

# THE ACCULTURATION OF CULTURALLY DISPLACED PERSONS: THE CASE OF PILIPINO-AMERICANS

Fernand San Andres Lubuguin

---

## ABSTRACT

This study examined the phenomenon of acculturation among Pilipino-American immigrants. The phenomenon of acculturation was defined as the achievement by a Culturally Displaced Person of a change in Person Characteristics, as the result of living in the new host culture, in the direction of the Person Characteristics of the Standard Normal Person of the host culture. A broad, systematic, and culturally universal conceptualization of acculturation, based on the Descriptive Psychology approach, explicated the concepts of Culture, the Standard Normal Person, the Culturally Displaced Person, Basic Human Needs, and Acculturation. A hierarchy of Choice Principles (or value statements, policies, and slogans) consisting of three levels (Central, Intermediate, and Peripheral) was formulated. In general, a person acts on Central Choice Principles (CCP's) by acting on some Intermediate Choice Principles (ICP's), which in turn are implemented by acting on some Peripheral Choice Principles (PCP's). The Attraction Model and the Conflict Model were developed to account for the nature of the acculturation process. This study tested the following hypotheses that were generated from the conflict model: (a) PCP's would change more readily than

---

*Advances in Descriptive Psychology*, Volume 7, pages 167-233.

Editors: H. Joel Jeffrey and Raymond M. Bergner.

Copyright © 1998 Descriptive Psychology Press.

All rights of reproduction in any form reserved.

ISBN: 1-891700-01-4

ICP's, which in turn would change more readily than CCP's; (b) high conflict PCP's would change sooner than low conflict PCP's; (c) for the first generation immigrant, at least one CCP would increase in importance and would be transmitted to subsequent generations; (d) the endorsement of the host culture's PCP's and ICP's would increase across generations; and (e) the CCP's across generations were less likely to change and change less than ICP's and PCP's. Cultural analyses of Pilipino and American cultures provided the basis for specifying the particular choice principles that were examined. The Perspectives Questionnaire was created and utilized to assess the levels of endorsement of the particular American and Pilipino choice principles. This questionnaire was administered to first and second generation Pilipino-Americans, as well as a group of Anglo-Americans. The comparisons within and between these groups yielded results that generally supported the hypotheses and conceptualization. However, the pattern of results suggested that the attraction model was more applicable than the conflict model in this population.

## INTRODUCTION

Acculturation in its many dimensions and derivatives has been studied extensively since the turn of the century. Various conceptualizations of acculturation have been formulated through the years. However, the concept of acculturation remains ambiguous since there are numerous definitions of acculturation in the literature. An adequate codification of the process of change in adapting to a new culture remains to be done.

The lack of theoretical clarity and consensus about acculturation is particularly salient in the context of recent demographic trends around the world, and especially in the United States. This limitation is particularly problematic given the very large and growing number of people to whom it potentially applies. The rates and volume of people who emigrate and settle in the U.S. are quite substantial. According to the 1990 census, Asian-Americans are the fastest growing ethnic minority population. Moreover, Pilipino-Americans<sup>1</sup> are currently the largest Asian-American population in California and the second largest foreign born group

---

<sup>1</sup>None of the major Philippine languages has an "f" sound. Accordingly, the people refer to their country as "Pilipinas" (Philippines), and themselves as "Pilipinos" (masculine) or "Pilipinas" (feminine). This study will use the English term "Philippines" when referring to the country, the native term "Pilipinos" when referring to those in the Philippines, and "Pilipino-Americans" when referring to those in the United States.

in the U.S. About 19 percent of Asian-Americans in the U.S., or 1.4 million people are of Pilipino heritage.

The substantial presence of Pilipino-Americans in the U.S. is rooted in strong historical ties between the Philippines and the U.S. The earliest United States immigrants from the Philippines were Pilipino sailors who settled along what is now the Louisiana coast during the period of Spanish control in the mid 1700's (Pido, 1985). Large scale migration of Pilipinos began after the U.S. acquired and colonized the Philippine Islands in 1898 as a result of the Spanish-American War.

Since the turn of the century, there have been three distinct periods of immigration (Vallangca, 1987). The first, ending in 1934, consisted primarily of young, unmarried, and unskilled males who were recruited as farm laborers in California and Hawaii. The rest of these immigrants were men who enlisted in the U.S. navy as stewards, or men who were students (called *pensionados*) supported by the U.S. government or church related groups (Pido, 1985). The second period from 1934 to the mid-1960's was a time of curtailed immigration as U.S. legislation established a quota system based on national origin. The third period was precipitated by the 1965 Immigration and Naturalization Act which attracted urban, educated, and professional Pilipinos to the U.S. From 1968 until the early 1980's, the Philippines led all Asian countries in the number of new immigrants. Between 1980 and 1990, Pilipino-Americans increased their numbers by 81.6 percent, or more than 600,000 people. These tremendous rates of immigration have led to the current status of Pilipino-Americans in the U.S. as the second largest foreign born Asian-American group.

Despite the long history of Pilipinos in the U.S., not much is known about the pressures and changes they have undergone as a result of living in this country. (In contrast, there is a comparatively extensive general literature on Chinese- and Japanese-Americans.) Because of the size of the Pilipino-American population, understanding the group has significant implications for many U.S. social institutions, including education, labor, social services, and mental health. For these institutions to serve Pilipino-Americans properly, more must be known about the psychological characteristics of this ethnic group.

In general, the literature concerning Pilipino-Americans has been consistently inadequate. In particular, there have been no studies heretofore examining acculturation among Pilipino-Americans. Even the literature on acculturation among Asian-American groups in general is sparse. The body of knowledge about acculturation among Asian-Americans includes studies that have examined its relationship with stress (Brown, 1982; Padilla, Wagatsuma, & Lindholm, 1985; Yu & Harburg, 1980, 1981; Yu, 1984), personality characteristics (Sue & Kirk, 1972), utilization of counseling services (Atkinson & Gim, 1989; Atkinson, Whiteley, & Gim, 1990; Gim, Atkinson, & Whiteley, 1990; Gim, Atkinson, & Kim, 1991), second language acquisition (Young & Gardner, 1990), values concerning occupations (Leong & Tata, 1990), and treatment approaches (Sue & Morishima,

1982; Sue & Sue, 1990). With regard to measures of acculturation, the Suinn-Lew Asian Self-Identity Acculturation Scale (Suinn, Rickard-Figueroa, Lew, & Vigil, 1987) is the only existing acculturation scale for Asian-Americans.

The purpose of the present study is both theoretical and practical. First, it will provide a systematic conceptualization of acculturation. The conceptualization provides a model that yields predictions as to how the process of acculturation will proceed, in general. The predictions are studied empirically for the case of Pilipino immigrants in American culture. In view of the dearth of literature on Pilipino-American acculturation, the data itself is an additional valuable outcome of the study.

## **CRITIQUE OF THE CLOSELY RELATED LITERATURE**

There is apparently no existing literature concerning the acculturation of Pilipino-Americans. The literature critique therefore reviewed two closely related topics, i.e., the models and theories of acculturation, and the acculturation of other Asian-American groups.

Upon reviewing the various studies, it seems clear that on the whole the studies heretofore have been limited in the conceptualization of acculturation. In general, the conceptualizations have dealt with aspects other than the process of change itself. These aspects include the political, social, and cultural context; the factors that affect the rate and extent of acculturation; the effects of character and role structures; and the general classifications of acculturative change. In all cases, the nature of the process of acculturation itself is not clearly conceptualized.

Furthermore, there is tremendous variability in the definition of acculturation across all of the studies reviewed. Some definitions amount to referring to whatever happens when groups of individuals of different cultures come into continuous direct contact (Dohrenwend & Smith, 1962; Kim, 1988; Berry, 1991; and Feldman & Rosenthal, 1990). Other definitions generally refer to the changes in a person's behavior, values, and culture from their native cultural group toward the standard of the host cultural group (Weinstock, 1974; Padilla, 1980; Smither, 1982; Wong-Rieger & Quintana, 1987; Naidoo & Davis, 1988; and Blanchard, 1991). Another general definition amounts to the process of adaption and/or accommodation to a new cultural context (Szapocznik & Kurtines, 1980; and Kagan, 1981). In addition to the tremendous variability in both the conceptualization and definition of acculturation, the distinction between the outcome of acculturation and the process of acculturation is not always clearly described, if at all.

With regard to the operationalization of acculturation, the logical relationship between the conceptualization and the empirical measure of acculturation is

generally weak, and occasionally questionable. The dimensions that are measured by the various instruments are not always clearly related to the dimensions outlined in the conceptualization (Weinstock, 1974; and Feldman & Rosenthal, 1990). Furthermore, in one case the operationalization does not clearly distinguish between behaviors, preferences, values, and attitudes (Padilla, 1985).

The scope and generalizability of these various models and theories of acculturation is generally limited. Many of them are based on a specific culture or ethnic group (Weinstock, 1974; Padilla, 1980; Szapocznik & Kurtines, 1980; and Kagan, 1981). Some are based on Western cultures or urban settings (Dohrenwend & Smith, 1962; Weinstock, 1974; Kagan, 1981; and Smither, 1982). One model was developed within the framework of a particular type of migrating group, i.e., immigrants and not refugees or sojourners (Weinstock, 1974). Several are modifications or enhancements of preexisting limited-scope theories of human behavior, and as such are limited in scope and/or explanatory power (Weinstock, 1974; Kagan, 1981; Garza & Gallegos, 1985; and Kim, 1988).

In all cases, a central premise is the cultural adjustment model which has clinical implications regarding acculturative stress, maladjustment, and cultural dominance and subordination. Bochner (1986) elaborated on the shortcomings of the clinical-adjustment model of coping with unfamiliar cultures in the following ways. First, the model "has ethnocentric overtones in its insistence that newcomers should adjust to the dominant culture, with the implication that their original culture is inferior, and should be renounced" (p. 348). He referred to this process as assimilation. Second, "the adjustment approach, with its clinical emphasis on intra-psychic determinants of behavior, stigmatizes those who do not readily adjust to their new environment, in the same way as the medical model stigmatizes psychiatric patients in implying that there is something wrong with the people who are unable or unwilling to behave in a conventional manner" (p. 348). Finally, "the process of adjustment and its goal of assimilation represents at best a pseudo-solution to what is undoubtedly a genuine problem, that life was not meant to be easy for the cross-cultural traveler" (p. 348).

On the whole, these limitations in the acculturation literature clearly indicate the need for a broad and systematic conceptualization, which would clarify the nature of the phenomenon and provide clear guidelines for how to study it. The Descriptive Psychology approach appears to have the characteristics needed to support an adequate conceptualization of acculturation and related phenomena (Aylesworth & Ossorio, 1983; Lasater, 1983; Ossorio, 1983; Silva, 1983).

## CONCEPTUALIZATION

The Descriptive Psychology literature provides resources for conceptualizing acculturation, the background phenomena within which it occurs, related

phenomena, and factors affecting these phenomena. The primary concept involved is the *Culturally Displaced Person*. Aylesworth and Ossorio (1983) defined a culturally displaced person as one who must live in a culture (the "host culture") which is different from the culture in which that person has been primarily socialized (the "native culture" or "culture of origin"). In the case of the immigrant, a person voluntarily moves to a new country, with or without their family. Upon arrival, the person has to somehow come to terms with a new way of life and manage living in the new culture, in order to survive at all. One common, but not exclusive, way of managing is to become more like a member of the host culture. However, for various and obvious reasons this task is not easily achieved. Immigrants may or may not regard themselves as one of them; that is, they may or may not identify with the new culture. In adapting to the new culture, the immigrant may manage for better or worse, and may learn more or less about the new culture.

A central concept in the phenomenon described above is acculturation. In this study, *acculturation* is defined as follows. A culturally displaced person may, as a result of living in the host culture, undergo a change in Person Characteristics in the direction of the Person Characteristics of the Standard Normal Person of the host culture. When this phenomenon occurs, it is called acculturation. As an achievement by the person and a change in the person, acculturation varies in terms of degrees. The process of acculturation is called *acculturating*. The broader background conceptualization will be described below.

### A Parametric Analysis of Culture

Primarily, in order to understand how persons adjust to a new culture, we must first understand how persons function in culture in general; which in turn requires us to primarily understand the concept of culture per se. Accordingly, this investigation will use a Descriptive Psychology approach to articulate the concept of culture and the phenomenon of persons behaving in a cultural context, and to empirically examine the course of adaptation to a new culture.

Descriptive Psychology provides a conceptual device that can be used as part of an approach to understanding culture and how persons function within culture. A Parametric Analysis is a conceptual-notational device that allows us to formulate the possibilities of what a phenomenon could be and still be a thing of that kind. As defined by Ossorio (1983), to give a parametric analysis of a given domain is to specify the ways in which one particular (or kind) within that domain can, as such, be the same as another such particular (or kind) or different from it. Thus, a parametric analysis of culture would specify the relevant set of parameters for culture.

Particular cultures (or groups or classes of cultures) are characterized by specifying values for the parameters in greater or lesser detail. In turn, these

parametric values are the basis for making explicit similarities and/or differences among cultures.

The articulation of the concept of culture gives us an essential resource for understanding how persons function in their native cultures, and this in turn provides a basis for understanding how displaced persons function in other cultures.

A parametric analysis of culture is given as follows:

$$\langle \text{Cu} \rangle = \langle \text{WOL} \rangle = \langle \text{M, W, S, L, SP, CP} \rangle$$

where

- Cu = Culture
- WOL= Way of Living
- M = Members (Participants)
- W = World
- S = Statuses
- L = Language
- SP = Social Practices
- CP = Choice Principles

Ossorio (1983) described these parameters as follows:

### *Members*

These are the individuals who have participated or currently participate or will participate in the particular culture. In general cultures outlive individuals, thereby the membership of a culture includes the historical totality of members and not merely the current participants.

### *World*

This parameter refers to the context, structure, and principles of the world as it is understood. This includes (a) the place of the community in the world, (b) the history of the community, including its relations and interactions with other communities, and (c) the past, present, and (in principle) future history of the world.

### *Statuses*

This parameter reflects the social structure which involves the differentiation and meshing of activities, standards, and values among different sets of individuals. This social structure can be articulated in terms of statuses.

### *Social Practices*

This term refers to the repertoire of behavior patterns which in a given culture constitute what there is for the members to do. "Social practice" also refers to the

various ways in which a given behavior pattern can be done. Some instances of social practices are having dinner, reading the newspaper, and attending an artistic performance. In general, social practices are components of organized sets or structures of social practices, the latter being referred to as institutions or organizations. Examples of the latter include raising a family, passing laws, educating children, engaging in commerce, and so on. Social practices are either intrinsic or non-intrinsic. An intrinsic social practice is one that can be understood as being engaged in without ulterior motives and without a further end in view. Non-intrinsic social practices are social practices which are not intrinsic. Most institutions generally operate like intrinsic social practices in that people do not generally need reasons to raise families, pass laws, educate their children, and so on; rather, that is simply what one does unless one has a reason not to.

### *Language*

Every culture has at least one language spoken by its members.

### *Choice Principles*

A social practice is a behavior pattern which has a hierarchical structure that reflects the multiplicity of stages and of options through which a person can engage in that social practice. Choices are inevitable since, on any given occasion, a social practice must be done in *one* of the ways it can be done. These choices are usually within the organizational or institutional level, (e.g., one has to make various choices in the course of raising a family). Cultural choice principles are more or less normative and provide guidelines for choosing behaviors in such a way as to express and preserve the coherence of human life as *we* (the members of the culture) live it and (generally) to preserve the stability of the social structure. Choice principles apply to the choice of a social practice to engage in, as well as the choice of options within a practice. Thus, they apply at all levels of cultural participation. Choice principles are generally articulated in the form of value statements, or policies, or slogans, or maxims and mottos, or in scenarios such as myths and fables. Choice principles are most commonly articulated in value terms, and most directly expressed in policy terms; however, any of the forms described above will qualify. Accordingly, the delineation of the choice principles of a specific culture is particularly well suited to portray "the essence" or "the spirit" of that culture and distinguish it from others.

By giving this parametric analysis of culture, we have articulated the phenomenon of culture as such and provided a conceptual framework within which we can now describe how persons function in a cultural context.

## **The Standard Normal Person**

To illustrate how a person functions in culture, we can introduce the notion of a *Standard Normal Person* in a given culture. A standard normal person is someone



who does nothing more than successfully enact (culturally) appropriate choices on appropriate occasions – someone who merely “does what the situation calls for” (Ossorio, 1983). Accordingly, this person is someone to whom other members of the society will not attribute personal characteristics other than double negative ones (e.g., “reasonably friendly,” meaning “not really friendly, but not unfriendly either”) since, in effect the attributes are merely social, not individual.

As a legitimate member of the community and participant in the culture, the world of this standard normal person is not in gross conflict with the world of the culture, and the person has a place in that world. The person speaks the language of the culture. The culture provides what there is for this person to do in the form of social practices. The person follows the choice principles of the culture normatively in selecting which of the social practices to do and how to do them. When the person engages in a particular social practice, that person does so in one of the statuses that that person has. When the person does all of this, that person is living a particular way of life in a particular culture, rather than engaging in an incoherent series of behaviors without context.

Normative socialization results in *Person Characteristics* that enable and incline persons to follow choice principles and engage in social practices appropriately and naturally. Person Characteristics refer to the Dispositions (i.e., Traits, Attitudes, Interests, and Styles), Powers (i.e., Abilities, Knowledge, and Values), and Derivatives (i.e., Embodiment, Capacities, and States) of a person. Usually, native members of a given culture successfully engage in that culture’s social practices.

