



Published in final edited form as:

Parent Sci Pract. 2011 July 29; 11(2-3): 163–176. doi:10.1080/15295192.2011.585564.

Attributions and Attitudes of Mothers and Fathers in the Philippines

Liane Peña Alampay and Rosanne M. Jocson

Liane Peña Alampay, Department of Psychology, 3/F Leong Hall, Ateneo de Manila University, Loyola Heights, Quezon City 1108, Philippines. lpalampay@ateneo.edu. Rosanne M. Jocson is also at Ateneo de Manila University

SYNOPSIS

Objective.—This paper investigates the mean level and within-family similarities and differences in Filipino mothers' and fathers' attributions about success and failure in caregiving situations, and their progressive and authoritarian parenting attitudes.

Design.—Both mothers and fathers in 95 families in metropolitan Manila completed interviews.

Results.—Controlling for parents' age, education, and possible social desirability bias, there was a significant gender difference in modernity of attitudes, with mothers exhibiting higher levels of modernity than fathers. There was a strong correlation in mothers' and fathers' authoritarian attitudes and moderate correlations in modernity of attitudes. There were neither parent gender effects nor concordance in the attributions of mothers and fathers.

Conclusions.—Cultural explanations are presented to account for the findings, specifically the sociocultural values that foster traditional attitudes favoring parental authority and child obedience, and the differences in gender and family roles of Filipino mothers and fathers.

INTRODUCTION

The role of parents' cognitions in shaping socialization practices and children's developmental outcomes is conceivably of universal significance. However, as with the majority of research on other psychological phenomena, studies in this area have largely been conducted in Western countries, particularly the United States. It therefore behooves researchers to examine mothers' and fathers' cognitions, and their consequences for children's development, in other cultural contexts to achieve a more comprehensive understanding.

This study focuses particularly on Filipino mothers' and fathers' childrearing attitudes and their attributions for successes and failures in interactions with children. Investigations of these issues among Filipino families are scarce and are generally descriptive and intuitive accounts of local sociocultural family values, some of which were conducted two or three decades past (Shwalb, Shwalb, Nakazawa, Hyun, Le, & Satiadarma, 2009). This paper contributes a current, empirical examination of Filipino parenting cognitions in its consideration of mean level and within-family similarities and differences between mothers and fathers in attributions and attitudes. The next section provides an overview of Philippine culture and reviews the local literature that, while limited, sets the foundation and presents implications for the current analyses.

Correspondence concerning this manuscript may be addressed to Liane Peña Alampay, Department of Psychology, 3/F Leong Hall, Ateneo de Manila University, Loyola Heights, Quezon City 1108, Philippines. Phone: (632)-4265905. Fax: (632)-4265905. lpalampay@ateneo.edu.

Philippine Culture

The Philippines is an economically developing country with a per capita Gross National Income of USD\$1,620 and 36.8% of the population living below the national poverty line. In basic health and education indices—for instance, an under-5 mortality rate of 2.8% and an adult literacy rate of 93%—the country fares comparatively better than other developing nations, but still falls short of its millennium development goals (United Nations Development Programme, 2007). The country also ranks among the highest in Asia in inequalities between rich and poor individuals (Ney, 2007). Economic growth and increased consumption are predominantly experienced by families living in urban areas and with a highly educated head of the household, but progress has lagged significantly for the lower income class.

Not unlike its Asian neighbors, Philippine society has been described as predominantly collectivist, and Filipinos as strongly valuing, prioritizing, and cultivating relational bonds, especially within the family (Chao & Tseng, 2002; Ho, 1993; Hofstede, 1980). Unlike its Asian neighbors, however, where the principles of Confucianism and Buddhism are considered the foundation of familial attachments and obligations (Chao & Tseng, 2002; Ho, 1993), Filipinos' collectivism is thought to be rooted in the pivotal value of “smooth interpersonal relations,” exemplified in desiring harmony and inclusiveness in relationships and the subjugation of individual interests for the sake of the in-group (Lynch, 1973). Beyond smooth interpersonal relationships, indigenous psychology has proposed that a core of Filipino interpersonal behavior is the concept of *kapwa* (Enriquez, 1994). Literally translated, *kapwa* refers to the “other” or “fellow-being.” In the Filipino psyche, it reflects a self that is shared with the other (Bulatao, 1992/1998). It follows that the central value guiding Filipino social behavior is a basic respect for another person's being, which is rooted in a regard for the other as *not* different or as one's equal. To think and act as if the self were separate from *kapwa* is to be individualistic, egotistic, and *walang kapwa-tao* (“without fellow-feeling”), a serious transgression in Filipino society.

