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In career development research with racial/ethnic minorities, researchers have examined the cross-cultural validity of existing career constructs and theories, as well as culture-specific constructs such as acculturation. There has also been an increase in the examination of contextual variables, such as culture and race, in Asian American career development research. Psychological separation and attachment are familial variables which have been shown to influence aspects of career development. However, studies in this area have sampled primarily Caucasian populations or have combined different ethnic groups in the sample. Given the possible differences between ethnic groups, the main purpose of this study was to examine psychological separation (PSI; Hoffman, 1984) and attachment (IPPA; Armsden & Greenberg, 1987) and their influence on career maturity and career commitment among Filipino American college students. This study also sought to determine how culture-specific constructs, such as acculturation (AAMAS; Chung et al., 2004) and interdependence (SCS; Singelis, 1994), relate to separation and to what extent these cultural variables influence the relationships between separation and attachment and the career variables. Additionally, acculturation was hypothesized to influence the interest area and prestige of Filipino Americans’ career choices, as well as their willingness to compromise on a career choice with their parents. My findings
revealed that acculturation and interdependence related differently to psychological separation from parents. In addition, separation and attachment had limited impact on career maturity and career commitment. Greater interdependence was associated with lower separation, as measured by a composite of emotional and attitudinal independence. Higher acculturation was related to lower conflictual independence for mother only. The relationship between the separation composite and career maturity was stronger for lower acculturated Filipino Americans. Participants who reported greater conflictual independence had higher scores on career maturity, and participants who reported greater conflictual independence and attachment reported greater career commitment. Some gender differences were found. Males were more psychologically independent from their parents than females and females tended to choose Social occupations with greater frequency than males. Contrary to hypotheses, acculturation was not related to career preference, occupational prestige, or willingness to compromise with parents on occupational choice.
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CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

A recent review of family and contextual variables on career development by Whiston and Keller (2004) inspired researchers in the area of career development to affirm not only the examination of familial variables, but also contextual factors (i.e., Blustein, 2004; Brown, 2004). As Blustein (2004) points out, this extends the focus on career development from an intraindividual perspective to one that is couched in context. Together, these variables, such as attachment, culture, race, and those stemming from family of origin, inform one’s career development and implementation of career plans, both directly and indirectly. Based on Whiston and Keller’s (2004) review, Brown (2004) noted the scarcity of studies reporting results for racial and ethnic minorities (REMs), and suggested that researchers examine variables that impact career-related outcomes, such as vocational exploration and career decidedness. Such variables include parental separation and attachment. Brown suggested that attachment may be a salient variable for collectivistic cultures. This paper discusses the influence of both psychological separation and parental attachment on selected career development constructs in one specific Asian group, Filipino Americans.

Asian Americans and Career Development

In his review of career development of Asian Americans, Leong (1985) stated that “only fragmentary knowledge of Asian Americans appears in the career development literature (p. 540).” In addition, he noted that career development theories applicable to Asian Americans are lacking and that most have been based on a White, middle-class sample. In a more recent review of trends in career development research with REMs,
Byars and McCubbin (2001) underscored the importance of cultural validity of career theories, as well as the examination of variables affecting career development specific to different cultures.

Within the past decade, studies on Asian Americans and career development have examined such areas of interest as acculturation (e.g., Park & Harrison, 1995), career maturity (e.g., Leong, 1991), career interest and choice (e.g., Leung, Ivey, & Suzuki, 1994), independent and interdependent self-construal (e.g., Hardin, Leong, & Osipow, 2001), and perceived barriers (e.g., Luzzo, 1993). Through these studies, culturally-relevant constructs that have been applied to Caucasian Americans have been examined in relation to the Asian American population. For example, Asian Americans have been shown to be low in career maturity ["the extent to which an individual has mastered the developmental tasks appropriate to his or her career stage” (Hardin et al., 2001, p. 36)]. Hardin and her colleagues proposed that Asian American’s low career maturity may not be due to their lower independence in career-decision making, but rather their interdependent self-construal. Self-construal refers to how individuals see themselves in relation to others. Persons who have an independent self-construal tend to be separate, autonomists and individualists. In contrast, persons who have an interdependent self-construal have “flexible, variable selves” that are intertwined with others.

Hardin et al. noted that those with interdependent self-construal may be more influenced by the wishes of significant others and so may be less likely to compromise when making a career choice, in the sense that there is less personal involvement by the individual in the career-decision making process. This proposition was touched upon by Tang, Fouad, and Smith (1999), who examined social cognitive theory of career choice
behavior (Lent, Brown, & Hackett, 1994) in relation to factors influencing Asian American’s career choices. Their findings indicated that interest does not influence career choice but familial influence does. In this study, the most frequent occupations chosen were those that have been stereotyped to Asian Americans (e.g., engineer, physician, scientist). Tang et al. concluded that the participants seemed to choose traditional occupations, regardless of interest. Because a positive relationship exists between family involvement and career choice, the authors posit that parental influence plays a part in Asian Americans’ career choices.

Tang (2002) examined family influences on the career choices of Chinese, Asian Americans, and Caucasian Americans. Tang found that Asian Americans and Caucasian Americans were more likely to compromise on a career choice with their parents, as compared to the Chinese participants, who tended to yield more to their parents’ choice. In addition, a discrepancy was shown between participants’ ideal choice and actual career choice. Consistent with Park and Harrison’s findings (1995), Asian Americans’ career choices were distributed in a more balanced manner when they were asked to choose an occupation assuming they had no limitations. Tang (2002) posited possible explanations for this discrepancy, including the importance of prestige, financial stability, occupational stereotyping, and the need to overcome difficulties experienced by first-generation Asian Americans. What Tang did not examine, however, was the role of acculturation. Previously, Tang et al. (1999) found that acculturation influenced career choice in that Asian Americans who were highly acculturated were more likely to choose less typical occupations than those who were less acculturated. Along these lines, Tang (2002), in her more recent study, suggested that acculturation may have influenced Asian Americans to
compromise with their parents. Other studies have shown the influential role
acculturation plays in Asian American career development. For example, Park and
Harrison (1995) found that Asian Americans who were more highly acculturated had
more interest in careers in the Social category (of the Self-Directed Search [SDS;
Holland, 1991]) than the low to medium acculturated participants.

With the exception of a study by Leong, Kao, and Lee (2004), which investigated
family dynamics and the career interests of Chinese Americans and Caucasian Americans
using the Family Environment Scale (FES; Moos & Moos, 1987), there has not been
much focus on familial influence in Asian American career development. Within the
career development literature more generally, however, psychological separation and
attachment have provided a foundation from which to explore the role of familial
influence, specifically relationship with parents.

*Psychological Separation and Parental Attachment*

The concept of separation or individuation is taken from contemporary
psychoanalysis and family systems theory, and is defined as “the process of increasing
one’s sense of differentiation from parents and achieving some degree of self-definition”
(Rice, 1992, p. 203). Attachment, as conceptualized by Bowlby (1988) and Ainsworth,
Blehar, Walters, and Wally (1978), refers to affectional ties or bonds providing a secure
base from which autonomous functioning is promoted. Bowlby (1988) indicated that
these bonds persist throughout the lifespan, from infancy and infants’ ties to their
caregivers, to adolescence and adulthood, where parental ties continue but new bonds are
also created, such as with partners.
The influence of both separation and attachment has been examined in relation to identity development. Grotevant and Cooper (1986) identified various aspects of identity development, including interpersonal relationships, values, sexual identity, and with respect to career development, occupational choice. Kenny and Donaldson (1991) examined the relationship between parental attachment and family structure and social and psychological functioning among college freshmen, using the Parental Attachment Questionnaire (PAQ; Kenny, 1987) as a measure of attachment. The authors found that secure attachment was associated with adaptive functioning for college women, specifically with social competence and decrease in stress. Within the area of separation/individuation, Rice (1992) found in his longitudinal study that separation from parents [as assessed by the Psychological Separation Inventory (PSI; Hoffman, 1984)] in participants’ junior year of college was positively related to greater college adjustment as compared to freshman year. Separation/individuation was associated with social and emotional adjustment, but not academic adjustment. Although gender mean differences were not clinically significant, a different pattern of significant relationships was found for men versus women between separation/individuation and college adjustment in the freshman and junior years. Although a positive relationship existed between separation/individuation and social and emotional adjustment for women in their freshman year, no such relationship existed for men. In women’s junior year, separation/individuation was associated with social adjustment and to a lesser degree emotional adjustment. The results were opposite for the males, who evidenced greater emotional adjustment than social adjustment.
Researchers, including Rice (1992) and Kenny and Donaldson (1991), have pointed out the importance of taking into account both separation and attachment as influences on psychological maturity and development. In their model of individuation, Grotevant and Cooper (1986) incorporated these competing needs, in the sense that they touch upon both connectedness and individuality within family relations. They briefly discussed historical perspectives on individuation. Specifically, they summarized the construct of individuation from the work of Blos (1979) and Mahler (1979) as a “process of disengaging from parents and to the achievement of becoming a separate person” (Grotevant & Cooper, 1986, p. 88). They also discussed the views of other researchers (e.g., Bell & Bell, 1983, as cited in Grotevant & Cooper, 1986) who referred to individuation as being more “a quality of relationships in the family” (p. 88). However, Grotevant and Cooper’s model is different from other individuation models that either assert that adolescents must sever ties with their parents or that adolescents’ relationships with their parents remain continuous. Instead, they emphasize the continual bond of the parent-child relationship into adolescence and adulthood. They have incorporated both the concepts of separation and attachment and have taken family context into account as a relational influence on individual development. Specifically, they define an individuated relationship as “one in which moderate to high levels of individuality are expressed…in the context of at least moderate levels of connectedness” (p. 91). Kenny and Donaldson’s (1991) emphasis is on connection. They write that “connection…is viewed as primary, as important throughout the life span, and as offering the potential for fostering security and promoting competence” (p. 480). Kenny and Donaldson also emphasized that this promotion of autonomous functioning is different from dependency.
Although these authors’ views are coming from different perspectives, what is significant is the consideration of both psychological separation and parental attachment as important for identity development. Blustein, Prezioso, and Schultheiss (1995) expanded upon the argument that attachment is as important as separation/individuation to the process of development when they discussed the influence of attachment on career development. In reviewing the literature that examined attachment relationships, whether through Bowlby’s (1988) construct or by examining parent-adolescent connectedness in general, Blustein and his colleagues (1995) concluded that attachment relationships positively influence developmental progress. They asserted that it is risk-taking and exploration of new roles and novel settings that is important in developmental tasks. Furthermore, it is through the idea of exploration that Blustein and his colleagues extended the influence of attachment relationships into the area of career development, such as in career exploration and decision-making.