### **The Culturally Displaced Person**

However, for a variety of reasons not all members of a given culture undergo normative socialization. One such instance is the case of the culturally displaced person. Ossorio (1983) described the various instances of cultural displacement. Cultural displacement can occur as a forced and involuntary move, as in the case of refugees. In those instances where the move is voluntary we have the case of the immigrant. Cultural displacement can also be temporary, as in the case of sojourners such as the diplomat, the Army spouse, the multinational-corporation employee, and so on. Returning veterans are another case of cultural displacement; in this case, they have experienced a second displacement upon their return. Actual geographic movement is not necessary for cultural displacement, as in the case of members of ethnic minorities who must live in the context of a contrasting majority culture. For the purposes of this investigation, the case of the immigrant experience will be the primary focus.

Since a culturally displaced immigrant has not undergone normative socialization into the host culture, the immigrant has an impaired ability to follow choice principles normatively and to appropriately engage in the social practices of the host culture. Immigrants lack the person characteristics that would enable and incline them to act naturally in the host culture. Since they cannot act naturally,

they are generally in a state of psychological distress, and in a position of paying a psychological price for non-normative functioning.

### Basic Human Needs

To assess the psychological suffering that an immigrant undergoes, we can introduce the concept of *Basic Human Needs* (BHN's). Since BHN's is a derivative concept, we must first define several fundamental concepts:

1. *Deliberate Action* – When a person engages in deliberate action, the person knows what they are doing and has chosen to do that.

2. *Pathological State* – When a person is in a pathological state there is a significant restriction on their ability to (a) engage in Deliberate Action, and equivalently, (b) participate in the social practices of his community. (Thus, a pathological state is one in which there is significant restriction in one's behavior potential.)

3. *Need* – A need is a condition or requirement which, if not met, eventually results in a pathological state (a state of significantly reduced behavior potential).

Accordingly, we can now derive BHN as a special case of Need. That is, a BHN is a condition or requirement which if not met *at all*, makes Deliberate Action *impossible* (a state in which behavior potential is not merely restricted, but is reduced to zero). The concept of BHN is culturally universal in that as living persons, we all must satisfy BHN's to at least some extent. In principle, there is no definitive set of BHN's for the same reason that there is no definitive list of the ways in which things can go wrong, i.e., there is an indefinitely large number of ways of classifying things. As an example, Lasater (1983) generated the following list of BHN's: physical health; self esteem and worth; love and affiliation; agency and autonomy; adequacy and competence; identity; belonging and acceptance; disengagement; order, understanding, and predictability; personal and social legitimacy; and meaning, hope, and significance.

A viable culture provides us with a repertoire of social practices and choice principles through which we can, in general, meet our BHN's to a significant degree. Different cultures provide different ways of satisfying BHN's, and different degrees of satisfaction. These ways and degrees of satisfaction enable us to articulate differences and similarities between cultures with minimal ethnocentricity.

When we engage in social practices using normative choice principles and reasonable judgment, the satisfaction of BHN's is, in a practical sense, more or less guaranteed. Although social practices are not explicitly designed to satisfy BHN's, we would expect that, in general, for any social practice to endure, it must result in at least partial satisfaction of some BHN's. The extent to which a person satisfies their BHN's corresponds roughly to the degree to which that person effectively participates in the social practices of their community.

This real connection between social practices and BHN's provides a means of indexing the psychological price that an immigrant pays. Since culturally displaced persons cannot normatively engage in the social practices of the host culture, in effect they have an impaired ability to satisfy their BHN's. Normative participation requires knowledge of at least some of the social practices and choice principles of the community, and of their effective enactment. The success and effectiveness of a person's behaviors can then be evaluated in terms of how well they satisfy BHN's and, correspondingly, how appropriate they are as enactments of the social practices of the community.

### **Acculturation**

Since immigrants are cultural misfits in their new culture and they have an impaired ability to satisfy their BHN's, they are faced with great pressure to acculturate in order to adapt to their new host culture. Acculturation, as an achievement or outcome concept, is the degree to which a culturally displaced person has undergone a change in their person characteristics and thereby has internalized the new host culture. When a person internalizes X, X is a natural, right, and real "part" of that person (i.e., he or she really is that way). Internalization entails change through learning. Persons internalize the way of living of the host culture in ways that help them effectively meet their BHN's. The person internalizes the world, statuses, language, social practices, and choice principles, in varying ways and in varying degrees. When a person has internalized the new way of life, the person characteristics of that person have necessarily changed as well.

However, given the immigrant's own personal history, problems arise in acculturating. The problems for a culturally displaced person in general, and an immigrant in particular, are threefold.

First, the immigrant must cope with the newness of the new host culture. The immigrant is more or less uninformed about the culture's social practices, choice principles, statuses, and so on.

Second, not only does the immigrant lack cultural knowledge; the immigrant has the wrong behavioral inclinations, based on experience with the native culture. The immigrant is well prepared to engage normatively in the social practices of the native culture; there, that person has clear knowledge and experience of what is right, and a clear sense of what is natural and what "is me." This predisposition contributes to the active distortion of the immigrant's perceptions and understanding of the host culture.

Third, what is right, natural, and real are all, in effect, prior commitments. These prior commitments must be maintained in the host culture in order to maintain the sense of true self, which is largely equivalent to the person's ethnic identity. Yet, culturally displaced persons must for the most part engage in the social practices of the host culture. The host culture does not provide the environmental support for

maintaining the displaced person's "real self" through engaging in all of the native social practices. The social practices of the host culture are generally non-normative with the native culture. In some cases, the host culture's social practices and choice principles are contrary to those of the native culture. For instance, in many Asian cultures, the wellbeing of the group and maintenance of interpersonal harmony is highly valued. However, in American culture, competition and individuality are generally primary values. These conditions generally lead to the fourth problem that culturally displaced persons face, namely ethnic identity problems.

Despite these significant problems, since the culturally displaced immigrant voluntarily moved to the host culture, the immigrant usually attempts to acculturate in some manner. Immigrants undergo changes which in effect help them engage normatively in the social practices of the host culture, thereby improving their ability to satisfy their BHN's.

### A Hierarchy of Choice Principles

The nature of these changes can be better understood by reference to a hierarchy of choice principles. For present purposes, choice principles can be classified as central, intermediate, and peripheral. *Central Choice Principles* (CCP's) are those that have the greatest importance and priority relative to the others. There may or may not be any one central choice principle that is *the* highest in importance and priority. Correspondingly, *Intermediate Choice Principles* (ICP's) are those that have relatively less importance and priority than central choice principles. Finally, *Peripheral Choice Principles* (PCP's) have the least importance and priority relative to the other two.

In general, central choice principles can be acted on in a large number of ways, depending on a large number of circumstances. The full range of possibilities can be divided into a number of groups each of which is the point of application of some less general principles.

Thus, at the intermediate level, there are smaller domains, each having its own set of relevant choice principles. Intermediate choice principles have less scope than central choice principles. Their importance is largely derived from the importance of central choice principles, since intermediate choice principles do not have any intrinsic importance of their own. There is no simple either/or relationship between these intermediate choice principles, since you can act on more than one simultaneously.

There is at best a weak logical relationship between the central and intermediate choice principles, but there is a strong psychological connection. In general, acting on an intermediate choice principle on a given occasion is a way of acting on a central choice principle.

The relationship described above also holds between the intermediate and peripheral choice principles. Peripheral choice principles seem more likely to have

some incidental intrinsic value than intermediate ones, e.g., some can simply be fun. In general, central choice principles are implemented by acting on some intermediate choice principles, which in turn are implemented by acting on some peripheral choice principles.

### *Significance and Implementation*

To elaborate and clarify the logical relationships between central, intermediate, and peripheral choice principles, consider the following scenario: Imagine a situation with several key elements: (a) There are a number of people in a house who are plotting to overthrow the country and they have a good chance of succeeding; (b) There is a man who is aware of this situation and wants to save the country; (c) There is a well of poisoned water near the house; (d) The well is connected to the house by a pipe; and (e) The inhabitants of the house will be drinking the water. The problem this man faces is how to save the country. Given the particular set of circumstances, the man can save the country *by* poisoning the people in the house. How could he do this? In this situation, he can do this *by* pumping the poisoned water to the inhabitants. How could he do this? In this case, he can pump water to the house (since the people are in the house and not elsewhere). How could he do this? Under these circumstances, he can pump the pump. How could he do this? Finally, he can grasp the pump handle and move his arm up and down. Note that at each problem level, you have a behavior description of a man doing X, and that all of these behaviors are being done by this man at roughly the same time and place.

As the series of descriptions is represented above, the relationship between a given preceding description and any of the later descriptions is that the latter is the implementation of the former. *Implementation* refers to a relationship between behavior A and behavior B such that a person is doing A *by* doing B. In the scenario described above, the man saves the country *by* poisoning the inhabitants of the house, and so on down each level of behavior description.

In general, the deliberate action lower on the series is "more concrete" than the deliberate action immediately higher on the series, (e.g., poisoning the inhabitants is "more concrete" than saving the country). Implementation continues until a deliberate action that can be directly implementable is reached, (e.g., moving his arm up and down). This final deliberate action is referred to as the *performance*. This directly implementable performance is what brings the implementation series to a logical end.

*Significance* refers to the inverse relationship, such that whenever doing behavior A is the implementation of doing behavior B, then doing B is the significance of doing A. For instance, poisoning the inhabitants is an implementation of saving the country; correspondingly, saving the country is the significance of poisoning the people.

The formulation of significance descriptions can be guided by the question, "What is the person doing by doing that?" For instance, what is the man doing by moving his arm up and down? In this particular case, he is pumping a pump. This question can be asked as you continue through the series of deliberate actions until an *intrinsic social practice* is reached. An *intrinsic social practice* brings the significance series to a logical end, just as a performance brings the implementation series to a logical end. (Recall that intrinsic practices are ones engaged in with no further end in view; we do not need to ask, "But *why* was he saving the country?")

Significance and implementation reflect a logical structure of deliberate actions. In such a structure, deliberate actions are logically nested and arranged in a series. Note that the order is fixed; i.e., the man poisons the inhabitants by pumping water to them - he does *not* pump water to the inhabitants by poisoning them. The deliberate action at the top of the series is an intrinsic social practice, while that at the bottom is a performance.

It is important to note that this logical structure of deliberate actions is an observer's account of behaviors. The person actually behaving almost certainly does not experience his or her behavior in terms of complex significance or implementation patterns or descriptions.

The importance of the notions of significance and implementation is that the hierarchy of choice principles generally reflects the logical structure of significance and implementation. In other words, central choice principles are generally implemented *by* intermediate choice principles, which are in turn generally implemented *by* peripheral choice principles. Conversely, central choice principles are ordinarily the significance *of* intermediate choice principles, which are ordinarily the significance *of* peripheral choice principles.

The hierarchy of choice principles represents the set of priorities among choice principles which operates generally to guide the choices of a person or group of persons. The way in which they function is relatively simple in its general outline, but not so simple when considered in greater detail.

1. For example, it is generally the case that central choice principles are more broadly applicable than intermediate ones. However, the notion of "applicable" may be misleading here. Suppose, for example, that a central choice principle is "Further the interest of the family" (or equivalently, "Don't jeopardize the interests of the family"). To say that this is a "universal" principle is not to say that every issue is a family issue, or that every activity is a family activity, or that every decision has a demonstrable bearing on family interests. Rather, it is to say that the person in question will more or less automatically *consider* every choice or issue from the standpoint of its relevance to the family welfare. Or, to put it differently, the person is always acting *as* a family member, no matter what the issues, choices, or activities are.

2. It may happen that a given culture has a single choice principle at the apex of the hierarchy, but there is no reason to expect that this will generally be the case.

Rather, we would expect a small set of choice principles to be "the most important" with no clear priorities among them. We would expect, further, that this set of central principles would not be inherently in conflict, so that in general the person would be operating in accordance with all of them simultaneously, and in the rare cases where conflict did arise, one of the individual principles would consistently be given priority.

3. Similarly, we would expect that central choice principles would not be inherently in conflict with intermediate choice principles. Technically, we would expect this to be the case on the grounds that central principles such as "preserve the interest of the family" cannot be implemented directly as such. Rather, they must be implemented by doing something else which is more specific and is responsive to the actual context of opportunities, difficulties, and reasons. It is this level of behavior that is governed by the intermediate choice principles.

On theoretical grounds, we would expect the same logical relationships between these concepts. The formulation of a hierarchy of choice principles is, after all, an after the fact analysis of an existing way of living, and (a) a way of living would hardly qualify as such if it was inherently conflict-ridden, and (b) it would be extraordinary if ways of living on the whole evolved toward internal inconsistency rather than toward internal consistency.

4. Similar considerations apply concerning the consistency of peripheral choice principles with the intermediate and central choice principles. In addition, peripheral choice principles are important because they deal with the objects, behaviors, and social practices that are the concrete embodiments of the way of living. Without such concrete embodiments, a way of living could have at best a ghostly sort of existence. (This can be a serious problem for third generation immigrants in search of their "roots.") One cannot further the family's interest except by doing something else of a more specific sort, but one can have a family dinner of fried rice and stewed chicken directly without having to do something else.

The loss of the resources needed for the concrete embodiment of a way of living can be expected to exercise a major influence for change among refugees, immigrants, and other culturally displaced persons. Conversely, in these cases at least some of the concrete embodiments that remain available can be expected to take on increased importance insofar as they carry an increased burden of embodying an entire way of life. Those concrete embodiments that remain are likely to be the ones that are more easily practiced than others in the context of the host culture. For instance, Asian immigrants can more easily maintain their native diet than their native dress. Accordingly, it would not be surprising if having a family dinner of fried rice and stewed chicken had increased importance in the host culture, relative to the native culture.

As an important caveat to this conceptualization of a hierarchy of choice principles, in principle there can be any number of steps from the top central level

to the bottom peripheral level. There may also be no steps in between these two levels. For the purposes of this study, three levels have been identified.

### **The Process of Acculturation**

With this conceptualization in mind, we now move to its connection to the phenomenon of acculturation. To review, as an achievement concept, acculturation is the degree of change in the person characteristics of the culturally displaced person in the direction of the person characteristics of the standard normal person of the host culture.

In light of the foregoing model, we might expect that, on the whole, peripheral choice principles would change more readily than intermediate choice principles, and that the latter would change more readily than central choice principles. Since the implementation of peripheral choice principles is most responsive to the actual concrete context of opportunities, difficulties, and reasons, it would be reasonable to expect that this level changes first because the actual physical contexts in the host culture are different from those in the native culture, in at least some significant ways; and this alone would make it impossible *simply* to continue to do business as usual. Furthermore, the immigrant lacks the concrete props to implement the peripheral choice principles. For example, a person cannot climb the holy mountain to pay homage if access to the holy mountain is no longer possible in the practical sense. Also, in many cases if immigrants simply continue to do business as usual, many of their behaviors may be censured, or at best not get them anywhere. Under these circumstances, it is highly likely that some peripheral choice principles will be no longer viable, and therefore given up. Those few that remain are likely to increase in importance since they carry the burden of embodying the native way of life. These remaining peripheral choice principles that increase in importance will be referred to as *Marker Peripheral Choice Principles*.

Despite the inevitable loss of opportunity and possibility of implementing some of the peripheral choice principles, the immigrant can retain the central and intermediate choice principles, at least in principle. By doing so, the psychological strain experienced is, if not literally minimum, at least not maximum. Since, at least in principle, retaining these particular choice principles is viable, the immigrant's native sense of self is not directly threatened. Immigrants can still act as themselves, but simply do it differently. The fact that immigrants have to do it differently reflects the fact that it is highly likely that immigrants have fewer native and natural ways of acting effectively on their peripheral choice principles in the host country than they did in their native country. Accordingly, immigrants face new choices that they never encountered in their native culture.

#### *The Influence of Generation*

This model of acculturation expands when the factor of generation is considered. In the case of the first generation immigrant, the pressure to acculturate is greatest.



The immigrant arrives in the U.S. having been, in the paradigm case, socialized in the native culture. The situational demands on the first generation are the greatest compared to later generations, because the immigrant is the least familiar with the host culture. The novel circumstances of the host culture place immediate limitations on living the native way of life.

As the first generation born in the host culture, the members of the second generation do not come with their native culture. Rather, they receive a modified version of the native culture from their parents and/or others around them. On the whole, they have less of their native culture, and what they have is a weaker version than that of an immigrant. The native culture is likely to be learned less completely. The host culture is acquired from birth first hand and not second hand, as in the case of the immigrant. Consequently, the second generation is likely to have different general person characteristics from the first generation immigrant. A second generation person may still acquire the native central choice principles from their family. However, the intermediate and peripheral choice principles are likely to be more similar to the host culture than to the native culture.

The third generation person has even less of the native culture and even more acquisition of the host culture. This likely occurs at least in part because the parents are more acculturated than the grandparents. Eventually, it becomes likely that many of the third generation develop identity problems. They begin to have questions about who they really are and what it is to be, for example, of Pilipino heritage. The central choice principles of the native culture are likely to be more or less lost. This generation lacks many of the concrete embodiments of their native culture, and consequently their native culture becomes less real. Furthermore, their native culture is more implicit than it is for earlier generations, and therefore it is difficult to retain since it is not supported by either the concrete or symbolic social context.

These conditions faced by the third generation can lead to certain outcomes. Those who place primary importance on aesthetic values are likely to want their authentic culture and try to regain their lost native culture. At best, these persons will usually immerse themselves in the history and social practices of their ancestors. In contrast, those who act on primarily hedonic and/or prudential reasons will more often choose to assimilate expeditiously into the host culture. Consequently, to a greater extent than those who act on aesthetic reasons, these persons will develop their identity based on the values and beliefs of the host culture.