The family is the most important social group in Filipino culture; it is “the center of their universe” (Jocano, 1998, p.11). Filipino identity is typically and strongly defined by close-knit family ties (Medina, 2001; Wolf, 1997). As in other collectivist contexts, harmony, respect for elders, fulfilling duties and expectations, and deference to parental authority are valued.

Individual behaviors and achievements reflect on the family as a whole and bring about familial pride or shame (Chao & Tseng, 2002; Ho, 1993). Thus, in the Filipino family it is imperative that one behaves with respect to the self and the family's sense of *hiya*, which is a deeply held value that refers to honor, dignity, and propriety (Enriquez, 1994). Typical admonitions of the parent in response to a child's undesirable behavior remind the child to uphold his or her and the parent's *hiya*.

Filipino children are likewise expected to obey parental authority and sacrifice individual interests to prioritize familial obligations (Medina, 2001; Peterson, 1993; Wolf, 1997). Such implicit expectations are encapsulated in the value of *utang na loob* (“debt of one's being”) or the life-long “debt” owed to another person that exists not merely because of receipt of some favor, but because of deep respect and gratitude (Enriquez, 1994). Children are expected to possess a sense of *utang na loob* towards their parents for having reared them, which must be manifested in respectfulness and honoring of family obligations. Otherwise, the son or daughter will be known as without *hiya* or without *utang na loob*—no honor or gratitude—signifying that one is not a “good” child, much less a decent person.

Consistent with the foregoing interdependent values, researchers have extensively documented that Filipino youth place a high value on *familism*, expressed in higher endorsement of parental authority and influence in making decisions, lower disagreement with parents, and greater adherence to family obligations, than European American youth (Cooper, Baker, Polichar, & Welsh, 1993; Darling, Cumsille, & Peña-Alampay, 2005; Fuligni, 1998; Fuligni, Tseng, & Lam, 1999).

Attitudes and Attributions of Filipino Parents

The emphasis on the aforementioned family values suggests parental childrearing attitudes that are more authoritarian than progressive. Authoritarian attitudes emphasize parental authority and child obedience and conformity; in contrast, progressive attitudes involve beliefs that children are agentic and self-directing and should be able to express and assert themselves (Schaefer & Edgerton, 1985). The extant local data bear this out. In the cross-national Value of Children (VOC) study conducted in the 1970s, the quality that over 60% of Filipino parents most valued in their children is “to mind their parents.” In contrast, independence and self-reliance were among the lowest cited responses (Hoffman, 1988). Even two decades later, when asked to define a “good” and competent child, the most frequent responses of Filipino rural mothers pertained to obedience towards parents, being helpful in household chores, caring for younger siblings, and providing for the needs of the family (Durbrow, Peña, Masten, Sesma, & Williamson, 2001).

It corresponds that disobedience is the transgression that most often warrants disciplinary action, typically in the form of physical punishment (spanking) and verbal reprimands (De la Cruz, Protacio, Balanon, Yacat, & Francisco, 2001; Jocano, 1970; Licuanan, 1979; Medina, 2001). Indeed, parents believed that discipline—often equated with physical punishment—is a necessary responsibility of parents to “bend the young in the right direction” (De la Cruz et al., 2001; Jocano, 1970). Thus, in their emphasis on obedience to authority, the foregoing clearly indicates that Filipino parents hold predominantly traditional and authoritarian childrearing attitudes. This is in the context of a childrearing environment that is generally reported to be affectionate, indulgent, and supportive, especially for younger children (Medina, 2001; Ventura, 1981).

The implications for Filipino parents’ attributions are less explicit. Parents’ beliefs are rooted, in part, in adults’ conceptions of the nature of children. In a qualitative study on concepts of children and parenting, 74 mothers and 13 fathers expressed that children do not have a “mind of their own”; that is, they have yet to develop reason and an understanding of reality, are impulsive and demand immediate gratification, and possess a natural penchant for mischief. These beliefs legitimize parental authority and children’s subservience (De la Cruz et al., 2001). Indeed, if a child does grow up to be “good,” then this is primarily attributed to proper discipline, monitoring, and the teaching of values, according to Filipino mothers (De la Cruz et al., 2001; Durbrow et al., 2001). In Durbrow et al.’s (2001) cross-national study of Filipino, American, and Caribbean mothers, only 26% of Filipino mothers believed that competence is inherent in the nature of the child (although this is more than the number of U.S. and Caribbean mothers who thought the same).

In the framework of Bugental and her colleagues, parents consider successful and unsuccessful interactions with children as either caused or controlled by them or by the child (Bugental & Happaney, 2000; Bugental & Shennum, 1984). In the context of the foregoing, so much power in the hands of Filipino parents to mold and discipline children suggests parent-centered explanations for both successful and unsuccessful outcomes and interactions with children. Similarly, that successes and failures are thought to reflect on the collective, rather than the individual, may encourage attributions directed to the parent who socializes,

instead of the child. It may also be speculated that negative child outcomes are attributed to the child's nature, which has yet to be shaped by the parent.