Research in the area of career development has examined both psychological separation and attachment, as independent influences, or in combination. Separation and attachment to parents have been examined in relation to such career development constructs as career indecision (Kinnier, Brigman, & Noble, 1990) career commitment (Blustein, Walbridge, Friedlander, & Palladino, 1991; Scott & Church, 2001), and career maturity (Lee & Hughey, 2001). Kinnier et al. found that undergraduates who are more individuated are less likely to experience difficulty in deciding on a career. Lee and Hughey (2001) did not find a significant relationship between psychological separation and career maturity; however, they found that a secure attachment is significantly related to career maturity. Other studies have found that both separation and attachment can
influence the career development process. Blustein et al. (1991) found no significant relationship between psychological separation and career indecision or decision-making self-efficacy, but did find that a balance of both psychological separation and attachment leads to progress in committing to career choices. Brown’s (2004) observation regarding the limitation of cultural components within career development research holds true, however, as cultural background in these studies has been primarily limited to Caucasian participants.

Brown (2004) noted the limited studies examining race and ethnicity as contextual variables in career development research. Racial and ethnic minorities have been included in sample populations examining career development and the influence of psychological separation and attachment. However, research examining these influences within specific REM groups is virtually nonexistent. Within the general attachment literature, proponents of attachment theory have encouraged the incorporation of cultural theories, norms, values and other culture-specific constructs to fully understand the contextualized meaning of attachment behaviors (Crittenden & Claussen, 2000; Harwood, Miller, & Irizarry, 1995). The importance of this can be seen in how attachment patterns vary among different cultural groups. For example, Harwood et al. (1995) wrote that though the secure attachment style (Group B) is “more modal in most cultural groups…Group C [anxious/resistant] is more common in Israel and Japan” (p. 11). As discussed above, attachment past early childhood has been a focus of study, as the effects of attachment carry throughout the entire lifespan (Crittenden & Claussen, 2000). Ethnicity as a contextual variable in this population has been examined in only a few studies (Lopez, Melendez, & Rice, 2000). For example, it has been examined in
relationship to emotional well-being between Blacks and Whites (Rice, Cunningham, and Young, 1997). Though not necessarily within the attachment framework, one study is worth noting because it involved Asian Americans and perceptions of family relationships. Greenberger and Chen (1996) examined family environment and relationship with parents (maternal/paternal warmth and conflict with mother/father). They compared Asian American and European American adolescents (7th and 8th graders) and college students and found only one significant difference between early adolescent Asian Americans and European Americans—Asian Americans perceived their mothers to be less warm and accepting. Perceived family environment and parental relationships were overall positive in late adolescents for both ethnic groups. One other finding relates to independence. Greenberger and Chen noted that familial conflicts seemed to decrease with age for European Americans but increased with age for Asian Americans. The authors suggested that establishing autonomy and independence may be a delayed process for Asian Americans.

As previously discussed, the process of psychological separation/individuation is thought to be important to psychological adjustment. However, to what extent this process plays out among Asian Americans is unclear. Though not a major focus in her study, Lucas (1997) alluded to cultural and ethnic factors when discussing the results of her study, which examined the contributions of psychological separation (as measured by the PSI) and selected career development constructs on participants’ identity development [as measured by the revised Extended Objective Measure of Ego Identity Status (EOMEIS-R; Bennion, L. D., & Adams, G. R., 1986)]. Her participants included 47% Caucasians and the rest from other ethnic groups, primarily African Americans
Lucas created her hypotheses, in part, by drawing on gender differences found in the literature. For example, she noted that women have a greater orientation towards maintaining connection and commitment to relationships than do men. Accordingly, she anticipated that women would more often refer to their parents’ views and seek continuous emotional support throughout the exploration process. Lucas found, however, that for men, a lower level of conflictual independence was related to a higher level of exploration. In addition, lower levels of emotional independence for men and attitudinal independence for women positively related to commitment of various dimensions of identity. Lucas noted that identity formation and the extent to which specific cultural groups accept mainstream American values are not well-studied, and that identity formation for these groups may be a different process. In particular, Lucas suggested that this process may include acceptance of parental beliefs and values. She concluded that “for the men and women in [the] sample, ‘coming into one’s own’ cannot succeed outside of the relational structure of the family” (p. 130).

Lucas’s study (1997) highlighted the potentially different meaning and process of individuation for individuals from diverse cultural backgrounds. With respect to identity development, Lucas indicated that this process is a dynamic one for minority students who live in the majority culture. She writes that “in some cultures, identity development may not involve distancing oneself from one’s parents’ beliefs and values, but rather accepting without question established beliefs” (p. 129). An underlying assumption in this statement is the significance of both culture and context. For ethnic minorities, such
as Asian Americans, their degree of interdependence and acculturation to U.S. society may play a role in their degree of individuation as defined by the majority culture.

*Purpose of the Study*

The movement toward examining relevant contextual factors, such as culture and ethnicity, can be seen in recent literature. Within career development research, researchers have begun to question and examine the cultural validity of career development constructs for minority groups (e.g., Hardin et al., 2001), as well as assessments of other contextual factors, such as family environment, that may affect career development (e.g., Leong et al., 2004). The purpose of this study was to extend research by Tang (2002) and Leong et al. (2004) in examining familial influence and relevant contextual and cultural factors. Specifically, it sought to examine the influence of psychological separation and attachment on the career development of Filipino Americans and how culturally specific constructs, such as acculturation and interdependence, may influence these relationships.
CHAPTER TWO

Literature Review

The results of studies that have examined the influence of psychological separation and attachment on various aspects of career development have been mixed. While some studies support the independent role of psychological separation (e.g., Kinnier et al., 1990) and others the independent role of parental attachment (e.g., Ketterson & Blustein, 1997) on career development constructs, other studies support the combined influence of separation and attachment (e.g., Blustein et al., 1991). In this chapter, I review the research relating separation-attachment to career indecision, career maturity, career commitment, and other selected career development constructs. I then discuss Asian American career development research and follow this with a discussion of Filipino Americans. I conclude this chapter with a list of my hypotheses.

Psychological Separation, Attachment, and Career Development

Career Indecision

Tokar, Fischer, Subich, and Moradi (2003) broadly defined career indecision as "the inability to select and commit to a career choice" (p. 3). In their review of the influence of family of origin on career development, Whiston and Keller (2004) concluded that the degree to which familial variables influence career indecision remains inconclusive. This conclusion appears to be supported with the studies discussed below.

Using a sample of undergraduate and graduate students, Kinnier et al. (1990) found a weak, though significant positive relationship between psychological separation and career indecision. Career indecision was measured by the Career Decision Scale (CDS; Osipow, Carney, Winer, Yanico, & Koschier, 1976) and psychological separation
by two scales from Version C of the Personal Authority in the Family System Questionnaire (PAFS-Q; Williamson, Bray, & Malone, 1982). Kinnier et al. postulated that the relative newness of the PAFS-Q and the low test-retest reliability coefficient (.55) of the individuation scale may have affected the results. Individuation accounted for 3% of the total variance of career indecision (11%), along with student status (2%), whereas age accounted for the greatest percentage of variance (6%). With a median age of 23 in a population that ranged from 17-54 years of age, results revealed that older students in this sample were more decided than younger students, and graduate students were more decided than undergraduates. Those who were more decided in turn tended to be more individuated.

Blustein et al. (1991) conducted two studies. The first examined the influence of psychological separation on career indecision and career decision-making self-efficacy among college students. Undergraduates under 20 years of age were excluded to rule out the developmental factors that can account for high indecision. The CDS was used as a measure of career indecision. The PSI, rather than the PAFS-Q, was used to measure psychological separation. There was no support for a relationship between psychological separation and career decision-making. After examining mixed findings in the literature, Blustein et al. (1991) concluded that psychological separation may be linked to vocational identity, which is a component of one's process of developing a "coherent and separate identity" (p. 42). They stated that the familial antecedents to career indecision, on the other hand, may be more complex. To illustrate, Blustein et al. used the construct of psychological separation as an example. They suggested that difficulties in psychological separation may lead to career foreclosure for some individuals but
indecisiveness for others. In light of this argument, Blustein et al. conducted a second study exploring career development from a developmental perspective, which will be discussed below, but also encouraged further research on career indecision.