The above account, that acculturating progresses sequentially from the peripheral to the central level, seems intuitively reasonable but it is not logically required. In fact, one would expect to see variations, and the progression of acculturating has not been empirically determined or demonstrated. The influence of generation is one of the factors empirically investigated in this study.

## The Attraction and Conflict Models of Acculturation

This broad conceptualization can generate several plausible models that describe the basis of the process of acculturation. Two major models of change are the *Attraction Model* and the *Conflict Model*. These models are not the only viable representations of the process of acculturation, although they are the most reasonable. The two models differ in their implications in regard to the following: (a) the likelihood of the culturally displaced person identifying with the host culture, (b) the ease of adaptation, (c) the rate of change, and (d) the amount of change across generations.

In the attraction model, the culturally displaced person wants to become a full member of the host culture as quickly as possible. This person wants to change and, consequently, embraces and subscribes to most, if not all, of the various aspects of the new way of life. In general, the attraction model seems to be more characteristic of immigrants than of any of the other culturally displaced groups. The consequences of this model are as follows. These people are very likely to strongly identify with the host culture and regard themselves as true members of the host culture. The areas of the greatest change will correspond to those aspects of the host culture that are most attractive. The basis of this attraction may be the nature of the choice principles of the native culture. For instance, in the case of American immigrants, if there is an excessive degree of sociopolitical control in the native culture, the immigrant may be quite attracted to the freedom in American culture. However, despite the strong reasons and desire to become a full member of the host culture, adapting to the new way of life is not easily achieved. The problem can be described as "how can I really, and not just officially, be one of them." Those aspects of the host culture that are readily accessible to the person are at the level of peripheral choice principles, since these correspond to the concrete manifestations of the new way of life. The person has comparatively less access to the intermediate and central choice principles since those levels are much less visible, especially to someone unfamiliar with those choice principles.

In the conflict model, culturally displaced persons have to somehow manage to live in the host culture while maintaining their identity as much as possible. The conflict is between the person and the behaviors that are required by the situations in the new culture. The conflict can be described as "how can I, being who I am, do that." The person does not really want to participate normatively in the host culture, since doing so requires that person to give up what is normal and natural, at least to some significant degree. The consequences of this model are as follows. Despite the strong resistance to the kind of participation that results in personal change, the pressures for such participation are inherent in living in a new culture and managing a new way of life. Moreover, the pressures are greatest at the points of conflict between the native culture and the host culture. These pressures are expected to be greatest at the level of peripheral choice principles, less at the level

of intermediate choice principles, and least at the level of central choice principles; with variations within levels depending on the degree of conflict between specific choice principles. The pressures decrease as the level of generality increases, since the degree of compatibility across circumstances and cultural contexts also increases. In comparing these two models, the case of adaptation, rate of change, and amount of change are comparatively greater in the attraction model than in the conflict model. The likelihood of identifying with the host culture is lower in the conflict model than in the attraction model.

These two models are not mutually exclusive, since it is highly unlikely that the process of acculturation occurs purely in terms of one model or another. It is plausible that both dynamics occur simultaneously to varying degrees, both within a generation and across generations. For the first generation immigrant, it is likely that although it is very important to retain most aspects of the native way of life, some aspects of the way of life of the new host culture may be attractive. For subsequent generations, it is likely that attraction increases over generations as conflict decreases. This attraction is based on the greater behavior potential that corresponds with the host culture over the native culture. Furthermore, unlike the first generation, the later generations do not have to give up something, namely their native culture based on first hand socialization. In either the attraction model or the conflict model, the changes that occur in acculturating can be derived from the broader conceptualization of a hierarchy of choice principles.

The present study will test hypotheses that have been generated from the conflict model. Although other models and hypotheses can be derived from the broad conceptualization and may actually apply, the hypotheses developed from the conflict model are most interesting from practical and clinical perspectives. Studying the difficulties in acculturation has traditionally been problematic, as indicated by the review of the literature. These difficulties are going to be maximum in the conflict model relative to the attraction model. Even though the attraction model is likely to be characteristic of immigrants, there are difficulties in acculturating in either model and the primary interest in acculturation is the difficulties. This study will develop the implications of the conflict model and examine the extent to which it accounts for what actually happens in the process of acculturation. This study will not examine the differences between the conflict model and attraction model. Although in principle these hypotheses apply to any two cultures, they will be tested as they apply to Pilipino and Anglo-American cultures. Parametric descriptions of these cultures are provided in Appendix A to identify the major differences between these two cultures, from which the particular predictions have been derived.

## HYPOTHESES

The process of acculturation, if any, will proceed along these lines:

Hypothesis 1: As the immigrant acculturates, PCP's will change more and more quickly than ICP's, which in turn will change more and more quickly than CCP's.

Hypothesis 2: For the first generation immigrant, the PCP's of the native culture that are in the greatest conflict with the PCP's of the host culture will, other things being equal, change sooner than the native PCP's that are in less conflict with the host culture.

Hypothesis 3: For the first generation immigrant, as PCP's change and some are given up, of those that remain there will be at least one Marker PCP (i.e., a Pilipino PCP that is rated higher than the rest of the PCP's) that will increase in importance in the first generation and will be transmitted to subsequent generations.

Hypothesis 4: For those American choice principles where there are initial differences between the Anglo-American and Pilipino-American ratings, the Pilipino-American ratings of the American PCP's and ICP's will change across generations in the direction of endorsing the host culture. The PCP's and ICP's of the second generation (first born in host country) will be more similar to those of the host culture than those of the first generation immigrant.

Hypothesis 5: The CCP's across generations are less likely to change and change less than ICP's and PCP's.

## PROCEDURES

### Subjects

#### *Pilipino-American Subjects*

Members of the Philippine American Society of Colorado (PASCO) and the Kaibigan Filipino American Club (KFAC) at the University of Colorado at Boulder were recruited to volunteer for this study. Both organizations are Pilipino cultural groups. Additionally, churchgoers at the Queen of Peace Catholic church in Aurora, Colorado were recruited. Finally, subjects were recruited through various professional and personal contacts of the experimenter.

### *Anglo-American Subjects*

Subjects were recruited from three sources. About one-third of the subjects were recruited from the Department of Psychology experimental subjects pool at the University of Colorado at Boulder. To broaden the demographic characteristics of the Anglo subject pool, subjects were also recruited from the Queen of Peace Catholic church in Aurora, Colorado and from the Albertson's supermarket in Longmont, Colorado. Those who were recruited from the supermarket were paid a \$10 honorarium for completing the questionnaire. In order to get a broad distribution across ages, the supermarket sample was stratified in three levels (i.e., 18 to 30 years old, 31-40 years old, and 40 years old and older).

## **Instrument**

### *Perspectives Questionnaire*

This study utilized the *Perspectives Questionnaire*. This questionnaire was constructed to assess the cultural values that were derived from the cultural analyses of American and Pilipino cultures. The Perspectives Questionnaire consisted of an introduction page, a general information sheet, and a list of questions. Each of these sections is described in detail below.

#### *Introduction Page*

This section provided a general overview of the nature and procedures for the questionnaire. A statement about their rights as participants was included.

#### *General Information Sheet*

Two distinct general information sheets were devised for the Pilipino-American and Anglo-American subjects. For both groups, general basic demographic information was gathered (i.e., age, birthplace, ethnicity, sex, level of education, occupation, and marital status). For the Pilipino-American subjects, additional questions were asked to determine the generation of the subject, and whether the subject is pure Pilipino.

#### *List of Questions*

A list of questions that assess the particular Anglo-American and Pilipino cultural values was generated. From this list of questions, four forms were generated, two for each culture. The Anglo Form 1 questionnaire consisted of the Introduction page, the Anglo General Information sheet, and the four sections of questions. The Anglo Form 2 differed only in the sequence of the four sections of questions; that is, the last two sections of Form 1 are used as the first two sections of Form 2. The Pilipino Form 1 questionnaire consisted of the Introduction page, the Pilipino General Information sheet, and the four sections of questions. The same arrangement principle was applied to generate the Pilipino Form 2 questionnaire. This sequencing procedure was performed to minimize order effects.

### *Feedback Sheet*

A Feedback Sheet was written to provide the participants a more thorough description of the study, as well as the means to reach the experimenters for further questions and information.

## **Experimental Procedure**

### *Data Collection*

#### *Pilipino Subjects*

For the Philippine American Society of Colorado and the Kaibigan Filipino American Club, the investigator contacted the head of the organization to request some time during a regularly scheduled meeting. At the meeting, volunteers were recruited to participate in the study. A general verbal description of the study was provided. The participants were informed of their rights as experimental subjects in verbal and written form. The questionnaires were distributed. Verbal and written step-by-step instructions for completing the questionnaire were given. The investigator answered questions and provided assistance in completing the questionnaire. Upon completion and collection of the questionnaires, the Feedback Sheet was distributed and reviewed.

For the churchgoers, the investigator recruited volunteers during the regularly scheduled social hour that immediately follows the mass. During that time, the same questionnaire administration procedure described above was followed.

For the subjects who were recruited through professional and personal contacts of the experimenter, copies of the questionnaire were mailed out. The experimenter made several follow-up phone calls to answer whatever questions arose, and facilitate the completion and return of the questionnaires.

#### *Anglo Subjects*

For the subject pool participants, a particular meeting time and place was specified. For the churchgoing subjects, the same recruitment procedure employed for the Pilipino-American churchgoers was performed. The same questionnaire administration procedure described above was performed for the subject pool and church samples.

For the supermarket sample, the investigator initially contacted the store manager for permission to collect research data. The experimenter then set up a table with chairs in front of the supermarket, and recruited subjects as they walked by. The same administration procedure outlined above was performed. Upon completing the questionnaires, these subjects were given their cash honorarium.

### *Operational Definitions*

1. Marker PCP – The Marker PCP for group  $n$  is the PCP that is the highest of the 5 PCP means for group  $n$  ( $n=1$  or  $2$  for first and second generation, respectively).

2. Preferred PCP – The Preferred PCP for group n is the Marker PCP for group n that is significantly higher than each of the 4 remaining PCP means.

*Criterion for Significance*

For all of the predictions, the criteria for acceptance was a t-test of the means of the group scores as indicated by the corresponding indices.

*Data Coding*

Indices were generated from the raw scores in order to test the hypotheses. Indices representing mean ratings for individual subjects and groups of subjects are indicated below in Table 1:

Index Name	<b>Table 1 – Data Coding</b> Subject or Group Performing Rating	Choice Principle Being Rated
Anglo(Anglo P)	Anglo–American	Anglo PCP
Anglo(Anglo I)	Anglo–American	Anglo ICP
Anglo(Anglo C)	Anglo–American	Anglo CCP
Pilipino1(Anglo P)	First Generation Pilipino–American	Anglo PCP
Pilipino1(Anglo I)	First Generation Pilipino–American	Anglo ICP
Pilipino1(Anglo C)	First Generation Pilipino–American	Anglo CCP
Pilipino2(Anglo P)	Second Generation Pilipino–American	Anglo PCP
Pilipino2(Anglo I)	Second Generation Pilipino–American	Anglo ICP
Pilipino2(Anglo C)	Second Generation Pilipino–American	Anglo CCP
Pilipino1(Pilipino P)	First Generation Pilipino–American	Pilipino PCP
Pilipino1(Pilipino I)	First Generation Pilipino–American	Pilipino ICP

**Table 1 – Data Coding**

Index Name	Subject or Group Performing Rating	Choice Principle Being Rated
Pilipino1(Pilipino C)	First Generation Pilipino–American	Pilipino CCP
Pilipino2(Pilipino P)	Second Generation Pilipino–American	Pilipino PCP
Pilipino2(Pilipino I)	Second–Generation Pilipino–American	Pilipino ICP
Pilipino 2(Pilipino C)	Second Generation Pilipino–American	Pilipino CCP
Pilipino Pn (n = 1 to 5)	First Generation Pilipino–American	nth Pilipino PCP
(Anglo)(Anglo P)	Anglo group	Anglo PCP
(Anglo)(Anglo I)	Anglo group	Anglo ICP
(Anglo)(Anglo C)	Anglo group	Anglo CCP
(Pilipino1)(Anglo P)	First Generation Pilipino–American Group	Anglo PCP
(Pilipino1)(Anglo I)	First Generation Pilipino–American Group	Anglo ICP
(Pilipino1)(Anglo C)	First Generation Pilipino–American Group	Anglo CCP
(Pilipino2)(Anglo P)	Second Generation Pilipino–American Group	Anglo PCP
(Pilipino2)(Anglo I)	Second Generation Pilipino–American Group	Anglo ICP
(Pilipino2)(Anglo C)	Second Generation Pilipino–American Group	Anglo CCP
(Pilipino1)(Pilipino P)	First Generation Pilipino–American Group	Pilipino PCP
(Pilipino1)(Pilipino I)	First Generation Pilipino–American Group	Pilipino ICP



**Table 1 – Data Coding**

Index Name	Subject or Group Performing Rating	Choice Principle Being Rated
(Pilipino1)(Pilipino C)	First Generation Pilipino–American Group	Pilipino CCP
(Pilipino2)(Pilipino P)	Second Generation Pilipino–American Group	Pilipino PCP
(Pilipino2)(Pilipino I)	Second Generation Pilipino–American Group	Pilipino ICP
(Pilipino2)(Pilipino C)	Second Generation Pilipino–American Group	Pilipino CCP

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Sample Characteristics

#### *Pilipino–American Subjects*

The sample consisted of 47 subjects. Thirteen subjects (27.7%) were recruited from the Philippine American Society of Colorado (PASCO). Four subjects (8.5%) were recruited from the Kaibigan Filipino American Club (KFAC) at the University of Colorado at Boulder. Twenty-two subjects (46.8%) were recruited from the Queen of Peace Catholic church in Aurora, Colorado. The remaining eight subjects (17.0%) were recruited through various professional and personal contacts of the experimenter.

For the purposes of this study, the following guidelines were used to classify this group into generations. Those who immigrated at 14 years old or later were classified as first generation (N=27). Those who immigrated from 5 to 13 years old were classified as an ambiguous intermediate group between first and second generations (N=5). Lastly, those who were born in the U.S. and those who immigrated at 4 years old or younger were classified as second generation (N=15). Table A summarizes the demographic characteristics of the three generations.

For the entire group, the mean age was 34 years, 16 were male (34%), and 31 were female (66%). The mean number of years of education was 15 for all but ten subjects who did not provide this information. In terms of occupation, 5 were blue collar workers (10.6%), 13 were white collar workers (27.7%), 7 were professionals (14.9%), 12 were students (25.5%), 2 were homemakers (4.3%), 3 were classified as other (6.4%), and 5 did not specify an occupation (10.6%). Regarding marital status, 24 were never married (51.1%), 21 were married

(44.7%), 1 was divorced (2.1%), and 1 was widowed (2.1%). On average, they had been in the U.S. for 17.6 years.

For the first generation group, the mean age was 40 years old. Twelve of these subjects were male (44.4%), and 15 were female (55.6%). The mean number of years of education was 15 for 19 of the 27 subjects. Regarding occupation, 5 were blue collar workers (18.5%), 6 were white collar workers (22.2%), 6 were professionals (22.2%), 2 were students (7.4%), 1 was a homemaker (3.7%), 3 were classified as other (11.1%), and 4 did not specify their occupation (14.8%). Regarding marital status, 8 were never married (29.6%), 17 were married (63.0%), 1 was divorced (3.7%), and 1 was widowed (3.7%). On average, they have lived in the U.S. for 13.5 years.

For the intermediate generation group, the mean age was 29.4 years, 1 was male, and 4 were female. The mean number of years of education was 14 for 4 of the 5 subjects. Regarding occupation, 2 were white collar workers, 1 was a professional, and 2 were students. Regarding marital status, 4 were never married, and 1 was married. On average, they have lived in the U.S. for 20.8 years.

For the second generation group, the mean age was 24.7 years, 3 were male (20%), and 12 were female (80%). The mean number of years of education was 15.1 years for the 14 subjects who provided this information. Regarding occupation, 5 were white collar workers (33.3%), 8 were students (53.3%), 1 was a homemaker (6.7%), and 1 did not specify an occupation (6.7%). Regarding marital status, 12 were never married (80%), and 3 were married (20%). On average, they have lived in the U.S. for 23.9 years.

**Table A - Demographic Characteristics of Pilipino-American Sample**

Generation	N	Males	Females	Mean Age	Mean Years of Education	Mean Years in U.S.
First	27	12	15	40.0	15.1	13.5
Intermediate	5	1	4	29.4	14.0	20.8
Second	15	3	12	24.7	15.1	23.9
Across Generations	47	16	31	34.0	15.0	17.6

Regarding hypothesis 1, the testing of two predictions was contingent on the availability of subjects who have been residents of the U.S. for 5 years or less. Eleven subjects were in this category. The range of years of residency is as follows. Five have been in the U.S. for 1 year or less, 1 for 2 years, 3 for 3 years, and 2 for 4 years.

#### *Anglo-American Subjects*

The sample consisted of 45 subjects. Seventeen of these subjects (37.8%) were recruited from the Department of Psychology experimental subjects pool at the

University of Colorado at Boulder. Thirteen subjects (28.9%) were recruited from the Queen of Peace Catholic church in Aurora, Colorado. The remaining fifteen subjects (33.3%) were recruited from Albertson's supermarket in Longmont, Colorado. Table B summarizes the demographic characteristics.

