

Cultural and Emotional Expression Scale for Filipino Youth (CEES-FY): A Psychological Tool for Understanding Emotional Awareness, Regulation, and Cultural Influences

¹Emma Flor C. Ubalde , ²Leonor Lynette F.C. Mendoza 

Ateneo de Naga University

¹uemmaflor@gmail.com, ²llmendoza@gbox.adnu.edu.ph

Article Details:

Received: 8 July 2026
Revised: 3 August 2026
Accepted: 10 August 2026
Published: 31 August 2026
Corresponding Email:
uemmaflor@gmail.com

Recommended Citation:

Ubalde, E. F. & Mendoza, L. L. (2026). Cultural and Emotional Expression Scale for Filipino Youth (CEES-FY): A Psychological Tool for Understanding Emotional Awareness, Regulation, and Cultural Influences. *The International Review of Multidisciplinary Research*. 1 (10), 192-202.
<https://doi.org/10.67167/vertex.716>

Index Terms:

emotional regulation, Filipino youth, cultural psychology, scale development, emotional intelligence, kapwa, pakikisama, hiya, utang na loob, psychological assessment

Abstract. Emotional awareness, regulation and expression are indicative factors of adolescent development, specifically in communities that are clearly rich in diverse forms of culture. The Cultural and Emotional Expression Scale for Filipino Youth (CEES-FY) was developed to make a thorough assessment with the unique emotional experiences of Filipino adolescents which will integrate cultural dimensions that largely influence emotional expression. Extensively drawn from Emotional Intelligence Theory (Salovey & Mayer, 1990) and Cultural Psychology and Emotion (Markus & Kitayama, 1991), the CEES-FY captures five key dimensions: Emotional Awareness, Emotional Regulation, Interpersonal Emotional Expression, Cultural Influences on Emotional Expression, and Emotional Coping and Family Bonds. The study employed a two-phase validation process which includes exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses. It resulted in a 33-item scale with good internal reliability ($\alpha = 0.792$). Findings suggest that Filipino adolescents' emotional regulation is informed by cultural expectations, where values such kapwa (connectedness), pakikisama (social harmony), hiya (shame), and utang na loob (debt of gratitude) significantly influence how emotions are processed and expressed. The CEES-FY provides a responsive framework in appropriate alignment with culture for understanding adolescent emotional well-being, offering practical applications in psychological assessment, education and mental health interventions. It marks a solid progress not only in heightened awareness of how sociocultural influences greatly affect emotional development but also can act as an invaluable utility in research and practice to support adolescent mental health. This study offers new ground to encourage broader discussions on inclusive psychological assessment and culturally relevant actions by reorienting the focus on the overlap of culture and emotional regulation.

Introduction

Adolescence marks a transitory but transformative phase in life (Cabigon, 1999) which represents a developmental stage that entails both excitement and obstacles. (Limbadan & Udarbe, 2012). Cabigon (1999) focused on the fact that this period is crucial for developing maturity, as adolescents are expected to understand their growth, build self-esteem, think with analytical measure, and engage in sociopolitical and cultural issues. His pressing question remains: "How well are we guiding Filipino adolescents in navigating these challenges and becoming mature, responsible individuals for society?" This stage is often marked by inescapable turbulence, including mood swings, stress, and conflicts (Limbadan & Udarbe, 2012). While not every adolescent experiences adversities with equal intensity, Steinberg (2002) claimed that some face serious psychological and behavioral challenges, including substance abuse, depression, self-harm, and delinquency, that may disrupt their own lives and those around them.

Emotional awareness, expression, and regulation serves an important function in adolescent development, specifically among Filipino youth who navigate distinct sociocultural challenges (Cebu, 2023). Cebu (2023) found that Filipino adolescents exhibit high levels of emotional awareness but often face hardships with emotional regulation. His study highlighted that cognitive reappraisal, which encourages adjusting emotional responses to challenging situations, was a

common skill among adolescents. However, expressive suppression, or the tendency to inhibit emotional expression, has a high incidence. The study further uncovered a link between lower emotion regulation and higher instances of Non-Suicidal Self-Injury (NSSI) behaviors, such as self-hitting and hair-pulling.