Although the discourse on Filipino sociocultural and family values has been largely consistent, recent demographic trends suggest that the Filipino family is changing. Increasing numbers of women in the labor force, single-parent homes, overseas migration, and other influences of globalization (McCann-Erickson Philippines, 2006) may portend a shift in parenting beliefs and practices. Medina (2001, p. 237) observed that Filipino parents “are adapting gradually to the changing times by shifting their childrearing orientation from dependency to independence, from restrictiveness to permissiveness, from extreme control to autonomy, and from authoritarianism to liberalism and individuality.” However, there are few empirical data to support this assertion, and the current study examines, in part, contemporary Filipino parents' cognitions.

Similarities and Differences Between Mothers and Fathers

From a systems perspective, mothers and fathers have individually unique and mutually interactive contributions to children's development, thereby warranting the study of their concordances and dissimilarities in cognitions and behaviors. To date, however, there have been few investigations involving Filipino fathers, much less of the similarities and differences in Filipino mothers' and fathers' parenting cognitions.

To the extent that general Filipino sociocultural and family values pervasively shape childrearing attitudes, it may be expected that mothers and fathers are similarly traditional or authoritarian and similarly parent-centered in their attributions. However, much of the literature has considered differences in the *roles* of mothers and fathers. Invariably, Filipino fathers and mothers reported taking on traditional roles in the home, with fathers being providers and “protectors” but having limited purview in the daily lives of their children and mothers taking on the tasks of childrearing, discipline, and “managing the home” (De la Cruz et al., 2001; Licuanan, 1979; Liwag, De la Cruz, & Macapagal, 1998). From the perspective of children, mothers are indeed more nurturant and involved than fathers; mothers are also perceived to be more powerful than fathers in that they give the directives and organize the child's activities. Although children do not perceive differences in punitiveness between their parents (Carunungan-Robles, 1986), it is not uncommon for fathers to be called on and to implement punishment for major transgressions (Liwag et al., 1998; Medina, 2001).

Other studies report more egalitarian gender roles. In a national survey conducted in 15 highly populated and semi-urban sites, mothers reportedly managed household finances but both mothers and fathers reported joint decision-making in matters regarding the children's discipline and education and financial investments (Licuanan, 1979; Porio, Lynch, & Hollsteiner, 1981). These responses were more prevalent among more educated parents with higher incomes and may reflect more “modern” arrangements in family decision-making. Moreover, younger and more educated fathers spend relatively more time than their older counterparts in child care and consider “nurturance” to be a primary duty alongside financially supporting the family (Dalisay, 1983; McCann-Erickson Philippines, 2006). Fathers' shifting roles in the family likewise suggest more progressive views, at least for the younger generation of parents.

It is as yet unclear how mother and father roles—still largely in keeping with traditional norms, but also suggestive of progressive views for younger and more educated parents—translate to similarities or differences between mothers' and fathers' cognitions (whether mean level or within family). The pervasiveness of collectivist and familistic sociocultural values can translate to similar childrearing attitudes and attributions between genders;

however, clearly defined gender roles in the family may be associated with key differences in parenting cognitions, especially within families. This question is dealt with in this study.

The Present Study

This study investigates two questions pertaining to Filipino mothers' and fathers' childrearing attributions and attitudes. First, what are the similarities and differences between mean levels of Filipino mothers' and fathers' attributions and attitudes? Second, how highly are Filipino mothers' attributions and attitudes correlated with Filipino fathers' attributions and attitudes within the same family? The relevant literature on Filipino parenting points to childrearing attitudes that are authoritarian and suggests parent-centered attributions for successful and unsuccessful childrearing situations. However, the possible outcomes of comparisons between mothers and fathers are, as yet, equivocal. The present study addresses the gap in this area.

METHOD

Context

Respondents were residents of Quezon City, the most populous and geographically largest city in metropolitan Manila. As the former capital, the city houses several major government institutions, prominent schools and universities, hospitals, business districts, and commercial shopping areas. Its 2.68 million residents (half of whom are below the age of 24) come from all socioeconomic strata; the most affluent communities can be readily observed alongside middle-class and slum-dwelling citizens (Quezon City Annual Report, 2008).

Participants

The study involved 117 mothers and 98 fathers (5 mothers and 4 fathers were non-biological adoptive or surrogate parents). Only families with relevant data from both mothers and fathers ($n = 95$) were included in the analyses. Efforts were exerted to sample families in proportions that approximate the national socioeconomic distribution, using the type of school (whether public or private) as a rough estimation of socioeconomic status. Public school education is free and typically caters to low-income children, whereas private schools are more expensive, with widely varying tuition rates that are fairly good indicators of a family's income level. Very indigent children are unable to attend school and are not represented in the study. Thus, the respondents were composed of roughly 50% low-income families, 40% middle-income, and 10% high-income families. Though not sizable, the sample distribution is fairly representative of urban-dwelling Filipino parents.

