributed to only 5.7% of the variance, which is possibly an indication for additional topics for future research and clinical practice about ethnic identity Resolution and Colonial Debt. In the Yaman sa Kulturang Pilipino function, the negative relationship between ethnic identity Exploration and Colonial Debt could explain ethnic identity processes that operate similarly to Marcia’s (1980) psychosocial explanations of identity
diffusion and achievement—both of which necessitate high levels of identity exploration. In other words, Filipino Americans’ increases in ethnic identity Exploration are related to decreases in an automatic preference for mindsets that claim indebtedness to Western, American, or European colonizer cultures and institutions. Conversely, it is possible that rigid beliefs and historical narratives, which frame Western colonizers as “saviors” for Filipinos, may be related to decreased motivations and desires to explore Filipino culture because of what is presumed to be owed (to the colonizers).

Concepts, such as Pagmamahal sa Sarili at Kapwa and Yaman sa Kulturang Pilipino, are indicative of radical, new forms of familial, aspirational, social, resistant, linguistic, and navigational wealth within Filipino American communities that are still understudied in counseling psychology studies on this population. Given that many participants within the current study were exposed to ethnic studies coursework, involved with Filipino American organizations, or had consumed media developed for engaging with Filipino culture, the findings were named to address a gap in the research on ethnic identity: a need for ethnic identity to include components that endorse community actualization, cultural perpetuity, and revolution. Inclusion of attitudes and behaviors that endorse advocacy and liberation is needed within counseling psychology research to move forward in identity studies that emancipate minoritized groups, like Filipino Americans, because these behaviors often create the conditions for increased psychological wellness and help-seeking in oppressive systems. Many ethnic identity scales, such as the MEIM-R and the EIS, have yet to incorporate subscales or items that measure an individual’s influence on community actualization or cultural perpetuity—values which may be of high importance to Filipino Americans who develop an ethnic identity influenced by a sense of belonging and loving protection for their community. Similarly, the Colonial Mentality
Scale may need some additional items to reflect some more attitudinal and behavioral forms of opposition towards revolutionary, emancipatory types of education rooted in Critical Race Theory or ethnic studies. While this measure does contain items that describe disdain for Filipino culture, disdain for acts of liberation or decolonization may be required to reflect on how colonial mentality has changed over time. While psychology does an adequate job of measuring highly individualized experiences of ethnic identity and colonial mentality, there is still a need for including more of the individual’s contexts (e.g., communities, systems) within these measures.

Because causality cannot be inferred, future research may benefit from newer, nuanced explanations for the process(es) of individual(s) giving up a need for maintaining colonial mentality and dismantling contemporary forms of oppression as a Filipino American in everyday life. For example, as ethnic identity exploration increases for Filipino Americans, feelings or sentiments endorsing indebtedness towards Western, colonial institutions and oppressive practices are less supported by individuals. Furthermore, Filipino Americans individuals may begin to endorse fostering a healthy relationship between themselves and their communities, which is still understudied by counseling psychologists. Overall, the statistical significance of these less substantial association sources provides a brief insight into possible areas of research and personal reflection about current Filipino American ethnic identity and colonial mentality.

**Research Hypothesis 3**

Research Hypothesis 3 answered the following research question: *Does a relationship exist between ethnic identity subscale scores and enculturation subscale scores in Filipino Americans?* In response to the constructs investigated, the specific hypothesis predicted the following: *Higher enculturation subscale scores will be related to higher ethnic identity subscale*
scores in Filipino Americans. More specifically, it was predicted that higher enculturation scores would relate to higher ethnic identity scores in Filipino Americans. Results from a canonical correlation between enculturation and ethnic identity scales confirmed the presence and nature of the relationship(s) between both variable sets.

Evidence from the current study provides support for a unique set of associations between ethnic identity Exploration and Affirmation with enculturation experiences of a Connection with the Homeland among Filipino Americans. The source of association, labeled as Pagkakasundo sa Kultura at Sarili (Cultural and Self Harmony), contributed about 14% of the variance to ethnic identity among Filipino Americans. In this function, ethnic identity Exploration and Affirmation subscale scores increase with enculturation Connection with Homeland subscale scores. This means that, when Filipino Americans explore, participate, and feel more encouraged by their Filipino culture, they feel more connected with the Philippines. Overall, this finding provides strong evidence for connections between ethnic identity and enculturation in Filipino Americans, even as they are explained and experienced by Filipino Americans as unique processes.

One explanation for this association may be attributed to the need for Filipino Americans to have accessibility to cultural practices and a sense of agency in developing their ethnic identity to strengthen their ongoing connection to Filipino culture and the Philippines, which confirms findings in past literature about ethnic identity development in Filipino American adults (Teppang et al., 2017). While many Filipino Americans, especially the second generation, encounter pressures to acculturate or assimilate into their host country, a major source of strength comes from this population’s resilience and efforts towards pedagogies of resistance found within critical ethnic studies that center Filipino American narratives (Tintiangco-Cubales et al.,
Given the increasing accessibility to formal and informal sources of information about Filipino culture, it is possible that the association between identity exploration, affirmation, and connection with homeland contribute to or drive development of identity resolution within this population.

Another source of association, labeled as *Pakikisama Concerns*, provided a small source of variance that may be an area of interest for future research, clinical practice, or dialogue within the Filipino American community. Though this association only contributed to 4% of the variance, it indicated, contrary to initial predictions, relationships between ethnic identity and enculturation. Decreases in ethnic identity resolution were related to increases in interpersonal norms. This is a small but statistically significant source of association, which may benefit from a variety of explanations for its negative, moderate association between these two subscales. One possible explanation for these findings is that participants might be expressing attitudes towards the interpersonal norms described in the scale that reflect more internalization of Western, Americanized social norms or usage of “code-switching” in daily interactions.

In some ways, *Pakikisama Concerns* could explain a sense of ambivalence about navigating different social spaces and the norms that dictate preferred interpersonal styles in Filipino and American cultures. In the case of second-generation Filipino Americans, certain interpersonal norms or strategies may occasionally feel uncomfortable or disingenuous to some Filipino American individuals. While a Filipino American person may use code-switching behaviors to navigate interactions with, for example, elders within their family or community, they may not agree with its use or that this disagreement deeply hinders their overall ethnic identity. This ambivalence may be further explained by acculturative stress or navigating a
bicultural identity; however, a more appropriate name/label to consider, which may be of greater relevance for second- and subsequent-generation statuses, is enculturation stress.

However, this source of variance may be characterized by Filipino American individuals who identified as having less clarity about their ethnic identity and actively seek for assistance with this area of ethnic identity among Filipino American family members, peers, or ethnic studies. This explanation may be likely given that most of the dataset identified themselves as second-generation Filipino Americans—a generation that is generally described by the literature as being more likely to seek help than the first generation (De Luna & Kawabata, 2020). Even though the direction of this relationship is surprising, it may indicate a strength—cultural help-seeking, within a small percentage of Filipino Americans who participated in the study, which confirms studies about second-generation Filipino Americans’ use of cultural portals (Ferrera, 2017). If this is the case, then another argument can be made for continuing research that examines strengths that arise from Filipino American adults seeking to increase clarity and meaning making from their ethnic identity within their communities. Filipino American participants reported lower ethnic identity affirmation scores when endorsing higher scores on enculturation interpersonal norms.

While the relationship between enculturation and ethnic identity exists, the low strength of this relationship is somewhat surprising and brings into question whether these concepts need to be revisited for individuals with a background in ethnic studies or who have immersed themselves in Filipino culture through their peers. Overall, the sample endorsed high levels of ethnic identity, yet relatively lower levels of enculturation, which indicates, perhaps, a need for a new subscale that measures an orientation towards building Community Cultural Wealth (CCW) with other Filipino Americans. While this concept is gaining popularity in education, it is still
emerging in counseling psychology research, especially on Filipino Americans. Since acculturation research has historically been characterized by a one-dimensional view of groups like Filipino Americans, the addition of more indigenous Filipino cultural concepts on community engagement and liberation, like the barangay and bayanihan, could speak to an even stronger relationship in Pagkakasundo sa Kultura at Sarili and in Pakikisama Concerns. For a growing segment of second-generation Filipino Americans, internal motivation towards cultural/interpersonal harmony and advocacy for Filipino American communities are recognized as part of a cultural legacy; however, this revolutionary part of both ethnic identity and enculturation is not yet recognized in psychology research. Furthermore, peer socialization or acknowledgment of counterspaces as a source of enculturation is not yet recognized in a lot of psychology research on racial and ethnic minorities because of overwhelming emphasis on cultural transmission from older to newer generations. In essence, the novel findings from testing this hypothesis indicate new explanations for ethnic identity and enculturation to be explored in Filipino Americans and among many other racial and ethnic minorities in psychology.

**Research Hypothesis 4**

To answer the research question—*Are enculturation subscale scores related to colonial mentality subscale scores in Filipino Americans?*—the following hypothesis was developed: *Higher enculturation subscale scores will be related to lower colonial mentality subscale scores in Filipino Americans.* More specifically, higher enculturation scores were predicted to be related to lower colonial mentality subscale scores of Within-Group Discrimination, Physical Characteristics, and Colonial Debt. Evidence from the dataset confirmed the presence of a relationship and/or associations between enculturation and colonial mentality but not in the predicted direction of the hypothesis.
While multiple relationships between the two sets of variables were observed, the results did not fully support the direction of the hypothesis. Evidence from the current study provided strong support for three unique and statistically significant sets of canonical correlations between enculturation and colonial mentality experiences among Filipino Americans at the $p < .001$ level. The first canonical correlation function, which was labeled as *Rebolusionaryong Kaisipan* (Revolutionary Thinking), contributed to 26.3% of the shared variance and described a positive, mostly direct correlation between Conservatism and Colonial Debt.