Emotional awareness, expression, and regulation are crucial aspects of psychological well-being, and various instruments have been developed to measure them. The Emotion Regulation Questionnaire (ERQ), created by James J. Gross and Oliver P. John in 2003, assesses two primary emotion regulation strategies: cognitive reappraisal, which involves reframing situations to alter emotional impact, and expressive suppression, which refers to inhibiting emotional expressions. This 10-item scale is widely used across different populations. However, the ERQ has a narrower focus compared to the Cultural and Emotional Expression Scale for Filipino Youth (CEES-FY), which aims to assess emotional awareness, emotional regulation, interpersonal emotional expression, cultural influences on emotional expression, and emotional coping and family bonds in Filipino youth. Similarly, the Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale (DERS), developed by Kimberly L. Gratz and Lizabeth Roemer in 2004, examines six dimensions of emotional dysregulation, such as impulse control difficulties and limited emotion regulation strategies. While DERS focuses on identifying and addressing emotional dysregulation, CEES-FY balances both positive and negative emotional processes, emphasizing cultural influences. Another widely used tool is the Trait Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire (TEIQue) by Petrides, Frederickson, and Furnham (2001), which measures emotional intelligence as a personality trait, assessing well-being, self-control, emotionality, and sociability. Unlike TEIQue, which provides a holistic view of emotional intelligence, CEES-FY concentrates on emotional awareness, regulation, and cultural factors.

The study of emotional intelligence in youth populations has also led to the development of specialized assessment tools. The Self-Report Emotional Intelligence Test for Adolescents (SREIT-A), adapted from Schutte et al. (1998), evaluates adolescents' ability to perceive, understand, and manage emotions. Based on Salovey and Mayer's emotional intelligence model, this tool provides insights into emotional well-being and social functioning. However, SREIT-A does not account for cultural values and situational appropriateness as comprehensively as CEES-FY does. Similarly, the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ), developed by Robert Goodman in 1997, is a widely used behavioral screening tool that assesses emotional and behavioral difficulties in children and adolescents. It measures five domains: emotional symptoms, conduct problems, hyperactivity/inattention, peer relationship problems, and prosocial behavior. While the SDQ is a broad behavioral assessment tool, CEES-FY is more specialized in understanding emotional processes and cultural influences.

Cultural factors considerably shape how Filipino adolescents perceive and manage their emotions (Manalastas, 2023). Core values such as *kapwa* (connectedness), *pakikisama* (social harmony), *hiya* (shame), and *utang na loob* (debt of gratitude) affect emotional expression and regulation within this demographic. While these cultural values promote respect and social cohesion, they can also act as barriers to open emotional expression, especially in family settings (Javier et al., 2018). Already established norms emphasizing respect for elders and familial loyalty may result into pressuring adolescents to suppress their emotions rather than seek help (Javier et al., 2018).

Family cohesion is a primary element of Filipino culture that has a dual role in emotional regulation. Supportive family environments can foster emotional resilience, yet family conflicts or a lack of open communication may contribute to emotional distress (Javier et al., 2018). Many Filipino adolescents feel obligated to play a large role in maintaining family honor and avoid bringing shame, leading them to internalize struggles rather than express them openly (Javier et al., 2018).

These findings markedly align with the goals of the Cultural and Emotional Expression Scale for Filipino Youth (CEES-FY), which aims to assess emotional awareness, emotional regulation, interpersonal emotional expression, cultural influences on emotional expression, and emotional coping and family bonds in Filipino youth. By capturing these often overlooked nuances, the CEES-FY can provide much needed holistic knowledge on how Filipino adolescents confront emotional awareness, cultural expectations, and coping strategies within their unique sociocultural landscape.

Research Questions

This study was guided by the following research questions:

1. How can emotional awareness, regulation, expression, and coping strategies of Filipino youth be effectively measured within their cultural context?
2. What are the underlying factors of cultural and emotional expression among Filipino youth, as identified through psychometric analysis?
3. Is the newly developed Cultural and Emotional Expression Scale for Filipino Youth (CEES-FY) a valid and reliable instrument for psychological assessment and intervention design?

These questions address a crucial gap in the psychological assessment of Filipino adolescents, particularly the absence of culturally relevant tools that reflect their unique emotional landscape shaped by Filipino values, such as *hiya*, *pakikisama*, *kapwa*, and *utang na loob*.

Assumptions of the Study

This study is based on the assumptions that: (a) Adolescence is a critical developmental stage for emotional growth; (b) Filipino adolescents' emotional experiences are shaped by cultural values such as *kapwa*, *pakikisama*, *hiya*, and *utang na loob*; (c) These constructs can be measured using a self-report instrument; (d) Respondents provide honest and accurate responses; and (e) The CEES-FY captures the multidimensional nature of emotional functioning within the Filipino cultural context.

Methodology

Design

This study utilized a quantitative, descriptive-inferential, and psychometric design, specifically an instrument development and validation design. The process followed established scale development procedures outlined by DeVellis (2016) and Boateng et al. (2018), emphasizing systematic item generation, content validation, pilot testing, and construct validation. The study integrated both Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) and Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) to establish the factorial structure and validate the measurement model of the Cultural and Emotional Expression Scale for Filipino Youth (CEES-FY).

