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Abstract

Deconstructing the Colonial Mentality and Ethnic Identity of Filipinos: An Exploratory Study of Second Generation Filipinos

By

Desmond R. Morente

Claremont Graduate University & San Diego State University

2015

Studying the ethnic identity perceptions and experiences of Filipinos is important because Filipinos are homogenized as Asians in contemporary U.S. society. This misidentification of Filipinos as Asians is misleading. Asians have been stereotyped as the model minority. The term “model minority” romanticizes Asian Americans as hardworking, successful, and law abiding citizens that overcome hardship, oppression, and racism to achieve success (Alvarez, Juang, & Liang, 2006; Lee & Joo, 2005). Yet, there are significant differences between Asians and Filipinos based on social class, period of immigration into the U.S., immigration patterns, language diversity, religion, and beliefs or values, and sense of colonialism.

The purpose of this study was to examine Filipino college students’ perspectives on internalized colonial mentality, collective self-esteem, ethnic identity, social class, and academic success. The main research question asked: What social factors (colonial mentality, collective self-esteem, social class, ethnicity, academic success) influence Filipino college-aged students’ perception of their identity. To begin to answer the main research question, a sequential explanatory mixed methods design was used, a two-phase design.
The first phase consisted of collecting and analyzing quantitative data from 100 Filipino/a college students in San Diego County. The second phase consisted of semi-structured focus group and student interviews with Filipinos. Lastly, a mixed methods phase was used to explore and explain quantitative patterns using the results from the qualitative phase.

The salient findings of the study suggest the following:

1. Quantitative findings: Moderate levels of colonial mentality, high levels of ethnic Identity, and collective self-esteem among Filipinos.

2. Qualitative findings: Themes that emerged were colonial mentality, ethnic identity, language, Kapwa, minority, education, and collective self-esteem.

3. Mixed Methods: Qualitative findings supported and explained the patterns during the quantitative phase.

This study highlighted the personal narratives and struggles of Filipinos. Furthermore, this study contributed to our understanding of the educational barriers faced by Filipinos and to unmasking the barriers and struggles that go unseen or hidden by the racialization of Filipinos as Asians (Buenavista, 2010). Moreover, this study suggests strategic ways to support and foster success among this forgotten group.
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Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study

“We in America understand the many imperfections of democracy and the malignant disease corroding its very heart. We must be united in the effort to make an America in which our people can find happiness. It is a great wrong that anyone in America, whether he be brown or white, should be illiterate or hungry or miserable.” (Carlos Bulosan, 1946, p. 188)

Carlos Bulosan, a Filipino immigrant, vividly describes his hope and transformation for harmony and peace among all individuals. This transformation of hope and compassion continues to resonate with marginalized communities. Marginalized communities are oppressed and not afforded the same opportunities as Whites. During the 1940s, Filipinos were referred to as the brown monkeys, Negros, uncivilized, inferior human species, savages, and ignorant. Additionally, the phrase, “positively no Filipinos allowed,” is a reminder of the unjust and anti-Filipino practices in the United States, particularly in California. During the 1920s and 1930s, this phrase was displayed on doors of hotels and other business establishments in California (Tiongson, 2006). White business owners and establishments explicitly displayed their hate towards Filipinos.

In 1954, Brown v. Board was a historical legal case that challenged racial segregation in schools. The 1960s was a pivotal decade for the Civil Rights Movement. Forty-eight years later, in 2008, another critical moment in the United States occurred with the election of the first African American President, Barack Obama. With Obama’s election, the idea of a post-racial era was embedded in the minds of many Americans. Even though this was a pivotal moment in history, racism in America is still pervasive in social programs and
education. Racial microaggressions, racialization, tracking, and deficit teaching pedagogies are explicit ways of exhibiting racist and white supremacist practices in schools and society.

As our nation becomes complex and ethnically diverse, ethnic minorities possess knowledge and experiences that are valuable and critical to our society. For a large majority of people, there is a belief that the knowledge and experiences of ethnic minorities are trivial and insignificant. Given that ethnic minorities are subjected to racism, social exclusion, and oppressive practices, there is a significant body of literature that has examined such social experiences of African Americans and Latinos over the last 200 years. However, in the case of Asian American Pacific Islanders (AAPIs) such literature is often excluded from this discourse of racism, social exclusion, and oppression.

Scholars and social scientists have thoroughly examined racial issues in social structures such as education and higher education. One theory that has been widely cited is Critical Race Theory. Critical Race Theory (CRT) has been used in examining racial issues in education of African American and Latino students (Delgado Bernal, 2002; Ladson-Billings, 2007; Yosso, Smith, Ceja, & Solórzano, 2009). The discourse around race and racism is usually tied to African Americans, Latinos, and Whites in the literature. In reviewing the literature of Filipinos and CRT, there were very few studies conducted on this invisible group. For instance, Teranishi (2002) examined the racial stereotypes of Filipinos and Chinese students. His study concluded that Chinese students were treated like the model minority, whereas educators had lower academic expectations for Filipino students. Another study by Buenavista (2007) examined the retention and access of 1.5-generation Pilipino college students. The results of her study found that the school
experiences of 1.5-generation Filipino students and underrepresented students of color were similar.

Asian American Pacific Islanders (AAPI) are growing faster than any other racial group in the U.S. However, they are often ignored in the research literature (Buenavista, 2007; Teranishi, 2010). There is a pervasive stereotype that the AAPI group is the model minority (Buenavista, 2007; Teranishi, 2010). AAPI students are perceived as successful both in school and the workplace. Furthermore, AAPIs are lumped into one racial group (Buenavista, Jayakumar, & Misa-Escalante, 2009; Teranishi, 2010). There are 48 different cultures and ethnicities that make up the AAPI group (Teranishi, 2010; U.S. Census Bureau, 2000). However, there are significant and notable differences among the cultural groups that make up AAPI, such as cultures, immigration, languages, and history in the United States (Pang, Han, & Pang, 2011; Teranishi, 2010). While some AAPIs, such as Chinese, Koreans, Japanese, and Asian Indians, are thriving academically, there are groups that are experiencing the opposite, such as dropping out of high school and living in poverty. There is an idealistic perception that Filipinos are achieving academically and have a higher occupational status (Nadal, 2008). This perception also appears to be unrealistic and thus inaccurate.

Statement of the Problem

The contemporary issues of Filipinos have been masked by the racialization of Filipinos as Asians or Asian Americans (Buenavista et al., 2009; Teranishi, 2010). Asians and Asian Americans have been labeled the model minority, a term that was coined in the 1960s to eradicate the idea of racism under a democracy and supported by the belief that hard work and self-determination are sufficient elements to achieve success in American
society (Teranishi, 2010). The model minority myth was linked to Asians and Asian Americans achieving success in the United States despite any obstacle and challenge they confronted (Teranishi, 2010).

While there are some Asian and Asian American groups that are perceived as successful and thriving, Filipinos and Southeast Asians are trying to live up to this myth. Yet, Teranishi (2010) speaks to the contemporary issues that the Filipino community faces. Because of the racialization of Filipinos as Asians or Asian Americans, school resources are often limited for Filipino students (Teranishi, 2010). In the case of school dropouts, Filipino American youth have one of the highest high school dropout rates, and they have high rates of teen suicide ideation and attempts as compared to other Asian groups (Nadal 2008; President’s Advisory Committee on Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders, 2001). In 2009, 10.7% of Filipinos dropped out of California schools, compared to 2.7% of Whites and 1.7% of Asians (Buenavista, 2010; California Department of Education, 2009). According to Nadal (2008), in California schools, Filipino Americans have the highest percentage of high school dropouts as compared to other Asians. In Los Angeles, 5.3% of Filipinos and 15.4% of Pacific Islanders were dropouts compared to 4.4% of other Asian groups (California Department of Education, 2012). In San Francisco, 18.7% of Filipinos and 44.7% of Pacific Islanders dropped out of school as compared to 9.5% of other Asians groups (California Department of Education, 2012). Despite these alarming statistics, the discourse in education focuses on African Americans and Latinos, while Filipino Americans remain invisible in the conversation of achievement and opportunity gaps.
Purpose of the Study

Studying the ethnic identity perceptions and experiences of Filipinos is important because Filipinos are homogenized as Asians in contemporary U.S. society. This misidentification of Filipinos as Asians is misleading. Asians have been stereotyped as the model minority. The term “model minority” romanticizes Asian Americans as hardworking, successful, and law-abiding citizens that overcome hardship, oppression, and racism to achieve success (Alvarez, Juang, & Liang, 2006; Lee & Joo, 2005). Yet, there are significant differences between Asians and Filipinos based on social class, period of immigration into the U.S., immigration patterns, language diversity, religion, beliefs or values, and sense of colonialism. While there are some Filipinos that are thriving to meet the model minority perspective, there are those who are not living up to the model minority status imposed by Euro-American society. In the case of Filipino youth, the high school dropout rate in 2012 in large urban counties such as Los Angeles (5.2%) and San Francisco (18.7%) are troubling, yet the attention and discourse has resided in examining African Americans and Latinos students’ dropout condition. In these California counties, one finds that Filipinos have a high dropout rate (5.2% to 18.7%), and lack of school support, such as the lack of Filipino courses, academic enrichment classes, and courses for postsecondary preparation, has contributed to the high school dropout rates of Filipinos.

This study seeks to highlight the personal narratives and struggles of Filipinos. Furthermore, this study will contribute to our understanding of the educational barriers faced by Filipinos and to unmask the barriers and struggles that go unseen or hidden by the racialization of Filipinos as Asians (Buenavista, 2010).
The purpose of this study is to examine Filipino college students’ perspectives on internalized colonial mentality, collective self-esteem, ethnic identity, social class, and academic success. A sequential explanatory mixed methods design will be used, a two-phase design. The first phase will consist of collecting and analyzing quantitative data. The second phase will be a semi-structured focus group with Filipinos.

Thus, there is a need to examine and analyze the complex lives of Filipinos. Given the colonial history of the Philippines with Spain, the United States, and Japan, the Philippines and its people have lost their culture and history (Leonardo & Matias, 2013). These colonizers have shaped the culture and history of the Philippines. Moreover, colonialism and internalized oppression have had a significant influence on how Filipinos view themselves and society.

Research Questions

The central research question guiding the study asks: What social factors (colonial mentality, social class, ethnicity, academic success) influence Filipino college-aged students’ perception of their identity?

The following sub questions inform the main question:
1. What is the relationship between ethnic identity, colonial mentality, and academic success and college choice among Filipino young adults?
2. Is there a difference between self-reported levels of colonial mentality among Filipino students that attend the following California university systems: University of California, California State University, and California Community College?
3. Are elements of colonial mentality, social class, or levels of ethnicity predictors of academic success in college? If so, to what degree do these impact on academic success?
Conceptual Framework

A conceptual framework that focuses on four salient constructs guides the study among Filipino students—critical race theory, colonial mentality, Kapwa, and ethnic identity. Figure 1 illustrates the tensions of these constructs that will be examined in the study.

The researcher examined the study through a Critical Race Theory lens, incorporating the constructs of colonial mentality, Kapwa, and ethnic identity. These lenses seek to empower marginalized and oppressed groups such as Filipinos. Solórzano and Yosso (2002) explain the following:

CRT in education is defined as a framework or set of basic perspectives, methods, and pedagogy that seeks to identify, analyze, and transform those structural, cultural, and interpersonal aspects of education that maintain the marginal position and subordination of [African American and Latino] students. (p. 25)

CRT is based on the following five principles: the centrality of race and racism, the challenge of dominant ideology, the commitment to social justice and praxis, a centrality to experiential knowledge, and a historical context and interdisciplinary perspective (Solórzano & Yosso, 2002). CRT can be used as a point to begin the dialogue of the possibilities for schools and colleges to engage in the transformation of society (Solórzano, 1998).

Colonial mentality is a form of internalized oppression that affects the colonized groups as a result of their colonization (David & Okazaki, 2006b). According to Smith (1999), there are four main concepts of colonialism:
Colonialism is but one expression of imperialism. Imperialism tends to be used in four
different ways when describing the form of European imperialism which “started” in the
fifteenth century: (1) imperialism as economic expansion; (2) imperialism as the
subjugation of ‘others’; (3) imperialism as an idea or spirit with many forms of realization;
and (4) imperialism as a discursive field of knowledge. (p. 21) The Spanish colonization and
American imperialism were specific ways to take over the indigenous peoples of the
Philippines. The colonizers exploited and conquered the indigenous peoples and imposed
their ideologies of cultural, intellectual, and technical expressions upon them (David &
Okazaki, 2006b). Consequently, colonial mentality (CM) involves the automatic rejection of
anything that is Filipino and an automatic and uncritical preference for anything American
or White (David & Okazaki, 2006b). According to David and Okazaki (2006b), CM is an
individual-difference variable and a multifaceted construct that can be manifested in
various ways: (a) denigration of the Filipino self (feelings of shame or embarrassment of
the Filipino heritage), (b) denigration of the Filipino culture or body (anything that is
Filipino is inferior to anything White), (c) discriminating against less-Americanized
Filipinos, and (d) tolerating historical and contemporary oppression of Filipinos and
Filipino Americans.

Kapwa is the unity of “self” and “others” (Enriquez, 1994). Kapwa is the core of the
Filipino value system and the shared identity. Utang na loob, pakikisama, and hiya are
surface values. Utang na loob means “debt of gratitude.” Moreover, it does not focus on the
gift, acceptance, repayment, and the elements of need and surplus (Enriquez, 1994).
Instead, utang na loob focuses on respect and defends the basic dignity of each person
(Enriquez, 1994). Pakikisama is defined as yielding to the leader or majority, and it also
means companionship (Enriquez, 1994, p. 167). In other words, *pakikisama* refers to prioritizing the group’s goals or going along with the group’s decision and putting the individual’s thoughts and feeling aside (David, 2013). The last surface value is *hiya*. *Hiya* translates to feelings of shame one might bring to oneself or to one’s group (such as family) and the conscious effort to avoid behaviors that may bring shame to oneself or family.

The last construct of the conceptual framework is ethnic identity. Ethnic identity refers to an individual's sense of self in terms of membership in a particular ethnic group (Liebkind, 1992; Phinney, 1990). Furthermore, ethnic identity embraces various aspects of self-identification, feelings of belongingness and commitment to a group, a sense of shared values, and attitudes towards one’s own ethnic group (Phinney, Horenczyk, Liebkind, & Vedder, 2001, p. 496). Ethnic identity is a dynamic construct (Marcia, Waterman, Matteson, Archer, & Orlofsky, 1993) and a progression of an individual’s movement towards an achieved ethnic identity (Phinney, 1989). Ethnic groups with lower status of power may become involved with learning about their ethnicity to help affirm the value of their group (Brown, 2000; Tajfel & Turner, 1986). These individuals develop a strong sense of ethnic identity and self-esteem. However, immigrants and ethnic groups with lower status are often viewed in negative or derogatory ways by the larger society (Liebkind, 1992). As a result, these individuals develop feelings of insecurity, confusion, or resentment over treatment of their group (Phinney et al., 2001).

The four constructs are critical in examining the social issues that potentially impact the Filipino community. Using the lens will provide Filipino college students an opportunity to share their narratives and educational experiences. CRT uses a methodology called counter storytelling (Delgado, 1989). Counter storytelling are stories
that were left out and challenge the dominant discourse (Delgado, 1989). In other words, they are stories and experiences of marginalized communities. Similar to counter storytelling, the researcher will use *kuwento*. *Kuwento* translates to story or storytelling in Filipino (Jocson, 2009). *Kuwento* is used to communicate daily experiences with family and members of the community (Eugenio, 1981). *Kuwento* helps create alternative ways of seeing the world and sharing experiences about being in the world they live in (Jocson, 2009).
Figure 1. Kapwa Framework
Significance of the Study

The Philippines has had a historical relationship with Spain, the United States, and Japan. Consequently, these relationships have had significant implications and consequences. For instance, Filipinos have developed internalized oppression or colonial mentality (David & Okazaki, 2006b). Filipinos view their culture and ethnicity as inferior. They embrace and idolize anything that is “American.” In the educational context, curriculum that is used in public schools does not provide an accurate historical perspective of the Philippines. According to Coloma (2013), less than 1% of secondary history textbook content is devoted to the Philippines and Filipino topics. The explicit message for Filipinos and other ethnic minorities is that the history of the Philippines is trivial and insignificant.

Aside from secondary textbook content, the literature on Filipinos remains sparse. The educational and social discourse is predominantly tied to African Americans and Latinos. The experiences of African Americans and Latinos are well documented in the literature. However, Filipinos remain invisible in the educational and social conversations. The goal of this research is to fill the gap in the literature. More importantly, this research is intended to document and engage in a critical dialogue with Filipinos, specifically focusing on issues of ethnic identity and colonial mentality.

The study surveyed 100 Filipino college students attending three of the university systems of California. Nationally, there are 2.5 million Filipinos residing in the United States (Maramba & Bonus, 2013; U.S. Census Bureau, 2011). In large urban areas, such Los Angeles, San Francisco, and San Diego, Filipinos have made these areas their homes. The
parents of Filipino college students immigrated to the United States to seek better opportunities for their children (Espiritu, 2003). Tintiangco-Cubales (2013) states many families have experienced unbearable conditions, such as “poverty, occupational downgrading, and discrimination” (p. 128). For Filipino parents, social class and socioeconomic status play a pivotal role in the college choice and educational trajectory of Filipinos.

Filipino youth are attending colleges at a fairly steady rate, despite the social and economic barriers faced by their families. Even though Filipino youth can be found on college campuses, ethnic identity and colonial mentality play a critical role in the education process of Filipino college students. Arellano and Padilla (1996) have posited that a strong sense of ethnic identity is associated with academic achievement. While some Filipinos are thriving academically, there are those who are struggling in public schools and colleges. Even though Filipinos are attending two-year and four-year colleges at a steady rate, it is important to understand how the colonial mentality and ethnic identity of Filipinos affect their college choice. In examining college enrollment of AAPIs, Teranishi (2010) found that 38.1% of Korean Americans and 34.6% of Chinese Americans had larger proportions of students that attended selective colleges compared to 18.5% of Filipinos and 24.6% Southeast Asian Americans (p. 114). Teranishi (2010) points out that Filipinos and Southeast Asian Americans were more likely to choose a college based on cost or having low tuition. For this reason, Filipino students from the three California systems will be part of the study to examine the impact of colonial mentality and ethnic identity on their college choice.
Operational Definitions

Colonial mentality (CM) refers to the superiority, pleasantness, or attraction that is associated with any cultural values, behaviors, physical appearance, and objects that are American or Western (David & Okazaki, 2006a; Root, 1997; Strobel, 2001).

Colonial Mentality Scale (CMS-I) is a 36-item measure that is designed to assess feelings, opinions, attitudes and behaviors that assesses common Colonial Mentality (CM) manifestations among Filipino Americans (David & Okazaki, 2006b, p. 243).

Collective self-esteem (CSE) refers to how individuals feel about being associated with a particular social group.

Critical race theory (CRT) examines, challenges, and dismantles the idea of fairness, meritocracy, color-blindness, and neutrality of people of color and provides a counter-narrative of lived experiences.

Ethnic Identity “derives from a sense of peoplehood within a group, culture, and a particular setting. It is not just an understanding and knowledge of one’s in-group afflictions but the a construction of experience over time to achieve a sense of belonging to a particular group” (Phinney & Ong, 2007, p. 271).

Filipino/Pilipino- refers to individuals who were born in the Philippines or whose parents are from the Philippines. I will use “Filipino” and “Pilipino” interchangeably throughout the paper.

Liminal student “refers to the literal and figurative position of being between two states that is characterized by ambiguity” (Buenavista et al., 2009, p. 75). Buenavista (2007) postulated that Filipinos are people of color, but are often marginalized by other people of color and Whites (p.12). Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM)
measures ethnic self-identification, using three distinct subscales: (a) affirmation and belonging--sense of group membership and attitudes toward the individual’s group; (b) ethnic identity achievement –feeling secure and confident of his or her ethnicity; and (c) ethnic behaviors --engaging in activities that are associated with group membership.

**Limitations of the Study**

The findings of the study will be limited to the selected Filipino college age students from which data will be gathered. Data will be derived from three research sites representative of the three college systems in California.

The research design and process to be used for the study will suggest a framework for understanding and exploring Filipino students’ sense of ethnic identity and perceptions of colonial mentality in Southern California, yet the specific geographic location will make it difficult to ascertain the perceptions of Filipino students in other similar regions in the nation (Creswell, 2003).

Another limitation is the sample size of the quantitative (N= 100) study and selected participants for student interviews. In addition to the limited scope of data (N=100) and analysis during a specified timeframe and based on participant subjective responses, the findings will only contribute to the exploration of Filipino ethnic identity and sense of colonial mentality. Moreover, the findings of the study will be limited to the design of the three surveys used to assess perceptions of ethnic identity, colonial mentality, and collective self-esteem of Filipino students.
Organization of Study

The purpose of this study was to examine Filipino college students’ perspectives on colonial mentality, collective self-esteem, and ethnic identity. This dissertation is divided into six chapters. Chapter 2 contextualizes the contemporary issues that Filipino college students face. More specifically, this chapter will examine the construct of colonial mentality, ethnic identity, and collective self-esteem through a Critical Race Theory lens. This chapter concludes with a summary of the literature review and implications for future research on the Filipino community. Chapter 3 outlines the methodology used for this study. Moreover, this chapter includes a discussion of the selection of study participants, data collection, and analysis processes. Chapter 4 of this study presents the findings of the quantitative phase of the study. In chapter 5, the qualitative results are summarized. Chapter 6 summarizes the mixed methods analysis and concludes with the discussion, limitations, and recommendations for future research.

Summary

This study examined the narratives and social experiences of Filipino college students using a two-phase sequential explanatory approach. During the first phase, 100 Filipino colleges took a survey that asked questions about colonial mentality, ethnic identity, and collective self-esteem. The researcher then analyzed the quantitative data to develop questions for the qualitative phase. In the second phase, the researcher conducted two focus groups and three student interviews. After the data collection, using the Critical Race Theory as the theoretical lens, the researcher analyzed the qualitative data. The CRT lens provided the researcher with a deeper understanding of the salient issues that were impacting on Filipino college students.
Chapter 2: Review of the Literature

The purpose of this literature review is to use Critical Race Theory (CRT) to expose contemporary issues of Filipino youth in the United States. In reviewing the literature, CRT focuses on African Americans and Latino students. There were few articles that used the CRT framework with the Filipino community. The second part of the literature review will examine the impact of colonialism, Kapwa, Sikolohiyan Pilipino, and ethnic identity on Filipino Americans. In addition, the researcher will examine demographics of the Filipinos to highlight some of the disparities in the educational context.

Critical Race Theory

According to Solóranzo (1998), “critical race theory in education challenges that traditional claims of the educational system and its institutions to objectivity, meritocracy, color and gender blindness, race and gender neutrality, and equal opportunity” (p. 122). CRT originated from law, sociology, history, ethnic studies, and women's studies (Matsuda, 1987; Solórzano, 1998). The purpose of the CRT framework in education is to set insights, perspectives, methods, and pedagogy that seek to challenge and identify dominant racial positions in and out of the classroom (Matsuda, Lawrence, Delgado, & Crenshaw, 1993; Solórzano & Yosso, 2002).

CRT emerged from the legal arena to unpack the racial exclusion of people of color (Parker & Lynn, 2002). CRT pioneers argued that racism should not be viewed as acts of individual prejudice but an “endemic” part of American life (Bell, 1988; Delgado, 1989; Parker & Lynn, 2002). The historical consciousness and ideological choices about race have been deeply ingrained in members of society (Harris, 1993). CRT grew out of critical legal studies (CLS)—a movement in law that was composed of White Marxist and
postmodernist legal scholars whose passion was unpacking the ideological fundamentals of law (Crenshaw, 1988; Matsuda, 1991; Parker & Lynn, 2002; Williams, 1987).

In the educational context, CRT challenges and dismantles the idea of fairness, meritocracy, color-blindness, and neutrality of people of color (Parker, Deyhle, & Villenas, 1999). The CRT framework consist of five elements: (a) the centrality of race and racism and their intersectionality with other forms of subordination, (b) the challenge of dominant ideology, (c) the commitment to social justices, (d) the centrality of experiential knowledge, and (e) the transdisciplinary perspective (Solórzano, 1997, 1998; Solórzano & Delgado Bernal, 2001; Solórzano & Yosso, 2000). The historical and contemporary experiences of students of color must examine the current educational practices and policies using the five elements of CRT (Buenavista, 2010). Normative frameworks often overlook marginalized populations and CRT serves as a lens and framework to effectively challenge and examine these normative frameworks (Teranishi, 2010).

CRT has been utilized to study the racial stratification of students in higher education and to challenge the pervasive assumptions of access to opportunity and equity. It focuses on the educational experiences of students of color in broader social, institutional, legal, and historical context (Delgado, 1995). This study will deconstruct the stereotypes and assumptions about Filipinos. The dominant discourse in education and race analyzes the achievement gap and inequities of African Americans and Latinos and White students (Solórzano & Yosso, 2002; Teranishi, 2002; Teranishi, Behringer, Grey, & Parker, 2009). CRT questions the dominant discourse on race and racism in education by inquiring how educational theory, policy, and practices have been used to subordinate certain racial and ethnic groups (Solóranzo, 1998).
Solórzano and Delgado Bernal (2001) acknowledge that educational structures, organizations, processes, and discourses operate in contradictory ways that continue to oppress and marginalize students of color (p. 315). Education is viewed as an equalizer; however, when examining the education structure it continues to oppress students of color. For instance, the idea that all Filipinos are successful and are the model minority is false. In a study conducted by Teranishi (2002), the researcher examined how the racial and ethnic experiences of Chinese and Filipino students affect their educational process and postsecondary planning and opportunities at four different California public high schools (p. 144). Using the CRT as a methodology provided students an opportunity share their narratives that challenge the dominant discourse (Teranishi, 2002; Teranishi et al. 2009). Teranishi (2002) found that more than half of the Chinese students considered highly selective and elite colleges. The findings for Filipinos were significantly different; one-third of the Filipino respondents pursued some college. Moreover, Filipinos students had a wide range of interest in colleges and had lower academic aspirations. Filipinos opted for less selective institutions such as community college, local, and public institutions. Filipino students also considered non-academic vocational programs or decided to join the military.

While Chinese students had a specific focus when selecting colleges, educators had viewed Filipino students differently. Teranishi (2002) found the following: Chinese students reported feeling that teachers and counselors treated them as the model minority. Chinese students were selected by counselors and teachers to enroll in college preparatory courses. On the other hand, Filipinos students felt a lot of negative stereotypes from teachers and counselors. Many Filipinos were perceived as gang members, delinquents and failures. Educators offered Filipinos more vocational courses than college.
preparatory courses (p.148). Teranishi’s (2002) study highlighted that Filipinos and Chinese students’ school experiences were significantly different from each other. Chinese students were held to higher educational standards and were treated like the model minority. In addition, educators were more willing to assist Chinese students in their efforts to navigate their post-secondary aspirations. On the other hand, Filipinos experienced and described their teachers and counselors as “unavailable,” “inaccessible,” or “unapproachable” (Teranishi, 2002).