In *Rebolusionaryong Kaisipan* (Revolutionary Thinking), decreases in feelings of indebtedness to Western, colonial powers are related to decreases in Enculturation Conservatism. The high correlation between these variables may be better explained by the specific wording and references to Christianity and unwavering obedience to authority figures in the ESFA-S subscale items. Given that Christianity was a product of Spanish and American colonization and historically used as a means of subjugating Filipinos, feelings of indebtedness and gratitude may be higher among Filipino Americans who identify strongly with their religion, particularly among Roman Catholics. Historically, the United States colonized the Philippines and modeled the education system in ways that mirrored the cultural indoctrination and oppression of Indigenous populations in North America, Puerto Rico, and the Pacific (David, 2013; Dunbar-Ortiz, 2014; Reyes, 2015). Therefore, it is possible that, for Filipino Americans with less expressed religiosity and low affiliation with Christian denominations (i.e., Roman Catholicism) emphasizing internalized guilt and indebtedness towards authority, Colonial Debt may be less salient because of what their religion means to them. If some Filipino Americans have developed a deep, critical awareness of colonization and a strong commitment to decolonization, then they
may choose not to believe or practice more conservative values, especially if they strongly endorse Christianity.

A second canonical correlation function, labeled as *Nahahati sa Kamalayan* (Divided in Consciousness), described a relationship between decreases in enculturation Interpersonal Norms and decreases in Internalized Inferiority, Cultural Shame and Embarrassment, Within-Group Discrimination, and Physical Characteristics. This function may draw more attention to the complex nuances between enculturation and colonial mentality and similar correlations observed between familial, peer, and community indexes with colonial mentality (David & Nadal, 2013). This could be explained by increased exposure to other Filipino American individuals with colonial mentality and how this may be reinforced or maintained by an individual’s lived experiences with racism in the United States. It would be erroneous and harmful to interpret the relationship between enculturation and colonial mentality in Filipino Americans’ consciousness as a cultural deficit that emphasizes self-loathing from a Westernized perspective that values the individualism and self-autonomy rather than a decolonized lens that considers the adaptive features of more interdependent, collective, non-Western values, such as *hiya* (shame) and *pakikisama* (accommodation, cooperation).

Given that the sample is mostly second generation, participants may be attempting to describe protective factors and negotiations that arise while adeptly navigating bicultural identities—processes which may be elaborated by identity management models and studied further in a qualitative follow-up or via mixed-methods research (Teppang et al., 2017; Wei et al., 2010). The statements used in the interpersonal norms may describe interpersonal processes that are not adaptive for bicultural, second-generation Filipino Americans in many situations while living in the United States, if issues of racial discrimination and coping with these issues are
salient to them. While Du Bois (1909) described the process of double consciousness within the African American experience, some Filipino Americans may also experience other forms of reconciling their Filipino-ness and American-ness internally and among their families or communities.

The presence of a third, though weakly observed, function did support this hypothesis in the predicted direction. This function, labeled as Paglalakad Sa Sakit (Walking through the Pain), provided evidence for an indirect relationship between scores from the Connection with Homeland subscale and colonial mentality Within-Group Discrimination subscale scores. Within this function, decreases in an individual’s connection with the homeland were related to increases in discrimination and denigration of fellow Filipino Americans. The outcome may be explained by a sense of familiarity, kinship, or kapwa experienced by Filipino Americans when a connection to the Philippines is communicated and accepted, which further highlights the importance of kapwa in challenging colonial mentality (David et al., 2017). Filipino American individuals or subgroups may be less likely to discriminate against members of their group when they learn about a shared connection to the homeland, which emphasizes feelings of connectedness and empathy towards others who are also deeply engrained in Filipino cultural values of kapwa.

A source of this critical awareness within the sample comes from participants’ knowledge of ethnic studies and the second generation’s increased peer socialization on the negative effects of colonialism and internalized racism. While many second-generation Filipino Americans have some formative experiences of cultural socialization with their first-generation parents, the experiences of Ferrera’s (2017) constrained enculturation (i.e., first generation endorsement of assimilation) may lead second-generation Filipino Americans to creatively seek out and develop
mechanisms for enculturation that are specific to the needs of this subpopulation’s decolonization efforts. Enculturation could be happening more laterally and in a socially liberal way between individuals of a similar generation, especially among second-generation Filipino Americans. So far, counseling psychology has not yet named or measured the psychological health benefits of adopting Rebolusinong Kaisipan and navigating Nahahati sa Kamalayan and Paglalakad sa Sakit because the inclusion of social activism and engagement as a beneficial mental health practice for historically excluded individuals and communities is not popularly recognized among clinicians and researchers. Embodiment of these ideals and linking them to indigenous Filipino concepts of community, past narratives of Filipino ancestors’ resilience, and hopes for cultural perpetuity have become more prevalent among second-generation Filipino Americans’ path towards psychological decolonization efforts; however, it is mostly first generation, socially conservative values that are reflected in the enculturation scales. Inclusion of new items or subscales in enculturation to reflect more socially liberal and community-engaged Filipino practices can increase the scale’s effectiveness in measuring enculturation in second-generation Filipino Americans. To effectively work against a problematic past in acculturation research, psychology will need to accept how narratives of community resistance and actualization are just as important as self-actualization among newer generations of Filipino Americans.

Research Hypothesis 5

Research Hypothesis 5 was developed to investigate potential mean differences in enculturation scores among Filipino American immigrant generation groups. The hypothesis reads as follows: First- and 1.5-generation Filipino Americans will have higher enculturation scores than second- and third/subsequent-generation Filipino Americans. The current study’s results provided strong evidence for intergenerational differences in Connection with Homeland
in the predicted direction and some strong evidence for intergenerational differences in Interpersonal Norms, though, in a novel, unobserved direction to be studied in future research.

Results from the current study indicated that first-generation Filipino Americans had the strongest feelings of connection with the Philippines when compared with 1.5-, second-, and third/subsequent-generation Filipino Americans. When comparing 1.5- and third/subsequent-generation Filipino Americans, there was also strong evidence for higher levels of connection with the Philippines for the 1.5 generation. In other words, first-generation Filipino Americans are more likely to initiate contact with the Philippines and other Filipinos, adhere to cultural customs, and use Tagalog, the primary language of the Philippines, with a preference or knowledge of how to speak in Tagalog. The evidence for statistically significant differences between generation statuses on Connection with Homeland are better explained by the first generation’s salience of lived experiences in the Philippines during their formative years and their status as having English as a Second Language (ESL)—experiences that are less common among 1.5-, second-, and third-generation Filipino Americans. As for the 1.5-generation Filipino Americans, depending on their age of immigration during their childhood or adolescent years, they may be more likely to experience connections with the homeland compared to third/subsequent generations, despite spending less time in the Philippines compared to the first generation. Unlike the other generations, the first generation grew up more immersed in Filipino culture. Therefore, even though second-generation Filipino Americans may make significant efforts to connect with their culture through cultural portals within the family, these first-generation cultural portals possess the strongest ties to the Philippines.

While there is strong evidence for generational differences between in Interpersonal Norms, the unanticipated direction of these differences adds richness to the current study’s
analysis and implications for future study. Even though previous literature suggests that first and 1.5 generations are more likely to adhere to Filipino cultural ways of interpersonal interaction (Agbayani-Siewert, 1994, 1997; Heras, 2007; Nadal, 2020), the results suggested the opposite phenomenon occurring based on participant responses to the survey. Within the current study, first-generation Filipino Americans were more likely to report lower levels of adhering to Filipino cultural interpersonal styles compared to 1.5-, second-, and third/subsequent-generation Filipino Americans, and 1.5-generation Filipino Americans reported lower adherence to these interpersonal styles than third/subsequent generations.

Though this result is surprising, it elicits a few possible explanations and questions for this generational difference to be considered for future research. Given that the current study has confirmed previous literature findings about the first generation’s increased ethnic identity resolution and connection with the homeland compared to other generation groups, adherence to Filipino interpersonal norms might become less of a priority for this generation years after immigrating to the United States. If first-generation Filipino Americans are positioned to have greater resolve with their ethnic identity and connection with the homeland, then perhaps assimilation to American interpersonal norms becomes less of a threat to their ethnic identity or enculturation overall. Furthermore, the Interpersonal Norms described in the wording of the items are more likely to endorse interpersonal ways of communication that are more functional to life in the Philippines than in the United States for first-generation Filipino Americans. First-generation Filipino Americans who have retained fluency of their native Filipino language(s), including Tagalog, may also be less likely to describe nonadherence to these norms as a threat to their Filipino identity and enculturation. If the first generation possesses this linguistic versatility.
over 1.5, second, and third/subsequent generations, assimilation may become a less distressful
task for navigating social contexts in the United States.

As for the higher levels of adherence to interpersonal customs for second and
third/subsequent generations, learned interpersonal norms may be the most prominent and
retained aspect of Filipino culture passed down through family socialization in the absence of
lived experiences in the Philippines and fluency in Filipino languages. In this case, one can
hypothesize for future study the possibility that second and third/subsequent generations may be
more likely to adhere to interpersonal norms to compensate for this difference or find *kapwa* with
other Filipino Americans. The current study has, in essence, found an adaptive strength of
second- and third/subsequent-generation Filipino Americans’ ability to enhance their
enculturation in the absence of strong connections to the homeland or clarity about the meaning
of their ethnic identity. While interpersonal norms may not be as functional to first- and 1.5-
generation Filipino Americans’ daily life in the United States, they may be more important for
connecting with Filipino culture and communities for second and third/subsequent generations
hoping to build *kapwa*. In identifying this uncommon pattern as a strength, the current study has
potentially revealed a way in which the second and third/subsequent generations of Filipino
Americans bridge their experiences with the first and 1.5 generations.