More recent studies have since addressed the inconsistent conceptualization of career indecision. Santos and Coimbra (2000) proposed that the unidimensional focus of the career indecision construct in previous research may account for inconsistent findings relating career indecision and family interactions in extant literature. In a study of Portuguese high school students in the 12th grade with two living parents, Santos and Coimbra (2000) examined the relationship between psychological separation and two types of career indecision, developmental and generalized. They translated and adapted for use with Portuguese secondary school students the PSI, the Indecisive Scale (IS; Frost & Shows, 1993) for generalized indecision, and the Career Factors Inventory (CFI; Chartrand, Robbins, Morril, & Boggs, 1990) for developmental indecision. Only the Conflictual Independence (CI) and Emotional Independence (EI) scales of the PSI were used, and two factors were extracted from the CFI, Generic Indecision (GIND) and Need for Career Exploration (NFCE). The Conflictual Independence Scale assesses the absence of guilt, anxiety, mistrust, or resentment toward parents, and the Emotional Independence scale assesses freedom from an excessive need for approval, closeness, and emotional support from parents. Although it was found that females showed less independence from their parents on three of the scales (CI for father, EI for mother, EI for father), as with previous research (e.g., Blustein et al., 1991), no relationship was found between psychological separation and career indecision. Santos and Coimbra (2000) agreed with the conclusion proposed by Blustein et al. (1991), that individuals with low psychological
separation may be on either ends of the career indecision continuum for both generalized and developmental indecision. In particular, they discussed the potential differences between career exploration that is self-initiated (crystallized) from that which is influenced by parental figures (pseudocrystallized). The latter may influence the individual's tendency to foreclose on a career. Santos and Coimbra (2000) acknowledged the limitations of current instruments to distinguish between these two types of exploration and offered Marcia's (1987) ego identity status model as a theoretical approach that would enable this distinction. Ultimately, they proposed four statuses of career decision, which allow for convergence of the processes of identity and the processes of career exploration and investment. The four statuses represent two types of decision (autonomous and foreclosed) and two types of indecision (developmental and diffuse).

As previously discussed, both psychological separation/individuation from parents and attachment security are believed to facilitate ego identity development, which in turn has been linked to the promotion of effective career development (Blustein et al., 1995; Lopez & Andrews, 1987). Tokar et al. (2003) considered both the influence of psychological separation and attachment on career indecision, and proposed that vocational self-concept crystallization would mediate this relationship. As did Santos and Coimbra (2000), Tokar et al. (2003) differentiated between types of career indecision, specifically global indecision, as measured by the CDS (Osipow et al., 1987), and Career Indecisiveness and Need for Information, as measured by the CFI (Chartland et al., 1990). A difference in this study from previous studies that examined an individual's attachment to parents was the investigation of a broader construct, adult attachment styles
[as measured by the Adult Attachment Scale (AAS; Collins & Read, 1990)]. The authors proposed that existing measures that assess an individual’s attachment to parents may not be measuring attachment at all, but the general affective quality of parental relationships. The three subscales of the AAS (Depend, Close, and Anxiety) are proposed to measure the underlying dimensions of Hazan and Shaver's (1987) description of the three attachment styles. Depend (measures “belief that others can be depended on”) and Close (measures “comfort with closeness”) scores were used as indicators of Attachment security, and Anxiety (assesses “extreme desire for closeness and fear of abandonment”) scores were used to assess Attachment Anxiety. This choice for a broader assessment of attachment was in response to the indication of construct redundancy between parental attachment measures (e.g., IPPA; Armsden & Greenberg, 1987) and measures of psychological separation (e.g., PSI) (Obrien, 1996), as well as the possibility of examining the influence of other types of relationships, such as peer and romantic.

Tokar et al. (2003) also discussed the relationship between adult attachment styles and personality. In particular, they examined the personality dimension of neuroticism, which has been consistently shown to relate to career indecision (Tokar, Fischer, & Subich, 1998). In addition, a key goal in this study was to determine to what extent mother and father separation make independent contributions in predicting career indecision. Tokar et al. proposed that examining separate parental influences may reveal parent-specific relations to career indecision, unlike previous studies that combined measures of separation-individuation for both parents. In their review of selected attachment and separation-individuation measures, Lopez and Gover (1993) noted the advantage of using separate subscales to assess relationships with each parent in
determining the nature of mothers’ and fathers’ influence on different developmental outcomes. Tokar et al. (2003) also pointed out the negative relationships between the Conflictual Independence subscale of the PSI and the other three PSI subscales in previous research and discussed how researchers have assessed the Conflictual Independence subscale separately or combined the other three subscales as a measure of overall separation. Tokar and his colleagues conducted LISREL analyses through which they specified four latent variables for separation: Maternal and Paternal separation (Functional, Emotional, and Attitudinal Independence) and Maternal and Paternal Conflictual Independence. Their sample was composed of university students, ages 18 to 52, with a mean age of 22.7. The authors split the sample into older (above 21) and younger (21 and below) participants to determine equivalence between the two groups and subsequently determined that the data can be combined into a single sample.

The results of Tokar et al.'s (2003) study supported a relationship between separation and attachment and all three of the career indecision constructs (global career indecision, need for information, and career indecisiveness), though not in all of the expected directions. For global career indecision, greater maternal separation and maternal conflictual independence resulted in greater vocational self-concept crystallization and less career indecision. However, “psychological separation from father was related to less vocational self-concept crystallization, and through its effect on vocational self-concept crystallization, greater indecision” (p. 15). And as expected, greater levels of attachment anxiety were related to less vocational self-concept crystallization and greater global indecision. Attachment security, however, was not related to self-concept crystallization or any of the dependent variables. Tokar et al.
proposed that the results for attachment anxiety may be due to attachment anxiety being one manifestation of neuroticism, which has been shown to relate to career indecision (Tokar et al., 1998). For informational (i.e., need for information) and personal-emotional antecedents of indecision (i.e., career-indecisiveness), relations that were observed for global indecision were also observed for these antecedents. However, there were departures from the model that included unique direct effects on career indecisiveness, which were not mediated through vocational self-concept crystallization. First were the direct effects of greater attachment anxiety, poor separation from mother, and greater psychological independence from father on "students' chronic anxiety about and inability to make career decisions" (p. 16). In another direct effect, greater maternal conflictual independence was related to lower career indecisiveness. In addition, the combination of predictor variables and mediator variable accounted for more variance in personal-emotional antecedents (67%) than for informational antecedents (27%) of indecision, suggesting the existence of other possible factors contributing to informational antecedents.

In sum, only two of the studies found relationships between psychological separation and career indecision, with Kinnier et al. (1990) finding a weaker relationship than Tokar et al. (2003). With the exception of Kinnier et al. (1990), who utilized the PAFS-Q as a measure of separation/individuation, all other studies utilized the PSI. Anxious attachment also related to less vocational self-concept crystallization and greater global indecision. The more recent studies of career indecision have also differentiated between different kinds of career indecision, emphasizing a multidimensional focus for this construct. More research needs to be conducted, however, to further determine the
role of separation and attachment on career indecision. The manner in which the PSI was used has not been consistent in the above studies. Some studies have used separate subscales and others the whole instrument. However, it is possible that, as Tokar et al. (2003) concluded, more information is revealed, and more relationships are found, between separation and career indecision when mother and father influences are separated.

**Career Maturity**

Swanson and D'Achiardi (2005) described career maturity as a multidimensional concept, with attitudinal and cognitive dimensions, that "has been used to describe both the process by which individuals make career choices appropriate to their age and stage of development and their ability to successfully resolve and transition through the specific tasks of each of these stages" (p. 358). According to these authors, there has been controversy not only about the definition of career maturity, but also about what the instruments that purport to assess career maturity exactly measure. The three studies that will be discussed in this section all utilized subscales from the Career Development Inventory (CDI; Super, Thompson, Lindeman, Jordaan, & Myers, 1981) as measures of career maturity, with two studies (Kenny, 1990; Lee & Hughey, 2001) utilizing the College and University Form (CDI-CU; Super et al., 1981). Two subscales of the CDI, Career Planning (CP) and Career Exploration (CE), assess the attitudinal component of career maturity. Career Planning assesses the extent to which the student engages in career planning activities and student’s knowledge of what they would like to do after completing their education. Career Exploration assesses the student’s awareness of sources of career planning information. Two additional CDI subscales, Career Decision-
Making (CDM) and World-of-Work Information (WW), assess the cognitive component. The Career Orientation Total (COT) combines scores from both the attitudinal and cognitive dimensions.

The Career Planning subscale of the CDI was used to assess career maturity in a study conducted by Kenny (1990). She explored the perspective of attachment theory described by Ainsworth et al. (1978), who argued that the attachment figure provides a secure base that is "stable and promote[s] autonomy and competence" (p. 40). Kenny sought to examine the role of attachment with a population that will be making a transition from college to the adult world. Therefore, she assessed college seniors' perceptions of parental attachment and examined the relationship between attachment and social competence. Maturity in career planning, in addition to assertion and dating competence, were used as an index of social competence. Twenty-nine of the participants had participated in a similar study in their freshmen year and served as a comparison group. Time and gender effects were assessed. Although career planning was used as a measure of career maturity, Kenny did not explain the rationale for focusing on only this subscale. Parental attachment was assessed by the Parental Attachment Questionnaire (PAQ; Kenny, 1987), a 55-item questionnaire containing three factors: Quality of the Parental Relationship (Factor 1), Parental Role in Fostering Autonomy (Factor 2), and Parental Role in Providing Emotional Support (Factor 3). Participants were asked to think of their parents together when filling out the questionnaire, except in the event that students' parents were separated or divorced, in which case participants were asked to "respond with reference to [their] living parent or the parent toward whom [they] feel closer." Kenny (1990) found small but significant associations between the Autonomy
factor and career planning for females, the Emotional Support factor and career planning for males, and the Emotional Support factor and career planning for the combined sample. In general, both males and females reported that the quality of parental interactions were positive, viewing their parents as both supportive and encouraging independence. Women averaged higher, however, for emotional support, which Kenny suggests may be indicative of women being more willing to give and receive help from others. No significant time effects were found in comparing the results of seniors who participated in their first year and their current results, nor between first year scores and the total sample. Kenny did not find a relationship between parental attachment and dating competence. Based on the above results, Kenny concluded that parental attachment and its relationship to career maturity among this sample is "stable and enduring throughout the college years" (p. 43).