Through a critical lens, the phenotypes (physical features and skin color) play a significant role in educational context. Chinese students are lighter in color compared to Filipinos. Filipinos have dark pigmentation and ethnic features (Kiang & Takeuchi, 2009). Those with lighter skin are more privileged (Kiang & Takeuchi, 2009). Keith and Herring (1991) found significant differences in income, education, and occupation of African Americans. Those with a lighter skin tone were favored to have “better outcomes” (Keith & Herring, 1991). Codina and Montalvo (1994) found similar results with Mexican Americans. Those with dark skin not only exhibited lower academic and job success, but were also more likely to suffer from depression compared to those with light skin (Codina & Montalvo, 1994). Kiang and Takeuchi (2009) conducted a study of 2,092 Filipinos in San Francisco and Honolulu examining the link between phenotypes and outcomes such as income, physical health, and psychological distress. Kiang and Takeuchi (2009) found that Filipinos who had darker skin and more Filipino characteristics were associated with lower incomes and poor physical health. Even though skin tone was not mentioned in Teranishi’s study, phenotypes and ethnic features play a critical role in the educational context. One
assumption can be that Chinese students were held to higher academic standards when compared to Filipino students because of phenotype.

In a doctoral dissertation, Buenavista (2007) conducted a qualitative study that examined access and retention of second-generation college Filipino students whose educational experiences were more like those of first-generation college students (p.16). The researcher called these students 1.5 generation college students. The results of the study led the researcher to conclude that the experiences of Filipinos were similar to students of color who were underrepresented, but Filipino students were considered “liminal” students of color. “Liminal refers to the literal and figurative position of being between two states that is characterized by ambiguity” (Buenavista et al., 2009, p. 75). Buenavista (2007) postulated that Filipinos are people of color, but are often marginalized by other people of color and Whites (p.12).

**Counter Storytelling in CRT**

Delgado (1989) used a methodology called counter storytelling. The purpose of this technique was to tell stories of those experiences that were left out and to challenge the dominant discourse (Delgado, 1989). Counterstories are theoretical, methodological, and pedagogical (Solórzano & Delgado Bernal, 2001). Solórzano and Delgado Bernal (2001) highlighted the objectives of counterstories:

(a) They can build community among those at margins; (b) they challenge the perceived wisdom of those at society’s center; (c) they open new windows into the reality of those at the margins of society by showing the possibilities beyond the ones they live and to show that they are not alone in their position; (d) they teach others that by combining elements from both the story and current reality,
one can construct another world richer than either the story or the reality alone; and (e) they can provide a context to understand and transform belief system.

(p. 328)

While storytelling is commonly utilized by African Americans, Latinos, and Native Americans communities, Filipinos use kuwento to share or tell stories. Kuwento translates to story or storytelling in Filipino (Jocson, 2009). Kuwento is used to communicate daily experiences with family members and communities (Eugenio, 1981). Kuwento helps students create alternative ways of seeing the world and themselves (Jocson, 2009). Jocson (2009) found Kuwento to be an effective tool to promote cultural relevancy, while challenging the dominant discourses and texts about Filipinos (p. 35). To illustrate the power and effectiveness of kuwento in a school setting, a Filipino Heritage class in San Francisco used kuwento to describe and examine the Philippines-American War. Filipino Heritage was a high school course designed to provide students with a historical perspective of the Philippines and its relationship with Spain and the U.S. Kuwento provided students two perspectives: the colonizer’s perspective and the Filipino perspective. Mainstream text and curriculum leave out valuable and critical information about the Philippines (Jocson, 2009). Kuwento was a powerful tool that helped students examine their history with a critical lens.

CRT has been widely used to examine educational inequities and practices. Students of color are not afforded the same opportunities as privileged and White students. The blanket statement that Filipinos are thriving socially and academically because they are Asian or Asian American is false. Teranishi’s (2002) study highlighted how educators treated Chinese and Filipino high school students. Filipinos were not treated and given the
same educational opportunities as Chinese students. Chinese students were treated as the model minority. Additionally, Buenavista’s (2007) study found that Filipinos’ school experiences were similar to underrepresented students. The following section will discuss the colonial period of the Philippines and its implications for the Philippines and the people.

**Colonialism Periods from Spain to the United States**

This section will provide a brief overview of the colonial history of the Philippines followed by an examination of the impact of colonialism on Filipinos in the United States and the Philippines. A brief historical background must be presented to better understand the complexity of this invisible group. Three empires have colonized the Philippines: Spain, the United States, and Japan. The first documented inhabitants of the archipelago were the **Negritos**. **Negritos** were dark-skinned pygmies with kinky hair, flat noses, and small hands and feet (Woods, 2006). The archipelago was mistakenly located by Spain, as they were in search of the Spice Island (Woods, 2006). In 1565, Spain colonized the archipelagos for nearly 300 years. The archipelago was named after King Felipe (Philip) II of Spain, and it is now known as the Philippines. One of the major influences brought to the Philippines from Spain was Catholicism (Tuason, Taylor, Rollings, Harris, & Martin, 2007). “This coercive ploy to construct Filipinos as passive and in need of Christian redemption also allowed for future foreign powers, such as the United States, to justify their colonial tutelage of the Philippines” (Leonardo & Matias, 2013, p. 8). The **Negritos** and indigenous people of the archipelago were coerced to accept and assimilate to the new religion and new life for the next 300 years.
The Spaniards not only introduced Catholicism to the people of the islands, but they created social classes among different ethnolinguistic groups (Woods, 2006). The two classes were the indigenous and elite (Woods, 2006). The _ladinos, mestizos, and ilustrados_ formed the elite group in the Philippines. The _ladinos_ were composed of Filipinos who became bilingual in Spanish and their own language. The _mestizos_ were offspring of Spaniards and Filipinos and sometimes Chinese and Filipinos. _Mestizos_ were typically light skinned and did not have distinct Filipino physical features (i.e., flat nose, dark skin, kinky hair). _Ilustrados_ were Filipinos who were trusted and managed the haciendas. The elite embraced Spain while the indigenous people resisted the Spaniards.

Even though the two social classes were evident, the people of the Philippines resisted and revolted against Spain. After 300 years of colonial rule, on June 12, 1898, the Philippines would gain its independence from Spain but quickly lost it to the United States. A mock battle ensued between the U.S. and Spain to conclude the Spanish-American War (Woods, 2006). Spain surrendered to the U.S. under the Treaty of Paris agreement. After the war, the United States had control over the Philippines. Immediately after the pacification of the Philippines, education was introduced and implemented in the Philippines. Public education in the Philippines was explicitly tied to the goal of triumph (Hsu, 2013).

Education is an active process that reinforces and occasionally challenges institutionalized racism, sexism, and class exploitation (Leonardo, 2003). Moreover, education reflects society’s dominant norms and is used to perpetuate the existing social stratification (Leonardo & Matias, 2013). Filipinos were not educated enough, and it was the U.S.’s job to educate the Filipinos of the Philippines. “In the banking concept of
education, knowledge is a bestowed gift by those who consider themselves knowledgeable upon those whom they consider to know nothing” (Freire, 1970, p. 72). The implementation of colonial education in the Philippines was to model the paradigms and social norms of the colonizer, in this case the United States (Leonardo & Matias, 2013).

As military forces occupied the physical spaces in the Philippines, the first public school was built on the Corregidor Island (Hsu, 2013). Filipinos were “constructed and racialized” as non-Whites and others and were considered uncivilized savages (Kramer, 2006). Filipinos were the racial, political, and moral problems, similar to Native Americans and African Americans, which needed to be “removed” and “improved” to assist in the development and expansion of U.S. democracy (Coloma, 2009; Hsu, 2013). Education was the foundational element of building a Filipino national development (Hsu, 2013; Kramer, 2006). The curriculum that was introduced in the Philippines was similar to the curriculum offered to African Americans, Native Americans, and Hawaiians in the United States (Coloma, 2009; Hsu, 2013).

In 1903, sponsored Filipino scholars known as pensionado/as were educated in the United States (Coloma, 2009; Vergara, 2013). The intent of the pensionado/a program was to train elite and wealthy Filipino/as, who valued American ideals (Leonardo & Matias 2013; Vergara, 2013). Moreover, pensionado/as were supposed to contribute to the new colonial system in the Philippines after completing their education in the U.S. Coloma (2009) postulated that the pensionado/as, once they returned to the Philippines, were directed to teach practical trades such as woodwork, carpentry, agriculture, teaching, engineering, and domestic science (p. 511). The purpose of the pensionado program was for
the graduates to help disseminate and extend American values through teaching native Filipinos (Coloma, 2009; Leonardo & Matias, 2013; Vergara, 2013).

Aside from the massive push for education in the Philippines, another significant influence was the use of the English language. English instruction became the foundation of education in the Philippines (Hsu, 2013). The use of the dominant language was to unify the people of the Philippines (Hsu, 2013). Additionally, the implementation of the English language curriculum was another form of colonization and Americanization (Andersen, 2013). From the colonizer’s perspective, imposing the dominant language was a way to bring the Filipinos and Americans together. Textbooks were printed in English. Courses were focused on U.S. History and American culture (Andersen, 2013). Not only was the U.S imposing the dominant language, but the expansion of U.S. history and culture was also disseminated in schools through the curriculum.

The Occupation of the Japanese

In 1941, the Japanese invaded the Philippines and attacked Clark Air base in Pampanga (Philippine History, 2013). On April 9, 1942, the U.S. surrendered to the Japanese. The Japanese outnumbered Filipino and American soldiers. Reinforcements and supplies were running low for Filipino and American soldiers. Filipino and American soldiers were forced to march from the peninsula to the central part of Luzon, known as the Bataan Death March (Woods, 2006). 76,000 POWs were forced to walk 66 miles in the tropical, humid, and hot weather (Woods, 2006). Additionally, POWs were given little or almost no water or food during this horrendous march. Historians referred this to event as the death march because if POWs stopped marching to get a drink of water or tried to escape they were beaten or killed. The Bataan Death March took five days to reach Camp
O’Donnell, the prison camp. An estimated 10,000 POWs were killed during the march due to thirst, hunger, and exhaustion (Philippine History, 2013).

A former POW, Richard Gordon, gives his personal testimony from the Bataan Death March (American Experience, 2013):

As we were marching out of Bataan, men were very desperate for water. And they would break ranks and the Japanese wouldn't tolerate that. And they'd run to the side of the road to get some water. And along the side of the road would be caribou wallows, which were puddles of water that the caribou used to wallow in ...so they’d keep away flies and mosquitoes. And the Americans and the Filipinos both would actually lap up that water like a kitten would lap up milk. And of course the water was contaminated. So many of them became very ill as a result of drinking that. Several who broke ranks...would be shot by the Japanese who were part of that detail. I saw a beheading of a Filipino who had broken ranks and ran for that type of water. So killings, yes, we saw a number of them along that march at different places.

In 1945, General MacArthur returned to the Philippines to reclaim it from the Japanese. Even though Japan controlled the Philippines for a short period of time, the impact was tremendous in terms of number of people killed and the damage to the Philippines. Prior to the U.S. taking over the Philippines, the Japanese troops went on a killing spree; 100,000 Filipinos and Americans were murdered (Woods, 2006). The aftermath of the war left the Philippines in a catastrophic condition. Roads, bridges, farms, and lives were destroyed. The road to recovery to rebuild the Philippines was difficult.
because of the lack of finance and shortage of food. One year later, in 1946, the Philippines was granted its independence, and became the Republic of the Philippines.

The archipelago had suffered significant changes and challenges over four hundred years of imperialism and colonialism from Spain, the United States, and Japan. Religion, social class, government, education, and the English language were the colonial imprints of the three empires. Filipinos have a unique and complex history unlike any other country. Consequently, Filipinos continue to struggle with the effects of colonialism. The subsequent section provides the effects of colonialism on Filipinos and Filipino Americans.

**The Effects of Colonialism on Filipinos and Filipino Americans**

According to Leonardo and Matias (2013), the valuing of light skin, the straightening of the hair, sharpening of one’s nose, the American attitude, and the linguistic dominance of English are imprints of Spanish and U.S. colonization (p.5). The preservation of light skin and the use of the English language are common practices of Filipinos both living in the Philippines and United States. For example, on The Filipino Channel (TFC), a cable station devoted to airing Filipino shows, the majority of the actors and actresses have light skin and sharp noses. Filipinos that have distinct Filipino features are portrayed as poor, peasants, or criminals. Filipino game shows such as “It’s Show Time” and “Minute To Win It” copy American game shows such as “Deal or No Deal.” The imprints of colonialism are evident here, where the hosts of the game show have light skin and sharp noses and the contestants are poor, have dark skin, and have flat noses. The purpose of the game is for the poor to capitalize on money through completing tedious tasks such as finding money in a bag or stacking golf balls. While these shows are pure entertainment, the media
perpetuates the colonialism through having light skin Filipinos host the shows and dark skin Filipinos be the contestants, criminals, or peasants.

Aside from the entertainment from TFC, these imprints are pervasive among Filipino Americans living in the United States. For instance, Filipinos living in the Philippines and United States value light skin. In the Philippines, skin-whitening soap and bleach products are sold in street markets and retail stores. Many Filipinos purchase these soaps and bleaches in hope that their skin will get lighter. It is not unusual for Filipinos to walk around in the tropical weather with an umbrella. The umbrella is to help protect their skin from getting brown. In the U.S., Filipino Americans, particularly parents, will make comments to their children regarding skin color. For instance, “don’t stay out in the sun for too long because you’re going to get dark” or “her skin is light; she’s so pretty” or “if her skin was lighter, then she would be pretty.” Not only is the colonial mentality perpetuated by the media, but parents as well. The notion that white is beautiful and brown is ugly is a consistent reminder of the colonialism that still exists (Nadal, 2008).

While the physical traits are reminders of colonialism, the frequent use of the English language and the denial of the Filipino language is pervasive within the Filipino community. Because of the colonial relationship between the United States and Philippines, Filipinos are accustomed to American culture and English (Salazar, Schludermann, Schludermann, & Huynh, 2000). Many Filipino families living in the United States do not teach their children any of the Filipino languages. In a study conducted by Espiritu (2003), the researcher found tension between Philippine-born and U.S.-born Filipinos in terms of language and “overt-racism.” Dario Villa, a participant of the study, provides a personal account about his experience:
When we arrived in San Diego in 1976, I attended Montgomery High School in South San Diego. I was happy to be there because I saw many Filipino faces that reminded me of home... To my surprise, I offended many Filipinos because I was an “FOB”-“fresh off the boat.” I was ridiculed because my accent reminded them of their parents. It was their shame coming out at my expense. I was a reminder of the image they hate, part of themselves. (Espiritu, 2003, p. 183)

While Filipinos are familiar with the English language, new immigrants who speak English have a “FOB” accent. In the context of language, U.S.-born Filipinos feel like they are better than newly arrived Filipino immigrants because they do not have the “FOB” accent. In addition, “FOBs” are teased and rejected by their Filipino peers. Another participant from the study, a Filipino parent, refused to teach his children Tagalog and Filipino History. “I don’t see what’s the point. The Filipinos haven’t made much contributions in terms of the world” (Espiritu, 2003, p. 195). There is shame about the Filipino language and culture because of the lack of contribution and recognition in the world.

Colonial Mentality

Colonial mentality (CM) is a conceptual theory around feelings of inferiority within some societies experiencing post-European colonialism, relative to the values of the foreign European powers that they became aware of through the contact period of colonization (Schirmer & Shalom, 1987). The concept essentially refers to the acceptance, by the colonized, of the culture or doctrines of the colonizer as intrinsically more worthy or superior (Schirmer & Shalom, 1987).

The colonization of the Philippines began with the arrival of a Spanish expedition on February 13, 1565 and with the establishment of the first permanent settlement of San
Miguel on the island of Cebu. The expedition continued northward reaching the bay of Manila on the island of Luzon on June 24, 1571, where the Spaniards established a new town and thus began an era of Spanish colonization that lasted for more than three centuries (Agoncillo, 1990). The Americans were the last country to colonize the Philippines (1898-1946) and nationalists claim that it continues to serve as a neo colony of the United States despite its formal independence in 1946 (Agoncillo, 1990).

According to Leonardo and Matias (2013), Filipinos have been forced to see themselves through the lens and eyes of Spanish, Japanese, and American colonizers. Indigenous values and cultures are viewed as inferior and the colonizer’s values and culture are viewed as superior and better (David, 2008). Filipino scholars have used the term *colonial mentality* (CM). CM refers to the superiority, pleasantness, or attraction that is associated with any cultural values, behaviors, physical appearance, and objects that are American or Western (David & Okazaki, 2006a; Root, 1997; Strobel, 2001). In addition, CM rejects anything that is Filipino, and it is a form of internalized oppression (David & Okazaki, 2006a).

According to David and Okazaki (2006b, p. 241), CM can be manifested in various ways such as (1) denigration of the Filipino self (feelings of inferiority); (2) the denigration of the Filipino culture and the perception that anything Filipino is inferior; (3) discriminating against less-Americanized Filipinos; and (4) tolerating historical and contemporary stereotypes that lead to the acceptance of oppression.

David and Okazaki (2006b) argued that internalized oppression is a significant experience that affects Filipinos, and it is a construct that has been developed to measure this experience. To fill in this gap, David and Okazaki (2006b) developed the *Colonial
Mentality Scale (CMS-I). The purpose of the CMS is to measure feelings, attitudes, and behaviors that are manifestations of CM (David & Okazaki, 2006b). David (2008) conducted a study using the CMS-I to examine 248 Filipino Americans’ experiences with internalized oppression or CM and their mental health. The results of the study revealed “CM was associated with lower levels of enculturation, negative evaluations of one’s personal and ethnic group characteristics, negative sense of belonging in and attitude towards one’s ethnic group, and more depressive symptoms” (David, 2008, p. 123). This study and scale is critical because of historical experiences that Filipinos encountered with colonialism. A measurement has not been developed until now. Moreover, the study examined the effects of colonialism and mental health of Filipinos. This measurement is not only applicable to the Filipino community, but can be utilized by other cultural, racial, and ethnic minority groups that experience similar internalized oppression (David, 2008).

The physical characteristics and the use of the English language are reminders of the imprints from Spain and the United States. The indigenous and natively constructed Filipino identity and history has been lost and destroyed because of Spain and the U.S. (Leonardo & Matias, 2013). The colonization of the Philippines encompasses a history of disadvantages, racial discrimination, social injustice, and biased education (Leonardo & Matias, 2013). Furthermore, the process of acquiring a colonial mentality is a specific form of “internalized oppression, characterized by a perception of ethnic or cultural inferiority as a result of colonization by Spain and the United States” (David & Okazaki, 2006b, p.241). The internalized oppression that Filipinos have adopted was through the imposition of values and preferred characteristics introduced by Spain and the United States over a period of time. The next section will discuss Sikolohiyah Pilipino (Pilipino Psychology).
Filipinos are characterized as a collectivistic culture (David, 2013; Nadal, 2004). Collectivistic cultures are characterized by groups of people who have a strong desire to fit in, prioritize the group’s goal over one’s personal goals, and maintain harmonious relationships with other people (David, 2013; Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Triandis, 2001). In contrast, in individualistic cultures, particularly in Western societies, there is a strong emphasis on individuality. There is a desire to be unique, to stand out, and to rise above the rest, and to pursue one’s goal and become your own person (David, 2013; Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Triandis, 2001). Furthermore, there is a greater emphasis on self-interest and personal achievement (Rego & Cunha, 2009).

While these characteristics are evident in Western cultures, many Filipino scholars have postulated collective values within the Filipino culture: Hiya (shame), Utang na Loob (sense of inner debt or gratitude), and Pakikisama (companionship). Hiya refers to feelings of shame one might bring to oneself or family. The goal is to avoid bringing hiya/shame to oneself or the family. The individual must be conscious of behaviors to avoid hiya. For example, Filipino families immigrate to the United States to live the “American Dream.” Part of this dream is for immigrant children to graduate from college. If he/she drops out of college or even worse does not attend college, this brings hiya to the family and to oneself. Utang na loob is a feeling of indebtedness or gratitude that one gets after another fellow Filipino/a has provided some type of assistance. Utang na loob is similar to reciprocity. Utang na loob is an act of kindness for another Filipino/a, and there is a mutual understanding of repayment (Nadal, 2004). Pakikisama is referred to prioritizing the group’s goals or going along with the group’s decision and putting their thoughts and
feeling aside. According to David (2013), it is a value that puts the group’s needs before their own needs in order to maintain harmony. Filipinos will thrive on the acceptance of those surrounding him/her and will remain a collective member of the group or community (Nadal, 2004).

These values of **hiya**, **utang na loob**, and **pakikisama** are shared among the Filipino community. According to Enriquez (1994) these values of **hiya**, **utang na loob**, and **pakikisama** are surface values. Enriquez (1994) contended that what drives these surface values is **Kapwa**. When translated from Tagalog to English, **kapwa** means “others” (Enriquez, 1994). However, the Filipino word **kapwa** is different from the English word “others.” In Filipino, **kapwa** is the unity of the “self” and “others” and is the recognition of shared identity and an inner self with others (Enriquez, 1994).

Virgilio Enriquez (1994), a Filipino psychologist, coined the term **sikolohiyang Pilipino** or Pilipino Psychology. Dissatisfied with the development of Westernized psychology frameworks among Filipinos in the Philippines, Enriquez (1994) developed **sikolohiyan Pilipino**. Moreover, in Western research methods, the researcher has the “absolute power and control” (Enriquez, 1994). The researchers control the conditions, activities, and sometimes the lives of the participants. According to Enriquez (1994), **sikolohiyan Pilipino** is “the embodiment of the systematic and scientific study, appreciation and application of indigenous knowledge of Filipinos that is composed of their historical past, society, culture” (p. 27). Moreover, **sikolohiayn Pilipino** attempts to find “application” of Filipino psychology in indigenous health practices, agriculture, art, and religion (Enriquez, 1994, p. 27). The purpose of **sikolohiyan Pilipino** is to validate and acknowledge culturally appropriate methods that are congruent with and consistent with indigenous
Filipino behaviors and worldviews (Enriquez, 1994). Because of the colonization of the Philippines, scholars have challenged the colonial mentality through sustaining indigenous practices and challenging dominant ways of thinking. *Sikolohiyan Pilipino* advocates for the use of research methods that are culturally appropriate for the Filipino people (David, 2013). While Western or American psychological research utilizes experiments and surveys to collect data, Enriquez (1994) argued for the use of natural strategies such as *pagtatanong-tanong* (asking around), *pakikiramdam* (using one’s shared inner perception), *panunuluyan* (staying with), and *pakikipamuhay* (living with). Applying these research methods are critical and effective when working among the Filipino people. For instance, the application of *sikolohiyan Pilipino* can be viewed at two different levels of social interaction: the outsider or the *Ibang – Tao* (other people) and one of us or *Hindi Ibang Tao* (the insider). These two levels of interactions are important when working with members of the Filipino community. As an outsider (i.e., researcher, tourist, non-community member), members of a Filipino community will not trust the “outsider” because a meaningful relationship has not been established. According to Enriquez (1994), in order to develop trust, one must live in the community to establish trust to foster a meaningful relationship with the Filipinos.

The movement of the *sikolohiyan Pilipino* was to sustain indigenous values of the Filipino community and culture. According to David (2013), while *sikolohiyan Pilipino* challenges Westernized psychological methods, theories, and concepts, it does not completely reject them. In other words, *sikolohiyan Pilipino* is open to all methods as long as it generates accurate and empowering knowledge about the psychological realities of
Filipinos (David, 2013, p. 216). The purpose of *sikolohiyan Pilipino* is to ensure that the culture, history, and social realities are meaningful and culturally appropriate for Filipinos.

**Kapwa: Fellow Being and Unity**

The *sikolohiyan Pilipino* was an important concept to help preserve the history, culture, and realities of Filipinos. Moreover, it has helped conceptualized the indigenous core values of Filipinos and *kapwa*. Enriquez (1994) defines *kapwa* as the following:

A person starts having *kapwa* not so much because of recognition of status given to him/her by others but because of his/her awareness of shared identity. The *ako* (ego or self) and the *iba sa aking* (others) are one and the same in *kapwa* psychology: *hindi ako iba sa aking kapwa* (I am no different from others). Once *ako* starts thinking of himself/herself as separate from *kapwa*, the Filipino “self” gets to individuate in the Western sense and in effect denies that status of *kapwa* to the other. By the same token, the status of *kapwa* is also denied to the self. (p. 45)

*Kapwa* is the core Filipino value that serves as the base or “trunk” that drives and connects *hiya*, *utang na loob*, and *pakikisama*. Enriquez (1994) continued with “*kapwa* is a core value of the Filipino personality” (p. 62). *Kapwa* translates to “both” or “fellow being” or *kapwa tao* (Enriquez, 1994) and refers to the unity or oneness of a person with other people (David, 2013). *Kapwa* is the foundation of human values within the Philippines’ value system. Furthermore, *kapwa* not only determines the individual’s personality but his/her personhood or *pagkatao* (Enriquez, 1994). According to Enriquez (1994), without *kapwa*, one denies being Filipino/a and one also rejects being human (p. 63). The question is how can one identify as being Filipino/a when he/she rejects humanity.
Another concept and value that is connected to *kapwa* is *pakiramdam*. *Pakiramdam* refers to feeling the needs, desires, intentions, motivations, moods, emotions, or other internal characteristics and states of other people (David, 2013, p. 111). Moreover, *pakiramdam* is a shared inner perception where an individual has a strong sense of awareness and sensitivity (Enriquez, 1994). Furthermore, individuals that have a heightened sense of *pakiramdam* have the ability to be highly sympathetic or empathetic towards others (de Guia, 2005; Enriquez, 1994). *Pakiramdam* connects the core value of *kapwa* to the surface values (David, 2013). Enriquez (1994) stated, “The function of this value (*pakiramdam*) acts as a processor or pivot, which spins off the surface values from the core value of *Kapwa*” (p. 62). Without *pakiramdam*, one cannot feel shame (*hiya*), a sense of gratitude (*utang na Loob*), or put other’s needs ahead of one’s own (*pakikisama*). *Pakiramdam* is a critical and vital characteristic within the Filipino value system. Figure 2 illustrates the constructs of *hiya*, *utang na loob*, *pakikisama*, *kapwa*, and *pakiramdam*. 
Figure 2. Filipino Value Framework
Colonial Mentality and Kapwa

In reviewing the concept of CM and Filipinos and Filipino Americans, CM refers to “automatic” preference for anything American or Western and an “automatic” rejection of anything Filipino (David, 2013). There is a relationship between CM and the extent that Filipinos and Filipino Americans regard Western and American values and the rejection of Filipino values. In other words, individuals with CM may view Filipino values, culture, and behaviors negatively and hold American or Western values in a higher regard (David, 2013). For instance, Filipino Americans may view newly arrived immigrants as not as educated or different. This individual may refer to the newly arrived immigrants as “FOBs” (Fresh Off the Boat), a negative remark, referring to an individual as not being “Americanized.” Because of this, individuals with CM will begin to separate themselves from identifying as Filipino and look down upon other Filipinos. Enriquez (1994) argued that once an individual begins to separate themselves from others and rejects being Filipino, one loses their kapwa—the essence of being a person and the core of being Filipino.

