

Summer 2015

# Cultural Influences on Attitudes Toward the Criminal Justice System: A Focus on the Filipino American Community

Moises Osias Mina Jr.  
*Old Dominion University*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/sociology\\_criminaljustice\\_etds](https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/sociology_criminaljustice_etds)

 Part of the [Asian American Studies Commons](#), [Asian Studies Commons](#), and the [Criminology Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Mina, Moises O.. "Cultural Influences on Attitudes Toward the Criminal Justice System: A Focus on the Filipino American Community" (2015). Doctor of Philosophy (PhD), dissertation, Sociology/Criminal Justice, Old Dominion University, DOI: 10.25777/5sz4-ap66  
[https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/sociology\\_criminaljustice\\_etds/38](https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/sociology_criminaljustice_etds/38)

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Sociology & Criminal Justice at ODU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Sociology & Criminal Justice Theses & Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ODU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [digitalcommons@odu.edu](mailto:digitalcommons@odu.edu).

CULTURAL INFLUENCES ON ATTITUDES TOWARD THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE  
SYSTEM: A FOCUS ON THE FILIPINO AMERICAN COMMUNITY

by

Moises Osias Mina, Jr.  
B.A. December 1996, Saint Leo University  
M.A. August 1999, Old Dominion University

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of  
Old Dominion University in Partial Fulfillment of the  
Requirements for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

CRIMINOLOGY AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE

OLD DOMINION UNIVERSITY  
August 2015

Approved by:

---

Randy R. Gainey (Director)

---

Luisa A. Igloria (Member)

---

Elizabeth A. Monk Turner (Member)

---

Xiushi Yang (Member)

## ABSTRACT

### CULTURAL INFLUENCES ON ATTITUDES TOWARD THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM: A FOCUS ON THE FILIPINO AMERICAN COMMUNITY

Moises Osias Mina, Jr.  
Old Dominion University  
Director: Dr. Randy R. Gainey

Based on the Individualism-Collectivism (I-C) perspective and elements of Cullen's social support theory, the present exploratory analysis tested for differences in individualism and collectivism and the potential impact of such differences on attitudes toward criminal justice constructs. Survey participants were Philippine residents, Filipino immigrants to the United States, and US-born Filipino Americans. Initial results suggested minimal variations in individualism and collectivism among the three groups, however, more significant differences were found when respondents were grouped by country of birth, with US-born Filipino Americans exhibiting lower scores in collectivism and, unexpectedly, in individualism. Measures of specific I-C traits, such as independence, familism, *bayanihan* (community spirit), and *pakikipagkapwa tao* (concern for others) were found to correlate with attitudes toward a number of criminal justice constructs examined, though not always in the hypothesized direction. Lower scores in collectivist trait measures were indicative of less favorable attitudes toward rehabilitation, restorative justice, and collective efficacy. Higher measured levels of individualism corresponded with more favorable attitudes toward punishment. Discussion included implications for the Filipino American community and avenues for further research.

This dissertation is dedicated to my family. First and foremost, to my wife Margaret for her endless words of encouragement, love and support, and for being my inspiration throughout. Without you, this work would not have been possible. I thank my children for their support and my grandchildren for their stimulating presence.

This work is also dedicated to the memory of my parents, Moises (Sr.) and Ceferina Mina. I am grateful for their guidance in my youth, for giving me direction, and for instilling in me, at a very early age, the importance of educational achievement.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is with sincere gratitude that I acknowledge the many people who have contributed to this dissertation. Special thanks to Dr. Randy Gainey, my dissertation committee chair and advisor, for his patience, encouragement, and tireless effort in the countless hours spent reviewing, correcting, and analyzing my work. Thank you for always being available, even on weekends, and for always providing quick responses and feedback. Thank you Dr. Elizabeth Monk Turner and Dr. Xiushi Yang for serving on the committee and providing many concrete suggestions and comments that have helped improve the final product. Thank you Dr. Luisa Igloria for serving on the committee as the member from outside the department, lending your expertise on Philippine culture, and sharing your knowledge of the relevant works of Philippine authors. Your ideas and feedback on Filipino immigrant and Filipino American issues, past and present, were invaluable contributions to this project. I am also deeply appreciative and grateful for the work, total support, and untiring dedication of Dr. Mona J. Danner and Dr. Dawn L. Rothe, the Graduate Program Directors during my stay in the program.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge and thank the members of my extended family and my friends who were instrumental in disseminating the survey questionnaire via Facebook.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|   | Page |
|---|------|
| LIST OF TABLES .....                        | vii  |
| Chapter                                     |      |
| I. INTRODUCTION .....                       | 1    |
| II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE .....              | 6    |
| PREVIOUS WORK ON IMMIGRANTS AND CRIME ..... | 7    |
| THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES .....              | 10   |
| FILIPINO CULTURAL TRAITS .....              | 17   |
| INDIVIDUALISM IN THE UNITED STATES .....    | 23   |
| RESEARCH HYPOTHESES .....                   | 24   |
| III. METHODS .....                          | 27   |
| RESEARCH DESIGN .....                       | 27   |
| SAMPLE AND DATA COLLECTION .....            | 28   |
| MEASURES .....                              | 31   |
| THE SURVEY INSTRUMENT .....                 | 32   |
| IV. RESULTS .....                           | 41   |
| DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS .....                  | 41   |
| GROUP COMPARISONS .....                     | 43   |
| BIVARIATE CORRELATIONS .....                | 58   |
| REGRESSION RESULTS .....                    | 65   |
| V. ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION .....            | 76   |
| GROUP COMPARISONS ON INDIVIDUALISM .....    | 76   |
| GROUP COMPARISONS ON COLLECTIVISM .....     | 79   |
| FILIPINO GROUPS, I-C, AND ATTITUDES .....   | 81   |
| SOCIAL SUPPORT .....                        | 86   |
| RESEARCH IMPLICATIONS .....                 | 87   |
| RESEARCH LIMITATIONS .....                  | 89   |
| VI. CONCLUSIONS .....                       | 91   |
| REFERENCES .....                            | 94   |
| VITA .....                                  | 101  |

## LIST OF TABLES

| Table   | Page |
|---|------|
| 1. Measures of Collectivism with Trait Subscales Identified .....                                   | 34   |
| 2. Measures of Horizontal and Vertical Collectivism .....   | 35   |
| 3. Individualism Scale Variables .....  | 36   |
| 4. Horizontal and Vertical Individualism Scales .....   | 37   |
| 5. Variables on Attitudes about the Criminal Justice System .....                                   | 39   |
| 6. Descriptive Statistics of Scale Variables .....  | 43   |
| 7. Tukey HSD Results of Group Comparisons on Education<br>and Political Inclination .....           | 45   |
| 8. The Tukey HSD Results of Group Comparisons on Individualism .....                                | 47   |
| 9. The Tukey HSD Results of Group Comparisons on Collectivist Traits .....                          | 48   |
| 10. Post Hoc Results: Group Comparisons on Attitudes<br>Toward Criminal Justice Constructs .....    | 50   |
| 11. Post Hoc Results: Group Comparisons on Attitudes Toward<br>Restorative Justice Constructs ..... | 52   |
| 12. Post Hoc Results: Attitudes Toward Collective Efficacy .....                                    | 53   |
| 13. T-tests Results: Comparing Respondents Grouped by Country of Birth .....                        | 56   |
| 14. T-tests: Comparing Respondents Grouped by Gender .....  | 57   |
| 15. T-tests: Comparing Respondents Grouped by Marital Status .....                                  | 58   |
| 16. Bivariate Correlations: I-C Variables with Attitudes .....                                      | 61   |
| 17. Bivariate Correlations: I-C Variables with Attitudes on Restorative Justice .....               | 63   |
| 18. Bivariate Correlations: I-C Variables with Attitudes on Collective Efficacy .....               | 65   |
| 19. Linear Regression Results: Punitiveness Models .....  | 68   |

| Table   | Page |
|---|------|
| 20. Linear Regression Results: Attitudes about Rehabilitation .....   | 70   |
| 21. Linear Regression Results: Attitudes about the Lack of Fairness<br>in the Criminal Justice System ..... | 71   |
| 22. Linear Regression Results: Willingness to Report a Crime .....  | 72   |
| 23. Linear Regression Results: Restorative Justice .....  | 74   |
| 24. Linear Regression Results: Collective Efficacy .....  | 75   |



## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

Filipino Americans are the second largest Asian group in the United States. Root (1997) provides an all-inclusive definition of *Filipino American*:

We are immigrants-now-citizens, American born, immigrant spouses awaiting eligibility for green cards, mixed-heritage Filipinos, students or workers on visa, *tago-ng-tago* (undocumented), and transnationals moving between the Philippines and the United States. Thus, Filipino American is a state of mind rather than of legality or geography. Under the same roof, family members hold different meanings for and attachments to being Filipino American. (xiv).

In spite of their relatively large presence in the Asian American community, research on Asian immigrants to the United States typically have little or cursory focus on Filipino Americans. Frequently, they are categorized under the generic Asian American label, along with Chinese, Korean, Japanese, Vietnamese, and similar groups originating from the Asian continent (Bonus 2000; Agbayani-Siewert 2004). Hart (1979) proposed that the scant attention given by researchers to this ethnic minority stemmed from a lack of knowledge about the group, as well as their political and economic powerlessness. Filipino Americans are “largely invisible in most accounts of U.S. history and in contemporary scholarship, excluded from numerous positions of power, and misrepresented in mainstream media” (Bonus 2000:1). In academia, social psychologists and personality researchers have accounted for much of the research on Filipino Americans; however, studies performed in criminology and criminal justice have had the tendency of lumping Filipino Americans with other Asian Americans, cultural differences notwithstanding. Conventional research presupposes a homogeneous Asian American community. However, the cultural orientation of Filipinos diverges greatly

from the Chinese, Japanese, Koreans, and other Asians as a consequence of over 400 years of Spanish domination and 48 years of American colonial rule (Nadal 2004). As a result, the Philippines is unique as a Christian, English-speaking Southeast Asian nation with a democratic form of government. Furthermore, in spite of having a national language, Pilipino, and over seventy regional dialects, English is the primary language used in the educational system (Salvador, Omizo, and Kim 1997; Selmer and Deleon 2002).

Beginning in 1906, large waves of Filipino immigrants, mostly males, were recruited to perform agricultural labor in Hawaii and the West Coast. Motivated by a desire for better employment, many were exploited, subjected to exclusionary and discriminatory practices, paid the lowest wages, and provided substandard living facilities (Bonus 2000; Bulosan 1973; Lott 1997; San Juan 1994). Others came as students intent on earning degrees that would enhance their opportunities upon returning home. Most workers and students intended and expected their stay in the United States to be temporary (Guyotte and Posadas 1992). As immigrants from a then U.S. colony, they arrived in the United States bearing U.S. passports supposedly as U.S. nationals, but were treated as foreign nationals considered ineligible for citizenship, barred from owning property and engaging in business, and banned from participating in any part of the electoral process (Lott 1997; Bonus 2000). In addition, Filipinos were also recruited into the United States military as service workers. As immigration restrictions eased starting in 1965, quotas for Filipino immigrants increased, resulting in waves of male and female Filipino professionals and highly skilled workers arriving in the United States. Further increasing the number of new arrivals were family members of pre-1965 immigrants

taking advantage of family unification provisions of immigration legislation enacted in 1965 (Bonus 2000). To date, this steady increase in immigration has made the Filipino American community the second largest Asian group in the United States.

Filipinos immigrating to the United States leave a collectivist culture to move into an individualistic one. This transition has been a topic examined in psychological personality research (Church and Katigbak 2000; Grimm, Church, Katigbak, and Reyes 1999); however, not much has been done in other areas. Immigrant Filipinos bring with them a unique set of character traits and collectivist values that may not serve them well in an individualist society. Grimm and colleagues (1999:467) noted that Filipinos emphasize and value “social acceptance, group identity, smooth interpersonal relations, close and extended family ties, deference for authority, close emotional ties, and reciprocal obligations”. In addition, collectivist societies are characterized by high levels of instrumental and expressive social support. The transition from a collectivist, communitarian culture to an individualist society should have a substantial impact on Filipino American immigrants and subsequent generations. It is expected that for first generation Filipino immigrants, collectivist traits, values, and practices will continue to influence behavior, in spite of acculturation influences toward individualism. Also, measures of social support are expected to be strong among Philippine-born immigrants. For second and subsequent generations of Filipino Americans, values, attitudes, and behavior will most likely gravitate toward the individualist end of the individualism-collectivism (I-C) continuum. Increased individualism is expected to significantly erode the level and importance of social support from families and social networks. Triandis (1995) linked individualism to higher divorce rates, more single-parent families, street

violence, delinquency, and crime, as well as loneliness, insecurity, and family tensions. Moreover, lowered self and social controls in individualist societies relate to a commensurate increase in crime (Triandis 1995). In addition, significant differences along the individualism-collectivism continuum would, in all likelihood, result in divergent worldviews between first generation Filipino immigrants and second and subsequent generations. Intergenerational shifts along the I-C dimension favoring individualism should result in behavioral and attitudinal differences, a reduction in perceived and actual social support, and de-emphasis on collectivist practices.

Present research has several objectives. First, measures of collectivism will be developed based on communitarian values and practices unique to Filipino culture. Second, it will probe for differences in individualist and collectivist attitudes between Philippine residents, Filipino immigrants, and subsequent generations of Filipino Americans. Third, this study will examine the effect of these differences on Filipino American attitudes toward crime and the criminal justice system. Fourth, it will also test elements of the I-C dimension and Cullen's social support theory.

This study hopes to contribute to the small body of criminological research focusing on Asian American groups. Specifically targeting the Filipino American population, the proposed study hopes to establish a basis for explaining intergenerational differences between Filipino immigrants and second and subsequent generations of Filipino Americans that could be of use in studying and understanding attitudes towards crime and the criminal justice system. Finally, it will utilize parallel perspectives from two social science disciplines in analyzing the intergenerational transformations in

Filipino and Filipino American behavior: Triandis' (1995) Individualism-Collectivism dimension and Cullen's (1994) Social Support theory.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Since the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, the link between immigration and crime has been the object of research and theoretical speculation. Shaw and McKay (1942) highlighted the tendency of immigrant and migrant groups to settle in economically deprived and socially disorganized urban areas with high rates of crime and delinquency. Merton (1938) emphasized inequities in the opportunity structure that blocked legitimate opportunities for marginalized groups (including immigrants). Other explanations of the immigration-crime link postulated the influence of cultural forces, from Sellin's (1938) ideas on culture conflict and acculturation to Lewis's (1965) culture of poverty perspective.

In recent years, a growing number of researchers have placed culture as a key component in their criminological investigations (Alsaybar 1999; Agbayani-Siewert 2004; Chang and Le 2005; Hunt et al. 2005). In comparisons of culture, Karstedt (2001) points out that Asian criminologists call attention to the endangering influence of Western culture as contributory to rising crime rates; while their Western counterparts focus their studies on family values and cultural attributes deemed responsible for low levels of crime in Asian nations. In other studies, the culture and acculturation variables have been used to examine generational differences in crime and delinquency among immigrant groups (Bui 2008; Guerrero et al. 2006; Kim and Goto 2000; Wang 1995). In examining the Filipino American community, the present study will pursue a similar line of inquiry.

## PREVIOUS WORK ON IMMIGRANTS AND CRIME

In an early study of Asian crime in the Pacific Northwest, Hayner (1938) compared crime rates of Whites (11.1%), Chinese (9.6%), Japanese (2.6%), and Filipinos (11.8%). The low crime rate of the Japanese community was attributed to the existence of closely integrated families and a more balanced sex-age composition of the population. In contrast, with a sex ratio of 32 males to every female, the closely knit family life prevalent in the Philippines was non-existent in the Filipino community in the Pacific Northwest (Hayner 1938). Filipinos were found to live in unstable communities of homeless men frequenting dance halls, houses of prostitution, and gambling joints. Furthermore, Hayner (1938) discerned cultural differences between Filipinos and the Chinese and Japanese. He pointed out that Filipinos were “racially oriental (Malayan)” and “culturally Occidental” (1938:917). The Chinese, Japanese, and Filipinos were similar with regards to closely knit families and a strong sense of filial duty; however, Hayner called attention to the Spanish and American influence on Filipino cultural traits and concluded that the Filipino is “too readily Americanized” (1938:917). More often than not, Filipinos of this era were victims rather than perpetrators. Many Filipinos became easy targets for unscrupulous employers, farm owners, organized crime groups, and institutionalized discriminatory practices (Bulosan 1973; San Juan 1994; Tyner 1999).

More recent criminological studies of Asian Americans have treated them as a homogeneous group, in spite of known differences in histories, identities, and cultural norms and practices. This assumption of homogeneity has resulted in variations in sampling and the lack of representation of all Asian groups in research. For example,

Hunt and his colleagues (2005) examined drug use by Asian Americans in San Francisco Bay Area dance events and found ethnicity to be an important feature of their subjects' social groups. They included Chinese, Filipino, Vietnamese, Korean, Indian, Japanese, and Taiwanese in their sample. Their results indicated that "ethnicity played an important role in the formation of their friendship groups" (Hunt et al. 2005:705) and found social divisions within ethnic groupings. Kim and Goto (2000) found peer delinquent behavior to be the strongest predictor of adolescent delinquency in their Asian American sample, regardless of parental social support and traditional cultural values. Their sample consisted of Korean Americans, Chinese Americans, Japanese Americans, and ten respondents from other Asian backgrounds. In another study, Hall (2002) questioned the notion of Asian Americans being overachievers and excellent students; calling attention to the increasing rate of crime, violence, and gang-related criminal activity in Asian American communities in the United States. He focused on Asian Americans of Vietnamese, Laotian, Hmong, and Cambodian origins. Dasgupta's (2000) work on domestic violence in the South Asian community made numerous references to South Asian women without identifying the composition of the group.

Of interest in these studies are the differences in the composition of their Asian American samples. Asian and Pacific Islanders represent a diverse mix of over 40 distinct ethnic groups (Chang and Le 2009). Researchers clearly assumed a homogeneous Asian American population with similar traditional cultural values; while acknowledging differences in histories, identities, and cultural norms and practices (Hunt et al. 2009; Hall 2002; Kim and Goto 2000). In contrast, a small number of recent research undertakings have digressed from this assumption of homogeneity (Agbayani-



Siewert 2004; Jang 2002; Chang and Le 2009). In a study on perceptions, attitudes, and beliefs about dating violence, Agbayani-Siewert (2004) challenged this assumption of Asian American homogeneity and found it to be unfounded. Her research results indicated that Filipinos have more similarities with white students than with Chinese students. In definitions of physical violence, Filipinos were closer to whites and Hispanics than to the Chinese (Agbayani-Siewert 2004). In their examination of influences on academic achievement, Chang and Le (2009) found both significant similarities and differences when comparing Chinese, Cambodian, Laotian, and Vietnamese adolescents. Jang (2002) found lower levels of general deviance in Asian American adolescents compared to non-Asians; however, Filipino American adolescents manifested deviance levels closer to non-Asian groups.

A growing recognition of the heterogeneity of Asian American groups is also reflected in acculturation measurement instruments that take into account the “*culture of origin*” (Chung, Kim, and Abreu 2004:68). Similarly, acculturation research on immigrant groups supports a heterogeneous approach. In a multi-ethnic study of immigrants, Bui (2004) found that acculturation can diminish commitment to education, increase family conflict, and increase the likelihood of participation in delinquent behavior. In lieu of using an Asian American sample, Bui (2004) compared Chinese Americans with Blacks, Cubans, and Puerto Ricans. Across immigrant generations, he found first generation immigrants to be less likely to report substance use and engage in delinquent acts. In an assessment of family obligation in young adults, Fuligni and Pedersen (2002) treated East Asians and Filipino Americans as distinct groups. They found that, compared to the third generation, first generation young adults were more

likely to believe in the familial obligation of providing continuing support to their respective families. The present study will assume Asian American heterogeneity, and focus solely on Filipino Americans. The results will not be generalizable to the Asian American population, but only to different generations of Filipino Americans.

## THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES

### *Individualism-Collectivism Theory*

In 1995, Triandis introduced the idea of an Individualism-Collectivism (I-C) cultural syndrome; defining a cultural syndrome as a pattern of shared beliefs, attitudes, norms, roles, and values sharing a singular theme. Within the I-C cultural syndrome are four distinct typologies: horizontal collectivism, vertical collectivism, horizontal individualism, and vertical individualism (Triandis 1995). Horizontal collectivism is characterized by equality, interdependence and social cohesion, with individuals feeling a oneness with the members of an in-group. Cooperation is also emphasized. In vertical collectivism, individuals are cognizant of and accept inequality, and are imbued with a sense of duty and service, even to the point of sacrificing for the benefit of the in-group. In horizontal individualism, individuals are assumed to be autonomous yet enjoy a measure of equality.

In contrast, vertical individualism assumes distinct, autonomous individuals, however, similar to vertical collectivism, it recognizes and accepts inequality. Also, achievement and success are accentuated. Cultures are neither purely collectivist nor purely individualist; rather, cultures can be placed along an individualism-collectivism continuum.

The key component of individualism is the supposition that individuals are independent of one another; while collectivism's principal element is the "assumption that groups bind and mutually obligate individuals" (Oyserman, Coon, and Kemmelmeier 2002:5). Comparisons of individualists and collectivists revolve around four central themes (Triandis 1995). First, individualists place a high priority on individual goals while collectivists have a willingness to consider subordinating personal desires to group goals. Second, individualists have a sense of self as an independent entity while collectivists have a group-connected sense of self. The self is defined as independent in individualism and interdependent in collectivism, as manifested in the degree that individuals are willing to share resources and conform to group norms. Singelis (1994) did posit that interdependence and independence can co-exist in an individual; therefore, at the individual level, these constructs need to be examined separately. Third, individualists underscore personal attributes versus the collectivists' emphasis on roles and norms in influencing behavior. "Personal and communal goals are closely aligned in collectivism and not at all aligned in individualism" (Triandis 1995:43). Fourth, individualists establish relationships with an eye toward personal benefit while collectivists do so for a sense of connection and obligation. Collectivists accentuate relationships, even when they are disadvantageous. In contrast, individualists would weigh the advantages and disadvantages of sustaining relationships. Attributes commonly associated with individualism include independence, creativity, competitiveness, self-assurance, and directness; while attentiveness, humility, harmony, sharing, obedience, and cooperativeness are linked to collectivism (Grimm et al. 1999).

Although individualism may push toward democratic tendencies, it also pushes toward narcissism. As a result, Triandis (1995) notes that individualist societies have higher divorce rates and more one-parent families. Individualism is also linked to street violence, delinquency, and crime, as well as loneliness, insecurity, and family tensions (Triandis 1995:180). In comparisons of societies along a continuum of aggressive behavior, independent and individualist societies tend to be on the more aggressive and violent end. When social controls, notably self-controls, are lowered in individualist societies, a commensurate increase in crime occurs (Triandis 1995). In addition, since inequalities are tolerated in vertical individualist societies, there is a lack of concern over the plight of the poor and unemployed. Thus, lacking jobs and resources, crimes by the poor can be seen as inevitable. Triandis, McCusker, and Hui (1990:1019), citing Naroll, state that “emphasis on primary groups leads to less crime, divorce, child abuse, homicide, delinquency, teenage pregnancies, child abuse, and mental illness.” On the other hand, extreme collectivism pushes toward undemocratic tendencies, where individuals are subordinate to the goals of the state. Extreme collectivists are blindly loyal to in-groups and treat out-groups harshly; the Nazis are a case in point (Triandis 1995). Ideally, a balance of collectivist and individualist traits may be what is most desirable in a society.

Individualism-Collectivism (I-C) theory has been previously used by cultural psychologists in comparing cultural influences on personality and behavior. I-C theory has become an important framework in the study of cultural similarities and differences (Cukur, De Guzman, and Carlo (2004). Most researchers have used I-C theory in comparing Asian groups with American or Western European samples (Vandello and

Cohen 1999). Wheeler, Reis, and Bond (1989) employed I-C concepts in comparing social interaction patterns among American and Chinese students. Grimm, Church, Katigbak, and Reyes (1999) used I-C theory as a basis for comparing the personality traits of United States and Philippine students. A comparative analysis of religiosity among U.S, Turkish, and Philippine students found links of I-C values to religiosity (Cukur et al. 2004). Vandello and Cohen (1999) employed I-C concepts in comparing collectivist versus individualist tendencies among residents of different regions within the United States.

The broad application of I-C theory signifies possibilities of its application in identifying the varying effects of cultural and acculturation influences on first, second, and possibly third generation Filipino Americans in the U.S.; and the impact of these differences on attitudes related to crime and the criminal justice system. For Filipinos, social acceptance, smooth interpersonal relations, group identity, deference for authority, close emotional ties, and reciprocal obligations are characteristics regarded to be of high importance; placing them at the collectivist end of the I-C continuum (Grimm et al. 1999).

#### *I-C, Personality Traits, and Attitudes*

Previous research has shown that individualism and collectivism can be associated with distinct personality traits (Bellah et al. 2008; Triandis 1995; Triandis 1993). Individualists are more likely to be independent, self-reliant, hedonistic, individual autonomy, and responsibility for one's actions or wrongdoing (Bellah et al. 2008; Triandis 1995). They will have a high regard for fairness, equality, competition,

separation from family, uniqueness, creativity, and high self-esteem. Collectivists are more likely to be interdependent, obedient, mindful of duty and obligation, have a willingness to sacrifice, focus on the in-group and adhere to in-group norms. They favor sociability and harmony, family integrity, and the sharing of responsibility for wrong doing (Triandis 1995).

Present exploratory analysis will test for relationships between I-C and attitudes toward criminal justice constructs and practices. Intuitively, members of individualist societies, believing in one being accountable for one's actions, would be expected to favor punitive policies towards offenders. They would also be more likely to report criminal offenses without regard for who the offender is. On the other hand, collectivists would most likely have ambiguous attitudes about punitive policies and officially reporting crimes, contingent on the offender being part of the in-group or out-group. Based on the traits associated with members of collectivist societies, they can also be expected to be more supportive of restorative justice and community-based correction initiatives. Sharing in the responsibility for a transgression implies a willingness to assist in correcting a wrong.

#### *Individualism in the United States*

In research and in literature, the individualistic nature of American society is well-documented. Observers of American society, from as far back as Tocqueville, have identified individualism as a fundamental element of the American persona (Zeitlin 1971; Hofstede 1984; Spence 1985). "Americans see their own culture as individualist; and this is interpreted as a major contributor to the greatness of the United States" (Hofstede

1984:150). American individualism stresses achievement and personal effort, values independence and self-reliance, glorifies strength, toughness, and winners, disparages losers and failures, and is intolerant of weakness or softness (Bellah et al. 2008).

Although the individualist nature of American society is widely accepted, classification into the vertical or horizontal categories is less apparent. Triandis states that "all individualistic cultures, relative to collectivist cultures, are horizontal" (1995:46).

However, he suggests that the American middle and upper classes lean toward vertical individualism, as evident in the lack of concern for the poor and the unwillingness to redistribute wealth by paying higher tax rates. The indifference to the problems of lower-class Americans is rationalized by blaming the poor for their plight (Bellah et al. 2008).

Thus, American individualism is uniquely more vertical than horizontal. Upon entering the United States, immigrants from collectivist cultures are faced with the task of coping with a mostly vertical individualist culture.

### *Social Support Theory*

Social support is explained as responsiveness to the needs of others (Cullen 1994). Central to the theory is the wide range of elements encompassing social support: from the instrumental (providing financial assistance, advice, or guidance) to the expressive (intangible emotional assistance, a positive identity, sense of belonging, dignity). These elements of social support find parallels in Filipino cultural traits, indicative of high levels of social support in that society. Cullen's (1994) use of social support was within the context of criminological applications. This research will draw from social support theory in analyzing variations in intergenerational attitudes toward

crime and the criminal justice system among Filipino groups. Cullen (1994) presented the key concepts of social support theory in the form of fourteen propositions that include the following key points: a community's or society's level of social supports is inversely related to its crime rate; greater support from families and social networks equate to less criminal involvement while an anticipated lack of support leads to increased criminal involvement; social support moderates the impact of exposure to criminogenic conditions; and that crime is less likely when social support favoring conformity is greater. Also, social support is seen as: a prerequisite for effective social control; necessary in a correctional system; leading to effective policing and criminal less victimization and the pains associated with the same (Cullen 1994). In addition, Cullen's social support theory posits that in addition to receiving actual support, of similar importance is the perception of social support.

Social support theory and I-C theory can be perceived as mutually reinforcing. Elements of both will be used in analyzing both the transition of Filipino immigrants from a primarily vertical collectivist society into a vertical individualist society and the potential differences in attitudes toward the criminal justice system. As Filipinos and Filipino Americans become acculturated into American individualist culture, it is expected that their character manifest the qualities of self-reliance; independence; intolerance of weakness, softness, and losers; and indifference to the plight of the poor and unemployed. In addition, familial and social support networks should receive less emphasis and a noticeable decrease in the willingness to provide instrumental and/or expressive support should be evident. As individualism of this group increases, attitudes toward the criminal justice system are expected to parallel the mainstream: increased



support for punitive policies; reduced acceptance of mediation and restorative justice; and less tolerant of rehabilitation, social programs crime prevention strategies. Further, in line with Triandis' (1995) research, higher rates of participation in violence, delinquency, and crime can be anticipated.

## FILIPINO CULTURAL TRAITS

Family relationships are central to a Filipino's existence. In Philippine culture, a family is defined in the extended sense, and kinship circles often include distant cousins. Respect for parents and elders, obedience, filial faithfulness, and a powerful sense of loyalty are behavioral traits expected of family members (Church 198; Church and Katigbak 2000). From this kinship circle emanates a deep well of emotional, moral, economic, and psychological support for each individual member. This exemplifies both the instrumental and expressive types of support found in social support theory (Cullen 1994) and is in line with the attributes of collectivist societies (Triandis 1995). Should a relative communicate a request for assistance, a family member is expected to respond in some positive manner, even at the expense of some personal hardship. The strength of Filipino familism extends to the corporate world, where family businesses are the norm and are highly successful organizations (Arce 2003).

Immigrant Filipinos arrive in the United States with a unique set of character traits and collectivist values that may not serve them well in an individualist society. Grimm, Church, Katigbak, and Reyes (1999:467) noted that Filipinos emphasize and value "social acceptance, group identity, smooth interpersonal relations, close and extended family ties, deference for authority, close emotional ties, and reciprocal

obligations". Central to Filipino culture is the foundation value of *kapwa*, defined as "recognition of shared identity, an inner self shared with others" (Enriquez 1992:43). *Kapwa* signifies a unity between oneself and others and does not treat the self as a separate identity (Nadal 2004). This is consistent with collectivist society's "emphasis on the views, needs, and goals of the in-group rather than on the self" (Triandis 1995:6). In practice, this is shown in the concept of *pakikipagkapwa* which defines how Filipinos relate to others; treating and assigning equal status to others and having respect and regard for their dignity (Enriquez 1977; Church 1987). *Pakikipagkapwa* exemplifies Triandis'(1995) description of the collectivists' desire for in-group homogeneity, as this should lead to harmony.

The shared identity *kapwa* exists at multiple levels. At the universal level, *kapwa-tao* (*tao* meaning human) represents recognition of being fellow human beings and *pakikipagkapwa-tao* prescribes social relationships with others based on a shared identity, equality, and concern for their well-being, and indicates acceptance of a moral obligation to act as such (Pasco, Morse, and Olson 2004). *Pakikipagkapwa* signifies an ethical necessity of treating family, relatives, and all others as well as the self (Aquino 2004). However, *kapwa* also extends to shared identities with groups. *Kapwa-Pilipino* recognizes one's shared Filipino heritage, and takes on greater importance outside the Philippines. Being both *kapwa-tao* and *kapwa-Pilipino* intensifies the moral obligation to be concerned with another Filipino's well-being.

Many first generation immigrant Filipinos speak, aside from the Pilipino national language, an ethnic language or ethnic dialect of the region of birth and/or residence. Ethnic dialects are foundations of shared identities among groups of Filipinos. For

example, the *Ilocano* language is spoken in the northernmost regions of the country and *Ilocano* speakers have a shared identity in addition to being Filipinos. Being *kapwa-tao*, *kapwa-Pilipino*, and *kapwa-Ilocano* serves to deepen one's loyalty and intensify one's moral obligation to members of this Ilocano-speaking community. Therefore, aside from a family identity, this person would self-identify as being a human being, Filipino, and Ilocano; easily satisfying the collectivist attribute of being part of one or more collectives (Triandis 1995). In the United States, many Filipino social organizations and associations are regionalist in nature and form based on ethnic dialects. For second and subsequent generations of Filipinos in the United States, this shared identity based on an ethnic dialect is expected to dissipate as knowledge of the language diminishes.

Related to *pakikipagkapwa* (concern for others) are the traditional values of *bayanihan* (community spirit), *pakikisama* (smooth interpersonal relations or SIR), and *pakikiramay* (showing sympathy). *Pakikipagkapwa* (concern for others) and Filipino collectivism is exemplified in *bayanihan*, a concept of community cooperation and cohesion. In works of art as well as folklore, this is demonstrated in the traditional farming community practice of volunteers assisting in relocating a family by carrying the whole house to a new geographic location. In turn, the grateful family often reciprocates by preparing a feast at the completion of the move. In contemporary usage, *bayanihan* refers to a spirit of cooperation and communal harmony in the pursuit of common goals. A current application of *bayanihan* can be found in today's *barangay*, a grassroots community organization empowered to manage community affairs. *Barangay* community-improvement projects are mostly self-help and receive no funding from the government; modern day manifestations of the *bayanihan* spirit. In the United States,

*bayanihan* can be evidenced in the activities of over 3,000 Filipino associations, from financial remittances to philanthropic giving to individuals and institutions in the Philippines. As an example, the fund raising efforts of *Gawad Kalinga* (A Group that Cares), an NGO formed by the Couples for Christ, has resulted in the construction of homes for the homeless in various locations in the homeland. Feed the Hungry, Inc. provides various types of assistance, from medical and dental missions, book donations, and disaster relief to economic development programs (Garchitorena 2007).

*Pakikisama* (SIR), another trait related to *pakikipagkapwa* (concern for others), is a key social interaction strategy focusing on getting along with others and going along with one's group. *Pakikisama* (SIR) implies that an individual belongs to an in-group, has strong feelings of loyalty to the group, and avoids conflict with group members/s at all costs (Herrington cited in Wang 1995; Bautista 1999). *Pakikisamat* can involve deferring or conceding to the wishes of others when necessary, sacrificing one's desires for those of the group, following the lead of others, and avoiding confrontation and disagreement in the interest of smooth interpersonal relations (Lynch cited in Church; Selmer and de Leon 2002). *Pakikisama* is a behavioral trait that can be applied in almost any situation; from routine interaction to complex business or political dealings. Once invoked, a positive response is expected; to respond in the negative can lead to be labeled as *walang* (without) *pakisama*. To be perceived as *walang pakikisama* or being without *pakisama* can lead to serious consequences, as in withdrawal of support, exclusion from the group, or having an unfavorable reputation in the community (Leoncini).

When one receives favors or benefits as a result of *pakikipagkapwa* or *pakikisama* shown by others, the recipient is expected to show *utang-na-loob*. Loosely translated,

*utang-na-loob* refers to a debt of gratitude (Church and Katigbak 2000). When one is a recipient of good deeds or favors, there is an unspoken obligation, not just of being grateful, but to return the favor sometime in the future. Repayment of favors need not be direct nor quantifiably equivalent to the original favor, *utang-na-loob* can be invoked in behalf of the grantor's friend or family member at any time in the future. However, the intensity or extent of the implied obligation varies based on contextual applications, ranging from blind loyalty to reciprocity. In the context of unequal relationships, a person with limited resources may be in a dependent relationship and feel *utang-na-loob* toward someone of greater power and resources who provides assistance. In a negative sense, the strength of the *utang-na-loob* bond in this instance could be akin to blind loyalty in the case of the dependent; on the opposite end, the other person may expect total obedience and blind support based on *utang-na-loob*. This blind loyalty may transcend one's moral principles and/or social and legal norms. Nevertheless, obligations must be satisfied and the in-group norms adhered to. This emphasis on group norms is consistent with the definition of collectivist cultures (Triandis 1995:11)

In more conventional applications, *utang-na-loob* is practiced without having to give up one's principles. By no means does *utang-na-loob* indicate that all favors thus invoked must be granted; a diplomatic, sincere, and honest explanation may be used to convey non-compliance with a request. Then again, should *utang-na-loob* be invoked for whatever positive or negative reason, non-compliance is construed as shameful and disrespectful (Salvador et al. 1997), and could result in being excluded from further contact with the person or group.

By Cullen's (1994) standards, Filipino culture would rank high in social support. Expressive support is seen in the way *pakikipagkapwa* provides a sense of identity, *pakikisama* bestows a sense of belonging, and strong kinship ties supplies emotional assistance. In similar fashion, instrumental support is exemplified in the tangible assistance made available through *bayanihan*, the likelihood of receiving financial assistance when invoking *pakikisama* and familial relationships, and the availability of advice and guidance from the extensive kin relationships.

Within the context of the individualism-collectivism perspective, Filipino culture can be categorized as vertical collectivist. Triandis (1995) stipulated four dimensions in comparing collectivism and individualism. On the collectivist end of the continuum, the self is defined as interdependent, personal and communal goals are closely aligned, obligations and duties guide behavior, and relationships are emphasized (Triandis 1995:43-44). *Pakikipagkapwa* at all levels of interaction demonstrates the Filipino's recognition and acceptance of belonging to one or more collectives and the interdependence of the members of the same. *Bayanihan* represents the community spirit and importance placed on communal goals. *Pakikisama* epitomizes the importance of maintaining good relationships and the subordination of individual preferences to group desires. Finally, *pakikisama*, and *pakikipagkapwa* exemplify the importance of abiding by the duties and obligations imposed by the group and society. Furthermore, Filipino culture meets Triandis's criteria of vertical collectivism. Vertical collectivist cultures "include a sense of serving the in-group and sacrificing for the benefit of the in-group and doing one's duty" (Triandis 1995:44) and is so aptly embodied in *pakikisama*, *pakikipagkapwa*, and the strength of kinship ties. In addition, vertical collectivist

cultures accept inequality and the privileges afforded by rank in society (Triandis 1994). The acceptance of inequality can be found in relations involving *utang-na-loob*, where assistance or favors are often requested from the more affluent or powerful. Also, in a Philippine society where thirty three percent of the population falls below the poverty line, the rank distinctions between the rich and poor are a matter of course.

## INDIVIDUALISM IN THE UNITED STATES

In research and in literature, the individualistic nature of American society is well-documented. Observers of American society, from as far back as Tocqueville, have identified individualism as a fundamental element of the American persona (Zeitlin 1971; Spence 1985;). "Americans see their own culture as individualistic; and this individualism is interpreted as a major contributor to the greatness of the United States" (Hofstede 1984:150). American individualism stresses achievement and personal effort, values independence and self-reliance, glorifies strength, toughness, and winners, disparages losers and failures, and is intolerant of weakness or softness (Bellah et al. 2008).

Although the individualist nature of American society is widely accepted, classification into the vertical or horizontal categories is less apparent. Triandis states that "all individualistic cultures, relative to collectivist cultures, are horizontal" (1995:46). However, he suggests that the American middle and upper classes lean toward vertical individualism, as evident in the lack of concern for the poor and the unwillingness to redistribute wealth by paying higher tax rates. The indifference to the problems of lower-class Americans is rationalized by blaming the poor for their plight

(Bellah et al. 2008). Thus, American individualism is uniquely more vertical than horizontal. Upon entering the United States, immigrants from collectivist cultures are faced with the task of coping with a mostly vertical individualist culture.

The transition of the Filipino immigrant and the Filipino American from a vertical collectivist Philippine society to a vertical individualist American society is a key element of this research endeavor. This study will examine I-C differences among Philippine nationals, Filipino immigrants, and Filipino Americans, with specific focus on their impact on attitudes toward the criminal justice system.