**Research Hypothesis 6**

To answer the research question—*Will generation status effect colonial mentality?*—the
following hypothesis was developed: *First-generation Filipino Americans will have lower
colonial mentality than 1.5-, second-, and third/subsequent-generation Filipino Americans.* Data
from the study did not provide evidence for statistically significant mean differences between
first-, 1.5-, second-, and third/subsequent-generation Filipino Americans on the five colonial mentality subscales.

While this finding is surprising, it presents an area of interest for future research about the mechanisms by which generations pass on colonial mentality and how they may be maintained when living in the United States. The lack of statistically significant mean differences between Filipino Americans of different generation statuses may speak to the strengths of familial socialization or transmission of cultural norms within the sample. Overall, most participants reported strongly or somewhat disagreed with statements provided in the CMS, indicating lower levels of colonial mentality. This notable similarity between generations in the current study’s sample indicates a need for more responses from other generations (e.g., first, 1.5, third/subsequent) and the possibility that there are unique characteristics to the sample in the current study. Furthermore, it poses the question of whether Filipino Americans who respond to a survey on Filipino American cultural experiences are more likely to have lower colonial mentality than Filipino Americans who do not engage with the survey because of their lower levels of internalized inferiority. Given the previous literature’s findings on colonial mentality’s negative impact on help-seeking behaviors (Constante, 2021; David, 2008; Tuazon, 2015; Tuazon et al., 2019), Filipino Americans with lower levels of colonial mentality are likely to be more motivated to not only seek help from other Filipino Americans, but also provide help to fellow Filipino Americans. There is currently little empirical research on colonial mentality’s effects on prosocial behaviors, like providing help or altruism, outside of traditional Filipino interpersonal norms, such as *utang na loob* (i.e., reciprocity), which means that these findings present another gap in psychology research on Filipino Americans that is worth exploring.
Although difficult to explore, this potential source of bias is worth noting for future research on colonial mentality.

These results support the adaptive strategy behind having a dual consciousness that includes colonial mentality, even though it may lead to increased psychological stress in Filipino Americans (David & Okazaki, 2006, 2010). It is possible that the data reported by 1.5-, second-, and third/subsequent-generation Filipino Americans on colonial mentality speaks to the extent to which they have inherited historical trauma and internalized oppression from first-generation elders and community members. While living in the United States, a lack of accessibility to decolonized perspectives and lived experiences with systemic barriers to equality limits Filipino Americans across all generation statuses from making significant changes to levels of colonial mentality without active self-reflection and awareness. Perhaps, regardless of the years spent living in the Philippines, life in the United States demands that all Filipino Americans maintain some level of colonial mentality to function within different institutions and communities for survival. This highlights a greater need, overall, for different institutions to reexamine how their demands prioritize and value colonial mentality at the cost of Filipino Americans’ self-concept and wellness. Indeed, the findings from this research question highlight a need to thoroughly examine how living in the United States may affect the generational transmission and maintenance of colonial mentality.

This novel, surprising lack of generational differences in Filipino Americans on colonial mentality offers several new explanations for how colonial mentality has evolved and how Filipino Americans have strategically navigated their lives to challenge colonial mentality. Given that this sample was either exposed to ethnic studies or consisted of individuals who are motivated towards Filipino American community engagement in mental health services, perhaps
these findings have detected the positive outcomes of colonization counterspaces. Among this sampling of mostly female Filipino Americans, exposure and engagement in ethnic studies or organizations promoting Filipino American mental health usage has an effect of creating low colonial mentality across generation statuses. When considering how the colonial mentality is related to ethnic identity and enculturation within this subpopulation, the current study has found that it accounts for a cumulative 89.8% of the variance by ways of new canonical functions, such as *Pagmamahal sa Sarili at Kapwa*, *Rebolusyonaryong Kaisipan*, and *Nahahati sa Kamalayan*—all of which imply that these participants have a unique relationship with colonial mentality despite scoring very low on its manifestations. These results highlight a need for psychology research to describe the value and psychological effects of resistant community cultural wealth among Filipino Americans quantitatively (Yosso, 2008).

**Summary of Discussion**

Overall, five out of the six hypotheses were provided with support for intergenerational differences in ethnic identity and enculturation, and for relationships between ethnic identity, enculturation, and colonial mentality variables. The results from this study suggest that there are generational differences in ethnic identity for Filipino Americans, especially when considering their sense of resolution towards their ethnic identity. Differences between generation groups in ethnic identity resolution were strongest between first generation and all subsequent generations (i.e., 1.5, second, and third/subsequent), with the first generation endorsing the highest levels of clarity and resolve about the meaning of their Filipino American ethnic identity. Thus, this study may be helpful to Filipino Americans who are trying to understand why they view their ethnic identity differently than individuals in other generation statuses.
In investigating the relationship between ethnic identity and colonial mentality variables in Filipino Americans, the study’s results found that increases in exploration, affirmation, and resolution of an individual’s ethnic identity were related to decreases in thoughts, feelings, and behaviors tied to internalized inferiority, cultural shame/embarrassment, within-group discrimination, colonial debt, and disdain for Filipino physical characteristics. This relationship was labeled as \textit{Pagmamahal sa Sarili at Kapwa} and was a significant finding, accounting for at least 40% of the variance within the sample. A major strength of this finding is that it confirms both the prevalence and strength of a relationship between ethnic identity and colonial mentality found in the literature, even when using a different theoretical perspective and psychological scale that is seldom used with Filipino Americans. This relationship between ethnic identity and colonial mentality may assist Filipino Americans with talking more openly about the possible attitudes, thoughts, and behaviors that contribute to an individual’s assumptions of inferiority towards their Filipino culture and members of their ethnic group in ways that promote mental wellness within the community. Overall, this finding strongly emphasized that love of self and an interdependent, culturally connected self that is in contact with the Filipino community is protective against the negative effects of colonial mentality.

Findings from the current study highlighted a strong relationship between ethnic identity Exploration, Affirmation, and Connection with Homeland. The function explaining this relationship, \textit{Pagkakasundo sa Kultura at Sarili}, accounted for 14% of the variance and maintained previous literature findings about connections between ethnic identity and enculturation in Filipino Americans. Relationships between enculturation and colonial mentality, were primarily described by two functions: \textit{Rebolusionaryong Kaisipan} and \textit{Nahahati sa Kamalayan}. These two functions accounted for 26.3% of the variance and 23.5% of the variance.
in the sample, respectively. *Rebolusionaryong Kaisipan* was characterized by decreases in endorsement of views espousing socially conservative values, disdain for Filipino physical characteristics, and indebtedness to Spanish and American colonizers. *Nahahati sa Kamalayan* was characterized by decreases in adherence to Filipino interpersonal norms, internalized inferiority, cultural shame and embarrassment, discrimination against other Filipinos, and disdain for Filipino physical characteristics.

Intergenerational differences were explored further in Filipino American enculturation and colonial mentality. First-generation Filipino Americans had the highest levels of connection with the Philippines, and 1.5-generation Filipino Americans were more likely to feel connected to the Philippines than third/subsequent generations. Surprisingly, first-generation Filipino Americans endorsed the lowest levels of interpersonal norms compared to other generation groups, and 1.5-generation Filipino Americans were less likely to adhere to interpersonal cultural norms than third/subsequent generations. This was explained by the adaptability of Filipino Americans and the different meanings of interpersonal norms for each generation of Filipino Americans. Finally, results did not suggest any statistically significant differences between generations in colonial mentality, confirming the use of colonial mentality as an adaptive strategy for Filipino Americans across generation statuses.

Additional canonical functions accounting for less than 10% of the variance were found in the study and described for the purpose of future studies to investigate relationships between ethnic identity, enculturation, and colonial mentality. The three functions provided for future research include: *Yaman sa Kulturang Pilipino, Pakikisama Concerns*, and *Paglalakad sa Sakit*. These functions indicated the presence of more complex, nuanced relationships between ethnic
identity, enculturation, and colonial mentality that can inform more intricate and in-depth conversations on Filipino American experiences in counseling psychology.

**Limitations**

There are several limitations that should be taken into consideration when examining the outcomes of the current study. In a web-based survey that relies on a combination of purposive and snowball sampling methods, many of the participants who engaged with the survey are self-selected and may already share similar characteristics, perspectives, and experiences. For example, participants who engage with various Filipino American organizations and cultural figures via online media may present with different responses, attributes, and thought processes than those who do not engage in those activities. The participants were mostly recruited from various professional organizations (i.e., Asian American Psychological Association), various chapters of the Filipino American National Historical Society (FANHS), Filipino/Filipino American college student associations, podcasts on Filipino American culture and identity (i.e., *This Filipino American Life, Bruha Baddies*), and some businesses serving Filipino Americans in the Midwest. It is critical to note that there is vast heterogeneity within Filipino Americans that may not be represented by participant responses from these recruitment sources.

Given these recruitment efforts, Filipino Americans who do not engage with these resources may have different experiences with navigating their ethnic identity, including the way they describe themselves. The term “Filipino American” was used in the recruitment materials and in the survey, which may limit generalizability to people who describe themselves in a similar way. As a result, individuals who did not identify with that term would have been less likely to participate in the survey or may have participated differently if they use different terms to describe their ethnicity and cultural experiences. possibly affecting the representation of first-
generation Filipino Americans in the sample. After correcting for birthplace and age of immigration, first-generation Filipino Americans may be underrepresented in the sample relative to second-generation Filipino Americans. Given their connection to the homeland, future research might explicitly recruit first-generation individuals by using different terms, such as “Philippine-born,” in recruitment materials or address whether Philippine-born individuals are more likely to identify themselves as Filipino versus Filipino American.