This rejection of humanity or being Filipino stems from parents, relatives, and social networks that have already weakened their own kapwa (David, 2013; Nadal, 2013). In other words, Filipinos’ and Filipino Americans’ ethnic identity have already been influenced at an early age (Nadal, 2013). Filipino American children with parents and/or grandparents who have CM and who may have lost their sense of kapwa may influence their children’s own ethnic identity and perpetuate the inferiority of being Filipino. David (2013) pointed out that “Filipinos that have covert CM separate themselves from other Filipinos because it may remind them of their own inferiority” (p. 115). For instance,
Filipinos begin to deny their Filipino heritage and culture because they are embarrassed about being Filipino. They may begin to perceive *kapwa* as unnecessary or embarrassing (David, 2013). Consequently, they no longer identify as being Filipino or Filipino American but identify as Asians or Americans. David (2013) posited that the identification from being Filipino to Asian or American is the result of the long colonial history with Spain and the U.S.

While this separation from being Filipino to Asian or American is covert, David (2013) noted that overt CM is when Filipinos begin to discriminate against others who are perceived to be too Filipino or who are not American or Western enough (p. 116). For instance, Filipinos or Filipinos Americans make fun of or tease newly arrived immigrants. Unlike covert CM, Filipinos or Filipino Americans are explicit about how they feel about FOBs. They make fun of their accents or inability to speak English accent free. Moreover, they make fun of how they dress and what type of clothes they wear. They do not want to associate with the “FOBs.” Filipinos or Filipino Americans who possess the overt CM tend to perceive themselves Americanized and better than the FOBs (i.e., “I speak better English,” “I can’t stand those FOBs; they are embarrassing,” or “I have lighter skin”). These explicit messages further separate Filipinos from others, which weakens their *kapwa*.

Besides badmouthing FOBs, Filipinos or Filipino Americans continue to loss their *kapwa* through avoiding family functions or cultural events. Participating in these events is perceived as being “too Filipino” or embarrassing (*nakakahiya*). As these feelings of shame and embarrassment continue to grow stronger, Filipinos and Filipino Americans may not help out the Filipino community or have anything to do with the community. For example, it is common for Filipino families to help newly arrived immigrant Filipino families adjust
to the new country. Generally, Filipino families will let the newly arrived families stay in their homes until they are able to secure a job and find a home. Filipinos or Filipino Americans with CM may not want to offer their homes or help them in anyway. As David (2013) highlighted, parents, relatives, and friends begin to perceive Filipinos or Filipino Americans with CM as someone who does not have gratitude (*walang utang na loob*) and one who does not know how to get along with others (*walang pakisama*) (p. 117). Filipinos and Filipino Americans who hold CM lack the surface values of *kapwa*: *Hiya, Utang na loob*, and *Pakikisama* (David, 2013).

As mentioned earlier, Filipinos come from a culture based on collectivism, where there is a group effort to help one another and maintain harmony. On the other hand, the Western culture is the opposite because it is more individualistic and independent. *Hiya, utang na loob*, and *pakikisama* are values that are deep within the Filipino culture. *Kapwa* is the core of the Filipino value system. David (2013) argued that Filipinos or Filipino Americans whose sense of *kapwa* is lost is the result of the colonial mentality. When Filipino or Filipino Americans have negative feelings about their culture and ethnicity, it affects their *kapwa* (core). These individuals begin to feel that *kapwa* is unnecessary, and they begin to deny their ethnicity as Filipinos. Consequently, the CM affects the surface values of *utang na loob*, *hiya*, and *pakikisama*. These individuals begin to separate themselves from Filipino culture and community. Nadal (2013) postulated that parents, family, and social networks that have CM significantly pass on the CM to their children. The CM is a cycle and has significant implications that disconnect Filipinos and/or Filipino Americans to the core values, which in essence is their connection to humanity. The following section will focus on collective self-esteem.
Collective Culture and Self-Esteem

According to social identity theory, the self-concept has two distinct components: a personal identity and a social identity (Tajfel, 1982; Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Personal identity is an individual’s belief about his or her traits and attributes. Tajfel (1981) defined social identity (collective identity) as “that aspect of the individual’s self-concept which derives from their knowledge of their membership in a social group together with the value and emotional significance attached to that membership” (p. 255). In other words, individuals are concerned with the characteristics of one’s groups or how others perceive them.

Collective self-esteem (CSE) is a construct that refers to several content areas of ethnic identity (Gupta, Rogers-Sirin, Okazaki, Ryce, & Sirin, 2014). Luhtanen and Crocker (1992) conceptualized collective self-esteem with four domains: (a) membership esteem (how worthy one feels within the group), (b) private CSE (beliefs about the value of the group), (c) public CSE (beliefs about how others view one’s group), and (d) importance to identity (importance of group membership to self-concept). According Liang and Fassinger (2008), studies that used diverse samples have yielded results that indicate CSE contributes to psychological well-being. For instance, Crocker, Luhtanen, Blaine, & Broadnax (1994) found that Asian American’s private CSE was positively related to personal self-esteem. Another study found that same ethnicity peers and ethnic communities were positively related to evaluation of the self as a worthy member of ethnic groups (Kim & Lee, 2011).

Much of the research focuses on personal self-esteem and individual’s motivation to maintain a positive personal identity or “personal self-esteem,” and researchers have
argued that the collective aspects also contribute to feelings of self-worth (Crocker & Luhtanen, 1990; Crocker et al., 1994). In the context of the educational setting, the primary focus is on the individual’s self-worth, motivation, and accomplishments. Individuals are recognized for the achievements through awards and merits. The focus is on maintaining a positive personal identity (Crocker & Luhtanen, 1990). For instance, educators invite guest speakers to try to motivate and inspire students. These guest speakers are individuals who achieved some type of degree or advanced in a career. Despite the challenges these individuals have faced, they are perceived to have “made it.” The message that is being presented is that, “I made it, so can you.” The focus is on the “I” as opposed to the “we.” In a study conducted by Monzon (1984) he examined the relationship between Filipino college students’ self-esteem and academic performance. The study revealed no significant relationship between self-esteem and academic performance. Instead, Monzon (1984) found that students’ personal self-esteem was related to perceived aspects of the family environment (p. 239). In other words, there is a strong relationship between family and academic performance among Filipino college students (Chiong, 1997; Heras & Revilla, 1994; Monzon, 1984).

Social identity theory posits that individuals are motivated to achieve or maintain a high level of self-esteem (Crocker & Luhtanen, 1990; Greenwald, 1980; Rosenberg, 1979; Taylor & Brown, 1988; Tesser & Campbell, 1983; Willis, 1981). In other words, the primary concern with social identity theory is the motivation to maintain a positive social identity (i.e., collective self-esteem). A study conducted by Crocker and Luhtanen (1990) examined individuals’ high and low collective self-esteem. This study attempted to assess whether scores on the trait collective self-esteem scale moderate reactions to threats (i.e., racial and
ethnic comments) to social identity (Crocker & Luhtanen, 1990). The study revealed people who are high in collective self-esteem may be more likely to engage in self-enhancing or in-group enhancing social comparisons following threat(s) (Crocker & Luhtanen, 1990). One of the limitations of the study was that the collective self-esteem scale has not been validated, but Crocker and Luhtanen (1990) do acknowledge this shortcoming.

There has been a significant amount of research on personal self-esteem and happiness. Recently, researchers have shifted their attention to collective self-esteem rather than the personal self, such as individuals or unique personalities (Crocker et al., 1994; Katz, Joiner, & Kwon, 2002). Moreover, a body of literature has positively linked collective self-esteem with personal self-esteem (Lay & Verkuyten, 1999), life satisfaction (Zhang & Leung, 2002), ethnic identity (Giang & Wittig, 2006; Kim & Omizo, 2006), and well-being (Crocker et al., 1994). Researchers have also found that collective self-esteem serves a protective factor from the harmful effects of racial discrimination (Liang & Fassinger, 2008).

A study conducted by Kim and Lee (2011) examined the interactions of individual and contextual variables (immigration generation statues and cultural identification) with collective self-esteem among Asian American college students. One of the things that the researchers found was that age was significantly associated with membership esteem (Kim & Lee, 2011). In other words, older students were perceived as worthy members of the Asian group. Moreover, collective self-esteem was related to the presence of same-ethnicity peers and the availability of Asian-American community members (p. 1030). Asian American college students that are surrounded by other Asian Americans felt better
about themselves. One of the limitations was the sample was limited to colleges where there was a significant number of Asian/Asian American college students. The researchers pointed out that the study would not be able to generalize to other Asian American students (i.e., other college campuses with low number of Asian American college students). The other limitation was that half of the respondents were Chinese, so the findings are only valid for that particularly Asian American group (Kim & Lee, 2011).

Another study conducted by Liang and Fassinger (2008) examined the role of collective self-esteem as a moderator and mediator between racism related stress and psychological adjustments among Asian American college students. CSE was not found to moderate the effects of racism-related stress on self-esteem, interpersonal problems, and career problems (Liang & Fassinger, 2008). One of the limitations of this study was the geographic location, which was in the mid-Atlantic region. The other limitation was the demographic data, which was composed of more than half East Asians. Consequently, the data could be generalized to the East Asian group.

As schools and communities become more diverse (i.e., language, culture, and immigration generation), it is critical that educators and clinical workers be mindful of one’s culture of origin (Gupta et al., 2014). Much of the literature regarding self-concept is shifting towards examining the collective self as opposed to the personal self. While the individual accomplishments and achievements are recognized, we need to shift our attention to a more collective approach. Gupta et al. (2014) suggested that clinical workers should strive to help Latino and Asian adolescents develop a strong sense of collective self-esteem through participating in activities within their communities and developing relationships within their ethnic group (p. 228). Educators also play a pivotal role in
helping students foster a strong sense of collective self-esteem. Since collective self-esteem is connected to ethnic identity, the following section will focus on the ethnic identity.

**Ethnic Identity**

According to the United States Census Bureau (2000), approximately 20% of the United States population consists of people from ethnic minority backgrounds. Moreover, the racial and ethnic landscape of the United States will increase over the next few decades (United States Census Bureau, 2009). As the United States population is rapidly changing, it is important to understand how ethnic identity plays a role in the lives of individuals (Umaña-Taylor, 2004). A number of theoretical models have described the way in which different American-born, ethnic minorities, and immigrants in the U.S. develop an ethnic identity (Kim & Lee, 2011). Ethnic identity is framed by the way in which individuals identify consciously or unconsciously with those whom they feel a connection through similar traditions, behaviors, values, and beliefs (Ott, 1989). Moreover, these connections help individuals make sense of the world around them (Chavez & Guido-DiBrito, 1999, p. 41). Researchers postulated that ethnic identity has been associated with academic achievement (Arellano & Padilla, 1996), higher self-esteem (Roberts et al., 1999; Umaña-Taylor, 2004), and psychological well-being (Phinney, 2003; Roberts et al., 1999; Umaña-Taylor, Diversi, & Fine, 2002).

Social identity (Tajfel, 1981) and Erikson’s (1968) theory of identity development are among the salient foundational theories of ethnic identity (Phinney, 1992; Umaña-Taylor, 2004). Social identity (Tajfel, 1981) focuses on a sense of belonging to a group and attitudes and feelings that accompany a sense of group membership. Moreover, social identity theory suggests that group identity is an important component of self-concept.
(Roberts et al., 1999). In other words, people attribute value to the group to which they belong and develop a stronger self-esteem because they belong to a particular group. According to the social identity theory (Tajfel, 1981), individuals’ self-concepts are derived from knowing that they are members of a particular social group (Umaña-Taylor, 2004). Moreover, Phinney (1992) pointed out that ethnic identity is an individual’s social identity that is acquired from membership in their ethnic group and their attachment to that group. The construct of social identity has been widely utilized in studying adults (Roberts et al., 1999), whereas ethnic identity has been used with adolescents (Phinney, 1992). Researchers have consistently found a positive relationship between ethnic identity and self-esteem among ethnic-minority adolescents (Phinney, 1992; Umaña-Taylor, 2004).

Aside from Tajfel’s (1981) social identity theory, ethnic identity is derived from Erickson’s (1968) identity formation theory and identity status theory (Kroger & Marcia, 2011). According to Erikson (1968), identity formation is a process of exploration and commitment in adolescents. In the early stages of identity formation, adolescents lack the awareness of identity and go through the exploration and commitment process of identity (Roberts et al., 1999). Modeled after Erikson’s identity formation theory (1968), Phinney’s (1989) ethnic identity three-stage model (See Table 2.1) begins with the person’s lack of understanding of his/her ethnicity. The first stage, unexamined ethnic identity, is characterized by a lack of exploration. In this stage, individuals may experience diffusion or foreclosure, a lack of interest in ethnicity, or a general acceptance of others opinions. The second stage of the model, ethnic identity search, combines the notions of encounter and exploration. The individual starts to develop their ethnic identity during this stage that is often initiated by a harsh or indirect event. According to Roberts et al. (1999), ideally
this phase leads to the final stage of the model, which is ethnic identity achievement. Individuals at this stage have a clear sense of their ethnic identity and are able to successfully navigate their bicultural identity. It is important to note that Phinney (1989) developed the three-stage model based on her research with adolescents and that college students have a different set of challenges and support that may affect the theory’s applicability. Thus, the final phase of “achieved ethnic identity” (Phinney, 1989; Roberts et al., 1999; Umaña-Taylor, 2004) is characterized by an individual that has committed to an ethnicity with an understanding of the implications and having a strong sense of group membership. Phinney (1992) argued that as individuals move into the advanced stages of racial/ethnic identity development, they develop a strong sense of security and begin to appreciate various cultures.

Table 2.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stages of Ethnic Identity Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phinney (1989)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unexamined Ethnic Identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of exploration of ethnicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two subtypes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Diffusion: Lack of interest or concerns with ethnicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Foreclosure: Views of ethnicity based on others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Identity Search (Moratorium)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in exploring and seeking to understand ethnicity to oneself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieved ethnic identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear, confident of own ethnicity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the literature on ethnic identity has focused on Latinos and African Americans, few studies have examined the ethnic identity among Filipinos. However, a
study by Kiang and Takeuchi (2009) examined the link between phenotypes (skin tone, physical features) and outcomes (income, psychical health, and psychological distress) among Filipino Americans. Ethnic identity was investigated as a protective moderator of phenotype bias (Kiang & Takeuchi, 2009). In other words, ethnic identity was found to moderate the link between physical features and distress among Filipino Americans. The study revealed that Filipino Americans who had darker skin tones were linked to lower income and health (Kiang & Takeuchi, 2009). However, more ethnic phenotypes appeared to be linked with less distress (Kiang & Takeuchi, 2009, p. 441). From a social identity perspective (Tajfel, 1981), the strength or social support that can arise out of one’s ethnic identity could serve as a moderator and/or protect against negative experiences. The study revealed that a strong ethnic identity was found to moderate the link between phenotype and distress (Kiang & Takeuchi, 2009).

As Kiang & Takeuchi (2009) highlighted the importance of a strong ethnic identity, it is critical to understand what factors contribute to the formation of a healthy ethnic identity. Huang and Stormshak (2011) postulated that the formation of a healthy ethnic identity is dependent on one’s early experiences with one’s parents. Parents influence and pass on their ethnic identity to their children through parenting (Inman, Howard, Beaumont, & Walker, 2007). As Nadal (2013) highlighted that Filipino parents with CM can influence their child’s ethnic identity, parents who teach and prepare their children to live in a diverse world are more likely to have a higher level of ethnic identity and skills to cope with racial and ethnic discrimination (Huang & Stormshak, 2011; Phinney & Chavira, 1992; Umaña-Taylor, Vargas-Chanes, Garcia, & Gonzales-Backen, 2008). Moreover, studies have revealed that if youth receive positive messages about their ethnicity through their parents
and community members, they are more likely to develop positive relationships with others from their own ethnic background (Huang & Stormshak, 2011; Umaña-Taylor et al., 2008).

Ethnic identity is a critical component of identity development for people of color. Moreover, the literature indicates that there is a relationship between ethnic identity and academic achievement (Arellano & Padilla, 1996). The next section will examine the functionalist perspective lens.

**Functionalism**

Functionalists argue that all societies require that their members perform different tasks (Feinberg & Soltis, 2009). In order for a society to function and operate, the “selection, socialization, and training processes are necessary for its members to ensure that certain task in society gets done” (Feinberg & Soltis, 2009, p. 14). The fundamental function of schools is to socialize students to adapt to the economic, political, and social institutions of society (Feinberg & Soltis, 2009, p. 6). Functionalists believe that the school furthers the selection of individuals on the basis of merit and talent but ignores race, sex, religion, and cultural background.

One primary function of schools is to facilitate the socialization of students through cultural assimilation (Feinberg & Soltis, 2009). Assimilation refers to an individual or group, usually a subordinate one, who then becomes part of the dominant group. For instance, Filipinos that immigrate to the U.S. assimilate through not speaking their native language and they (Filipinos that immigrate) adopt the English language, develop a negative attitude towards their own group, dress differently, and adopt the attitudes and norms of the dominant culture or society. At the school level, this practice of cultural
assimilation is pervasive and transparent. For example, the curriculum that minority students are exposed to focuses on U.S. history. Yet, the curriculum on Filipino, Mexican, African, and Pacific Islander history is minimal or non-existent. Aside from learning the U.S. history curriculum, students are expected to learn and adopt the English language when they are in school. When students enter the classroom, they must speak, read, and write in English. In the case of English Learners (EL) students, they are expected to read, write, and speak English within five years. Once they are proficient in English, EL students have “reclassified” from the program.

There have been significant moments in history that provided hope for marginalized communities of color. The continued effort of marginalized communities to come together and advocate for the same rights and privileges for their children is critical. The unjust and unfair educational practices are reminders that there is more work to do. Scholars and researchers have examined racial issues through the CRT framework. While there has been progress for African American and Latino communities, Filipinos and Southeast Asians are left out of the education discourse. In reviewing the literature, research remains invisible and sparse. Additionally, there are inadequate empirical studies on the Asian American Pacific Islanders (AAPIs) subpopulation (David & Okazaki, 2006a; Monzon, 2003; Nadal, 2004).

As indicated in the literature, AAPI have been categorized as one group. There are more than 48 different ethnic groups within the AAPI category (Teranishi, 2010). Moreover, each ethnic group has their own social, historical, and cultural experience (Pang, Han, & Pang, 2011; Teranishi, 2010). More specifically, Filipinos have been racialized as Asians or Asian Americans. This is problematic because the complex history of Filipinos
makes them uniquely different from other Asians. For instance, the dominant religion is Catholicism in the Philippines, while neighboring countries practice Confucianism or Buddhism (Tuason et al., 2007). In addition to the complex history, the contemporary experiences of Filipinos are different from Asians or Asian Americans. According to Okamura (1998), Filipino Americans have been discriminated against by other Asians. For instance, Filipinos are stereotyped as uncivilized, unintelligent, and a criminal. In one study, Teranishi (2002) found that educators had lower academic expectations for Filipino students compared to Chinese students.

Current Trends of Filipinos in the U.S.

In 2010, California led the nation with the largest minority population (22.3 million people). According to the U.S Census Bureau (2010), Asians were the fastest group that grew from 2000 to 2010. In 2000, the Asian population was 10.2 million, and in 2010 that number grew to 14.7 million. The definition used to identify Asians by the Census Bureau is “a person having origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East, Southeast Asia, or the Indian subcontinent, including Cambodia, China, India, Japan, Korea, Malaysia, Pakistan, the Philippines Islands, Thailand, and Vietnam” (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010). By definition, Filipinos are lumped and racialized into the Asian category. Currently, there are 2.4 million Filipinos in the United States, which makes them the second largest “Asian” group (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010). Other estimates find that there are 3.2 million Filipinos in the United States, of whom 10% are undocumented (Buenvista, 2010; U.S. Census Bureau, 2007).

The homogenization of Filipinos into the Asian category is problematic. Asians and Asian American have been labeled as the model minority. This stereotype obscures the academic, linguistic, and economic challenges that Asian and Asian Americans students face
in K-12 and college (Teranishi et al., 2009). The experiences of the different Asian ethnic
groups have been disguised by this stereotype. Filipinos have a rich history that makes
them uniquely different from other Asians or Asian Americans. Filipinos are different from
Asians because of skin color, physical characteristics, colonization, language, and religion
(Nadal, 2004). Filipinos are darker and identify themselves as “brown” (Nadal, 2004).
Besides the physical characteristics, their background is a fusion of aboriginal Pilipino
roots, with Spanish and American cultures and traces of Malay, Muslim, East Asian, Pacific
Islander, and Indonesian (Nadal, 2004).

There is a significant number of Filipinos that live in California and Hawaii
(Buenavista, 2010; Lai & Arguelles, 2003). In the 2010 U.S. Census, the highest proportion
of Filipinos lived in California (43%) compared to other states. Approximately 182,000
Filipinos live in San Diego, Carlsbad, and San Marcos areas (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010). San
Diego is the home of Filipinos because of the naval bases (Dela Cruz & Agbayani-Siewart,
2003; Espiritu, 2003).

**Demographics of San Diego Unified School District in 2012**

Table 2.2 illustrates the enrollment and dropout rate for students enrolled in San
Diego Unified School District for the 2012 school year. Latinos are the largest group
(46.1%) followed by Whites (23.3%). There were 10.8% African Americans, 8.4% Asians,
5.6% Filipinos, .7% Native Hawaiians/Pacific Islanders, and .3% American Indians
(California Department of Education, 2013).
Table 2.2.

_San Diego Unified School District Student Profile 2012_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Dropout Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_Note_. -- there were less than 10 students.

In the San Diego Unified School District, Latino students had the highest dropout rate (9.9%) followed by Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islanders (7.8%). The dropout for African Americans was 7%, Asians 4.2%, Filipinos 2.6%, and Whites 2.1%. While Latinos had the highest dropout rate in San Diego Unified, Filipinos, Native Hawaiians/Pacific Islanders, African Americans, and Asians had a significant number of dropouts in the 2012 school year. Yet, Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders are invisible in education research and discourse (Buenavista, 2010; Museus & Maramba, 2010; Nadal, 2008; Teranishi, 2010) despite these alarming statistics. The subsequent section will contextualize the educational attainment of Filipinos and Asian Americans.

**The Educational Attainment of Filipinos and Asians**

There are discrepancies when examining the educational attainment of Filipinos (Museus & Maramba, 2010). The educational attainment of Filipinos living in San Diego over the age of 25 for obtaining high school diploma was 17.9% (U.S. Census Bureau, 2011); 36.5% of Filipinos living in San Diego had some college or an associate’s degree, and
31.8% of Filipinos have a bachelor's degree. Some Filipino scholars argue that this number is incorrect because there is a large number of Filipinos who have already completed college in the Philippines and immigrated to the United States (Nadal, 2008). Only 5.8% of Filipinos have professional or graduate degrees (U.S. Census Bureau 2010).

The educational attainment of Chinese living in San Diego over the age of 25 for obtaining a high school diploma was 10.4%; 16.9% of Chinese had some college or associate’s degree, and 29.9% had a bachelor’s degree. Chinese living in San Diego were six times (31.7%) more likely to have a graduate or professional degree when compared to only 5.8% of Filipinos. The disparity with high school diploma and bachelor’s degree can be attributed to the low number of Chinese over 25 years of age living in San Diego (40,586).

Koreans living in San Diego share similar educational characteristics as Chinese. 11% of Koreans had obtained a high school diploma; 6.9% earned an Associate’s degree, and 40.7% of Koreans earned a bachelor’s degree. Also, 23.2% of Koreans in San Diego earned a graduate or professional degree. That rate is four times higher than the rate for Filipinos who have earned a graduate or professional degree. In addition, 4.5% of Asian Indians have high school diplomas, and 9.1% of Asian Indians have some college or an associate’s degree and 28.5% have a bachelor’s degree. Moreover, 53.8% of Asian Indians have a graduate or professional degree compared to 5.8% of Filipinos.

**Conclusion**

There are disparities when examining Filipino Americans and educational data at the national and state level (Museus & Maramba, 2010). As the literature reviewed highlighted, there is a significant number of Filipinos that reside in California and Hawaii. However, Filipinos are least represented at four-year institutions when compared to other
racial groups and other Asian Americans (Okamura, 2008). Additionally, there is an underrepresentation of Filipinos at selective colleges and universities compared to other Asian Americans (Museus & Maramba, 2010). For instance, Teranishi (2010) examined more than 18,000 Asian American Pacific Islander college students and found that 38% of Koreans, 26% of Japanese, and 34.6% of Chinese Americans attended selective colleges, and only 18.5% of Filipinos attend the selective institutions.

While there is a significant number of Filipinos with bachelor’s degrees, Nadal (2008) argues that many Filipinos have already obtained their degrees from the Philippines prior to immigrating to the United States. The number of Filipinos who hold bachelor’s degrees is misleading for scholars. Museus & Maramba (2010) and Vea (2013) argued that Filipinos have been invisible in postsecondary education research. Yeh (2002) argued that assumptions made about AAPI college students as the model minority are based on aggregated data or data collected on three groups: Chinese, Japanese, and Koreans. Furthermore, the absence of Filipino faculty at the college level can be attributed to the lack of Filipinos not obtaining graduate or professional degrees (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010).

As evident in the review of the literature, Filipinos remain invisible in empirical studies (David & Okazaki, 2006a; Monzon, 2003; Nadal, 2004). Despite the large number of Filipinos in California, their school experiences have been masked by the racialization as Asians or Asian Americans. Scholars and researchers argue that it is critical to disaggregate AAPI data because of the complexity of each group (Teranishi, 2010; Vea, 2013). Moreover, AAPI cohorts are not homogenous, and their social, cultural, and educational experiences are virtually different from each other (Teranishi, Ceja, Antonio, Allen, & McDonough,
There is a dire need for more research on the school experiences of Filipinos. The voices, struggles, and stories of the Filipino community must be heard.
Chapter 3: Methodology

This chapter provides an overview of the methods used in this study. Included is the description of the study design, approach, recruitment of participants, quantitative phase, qualitative phase, mixed methods phase, researcher’s skills, and summary.

Study Design

The purpose of this study is to examine Filipino college students’ perspective on colonial mentality, collective self-esteem, and ethnic identity. Using a two-phase approach, a sequential explanatory mixed methods design was used. The first phase was collecting and analyzing quantitative data. The second phase included a qualitative focus group, case studies, and research journal field notes and journal reflection. Lastly, merging the quantitative and qualitative data provided deeper and more thorough understanding of the experiences of Filipino college students in Southern California.

Approach

Creswell and Plano (2011) defined sequential explanatory design as “methods implemented sequentially, starting with quantitative data collection and analysis followed by qualitative data collection and analysis” (p. 73). The purpose of using mixed methods is to provide and contribute greater validity (Bryman, 2006) to the study. Bryman (2006) defines greater validity as combining both quantitative and qualitative research to triangulate the findings of the study. Using both quantitative and qualitative data provides an in-depth analysis as opposed to only using one research method. But more importantly, this approach contributed to developing the scant literature regarding the academic, personal, and familial struggle of Filipinos.
During the first phase of the study, quantitative data using three surveys were used to answer the research questions. More specifically, this included psychometric tests describing students’ self-reported levels of colonial mentality and ethnic identity. In addition, bivariate correlations were used to assess the relationship between colonial mentality, ethnic identity, and academic success and college choice. Regression analyses were used to assess various predictors of academic success of Filipino students. Data collected from the first phase were used to purposefully select participants for the second phase of the study.