## RESEARCH HYPOTHESES

The research design explained above was tailored to collect sufficient data to test the following hypotheses:

H1: Philippine nationals, Filipino immigrants, and Filipino Americans will manifest significant differences on measures of individualism. Respondents with greater exposure to American culture are expected to score higher on measures of individualism.

H2: Philippine nationals, Filipino immigrants, and Filipino Americans will vary significantly on measures of collectivism. Expectations here are opposite those in Hypothesis 1. It is expected that greater exposure to the American individualist culture will result in reduced levels in collectivism scores.

H3: Philippine nationals, Filipino immigrants, and Filipino Americans will vary significantly on measures of the Filipino cultural traits of *bayanihan*, *pakikisama*, *pakikipagkapwa*, and familism. Given that these are collectivist traits, participants with more exposure to American culture are expected to score lower on these measures.



H4. Measures of individualism and/or collectivism can be used to predict attitudes toward the criminal justice system, in the areas of punitiveness, rehabilitation, criminal justice system fairness, reporting crime, restorative justice, and collective efficacy.

H5. Measures of individualist and/or collectivist traits can be used to predict attitudes toward the criminal justice system, in the areas of punitiveness, rehabilitation, criminal justice system fairness, reporting crime, restorative justice, and collective efficacy.

H6: Philippine nationals, Filipino immigrants, and Filipino Americans will vary significantly on attitudes toward the criminal justice system, in the area of punitiveness. It is expected that a direct relationship between exposure to an individualist culture and punitive attitudes, resulting in respondents more exposed to individualist culture being more punitive.

H7: Philippine nationals, Filipino immigrants, and Filipino Americans will vary significantly on attitudes toward the criminal justice system, in the area rehabilitation. Communitarian values are presumed to correspond with rehabilitation; therefore, lower scores are anticipated from those more exposed to American individualist culture.

H8: Philippine nationals, Filipino immigrants, and Filipino Americans will vary significantly on attitudes toward the criminal justice system, in the area of perceptions of system fairness.

H9: Philippine nationals, Filipino immigrants, and Filipino Americans will vary significantly on attitudes toward the criminal justice system, in the area of reporting crimes committed by persons known to the survey respondent.

H10: Philippine nationals, Filipino immigrants, and Filipino Americans will vary significantly on attitudes toward restorative justice. It is expected that greater exposure to American individualist culture would indicate a less favorable attitude toward restorative justice concepts.

H11: Philippine nationals, Filipino immigrants, and Filipino Americans will vary significantly on attitudes concerning collective efficacy. It is expected that greater exposure to American individualist culture would indicate a less favorable attitude toward collective efficacy.

## CHAPTER III

### METHODS

This chapter describes the research design, data collection procedures, and the survey instrument. Research questions and variables are identified. The composition of scale variables are explained.

#### RESEARCH DESIGN

The empirical examination of Filipino group differences along the individualism-collectivism continuum involved unique data requirements. First, a meaningful analysis of differences ideally should encompass Philippine residents and at least two generations of Filipinos and Filipino Americans. For Filipino immigrants, it was expected that differences in length of residence in the United States could also result in significant variations in measures on the I-C continuum. Second, a sampling technique was developed in an attempt to ensure that the first and second (and possibly third) generations of this immigrant group are equitably represented in the data. Third, the data collection instrument was formulated to have the flexibility of discriminating between population subgroups according to potential socio-economic, demographic, and region-of-origin differences. In order to reach both residents of the Philippines and Filipino immigrants and Filipino Americans residing in the United States, an online survey was used for data collection.

## SAMPLE AND DATA COLLECTION

Data collection was accomplished via a modified snowball sampling strategy employing the use of an online survey administered via the Facebook social network. This web-based data collection method, patterned after snowball data collection procedures, was used in order to reach a wider audience at minimal expense. Cost efficiency, time savings, and the potential of accessing a geographically distributed target population are among the perceived advantages of online data collection (Lefever, Dal, and Matthiasdottir 2007). Previous studies have successfully used Facebook as a data collection tool (Bhutta 2012; Paris 2013). In their analysis of Facebook use for data collection, Gregori and Baltar concluded that “Facebook opens a new means of recruitment that can improve the effectiveness of traditional snowball sampling methods” (2013:145). Using Facebook, Paris (2013) reached a wider range of his target population, resulting in a better foundation for his research. Likewise, Bhutta (2012) concluded that Facebook had potential value in research of small, hard to reach populations absent from standard samples. For example, members of small religious groups and individual cancer survivors may be easier to reach via their Facebook groups.

In the initial solicitation of survey participants, the web link to the online survey was sent to this researcher's 72 Filipino and Filipino American Facebook friends (*seeds*). A message requesting participation emphasized that respondents must be at least 18 years old and must belong to one of three categories: Filipinos residing in the Philippines, Filipino immigrants residing in the United States, or Filipino American (defined as American-born, US residents having at least one Filipino parent). In addition, each friend was asked to participate in the survey and forward a copy of the message to all their

Facebook Filipino and Filipino American friends and, solicit their participation and for them to similarly disseminate the survey. It was expected that the survey would be disseminated in several waves, from friends to friends of friends, and so forth. Data collection commenced on March 13, 2013 and ended September 16, 2013.

Due to the initially low number of respondents, additional *seeds* were recruited from individuals listed as admins (administrators) in different Filipino Facebook groups. Admins were asked to participate in the survey and solicit respondents from their group members. It was also requested that admins ask their group members to pass the survey link to their friends, as previously described. Filipino Facebook groups were selected by using *Filipino Groups* and *Filipino Associations* as search criteria. Care was taken to identify and select groups with mostly Philippine-based or US-based members. Some positive responses were received from a diverse selection of administrators, representing US based groups that included the Stanford University Philippine American Students Union, Americans of Filipino Ancestry, Fil-Am Association of North San Diego County, Kaibigang Pilipino, Pinay Military Spouses Chat, Filipino American Association of the Triad, American Filipino Friendship Society, and the Filipino American Student Association at Old Dominion University. In addition, Philippine-based group admins who responded included those from Samahan ng Pinoy, Filipino Freethinkers, Pinay Lesbians, Bukluran ng Sikolohiyang Pilipino, You Know You are Cebuano If..., and the Samahan ng Mga Cute sa Pinas. Of the 75 Facebook group admins contacted, 14 (19%) agreed to solicit participation from group members and post the survey link. However, the postings could not be verified since nonmembers are not allowed to view group posts and messages.

### *Survey Participants*

The Facebook solicitation resulted in completed surveys by 191 respondents, 103 females and 88 males. Ages ranged from 18 to 81, with a mean of 35.5 years. US based respondents resided in the following states: Arizona, California, Colorado, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Kansas, Minnesota, Nevada, New York, Ohio, Oregon, Texas, and Virginia. Thirty three percent (63) of survey participants were born in the United States (Filipino Americans). Among the Filipino Americans, 73 percent had parents who were born in the Philippines, 16 percent had one parent born in the Philippines, and for the remaining 11 percent, both parents were born in the United States. Of the 67 percent (128) born in the Philippines, 30 percent (39) are current residents of the Philippines (Philippine nationals) and the rest (89) are first generation Filipino immigrants to the United States. As far as marital status, 53 percent of respondents were single and 47 percent were married. Among the first generation Filipino immigrants, 23 percent came to the United States via the US military.

Twenty percent of respondents were high school graduates; eighteen percent had associates degrees, while sixty one percent had at least a bachelor's degree. Respondents based in the United States had a median annual household income in the \$60-80,000 range. Previous to their arrival in the United States, 54 percent of Filipino immigrants mostly resided in urban areas, 38 percent in small provincial towns, and 8 percent in barrios or farming communities. For religious affiliation, 69 percent of the sample was Roman Catholic, with Protestants accounting for ten percent, and eight percent listed Christian, and eleven percent selected the other category. The religion question was open ended, allowing respondents to write in their affiliation as needed. Unfortunately, a great

diversity of responses were received, resulting in difficulties in coding and precluding the use of religion in the analysis. In the area of political inclination, 34 percent of respondents considered themselves conservative, 37 percent liberal, and percent were neither conservative nor liberal. For previous victimization, two percent had been victims of violent crimes and 21.5 percent had been victims of property crimes.

## MEASURES

The difficulty in measuring individualism and collectivism is well-documented in literature. Hui (1988) pointed out that early psychological measures of individualist tendencies developed in the 1960s did not define nor assess collectivism; it was assumed to be the opposite of individualism and not a separate construct. He then constructed the 63-item INDCOL Scale which takes into account collectivist values, attitudes, and behaviors and recognizes the variations in collective tendencies among those surveyed. After its use in six studies, Hui (1984) concluded that the INDCOL Scale did measure individualism- collectivism. In 1999, Grimm and colleagues successfully used a modified version of Hui's (1988) INDCOL Scale in testing I-C theory using samples of students from the Philippines and the United States. Other users made necessary refinements to the INDCOL scale to tailor it to their research. Finding the INDCOL scale too lengthy, Bierbrauer, Meyer, and Wolfradt (1994) created a 26-item Cultural Orientation Scale (COS). Bierbrauer and colleagues (1994) tested both INDCOL and COS scales and found them to significantly measure differences in collectivism between German students and those from the subject countries. In both cases (Grimm et al. 1999;

Bierbrauer et al. 1994), researchers found it necessary to modify the INDCOL scale to suit their research needs.

In 1995, Singelis and colleagues developed a 32 item scale which focused on assessing individual differences in horizontal and vertical individualism and horizontal and vertical collectivism. In a three-nation study involving Turkey, the United States, and the Philippines, Cukur, De Guzman, and Carlo (2004) used the Singelis scale to assess the relationship between horizontal and vertical I-C, religiosity, and values.

Research on individualism and collectivism has employed different assessment scales, all with varying levels of success. The need for different measures is reinforced by Matsumoto and associates' (1997) recommendation of a context-specific measure when assessing I-C at the individual level. Gudykunst and associates (1996), in examining the impact of I-C on communication styles, drew from different measurement tools, modifying each as necessary to fit their sample groups. The diversity in measurement instruments reinforces Triandis' contention that, in I-C measurement, "there is no such as 'the best method'. All methods have limitations. The use of multi-method approaches that converge is the only strategy that can be recommended" (1995:191).

## THE SURVEY INSTRUMENT

### *Assessment of Individualism-Collectivism*

Along these lines, this research adopted a three-step strategy in creating I-C measures tailored for use with the target Filipino and Filipino American sample. First, selected elements of the Singelis and colleagues (1995) scale were used as a base. Second, selected relevant items were drawn from Hui's (1988) INDCOL scale, the AICS,



and the ICIAI. In selecting collectivism elements, items that correspond to the Filipino collectivist traits of *pakikipagkapwa*, *bayanihan*, *pakikisama*, and familism were chosen. Finally, additional measurement items were created to include culture-specific behaviors not included in pre-existing scales.

*The collectivism scale variables.* Three separate strategies were developed to measure collectivism. First, a general collectivism scale utilizing all collectivism elements listed in Table 1 was used, with a resulting alpha of 0.90. Second, collectivism trait subscales (identified in Table 1) were developed using factor analysis, resulting in collectivist trait variables reflecting the Filipino cultural practices of *bayanihan* ( $\alpha=.87$ ), familism ( $\alpha=.82$ ), *pakikipagkapwa* ( $\alpha=.81$ ), and *pakikisama* ( $\alpha=.73$ ). Third, a horizontal collectivism scale ( $\alpha=.75$ ) and a vertical collectivism scale ( $\alpha=.84$ ) were created (Table 2) based on the scale developed by Singelis and colleagues (1990).

Table 1. Measures of Collectivism with Trait Subscales Identified.

| Measures of Collectivism   | Cronbach's Alpha |
|--|------------------|
| <b><u>Bayanihan (community spirit)</u></b>   |                  |
| <i>I am interested in developing close relationships with my neighbors.</i>  |                  |
| <i>If my neighbor's house burned down and they had nowhere to go, I would offer them the use of our spare bedroom.</i>                         |                  |
| <i>If my neighbor's house burned down and they were to lose everything, I would ask them to share in our family meals.</i>                     |                  |
| <i>If a relative is hospitalized and asked to borrow money to help pay medical bills, I would lend him or her as much as I possibly could.</i> |                  |
| <i>I believe in helping people who are in need.</i>  |                  |
| <i>I have an obligation to assist the poor and the needy to the best of my ability.</i>  |                  |
| <i>If a friend were in financial difficulty, I would provide as much financial assistance as I can afford to give.</i>                         |                  |
| <i>I have an obligation to assist members of my community even if I do not know them very well.</i>  |                  |
| <i>I feel good when I cooperate with others.</i>   |                  |
| <i>Bayanihan subscale</i>  | <i>.87</i>       |
| <b><u>Familism</u></b>   |                  |
| <i>If a relative were in financial difficulty, I would provide as much financial assistance as I can afford to give.</i>                       |                  |
| <i>Adult children have an obligation to care for aging parents.</i>  |                  |
| <i>Children should live with their parents until they get married.</i>   |                  |
| <i>If a relative is hospitalized and asked to borrow money to help pay medical bills, I would lend him or her as much as I possibly could.</i> |                  |
| <i>I would not marry someone whom my parents were opposed to.</i>  |                  |
| <i>After graduating from college, older children should provide financial assistance in sending younger brothers and sisters to college.</i>   |                  |
| <i>It is my duty to take care of my family even if I have to sacrifice what I want.</i>  |                  |
| <i>When making important decisions, I consider the impact of each decision on my family members.</i>   |                  |
| <i>Familism subscale</i>   | <i>.82</i>       |
| <b><u>Pakikipagkapwa tao (concern for fellow human beings)</u></b>   |                  |
| <i>I believe in helping people who are in need.</i>  |                  |
| <i>I believe the government should assist and take care of the homeless.</i>   |                  |
| <i>I believe in the government should assist the poor in obtaining food and housing.</i>   |                  |
| <i>Pakikipagkapwa tao subscale</i>   | <i>.81</i>       |
| <b><u>Pakikisama (Smooth Interpersonal Relations)</u></b>  |                  |
| <i>I usually sacrifice my self-interest for the benefit of my group of friends.</i>  |                  |
| <i>I hate to disagree with others in my group of friends.</i>  |                  |
| <i>I help acquaintances even if it is inconvenient.</i>  |                  |
| <i>My happiness depends very much on the happiness of those around me.</i>   |                  |
| <i>It is important to maintain harmony within my group of friends.</i>   |                  |
| <i>When someone in my group of friends is insulted, I also feel insulted.</i>  |                  |
| <i>I see nothing wrong with people I know arriving at my house unannounced.</i>  |                  |
| <i>Pakikisama subscale</i>   | <i>.73</i>       |
| <i>Collectivism scale (all variables)</i>  | <i>.90</i>       |

Table 2. Measures of Horizontal and Vertical Collectivism.

| Measures of Horizontal and Vertical Collectivism  | Cronbach's Alpha |
|---|------------------|
| <u>Horizontal Collectivism</u>  |                  |
| <i>My happiness depends very much on the happiness of those around me.</i>  |                  |
| <i>To me, pleasure is spending time with others.</i>  |                  |
| <i>I feel good when I cooperate with others.</i>  |                  |
| <i>If a relative were in financial difficulty, I would provide as much financial assistance as I can afford to give.</i>  |                  |
| <i>If my neighbor's house burned down and they were to lose everything, I would ask them to share in our family meals.</i>  |                  |
| <i>It is important to maintain harmony within my group of friends.</i>  |                  |
| <i>I see nothing wrong with people I know arriving at my house unannounced.</i>   |                  |
| <i>If a friend were in financial difficulty, I would provide as much financial assistance as I can afford to give.</i>  |                  |
| <i>A friend in financial difficulty asked to borrow a large sum of money. If I had the money, I would loan it to him/her, even if I knew that he/she would have a hard time paying it back.</i> |                  |
| <i>Horizontal collectivism subscale</i>   | .75              |
| <u>Vertical Collectivism</u>  |                  |
| <i>I usually sacrifice my self-interest for the benefit of my group of friends.</i>   |                  |
| <i>Adult children have an obligation to care for aging parents.</i>   |                  |
| <i>Children should live with their parents until they get married.</i>  |                  |
| <i>I have an obligation to assist members of my community even if I do not know them very well.</i>   |                  |
| <i>I hate to disagree with others in my group of friends.</i>   |                  |
| <i>After graduating from college, older children should provide financial assistance in sending younger brothers and sisters to college.</i>  |                  |
| <i>I would not marry someone whom my parents were opposed to.</i>   |                  |
| <i>It is my duty to take care of my family even if I have to sacrifice what I want.</i>   |                  |
| <i>I have an obligation to assist the poor and the needy to the best of my ability.</i>   |                  |
| <i>I help acquaintances even if it is inconvenient.</i>   |                  |
| <i>When someone in my group of friends is insulted, I also feel insulted.</i>   |                  |
| <i>When making important decisions, I consider the impact of each decision on my family members.</i>  |                  |
| <i>I believe in helping people who are in need.</i>   |                  |
| <i>Vertical collectivism subscale</i>   | .84              |

*The individualism scale variables.* Individualism measures were generated following the same procedures used in creating the collectivism scales. Table 3 lists all individualism variables used to create the general individualism scale ( $\alpha=.80$ ) and also lists the trait subscales of uniqueness ( $\alpha=.78$ ), competitiveness ( $\alpha=.79$ ), and

independence ( $\alpha=.73$ ). Variables used in constructing the horizontal individualism ( $\alpha=.77$ ) and vertical individualism ( $\alpha=.78$ ) scales are displayed in Table 4. Since the competitiveness scale elements identified through factor analysis are identical to the vertical collectivism variables, redundancy will be avoided by not using competitiveness in the analysis.

Table 3. Individualism Scale Variables.

| Measures of Individualism   | Cronbach's Alpha |
|---|------------------|
| <u>Uniqueness</u>   |                  |
| <i>I enjoy being unique and different from others in many ways.</i>     |                  |
| <i>I often do my own thing.</i>   |                  |
| <i>I am a unique individual.</i>  |                  |
| <i>Uniqueness subscale</i>  | .78              |
| <u>Competitiveness</u>  |                  |
| <i>Winning is everything.</i>   |                  |
| <i>It annoys me when other people perform better than I do.</i>         |                  |
| <i>It is important that I do my job better than others.</i>             |                  |
| <i>I enjoy working in situations involving competition with others.</i> |                  |
| <i>Without competition, it is not possible to have a good society.</i>  |                  |
| <i>Competitiveness subscale</i>   | .79              |
| <u>Independence</u>   |                  |
| <i>I prefer to be direct and forthright when I talk to people.</i>      |                  |
| <i>One should live one's life independently of others.</i>              |                  |
| <i>What happens to me is my own doing.</i>                              |                  |
| <i>When I succeed, it is usually because of my abilities.</i>           |                  |
| <i>I like my privacy.</i>   |                  |
| <i>I often do my own thing.</i>   |                  |
| <i>Independence subscale</i>  | .73              |
| <i>Individualism Scale<br/>(all measures)</i>                           | .80              |

Table 4. Horizontal and Vertical Individualism Scales.

| Measures of Horizontal and Vertical Individualism                       | Cronbach's Alpha |
|---|------------------|
| <u>Horizontal Individualism</u>   |                  |
| <i>I prefer to be direct and forthright when I talk to people.</i>      |                  |
| <i>One should live one's life independently of others.</i>              |                  |
| <i>I often do my own thing.</i>   |                  |
| <i>I like my privacy.</i>   |                  |
| <i>What happens to me is my own doing.</i>                              |                  |
| <i>When I succeed, it is usually because of my abilities.</i>           |                  |
| <i>I enjoy being unique and different from others in many ways.</i>     |                  |
| <i>I am a unique individual.</i>  |                  |
| <i>Horizontal individualism subscale</i>                                | .77              |
| <u>Vertical Individualism</u>   |                  |
| <i>Winning is everything.</i>   |                  |
| <i>It annoys me when other people perform better than I do.</i>         |                  |
| <i>It is important that I do my job better than others.</i>             |                  |
| <i>I enjoy working in situations involving competition with others.</i> |                  |
| <i>Without competition, it is not possible to have a good society.</i>  |                  |
| <i>Vertical individualism subscale</i>                                  | .78              |

### *The Filipino Groups Variable*

Respondents were placed in three groups based on presumed extent of exposure to American individualism: Filipino nationals residing in the Philippines (assigned the Philippine nationals), first generation Filipinos immigrants to the US who were born in the in the Philippines (labeled Filipino immigrants) and Filipinos born in the US (labeled Filipino Americans). Of the three groups, Philippine nationals were assumed to have received the least exposure to American individualist way of life. First generation Filipino immigrants were presumed to have received greater exposure to the same. By virtue of their being born in the United States, Filipino Americans were expected to have the greatest exposure to American individualist culture. Further comparisons were performed based on respondent's country of birth using the dichotomous variable USBORN. Philippine nationals and first generation Filipino immigrants (0) were

combined and compared them with Filipino Americans (1). Additionally, comparisons were made within the Filipino Americans based on their respondents' parents place of birth (Philippines or US). Finally, gender based comparisons were attempted to discern additional differences.