For the entire group, the mean age was 32.2 years, 22 were male (48.9%), and 23 were female (51.1%). The mean number of years of education was 13.9 for the church and supermarket samples. Regarding occupation, 9 were blue collar workers (20.0%), 8 were white collar workers (17.8%), 2 were professionals (4.4%), 18 were students (40.0%), 4 were homemakers (8.9%), and 4 were classified as other (8.9%). Regarding marital status, 21 were never married (46.7%), 18 were married (40.0%), and 6 were divorced (13.3%). Regarding birthplace, 7 were from the West coast (15.6%), 11 were from the Mountain states (24.4%), 11 were from the Midwest (24.4%), 12 were from the East coast (26.7%), and 4 were from the South (8.9%).

**Table B – Demographic Characteristics of Anglo-American Sample**

Source	N	Males	Females	Mean Age	Mean Years of Education
Subject Pool	17	11	6	18.8	N.A.
Church	13	6	7	44.4	15.0
Supermarket	15	5	10	36.9	12.9

### Hypotheses Testing

Primarily, two central premises of the hypotheses, predictions, and analyses will be explicated before reviewing the results. First, the overall expectation is that the Pilipinos living in the Philippines, on the whole, endorse all three levels of Pilipino choice principles equally highly. People who are living in their native country naturally live their way of life. Accordingly, most if not all of the choice principles are naturally followed and highly endorsed. The absolute degree of endorsement is secondary to the expectation that the level of endorsement is roughly equivalent across all three levels of choice principles. As explicated in the conceptualization, the phenomenon of cultural displacement prevents people from living their native way of life naturally. Under these circumstances, changes in the degree of endorsement and enactments of the native choice principles are expected to occur. These changes were expected to be in the negative direction.

Second, in examining the timing and the rate of these changes, the model that was applied is as follows. In general, the changes begin at a certain time and progress at a decelerating rate. The direction of the changes is toward decreasing endorsement of the Pilipino choice principles and increasing endorsement of the American choice principles. The changes of the different choice principles within a particular level (but not across levels) will occur at roughly the same rate, but at

different times. When the changes are examined at a given time, if the level of endorsement has not yet reached the comparative Anglo-American level of endorsement, then one can expect that those choice principles that started changing earlier will show greater change than those choice principles that started changing later. In the case of the Pilipino choice principles, those that started to change earlier will be endorsed less than those that started to change later. In the case of the American choice principles, those that started to change earlier will be endorsed more than those that started to change later.

For all of the analyses for which a t-test applied, a two-tailed t-test was performed.

### *Hypothesis 1*

As the first generation immigrant acculturates, PCP's will change more and more quickly than ICP's, which in turn will change more and more quickly than CCP's.

#### *Prediction 1.1:*

The (Pilipino1)(Pilipino P) index will be less than the (Pilipino1)(Pilipino I) index.

A t-test was performed to compare these two indices. The analysis yielded significant positive findings. The (Pilipino1)(Pilipino P) index of 5.63 (S.D.=1.05) is significantly less than the (Pilipino1)(Pilipino I) index of 6.81 (S.D.=0.75,  $t=-6.20$ ,  $p<<.001$ ,  $N=27$ ). Table 1.1 summarizes these findings.

**Table 1.1 – First Generation Pilipino–American PCP and ICP Ratings**

	Mean	S.D.	t	p
Pilipino PCP	5.63	1.05	-6.20	<<.001
Pilipino ICP	6.81	0.75		

#### *Prediction 1.2:*

The (Pilipino1)(Pilipino I) index will be less than the (Pilipino1)(Pilipino C) index.

A t-test was performed to compare these two indices. The analysis yielded significant positive findings. The (Pilipino1)(Pilipino I) index of 6.81 (S.D.=0.75) is significantly less than the (Pilipino1)(Pilipino C) index of 7.29 (S.D.=0.95,  $t=-3.60$ ,  $p=.001$ ,  $N=27$ ). Table 1.2 summarizes these findings.

**Table 1.2 – First Generation Pilipino–American ICP and CCP Ratings**

	Mean	S.D.	t	p
Pilipino ICP	6.81	0.75	-3.60	.001
Pilipino CCP	7.29	0.95		

*Prediction 1.3*

As duration of residency in the U.S. increases, the difference between the (Pilipino1)(Pilipino P) index and the (Pilipino1)(Pilipino I) index will increase.

This prediction was contingent on the availability of Pilipino-Americans who have been in the U.S. 5 years or less (N=11). The difference between the (Pilipino1)(Pilipino P) and (Pilipino1)(Pilipino I) indices was correlated with the duration of residency in the U.S. The analyses yielded an r-value of  $-0.148$  and a p value of  $.664$ . This finding does not support the prediction. Instead, the findings indicate a nonsignificant negative correlation. Table 1.3 summarizes these findings.

**Table 1.3 – Correlation of Difference Between Pilipino PCP and Pilipino ICP Ratings with Duration in the U.S.**

N	r-value	p
11	$-.148$	$.664$

*Prediction 1.4:*

As duration of residency in the U.S. increases, the difference between the (Pilipino1)(Pilipino I) index and the (Pilipino1)(Pilipino C) index will increase.

This prediction was also contingent on the availability of Pilipino-Americans who have been in the U.S. 5 years or less (N=11). The difference between the (Pilipino1)(Pilipino I) and (Pilipino1)(Pilipino C) indices was correlated with the duration of residency in the U.S. The analyses yielded a r-value of  $0.21$  and a p value of  $.952$ . This finding indicates a nonsignificant positive correlation. Table 1.4 summarizes these findings.

**Table 1.4 – Correlation of Difference Between Pilipino ICP and Pilipino CCP Ratings with Duration in the U.S.**

N	r-value	p
11	$.021$	$.952$

Both primary predictions for the first hypothesis were supported by the data. The Pilipino PCP's changed more and more quickly than the Pilipino ICP's, which in turn changed more and more quickly than the Pilipino CCP's. The difference between the PCP index and the ICP index was greater than the difference between the ICP index and the CCP index. Furthermore, the higher t-value and lower p-value of the prior difference compared with the latter strongly confirms this hypothesis. The conceptualization of the differences in the degree of retention of choice principles was definitely confirmed.

*Hypothesis 2*

For the first generation immigrant, the PCP's of the native culture that are in greatest conflict with the PCP's of the host culture will, other things being equal, change sooner than the native PCP's that are in less conflict with the host culture.

Two methods were employed in determining the Pilipino PCP's that are in greatest conflict with American culture. Primarily, the experimenter rank ordered the five Pilipino PCP's in terms of degree of conflict. The experimenter based this ranking on the cultural analyses and personal impressions. This procedure yielded the following results. The two Pilipino PCP's are (a) eat with your hands instead of using utensils (PCP5), and (b) use titles, sir, or madam when addressing people in authority (PCP2).

Secondly, the experimenter administered a rating instrument to three Anglo-American raters. These judges were asked to rate each Pilipino PCP on a 10-point scale in terms of the extent to which each behavior was out of character or incompatible with the American way of life. The range of the scale was 0 (not at all) to 9 (extremely). The two PCP's with the highest incompatibility ratings were regarded as those in greatest conflict with American culture. This procedure yielded the following results. The two PCP's with the highest rating was PCP4 (when in a group, forgo your personal needs for the good of the group) and PCP2 (use titles, sir, or madam when addressing people in authority). Both PCP's had a mean rating of 6.33. The third most incompatible PCP was PCP1 (use euphemisms to avoid the displeasure of an important person) with a mean rating of 5.0. PCP3 (whenever you go out, dress up so you won't look sloppy) was rated as the fourth most incompatible PCP with a mean rating of 4.33. The least incompatible PCP was PCP5 (eat with your hands instead of using utensils) with a mean rating of 3.33. These findings are summarized in Table 2.

**Table 2 – Rank Order and Mean Ratings of Degree of Incompatibility by Anglo-American Raters**

Rank Ordering	PCP4	PCP2	PCP1	PCP3	PCP5
Mean Incompatibility Rating	6.33	6.33	5.00	4.33	3.33

*Prediction 2.1:*

The (Pilipino1)(Pilipino P) index of the PCP's that are in greatest conflict will be less than the (Pilipino1)(Pilipino P) index of the PCP's that are in less conflict.

As determined by the experimenter's ratings, the (Pilipino1)(Pilipino P) indices of the two PCP's that are in greatest conflict were compared with the (Pilipino1)(Pilipino P) indices of the three PCP's that are in least conflict in two ways. Primarily, each index was individually compared with the remaining 3 indices by utilizing a t-test. This procedure yielded the following results.

The comparison of the PCP5 index (eating with your hands) with each of the three low conflict PCP indices showed that it was significantly less in all cases. The

index for PCP5 was 3.17 (S.D.=2.51). In comparison, the index for PCP1 (using euphemisms) was 7.02 (S.D.=1.16,  $t=-8.13$ ,  $p<<.001$ ). The index for PCP3 (dress up whenever you go out) was 6.48 (S.D.=1.61,  $t=-6.96$ ,  $p<<.001$ ). Finally, the index for PCP4 (forgo personal needs in a group) was 4.89 (S.D.=1.66,  $t=-3.40$ ,  $p=.002$ ). These findings support the prediction. See Table 2.1a for a summary of the results.

**Table 2.1a – Comparison of PCP5 with Low Conflict PCP’s**

	Mean	S.D.	t	p
PCP5	3.17	2.51	-8.13	<<.001
PCP1	7.02	1.16		
PCP5	3.17	2.51	-6.96	<<.001
PCP3	6.48	1.61		
PCP5	3.17	2.51	-3.40	.002
PCP4	4.89	1.66		

The second PCP determined by the experimenter to be in greatest conflict was PCP2 (use titles, sir, or madam when addressing people in authority). The comparison of the PCP2 index with each of the three low conflict PCP indices showed that it was not significantly lower. In two comparisons, the PCP2 index was actually higher. The PCP2 index (M=6.59, S.D.=1.73) was significantly higher than the PCP4 index (M=4.89, S.D.=1.66,  $t=3.40$ ,  $p=.002$ ), but not significantly higher than the PCP3 index (M=6.48, S.D.=1.61). In the last comparison, the PCP2 index was not significantly lower than the PCP1 index (M=7.02, S.D.=1.16,  $t=-1.21$ ,  $p=.238$ ). These findings do not support the prediction. See Table 2.1b for a summary of these findings.

**Table 2.1b – Comparison of PCP2 with Low Conflict PCP’s**

	Mean	S.D.	t	p
PCP2	6.59	1.73	-1.21	.238
PCP1	7.02	1.16		
PCP2	6.59	1.73	.28	.780
PCP3	6.48	1.61		
PCP2	6.59	1.73	3.40	.002
PCP4	4.89	1.66		

The second comparison procedure utilized a t-test to compare the mean of the indices of the two high conflict PCP’s with the mean of the indices of the three low conflict PCP’s. This analysis yielded significant positive results.

The mean of the PCP2 and PCP5 ratings was 4.88 (S.D.=1.71). The mean of the PCP1, PCP3, and PCP4 ratings was 6.13 (S.D.=0.94). The mean of the high

conflict PCP's is significantly less than the mean of the low conflict PCP's ( $t=-4.11$ ,  $p<.001$ ). These findings support the prediction. See Table 2.1c for a summary of these findings.

**Table 2.1c – Comparison of High Conflict PCP Ratings with Low Conflict PCP Ratings**

	Mean	S.D.	t	p
High Conflict PCP's	4.88	1.71	-4.11	<.001
Low Conflict PCP's	6.13	.94		

As determined by the Anglo raters, the two PCP's that are most in conflict with the American way of life were PCP4 (when in a group, forgo your personal needs for the good of the group) and PCP2 (use titles, sir, or madam when addressing people in authority). The selection of PCP2 by the Anglo raters as a high conflict PCP was consistent with the experimenter's ratings. The indices for these two PCP's will be compared in the same ways described previously. This analysis yielded the following results.

The PCP4 index was significantly less than two of the three low conflict PCP indices. In one comparison, the PCP4 index ( $M=4.89$ ,  $S.D.=1.66$ ) was significantly higher than the PCP5 index ( $M=3.17$ ,  $S.D.=2.51$ ). These findings partially support the prediction. Table 2.1d summarizes these findings.

**Table 2.1d – Comparison of PCP4 with Low Conflict PCP's**

	Mean	S.D.	t	p
PCP4	4.89	1.66	-6.00	<<.001
PCP1	7.02	1.16		
PCP4	4.89	1.66	-3.33	.003
PCP3	6.48	1.61		
PCP4	4.89	1.66	3.40	.002
PCP5	3.17	2.51		

The PCP2 index was not significantly less in any of the comparisons. The PCP2 index was less in only one comparison. The PCP2 index ( $M=6.59$ ,  $S.D.=1.73$ ) was less than the PCP1 index ( $M=7.02$ ,  $S.D.=1.16$ ,  $t=-1.21$ ,  $p=.238$ ), though this difference was nonsignificant. The PCP2 index was significantly higher than the PCP5 index ( $M=3.17$ ,  $S.D.=2.51$ ,  $t=6.77$ ,  $p<<.001$ ), but not significantly higher than the PCP3 index ( $M=6.48$ ,  $S.D.=1.61$ ,  $t=0.28$ ,  $p=.780$ ). These results do not support the prediction. Table 2.1e summarizes these findings.



**Table 2.1e – Comparison of PCP2 with Low Conflict PCP's**

	Mean	S.D.	t	p
PCP2	6.59	1.73	-1.21	.238
PCP1	7.02	1.16		
PCP2	6.59	1.73	0.28	.780
PCP3	6.48	1.61		
PCP2	6.59	1.73	6.77	<<.001
PCP5	3.17	2.51		

In comparing the mean of the high conflict PCP's (PCP4 and PCP2) with the mean of the low conflict PCP's (PCP1, PCP3, and PCP5), the mean of the high conflict PCP's was not significantly lower than the mean of the low conflict PCP's as predicted. Instead, the mean of the high conflict PCP's was higher than the mean of the low conflict PCP's, though the difference was nonsignificant. These findings did not support the prediction. Table 2.1f summarizes these findings.

**Table 2.1f – Comparison of High Conflict PCP Ratings with Low Conflict PCP Ratings**

	Mean	S.D.	t	p
High Conflict PCP's	5.74	1.09	.71	.483
Low Conflict PCP's	5.56	1.33		

The data partially supported the predictions for the second hypothesis as it was specifically tested. In analyzing the PCP's that were determined by the experimenter to be in greatest conflict, the endorsement of PCP5 (eating with your hands) was consistently and significantly less than the endorsement of the other PCP's. The practice of eating with one's hands instead of using utensils as one does in the Philippines is generally in conflict with the American way of life and, as such, not culturally or socially sanctioned. Moreover, publicly engaging in this practice will likely provoke criticism from those around you, since it is generally regarded as uncouth and offensive according to American standards. The size of the difference in levels of endorsement strongly indicates the extent to which this PCP is generally incompatible with the Anglo-American culture. Since it is a practice that is regarded as ill-mannered in American terms, Filipino-Americans would not publicly engage in this behavior in order to avoid social undesirability.

The second conflictual PCP as determined by the experimenter was PCP2 (using titles, "sir," or "madam" when addressing people in authority). The data did not support this prediction. The endorsement of this PCP was lower than one PCP, and higher than the other two PCP's. In one of the latter comparisons, the difference was significant. "Using titles, 'sir,' or 'madam' when addressing people in authority" (PCP2) was endorsed significantly higher than "forgoing your personal

needs for the good of the group" (PCP4). These findings indicate that PCP2 was not regarded as being in great conflict with the American culture, as had been predicted.

In comparing the mean of the two high conflict PCP's with the mean of the three low conflict PCP's, the data supported the hypothesis and prediction. The interpretation of this finding must be done in light of the two previous comparisons. Given the results of the comparison between PCP2 and the three low conflict PCP's, the significance of this comparison is likely due to the marked difference between PCP5 and the three low conflict PCP's. Taken together, the results provide a qualified confirmation of the hypothesis.

The analysis of those PCP's that the Anglo-American raters judged to be in conflict also provides partial support for the hypothesis and prediction. The two conflictual PCP's were PCP4 (when in a group, forgo your personal needs for the good of the group) and PCP2 (use titles, sir, or madam when addressing people in authority). Although each comparison between PCP4 and the three low conflict PCP's was significant, one comparison was in the opposite direction than predicted. The endorsement of PCP4 was significantly higher than the endorsement of PCP5 (eating with your hands). The non-selection of PCP5 by the Anglo-American raters may likely be due to the misunderstanding of the actual meaning of "eating with your hands instead of using utensils." The standard American cuisine includes items that are considered "finger food," and other food that can easily be eaten with one's hands. Many appetizers, snacks, fast-food meals, main courses, and desserts can be eaten with one's hands, if not customarily so. In this sense of PCP5, the degree of conflict with the American way of life is reasonably low. The actual meaning of eating meals without using utensils in the same way that this is done in the Philippines was not clearly conveyed or understood.

The results of the comparison between PCP2 and the three low conflict PCP's failed to support the hypothesis and prediction. The only significant comparison was the significantly higher (and not lower as predicted) endorsement of PCP2 over PCP5. These results further indicate the low degree of conflict that PCP2 has with the American culture. The comparison of the mean of the low conflict PCP's with the mean of the high conflict PCP's also failed to support the hypothesis.