During the second phase of this study, qualitative methodology was used through semi-structured focus groups, case studies, and research journal field notes and journal reflections. The purpose of the focus group was to provide Filipino college students an opportunity to share their perspectives regarding their experiences with the colonial mentality, ethnic identity, and collective self-esteem. Case studies served as an opportunity for students to reflect on their personal stories and narratives as Filipinos. Lastly, research field notes and journals were used to record the researcher’s reflections and observations during this process.

**Study Participants**

The target population for this study was Filipinos attending one of the following three campuses: University of California (UC), California State University (CSU), and California Community College (CCC). All three college campuses were located in Southern California. Participants in the study met the following criteria: (a) Filipino, (b) enrolled at one of the three California college systems, and (c) age 18 years old or older.
Given that there is a significant amount of Filipinos residing in California, it was appropriate to recruit from the three types of college campuses. In 2012, the University of California enrollment for Filipinos was 8,828 (males = 3,984 and females = 4,844). The Filipino enrollment in 2013 at the California State University was 5,006 (males = 2,355 and females = 2,651). The California Community College enrollment in 2013 for Filipinos was 65,902 (males = 31,968 and females = 33,934).

**Recruitment of Participants**

Recruitment was conducted by contacting advisors and presidents of Filipino student organizations at the three California college and university systems. The researcher identified the advisors and presidents/board members through the student organization websites and social media sites (i.e., Twitter, Facebook). The purpose of contacting the advisors and presidents/board members was to establish a relationship and inform them of the study. After the researcher met with the advisors and presidents/board members, the researcher and presidents/board members selected a time and day for the researcher to meet with students to present the study. Once a date was established, the researcher attended the meeting(s) and announced the study with a five-minute script (see Appendix A). The researcher provided the board members with the survey link to send it to the student organization list serve. Students had the opportunity to fill out the survey at their convenience. In addition to meeting with student organizations, the researcher met with three professors who taught a Filipino course at UC, CSU, and CCC campuses. The researcher shared the purpose of the study and provided the professors with the survey link. The professors helped disseminate the survey to their students in their classes. In addition to working with faculty and the student organizations, the researcher used a non-
probability sampling technique known as snowball sampling. Snowball sampling is a technique used to gain access to the Filipino population.

Recruitment for the focus group was conducted through the participants’ responses on the survey. At the end of the survey, there was a section for interested participants to fill out their name, address, email, and phone number. After analyzing the data, the researcher contacted the participants and invited them to attend the focus group. The researcher asked the students which days and times worked best for them and informed them that the researcher would be contacting them in the next few days to confirm a time, day, and location (see Appendix B).

At the end of the focus group, students were asked if they were willing to participate in a case study. The researcher contacted the willing students with the following script (see Appendix C). The case studies involved just the researcher and participant. Of those that indicated they would be willing to participate, the researcher and participants set up a time and location to meet. A series of questions guided this interview, but the researcher encouraged participants to speak about their own stories with respect to family, personal, and social experiences.

**Phase I: Quantitative**

The Phase I: Quantitative section describes the sample, quantitative data collection, Instrumentation: Colonial Mentality Scale (CMS-I), reliability, Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM), Collective Self-Esteem (CSE) instrument, quantitative data analysis, and reliability and validity.
Sample

Initially, the target participants were second-generation Filipinos. However, due to the responses on the survey the generations ranged from first- to fourth-generation Filipinos. For the selection of study participants the initial demographic survey (Appendix D) was used. The college students who identified as persons of Filipino/a heritage and as Filipino students were invited to participate in the study. A consent form (see Appendix E) was used to secure their participation. The participants were recruited from various Filipino-focused student organizations and Filipino courses that were offered at the selected UC, CSU, and CCC. For this study, the researcher surveyed 100 Filipino/a college students. Using quantitative data, in the first phase of the study, provided insight into college-age students' perceptions on identity and colonial mentality and yielded exploratory patterns of how the selected participants across three university systems (UC, CSU, CCC) viewed themselves.

Quantitative Data Collection

The researcher met with the advisor(s) and president(s) of the student organization(s) to discuss the purpose of the study. During this meeting, the researcher provided the club president(s) and advisor(s) with the survey link to distribute to students of the organization. Attached to the survey link was a description of the study for participants to read (Appendix E). The survey consisted of demographic questions and three validated surveys (see Appendix F, G, and H). The colonial mentality scale (David, 2008) measures levels of colonial mentality and ethnic identity (Phinney, 1992), which examines individuals' perception of their ethnic identity. The collective self-esteem instrument (Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992) measures the attitudes and feelings of one's social
group. Participants were asked to provide their current college Grade Point Average (GPA) to assess their academic progress.

An online survey was created using Qualtrics. Participants were informed in the consent form that their answers would be kept confidential and that there were no correct or incorrect answers. The survey asked their opinions about colonial mentality, ethnic identity, and collective self-esteem. The last part of the survey asked for volunteers to participate in a focus group. Those who volunteered to participate in the focus group were asked to fill out the last page of the survey providing their name, address, phone number, and email so they can be contacted for the interview.

**Instrumentation: Colonial Mentality Scale (CMS-I)**

In order to answer the research questions, the researcher collected data through the Colonial Mentality Scale (CMS-I). The CMS is a 36-item measure that “intends to assess feelings, opinions, attitudes and behaviors that are believed to be common Colonial Mentality (CM) manifestations among Filipino Americans” (David & Okazaki, 2006b, p. 243). David and Okazaki (2006b) postulated that CM among Filipino Americans is a form of internalized oppression. CM is characterized by a perception of ethnic and cultural inferiority and is a consequence of colonization under Spain and the United States (David & Okazaki, 2006b). Moreover, CM involves rejecting anything that is Filipino and idolizing anything that is American. David and Okazaki (2006b) identified four common themes of CM manifestations:

1. Denigration of Filipino self (feelings of inferiority, shame, resentment, self-hate about being a person of Filipino heritage);
2. Denigration of Filipino culture or body (the perception that Filipinos are inferior to anything White, European, or American (e.g., culture, physical characteristics, and language);

3. Discriminating against less Americanized Filipinos (distancing oneself from being Filipino and identifying more as American);

4. Tolerating historical and contemporary oppression of Filipinos and Filipino Americans (oppression is accepted because the mistreatment of Filipinos helped them become “civilized”).

In a validation study by David and Okazaki (2006b), the researchers found that CM was associated with psychological well-being and mental health of Filipino Americans. The CM is a validated scale that is not only applicable to Filipinos, but to other groups that have experienced colonialism (David & Okazaki, 2006b). David (2013) concluded that the CMS-I was a valid and reliable scale for capturing the feelings, opinions, behaviors, and attitudes of the colonial mentality.

**Reliability**

In order to ensure reliability of the CMS-I, Cronbach’s alpha reliability was performed. The CMS-I is a 36-item scale that measures an individual’s attitudes, beliefs, and opinions related to the colonial mentality of Filipino/as. Table 3.1 shows the Cronbach’s alpha score for the CMS-I and subscales. The Cronbach’s alpha for the total CMS-I was .90. The Within Group Discrimination alpha was .87, physical characteristics was .89, colonial debt was .81, cultural shame was .63, and internalized cultural was .75.
Table 3.1

*Cronbach’s Alpha Reliability Analysis for Colonial Mentality Scale and Subscales*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Valid Cases</th>
<th>α</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colonial Mentality Scale</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Group Discrimination</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Characteristics</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonial Debt</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Shame/Embarrassment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalized Cultural/Ethnic Inferiority</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even though the MEIM is a reliable instrument and has been widely used, the researcher conducted Cronbach’s alpha to ensure internal consistency for this study. Table 3.2 shows the Cronbach’s alpha for the MEIM (α = .87), which indicates a good internal consistency.

Table 3.2

*Cronbach’s Alpha Reliability Analysis for Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Valid Cases</th>
<th>α</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEIM Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3 shows the Cronbach’s alpha for the CSES and subscales. The results of the Cronbach’s alpha were too low. For example when looking at the public self-esteem subscale the alpha was .005. The alpha for the membership self-esteem was .28, the
private self was .36, and importance to identity was .52. Based on the findings, it was
decided the CSES subscales would not be used in this study.

Table 3.3

*Cronbach’s Alpha Reliability Analysis for Collective Self-Esteem and Subscales*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Valid Cases</th>
<th>( \alpha )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Membership Self-Esteem</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Self-Esteem</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Self-Esteem</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance to Identity</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM)**

In addition to using the CMS-I, the researcher used the Multigroup Ethnic Identity
Measure (MEIM). The MEIM is a 12-item Likert scale. Phinney (1992) developed the
MEIM, a questionnaire designed to measure ethnic identity as a generalized experience
across ethnic groups in the United States. The MEIM has been widely used by researchers
and social scientists to measure ethnic identity among diverse groups and adolescents
(Phinney, 1992; Roberts et al., 1999).

**Collective Self-Esteem (CSE)**

The last instrument was the Collective Self Esteem (Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992). The
CSE is a 16-item, seven point Likert scale measure that asks participants to think about
their feelings towards their own social groups (i.e., race, gender, religion, and ethnicity).
The scale includes a four item subscale: Membership esteem assesses individuals’
judgments of how worthy they are as members of their social group; Private CSE measures
one’s personal judgments of how good their social groups are; Public CSE assesses one’s judgments of how positively other people evaluate one’s social group; and Importance to Identity assesses how important one’s social group membership is to self-concept.

**Quantitative Data Analysis**

Once the data was collected, the researcher analyzed the data using Statistical Program for Social Sciences (SPSS). The researcher performed descriptive analysis (means, standard deviations, and variances of responses). Table 3.4 summarizes the approach to the study and how this study answered the research questions.

Table 3.4

*Quantitative Research Questions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Statistical Procedures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is the relationship between ethnic identity, colonial mentality, and academic success, college choice, among Filipino young adults?</td>
<td>Scores from CMS-I, MEIM, grade point average, and current college attending</td>
<td>Bivariate Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a difference between self-reported levels of colonial mentality among second-generation Filipino students that attend University, State, and Community colleges?</td>
<td>CMS-I Current school level</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are elements of colonial mentality, social class, or levels of ethnicity predictors of academic success in college? If so, to what degree do these impact on academic success?</td>
<td>Scores from CMS-I, self reported GPA</td>
<td>Multiple Regressions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reliability and Validity

In order to conduct quality research, it is important to establish the reliability and validity for the surveys used in the study. Reliability is referred to as consistency (Mertens, 2005). In other words, is what the researcher measures consistent over repeated testing? According to Huck (2008), assessing the reliability on an instrument can be done in three ways. For this study, the researcher selected an instrument that has demonstrated high reliability in previous studies. The research also performed statistical analysis to measure the internal consistency by using Cronbach’s alpha formula.

Validity is the extent to which the instrument measures what it is intended to measure (Huck, 2008; Mertens, 2005). Even though the CSM-I, MEIM, and CSE have been widely cited and proven to have high levels of validity, the researcher reestablished validity of the instruments used for this study. Content validity was achieved by having colleagues and experts review the CSM-I and MEIM.

Phase II: Qualitative Phase

For the second phase, participants were purposefully selected to provide data to answer the research questions for this study (Creswell & Plano, 2011). The realities and experiences of people are “holistic, multidimensional, and ever-changing; it is not a single, fixed, objective phenomenon waiting to be observed and discovered” (Merriam, 2009, p. 213). During the first phase of the study, students were asked if they would be willing to participate in the focus group. A list of those students and their responses on the CSE, MEIM, and CMS-I were used to identify participants for the focus groups. There were two groups. The first group consisted of six participants (one male and five females). The second group consisted of four participants (three males and one female). The focus group
was small enough so participants’ voices were heard but still large enough to generate themes through the participant’s experiences and responses.

For the case study, three participants were chosen to participate. Participants for the case study were selected from the pool of students based on the responses during the focus group interviews or selected based on their responses on the survey portion of the study. The purpose of the case studies was to engage participants in a rich conversation regarding their personal and educational experiences as Filipino college students. Additionally, the case studies provided the researcher the opportunity to fully explore the complexities of Filipinos’ experiences, which produced authentic and genuine stories.

**Interview Protocols**

For the focus group and case studies, the researcher developed a series of questions that focused on three categories: Filipino college students’ view of themselves? What challenges they have faced as a Filipino or Filipino American? What is their perception of the term colonial mentality? (See Appendix I.) Prior to conducting the focus group, the researcher piloted a focus group with Filipino college students. There were three students that participated in the focus group. The students were recruited from a Filipino student organization. The purpose of piloting the group was to test the qualitative questions (Appendix I). Moreover, the pilot focus group allowed the researcher to reflect on the process and noted any biases or challenges about running a focus group. This process allowed the researcher to modify the initial qualitative questions, so the questions would be more appropriate and designed to align to answer the researcher’s questions.
Qualitative Data Collection

For the focus group, the researcher looked through surveys and identified students who indicated that they would be willing to participate in the study. After analyzing the quantitative data from the first phase, the researcher identified themes and patterns to develop questions for the focus group. The researcher contacted participants via phone and email about participating in the study. In addition, the researcher informed participants that the focus group would be audio recorded. Once the researcher identified the participants, the researcher and the participants established a time and day for the focus group. The researcher provided the 10 participants with a comfortable environment, large enough where the participants and the researcher formed a circle. The researcher began the focus group with helping participants feel safe and explained confidentiality. The researcher asked questions and allowed participants to respond. The researcher did not force students to respond to questions if they were not comfortable answering and gave participants the right to pass. During the focus group, the researcher summarized and clarified statements to ensure that the researcher was capturing the participants’ voices. At the end of the focus group, the researcher asked participants if there was anything else they liked to add. The researcher thanked the participants for taking the time to participate in the study.

For the case study, the researcher asked the participants if they would be willing to participate in a follow-up case study. The researcher explained this part of the study and informed them that it was voluntary. For those who chose to participate, the researcher contacted the participants using the following script to recruit participants (see Appendix C). These interviews took place at the participants’ home, school, or a community setting.
The researcher informed participants that the interview would be recorded and notes would be taken during the interview. The researcher asked questions and allowed participants time to respond. The researcher explicitly stated that he would not force participants to answer questions they were not comfortable answering. The researcher informed the participants that the interview would be in a format of *kuwento* or storytelling. According to Eugenio (1981), *kuwento* is used to communicate daily experiences with family members and the community. The researcher encouraged the participants to share their stories as Filipinos.

The researcher utilized an iPhone application (Voice Memos) and a laptop that included the software Garage Band; these instruments recorded and captured the data of the participants. The use of data collection has changed with the integration of technology (Flick, 2006). Utilizing electronic devices allowed the researcher to be present in the moment for follow-up questioning (Stake, 1995). Being able to connect observational notes, field notes, and interviews allowed the researcher to make connections (Denzin & Lincoln, 2003). Moreover, the researcher was looking to capture narratives that encompassed non-traditional perspectives, participatory advocacy, and self-reflection (Creswell, 2003). The following steps were utilized during and for the preparation of both interview focus group and case study processes (McNamara, 2009).

1. Choose a setting with little distraction; this is important to ensure that the participant was comfortable at their own place of work, home, or community.
2. Explain the purpose of the interview.
3. Address terms of confidentiality; explain to the participants who will have access to their responses and how their answers will be analyzed.
4. Explain the format of the interview. If they should have any questions, have them ask at the beginning or at the end of the interview.

5. Indicate how long the interview will generally take.

6. Inform them how to get a hold of you later if they wanted to.

7. Ask them if they have questions before you both get started with the interview.

8. Do not count on your memory to recall their responses. Remind participants that the interview will be recorded and will be stopped at any time. Inform participants that the researcher will be taking notes during the interview. The notes included information on participants’ body language.

Data Analysis

This section will discuss the data analysis process for both the focus group and case study. According to Patton (2002, p. 432), “the challenge of a qualitative analysis lies with making sense of the significant amount of data.” It is critical to reduce large amounts of data and identify key patterns to communicate findings of the data (Patton, 2002).

Data from both the focus group and case study was transcribed into a word processing file. The goal of qualitative analysis is to make sense out of the data, which involves consolidating, reducing, and interpreting what participants said in the study (Merriam, 2009). The data retrieved must have processes and protocols in place to be able to replicate this study. The following six basic steps were implemented for data analysis (Creswell, 2003, p. 191).

1. Organize and prepare the data for analysis.

2. Read through all the data.

3. Begin detailed analysis with a coding process.
4. Use the coding process to generate a description of the setting or people as well as categories or themes for analysis.

5. Advance how the description and themes will be represented in the qualitative narrative.

6. A final step in data analysis involves making an interpretation or meaning of the data (p. 191-195).

The researcher was fully involved in the review of transcription of the interviews and visually scanned all the data. In doing so, this prompted the researcher to make “general sense” of the data and to reflect on the overall meaning (Creswell, 2003). Identifying themes was essential in the analytical process. Using the raw data allowed the researcher to make references and take notes for further analysis.

**Credibility and Reliability**

Establishing credibility and reliability is important when conducting qualitative research. In order to establish credibility, the researcher used progressive subjectivity, member checks, and triangulation (Merriam, 2009; Mertens, 2005). During the focus group and case studies, participants had the opportunity to share their perspectives and experiences on ethnic identity and colonial mentality. Throughout the interviews, the researcher summarized and paraphrased participants’ statements to ensure he captured their voices. Throughout the process, the researcher kept a journal of his thoughts and feelings to reflect on his biases and perspectives. Member checks were conducted during the focus group and case studies to ensure internal validity and credibility (Merriam, 2009). For instance, the researcher summarized and paraphrased the participants’ voices during both the focus group and case study. The researcher also contacted the participants
after each session to make sure he was not misinterpreting the participants’ voices. Triangulation was used to “shore up the internal validity of the study” (Merriam, 2009, p. 215). According to Merriam (2009), “triangulation of the data means comparing and cross-checking data collected through observations at different times or in different places, or interview data collected from people with different perspectives” (p. 216). The researcher used the collected data from the focus group, case studies, and researcher’s journal to triangulate the study.

**Mixed Methods Analysis**

According to Mertens (2005), mixed method design is where “both quantitative and qualitative methods are used to answer the research questions in a single study” (p. 292). The explanatory mixed methods approach begins with the quantitative phase followed up with a qualitative phase. The purpose of the qualitative phase is to explain the quantitative results in depth (Creswell & Plano, 2011). The researcher interpreted in what ways the qualitative data contributed or connected to the quantitative data. But more importantly, the researcher considered “what was learned in response to the study’s purpose” (Creswell & Plano, 2011, p. 83).

**Researcher’s Skills**

The researcher’s background is in counseling, which was critical during both interview processes. He has had 12 years of counseling experience. The researcher used essential counseling techniques to facilitate the focus group and case studies. For example, the investigator used strategies such as active listening, asking open-ended questions, paraphrasing, and summarizing the participants’ thoughts and feelings during the interviews. Moreover, the researcher was able to observe nonverbal and verbal messages
during the interview, which allowed him to gauge the participant’s comfort level. As a counselor, it was important to be open minded and nonjudgmental during the interview process. As mentioned earlier, a pilot focus was conducted. This process allowed the researcher to be familiar with conducting a focus group.

**Summary**

The purpose of this study was to explore Filipinos’ perspectives on colonial mentality, ethnic identity, and collective self-esteem. More specifically, the study examined how these constructs impacted on the academic success and college choice of Filipinos. This chapter began with the approach for this study, a sequential explanatory mixed methods design. Next, it illustrated the data collection process, instruments used, and analysis for both quantitative and qualitative phases of the study. Through the semi-structured focus group, participants provided multiple perspectives on the issue of colonialism, ethnic identity, and their educational experiences. Furthermore, case studies provided a deeper understanding of the experiences and struggles of Filipinos. The next chapter describes the quantitative and qualitative results of this study.
Chapter 4: Quantitative Findings and Summary

This chapter examines the effects of the colonial mentality and ethnic identity among Filipino/a college students using quantitative results. More specifically, this study explores how these two constructs affect academic success and college selection among Filipino/as attending one of the three college systems in California (CCC, CSU, and UC). To gain a deeper understanding of the social experiences of Filipino college students, an explanatory mixed method design was used. This method uses both quantitative and qualitative data to capture the realities and narratives of Filipino college students.

In order to answer the guiding research question, “What social factors (colonial mentality, social class, ethnicity, academic success) influence Filipino/a college aged students’ perception of their identity?”, the study began with distributing an online survey to Filipino/a college students attending one of the three college systems in California, and 100 Filipino/a college students completed the first phase of the study. This chapter begins with a descriptive analysis and answers the three questions through bivariate correlations, ANOVA, and multiple regression analysis.

Eight patterns emerged during the quantitative analysis: (1) moderate levels of colonial mentality; (2) high levels of colonial mentality based on five questions on the Colonial Mentality Scale (CMS-I); (3) strong sense of ethnic identity; (4) negative moderate correlation between the CMS-I and Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM), positive relationship between college choice and GPA, and negative moderate relationship between college choice and the colonial mentality scale; (5) significant difference between students that attend the three college system and the within discrimination and colonial debt subscale; (6) predictors of academic success as the physical characteristic subscales from
the colonial mentality scale; (7) significant differences between the colonial debt subscale and gender as well as significant differences between the MEIM and mother’s education level; results revealed significant differences between academic success and gender; and age had a significant effect on academic success; and (8) gender and age as moderate predictors for academic success as well as gender and mother’s education level as moderate predictors for college selection.

Description of Participants

Filipino college students were recruited from the three college systems (CCC, CSU, and UC) in California for this study. Participation in this study was voluntary, and participants completed a consent form prior to completing the online survey. The characteristics of the participants are summarized in Table 4.1. Of the 100 participants, 44% were male and 56% were female. The results revealed that 37% of the participants are in the range of 18-20 years of age, 49% are in the range of 21-29 years of age, 11% are in the range of 30-39 years of age, and lastly 3% are in the 40-49 year of age range. Data also revealed that 8% of the participants are 1st-generation Filipinos and 22% are 1.5-generation Filipinos. More than half, 62%, are second generation, 2% are third generation, 1% is fourth generation, and 5% are unsure of their generation level. Of all 100 participants, 37% are enrolled in a Community college, 36% are enrolled in a CSU, 25% are enrolled in a UC, and 1% is enrolled in another college institution. When looking at class level, 22.2% are freshmen, 21.2% are sophomores, 22.2% juniors, 25.3% are seniors, 6.1% are graduate students, and 3% are doctoral/professional students.

Included in Table 4.1 is demographic information regarding parents. When examining the education level of the mothers of students in the study, 11% of mothers
reported their highest level of school completed was less than a high school degree, 35% earned their bachelor’s degree, 7% received their graduate degree, and 1% earned a doctorate or professional degree. With respect to the fathers, 5.1% of fathers reported their highest level of education completed was less than a high school degree, 22.2% earned their high school diploma, 24.2% had some college but did not receive a degree, 13.1% earned an associate’s degree, 30.3% received their bachelor’s degree, and 5.1% earned their graduate degree.

Another demographic characteristic used in this study was family income. Of the 100 participants, 8% of participants indicated that their family income was $0-$24,000, 20% revealed that their family income was $25,000-$49,999, and 20% of the participants indicated that their family income was $50,000-$74,999. Results also showed that 26% of participants’ family incomes were $75,000-$99,999, 10% were in the $100,000-$124,999 income range, 5% were in the $125,000-$149,999 income range, 4% were in the $150,000-$174,999 income range, 4% were in the $175,000-$199,999 income range, and 3% were at $200,000 of family income.
Table 4.1

*Characteristics of Survey Participants as Frequency and Percentage*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 year old</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-20 year old</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-29 year old</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39 year old</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49 year old</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Generation Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Generation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Generation</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Generation</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Generation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Generation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate/Professional</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mother Education Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school Diploma</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college but no degree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate/Professional</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Table 4.1 Characteristics of Survey Participants as Frequency and Percentage (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father Education Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school diploma</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college but no degree</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate/Professional</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0-$24,999</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000-$49,999</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000-$74,999</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000-$99,999</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000-$124,999</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$125,000-$149,999</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000-$174,999</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$175,000-$199,999</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Dimension of Colonial Mentality and Ethnic Identity

A descriptive statistical analysis was conducted for the Colonial Mentality Scale (CMS) and Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM). This analysis included calculating individual items, total scores, and subscales for the CMS-I. Moreover, means, medians, modes, and standard deviations were calculated too for the CMS and MEIM.

Shown in Table 4.2 is the descriptive statistical analysis for the CMS-I. Participants rated their level of agreement with each item using a six point Likert scale with responses ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. The higher the scores on the CMS-I indicate higher levels of colonial mentality (David & Okazaki, 2006b). According to David and Okazaki (2006b), CMS-I has five subscales: (a) internalized cultural and ethnic
inferiority, (b) cultural shame and embarrassment, (c) within-group discrimination, (d) physical characteristics, and (e) colonial debt. The average total score on the CMS-I was 83.16 (SD = 21.48) out of a possible high score of 216 and low score of 36, with a median score of 84 and mode of 91. Based on the results, participants reported moderate levels of colonial mentality.