#### *Attitudes toward the Criminal Justice System Variables*

This portion of the survey focused on attitudes toward the criminal justice system. Emphasis was on law enforcement and the court system. Scales were developed to measure punitiveness ( $\alpha=.82$ ), perceptions of the lack of fairness ( $\alpha=.88$ ), rehabilitation ( $\alpha=.85$ ), and respondent's willingness to report a crime committed by a person known to them ( $\alpha=.85$ ) to the authorities. Survey questions were close-ended and participants' responses were on a 10-point rating scale. Table 6 displays an itemized list of scale elements.

Additionally, attitudes toward collective efficacy and restorative justice were also measured. Collective efficacy and restorative justice variables did not meet scale Alpha standards and variables for these constructs were analyzed separately. Three variables were used to measure how respondents felt toward each construct and are listed in Table 5.

Table 5. Variables on Attitudes about the Criminal Justice System.

| Measures of Attitudes toward the Criminal Justice System   | Alpha |
|--|-------|
| <b><u>Punitiveness</u></b>   |       |
| <i>I believe in a tough approach to crime.</i>   |       |
| <i>For persons convicted of murder, the death penalty is an appropriate punishment.</i>  |       |
| <i>Convicted offenders should not be given parole for good behavior.</i>   |       |
| <i>Every crime should have a mandatory sentence assigned.</i>  |       |
| <i>The criminal justice system is too lenient. There should be longer sentences for all crimes.</i>  |       |
| Punitiveness scale   | .82   |
| <b><u>Criminal Justice System Lack of Fairness</u></b>   |       |
| <i>Courts do not treat the poor as well as they treat the rich.</i>  |       |
| <i>Courts do not treat non-whites as well as they treat whites.</i>  |       |
| <i>Generally speaking, the criminal justice system favors the middle and upper classes.</i>  |       |
| <i>I believe that many individuals charged with a crime are not treated fairly in the criminal justice system.</i>   |       |
| CJS Unfair scale   | .88   |
| <b><u>Rehabilitation</u></b>   |       |
| <i>Convicted criminals should receive counseling while in prison.</i>  |       |
| <i>First time, non-violent offenders would be better off being handled in community corrections programs.</i>  |       |
| <i>While in prison, offenders should be provided vocational education and job training.</i>  |       |
| <i>Offenders under the age of 18 should be placed in community rehabilitation programs.</i>  |       |
| <i>In my opinion, the criminal justice system should focus more on helping offenders become law abiding members of society.</i>  |       |
| <i>Offenders found guilty of using illegal drugs should be placed in treatment programs.</i>   |       |
| Rehabilitation scale   | .85   |
| <b><u>Reporting Crime (committed by persons known to respondent)</u></b>   |       |
| <i>You are at a mall department store and see a friend shoplifting. How likely are you to report the incident to the authorities?</i>  |       |
| <i>You witness a friend beating up and hurting another person. How likely are you to report the incident to the police?</i>  |       |
| <i>You have seen a coworker, who is also your friend, stealing office supplies and high value items from your work. How likely are you to report the incident to your supervisor?</i>                                      |       |
| Reporting crime scale  | .85   |
| <b><u>Collective efficacy (not scaled)</u></b>   |       |
| 1. <i>Your neighbors are on vacation and you see some strangers hanging about their house. How likely are you to intervene and ask if they need assistance?</i>  |       |
| 2. <i>You see some neighborhood children spray painting graffiti onto sidewalks and fences. How likely are you to intervene and ask them to stop?</i>  |       |
| 3. <i>A fight breaks out in front of your house between two young neighborhood boys. How likely are you to intervene and ask them to stop?</i>   |       |
| <b><u>Restorative Justice (not scaled)</u></b>   |       |
| 1. <i>Instead of going to court, victims and offenders should be given a chance to meet face-to-face, in the presence of a mediator, to talk about the crime, express their concerns, and work out a restitution plan.</i> |       |
| 2. <i>Upon completion of all assigned punishment, offenders should be welcomed back into the community and given a chance at a fresh start.</i>  |       |
| 3. <i>If I were a victim of simple assault and the offender apologized and volunteered to make full restitution for my medical treatment, I would more likely still call the police and press charges.</i>                 |       |

*Demographic Variables*

The following demographic information was requested from all participants: age in years, sex, level of education attained, place of birth, marital status, number of children, religion, previous crime victimization, and political inclination. Political perspective was measured on a 5 point scale, with 1 being conservative and 5 being liberal. Filipino immigrants were further asked for their year of entry into the United States, if entry was via the military, and place of residence prior to immigration (city, small town, or barrio). Filipino Americans were also asked the number of Filipino parents and place of birth of parents. In addition, all US based participants were asked to indicate their income levels and whether they belonged to any cultural or civic organization.



## CHAPTER IV

### RESULTS

The ultimate goal of this project was to determine whether differences in measures of individualism/collectivism can be used to predict attitudes toward selected criminal justice practices and constructs. It was also hypothesized that varying levels of exposure to American individualist culture would result in significant differences among the Filipino groups surveyed. Initial assessment of the data centered on group characteristics. Among the Filipino groups, further testing probed for significant differences in levels of collectivism, individualism, and attitudes about elements of the criminal justice system. Bivariate analysis was employed to identify significant relationships between criminal justice attitudes and all collectivism and individualism scales and subscales. OLS regression was used to identify statistically relevant predictors of attitudes toward the criminal justice constructs.

#### DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS

Descriptive statistics of the scale variables used in this study are provided in Table 6, and include means, standard deviations, and minimum and maximum values. The relatively high values in the means column for several variables revealed that these are not normally distributed. The mean of 7.70 for the *pakikipagkapwa* (concern for others) variable indicated that most of the data points are clustered around the higher values, implying strength of this cultural trait among those sampled. Contrary to expectations, the means of the individualism (7.26) and vertical individualism (8.04)

measures were comparatively higher than collectivism (6.97) and vertical collectivism (6.77), indicating that the sample leans more toward the individualism end of the I-C continuum. This is consistent with the additional finding that the means of the individualist traits of independence (7.93) and uniqueness (8.27) were much higher than any of the collectivist traits measured. Although finding individualistic tendencies in a sample that was assumed to be collectivist was unexpected, an explanation can be found in previous research. Singelis' (1994) findings indicated that at the micro level of analysis, individualism and collectivism should be considered as separate constructs; individuals can be two-sided. An individual in a collectivist culture could manifest a tendency toward independence. Likewise, individualists could exhibit a strong sense of interdependence. However, at the macro level of analysis, the Individualism-Collectivism continuum remains a valid tool in defining cultural groups (Singelis 1994).

Table 6. Descriptive Statistics of Scale Variables.

| Scale                                      | N   | Min  | Max   | Mean   | Std Dev |
|--|-----|------|-------|--------|---------|
| Individualism                              | 188 | 4    | 10    | 7.2621 | 1.06896 |
| Vertical Individualism                     | 188 | 3.5  | 10    | 8.0412 | 1.03187 |
| Horizontal Individualism                   | 188 | 2.2  | 10    | 6.0077 | 1.72012 |
| Competitiveness                            | 188 | 2.2  | 10    | 6.0077 | 1.72012 |
| Independence                               | 188 | 2.67 | 10    | 7.9291 | 1.12650 |
| Collectivism                               | 190 | 1.78 | 9.96  | 6.9695 | 1.08571 |
| Vertical Collectivism                      | 190 | 1.42 | 9.92  | 6.7705 | 1.24314 |
| Horizontal Collectivism                    | 190 | 1.78 | 10.00 | 7.1831 | 1.16403 |
| <i>Bayanihan</i> (community spirit)        | 189 | 1    | 10    | 6.9196 | 1.51433 |
| Familism                                   | 190 | 1    | 10    | 6.8255 | 1.47958 |
| <i>Pakikipagkapwa</i> (concern for others) | 190 | 1    | 10    | 7.7053 | 1.61151 |
| <i>Pakikisama</i> (SIR)                    | 190 | 1    | 9.80  | 6.7233 | 1.36229 |
| <i>Pakikiramay</i> (show sympathy)         | 191 | 1    | 10    | 6.9415 | 1.59052 |
| Punitiveness                               | 187 | 1.8  | 10    | 6.7107 | 1.17996 |
| CJSunfairness                              | 187 | 1.50 | 10    | 6.9947 | 2.10338 |
| Reporting Crime                            | 185 | 1    | 10    | 6.6090 | 2.10338 |
| Rehabilitation                             | 187 | 1    | 10    | 7.4193 | 1.45105 |

## GROUP COMPARISONS

One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to probe for group differences among the three Filipino groups. Comparisons were initially drawn between Philippine nationals, Filipino immigrants, and Filipino Americans using selected demographic variables to ascertain group characteristics. Subsequent tests evaluated group differences using the individualism and collectivism scales and subscales and the

attitudes toward the criminal justice system scales. In addition, respondents were also grouped by country of birth, gender, and marital status, and tested for significant differences in individualism, collectivism, and attitudes toward criminal justice.

#### *Group Characteristics: Comparing Filipino Groups*

Initial comparisons of the three Filipino groups were made on the basis of gender, marital status, level of educational attainment, and political inclination. In addition, the income levels of Filipino immigrants and Filipino Americans income levels were examined, with no significant differences found. Overall, more females (103) participated in the survey than males (88). This disparity can be attributed to the low participation of males (28%) among Philippine nationals. Forty six percent of all respondents were married.

Significant differences in educational attainment were found between Philippine nationals and Filipino Americans and between Filipino immigrants and Filipino Americans, as determined by one-way ANOVA ( $F = 3.918$ ;  $p = .022$ ). Post hoc results (Table 7) indicated that the Philippine nationals' higher mean score in education were significantly different from those of Filipino Americans ( $p < .05$ ). Likewise, results showed significantly higher levels of educational attainment by Filipino immigrants compared to Filipino Americans ( $p < .10$ ). It should be noted that 61 percent of the sample had attained a bachelor's degree or higher.

Political inclination was measured on a five point conservative to liberal scale. One-way ANOVA results (Table 7) showed significant differences between all groups ( $F = 10.018$ ;  $p = .000$ ). Post hoc test results indicated that Philippine nationals were more

liberal than both Filipino immigrants ( $p < .01$ ) and Filipino Americans ( $p < .05$ ). However, Filipino Americans were more liberal than Filipino immigrants ( $p < .01$ ). Furthermore, a paired samples T-test revealed a direct relationship between educational attainment and political inclination ( $p < .01$ ). Higher educational attainment was correlated with a more liberal political outlook. This is consistent with previous research linking education with political tolerance and liberal attitudes (Bobo and Licari 1989; Phelan, et al. 1995; Shoon et al. 2010).

Table 7. Tukey HSD Results of Group Comparisons on Education and Political Inclination. (Only statistically significant results shown)

| Variable               | Filipino Group  | Filipino Group  | Mean Difference (I-J) | Std.Error |
|------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------------|-----------|
| Educational Attainment | Phil. Nationals | Fil. Americans  | .505*                 | .204      |
|                        | Fil. Immigrants | Fil. Americans  | .382 <sup>+</sup>     | .164      |
| Political Inclination  | Phil. Nationals | Fil. Americans  | .598*                 | .223      |
|                        | Phil. Nationals | Fil. Immigrants | .935**                | .210      |

\*\* =  $p < .01$ ; \* =  $p < .05$ ; <sup>+</sup> =  $p < .10$

#### *The Filipino Groups: Comparisons on Individualism*

Groups were tested for potential differences on the individualism scale, the vertical and horizontal individualism subscales, and individualism trait measures (Table 8). One-way ANOVA results yielded no significant differences between the three Filipino groups on the individualism and horizontal individualism scales. Though not statistically significant, the mean of individualism scores were unexpectedly highest for Philippine nationals and lowest for Filipino Americans. There was a statistically

significant between-groups relationship as determined by one-way ANOVA ( $F = 3.503$ ;  $p = .032$ ). A Tukey post hoc test indicated significant differences on vertical individualism between Philippine nationals and Filipino Americans ( $p < .05$ ), with Philippine nationals scoring unexpectedly higher than their American born counterparts. These results offer minimal support for H1, that there would be significant differences among the groups scores on individualism. Although a significant difference was found in the area of vertical individualism, overall results ran contrary to expectations that greater levels of exposure to American culture would result in Filipino immigrants and Filipino Americans having higher scores on the individualism measures than Philippine nationals. Possibly, present research may have underestimated the influence of American culture on Philippine cultural values, given the almost 48 years of American colonial rule. In spite of Philippine culture remaining collectivist, at the micro level, Filipinos in general may exemplify Singelis' (1994) description of the two-sided individual exhibiting both individualist and collectivist tendencies.

Group comparisons on the individualist trait of uniqueness yielded no statistically significant results. However, differences were noted in one-way ANOVA results (Table 8) for the trait of independence ( $F = 4.038$ ;  $p = .019$ ). Post hoc results established that Filipino immigrants ( $p < .05$ ) and Philippine nationals ( $p < .10$ ) were significantly more independent than Filipino Americans (Table 8). Based on the mean values for each group, Philippine nationals had the highest average and Filipino Americans the lowest. Consistent with the group comparison results on the individualism constructs, trait results also offer no support for H1.

Table 8. The Tukey HSD Results of Group Comparisons on Individualism. (Only statistically significant results shown)

| Variable               | Filipino Group  | Filipino Group | Mean Difference (I-J) | Std.Error |
|------------------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------------|-----------|
| Vertical Individualism | Phil. Nationals | Fil. Americans | .50216*               | .20877    |
|                        | FILIMMS         | Fil. Americans | .36021*               | .16963    |
| Independence           | Phil. Nationals | Fil. Americans | .51959*               | .22729    |
|                        | Fil. Immigrants | Fil. Americans | .47626*               | .18470    |

\* =  $p < .05$ ; + =  $p < .10$

#### *The Filipino Groups: Comparisons on Collectivism*

Based on one-way ANOVA, no significant differences were found among Filipino groups on the general measures of collectivism and horizontal and vertical collectivism. These results provided no support for H2. However, differences were found when comparing groups on specific collectivist traits derived from the collectivism scale.

*Filipino collectivist traits.* Comparing Filipino groups based on collectivist traits provided noteworthy differences in the areas of *bayanihan* (community spirit), familism, and *pakikipagkapwa* (concern for others). Post hoc scores (Table 9) on *bayanihan* (community spirit) revealed significant differences between Filipino immigrants and Filipino Americans ( $p < .05$ ), with the former exhibiting higher means. Philippine nationals ( $p < .05$ ) and Filipino immigrants ( $p < .05$ ) scored significantly higher when compared to Filipino Americans on the familism measure (Table 9).

In tests of *pakikipagkapwa* (concern for others), Philippine nationals scored significantly higher than Filipino Americans ( $p < .01$ ) (Table 9). Filipino immigrants similarly scored higher than Filipino Americans, but the significance level was lower ( $p < .10$ ). Comparisons based on *pakikisama* (smooth interpersonal relations) were not significant for all comparison groups.

Based on the comparisons of the Filipino groups on the collectivism, vertical collectivism, and horizontal collectivism constructs, H2 is not supported by the data. The expected differences in the collectivism constructs did not materialize, implying that Filipino immigrants and Filipino Americans remain generally collectivist. However, support for H3 was found in the analysis of specific Filipino collectivist cultural traits. The lower scores of Filipino Americans in familism, *pakikipagkapwa* (concern for others), and *bayanihan* (community spirit) indicate a reduced strength in each of these traits in second generation Filipino Americans.

Table 9. The Tukey HSD Results of Group Comparisons on Collectivist Traits. (Only statistically significant results shown)

| Variable                                      | Filipino Group  | Filipino Group | Mean Difference (I-J) | Std. Error |
|---|-----------------|----------------|-----------------------|------------|
| <i>Bayanihan</i><br>(community spirit)        | Fil. Immigrants | Fil. Americans | .59145*               | .24928     |
| Familism                                      | Fil. Immigrants | Fil. Americans | .71015*               | .24142     |
|   | Phil. Nationals | Fil. Americans | .69354 <sup>+</sup>   | .29777     |
| <i>pakikipagkapwa</i><br>(concern for others) | Phil. Nationals | Fil. Americans | .92027*               | .32547     |

\* =  $p < .05$ ; <sup>+</sup> =  $p < .10$ .



*The Filipino Groups: Comparisons on Attitudes Toward Criminal Justice Constructs*

*Punitiveness.* Results of one-way ANOVA (Table 10) made evident that when compared to Filipino Americans, Filipino immigrants ( $p < .05$ ) were more likely to be punitive. Though not statistically significant, the mean score for Philippine nationals being higher than that of Filipino Americans (mean difference = .63), indicating the former inclined toward more punitive attitudes than the latter. These results do not support H6 and run counter to expectations. By virtue of their exposure to American individualist culture since birth, Filipino Americans were expected to display more punitive attitudes. However, since Filipino Americans scored lower on individualism than the other two groups, there was support for the basic premise that individualism and punitiveness are directly related.

*Rehabilitation.* Mean scores for the three Filipino groups were all greater than 7 out of a possible 10, indicating highly favorable attitudes toward rehabilitation. There were no significant differences among the Filipino groups, and H7 is not supported.

*Lack of Fairness in the Criminal Justice System.* Philippine nationals differed significantly from Filipino immigrants and Filipino Americans on the issue of criminal justice system's fairness, or lack thereof (Table 10). Philippine nationals assigned higher levels of unfairness to the criminal justice system than both Filipino immigrants ( $p < .01$ ) and Filipino Americans ( $p < .10$ ). All groups believed that the criminal justice system in general, and the court system in particular, favored the middle and upper classes; showing partial support for H8. However, It must be noted that Philippine nationals were

evaluating the Philippine system while Filipino immigrants and Filipino Americans were focused on the criminal justice system in the United States.

*Reporting Crime.* This scale consisted of questions regarding the likelihood of the survey respondent reporting a crime committed by a person known to him or her. Philippine nationals and Filipino immigrants exhibited no significant differences; however, both were more likely to report the crime when compared to Filipino Americans ( $p < .01$ ) (Table 10). Although these results reflect a difference in attitude as proposed in H9, they are not in the expected direction. Filipino Americans were expected to be more likely to report a crime committed by a person known to them. However, these findings are consistent with the previously reported finding that Filipino Americans scored lower on individualism constructs.

Table 10. Post Hoc Results: Group Comparisons on Attitudes Toward Criminal Justice Constructs. (Only statistically significant results shown)

| Variable                                 | Filipino Group  | Filipino Group  | Mean Difference (I-J) | Std. Error |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------------|------------|
| Tukey HSD                                |                 |                 |                       |            |
| CJS Unfairness                           | Phil. Nationals | Fil. Immigrants | .97937*               | .34672     |
|  | Phil. Nationals | Fil. Americans  | .82204 <sup>+</sup>   |            |
| Tamhane T2                               |                 |                 |                       |            |
| Punitiveness                             | Fil. Immigrants | Fil. Americans  | .80190*               | .30267     |
| Reporting crime by person known to resp. | Phil Nationals  | Fil. Americans  | 1.71257**             | .38411     |
|  | Fil. Immigrants | Fil. Americans  | .1.76379**            | .34555     |

\*\* =  $p < .01$ ; \* =  $p < .05$ ; <sup>+</sup> =  $p < .10$

*Restorative Justice.* The three variables concerning attitudes about restorative justice did not meet scale requirements and were examined individually (Table 11). The first restorative variable (mediation) was based on the question: *Instead of going to court, victims and offenders should be given a chance to meet face-to-face, in the presence of a mediator, to talk about the crime, express their concerns, and work out a restitution plan.* One-way ANOVA indicated that Philippine nationals were significantly different from both Filipino immigrants ( $p < .05$ ) and Filipino Americans ( $p < .01$ ). Based on the higher means, Philippine nationals expressed more favorable attitudes than the latter two groups. The second restorative justice variable (fresh start) reflected responses to the following question: *Upon completion of all assigned punishment, offenders should be welcomed back into the community and given a chance at a fresh start.* Philippine nationals provided more favorable responses and differed significantly from Filipino Americans ( $p < .01$ ) and Filipino immigrants ( $p < .10$ ). The third restorative justice variable, litigation, measured the likelihood of pressing charges in spite of restorative justice initiatives and consisted of responses to the question: *If I were a victim of simple assault and the offender apologized and volunteered to make full restitution for my medical treatment, I would more likely still call the police and press charges.* No significant differences were found between the three groups. Based on the ANOVA results of significant differences in two of the restorative justice variables, H10 is well supported.