Letters explaining the purpose of the study and what participation entailed were sent to 1,810 parents via their second- and third-grade children enrolled in 11 schools in Quezon City. Of this number, 430 parents signified interest in participating in the study. Research assistants contacted interested parents and set interview schedules with them until the target number of families was reached.

Table 1 presents demographic characteristics of the participating families. On average, both mothers and fathers had some college education. (In the local education system, there are 6 years of compulsory primary education, followed by 4 years of secondary, and 4 years of tertiary education.) However, these data are possibly inflated as they do not account for the periods in which the adults might have temporarily stopped going to school. Discontinuous schooling is typically the result of financial deficiencies and is a pattern not uncommon among the low-income respondents.

Procedures

Interviews were conducted by trained graduate research assistants, with interviews of the mothers and fathers occurring separately but simultaneously. Interviews were conducted in the homes of the families, with the exception of a few participants who preferred to be interviewed in the university premises. Parents indicated the language they preferred to use in the interview, and the interviewers accordingly used the Filipino or English versions of the instruments. While certain sections of the interview were conducted orally for all respondents, for other sections parents responded in writing if it was their preference. As indicated in the protocol approved by the university ethics review board, parents provided their signed informed consent to participate in the study. Interviews lasted 1-1.5 hours for the adults. They completed a demographic questionnaire, a measure of social desirability bias (Reynolds, 1982), and two parenting measures.

The analyses in this paper focus on constructs from two measures of attributions and attitudes (see Lansford & Bornstein, 2012). First, parents completed the short form of the Parent Attribution Test (Bugental & Shennum, 1984), which was developed to measure parents' perceptions of causes of success and failure in hypothetical caregiving situations. Parents are presented with a hypothetical scenario that involves either a positive or negative interaction with a child (e.g., "Suppose you took care of a neighbor's child one afternoon, and the two of you had a really good time together."). Parents then are asked to respond to a series of questions regarding reasons that the interaction was positive or negative. Parents rate on a 7-point scale (1 = *not at all important*, 7 = *very important*) how important factors such as the child's disposition and the parent's behavior were in determining the quality of the interaction. The amount of power or control attributed to oneself versus children is the key dimension of interest. This measure yielded four variables: (1) attributions regarding uncontrollable success (6 items; e.g., how lucky you were in just having everything work out well); (2) attributions regarding adult-controlled failure (6 items; e.g., whether you used the wrong approach for this child); (3) attributions regarding child-controlled failure (6 items; e.g., the extent to which the child was stubborn and resisted your efforts); and (4) perceived control over failure (the difference between attributions regarding adult-controlled failure and attributions regarding child-controlled failure).

Second, parents completed the Parental Modernity Inventory (Schaefer & Edgerton, 1985), which assesses parents' attitudes about childrearing and education. Each of 30 statements is rated on a 4-point scale (1 = *strongly disagree*, 4 = *strongly agree*). This instrument yielded three variables: (1) progressive attitudes (8 items; e.g., Children have a right to their own point of view and should be allowed to express it.); (2) authoritarian attitudes (22 items; e.g., The most important thing to teach children is absolute obedience to their parents.); and (3) modernity of attitudes (the difference between the progressive attitudes score and the authoritarian attitudes score). The alpha coefficients of mothers' and fathers' scores are indicated in Table 2. All scales, save for progressive attitudes, have adequate reliabilities. Results pertaining to progressive attitudes are thus interpreted with caution.

RESULTS

Table 2 indicates that both mothers and fathers had fairly high scores on attributions regarding uncontrollable success, with means well above the midpoint of the scale. The means for adult- and child-controlled failure, as well as the differential score (i.e., difference between adult-controlled and child-controlled failure), signify that the parents perceived themselves as having relatively more control than children over failure situations. Variability in attributions was greater for uncontrollable success than adult- and child-controlled failure, however. In terms of attitudes, the means and differential scores (i.e., difference between progressive and authoritarian attitudes) suggest minor differences in

authoritarian and progressive attitudes overall for both mothers and fathers, albeit relatively higher progressive attitudes particularly for mothers. There is, however, the caveat that the progressive scores have low reliabilities.