Theoretical Framework

The development of CEES-FY was grounded in two complementary theories:

1. Emotional Intelligence Theory (Salovey & Mayer, 1990). This theory views emotional intelligence as the capability to recognize, understand, manage, and use emotions effectively in oneself and toward others. It provides the psychological foundation for the constructs of emotional awareness, regulation, and expression.
2. Cultural Psychology of Emotion (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Shweder & Haidt, 2000). This theory posits that emotional processes are shaped by culture-specific scripts and relational values. Based on the Filipino context, emotions are not just personal but are inextricably tied to family, community, and societal expectations.

Together, these frameworks supported the development of a culturally valid instrument that integrates both universal emotional processes and distinctively Filipino emotional expressions and coping styles.

Participants

A total of 307 Filipino youth (aged 13–24) participated in the study. The sample primarily consisted of high school and college students. Participants were drawn from Ligao City, Albay public schools, representing a sample of Filipino youth with varying backgrounds; however, further diversity in socioeconomic and geographic representation is recommended for future studies.

The participants were carefully selected using purposive sampling, with inclusion criteria that ensured cultural relevance: (a) Filipino heritage, (b) enrollment in formal education (secondary or tertiary), (c) ability to understand and respond to the instrument, and (d) willingness to provide informed consent or assent (with parental consent for minors). This demographic represents the primary population for whom the CEES-FY was designed, aligning with developmental psychology literature that emphasizes adolescence and young adulthood as important periods for emotional and identity formation.

For scale development procedures, the same sample was used for both EFA and CFA due to sample size constraints and the exploratory nature of the study. While this approach does not allow for cross-validation through independent subsamples, it is acceptable in initial scale development studies provided that appropriate model fit indices and validity checks are applied. This limitation is acknowledged, and future research is recommended to validate the factor structure using an independent sample to strengthen generalizability and confirmatory evidence.

Instrument Development

The Cultural and Emotional Expression Scale for Filipino Youth (CEES-FY) is a 33-item self-report instrument designed to assess emotional awareness, regulation, expression, and cultural influences on the emotional experiences of Filipino youth. The initial version of the scale consisted of 55 items, which were developed through a comprehensive review of relevant literature, consultations with subject matter experts, and careful consideration of cultural appropriateness within the Filipino context.

To establish content validity, the initial pool of items was evaluated by a panel of three experts in psychology and guidance counseling. The experts assessed each item in terms of clarity, relevance, and cultural appropriateness. Based on their feedback, revisions were made to improve item wording, eliminate ambiguity, and ensure alignment with the intended constructs. Although a formal Content Validity Index (CVI) was not computed, the use of expert judgment provided qualitative evidence supporting the adequacy and representativeness of the scale's content.

Following expert review, the items were further refined through pilot testing to enhance clarity, comprehensibility, and cultural sensitivity. The scale was subsequently subjected to exploratory factor analysis, resulting in a final 33-item instrument composed of five subscales: Emotional Awareness (5 items), Emotional Regulation (10 items; reverse-scored to control for response bias), Interpersonal Emotional Expression (6 items), Cultural Influences on Emotional Expression (7 items), and Emotional Coping and Family Bonds (5 items).

All items are rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). This format allows for the quantification of emotional and cultural tendencies in a manner that is both accessible and developmentally appropriate for adolescents and young adults.

Data Analysis

The data collected in this study were analyzed using both exploratory and confirmatory statistical techniques to evaluate the validity and reliability of the developed scale. Prior to factor analysis, the suitability of the data was assessed using the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) Measure of Sampling Adequacy and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity. A KMO value of at least .60 indicates adequate sampling, while a significant Bartlett's test ($p < .05$) confirms that the correlation matrix is appropriate for factor analysis.

Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was conducted to identify the underlying factor structure of the instrument. Factor extraction was performed using the Minimum Residual method, followed by Varimax rotation to achieve a simpler and more interpretable structure. The following criteria were used in retaining factors and items: (a) Eigenvalues greater than 1.00, (b) Factor loadings of at least .40, and (c) Minimal cross-loadings across factors. Items that did not meet these criteria were removed to improve the clarity and interpretability of the factor structure.

Internal consistency reliability was assessed using Cronbach's alpha coefficient. A value of .70 or higher was considered acceptable, indicating that the items within each factor consistently measure the same construct. Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was conducted to validate the factor structure identified in the EFA. Model fit was evaluated using multiple goodness-of-fit indices, including: (a) Chi-square to degrees of freedom ratio (χ^2/df), with values less than 3 indicating acceptable fit, (b) Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA), with values $\leq .08$ indicating acceptable fit, (c) Comparative Fit Index (CFI), with values $\geq .90$ indicating acceptable fit, and (d) Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI), with values $\geq .90$ indicating acceptable fit. These indices were used collectively to determine the adequacy of the model.