Table 11. Post Hoc Results: Group Comparisons on Attitudes Toward Restorative Justice Constructs. (Only statistically significant results shown)

| Variable                                       | Filipino Group  | Filipino Group  | Mean Difference (I-J) | Std. Error |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------------|------------|
| Tamhane T2                                     |                 |                 |                       |            |
| Attitude toward mediation                      | Phil. Nationals | Fil. Immigrants | 1.228*                | .423       |
|  | Phil. Nationals | Fil. Americans  | 1.831**               | .426       |
| Tukey HSD                                      |                 |                 |                       |            |
| Attitude toward giving Offenders a fresh start | Phil. Nationals | Fil. Immigrants | .786+                 | .351       |
|  | Phil. Nationals | Fil. Americans  | 1.099*                | .375       |

\*\* =  $p < .01$ ; \* =  $p < .05$ ; + =  $p < .10$

*Collective Efficacy.* The variables concerning attitudes about collective efficacy did not meet scale requirements and were examined individually (Table 12). The first collective efficacy variable (concern for neighbors) was based on the question: *Your neighbors are on vacation and you see strangers hanging about their house. How likely are you to intervene and ask if they need assistance?* There were no significant variations between the three Filipino groups on this variable. The second collective efficacy variable (stopping graffiti) was based on the question: *You see some neighborhood children spray painting graffiti onto sidewalks and fences. How likely are you to intervene and ask them to stop?* A significant difference emerged between Filipino immigrants and Filipino Americans ( $p < .01$ ). Based on the differences in means, first generation immigrants were more likely to intervene and attempt to dissuade the spray painting of graffiti. The third variable (breaking up fights) was based on the question: *A fight breaks out in front of your house between two young neighborhood boys. How likely are you to intervene and ask them to stop?* Filipino immigrants were

significantly more likely to intervene than both Philippine nationals ( $p < .05$ ) and Filipino Americans ( $p < .10$ ). These results find minimal support for H11.

Intuitively, Philippine nationals and Filipino immigrants were expected to have minimal differences in collective efficacy. The high scores of Filipino immigrants should have at least been equaled by Philippine nationals, given the collectivist nature of their culture. In retrospect, present research may not have accounted for the role of grass roots community associations, the *barangays*, in informal social control. These community organizations are tasked with maintaining order in neighborhoods (Ruland 1986). All Filipino citizens are required to be members of a *barangay*. The low scores of Philippine nationals on collective efficacy could be a reflection on the effectiveness of the *barangays* and not necessarily a lack of concern for the community. Given this, the responses of first generation Filipino immigrants could be more representative of the importance of collective efficacy in Filipino culture. The significant differences between first and second generation Filipino immigrants become more noteworthy and merit further research.

Table 12. Post Hoc Results: Attitudes Toward Collective Efficacy. (Only statistically significant results shown)

| Variable  | Filipino Group  | Filipino Group  | Mean Difference (I-J) | Std. Error |
|---|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------------|------------|
| Tamhane T2  |                 |                 |                       |            |
| Stop children from painting graffiti              | Fil. Immigrants | Fil. Americans  | 1.423**               | .420       |
| Intervening in fights among neighborhood children | Phil. Nationals | Fil. Immigrants | -.990*                | .352       |
|   | Fil. Immigrants | Fil. Americans  | .823+                 | .375       |

\*\* =  $p < .01$ ; \* =  $p < .05$ ; + =  $p < .10$

### *Comparisons Based on Country of Birth*

One-way ANOVA comparisons of the three Filipino groups indicated minimal differences between Philippine nationals and Filipino immigrants. Further tests were performed grouping respondents by country of birth (0 = Philippine-born; 1 = US-born) using Independent Samples T-tests. Comparisons were made on individualism, collectivism, and attitudes constructs, with significant results displayed in Table 13. Philippine born respondents (Philippine nationals and Filipino immigrants) were found to score higher on individualism ( $p < .05$ ) and vertical individualism ( $p < .01$ ) compared to their US born counterparts. In addition, Philippine born participants were significantly more independent than those born in the United States ( $p < .01$ ).

No significant differences were found using the collectivism, horizontal collectivism, and vertical collectivism scales. However, results revealed significant differences in comparisons of collectivist traits (Table 13). Compared to US-born participants, Philippine-born respondents had significantly stronger familism-based attitudes ( $p < .01$ ). In addition, the Philippine-born group significantly differed from their US-born counterparts on the *pakikipagkapwa* (concern for others) trait; with respondents born in the Philippines displaying stronger measures on this construct ( $p < .05$ ). Further, Philippine-born respondents were also more likely to exhibit *bayanihan* (community spirit), although at a lower level of significance ( $p < .10$ ).

T-test were also used to compare Philippine-born with US-born respondents on attitudes regarding criminal justice constructs (Table 13). Compared to their US-born counterparts, Philippine-born survey participants displayed significantly more punitive attitudes ( $p < .01$ ) and were more likely to report a crime committed by a person known to

them ( $p < .01$ ). Philippine-born respondents were also more inclined to support the restorative justice concepts of mediation ( $p < .05$ ) and giving an offender a fresh start ( $p < .10$ ). For collective efficacy, Philippine-born respondents were significantly more likely ( $p < .01$ ) to intervene to stop the painting of graffiti on neighborhood sidewalks and fences.

Overall, comparisons based on country of birth identified more statistically significant results than results from one-way ANOVA comparisons of Philippine nationals, Filipino immigrants, and Filipino Americans. It is assumed that most Philippine-born respondents will have been less influenced by American individualist culture and will therefore differ significantly from their US-born counterparts. This country of birth variable was eventually used in regression analyses aimed at identifying potential predictors of attitudes.

Table 13. T-tests Results: Comparing Respondents Grouped by Country of Birth. (Only statistically significant results are displayed)

| Variables   | Country of Birth | Mean | df  | t                  |
|---|------------------|------|-----|--------------------|
| Individualism   | Philippines      | 7.37 | 182 | 1.976*             |
|   | United States    | 7.04 |     |                    |
| Vertical Individualism  | Philippines      | 8.19 | 182 | 2.726**            |
|   | United States    | 7.75 |     |                    |
| Indiv. Trait – Independence   | Philippines      | 8.11 | 182 | 3.136**            |
|   | United States    | 7.57 |     |                    |
| Coll. Trait – Familism  | Philippines      | 7.01 | 182 | 2.642**            |
|   | United States    | 6.41 |     |                    |
| Coll. Trait – <i>Pakikipagkapwa</i><br>(concern for others)         | Philippines      | 7.88 | 182 | 2.358*             |
|   | United States    | 7.29 |     |                    |
| Coll. Trait – <i>Bayanihan</i><br>(community spirit)                | Philippines      | 7.08 | 182 | 1.714*             |
|   | United States    | 6.67 |     |                    |
| Punitiveness  | Philippines      | 6.95 | 182 | 3.052**            |
|   | United States    | 6.14 |     |                    |
| Reporting Crime   | Philippines      | 7.10 | 182 | 5.045**            |
|   | United States    | 5.55 |     |                    |
| Restorative Justice: Attitudes on<br>Mediation                      | Philippines      | 5.90 | 181 | 2.466*             |
|   | United States    | 4.97 |     |                    |
| Restorative Justice: Attitudes on giving<br>offenders a fresh start | Philippines      | 7.11 | 181 | 1.819 <sup>+</sup> |
|   | United States    | 6.58 |     |                    |
| Collective efficacy: Stopping children<br>from painting graffiti    | Philippines      | 5.90 | 181 | 2.466*             |
|   | United States    | 4.97 |     |                    |

\*\* =  $p < .01$ ; \* =  $p < .05$ ; <sup>+</sup> =  $p < .10$

### *Comparisons Based on Gender*

Gender- based comparisons performed using all individualism, collectivism, and attitude variables produced significant findings in three areas (Table 14). Males scored significantly higher on individualism ( $p < .05$ ) and horizontal individualism ( $p < .01$ ).



Female respondents were significantly higher on the variable *pakikipagkapwa* or concern for others ( $p < .05$ ).

Table 14: T-tests: Comparing Respondents Grouped by Gender. (Only statistically significant results are displayed)

| Variable  | Sex    | Mean   | df  | t        |
|---|--------|--------|-----|----------|
| Individualism   | Female | 7.0975 | 179 | -2.449*  |
|   | Male   | 7.4533 |     |          |
| Horizontal Individualism                                    | Female | 5.5896 | 179 | -3.946** |
|   | Male   | 6.4931 |     |          |
| Coll. trait - <i>Pakikipagkapwa</i><br>(concern for others) | Female | 7.9439 | 179 | 2.344*   |
|   | Male   | 7.3985 |     |          |

#### *Comparisons Based on Marital Status*

Respondents' marital status (0=single; 1=married) was also used as a basis for comparison (Table 15). Based on T-test results, no differences were found using all the individualism variables; however, several significant results emerged using collectivism and criminal justice attitude variables. Married respondents averaged significantly higher on familism ( $p < .01$ ), horizontal collectivism ( $p < .10$ ), and *bayanihan* (community spirit) ( $p < .10$ ). In addition, married respondents were also more punitive ( $p < .01$ ) and were more likely to report a crime committed by someone they knew ( $p < .01$ ). On the other hand, singles were more likely to have less favorable attitudes toward collective efficacy ( $p < .01$  for all three collective efficacy variables). Singles were also more likely to judge the criminal justice to be unfair ( $p < .05$ ).

Table 15. T-tests: Comparing Respondents Grouped by Marital Status. (Only statistically significant results are displayed)

| Variable   | Marital Status | Mean | df  | t                    |
|--|----------------|------|-----|----------------------|
| Horizontal Collectivism  | Single         | 7.04 | 178 | -1.820 <sup>+</sup>  |
|  | Married        | 7.36 |     |                      |
| Coll. trait – Familism   | Single         | 6.54 | 172 | -2.595 <sup>**</sup> |
|  | Married        | 7.09 |     |                      |
| Coll. trait – <i>Bayanihan</i><br>(community spirit)                   | Single         | 6.72 | 178 | -1.885 <sup>+</sup>  |
|  | Married        | 7.15 |     |                      |
| Punitiveness   | Single         | 6.33 | 178 | -2.790 <sup>**</sup> |
|  | Married        | 7.03 |     |                      |
| CJS Unfairness   | Single         | 7.27 | 178 | 2.431 <sup>*</sup>   |
|  | Married        | 6.61 |     |                      |
| Reporting Crime  | Single         | 6.19 | 178 | -2.729 <sup>**</sup> |
|  | Married        | 7.03 |     |                      |
| Restorative Justice: Favor Litigation<br>over Restitution.             | Single         | 6.26 | 180 | -1.738 <sup>+</sup>  |
|  | Married        | 6.82 |     |                      |
| Collective Efficacy: Concern for<br>Neighbor's Property                | Single         | 6.91 | 180 | -3.577 <sup>**</sup> |
|  | Married        | 8.12 |     |                      |
| Collective Efficacy: Stop Children<br>from Painting Graffiti           | Single         | 6.80 | 164 | -6.391 <sup>**</sup> |
|  | Married        | 8.71 |     |                      |
| Collective Efficacy: Intervene in Fight<br>among Neighborhood Children | Single         | 7.01 | 170 | -6.622 <sup>**</sup> |
|  | Married        | 8.78 |     |                      |

## BIVARIATE CORRELATIONS

To identify potential predictors of criminal justice attitudes, bivariate correlations were performed between all individualism, collectivism, and attitude scale variables. Significant results are displayed in three tables. Table 16 presents correlation

results between I-C scales and attitude scales. Tables 17 and 18 displays results between I-C scales and restorative justice and collective efficacy variables, respectively.

### *Punitiveness*

Results of bivariate comparisons (Table 16) revealed that the punitiveness variable had a direct and significant relationship with individualism, horizontal and vertical individualism, and the individualist traits of uniqueness and independence. The individualism scale variable manifested the strongest relationship ( $p < .01$ ;  $r = .374$ ), followed by the trait variable independence ( $p < .01$ ;  $r = .337$ ). These direct correlations indicate that individualists are more likely to manifest punitive attitudes toward offenders. Unexpectedly, a weak but significant relationship was found between punitiveness and familism ( $p < .01$ ;  $r = .191$ ).

### *Rehabilitation*

The rehabilitation variable exhibited moderately strong, significant relationships with collectivism, vertical collectivism, and horizontal collectivism at ( $p < .01$ ); with the collectivism exhibiting the strongest relationship ( $r = .361$ ). In addition, results shown in Table 16 demonstrated that rehabilitation was significantly correlated with all collectivist traits. The collectivist trait *pakikipagkapwa* (concern for others) manifested the strongest statistical relationship ( $p < .01$ ;  $r = .436$ ), followed by *bayanihan* (community spirit) ( $p < .01$ ;  $r = .341$ ). Unexpectedly, rehabilitation was shown to have weak but statistically significant relationships with individualism ( $p < .05$ ;  $r = .152$ ), vertical individualism ( $p < .05$ ;  $r = .183$ ), uniqueness ( $p < .01$ ;  $r = .196$ ), and independence ( $p < .05$ ;  $r = .147$ ). Overall,

the collectivist traits of *pakikipagkapwa* (concern for others) and *bayanihan* (community spirit) proved to be the strongest potential predictors of favorable attitudes toward rehabilitation; however, the significantly relevant individualism variables also merited further analysis.

### *Reporting Crime*

The reporting crime variable correlated directly with the individualist trait of independence ( $p < .05$ ;  $r = .157$ ), indicating that respondents with higher levels of independence are more likely to report a crime committed by a person known to them. However, the reporting crime variable was also shown to have direct relationships with the collectivist traits of familism ( $p < .05$ ;  $r = .166$ ), and *pakikiramay* (showing sympathy) ( $p < .05$ ;  $r = .137$ ). Survey participants scoring high on these traits were also more likely to report the crime previously described.

### *Criminal Justice System Lack of Fairness*

The CJS unfairness variable was significantly correlated with a vertical collectivism ( $p < .05$ ;  $r = .157$ ). In addition, CJS unfairness exhibited direct, significant relationships with the collectivist traits familism ( $p < .05$ ;  $r = .146$ ) and *pakikipagkapwa* (concern for others) ( $p < .01$ ;  $r = .225$ ). The correlation with these collectivism variables imply that collectivist respondents were more likely to view the criminal justice system as unfair to offenders.

Table 16. Bivariate Correlations: I-C Variables with Attitudes. (Only significant relationships shown; read from left to right)

| Variable                                      |                  | Rehabilitation | CJS<br>unfairness | Punitiveness | Reporting<br>Crime |
|---|------------------|----------------|-------------------|--------------|--------------------|
| Individualism                                 | Pearson <i>r</i> | .152*          |                   | .374**       |                    |
|   | Sig              | .030           |                   | .000         |                    |
| Vert. Individualism                           | Pearson <i>r</i> | .183*          |                   | .316**       |                    |
|   | Sig              | .010           |                   | .000         |                    |
| Horiz. Individualism                          | Pearson <i>r</i> |                |                   | .301**       |                    |
|   | Sig              |                |                   | .000         |                    |
| Uniqueness                                    | Pearson <i>r</i> | .196**         |                   | .191**       |                    |
|   | Sig              | .008           |                   | .009         |                    |
| Independence                                  | Pearson <i>r</i> | .147*          |                   | .337**       | .157*              |
|   | Sig              | .046           |                   | .000         | .033               |
| Collectivism                                  | Pearson <i>r</i> | .361**         |                   |              |                    |
|   | Sig              | .000           |                   |              |                    |
| Vert. Collectivism                            | Pearson <i>r</i> | .267**         | .157*             |              |                    |
|   | Sig              | .000           | .033              |              |                    |
| Horiz.  | Pearson <i>r</i> | .304**         |                   |              |                    |
|   | Sig              | .000           |                   |              |                    |
| Familism                                      | Pearson <i>r</i> | .195**         |                   | .191**       | .166*              |
|   | Sig              | .007           |                   | .009         | .024               |
| <i>Pakikipagkapwa</i><br>(concern for others) | Pearson <i>r</i> | .436**         | .225**            |              |                    |
|   | Sig              | .000           | .002              |              |                    |
| <i>Bayanihan</i><br>(community spirit)        | Pearson <i>r</i> | .341**         |                   |              |                    |
|   | Sig              | .000           |                   |              |                    |
| <i>Pakikisama</i><br>(SIR)                    | Pearson <i>r</i> | .177*          |                   |              |                    |
|   | Sig              | .016           |                   |              |                    |
| <i>Pakikiramay</i><br>(show sympathy)         | Pearson <i>r</i> | .199**         |                   |              | .137*              |
|   | Sig              | .007           |                   |              | .034               |

N=184

### *Restorative Justice*

Three variables were used to measure attitudes toward restorative justice. These did not meet scale requirements and were analyzed individually. The variables on mediation and giving offenders a fresh start exhibited significant relationships with most collectivism variables (Table 17). The mediation variable had a relatively strong relationship with collectivism ( $p < .01$ ;  $r = .268$ ) and the collectivist *pakikipagkapwa* (concern for others) trait ( $p < .01$ ;  $r = .267$ ). Weaker, statistically significant correlations also existed between this mediation variable and familism ( $p < .01$ ;  $r = .242$ ), *pakikisama* (SIR) ( $p < .05$ ), and *pakikiramay* (sympathy) ( $p < .05$ ) (Table 17). The fresh start variable displayed the relatively strongest relationships with the trait variables *pakikipagkapwa* (concern for others) ( $p < .01$ ;  $r = .278$ ) and *bayanihan* (community spirit) ( $p < .01$ ;  $r = .267$ ). Weaker relationships were found with the general collectivism scale ( $p < .01$ ;  $r = .223$ ) and the horizontal collectivism ( $p < .01$ ;  $r = .229$ ). The third restorative variable measuring a preference for litigation had statistically significant associations with vertical individualism ( $p < .01$ ;  $r = .274$ ), the individualist traits independence ( $p < .01$ ;  $r = .282$ ) and uniqueness ( $p < .05$ ;  $r = .164$ ), and the collectivist trait familism ( $p < .05$ ;  $r = .169$ ). This variable inquired about the likelihood of a victim still pressing charges after an offender's apology and restitution. On the scale of 1 – 10, a high score would indicate the survey respondent's unfavorable attitude toward restorative justice. (Note: when attempting to create a restorative justice scale variable, the values for the litigation variable were reversed).