In the current study, the sample is mostly limited to participants who engage in some use of internet or social media use due to the nature of recruitment. The means of recruitment may have affected the availability of responses from participants who do not typically use social media or have limited access to a mobile phone or internet connection. Given that the recruitment and survey materials are primarily written in English, Filipino American individuals who perceive themselves as less competent in English or with the use of digital surveys may have been less likely to engage with the study.

With regard to survey implementation and/or design within the current study, participants were able to skip or omit responses to items, which provided limitations in the analysis due to missing data. Participants who provided consent to participate in the study were not obligated to provide responses for every item. While non-response to items provides a glimpse into how members of the Filipino American population (dis)engage with survey items, missing data reduces the representativeness of the sample, and inferences from the study should be made or taken with caution to reduce bias. Although the number of cases with complete generation status data meets the minimum required by the a priori power analysis, exclusion of cases with missing generation status data for research questions comparing mean generational differences may still limit some of the generalizability of these results to the larger Filipino American population.
While many studies use complete case analysis approaches and delete incomplete cases from statistical analysis, this type of approach often increases the likelihood of Type I error bias and drastically alters the sample (van der Heijden et al., 2006).

Though MCAR tests and EM methods were used to minimize the influence of missing data on multivariate analyses in the current study, it could still be viewed as a limitation due to possible factors, such as participants’ survey-taking fatigue or their subjective interpretations/responses to question items concerning colonial mentality, questions on Physical Characteristics, and ethnic identity questions on Exploration. It should be noted, however, that the use of instruments, such as the CMS, ESFA, and EIS, have been widely studied and validated on Filipino Americans and other populations as reliable measures. While studies have shown that missing data in educational or psychological self-report survey research among historically undervalued populations is a common occurrence, it is still important to consider and discuss the potential causes and effects in current and future research with Filipino Americans. Future studies may benefit from implementing practices to reduce missing data in web survey distribution, considering use of planned missing response designs in studies, or using mixed methods (or qualitative follow-up) to investigate reasons for non-response to items.

Survey designs provide utility to researchers in making inferences about Filipino Americans; however, they may be limited in capturing subtleties and nuances of culture in that they fail to fully describe the context of social life for individuals and subgroups (Agbayani-Siewert, 2004) due to some of these limitations and the nature of the question(s) they answer. Use of survey approaches may not provide an abundance of information on the breadth of participants’ subjective experiences. Although the current study involved use of a large dataset and conducted analyses on multiple sets of variables with Filipino Americans from different
generation statuses, the study is cross-sectional and uses mostly correlational analyses, which cannot infer causality. Longitudinal research and comparison of quantitative results with qualitative data is needed to address differences in ethnic identity to expand on findings from the current study. Ethnic identity is a construct that is described by multiple researchers as a lifespan development process, therefore, cross-sectional data from this study serves as a momentary snapshot of participants’ ethnic identity (as defined by the measures used) within the context of their lifespans (Marcia, 2010; Meca et al., 2018; Williams et al., 2020). Furthermore, qualitative data would enhance researchers’ knowledge of the context(s) and process(es) used by participants in their survey responses. While it is helpful to know that generational differences exist for certain constructs within this sample, the use of quantitative methods alone fails to describe the meaning-making or coping processes that may be used by Filipino Americans in describing their ethnic identity, enculturation, generation status, and colonial mentality.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

Future studies utilizing these surveys should supplement or follow up with qualitative methods, such as interviews or focus groups, to generate more breadth and depth of knowledge about the relationships between the variables in the current study. Qualitative follow-up or a mixed-methods research design may be helpful to understand the specific types of experiences salient to different generations after completing the survey and in developing explanations or theories about Filipino American ethnic identity from an emic approach that is grounded in the culture. Quantitative studies, such as the current study, provide information and explanations about the results of measuring concepts of ethnic identity, enculturation, and colonial mentality. To explore the subjective contexts, which change within different Filipino American population subgroups and in response to the sociocultural zeitgeist or events in a historical period,
qualitative methods are required for information on new patterns of thinking, behaviors, and feelings about different aspects of Filipino American lived experiences. In a systematic review of psychological literature on internalized racism, David et al. (2019) found that psychology was still lacking in research to better understand internalized racial oppression and provided a call to psychology researchers to contribute for more work that

1. utilizes qualitative or mixed methods,
2. focuses on the experiences of different racial and ethnic groups,
3. investigates how internalized racism intersects with other forms of internalized oppression,
4. clarifies the connection of internalized racism with other theoretically similar phenomena, and
5. incorporates social justice and advocacy in clinical and community services to balance unequal power dynamics that perpetuate racism—the root cause of internalized racism.

Focus groups consisting of individuals from similar generations may help future researchers to develop narratives that guide future training and clinical work with Filipino Americans; however, focus groups with individuals from different generations may also provide future researchers with opportunities to observe how these differences or similarities may present themselves in real-time.

In addition to the use of qualitative methods, it may be helpful for researchers to consider a longitudinal design to increase opportunities for observing changes in individuals or groups over time. Analyzing data from multiple modalities across time may assist researchers with exploring new possibilities as to how Filipino Americans explore, resolve, and affirm their ethnic
identity over time in their behavior patterns and attitudes towards the self and others. With a longitudinal design, researchers may be able to observe baseline levels of subscale scores within a sample and the extent to which they may change over a period.

A longitudinal study that includes a generationally diverse sample may help researchers in psychology and other fields learn more about how levels of enculturation, colonial mentality, and ethnic identity change over time. Longitudinal designs may also benefit from working with Filipino populations before and after immigrating to the United States. Given that most studies on Filipino Americans collect data from individuals after having lived in the United States, it may be helpful to connect their experiences with the broader Filipino Diaspora. Filipino American researchers should consider collaborating with Filipino researchers in the Philippines who are studying similar concepts with Filipinos who wish to or are preparing to immigrate to the United States. Though literature suggests some changes to ethnic identity may occur in response to external stressors or an individual’s developmental processes, studies with a longitudinal design with attention to these sources of influence may help researchers understand which variables or constructs are susceptible to change over time (Syed, Juang, et al., 2018; Umaña-Taylor, 2018). This is consistent with theoretical frameworks that have historically acknowledged the fluidity with which a person experiences the degree of commitment or identification with their ethnic group (Umaña-Taylor, 2016). Furthermore, the use of a longitudinal design may help researchers develop a body of research that tells a richer narrative of how ethnic identity functions as a buffer for different Filipino American individuals or subgroups.

A deeper investigation into the potential role(s) or connections of the following beliefs or value systems among different Filipino American immigrant generations should also be
considered: meritocratic beliefs, social/political conservative viewpoints, and implicit biases. While counseling psychology research typically does not explore the relationships between ethnic/racial identity, mental health, and the endorsement of various political policies (i.e., healthcare, education, immigration, labor) on minoritized populations, generational shifts in identity development, life experiences, and attitudes towards political systems/structures may reveal more nuanced information about their varied effects on AA&PIs, including Filipino Americans (Cooc & Kim, 2021). Within the past year, political analysts, economists, and public health experts have begun to examine the impact of ethnic identity, generation status, and political viewpoints on familial relationships, and psychology research has confirmed these to be sources of strength, emotional wellness, and interpersonal harmony/strike for many Filipino Americans (Abdelkader & Liu, 2021; Leung, 2021; Nadal, 2020). Understanding Filipino Americans’ sense of agency, motivation, and belonging in political discourse and some of the related mental health outcomes can provide members within this community with starting points for understanding multiple facets and meeting points between seemingly personal experiences and political ones. This could allow for more potential to collaborate with researchers in other fields of social psychology and the social sciences for increased awareness and visibility of this growing ethnic group.

**Implications of the Study**

Overall, the current study’s findings suggest a need to continue research on issues affecting Filipino Americans’ ethnic identity, given the high likelihood of variance within this population. Even though some hypotheses were not strongly supported by observations from this study, unexpected newer findings with statistical significance may provide further areas of consideration for psychologists who engage in clinical practice, training, or research. As this
population grows, a conversation on serving the needs of this community may continue to flourish among Filipino American clinicians, educators, and researchers within the field of psychology and other mental health or medical professionals.

Implications for Mental Health Clinicians and Clinical Practice

Based on the current study’s findings, the following implications and their recommendations for clinical practice are provided as follows:

- Recognize that high colonial mentality, low enculturation, and low ethnic identity in Filipino Americans are manifestations of intergenerational trauma to be addressed with decolonized clinical practices in-session with clients.
- Consider adaptation or integration of Filipino cultural values with established clinical practices by using cultural humility and a critical consciousness of Westernized, individualistic perspectives.
- Develop a deeper understanding of **kapwa** to empower Filipino American clients with increasing self-agency during the therapeutic process.
- Consult with reliable Filipino research and community members on adapting evidence-based psychoeducation and skills for Filipino Americans to include appropriate cultural references.
- Name and confront the presence of systemic oppression towards Filipino Americans when using trauma-informed approaches with Filipino American clients in-session.