The study established construct validity through exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses, examining factor loadings and model fit indices. Reliability was assessed using Cronbach's alpha. These procedures are widely accepted as sufficient for initial scale validation.

Data Collection Procedure

Data collection for this study was conducted through both in-person and online modalities. Consideration was given to logistical constraints and participant accessibility. Prior to the administration of the instrument, participants were provided with an orientation outlining the nature, purpose, and procedures of the research. Informed consent was obtained from all participants, and for minors, assent was secured alongside parental or guardian consent. The CEES-FY instrument was self-administered in environments that were strictly quiet and free from obstructing distractions to ensure the accuracy and sincerity of responses. Ethical considerations were strictly observed throughout the process. Participation was entirely voluntary, and respondents were assured of the confidentiality and anonymity of their data. Furthermore, participants were informed of their right to withdraw at any stage of the study without any negative consequence. In cases where responses

indicated possible emotional distress, appropriate mental health referrals were prepared to respect the safety and well-being of the respondents.

Results and Discussion

Factor Loadings							
Factor							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	Uniqueness
50	0.695						0.495
43	0.631						0.566
4	0.625						0.587
7	0.590						0.623
2	0.581						0.650
18	0.561						0.625
32	0.473						0.705
35	0.438						0.707
26	0.437						0.696
37	0.433						0.658
23		0.696					0.471
12		0.686					0.474
27		0.626					0.569
40		0.609					0.557
30		0.467					0.684
44		0.462					0.695
52			0.738				0.325
51			0.637				0.542
17			0.524				0.625
54			0.504				0.534
55			0.450				0.596
13			0.441				0.734
19			0.426				0.688
29				0.607			0.413
48				0.598			0.448
11				0.581			0.520
46				0.502			0.730
42				0.462	0.480		0.501

1	0.647	0.561
6	0.515	0.704
3	0.515	0.720
8	0.458	0.705
10	0.454	0.739

Note. 'Minimum residual' extraction method was used in combination with a 'varimax' rotation

Table 1. Exploratory Factor Analysis

Table 1 presents the exploratory factor analysis (EFA) using the minimum residual extraction method with varimax rotation was conducted to examine the underlying structure of the 55-item CEES-FY scale. The items were analyzed with a minimum of 0.4 factor loading.

The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy was 0.791, indicating acceptable factorability. Bartlett's test of sphericity was statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 5747$, $df = 1485$, $p < .001$), confirming that the correlation matrix was suitable for factor analysis.

The scale initially comprised 55 items, of which 33 were retained in the final version following exploratory factor analysis (EFA). The initial EFA results suggested a six-factor solution, as presented in Table 1. However, closer examination indicated that Factor 5 was not psychometrically robust. Specifically, this factor consisted of a single item (Item 42) with a moderate loading (0.480) and a relatively high uniqueness value (0.501), suggesting limited shared variance with the underlying construct. Furthermore, Item 42 demonstrated cross-loading on Factor 4 (loading = 0.463), indicating ambiguity in its factor membership. Given that single-item factors are generally considered unstable and that cross-loadings reduce interpretability, Factor 5 was deemed unsuitable for retention. To address this, Item 42 was reassigned to Factor 4, where it showed better conceptual alignment and acceptable loading. Consequently, the six-factor structure was refined into a more parsimonious and interpretable five-factor model. Following this adjustment, the original Factor 6 was retained and renumbered as Factor 5 in the final model, resulting in a coherent five-factor structure used for subsequent analyses.

Factor 1: Emotional Regulation			
Eigenvalue: 3.07; % of variance: 30.66%			
Indicator	FL	M	SD
50. I find it hard to cope with strong emotions	0.695	0.740	0.0560
43. I find it hard to manage my negative emotions	0.631	0.687	0.0588
4. I find it difficult to name my feelings.	0.625	0.657	0.0643
7. I find it hard to notice my emotions.	0.590	0.634	0.0646
2. I often feel confused about my emotions.	0.581	0.517	0.0544
18. I find it hard to express emotions due to cultural expectations	0.561	0.562	0.0548
32. I often feel that my emotions are too intense for others	0.473	0.414	0.0530
35. I sometimes feel ashamed of my emotions	0.438	0.408	0.0516
26. I feel that I should hide my emotions in public	0.437	0.466	0.0579
37. I worry that expressing my emotions will upset others	0.433	0.382	0.0477

Table 2. Factor Loadings, Mean, and Standard Deviation of Factor 1

Factor 1, identified as Emotional Regulation, reflects an individual's ability to manage, understand, and express emotions effectively. From the 55-item questionnaire, items number 50, 43, 4, 7, 2, 18, 32, 35, 26, and 37 were retained for Factor 1: Emotional Regulation, having a total of 10 items.