Gender Similarities and Differences in Parents' Attributions and Attitudes

Repeated-measures linear mixed models with gender of parent as the within-subjects fixed factor tested for differences between mothers and fathers in attributions for success and failure in caregiving situations and progressive versus authoritarian attitudes. Test results are presented with and without controls for mothers' and fathers' ages, educations, and possible social desirability bias. There was a significant main effect of parent gender on only one of the seven constructs of interest: controlling for parents' age, education, and possible social desirability bias, there was a significant difference in modernity of attitudes, with mothers exhibiting higher levels of modernity than fathers, $F(1,86) = 5.46, p < .05$. There were no differences between mothers and fathers in attributions regarding successes and failures in caregiving situations.

Within-Family Correlations Between Parents' Attributions and Attitudes

The final columns of Table 2 present bivariate correlations of mothers' attributions and attitudes with fathers' attributions and attitudes. Only in authoritarian attitudes and modernity of attitudes were there significant correlations between mothers and fathers within families. The concordance in authoritarian attitudes remained strong after controlling for parents' age, education, and possible social desirability bias. The correlation in modernity was moderate with the control variables partialled out. There was no concordance between mothers and fathers in their attributions.

DISCUSSION

This study first addressed whether there were differences between mothers and fathers in their parenting attributions and attitudes. Among Filipino mothers and fathers, only in modernity of childrearing attitudes were there significant differences, with mothers exhibiting more modern views than fathers. Compared to fathers, mothers were more likely to espouse progressive attitudes such as granting children more agency and independence and encouragement to express themselves. Progressive parenting attitudes have been associated with more Western, individualist ideas (Harkness, Super, & Keefer, 1992; Markus, Mullaly, & Kitayama, 1997; Shweder, Goodnow, Hatano, LeVine, Markus, & Miller, 1997), which are readily observed in media and popular culture, and transmitted through business and educational institutions in rapidly modernizing cities such as Metro Manila (Kagitcibasi, 1996; McCann-Erickson Philippines, 2006). Given that Filipino mothers are the primary caregivers and are expected to hold the reins in bringing up the children and managing the home, they may be more likely to be exposed to and attend to, if not actively keep abreast of, modern childrearing information such as that presented in mass media, reading materials, and parenting seminars provided in schools and communities. In contrast, Filipino men are less likely to attend to childrearing information as they are not as involved (nor are they expected to be) in child care (De la Cruz et al., 2001; Licuanan, 1979; Liwag et al., 1998).

Still, mothers and fathers do not differ in authoritarian attitudes. The expectations that children obey adult authority and submit to parental directives are equally held by mothers and fathers and are consistent with the prevailing, well-entrenched sociocultural values of respect and obedience towards elders (De la Cruz et al., 2001; Enriquez, 1994; Medina, 2001). Although mothers are relatively more modern, it is also interesting to note that authoritarian and progressive attitudes do not differ widely in mean levels. Such a

coexistence in both traditional and modern orientations is consistent with models of emotional interdependence (i.e., individualist values in families in collectivist societies) and evidence of multiculturalism that arises in societies that are experiencing urbanization and social change (Kagitcibasi, 1996). The consequences of these beliefs for parenting and children remain to be fully examined, but the findings suggest that progressive and authoritarian attitudes are not necessarily orthogonal. It may also be that authoritarian attitudes lag behind in family changes that have ensued as a result of globalization (McCann-Erickson Philippines, 2006; Medina, 2001). They may still shift in the years to come.

In terms of attributions, there were no parent gender differences regarding uncontrollable success, adult-controlled failure, child-controlled failure, and perceived control over failure situations. Attributions are more specific to judgments about the child and the self in particular situations, whereas parental attitudes are more global or general. As such, attributions may not necessarily be influenced by external factors affecting attitudes, such as what was proposed to explain the more modern attitudes of mothers relative to fathers. Filipino parents reported generally high uncontrollable success, and higher adult-controlled failure relative to child-controlled failure. This suggests that, in general, parents perceive themselves as having more control over failed child-care situations, consistent with beliefs in their active role in “shaping” a passive child who has yet to develop proper reason and self-control (De la Cruz et al., 2001; Durbrow et al., 2001). Good childcare outcomes were generally considered to be outside of parents’ direct control, similar to other findings that Filipino mothers believe that some children are inherently good or competent (Durbrow et al., 2001). It seems, therefore, that parental action, influence, or power is elicited more in negative than in successful child outcomes. It is possible that this result is related to the cultural emphasis on deference to parental authority and upholding the honor and dignity of the parent and family. Parental control is less imperative when the child is well-behaved; it is crucial when the child misbehaves and potentially puts the adult to shame.

In terms of correlations between Filipino mothers and fathers within families, only authoritarian attitudes, and to a lesser extent, modern attitudes, showed significant agreement. The agreement between mothers and fathers in authoritarian beliefs is consistent with the absence of a gender effect in this domain overall, and again highlights the pervasive traditional sociocultural values that undergird these attitudes. Likewise, levels of modernity are similar between husbands and wives. This points to the phenomenon of assortative mating, wherein attraction and marriage are more likely between men and women with similar values (Luo & Klohnen, 2005). It is also possible that parents socialize their partners to progressive influences and ideas of parenting; if the Filipino mother is modern, then she is more likely to believe that the father should be involved and may interact with her spouse accordingly.