More detailed examples and explanations for the study’s implications on clinical practice with Filipino Americans is provided with references to common approaches and theoretical orientations used by therapists.
Clinicians may benefit from conceptualizing signs of high colonial mentality, low enculturation, and low ethnic identity affirmation in clients as possible manifestations of intergenerational trauma and systemic oppression for Filipino Americans, which may be addressed through a more decolonized lens of practice that addresses the role of systemic oppression in-session. This could mean using a culturally congruent integration of theoretical approaches with traditional, Filipino values, which may include opportunities for facilitating empowering insights and coping skills for Filipino American clients with lived experiences of identity concerns, family relational distress, acculturation, and discrimination. The following theoretical approaches and practices are examples presented for their potential to aid clinicians in conceptualizing and treating Filipino American clients with a variety of concerns when combined with a decolonized focus and cultural humility: Interpersonal Process Therapy (IPT), Dialectical Behavior Therapy (DBT), Cognitive Processing Therapy (CPT), and Acceptance and Commitment Therapy (ACT).

Given the important role of interpersonal norms and harmony within Filipino culture, it may be important for Filipino American clinicians to consider the strengths of using IPT and the process dimension in case conceptualization and treatment planning with their Filipino American clients. The benefits of using this approach include attentiveness to different levels of communication within the therapist-client relationship, provision of corrective emotional experiences, and client response specificity (Teyber & Teyber, 2017). Though researchers have provided broad recommendations for culturally adapting humanistic and person-centered therapies with Filipino Americans due to their preferences for emotional warmth and values for *pakikisama* (social acceptance), no studies have considered describing specific examples or

A deeper understanding of the core value of *kapwa* (unity, connection, and oneness with a fellow being) by a Filipino American therapist and their client can assist with the development of insight and self-agency within a trusting therapeutic relationship. An example of how the process dimension may be utilized is described by Filipino Canadian artist Anne Carly (2019):

I asked my therapist to speak to me in Tagalog because it felt right to me. It was intense. I had no idea my inner child needed to hear the words “Go ahead & cry” in my first language. “*Sige, umiyak ka. Walang problema sakin yun.*”

In that narrative, the client describes the importance of having her unmet emotional needs addressed by a Filipino therapist who could attend to and communicate on multiple levels in therapy. Feelings of safety in authentically expressing emotions were achieved in that exchange through the counselor’s focus on empathy and unconditional positive regard towards the client. The brief disclosure by the client described a specific way in which a Filipino therapist can effectively utilize the process dimension, purposive collaboration with the client, client transference, and common factors in a therapeutic way.

For Filipino American therapists who integrate the use of DBT in their work with Filipino American clients, it may be helpful to consider consultation and collaboration on culturally adapting mindfulness, interpersonal effectiveness, distress tolerance, and emotion regulation skills in session with clients from different generation statuses and enculturation levels. For example, a Filipino American client who may identify as first generation and exhibits high levels of conservatism and interpersonal norms may experience more challenges with practicing a DEAR MAN interpersonal effectiveness skill with elders due to values about obedience and
loyalty towards elders compared to an individual with lower levels of conservatism and interpersonal norms (Agbayani-Siewert, 1994, 1997; Sanchez & Gaw, 2007). In this case, the clinician may invest more time in exploring the pros and cons of using this skill, as well as a missing-links or chain analysis to gain more clarity on culture-specific adaptations and increase the client’s self-efficacy in utilizing the DEAR MAN interpersonal effectiveness skill.

Incorporation of cultural proverbs, narratives, and metaphors with specific DBT skills can strengthen the therapeutic relationship and clients’ ethnic identity affirmation (Hinton & Jalal, 2019; Litam, 2020). Furthermore, decolonized definitions of the commonly used Tagalog phrase, *Bahala na* (i.e., literally translated as “Leave it up to God”), may serve as a helpful way to help clients learn about DBT dialectics and use of reality acceptance skills in times of distress. The Tagalog phrase is often exclaimed during times of distress to express acceptance of life transitions, openness to uncertainty, or courage and willingness to attempt shaping one’s outcomes in the face of uncontrollable circumstances, which overlaps with DBT’s walking the middle path, radical acceptance, and turning the mind (David, 2013; Linehan, 2015; Reyes, 2015; Tomaneng, 2015). Recommendations for cultural adaptations of DBT for use with Filipino Americans are unavailable in existing literature for use in counseling practice; however, it is recommended that Filipino American therapists explore possible avenues for incorporating their cultural values/beliefs to increase therapeutic efficacy.

At this time, there is limited information on how CPT is adapted for use with Filipino American clients with PTSD symptoms and how to develop strategies for working through influences of colonial, historical, and intergenerational trauma on this population. Given that there is increased interest in trauma-informed approaches and broadening definition(s) of trauma to include intergenerational and/or environmental trauma, clinicians may benefit from
investigating how their client’s types of trauma responses may overlap with their ethnic identity narrative. Literature suggests that, while Filipino Americans, particularly Filipina Americans, report high levels of resilience, most Filipino Americans may use repression of trauma as a coping mechanism, which may result in increased somatic symptoms and poorer health experiences overall (Chan & Litam, 2021; Kim et al., 2012; Klest et al., 2013; Reyes et al., 2019). Many Filipino Americans reported signs of psychological distress and collective trauma in response to spikes in hate crimes towards Asian Americans, leading to a mental health crisis affecting a population already less likely to seek help from counselors and clinicians (Chan & Litam, 2021; Chen et al., 2020; Hong et al., 2021; Nadal, 2020; Sanchez & Gaw, 2007). Given the recent increases in anti-Asian violence towards Filipino Americans, due to assumptions of similarities between Asian ethnic groups and risk factors for Filipino American healthcare workers treating COVID-19 patients, demand or the development of incorporation of culturally-responsive, trauma-informed therapies will likely increase (Agbayani-Siewert, 2004; Nadal et al., 2012).

For example, clinicians familiar with Cognitive Processing Therapy (CPT) for PTSD are familiar with the influence of schemas and frames of reference about safety, trust, power/control, and community affected by trauma (Mahoney & Lyddon, 1988; McCann et al., 1988; Resick et al., 2017). It is possible for schemas about the self and others, particularly kapwa, to be altered/distorted by discrimination, microaggressions, and acts of racial/ethnic violence fueled by xenophobia and White supremacy. Over time, these harmful acts may increase Filipino American individuals’ risk for rumination about racial discrimination, helplessness, self-criticism, and internalization of negative feelings about Filipino ethnic identity that manifest as colonial mentality and/or racial trauma. Therapists from trauma-informed approaches would likely benefit
from deepening their understanding of how systemic racism and intergenerational trauma affects Filipino Americans and intersects with their clients’ individual history and their ethnic group’s history of surviving traumatic oppression.

A therapist utilizing CPT may consider conceptualizing their Filipino American client’s assimilated beliefs, overaccommodated beliefs, and “stuck points” about their Filipino ethnic identity as processes that may affect the client’s ethnic identity resolution process and learning processes, while intersecting with their history of traumatic experiences. Addressing this could mean attending to an individual client’s or therapy group’s processing of past fight, flight, fawn, or freeze responses and overlaps with how they have been socialized (as individuals from a minoritized identity) to cope with discrimination in their environment(s). When clinicians attend to or engage clients in developing insights about unconscious patterns or parallels between their existing trauma responses and manifestations of intergenerational trauma (e.g., colonial mentality), they may increase opportunities for clients to examine the impact of their trauma and develop greater cognitive flexibility to challenge problematic thoughts and challenging beliefs.

Currently, researchers have advocated for adapting evidence-based approaches, such as motivational interviewing, CBT, and ACT, given their effectiveness with Filipino Americans and other minoritized populations (Chen et al., 2020; Tomaneng, 2015). Recently, researchers have developed various CBT-specific treatment models and conceptualizations for specific East Asian and Southeast Asian ethnic groups that focus on treatment goals and interventions to address anxiety depression, somatic complaints, catastrophic cognitions, and emotion regulation from their cultural healing traditions and virtues (Hinton & Jalal, 2019). In a recent review of psychotherapy model applications with Asians and Asian Americans, researchers suggested adapting CPT conceptualizations with more interdependent conceptualizations of the self and
incorporating more indirect forms of communication and coping for clients’ use (Hall et al., 2019). Clinicians may refer Filipino American clients to Filipino American Decolonization Experience (FADE) workshops using individual and group interventions (e.g., colonial mentality logs, positive Filipino list, oppression logs, cognitive restructuring) based in CBT and on empirical evidence from colonial mentality models of depression for Filipinos (David, 2008, 2013).

As clinicians expand their knowledge on ways to culturally adapt existing therapeutic approaches and interventions for use with this population, the results from this study indicate that openness to continuing professional education to decolonize practices within this community are recommended to address the wide range of concerns experienced by Filipino Americans that are connected to their ethnic identity and/or culture, especially with regard to intergenerational trauma and healing. The mixed results from this study indicate that there is room for future discussions among Filipino American mental health professionals to develop and expand appropriate interventions for work with clients within this community. Intergenerational trauma and healing may manifest differently between and within generations, which may demand increased self-awareness and intentionality in navigating these lived experiences as therapists.

Increasing visibility of Filipino American mental health professionals, providing psychoeducation on effectiveness/uses of therapy within communities, development of task forces on Filipino American wellness, and involvement in Filipino American mental health professional organizations may serve as avenues to assist with serving this population.

**Implications for Researchers**

Implications for counseling psychology research on Filipino Americans based on findings from the current study are provided as follows:
• validation of ethnic identity, enculturation, and colonial mentality as related yet
distinct concepts with their own multifaceted impact on Filipino American
communities,
• more theoretically consistent exploration of ethnic identity as a multidimensional
concept in Filipino Americans, and
• cross-disciplinary analysis using critical perspectives and language centering
Filipino cultural knowledge and wisdom.

More detailed examples and explanations for the study’s implications on culturally responsive
research with Filipino Americans is provided with suggestions to common approaches and
theoretical orientations for researchers to use in studying ethnic identity, enculturation, colonial
mentality, and generational differences within this population.