Whereas Kenny's study examined the influence of parental attachment on career maturity among students who will be leaving college, Thomason and Winer (1994) explored the influence of separation or "familial independence" (p. 24) among students in late adolescence, using a sample of college freshmen who were less than 20 years old. Because of the reported inadequate reliabilities for the Functional Independence scale (Hoffman, 1984) and negative correlations between the Attitudinal Independence scale and a measure of adjustment [Adjective Check List Personal Adjustment scale (Gough & Heilbrun, 1983)], Thomason and Winer used only the scores for Emotional and Conflictual Independence scales of the PSI, and two composite scores for both mother and father. Thomason and Winer also chose the Career Development Attitudes (CDA) and Career Orientation Total (COT) subscales of the CDI over the other subscales
because of their reported superior reliabilities. The CDA score is derived from two attitude scales. The COT score is derived from the two attitude scales and two cognitive scales. The authors observed that past studies found gender differences with the PSI and CDI and so analyzed data separately by gender. No significant relationship was found between separation and career maturity; however, mean differences between genders were revealed. Women obtained a higher career development score, which the authors observed is consistent with previous literature. There was no difference in performance between genders on the CDA, but women scored higher on the COT. Thomason and Winer (1994) suggested this finding may be attributed to the differing ways men and women approach the inventory. Specifically, women see the inventory as more of a cognitive test of ability, whereas men may see the inventory as unrelated to academic demands. In addition, men's intelligence, unlike women's, was unrelated to any of the scales. In considering a past study of career decidedness (Graef et al., 1985), Thomason and Winer posed the possibility of gender socialization and its influence on how men and women make career decisions. Specifically, social norms may influence men to make career decisions before they are ready, whereas women will base their decisions on interest and achievement (e.g., grade point average).

Kenny's (1990) study supported the role of attachment on career maturity, whereas Thomason and Winer (1994) did not find separation to be a contributing factor. Lee and Hughey (2001) considered both the independent and combined influence of separation and attachment on career maturity in a sample of college freshmen. Psychological separation was assessed by the PSI and parental attachment was assessed by the mother and father subscales of the Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment.
(IPPA; Armsden & Greenberg, 1987). The IPPA is a 75-item inventory assessing the affective, cognitive, and behavioral dimensions of an individual's relationship to his or her parents and peers. To guard against confounding variables due to class standing, family structure, and ethnic background, only Caucasian students from intact families were included in this sample. Because the focus of the study was on the attitudinal components of career maturity and the cognitive components do not possess adequate reliabilities (Betz, 1988), the career planning (CP) and career exploration (CE) subscales of the CDI were used. Lee and Hughey (2001) also examined whether there would be significant differences in gender, but found none. In assessing the independent contributions of separation and parental attachment, only attachment was found to relate to career maturity. An analysis with both separation and attachment was significant, once again with attachment and not separation significantly contributing to career maturity.

Further analyses behind the nature of this relationship revealed that a moderate degree of functional dependence on both mother and father, a moderate degree of conflictual independence from father, and a moderate degree of attachment to mother positively relate to career exploration. Based on the above results, Lee and Hughey concluded that attachment is a more influential factor than separation on career maturity, and that neither separation nor attachment significantly contributes to career planning.

In general, the above studies suggest that attachment plays a more influential role than psychological separation on career maturity, as assessed by the CDI. The various authors posed diverse reasons for choosing particular CDI subscales. Kenny's (1990) rationale was not clearly explained and the explanation behind Lee and Hughey's (2001) focus on the attitudinal dimension was unclear. However, both Lee and Hughey's and
Thomason and Winer's (1994) choices suggested a preference for the attitudinal dimension and subscales, which they reported to have more favorable reliabilities than the other subscales. This may suggest that the cognitive dimension of the CDI has questionable psychometric properties. Because they found no influence of separation and attachment on career planning, Lee and Hughey (2001) stated that career planning may be influenced by other factors. Thus, they proposed that career planning and career exploration "should not be considered one dimension" (p. 290). Kenny (1990) found a significant relationship between attachment and career planning, but this relationship was small. Different attachment measures were used for these studies as well. Future research may need to continue to explore this issue to further delineate the relationship between attachment and career planning. In addition, other measures of career maturity, which are purported to be facilitative in career counseling (Swanson & D'Achiardi, 2005), have not been researched in relationship to separation or attachment. These include the Career Maturity Inventory (CMI; Crites, 1978; Crites & Savickas, 1995) and the Adult Career Concerns Inventory (ACCI; Super, Thompson, & Lindeman, 1984).

**Career Commitment**

Scott and Church (2001) described career commitment as "[including] a series of stages through which the person progresses and a focus on the process of the choice rather than its content," a construct which "suggests not only a sense of certainty about a career choice but also a level of confidence and positive anticipation about that choice despite the hard work of attainment that may lie ahead" (p. 331). Thus, career commitment is not only an indication of an ultimate career choice, but a conclusion that suggests a high degree of personal investment from the individual in the career
development process. In this section, career commitment is examined using the Commitment to Career Choices Scale (CCCS; Blustein, Ellis, & Devenis, 1989), a 2-dimensional scale that assesses (a) progress in committing to a career choice [i.e., the Vocational Exploration and Commitment Scale (VECS)], and (b) individual differences in the approach used to commit to a career choice [i.e., Tendency To Foreclose Scale (TTFS)]. Blustein et al. (1991) and Scott and Church (2001) utilized this scale in examining the influence of both psychological separation and attachment.

A particular focus for Scott and Church was the effects of parental divorce. They also examined other variables that may influence career decidedness and commitment, including financial independence and financial press. Their sample consisted of undergraduates from both intact families and from divorced families. A further distinction was made between students whose parents were recently divorced (the student was 15 years or older at the time of the divorce) or previously divorced (the student was under 15). Greater conflictual independence, parental attachment (as measured by the PAQ, Kenny, 1987), and financial press all modestly predicted students' progress in the career commitment process. These predictive relations were somewhat stronger for students whose parents were recently divorced, suggesting that parental divorce can accelerate psychological separation. Additionally, financial independence was higher for students from intact families than from families with divorced parents. However, separation, attachment, and financial press were not related to the tendency to foreclose.

Blustein et al.'s (1991) sample consisted of undergraduate students from intact families. No significant relationships were found between separation and attachment variables and career commitment when either psychological separation (as measured by
the PSI, Attitudinal and Conflictual Independence subscales) or attachment (as measured by the IPPA) was controlled. However, the authors did find a positive relationship between the combined influence of these variables and the career development process, with different influences for each gender. For women, a moderate degree of attachment to both parents, plus conflictual independence, resulted in greater commitment to career choice and less of a tendency to foreclose. For men, it was attachment to, and conflictual independence from, fathers that resulted in greater commitment, showing a more robust relationship between men and their fathers. Unlike in the female sample, however, no associations were found between separation and attachment variables and variations in the tendency to foreclose for men.

Taken together, these studies suggest a conjoint influence of psychological separation and parental attachment on committing to a career choice, but not on the tendency to foreclose. Scott and Church (2001) hypothesized that the limited relationship found between separation-attachment and the career commitment process in their study may be due to the multicollinearity of the predictors. The choice of attachment measure may be driven by theory or researchers’ preferences, but it appears that the IPPA is more often selected as the attachment measure of choice. The gender difference in Blustein et al.’s (1991) study reflects a reoccurring finding of women averaging higher than men in attachment to their parents. This finding gives credence to Kenny’s (1990) assertion that, as compared to men, women more easily “give and receive help from others…and to solve problems through communication and interaction with others” (p. 44).
Other Career Development Constructs and Self-Efficacy

As discussed above, Blustein et al.'s (1991) first study did not find a relationship between separation and either career indecision or decision-making self-efficacy. In a sample of high school women from a Catholic school, a study by O'Brien (1996) also examined self-efficacy, specifically career self-efficacy beliefs. O'Brien hypothesized that both attachment (as measured by a revised IPPA) and separation (as measured by an altered PSI for high school students) would influence career development. Accordingly, O'Brien examined the influence of young women's relationship with their parents on self-efficacy, career orientation, congruence of career choice, and realism of career choice. Although no significant effects were found for congruence of career choice, attachment and separation did influence self-efficacy beliefs, career orientation, and realism. In examining the unique contribution of the independent variables, however, only separation was significant. However, O'Brien asserted that lack of Conflictual, Functional, and Attitudinal Independence from the mother nevertheless indicates the "presence of a connection with mother," and thus attachment's contribution in the process towards individuation. Like other researchers (e.g., Tokar et al., 2003), O'Brien (1996) commented on the significant correlations between the IPPA and the PSI, and suggested an improvement in scale development to clearly differentiate between the two constructs.

O'Brien, Friedman, Tipton and Linn (2000) sampled from the same population five years later and again examined whether attachment and separation would influence career self-efficacy beliefs, and, in turn, career orientation. They also examined changes in career self-efficacy, aspiration, realism, congruence, prestige, and traditionality of career choice. In this study, O'Brien et al. attributed the intercorrelations between the
attachment and separation measures to continued attachment to parents but not complete independence from them. Although the same separation and attachment measures were used, O’Brien et al. did not include Conflictual Independence because this scale did not correlate highly, or showed an inverse correlation, with the other scales. Only attachment to mother at Time 1 and attachment to father at Time 2 had a direct effect on self-efficacy beliefs, which in turn influenced career aspirations at both times. The size of the relationships was small. None of the independent variables from Time 1, however, directly affected self-efficacy at Time 2. Women’s career self-efficacy, career aspiration, congruence of career choice, attachment, and independence from parents did not change over time. O’Brien et al. suggested that attachment may play a stronger role at this point in the women’s lives.