Upon examining each subscale, results show that the average score for the Within-Group Discrimination (i.e., *I tend to divide Filipinos in America in two types: the FOBs and the Filipino Americans*) mean was 23.12 (SD = 8.24) out of a possible high score of 44 and low score of 11, with a median score of 23 and mode of 17. Descriptive analysis of the Physical Characteristic (i.e., *I do not want my children to have Filipino flat noses*) subscale had a mean score of 20.32 (SD = 8.60) out of a possible high score of 44 and low score of 8, with a median score 20 and mode of 8. In terms of the Colonial Debt, (i.e., *The colonization of the Philippines by Spain and the US produced very little damage to the Filipino culture*) the possible high score was 34 and low score of 7, and the average score for Filipino/a college students was 19.18 (SD = 6.26) with a median score of 20 and mode of 17. Results for the subscale Cultural Shame and Embarrassment (i.e., *In general, I feel that being a Filipino is a curse*) revealed that of the 100 Filipino/a college students, the average score was 8.46 (SD = 3.17) with a possible high score of 16 and low score of 5. The median score was 8 with a mode of 5. The last subscale, Internalized Cultural/Ethnic Inferiority (i.e., *There are situations where I feel embarrassed of my ethnic background*), had a possible high score of 26 and low score of 5. The average score was 12.46 (SD = 5.20) with a median of 12 and mode of 5.
Table 4.2

*Mean, Median, Mode, and Standard Deviations for Items and Subscales of the Colonial Mentality Scale*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within Group</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>23.12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Character</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>20.32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonial Debt</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>19.18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Shame</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>8.46</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalized Culture/Ethnic inferiority</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>12.46</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS-I Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>83.16</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>21.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3 is a descriptive analysis of each item on the CMS-I that indicated Filipinos self-reported highest scores when answering the following five items (listed from highest to lowest average scores):

1. In general, Filipino Americans should be thankful and feel fortunate for being in the US;
2. Spain and the US are highly responsible for civilizing Filipinos and improving their ways of life;
3. There are situations where I feel inferior because of my ethnic background;
4. I generally think that a person that is part White and part Filipino is more attractive than a full-blooded Filipino;
5. I would like to have children with light skin-tones.
After the preliminary analysis, Filipino participants reported lowest scores, when answering the following five items (listed from lowest to highest):

(1) In general, I feel that being Filipino/a is a curse;

(2) In general, I feel ashamed of the Filipino culture and traditions;

(3) I feel embarrassed of the Filipino culture and traditions;

(4) In general, I am ashamed of newly arrived Filipino immigrants due to their inability to speak fluent, accent free English;

(5) I generally do not like newly arrived (FOBs) Filipino immigrants.
### Table 4.3

**Frequencies, Means, Median, Mode, and Standard Deviation for Items on Colonial Mentality Scale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item (Number on Survey)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are situations when I feel that it is more advantageous to deny my ethnic/cultural heritage (#1)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are situations where I feel inferior because of my ethnic background (#2)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are situations where I feel ashamed of my ethnic/cultural background (#3)</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, I feel that being a person of my ethnic background is not as good as being White (#4)</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, I feel that being a person of my ethnic heritage is not as good as being White/European American (#5)</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I tend to divide Filipinos in America in two types: FOBs and the Filipino Americans (#6)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, I don't associate with newly arrived (FOBs) Filipino immigrants (#7)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I generally do not like newly arrived (FOBs) Filipino immigrants (#8)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think newly arrived immigrant Filipinos (FOBs) are backwards, have accents, and act weird (#9)</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think newly arrived immigrants (FOBs) should be as Americanized as quickly as possible (#10)</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, I make fun of, tease, or badmouth Filipinos who are not very Americanized in their behaviors (#11)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.3

*Frequencies, Means, Median, Mode, and Standard Deviation for Items on Colonial Mentality Scale (continued)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item (Number on Survey)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I make fun of, tease, or badmouth Filipinos who speak English with strong accents (#12)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find persons who have bridged noses are More attractive than persons with Filipino (flat) noses (#13)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to have a nose that is more bridged (like Whites) than the nose I have (#14)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do want my children to have Filipino (flat) noses (#15)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find persons with lighter skin-tones to be more attractive than persons with dark skin-tones (#16)</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to have a skin-tone that is lighter than the skin-tone I have (#17)</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to have children with lighter skin-tones (#18)</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not want my children to be dark skinned (#19)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I generally think that a person that is part White and part Filipino is more attractive than a full-blooded Filipino (#20)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe that Filipino Americans are superior, more admirable, and more civilized than Filipinos in the Philippines (#21)</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, I feel embarrassed of the Filipino culture and traditions (#22)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.822</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.3

*Frequencies, Means, Median, Mode, and Standard Deviation for Items on Colonial Mentality Scale (continued)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item (Number on Survey)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel that there are very few things about the Filipino culture that I can be proud of (#23)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I tend to pay more attention to the opinions of Filipino, who are very Americanized, than to the opinions of FOBs (#24)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are moments when I wish I was a member of a cultural group that is different from my own (#25)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain and the US are highly responsible for civilizing Filipinos and improving their ways of life (#26)</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipinos should be thankful to Spain and the US for transforming the Filipino ways of life into a White/European American way of life (#27)</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipinos should feel privileged and honored that Spain and US had contact with them (#28)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, I am ashamed of newly arrived Filipino immigrants because of their inability to speak fluent, accent free English (#29)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, I am ashamed of newly arrived Filipino immigrants because of the way they dress and act (#30)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, I feel that being a Filipino is a curse (#31)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.419</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.3

*Frequencies, Means, Median, Mode, and Standard Deviation for Items on Colonial Mentality Scale (continued)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item (Number on Survey)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In general, Filipino Americans should be thankful and feel fortunate for being in the US (#32)</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, Filipino Americans do not have anything to complain about because they are lucky to be in the US (#33)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The colonization of the Philippines by Spain and the US produced very little damage to the Filipino culture (#34)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The American ways of living or the American culture is generally more admirable, desirable, or better than the Filipino culture (#35)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, I feel ashamed of the Filipino culture and traditions (#36)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.810</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The researcher developed a rubric to help conceptualize the results of the CMS-I. Based on a six-point Likert scale, participants responded to the CMS-I with responses ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. The rubric is shown in Figure 3. Means scores from 3.76-3.21 were considered high levels of colonial mentality, and scores that ranged from 3.20-3.14 were identified as moderate levels of colonial mentality, and scores between 3.13-2.94 were considered low levels of colonial mentality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean scores</th>
<th>Levels of Colonial Mentality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.76-3.21</td>
<td>High Levels Colonial Mentality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.20-3.00</td>
<td>Moderate Levels of Colonial Mentality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.94-1.19</td>
<td>Low Levels of Colonial Mentality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3. *Rubric for Colonial Mentality Scale*
Shown in Table 4.4 are the mean, median, mode, and standard deviation for each of the 12 items on the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM). The MEIM is a 12-item instrument based on a four-point Likert scale, with responses ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The mean score on the MEIM was 39.68 (SD = 5.90) with the high score of 48 and low score of 12. Included in Table 4.6 is the analysis of each item on the MEIM.

Results revealed that Filipino participants reported higher levels of ethnic identity based on the following five items (listed from highest to lowest). The item, *I am happy that I am a member of that group I belong to*, had the highest mean, 3.72 (SD = .570) and median of 4 and with a mode of 4. The item, *I feel good about my cultural or ethnic background*, demonstrated a mean of 3.69 (SD = .566), with a median and mode of 4. The item, *I have a lot of pride in my ethnic group*, showed a mean of 3.52 (SD = .630), with both median and mode of 4. The item, *I participate in cultural practices of my own group, such as special food, music, or customs*, had a mean of 3.50 (SD = .646), with both median and mode of 4. The item, *I feel a strong attachment towards my ethnic group*, had a mean of 3.43 (SD = .703), with median and mode 4.

Filipino college students reported lower levels of ethnic identity based on the following five items (listed to lowest to highest). The item, *I am active in organizations or social groups that include mostly members of my own ethnic group*, had the lowest mean, 2.74 (SD = .967), with both a median and mode of 3. The item, *I think a lot about how my life will be affected by ethnic group membership*, revealed a mean of 2.84 (SD = .960), with median and mode of 3. The item, *In order to learn more about my ethnic background, I have often talked to other people about my ethnic group*, had a mean of 3.18 (SD = .804), with
median of 3 and mode of 4. The items, *I understand pretty well what my ethnic group membership means to me* and *I have a clear sense of my ethnic background and what it means to me*, had a mean of 3.26 (SD = .693; SD = .764), with both a median and mode of 3.

The item, *I have spent time trying to find out about my own ethnic group, such as its history, traditions, and customs*, had a mean of 3.29 (SD = .718), with a median and mode of 3.

Table 4.4

*Means, Median, Mode, and Standard Deviation for Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item (Number on Survey)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have spent time trying to find out my own ethnic group, such as its history, traditions, and customs (#1)</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am active in organizations or social groups that include mostly members of my own ethnic group (#2)</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a clear sense of my ethnic background and what it means for me (#3)</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think a lot of how my life will be affected by ethnic group membership (#4)</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am happy that I am a member of that group I belong to (#5)</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a strong sense of belonging to my ethnic group (#6)</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand pretty well what my ethnic group membership means to me (#7)</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In order to learn more about my ethnic background, I have often talked to other people about my ethnic group (#8)</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a lot of pride in my ethnic group (#9)</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.630</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Table 4.4

*Means, Median, Mode, and Standard Deviation for Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (continued)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item (Number on Survey)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I participate in cultural practices of my own group such as special food, music, or customs (#10)</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel a strong attachment towards my own ethnic group (#11)</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel good about my cultural or ethnic background (#12)</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEIM Total</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>39.48</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis of Research Question # 1**

The first question was “What is the relationship between ethnic identity, colonial mentality, academic success and college choice among Filipino/a young adults?” In order to answer this question, the following items were correlated: (1) self-reported scores on the CMS-I and MEIM (2) self-reported grade point average; and (3) current college enrollment.

A Pearson product-moment correlation was computed to assess the relationship between college choice, grade point average (GPA), and levels of colonial mentality and ethnic identity. Observed in Table 4.5, the Colonial Mentality Scale (CMS-I) and the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM) were moderately negatively correlated \((r = -.31)\). Moreover, college choice and GPA were moderately positively correlated \((.24)\). College choice and the CMS-I were moderately negatively correlated \((- .21)\).
Table 4.5

Correlation Matrix of Total Valid Scores for CMS-I, MEIM, GPA, and College Choice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMS-I</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-.31**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEIM</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.24*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. CMS-I=Colonial Mentality Scale, MEIM= Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure, GPA = Grade Point Average. *p < .05, **p < .01.

Analysis of Research Question # 2

The second research question was “Is there a difference between self-reported levels of colonial mentality among Filipino students that attend the following California college systems: University of California (UC), California State University (CSU), and California Community College (CCC)?” In order to answer this question, a one-way ANOVA was conducted to examine any mean differences on the CMS-I and the subscales, particularly based on the college institution in which participants were enrolled. As shown in Table 4.6, there were no statistically significant difference on the CMS-I and participants' college institution [F(2,97) = 1.96, p > .05]. The results suggested that participants at the three California college system did not differ significantly on the self-reported CMS-I.

A one-way between subjects ANOVA was conducted to compare the within discrimination subscale and the three college systems in which participants were enrolled in (CCC, CSU, and UC). There was a significant difference between the within subscale and college types at the p < .05 level [F(2,94) = 6.04, p = .003]. Post hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for the California State University participants (M = 26.80, SD = 7.60) was significantly different than the University of California participants (M = 20.81, SD = 8.77). Community college participants (M = 21.22,
SD = 7.31) scored lower than CSU participants. Community college participants were not significantly different than University of California participants. When examining the physical characteristic subscale and the three college systems, the results yielded no significant difference [F(2,94) = .016, p = .985]. In other words, there were no difference in mean scores between CCC, CSU, and UC participants and the physical characteristic subscale.

In order to determine the difference between the colonial debt subscale for CCC, CSU, and UC participants, a one-way ANOVA was calculated. Results of the colonial debt subscale found significant differences among the college systems [F(2,94) = 7.33, p = .001]. Tukey HSD was computed to analyze the colonial debt subscale among the college systems. Results revealed significant differences between UC and CCC participants. UC participants had a lower mean of 15.64 (6.38) compared to community college participants’ mean of 21.50 (6.51). Participants enrolled in CSU and CCC did not differ significantly.

When examining the ethnic inferiority subscale and the three college systems, there was no significant difference [F(2,95) = 2.51, p = .86]. In other words, there was no difference between the college systems and the ethnic inferiority subscale. Similarly, there were no significant difference between the cultural shame subscale and the three college systems [F(2,97) = 1.58, p = .210. In other words, participants at the three college systems did not score differently on the cultural shame subscale.
Table 4.6

One Way ANOVA Results for CMS-I and Subscales Comparing the Three College Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>CSU</th>
<th>UC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMS-I</td>
<td>N 37</td>
<td>M 81.95</td>
<td>SD 18.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N 37</td>
<td>M 88.22</td>
<td>SD 21.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N 26</td>
<td>M 77.69</td>
<td>SD 24.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WD</td>
<td>N 37</td>
<td>M 21.22</td>
<td>SD 7.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N 37</td>
<td>M 26.80</td>
<td>SD 7.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N 26</td>
<td>M 20.81</td>
<td>SD 8.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>N 37</td>
<td>M 20.23</td>
<td>SD 7.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N 37</td>
<td>M 20.22</td>
<td>SD 8.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N 26</td>
<td>M 20.58</td>
<td>SD 9.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>N 37</td>
<td>M 21.50</td>
<td>SD 6.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N 37</td>
<td>M 19.33</td>
<td>SD 4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N 26</td>
<td>M 15.63</td>
<td>SD 6.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>N 37</td>
<td>M 8.30</td>
<td>SD 3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N 37</td>
<td>M 9.14</td>
<td>SD 2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N 26</td>
<td>M 7.73</td>
<td>SD 3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
<td>N 37</td>
<td>M 10.94</td>
<td>SD 4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N 36</td>
<td>M 13.47</td>
<td>SD 5.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N 26</td>
<td>M 13.15</td>
<td>SD 5.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. CMS-I=Colonial Mentality Scale, WD = Within Discrimination, PC = Physical Characteristics, CD = Colonial Debt, CS = Cultural Shame, and EI = Ethnic Inferiority *p < .05.

Analysis of Research Question #3

The third research question for the quantitative phase asked the following question:

“Are elements of colonial mentality, social class, or levels of ethnic identity predictors of academic success in college?” In order to answer this question, multiple regressions were performed. The independent variable can be found in Table 4.7 (I find persons with lighter skin tones to be more attractive than persons with dark skin tones). A stepwise regression was used to determine factors that were significant. The R2 was .073. The independent variable predicted 7.3% of the variance in the dependent variable, which was a moderate prediction. The independent variable was a significant predictor of academic success. Filipino college students, who found people with lighter skin tones to be more attractive than people with dark tones $\beta = -.271$, emerged as the strongest prediction of academic success.
Table 4.7

*Predictors for Academic Success (Colonial Mentality Scale)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I find persons with lighter skin tones to be more attractive than persons with dark skin tones.</td>
<td>-.271</td>
<td>-2.56</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* R = .271, R² = .073, F = 6.56, Sig F = .012.

Although this section answered the research questions, the researcher conducted additional statistical analysis to further investigate differences among gender, age, mother’s education level, and generation. The following section provides the results of the t-tests, ANOVAs, multiple regressions, and it concludes with a summary of the findings.

**Analysis of Gender, Age, Mother’s Education Level, Generation Level and CMS-I**

Observed in Table 4.8 are the results of an independent t-test conducted between males (n=44) and females (n=56) who took the Colonial Mentality Scale. The mean for males was 80.89 (SD = 22.70) and lower than females 86.05 (SD = 19.71). The results yielded no significant difference in scores for males and females on the CMS-I, t(98) = -.1.19, p > .05.

The mean of the males for the within group subscale was 23.56 (SD = 7.37) and females was 22.78 (SD = 8.92). The independent t-test revealed that there were no significant difference between males and females on the within group subscale, t(95) = -.461, p > .05. The mean of the males for the physical characteristics subscale was 20.07 (SD = 7.24) and for females the mean was 20.50 (SD = 9.52). The results of the independent t-test showed there were no significant difference between males and females on the physical characteristic subscale, t(95) = .240, p > .05.
The mean for males on the colonial debt subscale was 21 (SD = 6.09) and the mean for females was 17.74 (SD=6.06). The results yielded a statistically significant difference between males and females on the colonial debit subscale, t(95)= -2.62, p < .05. The results suggest that males have higher levels of colonial debt compared to females.

After examining the results of the t-test, the mean for the ethnic inferiority subscale was 12.05 (5.61) for the males and 13.00 (4.6) for the females. The results yielded no statistically significant difference between males and females on the ethnic inferiority subscale, t(95.15) = -.91, p > .05.

The last subscale, cultural shame, showed a mean of 8.91 (SD = 3.31) for the males and a mean of 8.11 (3.04) for females. The results of the independent t-test showed no significant difference in males and females on the cultural shame subscale, t(98) = -1.25, p > .05.
Table 4.8

*Gender Differences on the Colonial Mentality Scale and Subscales*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Mean (SD)</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>t-test sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMS-I</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>80.89 (22.70)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>86.05 (19.71)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Group</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>23.56 (7.37)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>.646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22.78 (8.92)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Characteristics</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20.07 (7.24)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>.811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20.50 (9.52)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonial Debt</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>21.00 (6.09)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>.010*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>17.74 (6.06)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Shame</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8.91 (3.31)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8.11 (3.04)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Inferior</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>12.05 (5.61)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>.362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13.00 (4.61)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* *p* < .05

Observed in Table 4.9 are the results of an independent t-test conducted between Philippine (PI)-born (*n* = 30) and U.S.-born Filipino (*n* = 70) participants who took the Colonial Mentality scale. The mean for PI-born participants 82.77 (SD = 21.87) was lower than U.S.-born participants 83.33 (21.46). There were no statistically significant differences in PI-born and U.S.-born Filipino college participants on the CMS-I, *t*(98) = .119, *p* > .05.

The mean of the PI-born participants for the within group subscale was 20.77 (8.59), while the mean for U.S.-born participants was 24.18 (7.91). An independent t-test was conducted and the results revealed no statistically significant difference between PI-born and U.S.-born participants on the within group subscale, *t*(95) = 1.91, *p* > .05.
When examining the physical characteristic subscale, the mean of the PI born was 21.30 (8.62) and the mean of the U.S. born was 19.88 (8.61). The results yielded no statistically significant difference between the PI born and U.S. born on the physical characteristic subscale, t(95) = -.750, p > .05.

The mean for PI-born participants on the colonial debt subscale was 21.30 (8.62) and the mean for U.S.-born participants was 19.88 (8.61). The results of the t-test reported no statistically significant difference between PI-born and U.S.-born participants on the colonial debt subscale, t(95) = -1.97, p > .05.

When examining the cultural shame subscale, the mean for PI born 8.20 (3.37) was lower than U.S.-born participants 8.57 (3.10). The results of the t-test reported no statistically significant difference between PI-born and U.S.-born participants on the cultural shame subscale, t(98) = .534, p > .05.

Lastly, the mean for PI born was 11.55 (4.30) and U.S. born had a mean of 12.84 (5.52) on the ethnic inferiority subscale. The results of the t-test yielded no statistically significant difference between U.S.-born and PI-born participants on the ethnic inferiority subscale, t(96) = 1.12, p = .265.
Table 4.9

*Generation Differences on the Colonial Mentality Scale and Subscales*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Mean (SD)</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>t-test sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMS-I</td>
<td>PI Born</td>
<td>82.77 (21.87)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>US Born</td>
<td>83.33 (21.46)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>PI Born</td>
<td>20.77 (8.59)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>US Born</td>
<td>24.18 (7.91)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Characteristic</td>
<td>PI Born</td>
<td>21.30 (8.62)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>US Born</td>
<td>19.88 (8.61)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonial Debt</td>
<td>PI Born</td>
<td>21.03 (6.0)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>US Born</td>
<td>18.36 (6.23)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Shame</td>
<td>PI Born</td>
<td>8.20 (3.37)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>US Born</td>
<td>8.57 (3.10)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Inferior</td>
<td>PI Born</td>
<td>11.55 (4.30)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>.265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>US Born</td>
<td>12.84 (5.52)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Shown in Table 4.10 are the results of an independent t-test conducted between younger adults (less than 29 years of age) and older adults (29 years of age or more) who took the CMS-I. The mean for the young adults 83.98 (21.90) was higher than the adults 78.14 (18.66). The results of the t-test revealed no statistically significant difference between young adults and adults on the CMS-I, t (98) = -.942, p > .05.

The mean for the young adults 23.51 (8.36) was higher than the adults 20.86 (7.34) on the within discrimination subscale. The results yielded no statistically significant difference between young adults and adults on the within discrimination subscale, t(95) = -1.11, p > .05.

The mean for the young adults was 20.80 (8.76) and for the adults was 17.50 (7.14) on the physical characteristic subscale. The results revealed no statistically significant
difference between young adults and adults on the physical characteristic subscale, t(95) = -1.33, p = .186

The colonial debt subscale showed a mean of 19 (6.25) for the young adults and a mean of 20.29 (6.40) for the adults. The results of the t-test reported no significant difference between young adults and adults on the colonial debt subscale, t(95) = .709, p > .05.

The mean for the young adults was 8.59 (3.25) and the adults reported a mean of 7.64 (2.59) on the cultural shame subscale. The results yielded no statistically significant difference between young adults and adults on the cultural shame subscale, t(98) = -.1.03, p > .05.

The last subscale ethnic inferiority showed a mean of 12.62 (5.39) for young adults and a mean of 11.50 (3.83) for adults. The t-test reported no statistically significant difference between young adults and adults on the ethnic inferior subscale, t(96) = -.743, p > .05.
Table 4.10

*Age Differences on the Colonial Mentality Scale and Subscales*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>t-test sign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMS-I</td>
<td>&lt; 29</td>
<td>83.98 (21.90)</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>.349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;29</td>
<td>78.14 (18.66)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>&lt;29</td>
<td>23.51 (8.36)</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>.268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;29</td>
<td>20.86 (7.34)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Characteristic</td>
<td>&lt;29</td>
<td>20.80 (8.76)</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;29</td>
<td>17.50 (7.14)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonial Debt</td>
<td>&lt;29</td>
<td>19.00 (6.25)</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>.480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;29</td>
<td>20.29 (6.40)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Shame</td>
<td>&lt;29</td>
<td>8.59 (3.25)</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;29</td>
<td>7.64 (2.59)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Inferior</td>
<td>&lt;29</td>
<td>12.62 (5.39)</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>.459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;29</td>
<td>11.50 (3.83)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Shown in Table 4.11 are the results of the independent t-test that was conducted for mother’s education level. The mean for mothers that had some college was 85.50 (18.30) and the mean for mothers that were college graduates was 81.73 (23.25). The results yielded no statistically significant difference for mother’s education level on the CMS-I, t(98) = -.851, p > .05.

The mean for mothers with some college was 23.54 (7.86) and mothers that were college graduates was 22.87 (8.52) on the within discrimination subscale. The results reported no statistically significant difference for mother’s education level, t(95) = -.389, p > .05.
The mean for mothers with some college was 22.38 (8.01) and mothers that were college graduates was 19.05 (8.76) on the physical characteristic subscale. After analyzing the t-test, results reported no statistically significant difference between mother’s education level and the physical characteristic subscale, $t(95) = -1.87$, $p > .05$.

The mean for mothers who had some college was 19.34 (5.77) and 19.08 (6.60) for mothers that were college graduates on the colonial debt subscale. The results yielded no statistically significant difference for mother’s education level, $t(95) = -1.97$, $p > .05$.

The mean for mothers that had some college was 8.79 (3.16) and the mean for mothers that were college graduates was 8.26 (3.19) on the cultural shame subscale. The results of the t-test reported no statistically significant difference for mother’s education level, $t(98) = -.811$, $p > .05$.

The last subscale, ethnic inferiority, had a mean of 11.64 (4.75) for mothers with some college and 12.94 (5.42) for mothers who were college graduates. The results yielded no statistically significant difference for mother’s education level, $t(96) = 1.19$, $p > .05$. 
Table 4.11

*Mother’s Education Level and Colonial Mentality Differences*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mother’s Ed Level</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>t-test sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMS-I</td>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>85.50 (18.30)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>.397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College grad</td>
<td>81.73 (23.25)</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Discrimination</td>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>23.54 (7.86)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>.698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College grad</td>
<td>22.87 (8.52)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Characteristics</td>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>22.38 (8.01)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College grad</td>
<td>19.05 (8.76)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonial Debt</td>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>19.34 (5.77)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>.844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College grad</td>
<td>19.08 (6.60)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Shame</td>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>8.79 (3.16)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>.420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College grad</td>
<td>8.26 (3.19)</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Inferior</td>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>11.64 (4.75)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>.236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College grad</td>
<td>12.94 (5.42)</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis of Gender, Age, Generational Level, Mother’s Education Level and MEIM**

Observed in Table 4.12 are the results of an independent t-test conducted between females (n=56) and males (n=42) who took the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM). The null hypothesis stated that there were no significant difference between females and males on the MEIM. The results yielded a statistically significant difference between females and males, t(96) = 2.02, p < .05. In other words, females reported higher levels of ethnic identity based on the MEIM.
Table 4.12

*Gender Differences on Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>MEIM</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>t-test sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>MEIM</td>
<td>40.71</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>.045*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>MEIM</td>
<td>38.31</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* *p* < .05

Shown in Table 4.13 are the results of an independent t-test conducted between younger adults (less than 29 years of age) and older adults (29 years of age or more) on the MEIM. The mean for the young adults was 39.65 (5.93) and for the adults was 39.86 (5.90). The results yielded no statistically significant difference between young adults and adults on the MEIM, *t*(96) = .87, *p* > .05.

Table 4.13

*Age Differences on Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>MEIM</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>t-test sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;29</td>
<td>MEIM</td>
<td>39.65</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>.906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;29</td>
<td>MEIM</td>
<td>39.86</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observed in Table 4.14 are the results of an independent t-test conducted between Philippine (PI)-born and U.S.-born college participants on the MEIM. The mean for the PI-born participants was 38.70 (5.54) and the mean for the U.S.-born participants was 39.68 (6.09). The results of the t-test appeared to have no statistically significant difference between PI-born and U.S.-born participants on the MEIM, *t*(96) = -.018, *p* > .05.
Table 4.14

*Generational Differences on the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>MEIM</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>t-test sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PI Born</td>
<td>MEIM</td>
<td>39.70 (5.54)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Born</td>
<td>MEIM</td>
<td>39.68 (6.09)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 4.15 are the results of an independent t-test conducted between mother's education levels on the MEIM. The mean for the mothers that had some college (i.e., high school diploma but no college degree) was 37.86 (5.33) and the mean for mothers that were college graduates was 40.79 (5.98). The results of the t-test showed a significant difference for mother’s education level, t(96) = 2.43, p = .017. These results suggest that mother’s educational level really does have an effect on ethnic identity. Specifically, participants’ mothers who were college graduates had higher levels of ethnic identity compared to participants’ mothers who had some college.

Table 4.15

*Mother’s Education Level and MEIM*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mother’s Ed Level</th>
<th>MEIM</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>t-test sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>MEIM</td>
<td>37.86 (5.33)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>.017*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Grad</td>
<td>MEIM</td>
<td>40.79 (5.98)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *p<.05

**Analysis of Gender, Age, Generation, Mother’s Education Level, and Academic Success**

In Table 4.16 an independent samples t-test was conducted to compare academic success (through self-reported GPA) in males and females. There was a significant difference in scores for females (M = 3.21, SD = .504) and males (M = 2.95, SD = .543); t(94) = 2.47 p = .015. These results suggest that gender has an effect of GPA. Female participants reported higher GPAs compared to male participants.
Table 4.16

Gender Differences in Academic Success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>t-test</th>
<th>sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>3.21 (.504)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>.015*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>2.95 (.534)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p<.05

In Table 4.17 an independent samples t-test was conducted to compare academic success (through self-reported GPA) in younger adults (less than 29 years of age) and older adults (29 years of age or more). There was a significant difference in scores for young adults (M = 3.02, SD = .571) and adults (M = 3.52, SD = .412); t(94)=3.38, p = .001. The results suggest age has an effect on academic success. Specifically, the results suggest that adults tend to have higher GPAs than young adults.

Table 4.17

Differences among Young Adults and Adults When Comparing GPAs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>t-test</th>
<th>sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>&lt;29</td>
<td>3.02 (.571)</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;29</td>
<td>3.52 (.412)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p < .05

Observed in Table 4.18 are the results of an independent t-test conducted between Philippine (PI)-born and U.S.-born participants. The mean for PI-born college participants 2.95 (.494) was lower than U.S.-born participants 3.15 (.539). The results of the t-test yielded no statistically significant difference between PI-born and U.S.-born participants, t(94) = 1.70, p = .09. The results suggest no difference between U.S.-born and PI-born participants and GPAs.
Table 4.18

Differences among Philippine-Born and U.S.-Born Filipinos and GPAs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>t-test sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>PI Born</td>
<td>2.95 (.494)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Born</td>
<td>3.15 (.539)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 4.19 an independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare mother’s education level and academic success. The mean for mother’s education with some college was 3.09 (.432) and mother’s education with a college degree was 3.10 (.588). There was no significant difference in scores, t(94) = .088, p = .930. The results of the t-test suggest no difference between mother’s education level and academic success.