Despite the inconsistent support of the hypothesis from the analysis procedure that was performed, the data supported the hypothesis in the general sense. In the specific terms of the prediction, the results only partially supported the hypothesis. However, in the broader perspective, PCP5 and PCP4 were the two PCP's that were most in conflict and were endorsed accordingly. In this general sense, the hypothesis was clearly supported. The prediction of these two PCP's as the ones that were most incompatible with the American culture was inconsistent. The experimenter rated PCP5 as highly incompatible, but not PCP4. Whereas, the Anglo-American raters rated PCP4 as highly incompatible, but not PCP5. This inconsistency in ratings may reflect a misunderstanding of PCP5 by the

Anglo-American raters, and a misinterpretation of the feasibility of PCP4 by the experimenter.

With regard to the broad conceptualization, the results generally supported the notion that those native PCP's that are in greatest conflict with the PCP's of the host culture will change earlier than those that are in less conflict. Most typical American contexts do not support eating with one's hands nor forgoing one's wishes for the good of the group. Despite the specific miscalculations and imprecise predictions of the particular PCP's that were in greatest conflict, the conceptualization was supported.

*Hypothesis 3*

For the first generation immigrant, as PCP's change and some are given up, of those that remain there will be at least one Marker PCP (i.e., a Pilipino PCP that is rated higher than the rest of the PCP's) that will increase in importance in the first generation and will be transmitted to subsequent generations.

*Prediction 3.1:*

In the first generation, the Preferred PCP will be the PCP that refers to eating with one's hands (PCP5). This PCP will also be the Preferred PCP for the second generation.

The Pilipino P5 index was compared with each of the remaining 4 Pilipino Pn indices by utilizing a t-test. In all comparisons within the first generation group, the Pilipino P5 index was not significantly higher than any of the other 4 Pilipino Pn indices. Instead, the Pilipino P5 index was significantly lower than each of the other 4 indices. These findings not only fail to support the prediction, but are also in the opposite direction. Table 3.1a summarizes these findings.

**Table 3.1a – Comparison of Preferred PCP with Remaining PCP's for the First Generation**

	Mean	S.D.	t	p
Pilipino P5	3.17	2.51	-8.13	<<.001
Pilipino P1	7.02	1.16		
Pilipino P5	3.17	2.51	-6.77	<<.001
Pilipino P2	6.59	1.73		
Pilipino P5	3.17	2.51	-6.96	<<.001
Pilipino P3	6.48	1.61		
Pilipino P5	3.17	2.51	-3.40	.002
Pilipino P4	4.89	1.66		

In all comparisons within the second generation, the Pilipino P5 index was significantly lower than each of the other 4 Pilipino Pn indices. These findings are

consistent with the findings in the first generation, and contradict the prediction. Table 3.1b summarizes these findings.

**Table 3.1b – Comparison of Preferred PCP with Remaining PCP's for the Second Generation**

	Mean	S.D.	t	p
Pilipino P5	1.90	1.90	-7.72	<<.001
Pilipino P1	7.13	1.32		
Pilipino P5	1.90	1.90	-7.21	<<.001
Pilipino P2	6.90	1.43		
Pilipino P5	1.90	1.90	-4.63	<.001
Pilipino P3	5.80	2.11		
Pilipino P5	1.90	1.90	-2.85	.013
Pilipino P4	4.17	1.71		

*Prediction 3.2:*

The Marker PCP will be the same for both generations.

The Marker PCP for the first generation was PCP1 (use euphemisms to avoid the displeasure of an important person). The Pilipino P1 value was 7.02 (S.D.=1.16). The Marker PCP for the intermediate generation was PCP2 (use titles, sir, or madam when addressing people in authority). The Pilipino P2 value was 8.20 (S.D.=1.51). The Marker PCP for the second generation was PCP1. The Pilipino P1 value was 7.13 (S.D.=1.32). These results support the prediction. Tables 3.2a to 3.2c summarize these results.

**Table 3.2a – First Generation Ranking of PCP's**

Rank Order	Mean	S.D.
1. PCP1 – Use Euphemisms	7.02	1.16
2. PCP2 – Use Titles	6.59	1.73
3. PCP3 – Dress Up Whenever Going Out	6.48	1.61
4. PCP4 – Forgo Personal Needs	4.89	1.66
5. PCP5 – Eat With Your Hands	3.17	2.51

**Table 3.2b – Intermediate Generation Ranking of PCP's**

Rank Order	Mean	S.D.
1. PCP2 – Use Titles	8.20	1.51
2. PCP1 – Use Euphemisms	7.60	1.71
3. PCP3 – Dress Up Whenever Going Out	5.80	1.57
4. PCP4 – Forgo Personal Needs	4.70	1.15
5. PCP5 – Eat With Hands	4.10	2.22

**Table 3.2c – Second Generation Ranking of PCP's**

Rank Order	Mean	S.D.
1. PCP1 – Use Euphemisms	7.13	1.32
2. PCP2 – Use Titles	6.90	1.43
3. PCP3 – Dress Up Whenever Going Out	5.80	2.11
4. PCP4 – Forgo Personal Needs	4.17	1.71
5. PCP5 – Eat With Hands	1.90	1.90

*Prediction 3.3:*

There will be a Preferred PCP, and it will be the same for both generations.

T-tests were performed comparing the Marker PCP for each generation with each of the remaining four PCP's. For the first generation, the Marker PCP was PCP1 which was significantly higher than PCP4 ( $t=6.00$ ,  $p<<.001$ ) and PCP5 ( $t=8.13$ ,  $p<<.001$ ), but not significantly higher than PCP2 ( $t=1.21$ ,  $p=.238$ ) or PCP3 ( $t=1.74$ ,  $p=.094$ ). These findings do not show that PCP1 was a Preferred PCP, and therefore the prediction was not supported. See Table 3.3a for a summary.

**Table 3.3a – First Generation Preferred PCP Comparisons**

	Mean	S.D.	t	p
Marker PCP1	7.02	1.16	1.21	.238
PCP2	6.59	1.73		
Marker PCP1	7.02	1.16	1.74	.094
PCP3	6.48	1.61		
Marker PCP1	7.02	1.16	6.00	<<.001
PCP4	4.89	1.66		
Marker PCP1	7.02	1.16	8.13	<<.001
PCP5	3.17	2.51		

For the intermediate generation, the Marker PCP was PCP2 ( $M=8.20$ ,  $S.D.=1.15$ ) which was significantly higher than PCP4 ( $M=4.70$ ,  $S.D.=1.15$ ,  $t=9.90$ ,  $p=.001$ ) and PCP5 ( $M=4.10$ ,  $S.D.=2.22$ ,  $t=3.62$ ,  $p=.022$ ), but not significantly higher than PCP1 ( $M=7.60$ ,  $S.D.=1.71$ ,  $t=0.88$ ,  $p=.426$ ) or PCP3 ( $M=5.80$ ,  $S.D.=1.57$ ,  $t=2.48$ ,  $p=.068$ ). These findings do not show that PCP2 was the Preferred PCP, and therefore the prediction was not supported. See table 3.3b for a summary.

**Table 3.3b – Intermediate Generation Preferred PCP Comparisons**

	Mean	S.D.	t	p
Marker PCP2	8.20	1.15	.88	.426

	Mean	S.D.	t	p
PCP1	7.60	1.71		
Marker PCP2	8.20	1.15	2.48	.068
PCP3	5.80	1.57		
Marker PCP2	8.20	1.15	9.90	.001
PCP4	4.70	1.15		
Marker PCP2	8.20	1.15	3.62	.022
PCP5	4.10	2.22		

For the second generation, the Marker PCP was PCP1 ( $M=7.13$ ,  $S.D.=1.90$ ) which was significantly higher than PCP3 ( $M=5.80$ ,  $S.D.=2.11$ ,  $t=2.59$ ,  $p=.022$ ), PCP4 ( $M=4.17$ ,  $S.D.=1.71$ ,  $t=7.88$ ,  $p<<.001$ ), and PCP5 ( $M=1.90$ ,  $S.D.=1.90$ ,  $t=7.72$ ,  $p<<.001$ ), but not significantly higher than PCP2 ( $M=6.90$ ,  $S.D.=1.43$ ,  $t=0.68$ ,  $p=.500$ ). These findings do not show that PCP1 was a Preferred PCP, and therefore the prediction is not supported. See Table 3.3c for a summary.

**Table 3.3c – Second Generation Preferred PCP Comparisons**

	Mean	S.D.	t	p
Marker PCP1	7.13	1.32	.68	.509
PCP2	6.90	1.43		
Marker PCP1	7.13	1.32	2.59	.022
PCP3	5.80	2.11		
Marker PCP1	7.13	1.32	7.88	<<.001
PCP4	4.17	1.71		
Marker PCP1	7.13	1.32	7.72	<<.001
PCP5	1.90	1.90		

Across both generations, there was no Preferred PCP, and therefore the third hypothesis was not supported. The first prediction specified PCP5 as the Preferred PCP for both generations. Not only did the data not support this prediction, the findings were in the opposite direction from the prediction. In both generations, the PCP5 index was significantly less than each of the other four PCP's. Furthermore, this prediction is mutually exclusive with prediction 2.1 above wherein PCP5 was determined by the experimenter to be one of the two PCP's that were most in conflict with the Anglo-American culture. Clearly, PCP5 cannot be simultaneously a dysvalued high conflict PCP and a Preferred PCP. These mutually exclusive predictions were the result of an oversight by the experimenter in failing to provide an adequate conceptualization of the potential significance of this PCP to Filipinos.

The practice of eating with one's hands can, in principle, be both a high conflict PCP and a Preferred PCP. This notion relies on the critical distinction between public and private social practices. As a public social practice in the U.S., eating with one's hands as one does in the Philippines is clearly censured. As such, one

would naturally expect that Pilipinos would poorly endorse the corresponding choice principle. However, as a private social practice that one engages in with fellow Pilipino-Americans who are family and friends, this practice can embody what it means to be "back home" and behave in familiar and "native" ways. Especially when eating native dishes during a cultural or religious celebration, this practice can, in principle, be highly valued and endorsed. This important distinction was not articulated in the conceptualization nor indicated at all in the instrument. Instead, the general descriptions of this practice and choice principle in the questionnaire conveyed it strictly as a public practice.

The second prediction was supported by the data, and therefore partially supported the hypothesis. For both the first and second generations, the Marker PCP was PCP1 (use euphemisms to avoid the displeasure of an important person). As the Marker PCP, the index for PCP1 was numerically highest for both generations. However, for the intermediate generation PCP1 was ranked second to PCP2 (use titles, sir, or madam when addressing people in authority). Since this group consisted of only five subjects, it is difficult to interpret these results with confidence. The consistency of PCP1 as the Marker PCP for both first and second generations suggests that at least this PCP was passed on from one generation to the next. Thus, the conceptualization regarding the retention of at least one PCP across generations was mildly confirmed.

The third prediction was not fully supported by the data. The Marker PCP for each generation was not significantly higher than each of the other four PCP's. In the first generation, PCP1 was significantly higher than only two of the four other PCP's. Whereas, in the second generation, PCP1 was significantly higher than only three of the four PCP's. These findings indicate that the conceptualization of a Preferred PCP was only partially supported. Although the Marker PCP was the same for both generations, this PCP did not qualify as a Preferred PCP. The absence of a Preferred PCP suggests that the Pilipino-Americans who were studied were not clearly hanging on to their native culture by endorsing a particular PCP significantly higher than the others, and then passing it on to the next generation. This lack of retention of a particular PCP suggested that the Pilipino peripheral choice principles were not grossly in conflict with the American culture. Therefore, the pressure to maintain native values did not seem to be great. These findings suggested that the attraction model may apply better than the conflict model in these circumstances.

#### *Hypothesis 4*

For those American choice principles where there are initial differences between the Anglo-American ratings and the Pilipino-American ratings, the Pilipino-American ratings of the American PCP's and ICP's will change across generations in the direction of endorsing the host culture. The PCP's and ICP's of

the second generation (first generation born in the host country) will be more similar to those of the host culture than those of the first generation immigrant.

Primarily, *t*-tests were performed comparing the Anglo-American and Pilipino-American ratings of the American choice principles to determine initial differences between their ratings. For all three levels of choice principles, there were no significant differences between the Anglo-American and Pilipino-American ratings. Therefore, this hypothesis could not be tested. Table 4 summarizes these findings.

**Table 4 – Anglo-American and Pilipino-American Ratings of American Choice Principles**

		Mean	S.D.	t	p
CCP's	Anglo Ratings	7.00	.95	-.80	.425
	Pilipino Ratings	7.16	.96		
ICP's	Anglo Ratings	6.57	1.14	-.95	.344
	Pilipino Ratings	6.80	1.10		
PCP's	Anglo Ratings	6.81	1.19	1.07	.289
	Pilipino Ratings	6.56	1.03		

The lack of initial differences suggests that the Pilipino-Americans may have been previously acculturated, at least to some significant degree, prior to immigrating to the U.S. If so, then the attraction model may apply better than the conflict model.

### *Hypothesis 5*

The CCP's across generations are less likely to change and change less than ICP's and PCP's.

In order to test this hypothesis, the levels of endorsement of the Pilipino choice principles across generations will be determined by calculating the mean indices across first and second generations.

#### *Prediction 5.1:*

The mean of the (Pilipino1)(Pilipino C) and (Pilipino2)(Pilipino C) indices will be higher than the mean of the (Pilipino1)(Pilipino I) and (Pilipino2)(Pilipino I) indices.

*T*-tests were performed comparing the means of these two sets of indices. The analysis yielded positive significant results. The mean of the (Pilipino1)(Pilipino C) and (Pilipino2)(Pilipino C) indices was 7.28 (S.D.=1.07). The mean of the (Pilipino1)(Pilipino I) and (Pilipino2)(Pilipino I) indices was 6.99 (S.D.=.96). This significant difference was in the direction predicted ( $t=2.61$ ,  $p=.013$ ). See Table 5.1 for a summary of these findings.



**Table 5.1 – Means of First and Second Generation Ratings of Pilipino CCP's and ICP's**

	Mean	S.D.	t	p
Pilipino CCP's	7.28	1.07	2.61	.013
Pilipino ICP's	6.99	.96		

*Prediction 5.2:* The mean of the (Pilipino1)(Pilipino C) and (Pilipino2)(Pilipino C) indices will be higher than the mean of the (Pilipino1)(Pilipino P) and (Pilipino2)(Pilipino P) indices.

T-tests were performed comparing the means of these two sets of indices. The analysis yielded positive significant results. The mean of the (Pilipino1)(Pilipino C) and (Pilipino2)(Pilipino C) indices was 7.28 (S.D.=1.07). The mean of the (Pilipino1)(Pilipino P) and (Pilipino2)(Pilipino P) indices was 5.47 (S.D.=1.00). This significant difference was in the direction predicted ( $t=10.90$ ,  $p<<.001$ ). See Table 5.2 below for a summary of these findings.

**Table 5.2 – Means of First and Second Generation Ratings of Pilipino CCP's and PCP's**

	Mean	S.D.	t	p
Pilipino CCP's	7.28	1.07	10.90	<<.001
Pilipino PCP's	5.47	1.00		

The data clearly supported the last hypothesis. The index for the CCP's was significantly higher than the index for the ICP's, and markedly higher than the index for the PCP's. The  $t$ -value of 10.90 and  $p$ -value of  $<.001$  were quite notable. These results strongly confirmed the conceptualization that across generations CCP's were most resistant to change relative to ICP's and PCP's.

### **The Applicability of the Attraction Model Versus the Conflict Model**

Overall, the data suggested that the attraction model was more applicable in this population than the conflict model. The several indicators are as follows. As indicated by the findings for hypothesis 3, the absence of a Preferred PCP suggested that the Pilipino-American immigrants were not hanging on to their native culture by endorsing a particular PCP much more than the others, and subsequently passing this on to the following generation. In the conflict model, the Preferred PCP is an important PCP since it carries the burden of embodying the native way of life. The absence of a Preferred PCP suggested that the prediction

that a native PCP would be strongly retained, despite the pressures from the host culture to change, was not supported.

Furthermore, as indicated by the entire set of analyses for hypothesis 4, there were no significant initial differences between the Pilipino-American ratings of the Pilipino and American CCP's and ICP's. This finding applied both across and within generations. This lack of initial differences suggested that the Pilipino-American immigrants may have been previously acculturated to the American way of life. Moreover, it is reasonable that one of their primary reasons for immigrating to the U.S. was their attraction to the American way of life. Practically speaking, the status of an immigrant implies that the voluntary move to another country was primarily motivated by being drawn to the new host culture. In contrast, the status of a refugee means that the move was involuntary, and therefore the new host culture may not necessarily be more attractive than the native culture.

In addition, the characteristic Pilipino belief in the colonial mentality further supports this notion of being drawn to the new host culture. According to the notion of the colonial mentality, most if not all aspects of America and the American way of life is better than the native Pilipino ways. The findings for those Pilipino-Americans who have been residents of the U.S. for five years and less further corroborate these general notions.

Although this study examined the extent to which the conflict model accounts for the nature of the process of change in acculturation, the background facts that have been outlined above suggest that the attraction model is more applicable to this population. As mentioned earlier, the selection of the conflict model was based on the clinical interest in focusing on the difficulties in adjusting to a new culture. Although the difficulties in adjustment can also be studied within the attraction model, those difficulties are qualitatively different from those within the conflict model. The difficulties within the conflict model are of relatively greater clinical interest, since those difficulties more clearly impinge on a person's ability to engage in their native social practices and thereby satisfy basic human needs.

### **Limitations of the Study**

The limitations of this study can be classified in the following categories: (a) specificity of the ethnic groups, (b) specificity of the model, (c) limitations in sampling, (d) limitations in the instrument, and (e) limitations in the procedures. Each of these aspects will be reviewed below.