Table 17. Bivariate Correlations: I-C Variables with Attitudes on Restorative Justice. (Only significant relationships shown; read from left to right)

| Variable                                      |                         | Restorative Justice:<br>Willingness to<br>Accept Mediation | Restorative Justice:<br>Favor Fresh Start<br>for Offenders | Restorative Justice:<br>Favor Litigation<br>over Restitution |
|---|-------------------------|--|--|--|
| Individualism                                 | Pearson <i>r</i><br>Sig |  |  | .194**<br>.009   |
| Vert. Individualism                           | Pearson <i>r</i><br>Sig |  |  | .274**<br>.000   |
| Uniqueness                                    | Pearson <i>r</i><br>Sig |  |  | .164*<br>.028  |
| Independence                                  | Pearson <i>r</i><br>Sig |  |  | .282**<br>.000   |
| Collectivism                                  | Pearson <i>r</i><br>Sig | .268**<br>.000   | .223**<br>.003   |  |
| Vert. Collectivism                            | Pearson <i>r</i><br>Sig | .254**<br>.001   |  |  |
| Horiz. Collectivism                           | Pearson <i>r</i><br>Sig | .221**<br>.003   | .229**<br>.002   |  |
| Familism                                      | Pearson <i>r</i><br>Sig | .242**<br>.001   |  | .169*<br>.023  |
| <i>Pakikipagkapwa</i><br>(concern for others) | Pearson <i>r</i><br>Sig | .267**<br>.000   | .278**<br>.000   |  |
| <i>Bayanihan</i><br>(community spirit)        | Pearson <i>r</i><br>Sig |  | .267**<br>.000   |  |
| <i>Pakikisama</i><br>(SIR)                    | Pearson <i>r</i><br>Sig | .170*<br>.023  |  |  |
| <i>Pakikiramay</i><br>(show sympathy)         | Pearson <i>r</i><br>Sig | .185*<br>.013  | .210**<br>.005   |  |

N=179

### *Collective Efficacy*

Three variables were used to measure attitudes about collective efficacy. The first measured the likelihood of the respondent's willingness to look after the property of an

absent neighbor. Results showed that the concern for an absent neighbor was correlated with horizontal collectivism ( $p < .05$ ) and the collectivism traits of *bayanihan* (community spirit) ( $p < .01$ ;  $r = .203$ ) and *pakikiramay* (sympathy) ( $p < .05$ ) (Table 18).

A second collective efficacy variable assessed the likelihood of the respondent stopping neighborhood children from painting graffiti. Results indicated that the willingness of the respondent to intervene was significantly associated with the collectivist traits *pakikiramay* (sympathy) ( $p < .01$ ;  $r = .242$ ), *bayanihan* (community spirit) ( $p < .01$ ;  $r = .209$ ), and familism ( $p < .05$ ) (Table 18). Furthermore, significant relationships were also found with horizontal collectivism ( $p < .05$ ), vertical individualism ( $p < .05$ ), and the independence trait variable ( $p < .05$ ). The third efficacy variable measured the likelihood of respondent interfering in fights among neighborhood children. Results displayed in Table 18 suggest a correlation with horizontal collectivism ( $p < .05$ ;  $r = .162$ ) and the collectivist traits *bayanihan* (community spirit) ( $p < .01$ ;  $r = .263$ ), *pakikiramay* ( $p < .05$ ;  $r = .171$ ), and familism ( $p < .05$ ;  $r = .149$ ).



Table 18. Bivariate Correlations: I-C Variables with Attitudes on Collective Efficacy. (Only significant relationships shown; read from left to right)

| Variable                               |                  | Collective Efficacy:<br>Concern for<br>Neighbor's Property | Collective Efficacy:<br>Stop Children from<br>Painting Graffiti | Collective Efficacy:<br>Intervene in Fight of<br>Neighborhood Kids |
|--|------------------|--|---|--|
| Vert. Individualism                    | Pearson <i>r</i> |  | .192*   |  |
|  | Sig              |  | .010  |  |
| Uniqueness                             | Pearson <i>r</i> |  | .163*   |  |
|  | Sig              |  | .030  |  |
| Independence                           | Pearson <i>r</i> |  | .191*   |  |
|  | Sig              |  | .010  |  |
| Horiz. Collectivism                    | Pearson <i>r</i> | .157*  | .169*   | .162*  |
|  | Sig              | .035   | .024  | .031   |
| Familism                               | Pearson <i>r</i> |  | .191*   | .149*  |
|  | Sig              |  | .011  | .046   |
| <i>Bayanihan</i><br>(community spirit) | Pearson <i>r</i> | .203**   | .209**  | .263**   |
|  | Sig              | .006   | .005  | .000   |
| <i>Pakikiramay</i><br>(show sympathy)  | Pearson <i>r</i> | .157*  | .242**  | .171*  |
|  | Sig              | .035   | .000  | .022   |

N=179

## REGRESSION RESULTS

Ordinary Least Squares regression analyses were utilized to identify potential predictors of attitudes toward the criminal justice system. Control variables employed in all analyses consisted of level of education, gender, marital status, and political inclination. Due to the high number of missing values (7%), age was not used in the analyses. However, exploratory analyses revealed that age was not statistically significant in any of the regression runs. The dichotomous country of birth variable was utilized to determine the potential impact of American individualist culture. Individualism and collectivism variables were selected for each analysis based on the significance of bivariate relationships with attitude variables.

### *Attitudes Toward Punitiveness*

The results of linear regression on the effects of individualism, familism, *pakikipagkapwa* (concern for others), country of birth, and control variables on punitive attitudes are displayed in Table 19, Model 1. Individualism ( $\beta = .391$ ) and familism ( $\beta = .191$ ) were directly correlated with punitive attitudes. Although familism is a collectivist trait, the direct relationship with punitive attitudes could suggest the importance of family safety concerns over the welfare of offenders. On the other hand, political inclination ( $\beta = -.290$ ), *pakikipagkapwa* (concern for others) ( $\beta = -.156$ ), and country of birth ( $\beta = -.144$ ) were inversely related to punitiveness. The inverse relationship between political inclination and punitiveness indicated that conservative respondents displayed more punitive attitudes. Likewise, lower scores on the collectivist trait of *pakikipagkapwa* (concern for others) were associated with more punitive outlooks. Unexpectedly, Philippine-born respondents manifested more punitive attitudes than their US-born counterparts. This inverse relationship ran counter to the expectations expressed in H5. It was expected that exposure to US individualist culture would result in more punitive attitudes. However, this result is consistent with findings that Philippine-born respondents had significantly higher individualism scores than their US-born counterparts. Based on *beta* values, individualism and political inclination were the strongest predictors of punitive attitudes, followed by the collectivist traits familism and *pakikipagkapwa* (concern for others), and country of birth. The strength of individualism as a predictor of punitiveness lends support for Hypothesis 4, which proposed that measures of individualism can be used to predict attitudes toward the criminal justice

system. Model 1 is slightly weak ( $R^2 = 0.325$ ), indicating that other factors have an impact on punitive attitudes.

Model 2 (Table 19) displays the effects of using the independence and uniqueness trait scales in lieu of the individualism variable, with all other variables retained from Model 1. This model was exploratory in nature to determine whether using the specific individualist traits would leave to a better model. As in Model 1, political inclination ( $\beta = -.219$ ), *pakikipagkapwa* (concern for others) ( $\beta = -.220$ ), and country of birth ( $\beta = -.148$ ) remained inverse and significant. The trait variables of independence ( $\beta = .282$ ) and familism ( $\beta = .211$ ) exhibited direct relationships with punitiveness, while the uniqueness trait variable was not statistically relevant. The successful use of these traits as significant predictors of punitiveness provided support for Hypothesis 5, which stipulated that specific traits can be used to predict attitude. Model 1 ( $R^2 = .325$ ) is slightly stronger than Model 2 ( $R^2 = .307$ ).

Table 19. Linear Regression Results: Punitiveness Models.

| Variable                                   | Unstandardized Coefficient<br>B | Std. Error | Standardized Coefficient<br>Beta |
|--|---------------------------------|------------|----------------------------------|
| <b>Model 1</b>                             |                                 |            |                                  |
| Education                                  | -.135                           | .113       | -.079                            |
| Political Inclination (Liberal)            | -.332                           | .106       | -.290**                          |
| Gender (Male)                              | -.095                           | .220       | -.028                            |
| Marital Status (Married)                   | .317                            | .223       | .093                             |
| Country of birth (USborn)                  | -.518                           | .240       | -.144*                           |
| Individualism                              | .627                            | .101       | .391**                           |
| Familism                                   | .220                            | .082       | .191*                            |
| Pakikipagkapwa                             | -.165                           | .079       | -.156*                           |
| Constant                                   | 3.491                           | .900       |                                  |
| <b>Model 2</b>                             |                                 |            |                                  |
| Education                                  | -.208                           | .115       | -.122+                           |
| Political Inclination (Liberal)            | -.330                           | .109       | -.219**                          |
| Gender (Male)                              | .059                            | .222       | .017                             |
| Marital Status (Married)                   | .178                            | .227       | .052                             |
| Country of birth (USborn)                  | -.535                           | .244       | -.148*                           |
| Independence                               | .429                            | .123       | .282**                           |
| Uniqueness                                 | .181                            | .112       | .129                             |
| <i>Pakikipagkapwa</i> (concern for others) | -.232                           | .082       | -.220**                          |
| Familism                                   | .244                            | .084       | .211**                           |
| Constant                                   | 3.755                           | 1.116      |                                  |

Dependent Variable: Punitiveness. N = 191

Model 1: R Square = .325; F significance = .000

Model 2: R Square = .307; F significance = .000

### *Attitudes Toward Rehabilitation*

Table 20 Model 1 displays the impact of collectivism and individualism on attitudes toward rehabilitation, while controlling for gender, marital status, education, political inclination, and country of birth. Collectivism ( $\beta = .358$ ) and political inclination ( $\beta = .332$ ) manifested statistical significant, direct relationships with rehabilitation. Based on the beta values, collectivism was the strongest predictor of attitudes toward rehabilitation. The significant impact of collectivism lends support for Hypothesis 4 on the feasibility of using I-C to predict attitudes toward rehabilitation. Based on the results

of bivariate correlations indicating that individualism was significantly correlated with rehabilitation, individualism was included in this model. Results showed that individualism ( $\beta = .122$ ) was a significant but weak predictor in the model. Though not statistically valid, the beta for marital status being negative indicated that singles are more likely to support rehabilitation than married respondents. The country of birth variable was not statistically significant, indicating that the country of birth had no significant impact on attitudes toward rehabilitation. The R Square of .265 for the model was relatively weak.

Table 20 Model 2 assessed the impact of the collectivist trait variables on attitudes toward rehabilitation. The collectivism variable was replaced with the trait variables of *pakikipagkapwa* (concern for others) and *bayanihan* (community spirit). *Pakikipagkapwa* (concern for others) had the strongest impact ( $\beta = .297$ ), followed by political inclination ( $\beta = .246$ ), and *bayanihan* (community spirit) ( $\beta = .235$ ). With an R Square of .304, Model 2 was relatively stronger than Model 1. Consistent with previous group comparisons, no differences were significant based on country of birth. It would appear that for this Filipino sample as a whole, the strength of collectivism and the specific collectivist traits *pakikipagkapwa* (concern for others) and *bayanihan* (community spirit) correlate with favorable attitudes toward rehabilitation.

Table 20. Linear Regression Results: Attitudes about Rehabilitation.

| Variable                        | Unstandardized<br>Coefficient<br>B | Std. Error | Standardized<br>Coefficient<br>Beta |
|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------|-------------------------------------|
| Model 1                         |                                    |            |                                     |
| Education                       | .039                               | .098       | .027                                |
| Political Inclination (Liberal) | .422                               | .085       | .332**                              |
| Gender (Male)                   | .140                               | .189       | .049                                |
| Marital Status (Married)        | -.055                              | .194       | -.019                               |
| Country of birth (USborn)       | .149                               | .207       | .049                                |
| Collectivism                    | .474                               | .085       | .358**                              |
| Individualism                   | .165                               | .088       | .122 <sup>+</sup>                   |
| Constant                        | 1.399                              | .990       |                                     |
| Model 2                         |                                    |            |                                     |
| Education                       | .050                               | .096       | .035                                |
| Political Inclination (Liberal) | .313                               | .088       | .246**                              |
| Gender (Male)                   | .340                               | .185       | .118 <sup>+</sup>                   |
| Marital Status (Married)        | -.064                              | .191       | -.022                               |
| Country of birth (USborn)       | .242                               | .203       | .080                                |
| Pakikipagkapwa                  | .265                               | .066       | .297**                              |
| Bayanihan                       | .224                               | .065       | .235**                              |
| Constant                        | 2.484                              | .675       |                                     |

Dependent Variable: Rehabilitation. N = 191.

Model 1: R Square = .265; F significance = .000

Model 2: R Square = .304; F significance = .000

### *Attitudes about the Lack of Fairness of the Criminal Justice System*

Results displayed in Table 21 Model 1 shows the impact of vertical collectivism, vertical individualism, education, marital status, gender, political inclination, and country of birth on attitudes about the lack of fairness of the criminal justice system. The model was weak, with an R Square of .142. Political inclination proved to be the strongest predictor ( $\beta = .262$ ), followed by vertical collectivism ( $\beta = .188$ ).

In Model 2 (Table 21), the collectivism variable was replaced with the collectivist traits of *pakikipagkapwa* (concern for others) and familism. Political inclination ( $\beta = .256$ ), familism ( $\beta = .179$ ), and marital status ( $\beta = -.147$ ) manifested statistical significance.

Table 21. Linear Regression Results. Attitudes about the Lack of Fairness in the Criminal Justice System.

| Variable                        | Unstandardized Coefficient<br>B | Std. Error | Standardized Coefficient<br>Beta |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------|----------------------------------|
| <b>Model 1</b>                  |                                 |            |                                  |
| Education                       | .037                            | .133       | .021                             |
| Political Inclination (Liberal) | .417                            | .116       | .262**                           |
| Gender (Male)                   | -.181                           | .253       | -.050                            |
| Marital Status (Married)        | -.504                           | .262       | -.140 <sup>+</sup>               |
| Country of birth (USborn)       | -.070                           | .280       | -.018                            |
| Vertical Collectivism           | .272                            | .101       | .188**                           |
| Vertical Individualism          | .148                            | .123       | .084                             |
| Constant                        | 2.892                           | 1.325      |                                  |
| <b>Model 2</b>                  |                                 |            |                                  |
| Education                       | .053                            | .134       | .030                             |
| Political Inclination (Liberal) | .408                            | .126       | .256**                           |
| Gender (Male)                   | -.119                           | .257       | -.033                            |
| Marital Status (Married)        | -.530                           | .264       | -.147*                           |
| Country of birth (USborn)       | -.033                           | .282       | -.009                            |
| Familism                        | .218                            | .097       | .179*                            |
| Pakikipagkapwa                  | .067                            | .094       | .060                             |
| Constant                        | 3.859                           | .963       |                                  |

Dependent Variable: CJS Unfairness. N = 191.

Model 1: R Square = .142; F significance = .000

Model 2: R Square = .142; F significance = .000

### *Attitudes on Willingness to Report a Crime*

Table 22 displays the impact of the country of birth, collectivist traits, and control variables on the respondents willingness to formally report a crime committed by a person known to them. The willingness to report a crime variable was more of a measure of the survey participant's attitude about his or her personal responsibility and less about the criminal justice system. Only the country of birth exhibited statistical significance, but was inversely related, indicating that Philippine-born respondents would be more inclined to report a crime committed by a person known to them. This was an unexpected result, since in theory, collectivist respondents would be less likely to

formally report the offense and be more likely to resort to less formal means of addressing the issue. The traits of *pakikisama* (SIR) and *pakikipagkapwa* (concern for others), presumed to be of relevance to the construct, were not statistically significant. On the other hand, this result was consistent with the previous finding that Philippine-born respondents had unexpectedly higher individualism scores than their US-born counterparts.

Table 22. Linear Regression Results: Willingness to Report a Crime.

| Variable                        | Unstandardized Coefficient<br>B | Std. Error | Standardized Coefficient<br>Beta |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------|----------------------------------|
| Model 1                         |                                 |            |                                  |
| Education                       | .051                            | .152       | .025                             |
| Political Inclination (Liberal) | -.165                           | .133       | -.090                            |
| Gender (Male)                   | -.005                           | .290       | -.001                            |
| Marital Status (Married)        | .349                            | .302       | .084                             |
| Country of birth (USborn)       | -1.351                          | .319       | -.308**                          |
| Familism                        | .046                            | .114       | .033                             |
| Pakikiramay                     | .136                            | .104       | .104                             |
| Constant                        | 5.964                           | 1.050      |                                  |

Dependent Variable: Willingness to Report a Crime. N = 191.  
R Square = .156; F significance = .000

#### *Attitudes on Restorative Justice*

Three separate variables were used to examine attitudes on restorative justice. These variables did not meet scale requirements and were assessed individually. Table 23 displays the impact of the collectivism, country of birth, and control variables on the restorative justice variables on willingness to accept mediation, willingness to give offenders a fresh start, and favoring litigation over restitution and apology. Results identified collectivism ( $\beta = .253$ ) and country of birth ( $\beta = -.150$ ) as significant predictors



of favorable attitudes toward mediation. As expected, more collectivist respondents and Philippine-born participants held significantly more favorable attitudes on mediation.

Two models were used in examining the willingness to give offenders a fresh start upon completion of punishment. (Table 23). Model 1 results show collectivism ( $\beta = .194$ ) and political inclination ( $\beta = .250$ ) as significant; an indication that collectivists and liberals are more likely to favor giving offenders a fresh start. The R-square of .126 reflected weakness and a failure to identify other influences on this restorative justice construct. In Model 2 (Table 23), collectivism was replaced with the collectivist trait *bayanihan*. The modest R-square increase to .152 indicated that, compared to the general collectivism variable, the collectivist *bayanihan* trait may be a better fit for the model. The negative  $\beta$  of country of birth in the mediation and fresh start models consistently sustain the idea that Philippine-born respondents are more supportive of restorative justice constructs.

Values for the third restorative justice variable measured in the opposite direction from the previous two. Respondents were asked about their likelihood of favoring litigation in spite of an offender's apology and restitution. A favorable response would indicate a lack of support for restorative justice. Results shown in Table 23 display the impact of independence and control variables. The model is extremely weak (R square=.088); with one variable, the individualist trait of independence ( $\beta = .317$ ), being the only significant predictor of a victim's likelihood of pressing charges and not accepting a restorative justice resolution.

Table 23. Linear Regression Results: Restorative Justice.

| Variable                           | Standardized<br>Coefficient<br>Beta | Standardized<br>Coefficient<br>Beta | Standardized<br>Coefficient<br>Beta | Standardized<br>Coefficient<br>Beta |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
|                                    | DV: Mediation                       | DV: Fresh start<br>Model 1          | DV: Fresh Start<br>Model 2          | DV: favor<br>litigation vs. RJ      |
| Education                          | .035                                | .006                                | -.003                               | -.038                               |
| Political Inclination<br>(liberal) | .043                                | .250*                               | .243**                              | -.074                               |
| Gender (male)                      | -.010                               | .085                                | .088                                | -.038                               |
| Marital Status (married)           | -.082                               | .009                                | -.009                               | .108                                |
| Country of birth (US-born)         | -.150*                              | -.120                               | -.113                               | .110                                |
| Collectivism                       | .253**                              | .194*                               |                                     |                                     |
| Bayanihan<br>Independence          |                                     |                                     | .255**                              | .317**                              |
| R Square                           | .104                                | .126                                | .152                                |                                     |
| F Significance                     | .002                                | .000                                | .000                                |                                     |

N = 191.

#### *Attitudes on Collective Efficacy*

The three variables used to assess attitudes on collective efficacy did not meet statistical scale requirements and were examined individually. The first variable inquired about the likelihood of respondents intervening in behalf of absent neighbors. Results displayed in Table 24 show that marital status ( $\beta = .221$ ) and the collectivist trait *bayanihan* ( $\beta = .155$ ) were significant predictors of this collective efficacy variable. Married respondents and those with higher scores on *bayanihan* (community spirit) were more likely to look out for the welfare of absent neighbors. However, the model is extremely weak ( $R^2 = .088$ ) and does not identify other predictors of the construct.

A second collective efficacy variable examined the likelihood of respondents intervening to stop neighborhood children from painting graffiti on sidewalks and fences. Results of linear regression, shown in Table 25, identify significant predictors of the construct: marital status ( $\beta = .350$ ), the collectivist trait *pakikiramay* ( $\beta = .156$ ), and

country of birth ( $\beta = -.228$ ). Married respondents and those scoring high on *pakikiramay* (show sympathy) were more likely to have favorable views on collective efficacy. The negative coefficient for country of birth indicated that Philippine-born respondents were more likely to intervene and curb the deviant behavior of neighborhood children.