The above studies once again underscore issues related to scale development and the underlying constructs that separation and attachment measures are purported to assess. Evidence for the impact of separation and attachment on varying career constructs has been demonstrated. O’Brien et al. (2000) have touched upon something integral to young adults, and that is the “mutual” influence of attachment and separation. Given the age and population of their sample, O’Brien et al. briefly commented on the possibility that independence from parents may occur later in life (e.g., when having their own family). Both studies sampled from the same population of women, who were privileged and had attended a Catholic high school. Thus, results can not be applied to the general population. For example, the greater importance women placed on family over career may stem from cultural factors and from factors related to attending a religious school. With respect to women’s career development, O’Brien et al. also assessed another
research area of focus, that of traditionality of career choice. Though careers the women
selected matched their interests, traditionality of career choice increased over the span of
five years for this particular group. The authors attributed this to the women’s possible
anticipation of establishing a family.

In addition to career exploration, Ketterson and Blustein (1997) also addressed the
extent to which attachment influences traditionality of career choice among
undergraduate students taking a career and life planning course. Similar to the studies
above, Ketterson and Blustein utilized the IPPA as a measure of parental attachment. The
authors hypothesized that secure attachment would foster greater comfort in undergoing
“potentially uncomfortable experiences,” including the exploration of nontraditional
careers (p. 169). Although attachment to both parents was significantly related to self as
well as environmental exploration, results did not render support for their hypothesis
regarding gender traditionality. As with Kinnier et al. (1990), who found that older
students were more decided on a career, older students in the present study engaged more
in self-exploration. This does not seem surprising given that the students in this career
and life planning course may have been motivated to explore by virtue of being in the
class. Those approaching graduation perhaps felt even more pressed to engage in
exploratory activity.

Ketterson and Blustein (1997) underscored the importance of secure, comfortable
relationships in the process of career development. If such a relationship with parents
does not exist, the authors encourage the utilization of other support networks. As has
been illustrated (Tokar et al., 2003), other researchers have discussed the potential for
increasing our understanding of the relationship between other attachment relationships
and career development. For example, in recommending a way to better differentiate between separation and attachment constructs, O’Brien (1996) asserted that the IPPA may be an “index of the quantity of general attachment” and suggested the development of an instrument that “differentiates among types or quality of attachment” (p. 269). This suggestion is reminiscent of Tokar et al.’s (2003) study, which assessed the influence of relationships outside of the parental realm on career indecision.

**General Discussion**

Among the contextual factors that can account for influences on career development, psychological separation and parental attachment are only two of many. As previously discussed, the research relating separation and attachment to various career constructs has resulted in mixed findings. Some evidence points toward the inconsistent utilization of separation-attachment measures and demographic variables that may account for these mixed results. Some researchers have noted the redundancy between attachment and separation measures (O’Brien, 1996; Scott & Church, 2001; Tokar et al., 2003). In fact, Lopez and Gover (1993) stated that scale developers seem to have included aspects of both attachment and separation, as if “directly or [tacitly acknowledging] that both adaptive attachment and separation-individuation incorporate some element of the other construct” (p. 566). By examining the combined influence of both separation and attachment, some researchers have acknowledged the interrelatedness of these two constructs. Tokar et al. (2003) chose to utilize an attachment measure that examines attachment relationships outside of the parental one, and O’Brien (1996) suggested refining the measures themselves so that a clearer differentiation can be made between the two constructs. With respect to undergoing scale refinement, Lopez and
Gover (1993) stated that measures with well-articulated theoretical frameworks have an advantage (e.g., PAFS, IPPA) over those with a mixed theoretical base, such as the PSI. As a measure of separation/individuation, the PSI appears to be the preferred separation measure among these studies. It is, however, used inconsistently. Some researchers have utilized only select subscales, others have used the entire measure, and still others have used separate subscales for each parent. The Conflictual Independence scale, in particular, appears to consistently relate to career development constructs. Among the attachment measures, the IPPA and the PAQ are used with relatively equal frequency in the above studies, though with slightly greater frequency for the IPPA. As attachment seems to be related to most of the career constructs above, more studies examining the relationship between parental attachment on career indecision seem needed, as only one study out of four incorporated attachment (i.e., Tokar et al., 2003). Additionally, with respect to the career constructs, issues have been raised regarding inconsistent conceptualization (career indecision) or validity of measures used to assess them (career maturity).

With respect to sample demographics, Whiston and Keller (2004) stated that researchers may want to consider age, culture, and gender when examining family of origin influence on career outcomes. Among some of these studies, age may have contributed a possible developmental influence and prevented consistent findings. For example, unlike the other studies that assessed career indecision in undergraduate students, Kinnier et al. (1990) included both undergraduate and graduate students. Kinnier and his colleagues showed that career decidedness increases with age. Much of the same can be said for the older students in Ketterson and Blustein’s (1997) study, who
engaged more in career exploration. Gender differences have been found in some studies (e.g., Blustein et al., 1991), yet the role of gender in the attachment and separation process remains unclear. For example, on one attachment measure (PAQ), Kenny (1990) showed that women are more likely to perceive their parents as a source of emotional support than men (PAQ), whereas Lee and Hughey (2001) did not find significant gender differences (IPPA). With respect to race, research studies among African Americans and Latino/a Americans show that familial influence, specifically parental support, may be even more significant for those from different racial backgrounds (Whiston & Keller, 2004). Some studies did not indicate the race or ethnicity of the participants (e.g., Blustein et al., 1991), whereas other studies were primarily of Caucasian participants (from 74%-92.7%). This reinforces the need to investigate the influence of separation and attachment with different ethnicities.

Influences on Asian American Career Development

Byars and McCubbin (2001) reviewed trends in career development research among various racial/ethnic minority groups (R/EMs), including Asian Americans. One main trend was the conscious effort by researchers to examine not only the cultural validity of career constructs and theories, but also culture-specific constructs (e.g., acculturation). This trend seems to reflect the recommendations made by several researchers, who have observed that current career development theories may not be applicable to ethnic minority groups (e.g., Leong, 1985; Luzzo, 1992). These researchers have encouraged further examination of the validity of these theories for ethnic minorities and the creation of culturally valid career development constructs. The increase in research on Asian American career development that has taken place over the past two
decades answers a call made by researchers such as Leong (1985), who found only three published studies of career-related research in the Asian American population. Leong posed several interacting explanations for the limited research and interest (e.g., the “success myth,” p. 539). He also identified variables that may influence Asian American career development, such as career segregation, acculturation as a possible moderator of career choice, and barriers to pursuing certain occupations. For example, he cited the existence of social and cultural stereotypes that Asian Americans excel in the scientific and engineering fields. The following review discusses research that has addressed the elements mentioned above, and the role of acculturation in reference to familial influence and to selected vocational constructs.

Influences on Vocational/Career Interest

Asian Americans, including international students (Shih & Brown, 2000), have expressed intentions to seek career counseling (Leong, 1991). Within the realm of career development research, occupational/vocational interest is a major career-related construct that has been investigated in many studies (e.g., Leong, Kao, & Lee, 2004). Leong and Hayes (1990) stated that the majority of Asian Americans pursue occupations in the science and engineering fields, although the reasons for this remain unclear. In their study of occupational stereotyping, they found that Asian American students are perceived by Caucasian American students as excelling in these types of occupations, such as mathematician and computer scientist. Studies of career development often classify occupations utilizing career measures based on Holland’s (1985) theory, which identifies six vocational types. Mathematicians and computer scientists are classified under the Investigative type. Additionally, Asian Americans were perceived to be less successful as
insurance salespersons (Long & Hayes, 1990). With the exception of one study (Leong et al., 2004), current research indicates that Asian Americans do appear to aspire more to Investigative and Realistic occupations than to Social ones (Leung, Ivey, & Suzuki, 1994; Park & Harrison, 1995; Tang, 2002; Tang, Fouad, & Smith, 1999).

Leong and Hayes (1990) discussed the possibility that these stereotypes may act as barriers to career development for Asian Americans, as internalization and socialization to these “traditional” careers may be encouraged as a result (p. 153). In her study of career choices, Tang (2002) also addressed the possibility that the Investigative interests of Chinese and Asian Americans may reflect occupational stereotyping and occupational discrimination, but also vicarious learning. Asian Americans may believe that engineering and science-related types of occupations are the ones in which they are most likely to succeed. In Luzzo’s (1993) survey, which addressed possible barriers to career development in five ethnic groups, racial discrimination was designated as a possible ethnic identity barrier. Participants’ responses to the open-ended survey were coded into preselected categories that have been investigated in past studies of career-related barriers. Additional barriers included family-related (e.g., family responsibilities), study skills, ethnic identity, and financial barriers. Luzzo treated Filipino and Asian Americans as two separate groups. He found that only study skills was a significant perceived future barrier for Filipino and Asian Americans, more so than for any other ethnic group. Filipinos and Asian Americans less frequently (13% and 25%, respectively) reported past ethnic identity barriers, as opposed to African Americans (40%). Filipino and Asian Americans were also less likely than other ethnic groups to cite perceived past financial barriers. Small ethnic sample sizes and the unknown reasons behind the
perceived barriers are limitations of Luzzo’s (1993) study. Nevertheless, he indicated that the differences found support the value of further investigation into these barriers and how they affect career development of ethnically diverse groups. The percentage of Asian Americans citing past ethnic barriers would have increased, however, had Luzzo included Filipinos in the Asian American group. Other studies, such as the one by Leong and Hayes (1990), included Filipinos in the narrower category of ‘Oriental’, in the hopes that this would trigger participants’ reference to what the authors identified as the primary Asian groups: Chinese, Japanese, Korean, and Filipino. Still others (e.g., Tang et al., 1999) have formed no such ethnic subgroups. Combining these different Asian subgroups assumes homogeneity among these groups. Relatively small sample sizes of each Asian group in research studies also exclude the potential to examine within-group differences.