Table 4.19

Mother’s Education Level and Academic Success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mother’s Ed Level</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>t-test sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>3.09 (.432)</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College Grad</td>
<td>3.10 (.588)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of College Type and Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure

In order to determine the difference between the MEIM and participants enrolled in a California Community College, California State University (CSU), or University of California (UC), a one-way ANOVA was calculated. Shown in Table 4.20 are the results of the one-way ANOVA. Results of the MEIM found no significant difference among college institutions and MEIM [(2,95) = .860, p = .426]. The results suggest that CCC, CSU, and UC college participants did not differ in mean scores on the MEIM.
Table 4.20

One-way ANOVA for MEIM and College Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>60.018</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>.860</td>
<td>.426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>3315.175</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>34.897</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Predictors of Academic Success and College Selection

A regression analysis was conducted to see what predictor factors contributed to academic success. The independent variables can be found in Table 4.21 (gender and age). This regression was run by stepwise algorithm. In order for variables to be entered into the equation, variables had to be statistically significant at .05 level. The R2 was .128. The two independent variables predicted 12.8% of the variance in the dependent variable, which suggests a good prediction. Age and gender were significant predictors of academic success. Gender emerged as the strongest predictor $\beta = -.263$ followed by age $\beta = .260$.

Table 4.21

Predictors of Academic Success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>sig t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.263</td>
<td>-2.76</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.260</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $R = .358$, $R^2 = .128$, $F = 6.80$, sig $F = .002$.

A regression analysis was conducted to predict college selection among Filipino college participants. The independent variables can be found in Table 4.22 (gender and mother’s education level). This regression was conducted by stepwise algorithm. In order for the variables to be entered into the equation, variables had to be statistically significant at .05 level. The R2 was .116. The independent variables predicted 11.6% of the variance.
in the dependent variable, which suggests a good prediction. Gender emerged as the strongest predictor $\beta = -0.258$ followed by mother's education level $\beta = 0.220$.

Table 4.22

Predictors of College Selection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>sig t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.258</td>
<td>-2.70</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's Education Level</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>0.023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. R = 0.341, R² = 0.116, F = 6.37, sig F = 0.002.

Summary

A brief summary of the quantitative findings are discussed below:

1. The majority of participants in the study reported moderate levels of colonial mentality based on the Colonial Mentality Scale. This finding suggests an average score was 83.16 (SD = 21.48) out of a possible score of 216 and low score of 36. Similarly, participants reported moderate levels on the Within Discrimination, Physical Characteristics, Colonial Debt, Cultural Shame, and Internalized/Ethnic Inferiority. The average score of the Within Discrimination subscale was 23.12 (SD = 8.24) with a high score of 44 and low score 11, with median of 23 and mode of 17. The mean for the Physical Characteristic subscale was 20.32 (SD = 8.60) out of a high score of 44 and low score of 8, with a median of 20 and mode of 8. The results of the Colonial Debt subscale had a mean of 19.18 (SD = 6.26) with a high score of 34 and low score 7, with a median of 20 and mode of 17. The mean score of the Cultural Shame subscale was 8.46 (SD = 3.17) with a high score of 16 and low score of 5, with a median of 8 and mode of 5. The average score of the Internalized
Cultural/Ethnic Inferiority subscale was 12.46 (SD = 5.20) with a high score of 26 and low score of 5, with a median of 12 and mode of 5.

2. After examining each item on the CMS-I, participants scored highest, when answering five of the following questions (listed from highest to lowest): (a) In general, Filipino Americans should be thankful and feel fortunate for being in the US; (b) Spain and the US are highly responsible for civilizing Filipinos and improving their ways of life; (c) There are situations where I feel inferior because of my ethnic background; (d) I generally think that a person that is part White and part Filipino is more attractive than a full-blooded Filipino; (e) I would like to have children with light skin-tones. These five questions suggest that participants have higher levels of colonial debt and internalized cultural inferiority.

3. The average score on the MEIM was 39.68 (SD = 5.89), with a mode of 45 and median of 41. An analysis of each item on the MEIM demonstrates that Filipino college participants participating in the study self-reported higher levels of ethnic identity based on the following five items. The item, I am happy that I am a member of that group I belong to, had the highest mean, 3.72 (SD = .570) and a median of 4 and with mode of 4. The item, I feel good about my cultural or ethnic background, demonstrated a mean of 3.69 (SD = .566), with a median and mode of 4. The item, I have a lot of pride in my ethnic group, showed a mean of 3.52 (SD = .630), with both median and mode of 4. The item, I participate in cultural practices of my own group, such as special food, music, or customs, had a mean of 3.50 (SD = .646), with both median and mode of 4. The item, I feel a strong attachment towards my ethnic group,
had a mean of 3.43 (SD = .703), with a median and mode 4. The five questions suggest that Filipino participants were proud of being Filipino based on the MEIM.

4. A Pearson product-moment correlation was computed to assess the relationship between college choice, grade point average (GPA), and levels of colonial mentality and ethnic identity. The Colonial Mentality Scale (CMS-I) and the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM) were moderately negatively correlated (r = -.31). College choice and self-reported GPA had a positive moderate relationship (.24). There was a negative moderate relationship between college choice and the CMS-I (-.21).

5. There was a significant difference between participants that attended one of the college institutions and the within discrimination and colonial debt subscales. These patterns suggest that college institutions that participants attended had an effect on their levels of colonial mentality.

6. The physical characteristic subscale from the CMS-I emerged as a predictor for academic success. The result suggests that since Filipino participants did not mirror the ethnic makeup of their college campuses, participants felt they had to adopt certain White characteristics to be successful in college.

7. There were significant differences between the colonial debt subscale and gender; there were significant differences between the MEIM and mother’s education level; results revealed significant differences between academic success and gender; age had a significant effect on academic success. These response patterns suggest that gender had an effect on the CMS, MEIM, and academic success. Moreover, participants’ mother’s education level had an effect on levels of ethnic identity.
8. Gender and age were predictors for academic success; gender and mother’s
education level were moderate predictors for college selection. These response
patterns suggest that gender, age, and mother’s education were strong predictors
for academic success and college selection among Filipino participants.

To further examine the quantitative patterns of the findings, 13 college students
participated in a focus group, as well as interviews with three college students. The
following chapter includes the significant findings during the qualitative phase of the
study. Chapter 6 also includes the third phase of the study, which includes an analysis
and discussion of the findings of both the quantitative and qualitative data.
Chapter 5: Qualitative Findings and Summary

The previous chapter discussed the quantitative findings of Filipino/a college students’ self-reported levels of colonial mentality, ethnic identity, and collective self-esteem. This chapter will discuss the findings of the qualitative phase of this study. The central question was the following: “What social factors (colonial mentality, collective self-esteem, social class, ethnicity, academic success) influence Filipino college students’ perception of their identity?” In order to answer this question, two sources of qualitative data were obtained: (1) two student focus group discussions and (2) three case studies with Filipino/a college students. The purpose of utilizing both sets of data was to incorporate the perspectives and experiences of Filipino/a college students.

The chapter starts with a description of participants during the qualitative phase of the study. Next, the findings from the focus groups and case studies are summarized. The data from both the focus group and case studies are organized by the themes that emerged from the analysis.

Demographic of Participants

A total of 100 Filipino/a college students participated in the survey. At the end of the survey, there was a section for participants to fill out, if they were interested in participating in the focus group. Thirty one students indicated they were interested in participating in the focus group. After contacting each participant and providing them with two dates, a total of 10 students confirmed and participated in the focus group discussions. Pseudo names were created to protect students’ identities. One of the focus groups consisted of five females and one male, and the second focus group consisted of three males and one female. All students that participated in the focus group were part of a Filipino
student organization at a CSU in San Diego. In addition, participants were selected to participate in student interviews. A total of three students participated in the student interviews. Shown in Table 5.1 are the demographics of the students that participated in the qualitative research phase.

Table 5.1

Demographics of Participants during Qualitative Research Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualitative Method Participant(s)</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gen Level</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Mother’s Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus Group (FG)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boy</td>
<td>&lt;29</td>
<td>1.5 Gen</td>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>Some college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby</td>
<td>&lt;29</td>
<td>2nd Gen</td>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>Some college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charmane</td>
<td>&lt;29</td>
<td>2nd Gen</td>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>Some college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bituin</td>
<td>&lt;29</td>
<td>2nd Gen</td>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>College grad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diwa</td>
<td>&lt;29</td>
<td>2nd Gen</td>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>Some college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liwanag</td>
<td>&lt;29</td>
<td>2nd Gen</td>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>Some college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pag-Ibig</td>
<td>&lt;29</td>
<td>2nd Gen</td>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>Some college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian</td>
<td>&lt;29</td>
<td>2nd Gen</td>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>College grad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjie</td>
<td>&lt;29</td>
<td>1.5 Gen</td>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>Some college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ligaya</td>
<td>&lt;29</td>
<td>2nd Gen</td>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>College grad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Student Interview (SI)**        |     |           |         |                    |
| Bayani                            | <29 | 1.5 Gen   | UC      | No college         |
| Efren                             | <29 | 2nd Gen   | CSU     | Some college       |
| Malaya                            | <29 | 2nd Gen   | CSU     | No college         |
Factors Contributing to Filipino College Students’ Identities

Transcripts from the two focus groups and three student interviews provided an extensive amount of qualitative data. Shown in Table 5.2 is the analysis of the data that provided themes and codes relating to the research question: “What social factors influence Filipino college aged students’ perception of their identity?”

Table 5.2

Themes and Codes Used for Student’s Perceived Identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Key Terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dualism as Social Force</td>
<td>Ethnic Identity</td>
<td>American, Pilipino, Filipino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>American, Asian American, Indigenous, Igorot,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Geographic place of birth, Cultural Conflict, Feelings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silence of Linguistic Integration</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Tagalog, English, Discriminated, Inferior, Teased, Fresh off the Boat, ESL courses, Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectedness</td>
<td>Kapwa</td>
<td>Student organizations, Cultural Organizations, Filipino/as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant Preferred Identity</td>
<td>Being a minority</td>
<td>Microaggression, underdog, Filipino/as, Celebrities, Media Role models, recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familial Cultural Conflict</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Prescribed majors, Finances, College, Expectations, Prized, Reputation, Respect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonial Mentality</td>
<td></td>
<td>Physical Characteristics, Inferior Language, Lightening products Competiveness, White</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Five themes emerged after respective codes were categorized. The codes were identified from the qualitative analysis of the data. Each of the five codes aligned to a theme, which are described in the following pages. The key terms evolved during the initial coding. After the initial coding, the researcher then triangulated the data by using multiple sources of data. For this study, the researcher analyzed the quantitative data, qualitative data, and the researcher's journal. In addition to triangulation, the researcher conducted member checks with participants to ensure validity.

**Dualism as Social Force: Ethnic Identity**

Dualism as social forces reflects the tension and conflict that participants experienced as Filipino/as and Filipino Americans. Moreover, the participants grappled with their own identities as Americans and Filipinos. Across student focus groups and student interviews the theme that emerged was the participants' ethnic identity. When asked how they identify themselves, most of the participants identified themselves as Filipino American. During the focus group, Boy shared, “I call myself Filipino American only because I have Filipino ties with the country still because I—one side of me grew up in the Philippines and the other half now is growing up in America.” Butuin, who was also in the same focus group, added, “I would consider myself a Filipino American because I was born to Filipino parents, but I was born in US soil, so part of me is American.” Boy and Butuin take on the hyphenated identity Filipino/a American through their geographic place of birth and ethnic background.

Aside from having the hyphenated identity, Efren, a participant from the student interview, shared an obsession with identifying as Asian when he was a younger. He
shares, “I actually had some sort of obsession having to be Asian and have to be identified as Asian. I always wanted to be identified as Asian, not specifically, not Pacific Islander and I was not sure why.” He continues, “My mom grew up in Florida, and she disliked being Filipino, and as she grew older I guess, and she raised me up, she made me feel that way.” The mom’s lack of acceptance of the Filipino culture influenced Efren’s dislike of being identified as Filipino, which influenced his obsession with the Asian culture.

Even though participants shared their hyphenated identities, Benjie, who was part of the focus group, shared that when he was in the fourth grade he shared his sense of identity, “For me it is like [sic] to describe Filipino, pride, it is basically you take in what culture you have and you don’t change it. Once you’re Filipino and you go here (to the US) you don’t take another culture and try to mix it that [sic] together.” He also adds, “For me it is like I’m Filipino, and I’m Filipino. That is me.” Benjie was born in the Philippines and immigrated to the United States when he was in the fourth grade. Benjie is proud of being Filipino, and unlike the other participants he does not take on the hyphenated identity.

Across both student interviews and focus groups, participants questioned the Filipino identity. Bituin, who was part of the focus group, expressed the following:

I tried to figure out what my culture is to be honest because I’m learning about how we got colonized and so we have historically some Spanish duties and we have some American duties or roles, so I’m trying to figure out okay so what is Filipino? What is Filipino exactly? Because everyone says you’re Mestizo, you’re Chinese, Spanish and Filipino. I’m like so what my food, my language, and my skin color is all that I am? Like is there anything else aside from this colonization
that is my culture? I researched the books on campus and they are not telling me --
ye they are only telling me social things; they are not telling me about historical roots
like where are all these indigenous people coming from? How can I figure out which
indigenous tribes I’m coming from? Because I feel like those indigenous tribes are
the true Filipinos. I don’t know who I am aside from being Chinese, Filipino, and
Spanish. So I’m just trying to figure it out.

Boy, who was in the focus group, added, “That is where my question comes in, if we have so
many American values, then what are we? How can we say we are Filipino if we full on
don’t know what the Filipino culture is?” The participants in the focus group engaged in
critical discussion about the impact of colonization on the Philippines and their own
identity. In one of the student interviews, Malaya shared that her mom was Igorot, an
indigenous community in the Philippines. As we talked about her identity, she identifies
now as half Igorot. Moreover, she started to explore the Igorot community through
meeting people who identified as indigenous Filipinos and various Filipino indigenous
organizations around San Diego. Malaya shares:

I started to meet people who were part of BIBAK. BIBAK is an Igorot group; it
represents the five regions: Benguet, Ifugao, and I don’t know the rest. They are not
located on campus; they are a community group. They are family and friends that I
reconnected with and just talking and reading stuff they would send me. Like now I
consider myself Igorot, and I did not before because my mom did not talk about it. I
thought Filipinos was a blanket.
Malaya shares her indigenous awakening through connecting with family and friends. Moreover, she realizes that she is Igorot and has taken an active role in understanding her indigenous roots.

Besides the ethnic identification, participants shared the cultural conflict within their families. The majority of the participants in the focus groups and student interviews were second-generation Filipinos and had a college major in the sciences. There were 13 students that participated in the qualitative portion of this study. Out of the 13 participants, five majored in Kinesiology. Moreover, the participants discussed how their identities were connected to the “American Dream.” Across the focus groups and student interviews, participants discussed that their parents wanted them to fulfill the American Dream. Efren, a participant from the student interview, describes it as, “the American Dream is the path for you to go to college and get a good job and get as much money as you want.” Ian, a student from the focus group, describes it as, “They (Filipino parents) always push their children to be dedicated and hard working and always exceed.” Participants’ identities are tied to what their parents raised them to believe concerning the American Dream. Many of the students appeared to be pursuing that American dream by seeking a Kinesiology degree. In the student interview, Bayani stated he felt conflicted. Bayani shared, “It is (American Dream) not my dream; it’s my dad’s dream. My dream is a lot different from his.”

The American dream is accomplished through one’s dedication, hard work, and commitment. Comparatively, Filipino/a families are a collective culture, and family members are expected to support each other. Bituin shares that she feels conflicted with the American culture and Filipino culture. She discussed a conversation with her parents:
“You need to do what is best for you, don’t worry about anyone else because that is the only way you can succeed here in America.” Diwa, a participant in the focus group, contributed: In the Asian culture or Filipino culture, we like to take care of family first. Family comes first; that is what I was taught. And although some will say yeah I take care of my family first but as they grow older they see less of their family members as in Asian or Filipino culture we will take care of our grandparents; we are the one who moves in with them.

Diwa provides an excellent description of what occurs with Filipino families. Culturally and traditionally, the kids are to take care of their parents when they get older. In addition, kids are never expected to send their parents to a nursing facility. It is a sign of disrespect to the elders.

The two identities and cultures, Filipino and American, oftentimes conflict. Benjie discussed his conflict with his level of happiness and the major that he is pursuing, “I would say that I am content because it is like I’m still like trying to—there are other majors out there but half of you wants to be successful but you want to do the other thing. You can’t combine the parental and son/daughter dream because it conflicts.” Filipino parents have an expectation of what this American Dream looks like, but it conflicts with the students’ dreams.

**Silence of Linguistic Integration: Language**

Another theme that emerged was silence of linguistic integration. While the code “language” was utilized, it does not fully represent the experience of “use” and “engagement” of language as connected to culture; rather, in most instances students felt
“silenced” either by using their native tongue or in how they spoke English. During the student interview, Bayani shared that his Tagalog language was part of him:

Well for me I can remember, I guess growing up, I didn’t have I guess the best accent or the way I speak English, I didn’t know there was a certain way to speak English, so yeah I would get that accent a lot. And I still have it; I mean I’m not proud of it. I’m not necessarily ashamed of having that accent or whatever. There was a time in high school where I would try to stop it (the accent) or fix it. People would tell me that you have to change that accent and if you don’t they are gonna look at you in a certain way and not take you seriously.

His accent and language defined who he was. He grew conscious of his accent at one point and tried to “stop it.” His peers told him that he needed to get rid of his accent, so people would take him seriously. Another participant, Boy, shared a similar experience when he immigrated to the US. He was unable to speak English. But when he learned to speak English, the English language defined his identity:

I moved to American in third grade, and I like had to learn how to speak English. I didn’t know how to speak English; it took me a year to speak English. I didn’t understand English. And so when I was finally able to speak and write English, that is when I started identifying myself as an American and not really Filipino because when I was young I was like, oh Filipinos are only in the Philippines, and now that we are in America we are just Americans now.

Bituin discussed that she was placed in an ESL course, even though she spoke English and was born in the United States: “My parents made the mistake of writing Filipino in the
school’s home language survey, so I had to do ESL most of my elementary life, but I spoke perfect English and I understood Tagalog.”

The participants shared that language played a critical role in their identity development. For instance, Boy shared that learning how to speak English defined his American identity. Bayani shared that his accent and language was a part of his identity. Oftentimes, students in America whose language is other than English try to get rid of their native tongue because they feel embarrassed.

As participants shared, they felt embarrassed because of their native tongue. Language policies in schools dehumanize participants with accents. For instance, EL courses isolate students who do not speak English by limiting college preparatory courses and A-G courses. Moreover, EL students tend to follow the same course sequence. Educators limit native tongue. Despite the strong research on bilingual education, schools continue to only adopt monolingual policies.

**Kapwa: Connectedness**

According to Enriquez (1994), *kapwa* is the unity of “self” and “others” and is the recognition of shared identity and an inner self with others; thus, the theme of connectedness reveals the importance participants placed in feeling a sense of community connection. Participants shared that being part of a cultural student organization in college was helpful in developing their perceived ethnic identity and connecting with other Filipino/a students on campus. Efren discussed his resentment towards Filipinos as a child, but after joining the Filipino college student organization, he now has a greater appreciation of the Filipino culture:
But I think now as of recently I have been identifying more as Filipino, especially since joining Samahan and understanding more about Filipino culture and really embracing like a different side that I have never known. I began to know that, you know being, it is okay to be Filipino and it is okay to be identified as Filipino.

Another student, Malaya, from the student interview, describes herself as inquisitive. As a youth, Malaya was very conscious of her connection to the Filipino culture. For example, she would ask her parents questions such as, “How was life in the PI and how was it under martial law?” This passion for learning about the Filipino culture continued throughout her high school and college years. Currently, Malaya is an executive board member of a Filipino student organization at San Diego State University. She states, “I think now more than ever, I think I am more in touch now as Filipino, but as far as a Filipina I think that is something I still need to explore.” She discusses her role as an executive board member and shares her frustration, because she feels that there is disconnection with Filipino students and the Filipino college student organization. Malaya expresses, “They don’t get me, Filipinos my age. It’s like hey we are Filipinos and let’s party and go to Friendship games. Being Filipino is nonexistent in the student organization.” She shares that students are here to only socialize and not really interested in learning about the Filipino culture. Moreover, she compares the Filipino student organization to MECHA. She expresses, “I don’t know why MECHA is so good. There is solidarity. They have a great sense of who they are.” She recognizes that kapwa is almost non-existent within the Filipino student organization.

In the focus group, Boy shares this idea of “fictive kinship.” He describes it as, “it’s a brotherhood or sisterhood because you are connected to one’s color or culture.” He
continues and uses the example of the Filipino student organization: "Well also culture, when you are together as a culture or as a color you feel more powerful; you feel greater." He uses this example as a connection to the Filipino student organization in which he has been active.

Ligaya, a participant from the focus group, shared that the college she is attending was one of her last choices. Ligaya is currently a junior at CSU and a Kinesiology and Pre Health Sciences major. Ligaya explained that she had a really strong GPA and applied to various UCs and private schools in California. However, she was not accepted to the UCs, where she had applied. “I was then wait listed for UCI, but because I put nursing as my major, I didn’t get in, so I was kind of bummed.” Financially, her parents were unable to pay for a private institution. She continues, “Where are we supposed to get that (money) realistically, and I was fine; I guess I’ll have to go to CSU San Marcos.” She continues, “Initially I just hated the orientation, like the first-year orientation you have to come on campus. I was so grumpy; I was like why am I here? This school I just hate so much.” Yet, during her first year at CSUSM, she joined the Filipino student organization, and she felt “more connected and felt like I wanted to be here.”

Many of the participants were first-generation college students. For the large majority, the college experience is foreign and unfamiliar. As with first-generation college students, it is important that students feel connected through a student organization, a club, or course(s) on campus. The students shared that there was a sense of “kapwa” with the Filipino student organization, and they expressed and felt connected with the student organization and each other.
Being a Minority: Dominant Preferred Identity

Across the focus group and student interviews, the theme of identity or a preferred identity emerged in relation to being from a minority group. Even though Filipinos are a minority group, participants expressed that Filipino/as are even more of a minority. During the focus group, Benjie stated, “We are one country, one culture, we are Filipino.” The participants shared that no one is aware of the Filipino history and culture. If Filipinos are represented, society recognizes them as dancers, Manny Pacquiao, and Jessica Sanchez.

Diwa shares her frustration:

Like everyone said, like they represent us, since they are such a minority here in America, and we have been here for a such a long time, and we haven’t been represented, the fact there is representation despite the fact that we have to get out of TV shows like Americas’ Best Dance Crew and pageants and stuff. They completely told us that Filipinos are not allowed to participate in those pageants because we keep winning.

Diwa continues, “Is it because we are show offs and such good at dancing and singing and acting and all these arts, that we are not allowed to participate in these type of events. I don’t know if I am embarrassed or just angry.” Boy adds to the discussion, “We prove to them that we are equal, and everyone hates us, or just making fun of us for not being anything and when the underdog comes out; it’s all about the underdog.” This student explains the social and political challenges as a Filipino/a, but even as a minority they are the “underdog,” because no one knows who they are.

Benjie shares that he feels even more of a minority because of the label Asian and Mexican. He expresses his frustration:
I think when people look at us straight in your face it is like oh he is Asian. That is the first thing they see but they don’t truly see what we are. I think sometimes it is you’re trying to assert like I’m Filipino not just Asian. We are not all like together. We are all different people. We have our own culture. And you know we as Filipinos are also categorized or either mistaken as Mexicans, or like people had come up to me, I have felt offended when they say oh Filipinos are the Mexicans of Asia. We have no connection with the Mexican culture. We are one country, one culture, we are Filipino.

Benjie expressed that Filipinos are not recognized, and there is a lack of awareness of the Filipino culture and community. Filipinos are a socio-political minority group and are often lumped into the Asian or Mexican category. However, Filipinos have a diverse history and culture, which distinguishes them from other Asians. During the focus group, Pag-Ibig questions the source of these assumptions: “There is a lot of misconception towards people and basically what’s from the source, would it be social media, and especially movies, they categorize Asians as just Asians.” As Pag-Ibig shared, the media perpetuates Asians as one ethnic group as opposed to diverse cultures and ethnicities.

Participants also shared their experiences with microaggression and racism. During an interview, Bayani shared his experience in high school with his Advanced Placement (AP) teacher: “My teacher would go around the class and ask, ‘Hey, what college are you going to?’” One of the things that stood out to him was, “She would not ask the ones sitting in the back of the classroom, and I was never asked. Filipinos were not really asked because our class was mixed with White and Chinese.” Bayani observed that based on race you were treated differently. Moreover, there is always a level of expectation based on a
students’ race and identity. For example, Filipinos were expected not to go to college. He continued to share another incident with his AP teacher:

My AP teacher would point and say to students you are going to pass the AP test and you are not going to pass the AP test, and for some reason she would put this list of students who had a chance of passing, and she named the 10 students in class. And my name was never on the list, but in the class of 30 only five people, and I was one of the five, passed the AP test.

During the focus group, Charmane shares her experience in high school, when other students teased her: “I have been called Chinese and Korean I think because of my complexion. They would call me ‘Chow Mein.’” Similarly, Diwa shares her experience in middle school: “Other students would say you have a flat nose or you have pancake face.” Participants were teased, because of their physical features (i.e., skin tones, noses, eyes). These racial messages caused emotional pain for the participants. As one describes it, “I mentally broke down.” Students not only have to combat racial insults from peers, but these students have also experienced microaggressions with teachers.

Students of color are vulnerable to microaggressions. Students both in the focus group and the student interviews shared that they all have experienced microaggression in and out of the classroom. Despite the experiences, the participants did not respond or react to the microaggressions. They have remained silent and continued to work towards their goal. For example, Bayani was one of five students that passed his AP test. Even though his own AP teacher did not think he would pass the test.
Colonial Mentality: Familial Cultural Conflict

Another theme that emerged was familial cultural conflict in relation to colonial mentality. The overall theme of familial cultural conflict reflects the participants’ personal experiences within their family both immediate and extended. In terms of colonial mentality, in one of the student interviews, Efren, discussed how his grandmother’s belief about having a lighter skin tone affected him.

She brought with her these certain ideals that she wasn’t giving exactly or she thought that she was inferior to like white people. The color of the skin was very important, and I mean it just really engrained in my mind that if I wasn’t light enough that I was not good enough. As time went on, it turned out that I was getting darker, but I kept saying to myself, wow, I’m really losing my self-worth, and I was actually losing self-esteem as time went on, and I was getting darker and darker.