The third and final collective efficacy variable was based on the likelihood of the survey participant intervening in a fight that breaks out between two neighborhood children and asking them to stop. Results (Table 26) identify two statistically significant predictors of the likelihood of intervention: marital status ( $\beta = .389$ ;  $p < .01$ ) and the collectivist trait *bayanihan* ( $\beta = .089$ ;  $p < .01$ ). Married respondents and those with higher scores on community spirit were more likely to intervene and ask the neighborhood children to stop fighting.

Table 24. Linear Regression Results: Collective Efficacy.

| Variable                            | Standardized Coefficient | Standardized Coefficient          | Standardized Coefficient    |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|
|                                     | Beta                     | Beta                              | Beta                        |
|                                     | DV: Care for neighbors   | DV: Intervene in Graffiti by Kids | DV: Stop Kids from Fighting |
| Education                           | .037                     | .062                              | .034                        |
| Political Inclination (liberal)     | -.042                    | -.009                             | -.017                       |
| Gender (male)                       | .034                     | .015                              | .073                        |
| Marital Status (married)            | .221**                   | .350**                            | .389**                      |
| Country of birth (US-born)          | .027                     | -.228*                            |                             |
| <i>Bayanihan</i> (community spirit) | .155*                    |                                   | .181*                       |
| <i>Pakikiramay</i> (show sympathy)  |                          | .156*                             |                             |
| R Square                            | .088                     | .210                              | .214                        |
| F Significance                      | .009                     | .000                              | .000                        |

N = 191.

## CHAPTER V

### ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

This exploratory analysis involved three simple, separate steps. First, one-way ANOVA and T-tests were used to identify differences among the Filipino groups on I-C constructs and attitudes about criminal justice constructs. Second, bivariate correlations were performed to identify significant relationships between I-C variables and attitude variables. Third, OLS regression analyses were employed to determine if the significant group differences found and I-C variables identified were statistically relevant predictors of the attitudes being analyzed.

#### GROUP COMPARISONS ON INDIVIDUALISM

Based on the concepts of the I-C perspective, the first three hypotheses proposed differences between Philippine nationals, Filipino immigrants, and Filipino Americans on individualism and collectivism constructs. Finding few differences in three-way comparisons using one-way ANOVA, subsequent evaluations based on country of birth were performed using Independent samples T-tests to explore for further differences. Overall, expected differences did not materialize in comparisons using the individualism, horizontal individualism, and uniqueness scales. As anticipated, Philippine-born respondents scored higher on collectivism measures. Unexpectedly, Philippine-born respondents placed significantly higher on individualism measures. This was unforeseen, since it is widely accepted that Philippine society is collectivist. In Hofstede's (1984) country individualism index, the Philippines ranked 28<sup>th</sup> among 39 nations, with a score

significantly below the group mean. In contrast, the United States placed first on the list. It was expected that Filipinos with greater exposure to American culture would exhibit significantly higher levels of individualism. The lack of differences may indicate that the influence of American culture on Filipino values, given the almost fifty years of American colonial rule, may have been underestimated. Furthermore, the impact of American individualist culture on second generation Filipino Americans may have been overestimated. Philippine born respondents also scored unexpectedly higher on vertical individualism as well as collectivism measures. Nevertheless, the high scores of Philippine nationals in both individualism and collectivism constructs may not be that much of a contradiction and finds support in research. Singelis (1994) asserted that, while cultural groups may be placed along the I-C continuum, it is possible for individuals to be two-sided; having both individualist and collectivist tendencies based on the co-existence of an independent self and an interdependent self. The two-sided nature may be a reflection of the impact of American colonial rule; however, measures of this phenomenon were not used in present research. Further, the small, highly educated sample of Philippine residents may not truly represent the collectivist nature of the society. Further research with a large, representative sample is necessary to validate present findings.

A further measure of individualism, using the individualist trait of independence, revealed results inconsistent with expectations. First generation Filipinos (immigrants) exhibited the highest levels on this measure. Further research into situational influences could provide possible explanations. Arguably, first generation immigrants might have

had limited sources of social support compared to Philippine nationals and US-born Filipino Americans, making independence a necessary element of their existence.

Based on the comparatively higher scores of Philippine-born respondents on individualism measures, results of current research challenges the widespread assumption that American culture is decidedly more individualistic than Philippine culture. Additionally, the position of the Philippines along the I-C continuum may need reevaluation. Triandis (1995) posits that capitalism, industrialization, and material affluence leads to individualism. Without question, these factors have had considerable impact on Philippine culture, and potentially at the individual level. Although the current study was not tailored to make comparisons at the cultural level, future studies should address this issue to gain a more accurate placement of the Philippines on the I-C continuum.

A different perspective could be used to explain why Philippine-born respondents scored higher on individualism measures. Current study used the theoretical framework of the I-C perspective, however, an alternate approach based on minority stress theory could be employed. Minority stress is experienced by a person identifying with a stigmatized group that is subjected to prejudice and discrimination (Wei et al. 2010). In research on Filipino immigrants and US-born Filipino Americans, Mossakowski (2003) found that the strong ethnic identity and ethnic pride in Filipino immigrants offers protection against the effects of stress due to racial or ethnic discrimination. Her findings indicated that US-born Filipino Americans, scoring lower on ethnic identity, were more likely to feel more stress from discrimination, resulting in more mental health issues. From birth, US-born Filipino Americans' acculturation experience is based on the beliefs,

values, and norms of the dominant white group. The paradox lies in their being US-born and being non-white, experiencing inequality and discrimination resulting in minority stress. Mossakowski's (2003) research could provide additional explanation for US-born respondents' lower scores on individualism in current research. Without the buffering effect of a strong ethnic identity, American-born Filipinos are more likely to experience higher levels of minority stress than their Philippine-born counterparts. Intuitively, such stress could result in low self-esteem and reduced self-reliance, both key attributes of individualists. Further, being subjected to discrimination and prejudice can result in mistrust, or at the very least a lack of confidence, in the society and its institutions. This could provide a partial explanation for the unexpectedly lower scores of US-born Filipinos in the areas of punitive attitudes and reporting crime committed by persons in their in-group. Future studies on the impact of I-C on minority populations should include an assessment of minority stress in measures to be used.

#### GROUP COMPARISONS ON COLLECTIVISM

Comparisons of the three Filipino groups on collectivism, vertical collectivism, and horizontal collectivism produced no significant results. Consistent with these findings, grouping respondents by country of birth similarly gave no results of statistical relevance. The lack of significant differences on I-C measures implies that, in general, collectivist practices are being transmitted to Filipino Americans. However, distinct differences were found when comparisons were made using specific Filipino collectivist traits.

In the three-way group comparisons, one-way ANOVA results revealed no significant differences in any of the trait measures comparing Philippine nationals and first generation immigrants. Statistically relevant differences were found when these two groups were compared to second generation Filipino Americans on the traits of familism, *pakikipagkapwa* (concern for others), and *bayanihan* (community spirit). These differences were best reflected when respondents were grouped by country of birth. Philippine-born respondents exhibited significantly higher scores on measures of these traits. Similar results can be found in Grimm and colleagues' (1999) research findings that Filipino students valued collectivist traits more than their U.S. counterparts. In addition, their research determined that in both Philippine and U.S. cultures, collectivist traits were deemed more socially desirable. Findings in present research indicated statistically significant downward trends in the strength of familism, *pakikipagkapwa* (concern for others), and *bayanihan* (community spirit) in second generation Filipino Americans. These trends parallel Mossakowski's (2003) previously discussed findings of a weakening of ethnic identity and pride in US-born Filipino Americans. In contrast, ethnic identity, pride, and solidarity were evident in the early waves of Filipino immigrants, as evidenced in Bulosan's (1973) work. However, the impact of American individualist culture on this trend can only be inferred at this time. Socialization practices or environmental influences could potentially have an influence on these outcomes. Further research is needed to determine causal elements for the decline in the aforementioned traits.

Comparisons of respondents grouped according to gender yielded results in the expected direction. Differences based on gender were consistent with previous research



findings (Grimm et al. 1999; Gilligan 1982 cited in Kobayashi, Kerbo, and Sharp 2010) that males manifested more individualistic tendencies. Gender-based comparisons on collectivism were statistically significant for the trait *pakikipagkapwa* (concern for others). Results were in the expected direction; females exhibited higher measures of the trait. Similarly, differences based on marital status were in the expected direction. Married respondents had significantly higher scores on measures of horizontal collectivism, familism, and *bayanihan* (community spirit).

#### FILIPINO GROUPS, I-C, AND ATTITUDES

Between-group analysis of attitudes produced mixed results. Philippine-born respondents were shown to be more individualist and more punitive than their American-born counterparts. However, Philippine-born participants were expectedly more favorable toward the communitarian constructs of restorative justice and collective efficacy. In contrast, although US-born respondents scored lower on individualism measures, they manifested less favorable attitudes toward restorative justice and collective efficacy. This can be viewed as additional support for Singelis; (1994) finding that individuals can manifest both individualist and collectivist traits.

In separate models, individualism and the individualist trait independence were shown to be significant predictors of punitive attitudes. Using the all-inclusive individualism variable resulted in a slightly stronger model. The direct relationship between the individualism variables and punitive attitudes was in the anticipated direction. Similarly, the inverse relationship between punitive attitudes and the collectivist *pakikipagkapwa* (concern for others) trait was also anticipated. The direct

relationship between punitive attitudes and familism can be seen as the prioritization of concern for family over offenders (outgroup), and is compatible with *pakikipagkapwa* (concern for others) going in the opposite direction. Theoretically, family safety concerns could contribute to punitive attitudes toward external criminal elements. On the other hand, the statistically significant inverse relationship between country of birth and punitive attitudes was not anticipated. Philippine-born respondents were significantly more punitive than their US-born counterparts. As previously mentioned, these results were consistent with the similarly unforeseen higher scores on individualism measures of Philippine-born over US-born respondents. The differences in levels of punitive attitudes between the two groups can be accepted in a general sense, with the following reservation. This outcome must be viewed with caution due to the differences in the criminal justice systems of the two countries. The Philippines has a formal criminal justice system comparable to the United States; however, restorative justice practices are also employed at the grassroots level that result in community-based solutions to lesser crimes. The grassroots *barangay* community organization exists in all neighborhoods and the *barangay tanods* (neighborhood guardians) patrol the streets around the clock. The *barangay* officials and the *tanods* are empowered to handle acts of delinquency and minor crimes. Therefore, Philippine-born respondents may have associated crime with more serious offenses handled by their formal criminal justice system, while US-born participants possibly considered both serious and lesser crimes. Without a doubt, future research may need to incorporate crime-specific measures to account for differences in the criminal justice practices of the two countries.

In several models, collectivism and/or collectivist traits were found to be statistically relevant predictors of attitudes. As expected, there was a strong and direct relationship between the all-inclusive collectivism variable and rehabilitation. Replacing collectivism with the collectivist traits *bayanihan* (community spirit) and *pakipagkapwa* (concern for others) resulted in a statistically stronger model. Likewise, collectivism and the collectivist trait *bayanihan* (community spirit) were significant predictors of attitudes about restorative justice. In particular, collectivists were shown to be more inclined to favor mediation and giving offenders a fresh start. Replacing the collectivism variable with the collectivist *bayanihan* (community spirit) trait resulted in a stronger fresh start model. Philippine-born respondents were also more likely to favor mediation. The *bayanihan* (community spirit) trait was also significant predictor in two of three collective efficacy models, while *pakikiramay* (show sympathy) was statistically relevant in the third. These findings were consistent with the expectation that members of collectivist societies would view restorative justice and collective efficacy more positively. In further comparisons based on marital status, married respondents also exhibited more favorable attitudes toward collective efficacy. Though this result was expected, it must be noted that the survey questions asked about behaviors more relevant to married respondents. In assessing attitudes on criminal justice system fairness, results indicated that vertical collectivists were more likely to sense a lack of fairness in the courts and law enforcement. Vertical collectivists are described as more likely to accept inequality (Triandis 1995) and could be more cognizant of inequities in the application of justice. Overall, the relationships between collectivism variables and attitudes on criminal justice constructs yielded few unanticipated results.

One unexpected outcome was found concerning attitudes about reporting a crime committed by a person known to the survey respondent. This scale variable consisted of questions about three types of crimes: simple assault, shoplifting, and minor employee theft. In each scenario, the hypothetical perpetrator was supposed to be a friend of the respondent. Results ran counter to expectations. Philippine-born respondents were more likely to report crimes by persons known to them. The hypothetical offender being a friend placed him or her within the respondent's in-group. It was expected that Filipino collectivist traits such as *pakikisama* (SIR) would override the sense of duty or obligation to report the crime and influence survey participants to consider less formal alternatives. Further, members of collectivist societies place a high priority on in-group relationships and harmony. Collectivists also tend to place high importance on forgiveness, especially toward in-group members (Exline et al. 2003). It follows that the high regard for forgiveness and the desire for smooth interpersonal relations within the in-group should have resulted in Philippine-born respondents being less likely to report a crime by a person within their in-group. Then again, similar to punitive attitudes, this result is consistent with the higher scores of Philippine respondents on two individualism variables. As previously discussed, this finding can arguably be supported by Mossakowski's (2003) research on minority stress. In addition, the existence of the *barangay* and the accessibility and quick response of the *tanods* (neighborhood guardians) make the reporting of crime relatively effortless in Philippine communities.

A second unforeseen outcome was the strength of the measure of the political inclination control variable as a predictor of several of the attitudes being analyzed. Respondents who self-identified as conservative were more likely to exhibit punitive

attitudes toward criminal offenders. Liberal participants in the study were more likely to be supportive of rehabilitation, giving offenders a fresh start (restorative justice), and were more likely to consider the criminal justice system as lacking in fairness. These relationships were in the expected direction.

Hypotheses Four and Five proposed links between individualism-collectivism and attitudes related to criminal justice. Both hypotheses were partially supported.

Individualism variables manifested strong relationships with punitive attitudes and one of the restorative justice variables. The rehabilitation scale displayed significant relationships with all but one of the I-C variables; however, the strongest relationships were with collectivism and collectivist traits. The variables for criminal justice unfairness, collective efficacy, and restorative justice manifested significant correlations with collectivist traits.

Results of regression analyses had significant implications for the concepts examined in this exploratory analysis. First, Filipino groups, represented by the country of birth variable, was a significant predictor in only four of fourteen attitude models: punitiveness, willingness to report a crime, mediation, and collective efficacy variable. Therefore, the hypothesized influence of exposure to American culture on attitudes received only limited support. Nevertheless, these initial findings suggest further examination in future research, possibly with a much larger, balanced sample.

Second, for this sample of Filipinos overall, I-C variables were significant predictors of several attitudes. In separate models, individualism, collectivism, and their associated traits manifested significant relationships with attitudes. Third, in comparisons based on I-C constructs, collectivist trait measures proved to be just as

effective as the general collectivism scales in discerning meaningful group differences. The use of traits enabled the identification of specific collectivist cultural practices. The traits of *pakikipagkapwa* (concern for others), *bayanihan* (community spirit), and familism were the most useful of the five measures designed specifically for Filipino respondents. For *pakikisama* (smooth interpersonal relations) and *pakikiramay* (showing sympathy), the weakness of these variables may be a function of the validity of the measures used in their construction. Overall, compared to the more general individualism and collectivism measures, individualist and collectivist traits were shown to be statistically significant predictors of attitudes. The validity of the all-inclusive I-C scales is not questioned here. Rather, trait measures seemingly provide more specific links between attitudes and cultural practices. The usefulness of these traits in present research is supportive of previous studies highlighting the importance of trait measures in understanding Filipino personality and behavior. (Church 1987; Church and Katigbak 2000; Church 2009).

## SOCIAL SUPPORT

Specific variables addressing social support were not created for the following reasons. The collective trait scales of familism, *bayanihan* (community spirit), and *pakikipagkapwa* (concern for others) consisted mainly of variables involving social support. The familism scale contained variables regarding the respondents' likelihood of giving support at the family level. Variables assessing the provision of support at the community level were included in the *bayanihan* scale. Finally, the *pakikipagkapwa* scale variables consisted of one variable on providing assistance to anyone in need and

two variables regarding support for government assistance to those in need of shelter and other forms of assistance. The social support questions used in all three scales were in keeping with Cullen's (1994) definition of social support in terms of the responsiveness to the needs of others. Sarason and colleagues also state that it is the "existence or availability of people on whom we can rely on" (1983:127). High values on the three measures indicate a general willingness to provide social support to in-groups (familism; *bayanihan*) and out-groups (*pakikipagkapwa*). Results from group comparisons did point to a statistically significant reduction in the levels of these three desirable collectivist traits in US-born respondents. Based on Cullen's (1994) theory, the reduction of support can have potentially negative consequences, among them the increased likelihood of criminal involvement. Present research did not address the likelihood of participation in criminal activity. These results are not conclusive and must be viewed with caution. Present analysis involved only two generations of Filipinos in the United States. Future research should include as many immigrant generations as possible.

## RESEARCH IMPLICATIONS

Research results lead to several implications. First, the modest differences among Filipino groups on some of the measured constructs provide some encouragement and indicate the need for further research on the impact of cultural influences on I-C and attitudes toward criminal justice constructs. A larger data set that includes several generations of Filipino Americans may lead to more definitive conclusions regarding the hypothesized variation in the levels of I-C.

Second, the use of Individualism-Collectivism trait measures in predicting attitudes merits further consideration in research. Traits were shown to be easily quantifiable and allows for the identification of specific cultural practices. The direct relationships between collectivism/collectivist traits and attitudes about restorative justice, rehabilitation, and collective efficacy suggest the possible inclusion of I-C general and trait variables in future research in these areas. For example, culture-specific assessment measures of community spirit, concern for others, sympathy, and familism could be designed for use with any target population. The strength of collectivist trait measures may be relevant to the acceptance or rejection of restorative justice, rehabilitation, and collective efficacy initiatives in communities under study.

Third, for the Filipino American community, the weakening of the highly valued traits of familism, *pakikipagkapwa* (concern for others), and *bayanihan* (community spirit) in second generation Filipino Americans may be of concern. In Grimm and associates' (1999) research, collectivist traits were found to be the most preferred characteristics in both individualist and collectivist cultures. Retaining the strength of the aforementioned traits across generations would undoubtedly be a desired result, given that the family and the community are key sources of social support for Filipino Americans in the United States. A continued decline in the levels of these traits in subsequent generations could result in much reduced social support. In turn, reduced levels of social support increase the likelihood of participation in criminal activity (Cullen 1994).



## RESEARCH LIMITATIONS

There were several limitations to this study. First, the sample size was small. The use of Facebook precludes determining the number of people reached; however, the software used identified a total of 1001 views/attempts and only 191 completed surveys. One possible reason for the low number of completed questionnaires was the length of the survey (87 questions). The length of the I-C *a priori* measures was a contributing factor; out of 87 questions, 45 were needed to measure I-C constructs. Another possible explanation may have been the deviation from the common practice of providing respondents with a reward incentive.

Second, the use of Facebook as a data collection tool may need further examination. Facebook enabled the collection of data from Philippine residents and Filipinos in fourteen states with no costs incurred. However, wide dissemination of a survey via social media may not necessarily result in high rates of completion. Some Facebook clients may be occasional users, with weeks or months between views. Also, if the Facebook administrator or user does not anchor the post about the survey, it can easily get buried under more recent posts, making it more likely to be ignored. In addition, the use of Facebook as the only data collection tool may have inadvertently limited survey access to people in middle and higher income groups. The median household income for US based respondents was in the \$60-80,000 range and was above US median household income. Information on household incomes was not collected from Philippine residents; however, based on the level of education measures, Philippine-based participants having the highest mean education level attained among all the groups increases the likelihood of these respondents being mostly middle and upper class. Also, the argument can be made

that access to computers and extended internet access may be more available to middle and higher income respondents.

A third limitation involved the lack of representation from third and subsequent generations of Filipino Americans. Though present research did find significant differences, a broader sample across several generations might provide more definitive variations in I-C perspectives and attitudes. Improvements in data collection methods could make this possible.

Fourth, since the survey questions revolved around cultural practices and specific attitudes, it can be expected that respondents answers may have included a component of social desirability. Respondents may have based their responses to survey questions on the accepted norms and provided answers deemed socially acceptable (Hofstede and McRae 2004). Not desiring to go against social norms and practices, survey participants may have selected responses that they considered culturally appropriate. In the future, researchers may need to include multiple methods of data collection, quantitative and qualitative, to examine and possibly account for the impact of social desirability on their measures.