Although the conceptualization can be applied to any two ethnic groups and cultures, this study strictly examined the Pilipino and Anglo-American cultures. The conceptualization of a hierarchy of choice principles may, in practice, apply differently in two other cultures. Although there is no apparent reason that this would be the case, the results of this study do not necessarily preclude the possibility that the process of acculturation proceeds differently in other ethnic

groups. In any case, these findings cannot be necessarily or logically generalized to other ethnic groups.

Moreover, the model that was tested in this study is only one of the possible models that can be derived from the conceptualization. The conflict and attraction models were the only two models that were explicitly described and developed. As an example of an alternative model, a learning model wherein a culturally displaced person acquires new choice principles through a process of learning is also plausible. This learning process could also proceed from the peripheral to the central level. Alternatively, some combination of any of the three possible models mentioned thus far may actually account for the phenomenon. In any case, the conclusions and assertions that can be made must be limited to those that can be directly derived from the conflict model and not any other model.

Within this specific model, there are further limitations concerning the particular population samples that were studied. The demographic characteristics of the Pilipino-American and Anglo-American populations were reasonably distinct. Almost half (46.8%) of the Pilipino-American group was recruited from a Catholic church, and as such their responses may be confounded with whatever choice principles are associated with practicing Catholics. Approximately two-thirds of the entire Pilipino-American sample were women. Within the second generation, eighty percent were women. Although no significant gender differences were found, the sample was not balanced in terms of gender. Regarding sample size, the first generation group was almost twice the size of the second generation group. Such a discrepancy limits the degree of confidence in making clear comparisons between the generations. Finally, the mean duration of residency in the U.S. for the first generation was 13.5 years. There were only eleven subjects who have been in the U.S. for five years or less. It is reasonable to speculate that the results may be different for a larger number of recent immigrants.

Regarding the demographic characteristics of the Anglo-American group, certain differences between the Anglo-American and the Pilipino-American sample characteristics may render these two populations limited in their comparability. For example, less than one-third of the Anglo-American sample was recruited from the same Catholic church, as compared to almost half in the Pilipino-American sample. Also, the Anglo-American sample was better balanced in terms of gender compared to the Pilipino-American sample. Finally, the Anglo-American sample consisted primarily of students (42.9%) compared to the more balanced distribution of occupations in the Pilipino-American sample. These sampling limitations in both populations limit the generalizability of these findings accordingly.

Certain limitations are inherent in drawing interpretations and conclusions from the findings of an instrument that has never been utilized. Primarily, the Perspectives Questionnaire sampled only certain choice principles that were derived from the cultural analyses of Pilipino and American cultures. Although

there is no clear indication that this particular sample was systematically biased in any way, it is plausible that this sample may not be the most sensitive in detecting differences between the cultures and changes in the process of acculturation. This limitation may be due to limitations in the cultural analyses and/or the manner in which these choice principles were described in the instrument. Despite these potential deficits and limitations, the sample that was utilized can be regarded as sound to the extent that the hypotheses were supported. A different sample of choice principles may or may not yield different findings.

Another aspect of the limitations of this new instrument concerns the face validity of the questionnaire. As questions that have been created and never tested, one can rely on face validity to assert with reasonable confidence that the items tap whatever they were designed to assess. However, one cannot definitively determine whatever additional constructs any given item taps as well. This uncertainty provides a clear and natural basis for improvement of the items. Additional refinements include undergoing reliability studies, as well as determining the extent to which items that are designed to measure the same choice principle correlate with each other, and then discarding and/or modifying those items that do not correlate.

Procedurally, there are clearly better ways than utilizing a questionnaire to establish and assess the degree of endorsement of choice principles. However, these methods are essentially unfeasible given the scope of this study. In principle, more direct ways of assessment could provide more accurate data. These methods may include, for example, extensive interviews, actual responses and choices in a set of specified conditions, and direct behavioral observation in naturalistic conditions. Nonetheless, there are no apparent indicators or reasons to believe that the questionnaire format was systematically biased.

In sum, the limitations described above specify the parameters within which one can and cannot make reasonable interpretations, conclusions, and statements about the phenomenon of acculturation as it has been conceptualized. Nevertheless, despite such parameters this study remains as a piece of pioneer research, since there have been no studies heretofore that have examined the acculturation of Pilipino-Americans.

### **Recommendations for Future Research**

The recommendations for future research will be described in the following two areas. First, recommendations for improving the current study will be articulated. Second, recommendations for developing this area of research will be delineated.

Regarding the limitations in the samples studied, the primary recommendation is to increase the size of the second generation group. The sample size of fifteen subjects was considered to be the absolute minimum with which to draw some interesting conclusions from the findings. A larger number of subjects, and a number that was comparable with the size of the first generation, would increase

the generalizability of the findings. The second recommendation is to recruit from a greater variety of sources. A sample that is predominantly from one source, in this case a church, limits the interpretations and conclusions that can be drawn. The sample can also be improved by having a balanced mix of men and women. This recommendation is specifically applicable to the second generation sample. Another recommendation is to increase the number of subjects who have been residents of the U.S. for five years or less. Additionally, improving the distribution of years within this duration would be preferable. The combination of a limited total number of subjects with a narrow distribution of duration greatly limits the conclusions that can be drawn from this group. Lastly, greater confidence in the interpretations and conclusions can be attained by improving the overall comparability of the Anglo-American and Pilipino-American samples. Controlling and matching most demographic factors between these two groups would more clearly isolate the actual differences that are of prime interest in this study.

With regard to recommendations concerning the instrument, the primary area of improvement is based on the mutual exclusivity of two predictions. Refining the conceptualization and description of the choice principle regarding eating with one's hands is of critical importance. An articulation of the distinction between the public and private implementation of this choice principle would likely yield different results. The improvement would be in the conceptualization itself, the descriptions in the instrument, and the descriptions in the scale administered to the Anglo-American raters to determine the degree of incompatibility of the Pilipino PCP's with the American way of life.

A secondary recommendation regarding the instrument is to refine the descriptions of other ambiguous and otherwise inadequately clear items in the questionnaire that may have contributed to missing data and/or inaccurate responses. A small but significant number of items were left unanswered despite the availability of the experimenter during the administration and completion of the questionnaires. Furthermore, it is quite reasonable to assume that despite great efforts in creating clearly stated items, not all of the items were adequately clear to all of the subjects. Improving the descriptions of the items would likely reduce the error variance. Further improvements in the instrument could be done by performing reliability studies, as well as by testing the correlation between items that were designed to measure the same choice principles.

Refinements in the cultural analyses could yield a set of choice principles that may more effectively tap the differences between Anglo-American and Pilipino cultures. Although the cultural analyses that were performed focused on the areas of conflict between the two cultures, the set of choice principles that were selected may not accurately reflect those areas of conflict. Perhaps a different set of choice principles would show greater differences between the levels of endorsement by the Pilipino-American subjects.

With regard to procedural refinements, utilizing a method of assessment and data collection that is more direct and intensive may provide more accurate data. Methods such as extensive interviews and direct observations may present different results.

The second broad area of recommendations for future research involves those steps that may be taken in developing this particular area of research. A natural extension of this research would be to apply this conceptualization in studying the acculturation of other ethnic and cultural groups. These groups could be other culturally displaced persons in the U.S., or those in other countries. The conceptualization was designed to be generalizable to potentially any cultural group. Further studies could test this generalizability.

In this study, Pilipino-Americans in the Denver Metro area of Colorado were studied. The Pilipino-American community in Colorado is very small relative to the Pilipino-American population in other areas of the U.S. These areas include California, Hawaii, New York, and Washington where the Pilipino-American communities are of significant size, and degree of organization and cohesion. Studying the acculturation of Pilipino-Americans in communities that are better developed than that in Colorado may yield very different findings and conclusions.

Another area of future research may be to study the acculturation of other culturally displaced groups. Culturally displaced persons consists of refugees, sojourners, returning veterans, as well as immigrants. In principle, the conceptualization could apply in the acculturation of any of these culturally displaced groups. Furthermore, it is reasonable to assume that different models of change may apply depending on the circumstances of departure from the original culture and arrival in the new culture.

As a final area of future research, the examination of other models that can be derived from the broader conceptualization may further illuminate the phenomenon of acculturation. A potential initial step would be to examine how the attraction model differs from the conflict model. Once the differences were clarified, then the applicability of the attraction model per se could be studied. Otherwise, other models could be generated and tested. These models may or may not be contingent on the characteristics of the particular group being studied.

In closing, the increasing mobility of people on a worldwide scale combined with the ever changing international sociopolitical conditions render this particular area of research especially salient. The increasing number of culturally displaced persons on an international scale calls for improving our understanding of the phenomenon of adapting to new cultures.

## APPENDIX A: CULTURAL PARAMETRIC DESCRIPTIONS

### Pilipino Culture

#### Members

The members of Pilipino society are a very diverse group consisting of many distinct social, political, linguistic, religious, and cultural communities. This diversity is rooted in certain geographic and historical facts about the Philippines. Geographically, the country is composed of an archipelago of over 7,000 islands and islets, of which about 800 are inhabited. Historically, the Philippines has been occupied by various people across time including the original Malaysians and Indonesians, followed later by the Spaniards, Chinese, Indians, and Americans (Pido, 1985).

Due to over 300 years of Spanish colonization, more than 80% of the population are Christian, of which the vast majority are Roman Catholics and a very small proportion belonging to various Protestant sects. Muslims amount to about 4% of the population. Approximately 40% of the population live in lowland urban areas. Most of these people are educated and make their living through a money market system. Roughly 60% of Pilipinos live in mountainous rural areas and make their living by working the land. These people are generally much less educated, and some are still on the barter economy (Pido, 1985).

Since the study of acculturation is the purpose of this examination, the Pilipino-American immigrant community will be the focus. One of the primary reasons Pilipinos immigrate to the U.S. is to improve their economic opportunities. Secondary reasons include better educational opportunities, reuniting with family members already in the U.S., political discontentment, and simply the spirit of adventure (Pido, 1985). Since the 1965 Immigration and Naturalization Act, many immigrants are professionals, such as dentists, doctors, accountants, lawyers, teachers, and engineers. Accordingly, the majority of them are middle class and well educated.

#### World

For review, this parameter refers to the context, structure, and principles of the world as it is understood. This includes (a) the place of the community in the world, (b) the history of the community, including its relations and interactions with other communities, and (c) the past, present, and (in principle) future history of the world.

*The place of the community in the world*

The current place of the Philippines and its people in the world is largely the outcome of the rise and fall of former President Ferdinand E. Marcos. In the early 70's, he declared martial law, thereby suspending the Constitution and civil liberties. He continued to rule the country through Presidential Decrees until 1986 when the "People Power" revolution ousted him from power and placed Corazon Aquino as the newly elected president. She remained in power until the recent election of Fidel Ramos as the new president. As a result of the many years of Marcos rule, the Philippine economic resources have been all but completely depleted. Accordingly, the Philippines is currently attempting to rebuild itself after years of economic devastation.

### *The history of the community*

The oldest known inhabitants of the Philippine Islands are people who are racially identical to the Pygmies of Africa (Pido, 1985). These people are called the "Negritos" (or little Negroes), which was a term originated by the Spaniards. After the Negritos, the Malays migrated from what is now Malaysia and Indonesia about 7,000 years ago. Following this large migration, small groups of people from China, Arabia, and India came to settle in the Philippines. Then in 1521, Magellan claimed the Philippines for Spain and named it after Prince Philip. The period of Spanish colonization began shortly thereafter and continued until 1898. During this colonization period, the Spaniards transformed much of the Pilipino culture in many ways including converting most of the Pilipinos to Catholicism. As part of the settlement of the Spanish-American War, the Philippines became a United States colony in 1898. The Philippines later became an independent republic in 1935. The next period of foreign occupation occurred during World War II when the Japanese occupied the Philippines from 1941 to 1946. From 1946 until the declaration of martial law by Marcos, the Philippines was a self-governing republic. Since the ousting of Marcos in 1986, the Philippines has resumed being a self-governing republic.

### *The history of the world*

Most cultures have certain beliefs and/or mythologies about the origin of people and the different races. In the Philippines, most children are taught at a young age that story about how God (known as Bathala) created the first human being (Pido, 1985). This legend is told in the metaphor of pottery.

Bathala created the first human being in his image from clay and placed it in a kiln to be fired. He let the clay figure stay too long and the image was burnt black, and so the first black person was created. At the second attempt, God was too cautious and did not get the correct temperature and firing time. The image was "uncooked" and too pale, and so the first white person was created. On the third attempt, Bathala had the correct mixture of clay and just the proper kiln



temperature and firing time. The result was the creation of the first man who was truly in the image of God, the brown person.

### *Context, structures, principles, and beliefs*

Pilipino culture has a personalistic view of the universe (Church, 1987; Marcelino, 1990). This perspective states that the universe is directly controlled by personal beings other than, and different from, oneself and others like oneself. This differs from a more Western mechanistic belief which states that the universe is governed by impersonal laws that humans can discover and manipulate.

Pilipinos also believe that good is limited. One individual or group of individuals cannot advance except at the expense of another, since there is only one source of good common to all. This belief is supposedly the basis of the common human failing of envy (Lynch, 1973).

Another belief is that success is undeserved by any person. If a person claims success as a personal achievement, or takes pride in it, or refuses to share it with others, then that person positively deserves failure. By sharing success and ascribing it to fate or luck, the envy of others who have been "deprived" by the successful person is averted. This behavior also assures that the good fortune will not be withdrawn since success is not attributed to personal effort or merit.

A frequently documented belief that characterizes Pilipinos is the *colonial mentality* (Church, 1987; Enriquez, 1988; Marcelino, 1990). This mentality is characterized by the belief that the colonizer (in this case Spaniards and Americans) are superior in many, if not most ways, to the colonized. The social, economic, and political realities that provided the basis for this mentality was the experience of over four centuries of Anglo and mestizo rulers almost exclusively holding power, authority, prestige, and wealth. Accordingly, the colonized Pilipinos adopt many of the beliefs and values of the colonizer, and attempt to emulate the colonizer. In general, the colonial mentality leads many Pilipinos to believe that they are inferior and second-class to Americans and other Anglo groups. Many Pilipinos attempt to improve their status and increase their behavior potential by emulating Anglos in ways that they can. This colonial mentality is evidenced in many aspects of Pilipino culture. Most Pilipinos regard light complexion and European features to be more attractive than traditional Pilipino features. Goods that are made in the U.S. are generally regarded as superior to those made domestically. Behaviorally, when Pilipinos interact with Anglos many act in a manner characterized by conformity, obedience, obsequiousness, humility, and high sensitivity to the white person's needs and approval (Lynch, 1973).

### **Statuses**

The concept of status can be formulated in terms of position, in terms of relationships, in terms of standards, in terms of reasons, and in terms of

perspective. The different formulations give us different views of the same concept, and the different idioms reflect different conceptual contexts or conceptual perspectives.

### *General order of statuses*

Overall, the different statuses within Pilipino culture are vertically arranged wherein the superordinate status has higher standing in the community than any of the subordinate statuses. In those cases where there are no clear vertically oriented differences in status, preference and loyalty are given to those statuses that are more similar and more closely related; i.e., (in order of increasing distance) nuclear family over other kinsmen, close relatives over other kinsmen, kinsmen over non-kinsmen, neighbors over other townmates, townmates over outsiders, those with the same mother tongue over those with a different mother tongue, and finally those with the same religion over those with a different religion (Lynch, 1973).

### *Social class*

In general, the society is divided into three broad classes. There is a very small ruling and wealthy elite. Many, if not most, of these people belong to long established wealthy families. The middle class is larger than the upper class and includes professionals, white collar workers, and blue collar workers who live and work in urban areas. More than half of the population belong to the rural lower class who generally live below the poverty level (Pido, 1985).

### *The notion of equivalence*

As regarded from outside a given group of persons, each group member represents and is equivalent to the total membership. For instance, person A is equivalent to group A since a member stands for his group. Also, person A1 is equivalent to person A2 since one member stands for another. Finally, person A is equivalent to person B if they are spouses (Lynch, 1973).

### *The notion of solidarity*

As viewed from inside a given group, fellow members are united against other groups of the same kind (e.g., families, villages, towns, and so on). Accordingly, any degradation of a group member is a degradation of the entire group (at whatever level); and so group retaliation is justified. Similarly, any member who disgraces himself disgraces the entire group, just as any member's success is a success of the group (Lynch, 1973).

### *Social stratification based on racial background*

Another vestige from the days of Spanish colonialism is the social stratification system based on race (Enriquez, 1988; Pido, 1985). The original structure instituted by the Spaniards placed the Spaniards born in Spain on top; below them were the Spaniards born in the Philippines; followed by the mestizos who were half Pilipino and half Spanish; and below them were those with one quarter Spanish blood. This ranking continued down to a person who was pure Pilipino. A person's position in this complex stratification greatly determined that person's access to economic opportunities, education, and prestige.

Today much of this stratification system persists. One of the immediate ways that a person is evaluated is to what degree that person appears Spanish. Accordingly, those with lighter skin and more European features have higher status than those with darker skin and more native Pilipino features. This stratification system is clearly exemplified by persons in the entertainment industry, since they are predominantly mestizos.

### *Family structure and statuses*

The extended family is the basic social, economic, political, and religious unit in society (Church, 1987; Enriquez, 1988; Marcelino, 1990; Pido, 1985). The paradigm case for the Pilipino extended family consists of three generations living in the same household; that is, grandparents, parents, and children. Usually, unmarried adult children do not set up their own households, but continue to live with their parents. Other relatives such as aunts, uncles, and cousins may occasionally be a part of the extended family household.