One trend in REM research is a shift in focus from studying an ethnic group in relation to European Americans towards “understanding” (Byars & McCubbin 2001, p. 642) each ethnic group’s unique worldviews. However, this trend has not been prevalent with studies of vocational constructs in Asian American samples. A common approach in understanding Asian American career development has been to study different Asian groups as a whole and, as Byars and McCubbin noted, in relation to Caucasian Americans. Leung, Ivey, and Suzuki (1994) made such a comparison in their investigation of influential factors in Asian American career choices. They, too, noted the possible effects of stereotypes, including the possibility of a self-fulfilling prophecy. In their study, they sought to examine potential influences on career choice, specifically personality and prestige level in a desired career—two explanations offered in the limited
Asian American career development literature in the 1970s to explain the career choice patterns of Asian Americans. The first explanation is what Leung and his colleagues termed the “personality structure hypothesis” (Sue & Kirk, 1973), which posits that Asian Americans prefer occupations characterized as more “structured, logical, concrete, and impersonal” and less ambiguous than those that require interpersonal interaction and verbal communication (Leung et al., 1994, p. 404). The second explanation is the “prestige hypothesis,” an idea suggested by Sue and Frank (1973), which refers to choosing occupations that will allow greatest survival and avoid racial and cultural discrimination. Leong (1991) addressed this latter hypothesis in his study of career development attributes and occupational values among Caucasian and Asian Americans. He found that, compared to Caucasian Americans, Asian Americans more often endorsed extrinsic and security values, values which include the attainment of prestige, status, and stability and security for the future. Similarly, the prestige hypothesis was supported in Leung et al.’s (1994) study, in which Asian Americans were more attracted to Investigative occupations than were Caucasian Americans. Investigative occupations are associated with high prestige. Leung et al. (1994) offered the possibility of familial and parental influences on the selection of occupations with high prestige. Tang (2002), in her examination of whether familial or social-cultural environment would influence career choice, also offered a prestige explanation of Asian American parents’ preference for Investigative occupations for their children. The prestige hypothesis, however, can not account for why Enterprising occupations, which also tend to be high in prestige, were the least attractive for these students. However, low preference for Enterprising occupations is congruent with the personality structure hypothesis because Enterprising
occupations often require “forceful communication and interpersonal influencing” (p. 407). Both populations in Leung et al.’s (1994) study were willing to consider Social, Artistic, and Realistic occupations. This finding lends partial support for the personality structure hypothesis because consideration of Social and Artistic occupations is not expected to fit within this framework. Leung and his colleagues proposed that because Social occupations tend to involve helping and teaching, these types of occupations may be more congruent with Asian American preferences in a people-oriented profession.

Prior to conducting their analyses, Leung et al. established equivalence between US-born and non-US born Asian Americans by showing that there were no generational differences on career choice. Acculturation is another factor that may influence career choice (e.g., Leong & Chou, 1994). One underlying question when considering acculturation and career choice is the following: Are the career choice patterns of higher acculturated Asian Americans more similar to those of Caucasian Americans? Acculturation is a process, and it is purported to occur when two cultures come together and one or both cultures change. Cuéllar (2000) defined acculturation as “an ecological, transactional process that occurs at various levels of human organization and functioning” (p. 47). These levels are consistent with the four levels of Bronfenbrenner’s Ecological Systems Theory (1989), which emphasizes a reciprocal relationship between individuals and their contexts. Cuéllar discussed how the process of acculturation can impact these levels: the microsystem level, where the focus is on the individual’s immediate context, cognition, emotion, behavior, beliefs, and other areas of functioning; the mesolevel, where acculturation can influence social and group behavior (e.g.,
customs, rituals); the exolevel, where institutions and organizations can be impacted; and the macrosystem level, which reflects factors such as culture, language and values.

Forty-nine of the 149 Asian Americans in Leung et al.’s (1994) study were born in the US, but many of them had lived in the US for over 10 years. The current mean age of participants was 24.6 years. Leung et al. did not find significant differences between US born and non-US-born Asian Americans on type of occupations preferred and prestige level of these occupations. The authors attributed this to the non-U.S. participants residing in the US for more than 10 years and so may have had the same level of acculturation as US-born participants. But it may also suggest that the population in this study continues to prefer Investigative occupations regardless of possible acculturation effects. In another study, Tang (2002) directly assessed student occupational preferences and parental involvement for Chinese students, Asian Americans, and Caucasian American students. She acknowledged that their exposure to two cultures may explain Asian American students’ willingness to compromise with their parents if a career choice conflict should arise. Although Chinese students were also willing to compromise, they more often stated that they would follow their parents’ advice on a career, while Caucasian American students stated that they would insist on making their own choices. Though both Leung et al. (1994) and Tang (2002) suggested familial and acculturative influences on career choice, only Tang included parental involvement in her questionnaire, and neither study directly assessed acculturation.

Acculturation and Familial Influence

Brown (2004) wrote that the family is most likely the biggest influence on career development. Given the collectivistic nature of Asian American culture (Hu & Chen,
1999), the importance of family, and the interdependence that has been shown to exist within such a culture’s dynamics (e.g., Hardin et al., 2001), it is not surprising that many researchers attribute family involvement as a possible significant factor in Asian American career development. Because Asian cultures place high importance on family, exploring the extent to which family dynamics influence career development can have practical usefulness when working with the Asian American population. For example, as discussed earlier, the values of prestige and security have been assessed (Leong, 1991) and reflected in the types of occupations Asian Americans prefer (Leung et al., 1994). Tang (2002) stated that, with the Asian American population, “an individual’s career choice is hardly an individual’s choice but a choice that has evolved from family needs and expectations” (p. 125). The overall results of her study do indeed give credence to the influence of family. Not only did Asian American parents prefer Investigative occupations for their children, but the majority of Asian American students’ actual career choices were indeed Investigative.

Byars and McCubbin (2001) underscored the importance of cultural validity of career theories and the need to examine variables affecting career development specific to different cultures. In response, Leong, Kao, and Lee (2004) conducted a study to examine the influence of family dynamics among Asian Americans. In their comparison of Chinese Americans and European Americans, they incorporated the role of acculturation, collectivism, and the influence of family dynamics, as measured by the Family Environment Scale (FES; Moos & Moos, 1987), on career interests. They hypothesized that Chinese Americans’ family environment would be more cohesive, less expressive, and have less conflict than the family environments of European Americans. Because of
Asian American values such as respect and loyalty, Leong et al. postulated that Asian Americans would implicitly understand the desires of their parents and the expectations their culture and family would have surrounding career interests. In utilizing the FES, Leong et al. hoped to incorporate a “cultural context” (p. 69) (i.e., family dynamics) into career assessment, and link this to career assessment tools. The Vocational Preference Inventory (VPI; Holland, 1985) was used to assess occupational interests and values and the Suinn-Lew Asian Self-Identity Acculturation Scale (SL-ASIA; Suinn, Rickard-Figueroa, Lew, & Vigil, 1987) was used to assess acculturation level. Contrary to previous findings, Chinese Americans preferred Enterprising occupations (26%), followed closely by Investigative (24%) and Social (22%) occupations. Similar to previous findings, however, a majority of European Americans preferred Social occupations (42.2%). The authors speculated that the Chinese American students may have been influenced by their “roots from burgeoning industrialized countries” (p. 78), in addition to their own personal and “family-generated” interests. The possibility of such an environmental influence may explain the partial support regarding acculturation level and occupational interest; the only significant relationship was a negative one between acculturation and Artistic preference. This suggested that as acculturation increased, Artistic interest decreased. The authors observed that this finding is similar to the career patterns of European Americans. Leong et al. (2004) also found that higher acculturation led to increased family cohesion, a finding contrary to their initial hypotheses. Also contrary to their hypotheses, Chinese Americans were higher in family conflict and lower in family cohesion than European Americans. As expected, Chinese Americans were lower in family expressiveness than European Americans. Explanations that Leong et al.
posed for these non-supportive findings included financial problems and generational and acculturation gaps. The Chinese American population as a whole reported relatively low acculturation levels. Assessing generational level would have further illuminated the extent to which generational gaps do exist. There was no significant relationship between family dynamics and occupational interests and values. It is possible that this lack of relationship may be a function of the family inventory used. Two out of the three expected relationships for ethnicity and for acculturation were not supported. Further research is needed to determine whether variables assessed by the FES may be variables influential for Chinese Americans and their career interests. A measure that more directly assesses parental and family involvement on career choice, such as the one used by Tang (2002), may account for more direct familial and parental influence. The Chinese students in Tang’s study predominantly preferred Investigative occupations, as did Asian Americans. The contrast in findings between these two studies may be due to geographical differences or within-group differences. Both Tang’s (2002) and Leong et al.’s (2004) samples were comprised of Chinese and Chinese American students. Chinese American students have constituted the biggest percentage of Asian Americans in empirical studies (e.g., Park & Harrison, 1995), and appear to be the only Asian American population that has often been studied as a single ethnic group. Using the FES with other Asian American populations may garner different results.