Bituin shares about the use of skin whitening products: “Yah, I buy lightening products. My parents were like you are so dark, can you please take a shower?” In this case, the parents sent an explicit message that being dark is dirty and that taking a shower will make her complexion lighter. Bituin continues, “I just want to be lighter skinned because I feel like I don’t look dirty.” Furthermore, she shared that her parents compare her to her cousin:

I am always compared to my cousin because both of our parents are full Filipino, she is Cebuano (another Filipino ethnic group in the Philippines) but she looks White. She has white skin, she is skinny, she has a bridged nose, and she has really American features. So I’m constantly compared to her. I’m taller, I’m big boned, I’m darker, and I do have a Filipino nose.
The explicit messages of being dark are not only conveyed to her, but she is reminded of other physical characteristics such as her weight and nose.

Diwa discussed a time when she was younger and her aunt would bathe her and her younger sister: "When I was younger, my Auntie would shower me and my little sister and my cousin, but she would scrub really hard because she thought that it would take off the darkness in my skin." Butuin interjects and adds, "My mom said it works, like if you do it that hard." It was repeated across the focus groups and student interviews that being dark skinned was not good enough and that scrubbing and using lightening products will remove the darkness. The everyday messages participants received from parents and older family members is that brown skin is ugly and inferior, and this belief is a reminder and indicator of the colonized mind.

Besides skin color, participants shared personal experiences about their Filipino (flat) noses. During the focus group, Liwanag who happened to be Mestizo (half white and Filipino), shared that her family adored her physical features: "When I was growing up—When I was little I had a flat nose and then I remember always hearing, 'Oh no, you got your mom's nose or whatever.'" She continues, "As it started growing in, it was like, and when I was younger, 'You know, if you go to the Philippines, you can be an immediate star just because of how you look.'" Liwanag also shared that her family would comment on her White physical features: "You got your dad's looks rather than your mom's, and you are light, have brown hair, and don't have a flat nose." Ligaya, who attended a predominately White private school shared, "When I was growing up, one of the things I was embarrassed about was just the way I looked because Filipinos had different noses." She expressed, "Being around white people, I look so gross and ugly."
Ian shared he began to develop a complex about his nose. He explains, “They always had to say pinch your nose before you go to bed. I always had to do that because they reminded me that my nose was like Filipino.” Efren discussed that when he was young, his grandmother would remind him to pinch “the bridge of his nose.” My grandmother said, “Whenever you have nothing to do, all you do (gestures the pinching of the nose) and you will grow up and have a beautiful nose, and it won’t be flat and ugly.” He continues, “It was really interesting because it is showing that like that’s a characteristic that she doesn’t want to have and that she wants to have modeled after someone else.”

Participants in both focus groups and student interviews shared their experiences with other dimensions of colonial mentality. Participants were reminded that a sharp or bridged nose is a preferred physical characteristic. Family members reminded participants of their flat noses and believed that pinching their noses will help them achieve a bridged or sharp nose. Within the Filipino culture, anyone who is Mestizo is praised because they are half-White. Liwanag’s family members admired her physical characteristics (i.e., skin tone and nose) at an early age. Participants were exposed to the colonial mentality of preferred characteristics at an early age by parents and family members. Respectively, participants in the study became conscious of these imperfect physical characteristics, which were internalized psychologically by impacting on their self-esteem and self-image.

**Education: Familial Cultural Conflict**

Familial cultural conflict is also reflected in participants’ educational experiences. The last theme that emerged concerned educational experiences. The participants shared their educational, financial, personal, and social experiences as a Filipino/a. Students in both the focus groups and student interviews expressed they felt pressured by their
parents to pursue “prescribed” majors. For instance, Ian shared, “Like my mom is a registered nurse and my dad is a respiratory therapist, and they want me to be in the medical field.” Ian is a Kinesiology major at a CSUSM. Similarly, Ligaya is also a Kinesiology major at CSUSM. Both shared the following parental influence:

I guess the biggest challenge for me was yeah like he [Ian] said, being a nurse because my parents, they weren’t trying to force it on me, but they implied it so much that it just got drilled into my head that I have to be a nurse because my Lola (grandmother) was a nurse, my aunties were registered nurses and administrative high-end position nurses, so it was really emphasized.

Bayani shared his personal experience with his dad when he was accepted to UCLA and UCSD. He shared, “My dad was like you got to be an engineer major or a doctor.” The participant was not unaware of the role of engineers and explains, “So I applied to be an engineering major at UCSD and I applied to UCLA as a sociology major. I got into both schools.” He continues, “When my dad found out, ‘Oh, you go to UCSD. You are going to be an engineer.’” While Bayani was accepted into competitive UCs, the father pressured him to a specific major. Currently, this student is at UCSD but ended up switching his major from engineering to sociology. Education among the Filipino community is prized and valued as evident with the experiences of Ian and Bayani. However, the participants felt pressured to pursue majors that were perceived as prestigious and reputable based on their parents’ knowledge.

When asked about challenges students faced, Benjie shares a personal experience with his parents’ expectations:
I had to live up to my parents’ expectations about having high grades. You have to pursue this career and similar stuff because you know how Filipinos parents [sic], you have to have a path that will set you to your future, and they will hold it against you if you go against what they want you to do. Like they want you to be a nurse, a doctor, and I remember telling my mom I want to be a pilot, and she was like, ‘No, you have to be a doctor or a nurse because you know the money is better.” I’m like and yah money, but parents feel like you’re set and once they know you’re willing to take that they’re happy.

In addition to the “prescribed majors,” participants reported that their parents suggested specific institutions such as University of California (UCs) and specialized charter schools. Parents believed that these institutions provided financial stability and better college opportunities for their children. In the student interview, Efren shared:

I think it has to do with basically how well off their kids will be. Basically from the start when they’re—they have their children they want them to be as well off as they can, be successful and by successful I mean in terms of making a sufficient enough [sic] money in a safe field but not exactly looking at the aspect of doing whatever they want to do or what they love to do. Also, when parents talk about their son going to like a certain university like UCSD, they feel like it is more prestigious because it really links to having better fields of professions that will lead to later on as opposed to San Diego State.

Ian discussed the impact of transferring to High Tech High, because his parents felt it would provide him with more college opportunities. He shares, “Well my parents thought it would be beneficial for me to go to High Tech because it is college based, and you know, a
lot of colleges would say hey this guy is from San Diego High Tech High.” The parents believed that attending this particular charter school would give more opportunities to selective colleges. While the parents believed that this school would provide him with more college choices, Ian shared that it was difficult to transition from an ethnically diverse school to a predominately White school. He describes how he felt when he was at High Tech High: “no connection to the community.” Even though this was a college-based school, he felt alone and did not feel connected.

In one of the focus groups, Ligaya shared that she did not get into the nursing program at CSUSM and questioned whether or not to continue with pursuing this career path. She explains, “My two cousins got into a nursing program this year. I was the other cousin that didn’t.” Ligaya expressed, “I felt so stupid. I’m like what the heck, like I just felt so down. I felt I wasn’t useful to my family because I couldn’t get in.” Consequently, she describes exploring a different career path:

When I didn’t get in I was debating like if I should still do nursing. I want to be chef or pastry chef but my parents were like no. They don’t get money; there is not a lot of places hiring to be a chef, or you might have to move to Vegas to find a job. And I’m like, ‘Oh, what if I start my own business?’ They are like, ‘That is going to cost a lot of money. Well, okay, you can do that on the side, but you should really choose a job that will support you financially.’ I’m like, ‘Okay, well, that makes sense, so I guess I could do it as a side job or as like a hobby but still pursue nursing.’

As Ligaya shared, she questioned the nursing career and began to explore other possible interests. Her parents encouraged her to continue with nursing, because it will
support her financially. Filipino families perceive the medical field as a financially stable career as opposed to the culinary arts and the social sciences.

Many of the participants grew up in ethnically diverse neighborhoods and some attended private schools. When asked about their educational experiences in high school, the theme that emerged was that schools lacked role models, specifically Filipino/a educators. In one of the focus groups, Baby shared, “I would say no, but I saw it for like Hispanic teachers or Mexican teachers. They would have role models, but like Latinos. I would ask, ‘Where are my role models?’” Another participant, Diwa, shared that there was a Filipino counselor at her high school. However, she did not recall if it was a positive or negative experience. “He was more willing to help me with my guidance to going to college, but since that stereotype about being smart or you’re Filipino you’re smart.” She continues, “He really didn’t show me I guess like the other, the side things that we don’t see, to taking like the SATs and stuff like that. I’m the first generation of going to college.”

Malaya, from the student interviews shared, “The Filipino teachers were nice to me, but I did a lot on my own because my parents studied in the Philippines. I am only child.” She adds, “No one personally reached out to me. I reached out to them (educators).” Bituin adds, “If I have the guidance, if I knew how important college was for me or it was gonna be, then I would have focused more in school because I didn’t really find out you needed good grades to go to college until my junior year when everyone was applying to go to college.” Participants shared that the schools they attended lacked role models, more specifically, Filipino educators. If there was a Filipino/a educator, students expressed that the experience was neither positive nor negative.
Bayani, one of the participants in the student interviews, had a positive experience with one of his teachers, who happened to be Filipino. His AP Biology teacher was a motivating educator. Bayani describes him, “Mr. T was the bomb, and he probably is the main reason why I am in college [sic] is because of the help he did.” He continues, “Mr. T would tell me stories about UCLA and told me about the Filipino clubs, and he even brought a handful of students to like college trips.” He explains part of his reason to attend UCSD was because of Mr. T: “Yah, one of the colleges I went to was UCSD, so kind of the reason why I’m here too is because of him.” Not only did Mr. T help this student to navigate the educational system, but he helped four of his peers as well. He shares, “He was very adamant about there’s four of us (Filipino students) that was just [sic] looked like as a mentor and he made sure that all four of us went to college and helped us in every single way possible.”

Finances determine participants’ college choice, specifically with ethnic minority and disadvantage families. During one of the student interviews, Malaya discussed how her parents were unable to support her with college finances. She shares, “I applied for a lot of scholarships. That is how I managed to pay for the first year because I dormed, and my parents were not financially able to pay for some of the college expenses.” Malaya continues, “Ever since I was a kid they (my parents) were like anak (child), you need to get scholarships because they knew they could not pay for it.” In one of the focus groups, Ligaya shares her experience with her college choice:

Well I applied to –I had a really good chance, well good enough to get into some of the UCs. I had a 3.9 GPA—I did not want to stay in San Diego for college. I wanted to stay in California, but I wanted to be in the Irvine or Los Angeles area.
With my parents, they were okay if you can get in you can probably go there, we can afford it. I was wait listed for UCI and got into Viola as well, but that was $54,000 a year and so with my parents, I mean there is four of us, four kids total, and they were just like, ‘No,’ like even though they were giving me $22,000 in grants. That is just for tuition. What about housing? My parents were like, ‘Where are we going to get the money realistically?’

Another student, Diwa, shares that she ended up at CSUSM because she did not want to burden her family financially. “I did tell them I purposely did not apply to UCs because I was thinking the first two years of college was strictly going to be GEs anyways, so why spend more money at a UC.” She continues, “If you can, spend less at a CSU or community, but I just wanted to save money.”

The qualitative aspect of this study revealed that Filipino families push their children to attend college. Parents understand the importance of obtaining a college education, so, their children will be financially stable. Moreover, this study highlights that while participants wanted to attend private colleges or University of California campuses, finances played a significant role in determining what college they attend.

From the qualitative analysis, ethnic identity, language, kapwa, being a minority, colonial mentality, and educational experiences emerged as themes for this study. Participants from both focus groups and student interviews shared personal experiences as well as their internalized conflicts and perceptions of preferred behaviors, physical features, and familial expectations. Some of the reflections that were shared were difficult for some of the participants because of they were psychologically traumatic experiences that include racism and behaviors that go unnoticed in the form of microaggressions.
While the student reflections, stories, and personal experiences were painful for some, they voluntarily disclosed their pain, and it was critical and needed to be shared. The next chapter will discuss the implications and recommendations for this study.
Chapter 6: Mixed Methods Analysis, Limitations, Discussion, and Conclusions

The purpose of this exploratory study was to examine the impact of colonial mentality, collective self-esteem, and ethnic identity on academic success, social class, and college selection as perceived by Filipino/a college students. More specifically, the study sought to explain how selected social factors impact on Filipino/a group of college students’ educational experiences.

The study research question asked, “What social factors (colonial mentality, social class, ethnicity, academic success) influence Filipino/a college aged students’ perception of their identity?” The findings from the study indicate that colonial mentality, collective self-esteem, and ethnic identity have a significant effect on Filipino/a college students’ personal and educational experiences. When examining the relationship between ethnic identity, colonial mentality, academic success, and college choice, the results showed that there was a moderate positive relationship between academic success and college choice. This means that participants with high GPAs attended more selective colleges (i.e., UCSD). Moreover, there were significant differences when comparing students that attend a California State University (CSU), California Community College (CCC), or University of California (UC) with scores on the Colonial Mentality Scale (CMS-I). For instance, this result revealed there was a significant difference between the within discrimination and colonial debt subscales. When examining the within discrimination subscale, participants that were enrolled in the California State University had a higher mean score ($M = 26.80, SD = 7.60$) compared to University of California participants ($M = 20.81, SD = 8.77$). In other words, CSU participants had higher levels of within discrimination compared to the participants that were enrolled in UC and CCC. When examining the colonial debt subscale, there were
differences between UC and CCC participants. In other words, CCC participants had higher levels of colonial debt compared to UC participants. Lastly, physical characteristics were a significant predictor of academic success. In other words, adopting White physical characteristics leads to academic success in college. These findings are part of the reflections of Bituin, a student who moved from Japan to the United States. She shared her experience:

I was legitimately terrified upon moving to the U.S. because one I did not know anyone, and I had moved to Japan when I was around five years old, so I didn’t know any culture or the American culture. I didn’t understand I had been overseas. The first thing I noticed was my community of resident. I did not see any Asian people; it was just White, Mexican, and African Americans. That was my first glimpse of American culture because the minute I walked on to the school campus they automatically like dogged me. They all looked me up and down, and it was just like I’m here to go to school. It was funny because it was lunch time, and I was literally contemplating eating lunch in the bathroom because no one spoke to me in my classes. So I realized that the only way to find friends here was to stick with my own kind.

Understanding how these sociocultural experiences impact on Filipino/as is critical because Filipino/as are racialized as Asians. Furthermore, David (2008) postulates that Filipinos are an understudied population. The data collected in this study highlight the struggles that Filipino/a college students encounter as they navigate the educational system. This final chapter begins with the mixed methods analysis followed by the
limitations of the study. Lastly, this chapter concludes with recommendations and discussion for future research.

To further understand the intricacies that Filipino/a college students encounter, a mixed methods approach was used. More specifically, a sequential explanatory design was used involving research in two phases. In the first phase of the study, an online survey was distributed by email and social media link to 100 Filipino/a college students attending one of the three college systems in California: CCC, CSU, and UC. After receiving the responses of 100 Filipino college students, an analysis of the quantitative data was undertaken in the fall of 2014. A second phase was then conducted.

During the second phase of the study, the researcher conducted two focus groups and three student interviews with Filipino/a college students. The focus groups and student interviews provided a significant amount of student narrative data. After the data was collected, the researcher analyzed the data using coding techniques, and themes that emerged were used as codes for the study. Lastly, to strengthen the quantitative data, the researcher connected both quantitative and qualitative data. In other words, the combined approach helped explain patterns from the first phase.

**Mixed Methods Analysis**

Table 6.1 summarizes the key findings during the quantitative and qualitative phase. Participants in the study reported moderate levels of colonial mentality based on the CMS-I. The average score was 83.16 (SD = 21.48) out of a possible score of 216 and the lowest score was 36. After analyzing the data from the qualitative phase, participants shared their experiences with colonial mentality. As participants shared these personal experiences, they were reminded of how colonialism is still pervasive and universal within their families. Colonial mentality refers to
the superiority, pleasantness, or attraction that is associated with any cultural values, behaviors, physical appearance, and objects that are based on American or Western culture (David & Okazaki, 2006a; Root, 1997; Strobel, 2001).

Based on the results from the quantitative data, the moderate levels of colonial mentality can be explained by the daily messages and experiences participants had with their parents. Parents and family members reminded participants that their Filipino characteristics were not good enough or White enough. As mentioned in the previous chapter, the physical characteristics of Filipinos, such as flat Filipino noses, dark skin tones, strong Filipino accents, and physical height and weight, were reminders that such attributes were not preferred. These Filipino characteristics are contrasted with White or Western physical characteristics, such as bridged or pointed noses, lighter skin tones, and being tall and skinny.

Even though participants had moderate levels of colonial mentality, participants reported high levels of ethnic identity based on the MEIM. The average score on the MEIM was 39.68 (SD = 5.89). During the quantitative phase, participants in the study reported higher levels of ethnic identity based on the following items on the MEIM. First, “I am happy that I am a member of that group that I belong to” had the highest mean of 3.72 (SD = .570). Second, “I feel good about my cultural or ethnic background” had a mean of 3.69 (SD = .566). Finally, “I have a lot of pride in my ethnic group” showed a mean of 3.52 (SD = .630). During the qualitative phase, participants shared a strong connection to their Filipino identity. While some took on the hyphenated identity, Filipino American, the participants identified as Filipino first. Moreover, when asked if they have ever denied their Filipino identity, all of the participants stated “no” and expressed that they were
proud of being Filipino. As Benjie stated, “For me it is like to describe Filipinos, it’s like pride, you take what culture you have and you know you don’t change it.” While participants in this study had moderate levels of colonial mentality, participants also had a strong sense of ethnic identity. As Ian shared, “I embrace my culture. I embrace who I am. You can’t deny who you are.” Pag-Ibig adds, “I either embrace or I don’t. What’s there to be embarrassed about? It is like Filipino; it is pride.” These outcomes can be explained by participants’ involvement with Filipino college student organizations or their enrollment in a Filipino Studies course.

In addition to the high levels of ethnic identity, the data revealed that there was a strong correlation between GPA and college choice ($r = .24$). In other words, academic success (self-reported GPA) had a positive relationship on the college institution in which participants were enrolled.

Throughout both focus groups and student interviews, participants expressed that their parents wanted them to pursue a major in the sciences (i.e., kinesiology, pre-medical, or nursing). Participants shared that parents reminded them of their personal struggles in the Philippines and the United States. Participants understood these challenges, which created personal and emotional tension for them. As Bayani shares, “My dad really wanted me to succeed. He kept telling me if you do not want to be a plumber, if you don’t want to be a taxi driver, you have to go to college.” Moreover Bituin shares, “My mom didn’t even finish her college Associate of Art degree when she moved here from the Philippines, and the only reason why my dad joined the Navy was because they had me.” She continues, “My parents did not care about where I wanted to go to college. They only wanted me to go to a field like doctor, lawyer, engineer, accountant.” This personal tension is based on the
Pilipino Psychology framework discussed in chapter two, especially the concept of *kapwa* felt by the students. *Kapwa* is the unity of self and others (Enriquez, 1994). Moreover, *Kapwa* is the core value that serves as the base or “trunk” that drives and connects *hiya*, *utang na loob*, and *pakikisama* (Enriquez, 1994). *Hiya* is described as shame, and *utang na loob* is a sense of inner debt or gratitude. In order to avoid *hiya* and to show *utang na loob*, participants put their personal goals aside (i.e., pursuing nontraditional majors). Moreover, participants wanted to maintain a harmonious relationship with their parents even though it created personal tension for them.

When examining the mother’s education level and the MEIM, the results yielded a significant difference between mothers with some college and mothers who were college graduates. According to Arellano and Padilla (1996), ethnic identity has been associated with academic achievement, higher self-esteem (Roberts et al., 1999; Umaña-Taylor, 2004), and psychological well-being (Phinney, 2003; Roberts et al., 1999; Umaña-Taylor et al., 2002). Within the Filipino culture and family, there is a strong emphasis on education. Filipino parents encourage and pressure their children to pursue reputable and distinguished careers (i.e., doctor, lawyer, engineer, dentist, etc.).

During the qualitative phase of the study, participants expressed that they felt pressured to pursue a career that was competitive and prestigious. While participants felt the personal tension with their parents, across the focus groups and student interviews they shared that their Filipino identity was important to them. Because participants understood their parents’ struggles, they felt pressured to get A’s in school and pursue a prestigious major. In Monzon’s (2003) study, he found that parental influence and agreement with parents about their choice of major was a predictor of having a positive
Similar to Monzon’s (2003) findings, this study reported that academic success is positively correlated to one’s identity.

In this study, the independent variable that was a significant predictor of academic success was the physical characteristic subscale. These findings can be explained by the moderate levels of colonial mentality found among participants, as supported by the quantitative portion of the study. Moreover, during the qualitative phase, participants expressed feeling inferior because of their ethnic/cultural background. For instance, one of the participants felt ashamed of being Filipino and was obsessed with being Asian. Another participant shared that he would remind himself when he would take exams that he was Asian. There is an assumption that “Asians” are the model minority because Asians are the bright, shining example of hard work and patience whose example other minority groups should follow (Asian Nation, 2014). It is widely believed that all “Asians” are successful (i.e., academically, socially, and economically), have achieved the “American Dream,” and experience no or minimal social problems.

Besides the labeling of Filipinos as Asians, the acculturation and assimilation frameworks (Enrile & Agbayani, 2008) explain the predictors of academic success among Filipino/as in this study. Acculturation refers to a change in attitudes or values that result from the contact of one culture with another (Berry, 1997). Moreover, acculturative changes may be in a person’s attitudes mainly in the following areas: political, economic, technical, linguistic, religious, and social interactions (Berry, 1970). While participants reported a strong sense of ethnic identity, they may feel the need to acculturate and assimilate in order to succeed in the United States. Assimilation refers to embracing of the host culture and abandonment of the culture of origin and accepting the values from both
the host and heritage culture (Berry, 1997). Because of the unique history between the United States and the Philippines, Filipinos are not only familiar with American culture but have adopted the English language, U.S. educational system, U.S. democratic belief systems, and faith in the “American Dream” (Enrile & Agbayani, 2008). According to Feenstra and Santos-Castillo (1971) Filipinos have acculturated to Western culture prior to actual immigration to the United States. There is overlap between the acculturation, assimilation, and the colonial mentality framework. In other words, colonial mentality may explain why Filipinos have assimilated easily to the United States. Participants in this study may feel the need to adapt to Westernized values and forget about their Filipino ethnic identity in exchange for upward mobility in the United States.

When examining gender differences, female Filipina participants had higher GPAs, higher levels of ethnic identity, and lower levels of the colonial mentality compared to the male participants. This can be explained by high expectations that parents set for female participants to do as good as any other family member. For instance, Bituin discussed that she was constantly compared to her cousin. She shared, “My family members would tell me about my cousin and how she took all AP classes and was only a freshman.” Bituin continues, “They would put my cousin on a pedestal, and she was going to UCLA and that I was going to be at the house.” Another student, Liwanag, shares the pressure she felt from her father. She said, “A lot of the pressure comes from my dad, which is weird because my dad is White and my mom is Filipino.”

The high levels of ethnic identity and lower levels of the colonial mentality can also be explained by the female participants’ participation in a Filipino student organization (i.e., AB Samahan, Kamalayan Alliance, and Kaibigang Pilipino). The participants in the
The female participants were involved in organizing Filipino events, such as the annual Filipino Culture Night and other annual conferences. Moreover, the female participants also presented and shared historical material regarding the Philippines and colonialism. The female participants in this study had an active role in disseminating historical and contemporary information that is impacting the sociopolitical dynamics of Filipinos. The researcher observed that the male participants led more of the social activities, such as Friendship Games and dance rehearsals.

Synthesis of the Study

To connect the quantitative and qualitative finding of this study, Table 6.1 provides a profile of the salient findings by theme, quantitative phase, and qualitative phase.

Table 6.1

Connecting the Quantitative and Qualitative Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Points</th>
<th>Summary of Data during Quantitative Phase</th>
<th>Summary of Data during Qualitative Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dominant Preferred Identity</td>
<td>76% of participants responded <em>strongly agree</em> to the item, “I am happy that I am a member of that group I belong to”</td>
<td>Across the focus group and student interviews, the participants were proud of their ethnic identity. Participants also expressed pride in their culture and ethnicity. At the same time, there was tension in how they felt comfortable (revealed by the qualitative data where they wanted to change skin color and felt embarrassed about their physical characteristics and native language.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.1

*Connecting the Quantitative and Qualitative Data (continued)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Points</th>
<th>Summary of Data during Quantitative Phase</th>
<th>Summary of Data during Quantitative Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s education level had an effect on levels of ethnic identity</td>
<td>Across both focus groups and student interviews, participants felt pressured to do well in school.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonial Mentality</td>
<td>Participants reported moderate levels of colonial mentality (mean = 83.16) out of a score of 216</td>
<td>Participants from both the focus groups and student interviews shared their personal experiences with colonial mentality (i.e., comments directed towards them about flat noses, skin color, weight, height, and language)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\beta = -.271$ (Academic Success-through self report GPA)</td>
<td>Participants in both the student interviews and focus groups reported feeling inferior about being Filipino.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Choice</td>
<td>Correlation between college choice and GPA (.24)</td>
<td>Participants shared that the majors they pursued made their parents proud/happy. The majors were not always the students’ choice. Participants shared they felt conflicted about their level of happiness and choice of major.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Differences</td>
<td>CMS-I, MEIM, and Academic Success</td>
<td>Female participants reported pressure from family members. Female participants also served as board members for the Filipino student organizations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In this study, the tension between participants’ ethnic identity and levels colonial mentality were illustrated during the mixed methods analysis. As the conceptual framework highlighted, the branches represent ethnic identity and the roots represent colonial mentality. While participants may have felt a strong sense of ethnic identity, the colonial mentality is deeply rooted within the Filipino culture. During the quantitative phase, participants stated that they were proud of being Filipino. However, during the qualitative phase of the study, participants expressed unpleasant feelings about their physical features (i.e., flat noses, dark skin tones, height) and language.

Another tension that emerged was participants’ level of happiness and their “prescribed majors,” such as nursing, dentistry, engineering, law, and medicine. The results of the quantitative data revealed that there was a relationship between college choice and GPA. In other words, participants with high GPAs were enrolled in more selective colleges. During the qualitative phase, participants expressed they were pressured to pursue these “prescribed majors.” Participants questioned their own level of happiness. The participants internalized this conflict and continued to pursue the “prescribed majors” in order to appease their parents.

The mixed methods sequential explanatory design was critical in understanding the tension between Filipino/as’ ethnic identity and colonial mentality. The quantitative data revealed trends and patterns of the colonial mentality and ethnic identity among the participants. Some of the challenges with surveys are that they are anonymous, time consuming, and ask closed-ended questions. Participants may not feel invested in filling out the survey because of the challenges mentioned above, and this can influence their responses. However, during the qualitative process, participants engaged in a meaningful
dialogue with each other. The participants were comfortable and were able to share their stories as Filipino/as struggling with ethnic identity.