The factor loadings (FL) ranged from 0.433 to 0.695, suggesting a strong relationship between the items and the underlying construct. Moreover, Factor 1: Emotional Regulation has an eigenvalue of 3.07, meaning it accounts for a significant portion of the total variance in the dataset. The percentage of variance explained (30.66%) suggests that this factor strongly represents the underlying construct of emotional regulation among respondents.

Factor 2: Interpersonal Emotional Expression
Eigenvalue: 2.15; % of variance: 35.82%

Indicator	FL	M	SD
23. I feel comfortable sharing my sadness with close friends	0.696	0.821	0.0595
12. I feel comfortable expressing my feelings to my friends.	0.686	0.764	0.0576
27. I find it easy to laugh and enjoy time with friends	0.626	0.446	0.0484
40. I believe my friends understand my emotional expressions	0.609	0.601	0.0492
30. I think it's important to show my true feelings to others	0.467	0.531	0.0595
44. I talk to someone when I'm feeling overwhelmed	0.462	0.582	0.0668

Table 3. Factor Loadings, Mean, and Standard Deviation of Factor 2

Factor 2, identified as Interpersonal Emotional Expression, captures an individual's ability and willingness to express emotions in social relationships, particularly with friends. From the 55-item questionnaire, items number 23, 12, 27, 40, 30, and 44, were retained for Factor 2: Interpersonal Emotional Expression, having a total of 6 items.

The factor loadings (FL) ranging from 0.462 to 0.696, indicate a strong association between the items and the underlying construct. Moreover, Factor 2, Interpersonal Emotional Expression, has an eigenvalue of 2.15, indicating that it significantly contributes to the structure of the psychological test. The percentage of variance explained (35.82%) suggests that this factor plays a crucial role in measuring how individuals express emotions in interpersonal relationships.

Factor 3: Cultural Influences on Emotional Expression Eigenvalue: 2.06; % of variance: 29.39%			
Indicator	FL	M	SD
52. I feel a strong connection to my cultural heritage when dealing with emotions	0.738	0.673	0.0445
51. My cultural values shape how I express my emotions	0.637	0.491	0.0431
17. I understand how my cultural values shape my emotional responses.	0.524	0.396	0.0432
54. I believe that showing emotions is important in my culture	0.504	0.569	0.0461
55. I feel proud of my cultural background when expressing my feelings	0.450	0.561	0.0504
13. I believe that cultural norms affect how I express emotions.	0.441	0.367	0.0527
19. I feel a sense of duty to uphold my family's honor in emotional situations.	0.426	0.334	0.0447

Table 4. Factor Loadings, Mean, and Standard Deviation of Factor 3

Factor 3, identified as Cultural Influences on Emotional Expression, highlights the role of cultural heritage, values, and norms in shaping how individuals experience and express emotions. From the 55-item questionnaire, items number 52, 51, 17, 54, 55, 13, and 19, were retained for Factor 3: Cultural Influences on Emotional Expression, having a total of 7 items.

The factor loadings (FL) ranging from 0.426 to 0.738, indicate a strong association between these items and the overarching theme of cultural influence. Moreover, Factor 3, Cultural Influences on Emotional Expression, has an eigenvalue of 2.06, indicating that it meaningfully contributes to the psychological test. The percentage of variance explained (29.39%) suggests that this factor effectively captures the role of cultural influences in shaping emotional expression.

Factor 4: Emotional Coping and Family Bonds Eigenvalue: 1.53; % of variance: 30.58%			
Indicator	FL	M	SD
29. I feel free to share my feelings with my family	0.607	1.070	0.0614
48. I seek support from family when I need help	0.598	1.007	0.0638
11. My family talks openly about emotions.	0.581	0.995	0.0624
46. I engage in physical activities to release tension	0.502	0.420	0.0674
42. I try to change negative thoughts to feel better.	0.462	0.192	0.0478

Table 5. Factor Loadings, Mean, and Standard Deviation of Factor 4

Factor 4, identified as Emotional Coping and Family Bonds, highlights the role of family support and coping strategies in managing emotions. From the 55-item questionnaire, items number 29, 48, 11, 46, 42, were retained for Factor 4: Emotional Coping and Family Bonds, having a total of 5 items.