Despite the correlation in mothers’ and fathers’ parenting attitudes, no concordance was found in their attributions, indicating that within families mothers and fathers vary in their beliefs about child and adult control in situations and interactions with children. Fathers, having relatively fewer experiences with and knowledge of children, are likely to have different views from their spouses, who interact more with children in various childcare scenarios (Licuanan, 1979; Liwag et al., 1998; Medina, 2001). Given the sharp demarcation in Filipino fathers’ and mothers’ roles, and because attributions are specific to judgments about the child and the self in particular situations, attributions about children and the self-as-caregiver may likewise differ within the couple.

What might be the implications of the foregoing for parenting and child outcomes? Ideally, mothers and fathers should convey to children a solidarity, consistency, and predictability in

parenting attitudes and behaviors (McHale, Lauretti, Talbot, & Pouquette, 2002). In Western literature, lack of consonance between parents has been linked to marital conflict and ineffectual socialization, which can lead to child behavior problems and other negative outcomes (Deal, Halverson, & Wampler, 1989; Vaughn, Block, & Block, 1988). It remains to be seen if such consequences obtain in the Philippine context, where apparently, mothers and fathers are not similar in attributions but where sharp delineations in parenting roles are culturally the norm.

Limitations and Directions for Future Research

The measure of progressive attitudes was not adequately reliable, and results pertaining to this variable are therefore interpreted with caution. From a cultural standpoint, poor reliability may suggest variabilities in meaningfulness and interpretation that is reflected in a lack of coherence among the items in the scale. Efforts were taken to ensure that the composition of the sample was fairly representative of urban-dwelling Filipino families. Still, the sample size is small and prevents generalizing the results to the larger population of Filipino parents. The implications of the similarities and differences in parents' attitudes and attributions for parenting processes and child outcomes are subject to further study. Given the distinction in mother and father roles in the local context, it is possible that mothers' attitudes and attributions may be more influential in determining children's outcomes, whereas fathers' attitudes, and the concordance between the two, may matter less. Nonetheless, studies have shown that fathers' attitudes affect children's outcomes in complex ways, via their influence on mothers' beliefs and behaviors (Belsky, 1984; Shears & Robinson, 2005), and depending on the gender of the child (Patel, Power, & Bhavnagri, 1996). Relations between parents' cognitions, parents' practices, and their consequences for children should be examined in accordance with the transactional nature of these variables.

Conclusions

Only in modernity in attitudes did Filipino mothers and fathers differ, with mothers overall adopting more modern views of parenting. There were no parent gender effects in attributions of success or failure in childcare situations. Within families, there were moderate to strong correlations in the authoritarian and modern attitudes of mothers and fathers, whereas there was an absence of concordance in their attributions. We propose that the well-entrenched Filipino cultural values of respect for parental authority and children's obedience account for the absence of gender effects and the similarity of mothers and fathers within families in authoritarian attitudes. Gender differences in modernity and the lack of within-family agreement in attributions might be explained by the sharp delineation in the roles of mothers and fathers in the Filipino family.

Acknowledgments

This research was funded by the *Eunice Kennedy Shriver* National Institute of Child Health and Human Development grant RO1-HD054805.

REFERENCES

- Belsky J. The determinants of parenting: A process model. *Child Development*. 1984; 55:83–96. [PubMed: 6705636]
- Bugental DB, Happaney K. Parent–child interaction as a power contest. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*. 2000; 21:267–282.
- Bugental DB, Shennum WA. “Difficult” children as elicitors and targets of adult communication patterns: An attributional-behavioral transactional analysis. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*. 1984; 49(1) Serial No. 205.