The extended family system is based on economic necessity as much as it is on cultural traditions. Pilipino society has been primarily rural and agrarian, and thus lacks the social service institutions usually present in urbanized and industrialized societies (e.g. unemployment compensation, medical insurance, welfare, social security, and so on). The extended family system provides, or at least attempts to provide, many of these services.

Membership in the extended family is not restricted to blood relatives, but also includes those who have become *compadres* (males) or *comadres* (females). These persons are non-blood related family members, and those who the family have come to consider to be informal family members. These statuses are roughly equivalent to the American notion of non-blood related "aunts" and "uncles." Ordinarily, a person acquires this status by acting as a sponsor at a marriage, baptismal, and/or confirmation ceremony.

The family statuses are hierarchically ordered. The father is generally considered to be the head of the family, followed by the mother. The children are ordered primarily according to age. Titles that denote a member's place and status in the family are used when addressing any member. For example, "kuya" refers to oldest

brother, "ate" refers to oldest sister, "ditse" refers to next younger sister, and "bunso" refers to youngest child.

The primarily role and responsibility of a parent is to raise children who will honor, respect, and practice the Pilipino values and way of life. Parents are considered to have done a good job if they raise children who are polite, considerate, well behaved, and respectful of their elders.

In general, the family treats children with great indulgence when they are young. As the child grows up, the child is raised to be always respectful to anyone of higher status, especially within the child's own family. Children also learn that they must help the family whenever they can. It is also important that the child do well in school and in social relationships in order to uphold the honor of the family. When children reach adulthood, their primary role is to begin to pay back the debt to their parents for bringing them into the world and raising them. One of the ways to do this is to always act with the family's and parents' interests in mind. Also, when parents reach old age, the children become responsible for their parents' well being until they die. It is generally unthinkable to send elderly parents to an institution such as a nursing home.

### *Compadrazco system (Ritual co-parenthood)*

When the Spaniards converted the Pilipinos to Catholicism, among the rituals introduced was the requirement of godparents in baptisms and confirmations (Pido, 1985). The acquisition of godparents resulted in expanded kinship groups and alliances. The Pilipinos later expanded this ritual to require godparents or sponsors as part of any quasi-religious ceremony such as ordinations, weddings, house blessings, and so on. By expanding one's alliances and kinship group through this ritual, one's social status is elevated.

### *Neighbors*

The status of being a neighbor includes the expectation that neighbors will help one another and share resources whenever necessary. Neighbors are also expected to share in household responsibilities and functions.

### *Age*

In general, people must always pay respect to anyone significantly older than themselves (Church, 1987; Pido, 1985). Older persons must be respected for their wisdom and experience, especially the elderly. Even among siblings, the older child is entitled to the respect from all younger siblings. A person pays respect by addressing an older adult in a particular manner. For instance, in the Tagalog language, the word "po" (or less formal "ho") is used when one addresses any older adult. This practice is roughly equivalent to the use of sir or madam in English.

### *Regional and linguistic distinctions*

Pilipinos generally identify themselves primarily by the ethnolinguistic group to which they belong (Pido, 1985). When Pilipinos meet, often times the first thing that they do is identify themselves by their regional or language affinities. (These different ethnolinguistic groups are described under "Language.")

### **Social Practices**

This term refers to the repertoire of behavior patterns which in a given culture constitute what there is for the members to do. "Social practice" also refers to the various ways in which a given behavior pattern can be done. Some instances of social practices are having dinner, reading a newspaper, and attending an artistic performance. In general, social practices are components of organized sets or structures of social practices, the latter being referred to as institutions or organizations. Examples of the latter include raising a family, passing laws, educating children, engaging in commerce, and so on. Social practices are either intrinsic or non-intrinsic. An intrinsic social practice is one that can be understood as being engaged in without ulterior motives and without a further end in view. Non-intrinsic social practices are social practices which are not intrinsic. Most institutions generally operate like intrinsic social practices in that people do not generally need reasons to raise families, pass laws, educate their children, and so on; rather, that is simply what one does unless one has reasons not to.

A social practice that in many ways expresses the spirit of the Pilipino culture is the celebration of special occasions. Birthdays, anniversaries, baptisms, confirmations, Christmas, New Years, graduation, and departures and arrivals of guests and relatives are all considered special occasions that call for special celebrations (Pido, 1985). These celebrations are usually held in the home, and the hosts customarily spare no expense in setting a lavish spread of food and drink for their guests. A significance of this social practice is to create the opportunity to express one's hospitality and display one's material success. Ordinarily, an excessive amount of food is prepared, more than can be consumed by the guests. This is not regarded as extravagant, rather as a gesture of generosity. If one prepares only enough, or worse, insufficient amount of food and drink, then one risks being criticized for being *kuripot* (stingy). The excess food is customarily given to guests to take home with them. However, one must also be careful of being criticized for being *mayabang* (show-off).

### *Language*

Every culture has at least one language spoken by its members. In the case of the Pilipinos, there are eight major ethnolinguistic groups, made up of 200 dialects (Pido, 1985). The eight major groups are Tagalog, Ilocano, Pampango, Pangasinan, and Bicolano in Luzon; and Warray Iiligaynor and Sugboanon in the Visayan

islands. Lastly, the Muslims on the island of Mindanao have their own language and culture.

The current national language is called "Pilipino" which uses primarily Tagalog grammatical construction and incorporates native and foreign terms and words. The fact that "Pilipino" is primarily based on Tagalog reflects the status that Tagalog has relative to the other languages.

### *Choice Principles*

#### *Policy statements*

These are direct prescriptions for choosing behavior.

1. **Maintain smooth interpersonal relationships (S.I.R.).** In general, Pilipinos relate in ways that aim to continually reduce interpersonal stresses by deemphasizing differences and thereby avoiding direct face to face confrontations (Church, 1987; Enriquez, 1988; Lynch, 1973; Marcelino, 1990; Pido, 1985).

2. *Utang na loob.* This policy statement roughly translates to "debt of gratitude" or "debt of good will" (Church, 1987; Enriquez, 1988; Marcelino, 1990; Pido, 1985). This policy expresses the importance of appreciating and reciprocating acts of generosity, kindness, and love. These gestures can be received from various relationships ranging from close relationships (e.g., family and friends) to distant relationships (e.g., business acquaintances). When good will, a favor, or some service is received, whether solicited or not, it must be reciprocated. The nature and proportion of the reciprocation is primarily determined by the relative statuses of the parties involved. A person of comparatively high status is expected to reciprocate in ways that are commensurate with their status; and likewise with a person of low status. If a person does not reciprocate commensurately, that person is likely to be criticized for being *kuripot* or stingy. If a person who can return a favor does not, that person can be ostracized and that person will experience shame. If the person does not experience shame, the person is *walang hiya*, or shameless, which is a further degradation of that person's status.

3. *Pakikisama.* This policy expresses the importance of cooperation through joining a group for a common good (Church, 1987; Enriquez, 1988; Marcelino, 1990; Pido, 1985). For example, a person may join along in helping organize a birthday party, or a person agrees to going out for Chinese food on an evening out. A person who is not involved or shows indifference to the interests, welfare, and activities of the group can be regarded with suspicion and mistrust. A person is usually expected to agree, concede their personal desires, and go along with the group (or at least give that impression). If a person does not practice *pakikisama*, that person may be alienated from the group since that person may no longer be regarded as an eligible or genuine member of that group.

4. *Respeto* This policy emphasizes the acknowledgment and sensitivity to the rights, feelings, and individuality of others (Church, 1987; Enriquez, 1988; Pido,

1985). In practice respeto involves listening to the opinions of one's parents and children without judgement or blame, for example. It also involves being able to take the perspective of others, and thereby appreciating their individuality. Respeto can also involve the expectation of obedience by someone in authority.

4. Use of titles. In general, it is imperative to address people by their titles whenever possible (Church, 1987; Pido, 1985). Titles include "Doctor," "Captain," "Attorney," or even "Mr." or "Mrs.." The use of titles is a primary way of showing respect for age and authority.

### *Values*

Although values are primarily used descriptively, they can also be used prescriptively.

1. Religiosity. The vast majority of Pilipinos are Roman Catholics. Some are devout Catholics who engage genuinely and completely in all of the tenets of the Catholic church. Others are cultural Catholics who have comparatively less understanding and appreciation of Catholic theology, and engage in the rituals and ceremonies socially, as opposed to religiously. For these people, church and religious events are primarily a socializing opportunity during which they can catch up on news "back home," eat Pilipino food, and generally enjoy the company of friends and relatives.

2. Competition. In general, Pilipinos are highly competitive (Santos, 1983). Usually, the object of the competition is not as important as winning per se, regardless of the prize. Winning and losing are not ordinarily regarded as an individual's victory or defeat, rather as a source of pride or disgrace for the entire family or group. The importance of winning often leads to high aspirations and great personal and familial sacrifices.

3. Modesty and humility. Persons who act in immodest and ostentatious ways call attention to themselves, and risk being criticized for being *mayabang* or being a show-off. Acting in these ways tends to set oneself apart from the group (Lynch, 1973).

4. Family and kinship. The extended family is the central and primary institution for Pilipinos (Lynch, 1973; Pido, 1985). The welfare of the family takes precedence over individual success. Accordingly, the individual works and makes sacrifices for his family. For example, a son or daughter may forgo marriage indefinitely if the interests of the family will be best served by remaining single. A professionally successful son or daughter may refuse a promotion if it requires relocating away from the extended family. However, the best interests of the family is not always served by remaining within the household. It is quite common for a husband to leave his family to work in another country as a means of removing his family from poverty.

In accordance with acting in the best interest of the family, those Pilipinos who have left some of their extended family behind in the Philippines will often maintain aiding, if not supporting, their families long distance. This support is

provided by sending money orders, cash inserted in letters, packages of clothing, household wares, and other necessary goods. Furthermore, homecoming trips or *balikbayan* are done regularly during which *pasalubong* (gifts one brings from a trip) are generously distributed.

5. Compassion. (*awa*) In general, any person who has suffered a grievous blow at the hand of Fate or human injustice, or who (even through their own fault) is in a helpless condition, deserves sympathy, pity, and mercy. If that person asks for assistance, that person is regarded as deserving it (Lynch, 1973).

6. Respect, deference, and obedience of authority and elders. (*galang*) As a strongly hierarchical and authoritarian society, status differences with regard to age, power, prestige, wealth, and authority are respected and honored (Church, 1987; Lynch, 1973; Pido, 1985). Gaining the approval and avoiding the displeasure of people in authority is a central value that guides behavior. Generally, Pilipinos do not talk back nor do they question authority. Authority figures are regarded as entitled to many privileges. In addition to respect and obedience, they receive adulation, and gifts in the form of money, material goods, and personal services. Aside from acknowledging the person's position of authority, these gifts and gestures are given to seek or return favors. By doing so, when a person is in need of assistance from an authority figure, that person can expect a favorable response. With regard to respect for elders, traditionally Pilipino children kiss the hands of their parents, grandparents, uncles, aunts, *ninongs* and *ninangs* (godparents) when greeting them or bidding them goodbye.

7. Education. Generally, Pilipinos place great importance on the schooling of their children (Church, 1987; Pido, 1985). They regard education as the primary means to acquiring good jobs, economic security, social acceptance, and upward mobility not only for their children, but for the entire family. Getting a good quality education is so important that it is not unusual for parents to go into heavy debt and sell property to ensure that at least one of their children, usually the eldest, gets a college degree. In this instance, that child upon graduation and successful employment, is obligated to return the sacrifice by supporting the next youngest child through school. Conclusively, family welfare takes precedence over individual economic and social advancement.

8. Attaining a position of authority and importance. As a society that is very hierarchically oriented, acquiring a position of power and prestige is highly regarded (Pido, 1985). In general, most of the professional positions such as doctors, lawyers, and professors are regarded with great respect, deference, and reverence. What one accomplishes in that capacity is often secondary to having the title and position itself.

9. Well groomed appearance. In general, Pilipinos place great importance on presenting oneself as well groomed and properly dressed. Men and women usually wear fashionable, neat, and fancy attire, especially to special occasions. Santos



(1983, pg. 138) described that "it is a Pilipino tradition to dress properly when you go out."

*Slogans and mottos*

1. *Bayanihan*. This slogan roughly translates to describe the spirit of togetherness and gregariousness (Church, 1987; Pido, 1985).

2. Golden Rule. Based on the Roman Catholic teachings, this motto guides people to "do unto others as you would have them do unto you."

*Maxims*

Pragmatically, maxims have the general character of warnings or reminders.

1. *Hiya*. This term roughly translated means "shame" (Church, 1987; Enriquez, 1988; Marcelino, 1990; Pido, 1985; Santos, 1983). This maxim reminds individuals to avoid bringing shame to themselves and their families by acting with honor and dignity, and within the parameters of acceptable conduct. Hiya can be described as the uncomfortable feeling that accompanies the awareness of being in a socially unacceptable position, or performing a socially inappropriate action. In effect, hiya enforces compliance and conformity with the sanctioned social practices and choice principles. By doing so, a person is regarded as a legitimate member of the Pilipino community by the community as a whole, and the immediate person with whom one is relating.

2. *Amor Propio*. This term refers to being sensitive to personal affront (Church, 1987; Enriquez, 1988; Lynch, 1973; Pido, 1985). People act towards others in ways that preserve (or at least not threaten) another person's self esteem. Functionally, amor propio aids people in maintaining their status and social acceptance. Amor propio does not imply extreme sensitivity to personal insult such that every indignity, slighting remark, or offensive gesture is taken to heart. Rather, those degradations that threaten a person's central values and identity can warrant a retaliatory reaction.

*Strategies*

1. Use of third parties as go-betweens. In potentially awkward or conflictual situations, third parties are customarily used preventively or remedially (Lynch, 1973; Pido, 1985; Santos, 1983). These situations include making an embarrassing request, voicing a complaint, or communicating a difficult and controversial decision. By utilizing a third party, shame can be avoided.

2. Use of euphemisms (e.g. *siguro na*). "Siguro na" roughly translates to "I guess so" or "could be" (Enriquez, 1988; Santos, 1983). By making ambiguous statements such as this, the risk of offending someone (and thereby no longer having a smooth interpersonal relationship) is minimized. By exercising subtlety and tact in relationships, a person expresses sensitivity and respect toward the other person. This strategy is particularly applicable when interacting with persons in authority.

## Anglo American Culture

### Members

The American society consists of people from many ethnic groups. Except for the native American Indians, all Americans or their ancestors came from foreign countries. In some cases, some Americans continue to strongly identify with their ethnic heritage. For instance, some Americans refer to themselves and others in terms such as "Swedes" or "Danes" or "Germans" (Kearny, Kearny, & Crandall, 1984). Despite the great ethnic diversity, what ties Americans together is their sense of national identity as Americans.

For the purposes of this investigation, the paradigm case American will be described with few qualifications. It is generally accepted and believed that the Anglo person is the paradigm case American. In general, most of the Anglo-Americans belong to the middle class. They generally have middle class values and live a middle class lifestyle.

### World

#### *The place of the community in the world*

Americans generally regard America as the land of abundant material wealth. Most Americans are proud of their nation's ability to produce material wealth and maintain a high standard of living. Although the U.S. does not have the highest standard of living worldwide, many Americans have a nationalistic view that the U.S. is the superior nation in most respects among all other nations worldwide. Many Americans believe that the American way of life is by far the best in the world.

#### *The history of the community*

The original Anglo-Americans emigrated as colonists from Great Britain to what is now the U.S. to escape religious and political persecution. These pilgrims settled in the northeast section of the U.S. In 1776, these colonists declared their independence from Great Britain and formed the United States of America.

### Statuses

#### *Social class*

In ideal terms, all people are believed to be equal, or at least have equal rights and opportunities for success and happiness. The lack of a formal class system was intended to provide equal opportunity for all members. This egalitarian society was created to prevent the socio-political oppression that caused most of the original emigrants to leave in the first place. Many of their native countries were aristocratic

in structure, and so for the most part socioeconomic opportunities were determined at birth.

In actuality, a class system exists consisting of upper, middle, and lower social classes. In general, members of the upper class are the wealthy minority. Usually, their wealth has been acquired through capitalistic means. Some of the wealthy elite do not work for a living, and many spend much of their time in leisure and recreation activities.

The vast majority of the American population belong to the middle class. Middle class persons generally work for a living and are not independently wealthy. Some members of the middle class are self employed. Unlike the upper class, most middle class people cannot afford to spend most of their time in leisure and recreation.

The lower class is smaller in number than the middle class, but the numbers are increasing. Generally, members of the lower class are unemployed, underemployed, or not in the work force for various reasons. They have the lowest standard of living especially in terms of meeting basic needs. Although the unemployed lower class commonly have much free time, this time is not usually spent on leisure or recreation.

### *Status as an individual*

Usually, each person stands for himself or herself and is not necessarily regarded as a representative of any group. Unlike more group oriented cultures, being a member of a group is not regarded as being equivalent to the group. Each member is regarded as an independent individual who is responsible and accountable for only their own behaviors.

## **Family Structure and Statuses**

Generally, American families are organized in a nuclear rather than an extended family system. In general, the primary function of the family is to advance the happiness and well being of the individual members. Accordingly, the needs of each individual takes priority in the life of the family.

The paradigm case nuclear family consists of a father, a mother, and at least one child. In principle, the family is not hierarchically organized wherein the parents (especially the father) are regarded as the "rulers" of the household. Instead, there is more social equality between parents and children than in many other cultures, including Pilipino culture. In a sense, the democratic system extends into the home. For instance, children are usually permitted to openly argue and disagree with their parents, within reason. Teenagers are also generally granted considerable independence, especially compared to Pilipino norms.