This study provides two unique contributions to the field through its empirical validation
of multiple scales on enculturation, ethnic identity, and colonial mentality on a predominantly
second-generation Filipino American adult sample and use of multivariate approaches to
studying their associated concepts. Previous validations of the ESFA-S and the CMS were
conducted within the last three years. Compared to previous research using these measures
(Cotas, 2017; David & Okazaki, 2006; De Luna & Kawabata, 2020; del Prado & Church, 2010;
Felipe, 2016; Murillo, 2009; Tuazon et al., 2019), this study’s validation sample included a much
higher percentage of second-generation Filipino Americans and more responses from geographic
areas (outside of California), which have been underrepresented in the past. Most studies using
these measures examined relationships among variables using univariate tests (i.e., Pearson’s
product-moment coefficient), which is a gap in research methodology and analysis that is
addressed by this study’s use of canonical correlation. Because these studies have examined
responses from both measures, a canonical correlation allowed for further examination of how
the variables from each scale relate to one another and how much variance was shared between
these variables. In doing so, this study contributed use of an analysis method that aligns with
explanations of enculturation and colonial mentality as multidimensional concepts in the
literature. The use of this multivariate test reduces the likelihood of error that is typically
attributed to interpreting variable relationships univariately.

Additional contributions of this study include its use of the EIS on a predominantly
second-generation Filipino American sample. While several studies have tested the scale’s
validity on Asian American samples or have included Filipino Americans to do cross-
ethnic/racial comparisons, few have utilized the EIS to accomplish a similar task using canonical
correlation analysis (David, 2008; Irwin et al., 2017; Lam & Tran, 2020; Suh et al., 2019). So far,
most studies on Filipino American ethnic identity have utilized the MEIM, devised brief survey
items asking about ethnicity, or included items from other surveys to measure this construct.
Currently, most studies using the EIS have validated the measure on Mexican American
adolescent samples. Given that ethnic-racial identity development is often described in the
literature as a multidimensional, lifespan process, this study has implications for exploring future
use of the EIS on adult samples from a different type of immigrant background. In validating the
EIS on Filipino Americans and using it in a canonical correlation analysis with the ESFA and
CMS, this study provides observations that may be used to expand on future methodology and
analysis. Few studies using ethnic/racial identity measures with a Filipino American sample have
proposed and completed the use of multivariate tests, which confirms explanations of this
construct as a multidimensional rather than a one-dimensional concept that relates to
enculturation and colonial mentality. Overall, the current study provides multiple possibilities for
researchers to consider in the measurement and analysis of ethnic identity, generation status, enculturation, and colonial mentality among Filipino Americans.

Lastly, further implications of this study for future research include understanding that the fields of health education, public health, and counseling psychology must be equipped with the critical frameworks and concepts to challenge racism, while promoting the health and well-being of different Asian American ethnic groups (Maglalang et al., 2021). If researchers of minoritized populations employ more critical perspectives (i.e., ethnic studies, Critical Race Theory, anti-imperialism) acknowledging the effects of racism and colonialism on Filipino Americans’ mental health and overall well-being, then they will have at least created the conditions for developing critical antiracist frameworks, evidence-based tools, and community-based research to act on the needs and concerns of Filipino American communities (Maglalang et al., 2021; Tintiangco-Cubales & Curammeng, 2018). Overall, the current study’s findings confirm findings within the literature about the important roles of ethnic identity, Filipino cultural values, and colonial mentality in the lives of Filipino Americans.

By framing systemic oppression and internalized oppression as everyday risk factors and contextualizing them within anti-racist frameworks in psychology research, psychologists within the field can more effectively engage in more praxis of decolonization efforts and highlight the Community Cultural Wealth of Filipino Americans as protective barriers (Acevedo & Solorzano, 2021; Maglalang et al., 2021; Yosso, 2005). To immediately center decolonization frameworks and empower Filipino American researchers to pursue a connection with the homeland, the current study made deliberate use of the Tagalog language in the nomenclature of themes and functions relevant to capturing Filipino American ethnic identity, enculturation, and colonial mentality experiences from a strengths-based perspective. Praxis of decolonization
recommendations, such as an intentional use of language to spark pride, curiosity, and connection with Filipino culture, can effectively center Filipino American communities and invite more collaboration with first-generation Filipino Americans or Philippines-based psychology researchers studying ethnic identity, enculturation, and colonial mentality.

**Implications for Training**

The current study’s implications and recommendations for training future Filipino American mental healthcare providers or culturally responsive training of mental health clinicians on Filipino American experiences based on findings from the current study are provided as follows:

- increasing active recruitment efforts and accessibility (i.e., grants, scholarships, mentorship, workshops) to training for future Filipino American mental healthcare providers,
- increasing cross-disciplinary collaboration and networking between various mental healthcare providers serving Filipino Americans,
- cross-disciplinary analysis using critical perspectives and language centering Filipino cultural knowledge and wisdom,
- including Filipino cultural referents, communications, and learning styles in education curriculum(s), and
- emphasizing Filipino American communities’ Community Cultural Wealth and knowledge sources from strengths-based perspectives.

Examples and explanations for the study’s implications for training of Filipino American mental healthcare providers and on culturally responsive care training practices is provided.
As the Filipino American population grows so will the need for Filipino American psychologists and experts on their unique psychological experience. A corollary need for this population’s rapid development and expansion into the mental health field are ongoing supports to reduce burnout of Filipino American psychologists in practice and in research (Maramba & Nadal, 2013). Networking, grants, and workshops for Filipino American psychologists at the Asian American Psychological Association (AAPA) annual convention and at the upcoming second biennial Division on Filipino Americans (DoFA) conference are examples of professional support structures at the national level.

Increasing the number of Filipino American psychologists to meet the demands of a rapidly growing population means developing a collaborative, multidisciplinary approach with Filipino social workers, occupational therapists, scholars, university administrators, nurses, and K-12 teachers. Furthermore, the classroom environment must allow for use of Filipino students’ cultural referents (e.g., cultural knowledge, prior experiences, and performance styles) to offer opportunities for this underrepresented group to reeducate themselves in a Filipino-centric way (Andresen, 2013; Gay, 2010; Halagao, 2010). The conclusions that Maramba and Nadal (2013) outline in their report on the Filipino American faculty pipeline overlap with a similar dilemma encountered in the field of counseling psychology—a lack of critical mass. Specific strategies for increasing the number of Filipino psychologists include collaborating with kapwa in related mental health/social services and ethnic studies, creating and maintaining opportunities for scholarship and professional development, and actively recruiting and psychoeducating in Filipino American communities about psychology services and careers.

In the absence of readily available formal education on decolonization and accessible mentors in certain regions or institutions, it becomes necessary for Filipino Americans to tap into
their ancestral knowledge of finding community and connection in ways consistent with Yosso’s interpretations of Community Cultural Wealth (2005). In recognizing and supporting Filipino Americans’ social capital (i.e., networks of community or peer resources to provide instrumental and emotional support needed to navigate through institutions) and navigational capital (i.e., skills of maneuvering through social institutions that were not designed with minoritized populations in mind), a critical mass of Filipino American educators, researchers, and practitioners may be able to serve the community and address health disparities in ways that cannot be served by their counterparts from more privileged identities. Lateral partnerships with Filipino American educators and social service and mental health care providers (e.g., Pin@y Educational Partnerships or PEP) could mean opportunities for transformative, experiential learning with peers who share a common cultural background and complementary sets of skills while training to serve their community (Tintiangco-Cubales et al., 2016). Developing research projects and presentations with kababayans (fellow countrymen) at major conferences will effectively provide a wealth of knowledge and experience for members of this forgotten, “invisible” population (Cordova, 1983). When a desire to connect with fellow Filipino Americans in helping professions is fostered, the spirit of bayanihan (a community tradition of helping a neighbor with a task) is revisited and nurtured as well.

Regional disparities in opportunities for Filipinos residing outside of California make it difficult for these professionals to find mentors or supervisors to provide guidance. In many instances, Filipino American students may rely on the help of non-Filipino professors, especially professors of color, for mentorship and guidance (Alvarez et al., 2009). For example, Alvin Alvarez, the first Filipino American president of AAPA and a founding member of the DoFA, sought and received mentorship from the late Joseph White, the father of Black psychology, as a
student while developing his career as a psychologist (Alvarez, October 5, 2017, personal communication). Non-Filipino professors, university administrators, and clinical supervisors can support the growth of their Filipino American students, supervisees, and/or colleagues by encouraging them to attend these conferences and defraying the cost of travel and participation, as needed. Recommending Filipino American psychology graduate students for scholarships and fellowships, such as APA’s Minority Fellowship Program or even funding opportunities at the local, university level, ensures that their research is provided with financial and academic support en route to degree completion and structural reinforcement to a pipeline that is still in development.

Efforts to recruit and hire Filipino American students, faculty, and clinicians are a high priority strategy for building a pipeline of psychologists. In addition, Filipino immigrant and second-generation youth experience high “push-out” rates in high school and lower engagement and retention rates in postsecondary education compared to other Asian American ethnic groups (Museus & Maramba, 2011; Ocampo, 2013, 2014; Okamura, 2008). A handful of empirical studies on Filipino American undergraduate and graduate students reveal that having a Filipino American tenure-track faculty member on campus can positively influence students’ sense of belonging, self-efficacy, and well-being, which echoes recommendations for African Americans and Latines in higher education settings (Alvarez et al., 2009; Maramba, 2008; Nadal et al., 2010). The practice of active, intentional recruitment and mentorship of underrepresented populations to expand psychological perspectives and enhance understanding of cultural minorities is used with Native Americans in school psychology and provides a well-researched base of practices that may be used to develop a larger cohort of Filipino American psychologists (Goforth et al., 2016). Active recruitment paired with mentorship may be the most important
intervention to enact to support the scholarship, professional development, and sense of kapwa among Filipino American psychologists and psychologists-in-training.