- Bulatao, JC. Phenomena and their interpretation: Landmark essays 1957-1989. Ateneo de Manila University Press; Quezon City: 1992/1998.
- Carunungan-Robles A. Perceptions of parental nurturance, punitiveness, and power by selected Filipino primary school children. *Philippine Journal of Psychology*. 1986; 19:18–28.
- Chao, R.; Tseng, V. Parenting of Asians. In: Bornstein, MH., editor. *Handbook of parenting*. Vol. 4. Erlbaum; Mahwah, NJ: 2002.
- Cooper, C.; Baker, H.; Polichar, D.; Welsh, M. Values and communication of Chinese, Filipino, Mexican, and Vietnamese American adolescents with their families and friends. In: Shulman, S.; Collins, WA., editors. *Father-adolescent relationships*. Jossey-Bass Publishers; San Francisco: 1993. *New Directions for Child Development*, no.62
- Dalisay, GA. Fathers as parents: An exploratory study. University of the Philippines; Quezon City: 1983. Unpublished master's thesis
- Darling, N.; Cumsille, P.; Peña-Alampay, L. Rules, legitimacy of parental authority, and obligation to obey in Chile, the Philippines, and the United States. In: Smetana, J., editor. *Changing boundaries of parental authority during adolescence*. Jossey-Bass; San Francisco: 2005. p. 47-60.
- Deal JE, Halverson CF Jr, Wampler KS. Parental agreement on child-rearing orientations: Relations to parental, marital, family, and child characteristics. *Child Development*. 1989; 60:1025–1034. [PubMed: 2805880]
- De la Cruz, MT.; Protacio, E.; Balanon, F.; Yacat, J.; Francisco, C. Trust and power: Child abuse in the eyes of the child and the parent. Save the Children UK and the United Nations Children's Fund; 2001.
- Dunlap WP, Cortina JM, Vaslow JB, Burke MJ. Meta-analysis of experiments with matched group or repeated measures designs. *Psychological Methods*. 1996; 1:170–177.
- Durbrow E, Peña L, Masten A, Sesma A, Williamson I. Mothers' conceptions of child competence in contexts of poverty: The Philippines, St. Vincent, and the United States. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*. 2001; 25:438–443.
- Enriquez, V. *From colonial to liberation psychology*. De La Salle University Press; Manila: 1994.
- Fuligni A. Authority, autonomy, and parent-adolescent conflict and cohesion: A study of adolescents from Mexican, Chinese, Filipino, and European backgrounds. *Developmental Psychology*. 1998; 34:782–792. [PubMed: 9681270]
- Fuligni A, Tseng V, Lam M. Attitudes toward family obligations among American adolescents with Asian, Latin American, and European backgrounds. *Child Development*. 1999; 70:1030–1044.
- Harkness, S.; Super, C.; Keefer, C. Learning to be an American parent: How cultural models gain directive force. In: D'Andrade, R.; Strauss, C., editors. *Human motives and cultural models*. Cambridge University Press; New York: 1992. p. 163-178.
- Ho, D. Relational orientation in Asian social psychology. In: Kim, U.; Berry, J., editors. *Indigenous psychologies: Research and experience in cultural context*. Sage; Newbury Park, CA: 1993.
- Hoffman, L. Cross-cultural differences in childrearing goals. In: Levine, R.; Miller, P.; West, M., editors. *Parental behavior in diverse societies*. Jossey-Bass; San Francisco: 1988. p. 99-122.
- Hofstede, G. *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Sage; Beverly Hills, CA: 1980.
- Jocano FL. Maternal and child care among the Tagalogs in Bay, Laguna, Philippines. *Asian Studies*. 1970; 8:277–300. [PubMed: 12278379]
- Jocano, FL. *Filipino social organization: Traditional kinship and family organization*. Punlad Research House; Quezon City: 1998.
- Kagitcibasi, C. *Family and human development across cultures: A view from the other side*. Erlbaum; Mahwah, NJ: 1996.
- Lansford JE, Bornstein MH. Parenting attributions and attitudes in diverse cultural contexts: Introduction to the Special Issue. *Parenting: Science and Practice*. 2012; 12:xx–xx.
- Licuanan P. Aspects of child rearing in an urban low-income community. *Philippine Studies*. 1979; 27:453–468.
- Liwag MEC, De la Cruz A, Macapagal M. How we raise our daughters and sons: Childrearing and gender socialization in the Philippines. *Philippine Journal of Psychology*. 1998; 31:1–46.