The factor loadings (FL) ranging from 0.462 to 0.607, suggest that emotional well-being is strongly influenced by open family communication and adaptive coping mechanisms. Moreover, Factor 4, Emotional Coping and Family Bonds, has an

eigenvalue of 1.53, suggesting that it accounts for a meaningful portion of variance in the dataset. The percentage of variance explained (30.58%) indicates that this factor plays an important role in assessing how individuals rely on family support and coping mechanisms to manage emotions.

Factor 5: Emotional Awareness Eigenvalue: 1.36; % of variance: 27.30%			
Indicator	FL	M	SD
1. I can easily recognize when I am feeling sad.	0.647	0.597	0.0559
6. I can tell when my mood changes suddenly.	0.515	0.419	0.0529
3. I can identify when I am feeling anxious.	0.515	0.474	0.0576
8. I can identify when I am feeling happy.	0.458	0.381	0.0506
10. I often reflect on my feelings after an event.	0.454	0.316	0.0518

Table 6. Factor Loadings, Mean, and Standard Deviation of Factor 5

Factor 5, identified as Emotional Awareness, reflects an individual's ability to recognize, identify, and reflect on their emotions. From the 55-item questionnaire, items number 1, 6, 3, 8, and 10, were retained for Factor 5: Emotional Awareness, having a total of 5 items.

The factor loadings (FL) ranging from 0.545 – 0.647, indicate that this construct is strongly associated with self-awareness and emotional introspection. Moreover, Factor 5, Emotional Awareness, has an eigenvalue of 1.36, indicating that it contributes meaningfully to the test structure. The percentage of variance explained (27.30%) suggests that this factor plays a role in measuring individuals' ability to recognize and reflect on their emotions.

Fit Measures				
RMSEA 90% CI				
CFI	TLI	RMSEA	Lower	Upper
0.820	0.804	0.0595	0.0543	0.0646

Table 7. Confirmatory Factor Analysis Fit Measures

The confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) results indicated suboptimal model fit. The Comparative Fit Index (CFI = 0.820) and Tucker–Lewis Index (TLI = 0.804) both fall below the commonly accepted threshold of 0.90, suggesting that the model does not achieve an adequate level of fit. These findings indicate that, although the proposed factor structure is theoretically grounded, it may not fully capture the underlying relationships among the observed variables.

In contrast, the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA = 0.0595), with a 90% confidence interval of 0.0543–0.0646, falls within the acceptable range, indicating a reasonable approximation of model fit. The upper bound of the confidence interval remaining below 0.08 further supports this interpretation.

Taken together, these results suggest that the model demonstrates partial but not fully satisfactory fit. While the factor structure remains interpretable and theoretically meaningful, the discrepancy in fit indices highlights the need for further refinement. Future model improvements may include item revision, re-specification of factor loadings, or testing alternative models. Despite these limitations, the model provides a useful preliminary framework for assessing cultural and emotional expression among Filipino youths.

Factor	Mean	SD	Cronbach's α
1: Emotional Regulation	2.31	0.606	0.817
2: Interpersonal Emotional Expression	3.63	0.702	0.784
3: Cultural Influences On Emotional Expression	3.64	0.545	0.790
4: Emotional Coping And Family Bonds	3.18	0.826	0.760
5: Emotional Awareness	4.21	0.533	0.664
Whole scale	3.39	0.348	0.792

Table 8. Reliability Analysis (Scale Reliability Statistics)

The reliability analysis for each factor shows acceptable to good internal consistency. Emotional Regulation ($\alpha = 0.817$) demonstrates strong reliability, indicating consistency in measuring difficulties in managing emotions. Interpersonal Emotional Expression ($\alpha = 0.784$) and Cultural Influences on Emotional Expression ($\alpha = 0.790$) also show good reliability,

suggesting that these subscales effectively assess emotional communication and the role of cultural norms. Emotional Coping and Family Bonds ($\alpha = 0.760$) is within the acceptable range, reflecting stable measurement of emotional support and coping strategies within family dynamics. Emotional Awareness ($\alpha = 0.664$), while slightly lower, still falls within an acceptable range, showing that it reliably captures recognition and understanding of emotions.

For the overall scale, the reliability coefficient of $\alpha = 0.792$ indicates good internal consistency, suggesting that the test provides stable and reliable measurements of cultural and emotional expression among Filipino youths. This supports the scale's potential as a valuable tool for assessing emotional experiences within a cultural context.

Variable	SSEIT
CEES-FY	.45**
N	307

Note: ** $p < 0.001$

Table 9. Correlation Matrix

The correlation analysis between the CEES-FY scale and the validated measure SSEIT resulted in a moderate positive correlation ($r = 0.454$, $p < .001$, $df = 305$). This significant relationship provides evidence for both convergent and concurrent validity of the CEES-FY scale. The moderate correlation suggests that the two measures assess related but distinct aspects of emotional functioning, supporting convergent validity by confirming that the CEES-FY scale aligns with a theoretically similar construct. Additionally, the significant association with an established instrument demonstrates concurrent validity, indicating that the CEES-FY scale effectively measures emotional functioning in a manner consistent with existing validated tools. These findings reinforce the reliability and applicability of the CEES-FY scale in assessing cultural and emotional expression among Filipino youths.