**Limitations**

Limitations are inevitable and must be acknowledged. In this study, one of the limitations was the sample size. During the first phase of the study, the researcher contacted the student organizations (AB Samahan, Kamalayan Alliance, and Kaibigang Pilipino) at the three college campuses (CCC, CSU, and UC) in San Diego County. The purpose of contacting the student organizations was to secure participants for the first phase of the study. After the initial contact with the student organizations, there was not a sufficient amount of participants that completed the survey. To address this issue, the researcher contacted the presidents of AB Samahan, Kamalayan Alliance, and Kaibigang Pilipino to encourage general board members to complete the survey. The survey link was sent on social media websites of the student organizations (Facebook, Twitter, etc.). In order to increase participation, the researcher utilized snowball sampling to increase student participation. Snowball sampling is achieved by asking participants to suggest someone else who might be willing to participate in the study.

In order to conduct valid survey research, Mertens (2005) suggests at least 100 observations for each major subgroup. In this study, the researcher was able to obtain the suggested number of participants. However, the sample that was obtained was from a regional location of California. As presented in Chapter 2, there are a significant number of Filipinos that reside in San Diego County. The results of the study cannot be generalized to other Filipino communities outside of San Diego.
The survey design may have contributed to the small sample in this study. Included in the survey design were demographic information and three instruments: Colonial Mentality Scale, Collective Self-Esteem Scale, and Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure. During a student interview, one of the participants shared that she felt the survey was too long. She shared that others may have felt the same way. Perhaps, future studies might consider shortening the survey to increase participation and strengthen the quantitative findings.

Initially, the study specifically targeted second-generation Filipino college students. However, as the survey was disseminated among various Filipino student organizations and courses, the generation level spanned from first- to fourth-generation Filipinos. Although 62% of the participants in the study were second-generation Filipino college students, the findings from this study should not be generalized to second-generation Filipinos.

Even though the CMS-I is a reliable and validated instrument, it is a relatively new scale. The instrument was developed to assess levels of colonial mentality among Filipinos (David, 2008). David (2008) cautions that further studies need to be conducted to better understand the impact of colonial mentality not only with Filipinos but other historically colonized groups. Due to the low reliability score, the CSES was removed from the study. The results of the Cronbach's alpha yielded low alpha levels, which prompted the researcher to remove the CSES and the subscales from the study.

Another limitation was the number of participants that participated in the qualitative portion of the study. While the goal was to obtain a total of 18 participants for the focus groups, the researcher was only able to secure 10 participants. One of the
challenges of collecting qualitative data was the conflicting schedules among college students. Many of the participants were working part-time jobs, were full-time college students, or held volunteer positions in the student organizations. Moreover, more than half of the participants lived at home and commuted to campus. Respectively, securing a time and day to meet was one of the constraints, which may have contributed to the low number of participants.

The participants that took part in the qualitative phase were students that attended a CCC, CSU, or UC in San Diego County. The college campuses were located in different cities in San Diego. One of the challenges was finding a common location for the focus groups. The focus groups were held at a CSU campus in San Diego. Since many of the participants lived and attended college in different parts of San Diego County, it was difficult for participants to commit to the focus group. Initially, 30 participants confirmed to participate in the focus group, but only 10 students showed up. The researcher emailed participants and followed up with a phone call to confirm their participation a few days before the day of the focus groups.

**Discussion**

The purpose of this study was to explore Filipino/a college students’ perspectives on colonial mentality and ethnic identity. Based on the findings, this next section will discuss recommendations for future studies.

Like many immigrant families, Filipino families immigrate to the United States to seek better employment and financial opportunities. Filipino parents view education as an opportunity for upward mobility in the United States. Moreover in Western society, college is an individualistic process, where the child determines what college she/he attends and
what major he/she pursues. Filipino families are a collective culture, and attending college is a collective process for them. In other words, the immediate family and child determine what college and major he/she will embark on. This is problematic because Filipinos view nursing, the medical field, engineering, and law as prestigious majors that will eventually lead to higher income and social status. A majority of participants in the qualitative portion of the study shared they wanted to pursue other majors such as arts, music, or culinary, but their parents talked them out of the less prestigious majors to pursue the prescribed majors. While Filipino families have good intentions for their children, the participants in the study were conflicted about their level of happiness and the majors they were pursuing. This creates familial cultural tension among Filipino families.

As Filipino/as navigate the educational system, they encounter barriers and challenges during this process. In this study, one of the challenges that participants faced was that they were first-generation college students. First-generation college students that attend a predominately White university can feel overwhelmed and abandoned. In previous studies, first-generation college students felt uncomfortable and isolated while attending a White university (Maramba, 2008). Participants expressed in the focus groups and student interviews that they did not feel connected to their respective college campuses.

While Maramba’s (2008) work exposes the struggles of Filipino college students’ lack of connection to college campuses, participants in this study expressed frustration about the lack of curriculum that focused on Filipino history and culture at the college level. Participants shared the only exposure about Filipino history and culture was passed down through parents and grandparents but limited in context. This was frustrating for
participants because the Filipino curriculum has been limited and nonexistent. One participant shared that at the college she was attending, there was very little Filipino literature in the library. How are students supposed to learn about their culture and history if resources are scarce and students do not have access to it?

One of the ways of addressing this issue is to provide college students with access to ethnic studies courses. While all the participants were involved with a Filipino student organization, participants shared that ethnic studies or Filipino courses were nonexistent at their respective campuses. Consequently, there is a need for ethnic studies or Filipino courses at the college level. These courses will provide first-generation college students with a space to engage in critical dialogue about social issues that impact students of color and marginalized communities. Moreover, this will provide students of color with an opportunity to learn and explore other cultures and ethnicities in a safe and comfortable environment. In addition, there is a need for more Filipino courses at the college level.

Aside from ethnic studies and Filipino courses, the participants in the study expressed that there were no Filipino/a educators to help them navigate the educational system. Liwanag shared that she felt the Filipino educator was helpful with her educational career but expressed that, “I wished he would have told more about the workings of the university.” In other words, she had hoped that he would have shared challenges and issues about the college and educational system. Across both focus groups and student interviews, participants did not recall any influential educators. However, one of the participants in the student interviews, Bayani, had a positive experience with his Biology teacher, who happened to be Filipino. Bayani shared that his teacher was the one who helped him get into college. Moreover, this educator not only mentored him but also...
worked with three other Filipino students and guided them through the same process. As Bayani shared, having a supportive and influential educator helped him with his educational trajectory. It is important for educators to develop positive relationships with their students, specifically with first-generation college students as they navigate the educational system.

The key to any successful relationship is to develop and foster a positive relationship. It is urgent and vital that educators develop positive relationships with their students. Students of color enter an educational system, which is foreign and geared towards White middle-class students. Marginalized students do not feel comfortable and are faced with social and family problems, such as poverty, violence, divorce, language acquisition, and gangs. These experiences are part of the lives of students. It is critical that educators try to empathize and be sensitive towards the experience of students of color. In this study, one of the participants shared his experience with an influential educator. This teacher helped him to navigate the educational system. This participant felt comfortable with this teacher because he had a positive relationship with him. The participant shared that his teacher advocated for him when he was not accepted into one of the AP classes. These pivotal interactive moments leave a lasting impression on students. These types of relationships are critical in schools, specifically schools with low-income and marginalized communities.

At the university level, mentoring programs, teacher education, and school counseling programs should continue to develop culturally and critically conscious educators. The training of such personnel should not stop at these programs but must continue at the K-12 school level. Developing culturally and critically conscious educators
is an ongoing process. Culturally and critically conscious educators are those who are aware of the oppressive policies and practices that impact on marginalized communities and students of color. Moreover, culturally and critically conscious educators are also aware of their own biases and continue to reflect and work on their personal and academic development. Across both the focus group and student interviews, participants shared their experiences with racism and microaggressions. Bayani shared how his AP teacher treated him differently because he was Filipino. For instance, she had low expectations for him but had high expectations for the White and Asian students in her class. She would do this by posting student names (mainly White and Asian students) on the board of who she thought would pass the AP exam. Bayani recalls his name was never put on the board as passing the AP exam. Negative experiences of microaggressions have a detrimental effect on students’ self-esteem, motivation, and ethnic identity.

**Recommendations for Further Research**

While the study offered insight into the struggles of Filipino college students, the study is limited to both time and context. Studies in the future should allow for more time to conduct the qualitative phase. Perhaps, running three focus groups in the fall and a follow up in the spring would be more effective. A longitudinal study would be appropriate to provide a deeper understanding of the struggles of Filipino/a college students. Future studies should include a larger sample size to strengthen the quantitative findings. Aside from the sample size, this study is limited to one geographic location, San Diego. It is recommended that future studies include Filipino/a college students from different campuses, cities, and states.
Among the recommendation for further research derived from this study are the following.

1. Provide safe and comfortable space for students to discuss issues (i.e., microaggressions) that are currently impacting them. One of the participants shared that she was glad she participated in the focus group because she was able to feel safe and talk about issues that were affecting her. Another participant from the student interview shared that it made her reflect on issues of ethnic identity and colonialism. She stated, "I am glad I did this." Oftentimes we are not afforded the time or space to reflect on issues that may be impacting us, unless it is coerced from us in situations such as this focus group or student interview. Filipino students are not given opportunities for these types of discussions, and students need a space to dialogue about historical and contemporary issues. In order to help create these safe spaces, college campuses and student organizations must work collaboratively to develop these spaces.

2. More research needs to be conducted with Filipinos using the Colonial Mentality Scale. In this study, participants had moderate levels of colonial mentality. Given the historical and contemporary issues that confront Filipino/as in the Philippines and the United States, using the colonial mentality scale will provide a deeper understanding of the impact of colonialism. David (2008) developed the scale to further understand the impact of colonial mentality on Filipinos. The CMS-I is a new scale; however, it is a valid and reliable instrument. David (2008) recommends facilitating future studies that utilize the scale. Moreover, there needs to be more
research on Filipinos because they have been underrepresented and understudied despite their complex history and culture.

3. To further understand the intricacies of colonial mentality among Filipino college students, another recommendation is to replicate this study, specifically focusing on students attending CSU, CCC, and UC. While the majority of participants were from the CSU system, this study cannot be generalized to other students enrolled in the three college systems.

**Conclusion**

The goal of the study was to answer the research question, “What social factors contribute to Filipino's perceived identities?” However, the study concluded with a powerful and critical question that emerged from the focus group, “Who are the true Filipinos?” Consequently, this research encourages students and the Filipino community to continue to engage in a critical dialogue about the Filipino identity and how to sustain this true identity.

This study contributes to the body of literature that documents the personal experiences and narratives of Filipino/as. Filipino/a scholars such as Dina Maramba, Rey Monzon, E.J. David, Patricia Espiritu, Allyson Tintiangco-Cubales, Leny Strobel, Kevin Nadal, and others began to create a space for Filipino/as to engage in a critical dialogue through their work. However, it is a small community of Filipino/a scholars that is promoting this work. This study contributes to this body of literature and to the Filipino community.

The results of the study highlighted the moderate levels of colonial mentality, strong sense of ethnic identity, and collective self-esteem among Filipino/a college students. These quantitative findings were supported through the focus groups and student
interviews, as well as pointing to sociocultural tensions and conflicts. Participants in the second phase shared their personal experiences and challenges with colonial mentality, collective self-esteem, and ethnic identity. The themes that emerged were ethnic identity, silence of the Filipino language, *Kapwa*, being a minority, experiences with colonial mentality, and challenges within the educational system. The themes from the second phase were utilized to explicate the quantitative findings. For instance, the moderate levels of colonial mentality can be explained by the participants’ experiences with colonial mentality as shared in the qualitative phase of the study. During the focus groups and student interviews, participants expressed that they were proud of being Filipino. This explains the results from the MEIM.

While the quantitative data provided significant findings, the qualitative phase of the study provided a deeper understanding of the salient issues Filipino/as currently face. The stories that participants shared through the focus groups and student interviews were powerful and compelling. The way that these stories were told was through *kwentuhan* (story telling). *Kwentuhan* is used to communicate daily experiences with family members and communities (Eugenio, 1981). Moreover, *kwentuhan* helps students discover alternative ways of seeing the world and themselves (Jocson, 2009).

Even though this study ended with a critical question (i.e., “Who are the true Filipinos?”), the findings from this study can begin to answer this question. Moreover, the theoretical framework presented earlier could also be used to facilitate a dialogue among Filipinos. As this framework suggests, colonialism, imperialism, colonial mentality, and indigenous roots have been deeply rooted within the people of the Philippines. *Kapwa*, which is the trunk of the tree, represents unity. The branches represent ethnic identity and
collective self-esteem of Filipinos. The trunk is what holds this tree together. Moreover, it is also the tension among colonialism, ethnic identity, and collective self-esteem. The Filipino sun symbolizes the critical theory of race, which provides light, life, clarity, and strength to the branches. By bringing light to the nuances of ethnic identity and collective self, these branches will strengthen the *kapwa*. While strengthening the *kapwa*, the indigenous roots will remain strong, and the colonial mentality and colonialism will weaken.
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APPENDIX A: Recruitment script for study

“Good evening. Thank you so much for allowing me to be part your meeting today. My name is Desmond Morente and I am a doctoral candidate at SDSU/CGU working towards my Ph.D. in education. For my study, I am interested in understanding how the colonial mentality and ethnic identity has affected Filipino college students. In order to understand my research question, I would like to have your participation in a survey and possibly a focus group and student interview. Participating in this study is optional and voluntary. Are there any questions at this time? Thank you for your time.”
APPENDIX B: Focus group script

“Hi (participant’s name) I wanted to talk to you for a few minutes about the possibility of participating in the focus group from the survey you recently took. The focus group will take about 30-45 minutes. I will be providing water and snacks for the participants. The focus group will be audio recorded and is voluntary. If this is something you are not comfortable with then I will not ask you to participate in the study. If they are not interested in participating, the researcher will say: “Thank you for your time and I appreciate you filling out the survey part of my study.” If they are interested in participating, the researcher will say: “Which days work best for you?” “Thank you for your time, I will be contacting you in a few days with the final day and time that we will be meeting for our focus group.”
APPENDIX C: Student interview script

“Hi (participant’s name) I wanted to talk to you for a few minutes about the possibility of participating in a follow up interview from the focus group that you recently participated in. Participating in this interview will help me better understand how the colonial mentality and ethnic identity has affected you. If you participate in this interview, I will conduct the interview with you. The interview will take place at your home or a convenient location. This student interview is voluntary and you may choose not to participate. If they are not interested in participating, the researcher will say” Thank you for your time and I appreciate you filling out the survey part of my study and participating in the focus group.” If they are interested, the researcher will say: “Thank you for your time and I will be contacting you in the next few days to set up a date and time to meet for our interview.” In the meantime, if you have any questions for me please feel free to contact me. Thank you.”
Appendix D: Demographic Profile

1. Gender: _____ male _____ female

2. Age: _____

3. Place of Birth: ________________________________

4. Generational Level
   _____ 1st generation: I was born in the Philippines
   _____ 1.5 generation: I was born in the Philippines but grew up in the U.S.
   _____ 2nd generation: I was born in the U.S., either one or both parents were born in the Philippines
   _____ 3rd generation: I was born in the U.S., both parents were born in the U.S. but all grandparents were born in the Philippines
   _____ 4th generation: I was born in the U.S., both parents were born in the U.S., at least one grandparent was born in the Philippines.
   _____ I am not sure

5. Current schooling level
   _____ Community College
   _____ State College
   _____ University College
   _____ Other: Please specify ___________________________

6. Year in school
   _____ Freshman
   _____ Sophomore
   _____ Junior
   _____ Senior
   _____ Graduate student (Masters or Doctoral student)
7. Are you currently a
   _____ Full time student
   _____ Part time student
   _____ Less than half time

8. On average how many hours do you spend studying a week: ____

9. Are you currently employed? __yes    ___no    if so, how many hours a week_____

10. Are you involved with a student organization on campus _____yes    _____no

11. Current grade point average (GPA) ________

12. Major/concentration ________________________________

13. Mother’s highest level of education achieved________________________

14. Father’s highest level of education achieved ________________________

15. Family income growing up:  _____ Less than $15,000
                             _____ $15,000 - $24,999
                             _____ $25,000 - $34,999
                             _____ $35,000 - $49,999
                             _____ $50,000 - $74,999
                             _____ $75,000 - $99,999
                             _____ $100,000 - $124,999
                             _____ $125,000 and over

16. Number of colleges to which you applied? ______

17. Please explain why you chose the college you are currently enrolled in.

_________________________________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________________________________

Thank you for completing the survey. If you are interested in participating in a focus group, please fill out the information below. The purpose of the focus group is to provide you with an opportunity to share your stories and experiences regarding colonial mentality and ethnic identity in the educational context.
Contact information:

Name:_____________________________________________

Email:____________________________________________

Phone number:____________________________________

Best time to contact:______________________________
APPENDIX E: Consent form for Online Survey

San Diego State University and Claremont Graduate University
Consent Form for Online Survey on Colonial Mentality, Ethnic Identity and Academic Performance

Dear College Student:

My name is Desmond Morente and I am a Ph.D candidate in the Education Department at San Diego State University and Claremont Graduate University. I am conducting a survey to understand how the colonial mentality and ethnic identity affects Filipino American students. Participation in this study will provide further understanding on how the colonial mentality and ethnic identity impacts social class and academic success. I am asking college students in the San Diego area to complete the survey. The results will be reported in a dissertation that I will complete as a requirement of my graduate program.

You will be asked to complete a personal data page, which includes general information such as place of birth, generation status, grade point average, and family income. The following survey includes your opinions about the colonial mentality and ethnic identity. The survey will take 20-30 minutes to complete. You can withdraw from the survey at any time and can refuse to answer any questions that you do not wish to answer without negative consequences.

In addition, I will be conducting a focus group. The purpose of the focus group is to provide Filipino students an opportunity to share their narratives and experiences regarding ethnic identity, social experiences, and about the use of colonial mentality. The focus group will take approximately 30-45 minutes to complete. If you are interested in participating in the focus group, I will be asking you to provide your name, address, phone number, and email at the end of the survey so I may contact you. This information will remain confidential. However, the interview is strictly optional.

You may withdraw from the study at any time without any consequences. Your participation in this study will be anonymous and is voluntary. Furthermore, your participation in this study will contribute to the research on the Filipino community.

If you have any questions regarding this study or your participation, you may contact Desmond R. Morente, at desmond.morente@gmail.com, 1850 Sheridan Way, San Marcos, CA, 92078 or William Perez, Ph.D at William.Perez@cgu.edu, Claremont Graduate University, 150 E. 10th St., Claremont, CA, 91711.

An institutional review board (IRB) is a committee that has been formally designated to monitor and review research involving humans, with the aim to protect the rights and welfare of the research subjects. If you have questions regarding your rights as a human subject and participant, you may contact an Institutional Review Board (IRB) representative at CGU (phone: 909-607-9406; email irb@cgu.edu). The review board is responsible for ensuring the protection of research participants.
If you wish to participate, please indicate the following

- I have read and understand this information. I understand that I may withdraw my participation at any time by exiting the survey or by closing my browser window.
- I am at least 18 years old
- I voluntarily agree to participate in this study
**APPENDIX F:** Colonial Mentality Questionnaire (CMS-I)

Using the scale given below to indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement by choosing the best response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Slightly Agree</th>
<th>5 Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. There are situations when I feel that it is more advantageous or necessary to deny my ethnic/cultural heritage.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. There are situations where I feel inferior because of my ethnic/cultural background.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. There are situations where I feel ashamed of my ethnic/cultural background.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In general, I feel that being a person of my ethnic/cultural background is not as good as being White.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. In general, I feel that being a person of my ethnic/cultural heritage is not as good as being White/European American.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I tend to divide Filipinos in America into two types: the FOBs (fresh-off-the-boat/newly arrived immigrants) and the Filipino American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. In general, I don’t associate with newly arrived (FOBs) Filipino immigrants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>1 Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2 Disagree</td>
<td>3 Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>4 Slightly Agree</td>
<td>5 Agree</td>
<td>6 Strongly Agree</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>8.</td>
<td>I generally do not like newly-arrived (FOBs) Filipino immigrants</td>
<td>1 Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2 Disagree</td>
<td>3 Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>4 Slightly Agree</td>
<td>5 Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>I think newly arrived immigrant Filipinos (FOBs) are backwards, have accents, and act weird.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>I think newly arrived immigrants (FOBs) should become as Americanized as quickly as possible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>In general, I make fun of, tease, or badmouth Filipinos who are not very Americanized in their behaviors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>I make fun of, tease, or badmouth Filipinos who speak English with strong accents</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) are more attractive than persons with Filipino (flat) noses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>I would like to have a nose that is more bridged (like Whites) than the nose I have.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>I do not want my children to have Filipino (flat) noses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>I find persons with lighter skin-tones to be more attractive than persons with dark skin-tones.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</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>Item</td>
<td>1 Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2 Disagree</td>
<td>3 Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>4 Slightly Agree</td>
<td>5 Agree</td>
<td>6 Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I would like to have children with light skin-tones.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I do not want my children to be dark skinned.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I generally think that a person that is part white and part Filipino is more attractive than a full-blooded Filipino.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. 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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. In general, I feel embarrassed of the Filipino culture and traditions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. In general, I feel ashamed of the Filipino culture and traditions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I feel that there are very few things about the Filipino culture that I can be proud of.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. 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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>1 Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2 Disagree</td>
<td>3 Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>4 Slightly Agree</td>
<td>5 Agree</td>
<td>6 Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. There are moments when I wish I was a member of a cultural group that is different from my own.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Spain and the United States are highly responsible for civilizing Filipinos and improving their ways of life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. 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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Filipinos should feel privileged and honored that Spain and the U.S. had contact with them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. In general, I am ashamed of newly arrived Filipino immigrants because of their inability to speak fluent, accent-free English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. 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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. In general, I feel that being a Filipino/a is a curse.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. In general, Filipino Americans should be thankful and feel fortunate for being in the United States.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. In general, Filipino Americans do not have anything to complain about because they are lucky to be in the United States.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. The colonization of the Philippines by Spain and the U.S. produced very little damage to the Filipino culture.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. The American ways of living or the American culture is generally more admirable, desirable, or better than the Filipino culture.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G: Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (Phinney, 1992)

Please indicate what best describes your ethnicity: _____________
1. Asian or Asian American
2. Black or African American
3. Hispanic or Latino
4. White, Caucasian, Anglo, European American
5. Native American
6. Filipino
7. Pacific Islander
8. Mixed; parents are from two different groups
9. Other (write in): _________________

Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I have spent time trying to find out more about my own ethnic group, such as its history, traditions, and customs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I am active in organizations or social groups that include mostly members of my own ethnic group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I have a clear sense of my ethnic background and what it means for me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I think a lot about how my life will be affected by my ethnic group membership.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I am happy that I am a member of that group I belong to.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I understand pretty well what my ethnic group membership means to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. In order to learn more about my ethnic background, I have often talked to other people about my ethnic group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I have a lot of pride in my ethnic group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I participate in cultural practices of my own group, such as special food, music, or customs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I feel a strong attachment towards my own ethnic group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I feel good about my cultural or ethnic background.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX H: Collective Self Esteem Scale

The collective self-esteem scale will measure how you feel about being Filipino/Filipino American. Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I am worthy of being Filipino/Filipino American.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I often regret that I am Filipino/Filipino American.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Overall, Filipinos/Filipino Americans are considered good by others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Overall, being Filipino/Filipino American has very little to do with how I feel about myself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I feel I don’t have much to offer to Filipinos/Filipino Americans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. In general, I am glad to be Filipino/Filipino American.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Most people consider Filipinos/Filipino Americans, on the average, to be more ineffective than other groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Being Filipino/Filipino American is an important reflection of who I am.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I am a cooperative participant among Filipinos/Filipino Americans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Overall, I often feel that being a Filipino/Filipino American is not worthwhile.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. In general, others respect Filipinos/Filipino Americans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Being Filipino/Filipino American is unimportant to my sense of what kind of person I am.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX I: Phase II: Qualitative Focus Group Guiding Questions

Ethnic Identity and Racial Identity

The overarching question is: How do Filipinos/as view themselves?

How do you identify yourself racially or ethnically?

Do you consider yourself Asian, Filipino/a, Filipino American, or Pacific Islander? What does it mean to be Filipino/a, Filipino/a American, Asian, or Pacific Islander? Please elaborate on why you identified yourself as one of the following. Is there a reason why you chose one over the other?

Have you ever felt you had to identify with another ethnicity or race? Please share this story.

What do you think are some stereotypes that exist about Filipino/as or Filipino/a Americans? Are these stereotypes similar to Asians or Pacific Islanders?

Now let's focus on how others perceive your identity. Let's think of a complete stranger, what category do you think he/she will identify you as: Filipino/a, Asian, Pacific Islander, or Hispanic? Why do you think they would identify you as __________?

Has this ever happened to you? Please share this experience and how did you deal with it.

Educational and Personal Experiences as a Filipino/a American

What are/were challenges you have faced as a Filipino/a or Filipino/a American? How did you overcome these challenges?

Growing up, did you feel any different from your peers? What was that experience like?

As a college student, are you faced with any challenges as Filipino/a American? Please share this experience with us.

How would describe your educational experience growing up? With teachers and
educators? Were there any teachers or educators who reached out to you and guided you through your educational journey?

In high school, did you take honors or advanced placement courses? What motivated you to take these courses? If so, what was the ethnic make up of your these classes?

In high school, were you planning on attending college? What types of colleges did you apply to? Did you think about applying to highly selective schools such as UCLA, Harvard, Berkeley, or Stanford? Why or why not?

What other colleges did you apply to? Why did you choose ________?

**Colonial Mentality**

Define what it means to be American, Filipino/a, Filipino/a American?

What about being Filipino makes you proud? What about being Filipino makes you feel embarrassed?

Do you prefer the American culture or Filipino culture? Please explain.

Let’s talk about the explicit and implicit messages that our parents, relatives, and/or peers tell us regarding our skin color, our noses, and language. Oftentimes, our parents, relatives, and/or peers make statements such as “You have flat Filipino nose”; “You are getting too dark”; “Why do you want to learn Tagalog, we are in America”. These are just examples, but have you ever experienced or heard statements similar to the ones described above from your parents, relatives, or peers. What was the experience like? How did you react?

Have you ever felt embarrassed because of your physical features? Please describe this experience.
What are your thoughts on preserving our culture? Do you think it is necessary to preserve our culture?

Do you think it is important to teach younger Filipino generations about the Philippine’s history? Have either parent taught you about Philippine history or culture?
Appendix J: Case Study Guiding Questions

Background

Please provide a description of your family (i.e. immigration, family work experience, family educational background).

What influence did family (i.e. parents, cousins, grandparents) have on your ethnic identity?

Growing up, how did you parents describe your ethnic background? What did your parents share with you with respect to you Pilipino culture (i.e. language, history, values)?

Growing up what images were portrayed about Pilipinos? Were these real or false images?

Please describe the community in which you grew up in? How diverse was your community? Did you live in a community that had a significant amount of Filipinos?

Whites? What influence has your community had on your educational journey?

Growing up do you remember being exposed to any Filipino curriculum in middle school or high school?

How do you see yourself as Pin@y in college? Do you feel connected to the campus you are attending? Please explain why or why not?

Growing up were exposed certain values about Pinoys, has that changed since attending college? If so, how has it changed? If not, why do you think it has not changed?

How would you describe Pilipino/as now?