Children are usually regarded as young adults when they reach 18 years of age. Sometime between 18 and 21 years of age, children are ordinarily expected to

move out of their parents' home and live on their own, regardless of whether they go on to college or not. Before moving out of the home, it is usually highly valued and practiced that each child has their own room. Since American families are usually not organized around an extended family system, grandparents rarely live in the same home with their married sons and daughters; and uncles and aunts almost never do. When grandparents are no longer able to care for themselves, they generally move to a nursing home, or a home for the elderly. The elderly are not generally taken into the families of their children.

### *Parents*

The primary role of a parent is generally to raise children who will be independent, productive, and successful adults (Kearny et al., 1984). The responsibility of raising children and being a parent usually diminishes greatly when the child is considered an adult at 18 to 21 years of age.

### *Children*

The role of a child is primarily to learn how to be an independent, responsible, and hard working adult (Kearny et al., 1984). As children grow up, they are expected to become increasingly self reliant, self sufficient, and independent. They also are granted greater amounts of responsibility with their increasing independence. For instance, with the considerable independence that teenagers are ordinarily granted, they are also expected to earn some of their own money and manage their time accordingly.

### *Kinship system*

Since American families are organized in terms of the nuclear family system, primary allegiance is to each person's immediate family (Kearny et al., 1984). The extended family is recognized as fellow kin, but family members generally do not have strong allegiance or identification with their extended family system.

### *Age and status*

In general, American culture is very youth oriented. Members who are productive, active, and good consumers (usually young adults) are generally more highly regarded than members who are non-productive, sedentary, and poor consumers (in some cases the elderly). Much of the American economic system is oriented towards the affluent young. Goods and services, advertising, and many media images are particularly targeted towards these young adults.

### *Neighbors*

Unlike more group oriented cultures, there is no cultural expectation that neighbors will help one another, as well as share resources and household responsibilities and functions (Kearny et al., 1984). Despite the absence of this

formal cultural expectation, neighbors who are helpful and share resources are appreciated and considered good neighbors.

### *Regional distinctions*

Americans occasionally classify themselves and others in terms of geographical origin (Kearny et al., 1984). Some Americans identify themselves as being from the West Coast, the East Coast, the Midwest, the South, and so on. These geographic identifications usually imply a particular way of life which includes such characteristics as values, pace of life, and specific social practices.

## **Language**

The national language of the U.S. is English. Different regions within the U.S. speak different dialects or have distinct accents. Spanish is the second most spoken language, and is particularly prevalent in the Southwest region.

### *Choice Principles*

#### *Policy statements*

These are direct prescriptions for choosing behavior:

1. Every man for himself. This statement directs people to rely only on themselves for the quality of their life and how they live their life. In general, receiving support from others, including family, is accepted but not usually admired or respected.

2. Look out for number one. This statement directs people to generally put their own interest before those of others. Each person's individual interests are usually more important than those of another person, organization, government, or other institutions.

3. Hard work and self reliance is the means to material success. This statement directs people to be hard working, self reliant, and perseverant since material success is generally the inevitable and just reward.

4. Be direct and to the point. This statement directs people to be clear, explicit, honest, straightforward, and to not speak in euphemisms.

5. Say what is on your mind. This statement is very similar to the prior policy statement. People should be open and honest, and not be deceitful.

6. Act with integrity and sincerity. This statement directs people to behave in a genuine, upright and honest manner, and without pretense or deceit.

7. Fight your own battles. This statement directs people to rely on themselves and not others to resolve their own conflicts and disagreements. Americans generally consider those who turn to others for help in resolving conflicts as weak in character.

8. Individual interests come before family interests. This statement directs people to consider the interests of the family as generally secondary to the interests of the individual.

9. If at first you don't succeed, try, try, again. This statement directs people to not give up the first time they meet failure. Instead, they should continue until they have succeeded or have given their best effort.

10. When the going gets tough, the tough get going. This statement directs people to increase their efforts even more when they are confronted with obstacles in order to overcome challenges and meet their goals.

### *Values*

Although values are primarily used descriptively, they can also be used prescriptively.

1. Individual freedom For most Americans, this is clearly the most fundamental value. This value refers to the desire and ability of all individuals to control their own destiny without outside interference from the government, a ruling class, the church, or any other institution or organized authority. This fundamental value can be traced back to the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights.

2. Self-reliance In general, Americans highly value a person's ability to take care of oneself, rely on oneself, and solve one's own problems. Americans generally believe that if people are not self-reliant, they risk losing their freedom (Kearny et al., 1984). If people rely excessively on support from family, government, or any organization, then people may not be free to do what they want. Furthermore, if people are dependent and not self-reliant, they risk losing the respect of their peers. People are allowed to receive support from charity and family, but they are not admired for doing so.

3. Equal opportunity Americans generally value the equal chance that all members have of succeeding, at least in principle. Since the U.S. does not have a hereditary aristocracy, social class per se does not determine one's status and opportunities in life.

4. The Protestant Work Ethic In general, Americans place great importance and value in hard work and self-discipline as the virtuous way of living (Kearny et al., 1984). The work of all people, not just those of the church, is regarded as holy. The capacity for self-discipline, defined as the willingness to save and invest one's hard-earned money rather than spend it on immediate pleasures, is a holy characteristic blessed by God.

5. Self-improvement Another aspect of the Protestant heritage is the value of self-improvement (Kearny et al., 1984). The importance of self-improvement is rooted in the fundamental religious belief in the natural wickedness of human nature. This wickedness cannot be forgiven by a priest acting in God's name. Instead, people are left responsible to improve themselves or else suffer eternal punishment by God

for their wickedness. Accordingly, Protestantism encourages a solid and persistent desire for self improvement.

6. Pursuit of Happiness The Constitution of the United States ensures all citizens of the right, among others, to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Each citizen has the right to take advantage of the opportunities for enjoyment, entertainment, and fun.

7. Competition Most Americans value competition and regard it as the price to pay for equal opportunity. Much of life is regarded as a race for success through competition with others.

8. Upward mobility This term refers to the improvement of one's lifestyle by raising one's social standing (i.e., occupation, income, social class, and so on). In general, Americans value upward mobility as the reward for hard work. In principle, upward mobility is attainable for every citizen because of equal opportunity.

9. Material wealth Generally, Americans value acquiring and maintaining a large number of material possessions since material wealth is the most widely accepted measure of success. Also, material wealth is regarded as tangible evidence of one's abilities and accomplishments.

10. Hard work Being industrious and working diligently and vigorously in one's job is regarded as the means to success. Material wealth is believed to be the natural reward for hard work. Through hard work, anyone can achieve a high standard of living, at least in principle.

11. Inventiveness Americans generally value the ability to create solutions for new problems, and to create inventions and new ways of doing things. The pioneers of the Old West were the prime embodiment of this value.

12. Can-do spirit Many Americans value having a sense of optimism that every problem has a solution, and take pride in meeting challenges and overcoming difficult obstacles (Kearny et al., 1984). Generally speaking, a difficult problem can be solved immediately, while an impossible one may take a bit longer.

13. Consumption over conservation Generally, Americans highly regard the consumption of goods and services for the following reasons: (a) comfort (e.g., as seen in the way homes are furnished, cars are designed, and manner in which people travel), (b) cleanliness (e.g., as exemplified by the media propagation of deodorants, mouthwash, cleansers, and laundry detergents), (c) novelty (e.g., as seen in the popularity of the phrase "new and improved," and in the tendency to replace old possessions with new ones even though old ones are still functional), and (d) convenience (e.g., as exemplified by fast food restaurants, numerous types of labor saving devices, and convenience foods that are already prepared or precooked). For these reasons, conservation is secondary to consumption.

### *Slogans and mottos*

1. Stand on your own two feet. This motto directs people to be self reliant and self sufficient.

2. Pull yourself up by your bootstraps. This motto directs people to rely on their own strength and bring themselves up when they are in a difficult situation.

3. Going from rags to riches. This slogan refers to the "American Dream" of material success. A person goes from being poor and wearing rags to having material wealth and economic success.

4. Keeping up with the Joneses. This motto urges people to buy possessions that are equal to or better than what others have.

5. God helps those who help themselves. This slogan states that God will only help those persons who attempt to meet their goals on their own.

6. Early to bed and early to rise makes a man healthy, wealthy, and wise. This motto reflects the Protestant work ethic which states that hard work leads to material and personal success. A means to this success is by taking care of oneself by getting adequate rest, and by utilizing the full day.

7. Eat, drink, and be merry, for tomorrow you may die. This motto reflects the importance of the present over the future in American culture. One should enjoy themselves fully today, since tomorrow is uncertain and death is inevitable.

8. Actions speak louder than words. This slogan states that a person's behaviors are more genuine than a person's statements.

9. Life is what you make it. This slogan states that each person is responsible for and in control of making their life the way they want it to be.

10. Cleanliness is next to Godliness. This slogan reflects the belief of most Americans that it is important and holy to keep their bodies clean by washing themselves and wearing clean clothes daily. Indeed, many Americans are offended by anyone who does not follow their accepted standards of cleanliness.

11. Time is money. This slogan reflects the importance and value of time in the pursuit of economic wealth and success.

12. May the best person win. This slogan reflects the importance of fair competition. In competition, the person who is most capable inevitably wins.

13. To the winner belongs the spoils. This slogan reflects the value that American culture places on competition. The winner of a competition deserves the prize, while the loser gains nothing.

14. It's a dog-cat-dog world. This slogan reflects the values of self reliance and competition. The world is a fiercely competitive place where a person can only rely on themselves and their own resources for success.

15. It's not whether you win or lose, it's how you play the game. This slogan reflects the value of fair play and personal effort. The manner in which one attempts to reach a goal is more important than the results of those efforts.

### *Maxims*

Pragmatically, maxims have the general character of warnings or reminders.

1. Look before you leap. This maxim reminds people to examine the situation carefully and thoroughly before taking action.



2. Never look a gift horse in the mouth. This maxim reminds people not to scrutinize a gift that is generously given.
3. Save something for a rainy day. This maxim urges people to save resources for possible difficult times in the future.
4. Idle hands are the devil's workshop. This maxim warns people that those who do not work hard are susceptible to evil.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This paper is an abridged version of my doctoral dissertation, which was presented at the Fifteenth Annual Conference of The Society for Descriptive Psychology in Breckenridge, Colorado in September 1993. My deepest appreciation goes to my mentor Dr. Peter G. Ossorio. This paper and the dissertation would not have been completed without his patience, guidance, and wisdom.

This paper is dedicated to my late parents, Celestino and Felicidad Lubugin.

Author's address: Society for Descriptive Psychology, 1705 14th Street, Suite 254, Boulder, CO 80302.

## REFERENCES

- Atkinson, D.R., & Gim, R.H. (1989). Asian-American cultural identity and attitudes toward mental health services. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 36*(2), 209-212.
- Atkinson, D.R., Whiteley, S., & Gim, R.H. (1990). Asian-American acculturation and preferences for help providers. *Journal of College Student Development, 31*(2), 155-161.
- Aylesworth, L.S., & Ossorio, P.G. (1983). Refugees: Cultural displacement and its effects. In K.E. Davis & T.O. Mitchell (Eds.) *Advances in Descriptive Psychology* (Vol. 3). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Berry, J.W. (1991). Refugee adaptation in settlement countries: An overview with an emphasis on primary prevention. In F.L. Ahearn, Jr. & J.L. Athey (Eds.) *Refugee children: Theory, research, and services*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Blanchard, K. (1991). Sport, leisure, and identity: Reinventing Lao culture in middle Tennessee. *Play & Culture, 4*(2), 169-184.
- Bochner, S. (1986). Coping with unfamiliar cultures: Adjustment or culture learning? *Australian Journal of Psychology, 38*(3), 347-358.
- Brown, D.E. (1982). Physiological stress and culture change in a group of Pilipino-Americans: A preliminary investigation. *Annals of Human Biology, 19*(6), 553-563.
- Brunswick, E. (1952). The conceptual framework of psychology. *International Encyclopedia of Unified Science, 1*(10). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Church, T.A. (1987) Personality research in a non-Western culture: The Philippines. *Psychological Bulletin*, 102(2), 272-292.
- Dohrenwend, B.P., & Smith, R.J. (1962). Toward a theory of acculturation. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology*, 18, 30-39.
- Enriquez, V.G. (1988). The structure of Philippine social values: Towards integrating indigenous values and appropriate technology. In D. Sinha & H.S.R. Kao (Eds.) *Social values and development: Asian perspectives*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications Inc.
- Feldman, S.S. & Rosenthal, D.A. (1990). The acculturation of autonomy expectations in Chinese high schoolers residing in two Western nations. *International Journal of Psychology*, 25(3), 259-281.
- Garza, R.T., & Gallegos, P.I. (1985). Environmental influences and personal choice: A humanistic perspective on acculturation. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 7(4), 365-379.
- Gim, R.H., Atkinson, D.R., & Kim, S.J. (1991). Asian-American acculturation, counselor ethnicity and cultural sensitivity, and ratings of counselors. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 38(1), 57-62.
- Gim, R.H., Atkinson, D.R., & Whiteley, S. (1990). Asian-American acculturation, severity of concerns, and willingness to see a counselor. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 37(3), 281-285.
- Kagan, S. (1981). Ecology and the acculturation of cognitive and social styles among Mexican-American children. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 3(2), 111-144.
- Kearny, E.N., Kearny, M.A., & Crandall, J.A. (1984) *The American way*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Kelly, G. (1955). *The psychology of personal constructs* (Vols. 1-2). New York: Norton.
- Kim, Y.Y. (1988) *Communication and cross-cultural adaptation: An integrative theory*. Philadelphia, PA: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Lasater, L. (1983). Stress and health in a Colorado mining community. In K.E. Davis & T.O. Mitchell (Eds.) *Advances in Descriptive Psychology* (Vol. 3). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Leong, F.T., & Tata, S.P. (1990). Sex and acculturation differences in occupational values among Chinese-American children. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 37(2), 208-212.
- Lewin, K. (1935). *The dynamic theory of personality*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Lynch, F. (1973). Social acceptance reconsidered. In F. Lynch & A. de Guzman (Eds.) *Four readings in Philippine values*. Quezon City, Philippines: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Marcelino, E.P. (1990). Towards understanding the psychology of the Pilipino. *Women and Therapy*, 9(1-2), 105-128.
- Naidoo, J.C., & Davis, J.C. (1988). Canadian South Asian women in transition: A dualistic view of life. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 19(2), 311-327.
- Ossorio, P.G. (1983). A multicultural psychology. In K.E. Davis and T.O. Mitchell (Eds.) *Advances in Descriptive Psychology* (Vol. 3). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Padilla, A.M. (1980). The role of cultural awareness and ethnic loyalty in acculturation. In A.M. Padilla (Ed.) *Acculturation: Theory, models and some new findings*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Padilla, A.M., Wagatsuma, Y., & Lindholm, K.J. (1985). Acculturation and personality as predictors of stress in Japanese and Japanese-Americans. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 125(3), 295-305.

- Pido, A.J.A. (1985). *The Pilipinos in America: Macro/micro dimensions of immigration and integration*. New York, NY: Center for Migration Studies.
- Redfield, R., Linton, R., & Herskovits, M.J. (1936). Memorandum for the study of acculturation. *American Anthropologist*, 38, 149–152.
- Santos, R.A. (1983). The social and emotional development of Pilipino–American children. In G.J. Powell (Ed.) *The psychosocial development of minority group children*. New York, NY: Brunner Mazel.
- Silva, J.C. (1983). What actually happens to Jose: Cultural displacement in a predominantly Anglo university. In K.E. Davis & T.O. Mitchell (Eds.) *Advances in descriptive psychology* (Vol. 3). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Smither, R. (1982). Human migration and the acculturation of minorities. *Human Relations*, 35(1), 57–68.
- Sue, D. & Kirk, B. (1972). Psychological characteristics of Chinese–American students. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 19, 471–478.
- Sue, S. & Morishima, J. (1982). *The mental health of Asian–Americans*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey–Bass.
- Sue, D.W., & Sue, D. (1990). *Counseling the culturally different: Theory and practice*. (2nd ed.). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Suinn, R.M., Rickard–Figueroa, K., Lew, S., & Vigil, P. (1987). The Suinn–Lew Asian self–identity acculturation scale: An initial report. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 47(2), 401–407.
- Szapocznik, J., & Kurtines, W. (1980). Acculturation, biculturalism and adjustment among Cuban Americans. In A.M. Padilla (Ed.) *Acculturation: Theory, models and some new findings*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Vallanca, C.C. (1987). *The second wave*. San Francisco, CA: Strawberry Hill Press.
- Weinstock, S.A. (1974). Some factors that retard or accelerate the rate of acculturation. *Human Relations*, 17, 321–340.
- Wong–Rieger, D., & Quiutana, D. (1987). Comparative acculturation of Southeast Asian and Hispanic immigrants and sojourners. *Journal of Cross Cultural Psychology*, 18(3), 345–362.
- Young, M.Y., & Gardner, R. (1990). Modes of acculturation and second language proficiency. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science*, 22(1), 59–71.
- Yu, L.C. (1984). Acculturation and stress within Chinese–American families. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 15(1), 77–94.
- Yu, L.C., & Harburg, E. (1980). Acculturation and stress among Chinese–Americans in a university town. *International Journal of Group Tensions*, 10(1–4), 99–119.
- Yu, L.C., & Harburg, E. (1981). Filial responsibility to aged parents – stress of Chinese–Americans. *International Journal of Group Tensions*, 11(1–4), 47–58.