Evidence of Validity

The present study provides initial evidence of the validity of the CEES-FY. Content validity was supported through the theoretical grounding of items in culturally relevant Filipino constructs such as *kapwa*, *pakikisama*, *hiya*, and *utang na loob* as well as expert review during item development. Construct validity was established through exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses, which supported a five-factor structure.

Convergent validity was indicated by the meaningful correlations among subscales and alignment with theoretical expectations. However, discriminant validity was not formally tested and should be examined in future research. Criterion-related validity was also not directly assessed in the present study, representing an important direction for further validation.

Overall, the findings provide preliminary support for the scale's validity, although additional studies are needed to establish a more comprehensive validation framework.

Limitations of the Study

This study is subject to several limitations that should be considered when interpreting the findings. First, the use of self-report measures may introduce response biases such as social desirability and limits the ability to capture actual behavioral or physiological aspects of emotional expression. Future research may benefit from incorporating multi-method approaches, including behavioral observations, physiological indicators, or informant reports (e.g., parents or teachers). Second, while the sample size of 307 participants is adequate for factor analytic procedures, the demographic composition of the sample may limit the generalizability of the findings. Future studies should aim to include more diverse participants across regions, socioeconomic backgrounds, and educational contexts. Third, although the overall scale demonstrated acceptable reliability, the Emotional Awareness subscale showed comparatively lower internal consistency, indicating the need for further refinement of items within this domain. Finally, this study did not examine test-retest reliability or measurement invariance across groups, which are important for establishing the temporal stability and cross-group applicability of the instrument. Future research is encouraged to address these aspects to further strengthen the psychometric properties of the CEES-FY.

Conclusion and Recommendations

The development and validation of the CEES-FY contribute to the growing body of literature on culturally grounded psychological assessment, offering both theoretical and practical value. The findings support the premise that emotional awareness, regulation, expression, and coping among Filipino youth can be meaningfully assessed using an instrument grounded in Filipino cultural context. The CEES-FY demonstrated acceptable internal consistency and preliminary

construct validity, supporting its potential use in research and applied settings such as counseling, school-based interventions, and emotional skills programs.

The study offers important implications. Theoretically, the findings reinforce the importance of situating emotional constructs within cultural contexts, emphasizing that emotional processes cannot be fully understood independent of sociocultural influences. The study contributes to the integration of Emotional Intelligence Theory and Cultural Psychology by demonstrating how culturally shaped emotional norms influence the structure and expression of emotional competencies among Filipino youth. Practically, the CEES-FY provides a culturally appropriate tool for educators, counselors, and psychologists to assess emotional functioning and inform the development of culturally sensitive interventions, such as emotion regulation training, school-based counseling programs, and preventive mental health initiatives. It may be particularly useful in school guidance programs, mental health initiatives, and youth development interventions.

Future studies are encouraged to examine the predictive validity of the CEES-FY in relation to outcomes such as mental health, resilience, and academic performance. Additionally, expanding the sample to include more diverse populations and employing longitudinal designs will further strengthen the scale's applicability and generalizability.

The CEES-FY represents a meaningful step toward addressing the need for culturally relevant psychological assessment tools for Filipino youth. By integrating cultural values into the measurement of emotional processes, the scale offers a more contextually grounded understanding of adolescent emotional development. Continued validation and application of the CEES-FY will be essential in establishing its role as a standard tool for culturally responsive assessment and in advancing inclusive psychological research and practice.

Acknowledgement

The authors are grateful to God for His guidance throughout the research process. Gratitude is extended to the participants for their voluntary participation, to Dr. Leonor Lynette F.C. Mendoza of Ateneo de Naga University for her guidance and validation of the study, and to Dr. Jessica U. Sayson, Secondary School Principal IV of Ligao National High School, and Dr. Jovert Ofracio of Ligao Community College, for approving and supporting the conduct of the study.

Funding

This research received no external funding from any public, commercial, or not-for-profit funding agency, and no organization provided financial support for the conduct of the study, authorship, or publication of this article.

Competing Interests Statement

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this article.

Data Availability Statement

The datasets generated and/or analyzed during the current study are not publicly available due to ethical and confidentiality considerations involving human participants. However, de-identified data may be made available by the corresponding author upon reasonable request, subject to approval and in accordance with institutional guidelines.