Tang, Fouad, and Smith (1999) also focused on contextual factors in their study based on Lent, Brown, and Hackett’s (1994) model of career choice and performance. The model is based on Bandura’s (1986, 1997) social cognitive theory, which “provides a social cognitive framework for understanding three aspects of career development:
interests, academic and career choice options, and performance and persistence in educational and occupational options” (Tang et al., 1999, p. 143). Within this theory, self-efficacy, or the extent of one’s confidence that one is able to excel in a given area, is influenced by contextual factors and is hypothesized to mediate the relationship between predictors and criteria. For example, greater self-efficacy is thought to influence one’s interest in a given field. In adopting this model, Tang and her colleagues not only utilized an existing Western model, but also addressed the underlying issue of cultural specificity. In addition to the role of acculturation, such investigations into cultural factors have been important in exploring the explanations behind the lack of differences between Caucasian and Asian Americans on career constructs such as vocational identity and career maturity (Leong, 1991). The specific contextual factors in Tang et al.’s model include acculturation, family SES, and family involvement. Because of these cultural factors, one hypothesis was counter to Lent et al.’s (1994) model. Specifically, career interest was not expected to relate to career choice, as career choice was thought to be an expression of both individual and family expectations. In this study, the sample was comprised of only Asian Americans. In contrast to Leong et al. (2004), Tang et al. (1999) found that Asian Americans chose more traditional occupations, such as the occupations of engineer and physician, which tend to be high in prestige. As expected, their occupational choices were not related to their career interests, as measured by the Strong Interest Inventory (Harmon et al., 1994). However, a strong relationship was found between family involvement and career choice, supporting parental influence on these occupations. Neither family involvement nor family SES had a relationship with self-efficacy. A relationship was found between acculturation and interests; the higher the acculturation, the less likely
students were to be interested in or to choose typical occupations. The Representation Index was used to indicate typicality of career choice, which assessed how representative a given occupation is for Asian Americans. Acculturation level was also negatively related to self-efficacy, and self-efficacy was positively related to career choice.

Acculturation and Interdependence

Park and Harrison (1995) also compared the career interests of Asian Americans with those of Caucasian Americans. Additionally, they examined the relationship of these variables to perceived control and, for Asian Americans, acculturation. The 184 Asian Americans who were surveyed were mostly permanent residents or citizens. As found in previous studies, the Asian Americans showed higher Realistic and Investigative interests than Caucasian Americans, and their greater interest in Social occupations than Investigative and Conventional occupations tended to slightly increase with higher acculturation. No differences were found between the two groups on career-related values. Perceived control was assessed using the Spheres of Control Scale (SOC; Paulhus & Van Selst, 1990), which is composed of three spheres: Personal, Interpersonal, and Socio-Political. Of the three, the Interpersonal sphere was of particular interest because it involves interacting with the host culture. Language barriers and other factors noted in the literature, such as social anxiety and fewer proclivities toward social occupations, can influence Asian Americans’ sense of control. Park and Harrison hypothesized that low acculturated Asian Americans would experience a lower sense of control and thus be attracted to occupations that require less social interaction. This hypothesis seems plausible and consistent with Asian Americans’ conception of self.
Park and Harrison drew upon Markus and Kitayama’s (1991) concept of self-construals. According to Markus and Kitayama, within a given culture, self-construals guide one’s behaviors, motives, and the nature of relationships with others. Specifically, they discuss the differences between an independent self-construal and an interdependent self-construal. These constructs may best be differentiated by the following statement: “The most significant differences between these two construals is in the role that is assigned to the other in self-definition” (p. 245). Those with an independent self-construal refer to and assert the uniqueness of their inner attributes, differentiating themselves from others and thus tend to view others as dissimilar to themselves. These inner attributes regulate behavior and reflect the core of the self, and the role of the other in an independent self-construal is to validate or affirm these attributes. In contrast, for individuals who hold an interdependent self-construal, connection to and relationships with others is the context in which the self is defined. It is the thoughts, feelings, and actions of the other that guides one’s behavior. Thus, not only is the inner self not characterized as a “bounded whole” (p. 227), but it is also more unreliable because it changes depending on the social context, particularly in reference to one’s relationship with others. The expression of the inner self becomes secondary and regulated. One such act of regulation can be illustrated with respect to the expression of feelings. Whereas those with independent self-construals may act on a private feeling, such as anger, as a way to be true to the self, the expression of anger may harm or damage harmonious relationships of those with interdependent self-construals. If emotional expressions are conveyed, they may not necessarily reflect inner feelings but instead become a way to maintain harmony in relationships. These differences have led Markus and Kitayama to
acknowledge the assumption of some psychologists and anthropologists—specifically that self-construals can determine “the very nature of individual experience” (p. 224).

It may be that, for low acculturated Asian Americans, the primary task of interdependence is more important than asserting one’s autonomy. In Park and Harrison’s (1995) study, no difference was found between Caucasian Americans and Asian Americans on the Socio-Political sphere. However, Asian Americans who were classified as low and medium on acculturation scored lower on the Personal and Interpersonal spheres of control, and Personal and Interpersonal spheres of control were correlated with Social and Enterprising interests, results that supported the researchers’ hypotheses. As the number of individuals who scored low on acculturation was minimal (n = 7 out of 184 Asian Americans), it would have been interesting to assess the relationship between generational influences and acculturation and the influence of both generational status and acculturation on career interest. This would have examined changes in career interest and occupational values over generations.

Although Asian American vocational/career interests have been studied most frequently, other vocational constructs have also been investigated. Hardin, Leong, and Osipow (2001), for example, examined interdependence as it relates to the construct of career maturity. Luzzo (1992) and Leong (1991) found that Asian Americans scored lower on career maturity than Caucasian Americans. However, no differences existed between the groups on career-decision making skills (Luzzo, 1991) or vocational identity (Leong, 1991). Leong’s proposition that cultural relativity may “moderate the meaning of career maturity” (Hardin et al., 2001, p. 37) was pursued by Hardin et al. Hardin and her colleagues defined career maturity as “the extent to which an individual has mastered the
developmental tasks appropriate to his or her career stage” (p. 36). They examined the relationship between career maturity and the cultural factor of self-construal, utilizing the Self Construal Scale (SCS; Singelis, 1994). They found that it is interdependence, not independence, that is associated with career maturity among Asian Americans. Asian Americans scored higher on interdependence, regardless of the level of independence they endorsed. Asian Americans who scored higher on interdependence scored low on the CMI Total Score and all CMI subscales. These participants also reported low and medium acculturation levels (as measured by the SL-ASIA, Suinn et al., 1987). No difference in career maturity was found between European Americans and highly acculturated Asian Americans. Based on these results, the authors contended that the CMI, which operationalizes independence as a unidimensional construct (i.e., the opposite being dependence), may not be an appropriate measure to assess Asian Americans’ level of career maturity. A unidimensional measure may identify those who are low in acculturation and high in interdependence as less career mature.

Leong (1991) proposed that Asian Americans, because they endorse low levels of career maturity, should exhibit less vocational identity. However, this proposition was contrary to his findings. Leong did not clearly define these constructs but did assert that they may be different despite the high correlation between them. It is also plausible that some constructs reflect career attributes that are not culturally appropriate for use with Asian Americans. Studies assessing career constructs specifically with Asian Americans are scant, however. Shih and Brown (2000) examined Taiwanese international students’ acculturation level and vocational identity and demonstrated that, in general, participants exhibited high vocational identity despite low acculturation. However, this finding does
not validate the appropriateness of the vocational identity construct for Asian Americans. These students were from one specific country, relatively older, and primarily graduate students. As international students, they may have come to the United States with a sense of purpose to pursue their stated field and may have had little motivation to engage in behaviors that can promote acculturation.

**General Discussion**

In sum, Asian American values, acculturation, and potentially stereotypes have influenced career choice and interest. Though more research has been conducted with Asian Americans over the past two decades, the diversity of the Asian American population and the Western origins of career development constructs and models invite further examination of Asian Americans and their career development. Career or vocational interest seems to be the preferred career construct in research, but more studies assessing other constructs not based on interest are needed. Even within the area of career interest, findings conflict, though the majority of studies seem to suggest that Asian Americans as a whole prefer occupations that provide status, prestige, and security. Only one study directly assessed and supported these values in careers (Leong, 1991) among Asian American students, and no study directly investigated the possibility that Asian American parents also hold these career values for their children. It is a likely hypothesis, however, because education and the prestige and security afforded by traditional occupations are valued and become a way to rise in social status. In addition to acculturation level and familial influence, other factors that may affect interest are generational level and the issue of compromise between career choice of child and parent. Hardin et al. (2001) suggested that, due to the deference afforded elders and the
interdependence within these cultures, Asian American children may be unlikely to compromise on a career because this will go against the cultural value. These authors suggest caution about this interpretation because of the low reliability of the Compromise subscale of the CMI. Tang (2002), on the other hand, suggested that acculturation level may influence a student’s willingness to compromise so that both familial and individual desires are considered. Tang’s populations of reference were Chinese students at a Chinese university and Caucasian American students. As mentioned above, Chinese or Chinese American students often constitute the majority of Asian Americans in these studies. There exists limited career development research on Filipino Americans as a group (e.g., Luzzo, 1992, 1993).

Filipinos

Cimmarusti (1996) writes that not much is known about Filipino Americans, despite their being the fastest growing and second largest Asian population in the United States (US Bureau of the Census, 2000, as cited in Espiritu, 2003). Filipinos now comprise the largest Asian immigrant group in the United States. Indeed, Filipino Americans are the least researched of all the Asian groups, with most of the research focusing on historical accounts (Agbayani-Siewert, 1994). In career development research, Filipino Americans are routinely included in Asian American samples. However, as researchers have contended, within-group differences inevitably exist among Asian Americans, as within-group differences exist within the Filipino population (Enriquez, 1994). These within-group differences may be reflected not only in values held, but also in factors such as educational background, generational status, and acculturation. Santos (1997) indicated that Filipino Americans can be placed on a
continuum, from traditional Filipino to modern American. However, he indicated that there remains constant core values that “underlie the socialization of Filipinos and Filipino Americans” (p. 130), values within the areas of emotional closeness and security in a family, approval by authority figures and by society, and economic and social betterment.