A final limitation is the potential relevance of age differences not being included in the analysis. Exploratory analyses did reveal that age was not statistically significant to the present sample, nevertheless, future studies should try to account for the impact of age on I-C and attitudes. Based on these limitations, significant findings in present research should be viewed with caution and should not be assumed as readily generalizable to the Filipino population nor to Filipino American groups.

## CHAPTER VI

### CONCLUSIONS

Initially, present research was premised on the expectation of differences in measurable levels of individualism and collectivism among Philippine nationals, Filipino immigrants, and Filipino Americans. For reasons previously discussed, these differences did not materialize. Most of the differences found were among Philippine-born and US-born respondents, mostly in levels of specific collectivist traits. The influence of American individualist culture on I-C differences can only be inferred; the relative weakness of regression models indicate that other factors influencing attitudes have not been considered or identified. The significantly favorable attitudes of Philippine-born respondents to rehabilitation, restorative justice, and collective efficacy can be attributed to the collectivist nature of Philippine culture at the macro level. This is reinforced by the relative strength of their collectivist traits measures when compared to US-born respondents. Nonetheless, based on present research, the reduced strength of collectivist traits in US-born respondents cannot be conclusively attributed to the influence of American individualist culture. A holistic approach that accounts for environmental and societal influences may yield better results. Yet in spite of research limitations, the serious implications attached to the significantly reduced levels in the desirable collectivist traits of *bayanihan* (community spirit), *pakikipagkapwa* (concern for others), and familism among second generation Filipino Americans should garner interest and provide motivation for further inquiry. The potential of reduced levels of social support, coupled with the increased likelihood of criminal participation, should be of concern to

both the Filipino community and the larger society. Future tests should also attempt to include measures of criminal participation.

Some questions remain unanswered and new ones bear asking. First, the hypothesized differences between Filipino groups along the I-C continuum were not conclusively determined. The extent to which Philippine culture is collectivist in contemporary times may need reevaluation and its position on the I-C continuum reexamined. The possibility exists that Philippine culture may no longer be as collectivist as assumed. A holistic approach analyzing the potential impact of industrialization, capitalism, material affluence, urbanization, and other social and environmental variables might produce a better understanding of I-C in present-day Philippine culture. This, in turn, would provide a solid basis for comparing the different Filipino groups examined herein. Second, further examination is required to determine whether the differences found in collectivist traits among the Filipino immigrants and US-born Filipino Americans weaken the assumption of a homogeneous population. Third, the assumption that people who lean more towards collectivism will be less individualistic may not be a viable one. Present research indicated that strength in both collectivism and individualism can be found in one group (Philippine-born respondents), supportive of the work of Singelis (1994) and Kobayashi and colleagues (2010). Future research should be open to the possibility of individuals displaying high levels of both individualist and collectivist traits. Due to the limitations of the sample size, a definite conclusion cannot be drawn from current findings and further testing is needed. Fourth, given the significant relationships between the specific individualist and collectivist trait variables with attitudes regarding criminal justice constructs, the question arises whether

culturally-specific measures of these traits can be applied to the general population. Trait scores could be a useful tool in predicting public acceptance to criminal justice initiatives. Linking I-C traits and attitudes on criminal justice constructs demonstrated adequate statistical relevance and should merit consideration in future attitudinal research in criminology. Collectivist traits, in particular, can potentially be used to gauge public acceptance of ideas and policies in the areas of punishment, rehabilitation, restorative justice, and collective efficacy. Culture-specific trait measures can be developed to target specific groups or populations. Overall, the individualism-collectivism perspective provided a valuable and useful theoretical framework for this research. Present work was exploratory, and additional steps along the research ladder need to be taken to find answers to these questions.

## REFERENCES

- Agbayani-Siewert, Pauline. 2004. "Assumptions of Asian American Similarity: The Case of Filipino and Chinese American Students." *Social Work* 49(1):39-51.
- Alsaybar, Bangele D. 1999. "Deconstructing Deviance: Filipino American Youth Gangs, 'Party Culture', and Ethnic Identity in Lons Angeles." *Amerasia Journal* 25(1):117-138.
- Alvarez, Alvin, Linda Juang, and Christopher T. H. Liang. 2006. "Asian Americans and Racism: When Bad Things Happen to Model Minorities." *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology* 12(3):477-492.
- Aquino, Clemen. 2004. "Mula sa Kinaroroonan: Kapwa, Kapatiran, and Bayan in Philippine Social Science." *Asian Journal of Social Science* 32(1):105-139.
- Arce, Wilfredo F. 2003. "Values, Organizational Culture, and Organizations." *The Loyola Schools Review of Social Sciences Online*.
- Bautista, Veltisezar. 1999. *The Filipino Americans from 1763 to the Present: Their History, Culture, and Traditions*. Farmington Hills, MI: Bookhaus Publishers.
- Bellah, Robert N., Richard Madsen, William M. Sullivan, Ann Swidler, and Steven M. Tipton. 2008. *Habits of the Heart*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Bhutta, Christine Brinkman. 2012. "Not by the Book: Facebook as a Sampling Frame." *Sociological Methods and Research* 41(1):57-88.
- Bierbrauer, Gunter, Heike Meyer, and Uwe Wolfradt. 1994. "Measurement of Normative and Evaluative Aspects in Individualistic and Collectivistic Orientations." Pp. 189-199 in *Individualism and Collectivism: Theory, Method, and Applications*, edited by Uichol Kim, Harry C. Triandis, Cigdem Kagitcibasi, Sang-Chin Choi, and Gene Yoon. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Bobo, Lawrence and Frederick C. Licari. 1989. "Education and Political Tolerance." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 53:285-308.
- Bonus, Rick. 2000. *Locating Filipino Americans: Ethnicity and the Cultural Politics of Space*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Bui, Hoan N. 2008. "Parent-Child Conflicts, School Troubles, and Differences in Delinquency Across Immigrant Generations." *Crime and Delinquency* 55(3):412-441.

- Bulosan, Carlos. 1973. *America Is in the Heart*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press. (first published in 1946)
- Chang, Janet and Thao N. Le. 2009. "The Influence of Parents, Peer Delinquency, and School Attitudes on Academic Achievement in Chinese, Cambodian, Laotian of Mien, and Vietnamese Youth." *Crime & Delinquency* 51(2):238-264.
- Chung, Ruth H. Gim, Bryan S. Kim, and Jose M. Abreu. 2004. "Asian American Multidimensional Acculturation Scale: Development, Factor Analysis, Reliability, and Validity." *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology* 10(1):66-80.
- Church, A. Timothy. 1987. "Personality Research in a Non-Western Culture: The Philippines." *Psychological Bulletin* 102(2):272-292.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2009. "Prospects for an Integrated Trait and Cultural Psychology." *European Journal of Personality* 23:153-182. DOI: 10.1002/per.700.
- Church, A. Timothy and Marcia S. Katigbak. 2000. "Trait Psychology in the Philippines." *American Behavioral Scientist* 44(1):73-94.
- Cukur, CemSafak, Maria Rosario De Guzman, and Gustavo Carlo. 2004. "Religiosity, Values, and Horizontal and Vertical Individualism-Collectivism: A Study of Turkey, the United States, and the Philippines." *Journal of Social Psychology* 144(6):613-634.
- Cullen, Francis T. 1994. "Social Support as an Organizing Concept for Criminology: Presidential Address to the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences." *Justice Quarterly* 11(4):527-559.
- Dasgupta, Shamita. 2000. "Charting the Course: An Overview of Domestic Violence in the South Asian Community in the United States." *Journal of Social Distress and the Homeless* 9(3):173-185.
- David, E. J. R., and Sumie Okazaki. 2006. "Colonial Mentality: A Review and Recommendation for Filipino American Psychology." *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology* 12(1):1-16.
- Enriquez, Virgilio G. 1992. *From Colonial to Liberation Psychology: The Philippine Experience*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1977. Cited in Church, A. Timothy and Marcia S. Katigbak. 2000. "Trait Psychology in the Philippines." *American Behavioral Scientist* 44(1):73-94.
- Exline, Julie Juola, Everett L. Worthington, Jr., Peter Hill, and Michael E. McCullough. 2003. "Forgiveness and Justice: A Research Agenda for Social and Personality Psychology." *Personality and Social Psychology Review* 7(4):337-348.

- Fuligni, Andrew J. and Sara Pedersen. 2002. "Family Obligation and the Transition to Adulthood." *Developmental Psychology* 38(5):856-868.
- Garchitorena, Victoria P. 2007. "Diaspora Philanthropy: The Philippine Experience." Prepared for The Philanthropic Initiative, Inc. and the Global Equity Initiative, Harvard University.
- Gregory, Aleix and Fabiola Baltar. 2013. "Ready to Complete the Survey on Facebook: Web 2.0 as a Research Tool in Business Studies." *International Journal of Market Research* 55(1):131-148.
- Grimm, Stephanie D., A. Timothy Church, Marcia S. Katigbak, and Jose Alberto S. Reyes. 1999. "Self-Described Traits, Values, and Moods Associated with Individualism and Collectivism: Testing I-C Theory in an Individualistic (U.S.) and a Collectivist (Philippine) Culture." *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 30(4):466-500.
- Guerrero, Anthony P.S., Earl S. Hishinuma, Naleen N. Andrade, Stephanie Nishimuna, and Vanessa L. Cunanan. 2006. "Correlations Among Socioeconomic and Family Factors and Academic, Behavioral, and Emotional Difficulties in Filipino Adolescents in Hawaii." *International Journal of Social Psychiatry* 52(4):343-359.
- Guyotte, Rolad L. and Barbara M. Posadas. 1992. "Jose Rizal and the Changing Nature of Filipino Identity in an American Setting: Filipinos in Twentieth-Century Chicago." *Revue Francais D'etudes Americaines* 51:45-53.
- Hall, Ronald E. 2002. "Myth of the "Model Minority": Stereotype and the Reality of Asian American Gangs." *Asian Profile* 30(6):541-548.
- Hayner, Norman S. 1938. "Social Factors in Oriental Crime." *The American Journal of Sociology* 43(6):908-919.
- Hofstede, Geert. 1984. *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hofstede, Geert and Robert R. McCrae. 2004. "Personality and Culture Revisited: Linking Traits and Dimensions of Culture." *Cross-Cultural Research* 38(1):52-88.
- Hui, C. Harry. 1988. "Measurement of Individualism-Collectivism." *Journal of Research in Personality* 22:17-36.
- Hunt, Geoffrey, Kristin Evans, Eileen Wu, and Alicia Reyes. 2005. "Asian American Youth, the Dance Scene, and Club Drugs." *Journal on Drug Issues* Fall 2005:695-732.



- Jang, Sung Joon. 2002. "Race, Ethnicity, and Deviance: A Study of Asian and Non-Asian Adolescents in America." *Sociological Forum* 17(4):647-680.
- Karstedt, Susanne. 2001. "Comparing Cultures, Comparing Crime: Challenges, Prospects, and Problems for a Global Criminology." *Crime, Law, and Social Change* 36:285-308.
- Kobayashi, Emiko, Harold R. Kerbo, and Susan F. Sharp. 2010. "Differences in Individualistic and Collectivistic Tendencies Among College Students in Japan and the United States." *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* 5(1-2):59-84.
- Kim, Tia E. and Sharon G. Goto. 2000. "Peer Delinquency and Parental Social Support as Predictors of Asian American Adolescent Delinquency." *Deviant Behavior* 21:331-347.
- Lefever, Samuel, Michael Dal, and Asrun Matthiasdottir. 2007. "Online Data Collection in Academic Research: Advantages and Limitations." *British Journal of Education Technology* 38(4):574-582.
- Leoncini, Dante Luis P. 2009. "A Conceptual Analysis of Pakikisama." Retrieved January 16, 2011. <http://www.crvp.org/book/Series03/IIID-4/chapter-8.htm>
- Lott, Juanita Tamayo. 1997. "Demographic Changes Transforming the Filipino American Community." Pp. 11-20 in *Filipino Americans: Transformation and Identity*, edited by Maria P. P. Root. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Massey, Douglas S. 1995. "The New Immigration and Ethnicity in the United States." *Population and Development Review* 21(3):631-652.
- Matsumoto, David, Michelle D. Weissman, Ken Preston, Bonny R. Brown, and Cenita Kupperbusch. 1997. "Context-Specific Measurement of Individualism-Collectivism on the Individual Level: The Individualism-Collectivism Interpersonal Assessment Inventory." *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 28(6):743-767.
- Mossakowski, Krysia N. 2003. "Coping with Perceived Discrimination: Does Ethnic Identity Protect Mental Health?" *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 44(3):318-331.
- Nadal, Kevin L. 2004. "Pilipino American Identity Development Model." *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development* 32(1):45-62.

- Naroll, Raoul and Frada Naroll. 1983. *The Moral Order: An introduction to the Human Situation*. Cited in Triandis, Harry C., Christopher McCusker, and C. Harry Hui. 1990. "Multimethod probes of Individualism and Collectivism." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 59(5):1006-1020.
- Oyserman, Daphna, Heather M. Coon, and Markus Kimmelmeier. 2002. "Rethinking Individualism and Collectivism." *Psychological Bulletin* 128(1):3-72.
- Paris, Cody Morris. 2013. "Surveying 'difficult-to-sample' Backpackers through Facebook? Employing a Mixed-Mode Dual Frame Procedure." *Anatolia – An International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research* 24(1):75-85.
- Pasco, Alberta Catherine Y., Janice M. Morse, and Joanne K. Olson. 2004. "Cross-Cultural Relationships Between Nurses Filipino Canadian Patients." *Journal of Nursing Scholarship* 36(3):239-246.
- Phelan, Jo, Bruce G. Link, Ann Stueve, and Robert E. Moore. 1995. "Education, Social Liberalism, and Economic Conservatism: Attitudes Toward Homeless People." *American Sociological Review* 60(1):126-140.
- Reid, Lesley Williams, Harald E. Weiss, Robert M. Adelman, and Charles Jaret. 2005. "The Immigration-Crime Relationship: Evidence Across US Metropolitan Areas." *Social Science Research* 34:757-780.
- Ruland, Jurgen. 1986. "Authoritarianism at the Grass Roots: Urban Neighbourhood Organizations in Metro Manila." *Asian Journal of Public Administration* 8(1):2-42.
- Salvador, Darryl S., Michael M. Omizo, and Bryan S. K. Kim. 1997. "Bayanihan: Providing Effective Counseling Strategies with Children of Filipino Ancestry." *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development* 25(3):201-209.
- Sampson, Robert J. and Janet L. Lauritsen. 1997. "Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Crime and Criminal Justice in the United States." *Crime and Justice* 21:311-374.
- San Juan, E., Jr. 1994. "Configuring the Filipino Diaspora in the United States." *Diapora: A Journal of Transnational Studies* 3(2):117-133.
- Sarason, Irwin G., Henry M. Levine, Robert B. Basham, and Barbara R. Sarason. 1983. "Assessing Social Support: The Social Support Questionnaire." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 44(1):127-139.
- Schoon, Ingrid, Helen Cheng, Catharine R. Gale, G. David Batty, and Ian J. Deary. 2010. "Social Status, Cognitive Ability, and Educational Attainment as Predictors of Liberal Social Attitudes and Political Trust." *Intelligence* 38:144-150.

- Selmer, Jan and Corinna De Leon. 2002. *Management and Culture in the Philippines*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong Baptist University.
- Shaw, Clifford R. and Henry D. McKay. 1942. *Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Shulruf, Boaz, John Hattie, and Robyn Dixon. 2007. "Development of a New Measurement Tool for Individualism and Collectivism." *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment* 24(4):385-401.
- Singelis, Theodore M. 1994. "The Measurement of Independent and Interdependent Self-Construals." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 20(5):580-591.
- Singelis, Theodore M., Harry C. Triandis, Dharm P. S. Bhawuk, and Michele J. Gelfand. 1995. "Horizontal and Vertical dimensions of Individualism and Collectivism: A Theoretical and Measurement Refinement." *Cross-Cultural Research* 29(3):240-275.
- Spence, Janet T. 1985. "Achievement American Style: The Rewards and Costs of Individualism." *American Psychologist* 40(12):1285-1295.
- Triandis, Harry C. 1993. "Collectivism and Individualism as Cultural Syndromes." *Cross-Cultural Research* 27(3 &4):155-180.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1995. *Individualism and Collectivism*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Triandis, Harry C., Christopher McCusker, and C. Harry Hui. 1990. "Multimethod probes of Individualism and Collectivism." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 59(5):1006-1020.
- Tyner, James A. 1999. "The Geopolitics of Eugenics and the Exclusion of Philippine Immigrants from the United States." *The Geographical Review* 89(1):54-73.
- Vandello, Joseph A. and Dov Cohen. 1999. "Patterns of Individualism and Collectivism in the United States." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 77(2):279-292.
- Wang, Zheng. 1995. "Gang Affiliation Among Asian-American High School Students: A Path Analysis of Social Developmental Model." *Journal of Gang Research* 2(3):1-13.
- Waters, Mary C. and Karl Eschbach. 1995. "Immigration and Ethnic and Racial Equality in the United States." *Annual Review of Sociology* 21:419-446.

- Wei, Meifen, Kelly Yu-Shin Liao, Ruth Chu Lien Chao, Brent Mallinckrodt, Pei-Chun Tsai, and Raquel Botello-Zamarron. 2010. "Minority Stress, Perceived Bicultural Competence, and Depressive Symptoms Among Ethnic Minority College Students." *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 57(4):411-422.
- Wheeler, Ladd, Harry T. Reis, and Michael Harris Bond. 1989. "Collectivism-Individualism in Everyday Social Life: The Middle Kingdom and the Melting Pot." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 57(1):79-86.
- Zeitlin, Irving M. 1971. *Liberty, Equality, and Revolution in Alexis de Tocqueville*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown and Company.
- Zhai, Fuhai and Qin Gao. 2009. "Child Maltreatment Among Asian Americans: Characteristics and Explanatory Framework." *Child Maltreatment* 14(2):207-224.
- Zhou, Min. 2007. "Divergent Origins and Destinies: Children of Asian Immigrants." Pp. 109-128 in *Narrowing the Achievement Gap: Strategies for Educating Latino, Black, and Asian Students*, edited by Susan J. Paik and Herbert J. Wahlberg. New York, NY: Springer.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1997. "Growing Up American: The Challenge Confronting Immigrant Children and Children of Immigrants." *Annual Review of Sociology* 23:63-95.

## VITA

Moises Osias Mina, Jr.  
 Department of Sociology and Criminal Justice,  
 Old Dominion University, Norfolk, VA 23529

## EDUCATION

---

Ph.D. in Criminology, Old Dominion University, Norfolk, VA. Expected Conferral August 2015.

M.A. Applied Sociology, Old Dominion University, Norfolk, VA, 1999.

B.A. Sociology, Saint Leo University, South Hampton Roads Center, Virginia Beach, VA 1996.

## PROFESSIONAL POSITIONS

---

*Lecturer*, Old Dominion University, Norfolk, VA (2011- 2013; 2014 – present)

*Adjunct Instructor*, Old Dominion University, Norfolk, VA (Fall 1999-2011; Fall 2013-Summer 2014)

*Training Specialist*, Center for Surface Combat Systems, Learning Site Dam Neck, Virginia, Beach, VA (2002-2007).

*Academic Advisor and Faculty*. (Full-time) Saint Leo University, South Hampton Roads Center, (2000-2002).

*United States Navy*. (1973-2000). Positions held included: Manpower Analyst, Department Manager, Career Counselor, and Branch Supervisor.

## RESEARCH INTERESTS

---

Communities and Crime, Grassroots Organizations and Social Control, Asian American Issues in Criminology and Criminal Justice, Criminological Theory, Social Inequality

## PUBLICATIONS

---

Published:

Monk-Turner, Elizabeth, John Allen, John Casten, Catherine Cowling, Charles Gray, David Guhr, Kara Hoofnagle, Jessica Huffman, Moises Mina, and Brian Moore. "Mandatory Identification Bar Checks: How Bouncers Are Doing Their Job." *The Qualitative Report*.