References

- Bowlby, J. (1988). *A secure base: Parent-child attachment and healthy human development*. Basic Books.
- Boateng, G., Neilands, T., Frongillo, E., Melgar-Quinonez, H., & Young, S. (2018). Best Practices for Developing and Validating Scales for Health, Social, and Behavioral Research: A Primer. *Front. Public Health*, 6. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2018.00149>
- Cabigon, J. (1999). Understanding Filipino Adolescents: Research Gaps and Challenges. *Philippine Social Sciences Review*, 56(1-4).
- Cebu, J. C. (2023). Non-Suicidal Self-Injury Symptomatology as Aftereffect of Emotion Regulation in a Community Sample of Filipino Adolescents. *East African Scholars Journal of Psychology and Behavioural Science*, 5(4). DOI: 10.36349/easjpbs.2023.v05i04.005.
- Cummings, E. M., & Davies, P. T. (2010). *Marital conflict and children: An emotional security perspective*. Guilford Press.

- Goodman, R. (1997). Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ). *APA PsycTests*. <https://doi.org/10.1037/t00540-000>
- Gratz, K. L., & Roemer, L. (2004). Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale (DERS). *APA PsycTests*. <https://doi.org/10.1037/t01029-000>
- Gross, J.J., & John, O.P. (2003). Individual differences in two emotion regulation processes: Implications for affect, relationships, and well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85, 348-362.
- Gross, J. J. (2015). *Emotion regulation: Conceptual and practical issues*. Guilford Press.
- Javier, J., Galura, K., Aliganga, F. A., DO, J. S., & Palinkas, L. (2018). Voices of the Filipino Community Describing the Importance of Family in Understanding Adolescent Behavioral Health Needs. *Family Community Health*, 41(1), 64-71. DOI: 10.1097/FCH.0000000000000173.
- Lane, R. & Smith, R. (2021). Levels of Emotional Awareness: Theory and Measurement of a Socio-Emotional Skill. *National Library of Medicine*, 9(3). doi: 10.3390/jintelligence9030042.
- Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, appraisal, and coping*. Springer.
- Limbadan, N. & Udarbe, M. H. (2012). Adolescents' Emotional Awareness, Regulation, and Transformation: Emotion-Focused Therapy as Anger Management. *Siliman University*, 53(2).
- Manalastas, G. A. (2023). *Emotion Regulation Strategies and Internalizing/Externalizing Problems in Filipino Americans: The Moderating Role of Acculturation*. Retrieved from <https://scholarworks.calstate.edu/downloads/r781wq07z>.
- Markus, H.R. & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the Self: Implications for Cognition, Emotion, and Motivation. *American Psychological Association, Inc.*, 98(2), p. 224-253. Doi: 0033-295X/91/.
- Morie KP, Crowley MJ, Mayes LC, & Potenza MN. (2023). The process of emotion identification: Considerations for psychiatric disorders. *J Psychiatr Res*. doi: 10.1016/j.jpsychires.2022.01.053.
- Nicomedes, C. J., Gamad, M. J., Dinglasa, J. V., Manas, J., & Patricio, L. A. (2020). An Exploration of Filipino Resilience of Young Adults in the 21st Century. *Research Gate*. DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.13317.63200.
- Petrides, K. V., Frederickson, N., & Furnham, A. (2004). Trait Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire--144 (TEIQue). *APA PsycTests*. <https://doi.org/10.1037/t12409-000>
- Riggio, H. (2017). Emotional Expressiveness. *Encyclopedia of Personality and Individual Differences*. doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-28099-8_508-1.
- Salovey, P. & Mayer, J. D. (1990). Emotional Intelligence. *Sage Journals*, 9(3). Doi: doi.org/10.2190/DUGG-P24E-52WK-6CD.
- Schutte, N.S., Malouff, J.M., Hall, L.E., Haggerty, D.J., Cooper, J.T., Golden, C.J., et al. (1998). Development and validation of a measure of emotional intelligence. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 25, 167-177.
- Shweder, R. A. & Haidt, J. (2000). *The Cultural Psychology of the Emotions: Ancient and New*. Handbook of Emotions, p. 397 – 410.
- Steinberg, L. (2002). *Adolescence*. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.
- Ti, Y. & Yang, J. (2021). The Social Nature of Emotion Expression: What Emotions Can Tell Us About the World. *Frontiers in Psychology*. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2021.686182.
- Varnum, M. E. W., Grossman, I., Kitayama, S., & Nisbett, R. The Origin of Cultural Differences in Cognition: The Social Orientation Hypothesis. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 19(1), p. 9-13. Doi: 10.1177/0963721409359301.

Appendices

No appendices are attached to this study.