- Luo S, Klohnen EC. Assortative mating and marital quality in newlyweds: A couple-centered approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 2005; 88:304–326. [PubMed: 15841861]
- Lynch, F. Social acceptance reconsidered. In: Lynch, F.; de Guzman, A., II, editors. *IPC papers no.2: Four readings on Philippine values*. Ateneo de Manila University Press; Quezon City, Philippines: 1973.
- Markus, H.; Mullally, P.; Kitayama, S. Selfways: Diversity in modes of cultural participation. In: Neisser, U.; Jopling, D., editors. *The conceptual self in context: Culture, experience, and self-understanding*. Cambridge University Press; 1997.
- McCann-Erickson Philippines. 2006 McCann inter-generation study: Youth study highlights. Author; Manila: 2006.
- McHale, J.; Lauretti, A.; Talbot, J.; Pouquette, C. Retrospect and prospect in the psychological study of coparenting and family group process. In: McHale, J.; Grolnick, W., editors. *Retrospect and prospect in the psychological study of families*. Erlbaum; Mahwah, NJ: 2002. p. 127-166.
- Medina, B. *The Filipino family*. 2nd ed.. University of the Philippines Press; Diliman: 2001.
- Ney, P. Inequality growing in Asia; 'fairly stable' in the Philippines. *The Daily PCIJ*. August 13. 2007 Retrieved June 3, 2010, from <http://www.pcij.org/blog/?p=1899>
- Patel N, Power TG, Bhavnagri NP. Socialization values and practices of Indian immigrant parents: Correlates of modernity and acculturation. *Child Development*. 1996; 67:302–313.
- Peterson JT. Generalized family exchange: A case from the Philippines. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 1993; 55:570–584.
- Porio, E.; Lynch, F.; Hollsteiner, M. *The Filipino family, community, and nation*. Institute of Philippine Culture, Ateneo de Manila University; Quezon City: 1981. *IPC Papers No. 12*
- Quezon City Annual Report. Author; Quezon City: 2008.
- Reynolds WM. Development of reliable and valid short forms of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*. 1982; 38:119–125.
- Schaefer, ES.; Edgerton, M. Parent and child correlates of parental modernity. In: Sigel, IE., editor. *Parental belief systems: Psychological consequences for children*. Erlbaum; Hillsdale, NJ: 1985. p. 287-318.
- Shears J, Robinson J. Fathering attitudes and practices: Influences on children's development. *Child Care in Practice*. 2005; 11:63–79.
- Shwalb, DW.; Shwalb, BJ.; Nakazawa, J.; Hyun, J.; Le, HV.; Satiadarma, MP. East and Southeast Asia: Japan, South Korea, Vietnam, and Indonesia. In: Bornstein, MH., editor. *The handbook of cultural developmental science. Part 2. Development in different places on earth*. Taylor & Francis Group; New York, NY: 2009. p. 445-464.
- Shweder, R.; Goodnow, J.; Hatano, G.; LeVine, R.; Markus, H.; Miller, P. The cultural psychology of development: One mind, many mentalities. In: Lerner, R.; Damon, W., editors. *Handbook of child psychology*. Vol. 1. John Wiley & Sons; New York: 1997. p. 865-937.
- Philippines midterm progress report on the millennium development goals. Author; Manila: 2007. United Nations Development Programme.
- Vaughn BE, Block JH, Block J. Parental agreement on child rearing during early childhood and the psychological characteristics of adolescents. *Child Development*. 1988; 59:1020–1035. [PubMed: 3168611]
- Ventura ER. An overview of child psychology in the Philippines. *Philippine Journal of Psychology*. 1981; 14:3–7.
- Wolf D. Family secrets: Transnational struggles among children of Filipino immigrants. *Sociological Perspectives*. 1997; 40:457–482.

TABLE 1

Demographic Characteristics of Children and Families

Child's gender (% female)	49.2%
Child's age in years	8.02 (.34)
Mother's age in years	37.93 (6.18)
Father's age in years	40.24 (7.09)
Mother's education in years	13.63 (4.06)
Father's education in years	13.88 (3.84)
Parents' marital status (% married)	85.8%
Number of children in household	2.77 (1.36)
Number of adults in household	3.73 (2.06)

M (SD)

TABLE 2
Parenting Attributions and Attitudes: Alphas, Tests of Gender Differences, and Correlations for Mothers and Fathers

	Mothers <i>α</i>	Fathers <i>α</i>	Mothers <i>M (SD)</i>	Fathers <i>M (SD)</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>F^a</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>d^a</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>r^a</i>
Attributions										
Uncontrollable success	.83	.78	5.81 (.99)	5.55 (.93)	3.46	2.10	.27	.21	.03	.05
Adult-controlled failure	.80	.75	4.35 (.56)	4.33 (.72)	.05	.06	.03	.03	.18	.18
Child-controlled failure	.83	.85	3.84 (.47)	3.76 (.47)	1.69	2.70	.18	.24	.05	.00
Perceived control over failure	-	-	.50 (.73)	.57 (.89)	.39	.66	-.08	-.11	.18	.17
Attitudes										
Progressive attitudes	.52	.37	3.08 (.33)	3.01 (.32)	2.58	3.84	.22	.28	.10	.04
Authoritarian attitudes	.89	.88	2.95 (.44)	2.97 (.40)	.44	1.22	-.06	-.12	.57***	.42***
Modernity of attitudes	-	-	.13 (.54)	.03 (.51)	3.52	5.46*	.19	.29	.52***	.26*

Note. *N*s range from 86-95. Repeated-measures linear mixed models with gender of parent as the within-subjects factor. Cohen's *d* was computed using Equation 3 for paired samples in Dunlap, Cortina, Vaslow, and Burke (1996).

^aControlling for parents' age, education, and possible social desirability bias.

* *p* < .05.

*** *p* < .001.