Professional development and training for non-Filipino psychologists is the best way to continue developing culturally competent services in the absence of Filipino American clinicians. The American Psychological Association (APA) code of ethics mandates that psychologists must “undertake ongoing efforts to develop and maintain their competence”—which can include work with underrepresented and understudied populations (2017, p. 5). Program directors, department chairs, and faculty dedicated to causes of anti-racism work must recognize that colonization’s image of Filipinos (e.g., invisibility) originates from the lessons learned in an educational system implemented for and by Whites (Andresen, 2013; Banks, 2008; Flores, 1998; Friere, 1970; Steele, 2003). Efforts to decolonize traditional curriculums emerge from fields of education, sociology, history, and ethnic studies. Psychologists can move towards non-Eurocentric perspectives through adopting critical, interdisciplinary approaches in classrooms and counseling centers that will increase Filipino American psychology graduate students’ engagement, retention, and graduation (David, 2013; Halagao, 2010; Lee, 2014).

Conclusion

The current study’s results and implications, novel as they are, produce more questions and areas of research for future psychology and social sciences researchers to explore and investigate on the process of colonial mentality. Colonial mentality did not produce the expected intergenerational differences despite being highly, directly related to enculturation and highly, indirectly related to ethnic identity. Given the newness of this finding, ongoing research is needed to develop more types of explanations to describe the Filipino American community’s relationship with healing from colonialism. Within the field of psychology, there is a high value
placed on studying concepts that are static and predictable along mathematical models, when, in fact, the lived experiences of these communities ebbs and flows within fluid, dynamic relationships between self and community over time. As Filipino American communities build upon different forms of familial, aspirational, social, resistant, linguistic, and navigational wealth over time, the manifestations of colonial mentality and forms of enculturation should reflect many of these changes within Filipino American communities’ narratives.

As researchers, educators, and clinicians increase their awareness on ethnic identity, generation status, and colonial mentality in Filipino Americans’ lived experiences, the hope is that increased visibility and understanding may translate into policies and actions contributing to systemic changes, which would lead to more overall positive experiences and mental health outcomes for members this population. While many aspects of theories about ethnic identity, enculturation, and colonial mentality remain static, it should be noted that the subjective contexts around these concepts change over time in response to different events and movements.

Increased accessibility to Filipino American-centered narratives in history, visibility of Filipino Americans in popular media, and spikes in ethnically charged situations, such as the increased risks for Filipino American COVID-19 frontline workers and racist hate crimes against Asian American women and elders, inevitably push individuals towards re-examining their ethnic identity exploration, affirmation, and resolution in a multitude of ways. Therefore, efforts within counseling psychology to serve this population should go beyond mere increases in representation and decolonization efforts and towards approaching work with Filipino American communities as an ongoing, evolving conversation.
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HSIRB Approval and Informed Consent Forms

Date: August 30, 2018

To: Joseph Morris, Principal Investigator
   Kamille La Rosa, Student Investigator for dissertation

From: Amy Naugle, Ph.D., Chair

Re: IRB Project Number 18-08-03

This letter will serve as confirmation that your research project titled “Effects of Enculturation, Colonial Mentality and Generation Status on Filipino Americans’ Ethnic Identity” has been approved under the exempt category of review by the Western Michigan University Institutional Review Board (IRB). The conditions and duration of this approval are specified in the policies of Western Michigan University. You may now begin to implement the research as described in the application.

Please note: This research may only be conducted exactly in the form it was approved. You must seek specific board approval for any changes to this project (e.g., you must request a post-approval change to enroll subjects beyond the number stated in your application under “Number of subjects you want to complete the study”). Failure to obtain approval for changes will result in a protocol deviation. In addition, if there are any unanticipated adverse reactions or unanticipated events associated with the conduct of this research, you should immediately suspend the project and contact the Chair of the IRB for consultation.

Reapproval of the project is required if it extends beyond the termination date stated below.

The Board wishes you success in the pursuit of your research goals.

Approval Termination: August 29, 2019
Western Michigan University
Department of Counselor Education & Counseling Psychology

Principal Investigator: Joseph R. Morris, Ph.D.
Student Investigator: Kamille P. U. La Rosa

You have been invited to participate in a research project titled, “Effects of Enculturation, Colonial Mentality and Generation Status on Filipino Americans’ Ethnic Identity.” This consent document will explain the purpose of this research project and will describe the time commitments, procedures used in the study, and the risks and benefits of participation. Please read this consent form carefully and completely and contact the investigator with any questions if you need clarification.

What are investigators trying to find out in this study? The purpose of the study is to understand the nature of the relationship between enculturation, colonial mentality, and generation status on ethnic identity in Filipino Americans.

Who can participate in this study? Individuals who are at least 18 years of age and identify as Filipino American (or of Filipino descent).

Where will this study take place? The survey will take place on an electronic survey website, Qualtrics, which can be accessed through devices with internet access.

What is the time commitment for participating in this study? The time commitment will be for one session of only 15-20 minutes.

What will be asked of participants in this study? You will first be told about the study and then asked to answer a set of questions about your experiences and attitudes towards your ethnic identity. There are no right or wrong answers, just what your experiences have been so far. You will be asked if you are willing to provide an email address if you would like to be compensated for your time with a raffle entry to one of three Visa eGift cards.

What information will be measured during the study? Information measured will be your experiences, opinions, feelings, and attitudes towards your cultural values and behaviors. Specifically, we would like to know information about your ethnic identity, enculturation, and attitudes (in relation to colonial mentality) – all of these measures will be in the survey.

What are the risks of participating in this study? No risk is expected from your participation in the study. If you have any questions prior to or during the study, you may contact Kamille La Rosa at (Kamille.p.larosa@wmich.edu).
What are the benefits of participating in this study? We believe the potential benefits of participating in this study will allow individuals to voice their concerns and feel a sense of connection to members of the Filipino American community. Results from the study can inform us about the nature of the relationships between enculturation, colonial mentality, and generation status on Filipino Americans’ ethnic identity. The findings may help us in providing feedback on how clinicians, researchers, and educators may approach individuals who are exploring, affirming, or resolving their ethnic identity in a variety of settings.

Are there any costs associated with participating in this study? No costs are associated with participating in this study.

Is there any compensation for participating in this study? Participants will be entered into a raffle drawing for one of three $25 Visa eGift cards. To obtain a raffle entry, participants are expected to complete the entire survey. If you opt to stop taking the survey, which you can at any time, then you will not be eligible for the raffle drawing entry.

Who will have access to the information collected during this study? Your replies will be completely anonymous. Your name and contact information will not be connected to your responses. All of your responses will be confidential. Results from the study will be presented for a dissertation defense and may be presented at a conference or published. However, the information will be based on a summary of everyone who has participated and not on one person.

What if you want to stop participating in this study? You can choose to stop participating in the study at any time for any reason without penalty. There are no personal consequences if you choose to withdraw from this study.

If you have any questions prior to or during the study, you may contact Kamille La Rosa at (Kamille.p.larosa@wmich.edu), the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (269-387-8293) or the Vice President for research (269-387-8298).

This consent document has been approved for use for one year by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (HSIRB) as indicated by the stamped date and signature of the board chair. Do not participate in this study if the stamped date is older than one year.

I have read this informed consent document. The risks and benefits have been explained to me. By clicking “Begin Survey” I agree to participate in this study.

[“Begin Survey” button]
[“Exit Survey” button]
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Recruitment Materials

DO YOU IDENTIFY AS FILIPINO OR FILIPINO AMERICAN?

Filipino and Filipino Americans: Cultural experiences and attitudes study

Please consider participating in our study! Our goal is to study the various cultural experiences and attitudes of Filipino and Filipino American adults.

- Survey will take up to 15-20 minutes to complete.
- Participants will be entered into a raffle drawing for one of three $25 Visa gift cards.


For more information, please contact: Kamille La Rosa (kamille.p.larosa@wmich.edu)
Filipino and Filipino Americans: Cultural experiences and attitudes study

DO YOU IDENTIFY AS FILIPINO OR FILIPINO AMERICAN?

Please consider participating in our study! Our goal is to study the various cultural experiences and attitudes of Filipino and Filipino American adults.

- SURVEY WILL TAKE UP TO 15-20 MINUTES TO COMPLETE.
- PARTICIPANTS WILL BE ENTERED INTO A RAFFLE DRAWING FOR ONE OF THREE $25 VISA GIFT CARDS.

THE DIRECT LINK TO THE SURVEY IS:

For more information, please contact: Kamille La Rosa
(kamille.p.larosa@wmich.edu)
Please consider participating in our study! We are conducting research on various cultural experiences and attitudes of Filipino and Filipino American adults in the United States. To participate in the study you must:

- Identify as Filipino or Filipino American
- Be 18 years of age or older

The survey will take up to 15-20 minutes to complete. Participants will be entered into a raffle drawing for one of three $25 Visa gift cards. The direct link to the survey is: [INSERT SURVEY LINK]

For more information, please contact the student investigator: Kamille La Rosa
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Enculturation Scale for Filipino Americans—Short Form (ESFA-S)

Instructions: The statements below describe values, attitudes, and behaviors that you may agree or disagree with. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement by putting a check mark in one of the boxes next to each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I am in regular contact with my family in the Philippines through telephone calls, email, mail, or texting.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Failing to recognize someone's social status or family standing is offensive.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I always listen carefully to those in positions of authority.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I visit the Philippines often.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>When my doctor gives me treatments or recommendations, I tend to be afraid or ashamed to ask questions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Children should give unquestioning respect and obedience to their elders and authority figures.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I would like to retire in the Philippines.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Instead of confronting someone face to face, I would rather talk about this person behind his or her back.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Praying cannot help cure illnesses.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I always celebrate Rizal Day (December 30th).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>If I am unsure about how much I need to repay someone who has done me a favor, I keep trying to pay back the favor so that I do not look ungrateful.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Going to church is not very important to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>I am familiar with many important events in Filipino history.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>My behavior is determined by what others will say, think, or do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Parents must teach the importance of religion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>I prefer to see a Pilipino/a physician.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>A personal failure is a letdown for the entire family.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Committing suicide is a mortal sin.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>I greet the elderly by gently placing the back of their hand on my forehead and saying &quot;mano po&quot; (kissing the hand).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>I try to please others, even if it is inconvenient to myself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Children are blessings and gifts of God.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>When speaking with elders, I address them with &quot;po&quot; or &quot;ho.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Using a third party is a good way to avoid the shame of making a request or a complaint face to face.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>I leave things to God's will.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>I frequently read Filipino newspapers/magazines/books.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>I may say I understand something, even when I only partly understand the instructions or what is being said.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>One must obey parental advice on education and money.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>While I currently do not live there, I consider the Philippines to be my home.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>I would give a job to a relative or friend, before giving it to a more qualified person that I did not know.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Siblings should respect the decisions and instructions of older siblings.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Appendix D

Colonial Mentality Scale (CMS)

Please respond to the following items honestly and as accurately as you can. There are not right or wrong responses to any of these items; we are interested in your honest responses and opinions. All responses are strictly anonymous.

Using the following scale, please circle the number that describes your level of agreement or disagreement with each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I tend to divide Filipinos in America into two types: the FOBs (fresh-off-the-boat/newly arrived immigrants) and the Filipino Americans.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>There are situations where I feel inferior because of my ethnic/cultural background.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I find persons with lighter skin-tones to be more attractive than persons with dark skin-tones.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>In general, I do not associate with newly-arrived Filipino immigrants.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I do not want my children to be dark-skinned.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Filipinos should feel privileged and honored that Spain and the United States had contact with them.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>There are situations where I feel that it is more advantageous or necessary to deny my ethnic/cultural heritage.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The American ways of living or the American culture is generally more admirable, desirable, or better than the Filipino culture.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>There are situations where I feel ashamed of my ethnic/cultural background.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I generally think that a person that is part White and part Filipino is more attractive than a full-blooded Filipino</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I believe that Filipino Americans are superior, more admirable, and more civilized than Filipinos in the Philippines.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>In general, I am ashamed of newly arrived Filipino immigrants because of the way they dress and act.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I find persons who have bridged noses (like Whites) as more attractive than persons with Filipino noses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I generally do not like newly-arrived Filipino immigrants.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I would like to have a skin-tone that is lighter than the skin-tone I have.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I think newly arrived immigrants should become as Americanized as quickly as possible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I would like to have children with light skin-tones.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Response Options</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Spain and the United States are highly responsible for civilizing Filipinos and improving their ways of life.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>I think newly-arrived immigrant Filipinos are backwards, have accents, and act weird.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>I would like to have a nose that is more bridged (like Whites) than the nose I have.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Filipinos should be thankful to Spain and the United States for transforming the Filipino ways of life into a White/European American way of life.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>I tend to pay more attention to the opinions of Filipinos who are very Americanized than to the opinions of FOBs/newly-arrived immigrants.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>In general, Filipino</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Americans should be thankful and feel fortunate for being in the United States.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>In general, I feel that being a Filipino American is not as good as being White/European American.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>I do not want my children to have Filipino noses.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>In general, Filipino Americans do not have anything to complain about because they are lucky to be in the United States.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>I feel that there are very few things about the Filipino culture that I can be proud of.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>The colonization of the Philippines by Spain and the United States produced very little damage to the Filipino culture.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Filipino is a curse.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>In general, I am ashamed of newly-arrived Filipino immigrants because of their inability to speak fluent, accent-free English.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>In general, I am embarrassed of the Filipino culture and traditions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>In general, I make fun of, tease, or badmouth Filipinos who are not very Americanized in their behaviors.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>There are moments when I wish I was a member of a ethnic/cultural group that is different from my own.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>I make fun of, tease, or badmouth Filipinos who speak English with strong accents.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>In general, I feel ashamed of the Filipino culture and traditions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In general, I feel that being a person of my ethnic/cultural background is not as good as being White.
Appendix E

Ethnic Identity Scale (EIS)

The United States is made up of people of various ethnicities. Ethnicity refers to cultural traditions, beliefs, and behaviors that are passed down through generations. Some examples of the ethnicities that people may identify with are Mexican, Cuban, Nicaraguan, Chinese, Taiwanese, Filipino, Jamaican, African American, Haitian, Italian, Irish, and German. In addition, some people may identify with more than one ethnicity. When you are answering the following questions, we’d like you to think about what YOU consider your ethnicity to be.

Please select what you consider to be your ethnicity here

__________________________________ and refer to this ethnicity as you answer the questions below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>My feelings about my ethnicity are mostly negative.</th>
<th>Does not describe me at all</th>
<th>Describes me a little</th>
<th>Describes me well</th>
<th>Describes me very well</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I have not participated in any activities that would teach me about my ethnicity.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I am clear about what my ethnicity means to me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I have experienced things that reflect my ethnicity, such as eating food, listening to music, and watching movies.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I have attended events that have helped me learn more about my ethnicity.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I have read books/magazines/newspapers or other materials that have taught me about my ethnicity.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I feel negatively about my ethnicity.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I have participated in activities that have exposed me to my ethnicity.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Does</td>
<td>not describe</td>
<td>me at all</td>
<td>Describes me a little</td>
<td>Describes me well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I wish I were of a different ethnicity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I am not happy with my ethnicity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I have learned about my ethnicity by doing things such as reading (books, magazines, newspapers), searching the internet, or keeping up with current events.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I understand how I feel about my ethnicity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>If I could choose, I would prefer to be of a different ethnicity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I know what my ethnicity means to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I have participated in activities that have taught me about my ethnicity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I dislike my ethnicity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I have a clear sense of what my ethnicity means to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F

Demographics Questionnaire

1. Gender (specify) _____
2. Age (in years) _____
3. Please indicate your sexual orientation: _____
4. Country of birth (specify)
5. Please select the generation status you identify with:
   - First generation
   - Second generation
   - 1.5 Generation
   - Third or subsequent Generation
   - Other: _____
6. If you were born outside of the United States, please specify the age at which you immigrated to the United States: _____
7. Indicate your racial background by choosing from one or more of the following options:
   - American Indian or Alaska Native
   - Asian
   - Black or African American
   - Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
   - Non-Hispanic White
   - Latino or of Hispanic descent
8. Indicate your ethnicity by choosing the option(s) that best applies to you:
   - Filipino/a
   - Pinay/Pinoy
   - Filipino/a American
   - Filipinx or Pinxy
   - Other: _____
9. Please select the state you currently reside in: [Dropdown list of 50 U.S. states & territories]
10. How would you describe your current community of residence?
    - Rural/provincial
    - Suburban
    - Urban
    - Other: _____
11. What is the racial composition of your current community of residence?
    - Mostly racial/ethnic minority (specify)
    - Mixed
    - Mostly White
    - Other: _____
12. What is your religious affiliation? _____
13. What is your political affiliation? _____
14. Have you served (currently or previously) in the U.S. military?  
   Yes    No

15. Please list the language(s) you speak or understand, and indicate your level of fluency for each:
   
   ______________

   No proficiency    Elementary    Limited Working    Professional Working

   Full Professional    Native or Bilingual Proficiency

16. If you are employed, what is your current occupation? _____

17. What is the best estimate of your annual income before taxes?
   
   Less than $10,000    Between $40,000 and $60,000

   Between $10,000 and $20,000    Between $60,000 and $80,000

   Between $20,000 and $30,000    Between $80,000 and $100,000

   Between $30,000 and $40,000    More than $100,000

   Prefer not to answer

18. How would you describe the primary community in which you were raised?
   
   Rural/provincial    Suburban    Urban    Other:_____ 

19. What is the racial composition of the community in which you were raised?
   
   Mostly racial/ethnic minority (specify)    Mixed    Mostly White    Other:_____ 

20. Please indicate the Philippine province(s) that your family calls as “home”: _____

21. During my formal education (e.g., K-12, undergraduate studies, graduate studies, vocational
    studies), I have taken one or more courses in Asian American studies or Ethnic Studies to learn
    about the history, culture, and experiences of Filipinos living in the United States.
    
    Yes    No    I don’t know
    
    If yes, please specify the number of courses: _____
    
    If no, please rate your level of interest in taking a course:
    
    0 – No interest    1 – little interest    2 – moderate interest    3 – high interest
22. During my formal education (e.g., K-12, undergraduate studies, graduate studies, vocational studies), I have taken one or more courses in Asian studies or another discipline to learn about the history, culture, and experiences of Filipinos living in the Philippines.

Yes  No  I don’t know

If yes, please specify the number of courses: _____

If no, please rate your level of interest in taking a course:

0 – No interest  1 – little interest  2 – moderate interest  3 – high interest

23. Please rank these sources of your cultural/ethnic knowledge or upbringing from the following list in order of influence or importance to you:

Elders in my family (e.g., parents, grandparents, aunts, uncles)  Siblings or cousins

Friends, Peers, & Coworkers from the same background

Friends, Peers, & Coworkers from another background  Media/Internet/News outlets

Social Media  Academic Journals & Publications  Formal education courses

Community Workshops & Seminars  Other:_____