Enriquez (1994) questioned the extent to which the indigenous perspective is accurately reflected in the Filipino values most often cited in literature. Nevertheless, these values are referred to as a way to understand the Filipino and Filipino American population. Agbayani-Siewert (1994) and Cimmarusti (1996) provided guidelines for working with the Filipino American population in a clinical setting. Cimmarusti, in particular, described cases of first- and second-generation Filipino Americans, demonstrating how knowledge of cultural values and member roles within the family can influence the interpretation a clinician can have for a given behavior. Salient values that both authors cite are the importance of family, *pakikisama* or the importance of harmony and the ability to get along well with others, *utang na loob* or reciprocal obligation, and avoidance of *hiya*, which is loosely translated as shame and occurs when an individual has engaged in a behavior that elicits disapproval from others (Agbayani-Siewert, 1994). Maintaining smooth interpersonal relationships is what guides the behavior of Filipinos. These values promote harmony and reflect respect and mutual cooperation, both in general social relations and within the family. As with other Asian groups, it is within the family that an individual feels a sense of belonging (Hu & Chen, 1999), and with Filipino Americans, it is through the family that an individual receives psychological, emotional, and financial support (Agbayani-Siewert, 1994). Within the area of career development,
such support is reflected in the value placed on education (Okamura & Agbayani, 1997), for the family’s support and encouragement is credited for an individual’s educational achievement. Attainment of higher education can allow a better prospect for future socioeconomic security, and as discussed in the previous section, security is associated with careers high in prestige.

Andres (1989) wrote that the orientation of Filipinos is toward occupations with prestige, citing family as an influential factor whose primary motivation is to support their children in obtaining such occupations without necessarily considering their children’s natural abilities and aptitudes. As a result, said Andres, these children ultimately become “unsatisfied and discontented graduates” (p. 30). As discussed above, although there is reason to believe that cultural factors are involved in the influence families have on Asian American career development, empirical literature has only begun to determine the extent of familial influences on such constructs as occupational choice. A review of the Filipino personality literature was conducted by Church (1986), wherein he referenced studies examining independent career choices by Filipino students. The review suggested that at least 50-60% of Filipino students choose their own majors, with one study characterizing families of these students as having high income, high educational attainment, and residing in urban areas (Pario, Lynch, & Hollnsteiner, 1978, as cited in Church, 1986). Concern for parental approval was the second influential factor in career choice for one set of high school students (Castillo, 1965, as cited in Church, 1986). Overall, however, it appears that Filipino students are making independent decisions, although these findings are based on self-report data. Because there is a dearth
of career development research on Filipino Americans, the extent of parental influence on career choice and other career development constructs is unknown for this population.

In Church’s (1986) review, he discussed how child rearing studies reveal that Filipino parents can be simultaneously “loving and controlling” (p. 61). One of Andres’ (1989) critiques of Filipino parents’ upbringing of their children was in reference to the latter characteristic, such as the use of authority to regulate behavior. He indicated that children learn to be conscious of others’ opinions and their ability to please, which inhibits experimentation and exploration of the unknown, as well as an ability to develop self-reliance. According to the concept of independence from the perspective of American psychology, Filipinos do appear to be low in autonomy but high in “group belongingness and close family ties” (Church, 1986, p. 48). This reflects a dependence that Guthrie and Jacobs (1966, as cited in Church, 1986) described as “better viewed as closeness, cooperation, respect, and duty” (p. 45). For Filipinos, then, obedience, attachment to family, and maintenance of family solidarity appear to be a more important value than independence. Such descriptions are in line with the interdependent self-construal as outlined by Markus and Kitayama (1991). For Filipinos, it appears that it is interdependence, not independence, which becomes a source of security.

Agbayani-Siewert (1994) pointed out that a majority of Filipino Americans are immigrants, many of whom were professionals who immigrated after 1965. Santos (1997) stated that Filipino values and customs are carried over with them. Drawing from his own experience in working with Filipino Americans, Cimmarusti (1996) stated that second-generation Filipino American teenagers in a first-generation Filipino American family can exercise individuality, as long as the importance of family is not challenged
by their behavior: “In the well functioning family, once this essential belief is validated, the individual is free to experiment with self-expression and pursue individual interests” (p. 209). On the continuum described by Santos (1997), this individual may lie between the traditional Filipino and the modern American in his or her values, beliefs, and sense of independence.

Because of generational and acculturation effects, there may be differences or variations between Filipinos and Filipino Americans on attachment and sense of independence. With respect to acculturation, there are indications that the history of colonization and American influence may play a role in the process and perhaps even the rate of acculturation. According to Bautista (2002), a marked difference between Filipinos and other Asian groups is their exposure to and subsequent influence by other cultures. Such influences include the Catholic religion from 300 years of Spanish colonization and values of loyalty to family, *hiya*, and *utang na loob*, as influenced by Chinese culture. In addition, the United States continues to exert influence on Filipino life and culture (Espiritu, 2003). In 1898, the United States acquired the Philippines following the Spanish-American War (Espiritu, 2003), to which Filipinos retaliated, ushering in the Philippine-American War (1899-1902). However, the Philippines remained a colony of the United States and was not granted sovereignty until 1946. Among the first wave of Asian immigrants (post-1898) who sought labor in the Hawaiian plantations, California agricultural fields, and Alaska canneries, were Filipino nationals, a majority of whom came after the passage of the 1924 Exclusion Act. Lott (2006) refers to this group as the first pioneer or Manong (older or big brother) generation. Because of their US national status, these laborers, who were predominantly young men from rural
working class backgrounds, saw themselves as sojourners and were far less inclined than other Asian groups to settle in the United States (Takaki, 1989). Furthermore, the possibility for creating communities was later limited by the Tydings-McDuffie Act (1934), which allowed only 50 Filipinos to immigrate a year. For varied reasons, particularly economic, many Filipinos remained in the United States, and their experience was often characterized by racial discrimination and prejudice, particularly on the mainland. In contrast, the second pioneer generation (post-1965) immigrated after the passing of the 1965 Immigration Act, which gave priority to individuals with relatives in the United States and individuals with special skills. The second immigrant generation was predominantly middle- to upper-class professionals, though many were also laborers (Lott, 2006). Lott contrasted the two immigrant groups by stating that the first pioneer generation as a whole saw themselves as Americans with Filipino ancestry, while the second pioneer generation saw themselves as expatriates and Filipinos in America.

Espiritu (2003) writes that the United States influenced many aspects of Filipino culture, including its educational system and language. Writers have discussed how deep this influence runs with the idea of “colonial mentality” and the influence of American culture both on how others may perceive Filipinos and how Filipinos who migrate to the United States may perceive themselves. To explain the disparity between Filipino Americans’ expressed and actual utilization of mental health services, for example, Cimmarusti (1996) discussed how the idea of colonial mentality engenders the stereotype of Filipinos being “well-suited” and “well-assimilated into American culture” (p. 206), which he states only succeeds in making Filipinos an invisible Asian minority. Cimmarusti indicated that what appears to be Filipinos embracing American values is
more their attempt to “adapt to 300 years of colonization.” One writer indicated that Western culture and institutions have been “Filipinized” into Filipinos’ own culture (Pido, 1986, as cited in Agbayani-Siewert, 1994). Bergano and Bergano-Kinney (1997) claimed that the colonial mentality is a reality, especially as applied to post-1965 immigrants to the East Coast. In contrast to Lott’s view (2006), Bergano and Bergano-Kinney (1997) state that these immigrants came to the United States to “stay and become American” (p. 202). The authors added that “many believed they were almost already Americans.” The authors asserted that such a mentality is also owned by second-generation East Coast Filipino Americans. They contrasted East Coast Filipino Americans to West Coast Filipino Americans, who have retained the attitudes of previous generations of Filipino Americans who experienced a history of discrimination and segregation. According to Bergano and Bergano-Kinney, these West Coast Filipino Americans had less of an assimilationist attitude towards Anglo American society and were more committed to preserving the Filipino American community. Similarly, Takaki (1989) writes that, along with Asian Indians, post-1965 Filipino immigrants have integrated themselves more than other Asian groups into American society.

The Filipino populations during the two major waves of Asian immigration have been discussed, but Filipino immigrants to America came as early as 1763, when Filipinos (known as Manilamen) jumped off Spanish ships during the Manila-Acapulco galleon trade era (1565-1815) to escape Spanish brutalities. These Filipinos settled primarily in the bayous of Louisiana while others settled in Mexico (Bautista, 2002). Beginning in 1903 and throughout the first three decades of the 20th century, students sponsored by the United States government, called Pensionados, were predominantly
Filipino men from affluent backgrounds whose purpose was to obtain degrees and then return to their home country and take on leadership positions. Filipinos who enlisted in the US Navy, as well as their families, comprised another group of immigrants, from 1903 until 1992 when Filipinos were no longer being recruited. The income the US Navy provided and the opportunity for eventual US citizenship made the US Navy career desirable to many Filipinos. Between 1946 and 1965, the Exchange Visitor Program (1948), established by the US Information and Education Act, recruited Filipino immigrants working in health care professions, such as nurses and physicians (Lott, 2006). “In fact,” Espiritu (2003) writes, “many women in the Philippines studied nursing in the hope of securing employment abroad, and many of the nursing programs in the Philippines accordingly oriented themselves toward supplying the US market” (p. 32). However, these professional Filipino immigrants, including those in pharmacy and veterinary medicine, were challenged by a stratified labor market, and by additional state requirements and exams needed to practice in their field, leaving many underemployed (Takaki, 1989).

The difficulties their parents face in employment have impressed upon children of Asian immigrants the value of education to increase their employment choices and overcome racial obstacles (Takaki, 1989). But during the process of educational attainment, these children face their own challenge with the possibility of being labeled as part of the model minority. As previously discussed, one result can be categorization into the science and technical fields and the pursuit of a career choice that is not congruent with their occupational interest. In the Filipino American literature, the identity of Filipino immigrant children is often discussed (Bautista, 2002; Espiritu, 2003; Lott,
Many immigrant parents attempt to strike a balance between teaching their children core cultural values, such as respect for elders and education, while at the same time teaching them to become more assertive and guarding them against potential discrimination (e.g., language-based). Espiritu (2003) noted that sources of discrimination for Filipino Americans also included individuals from their own race and nationality. The authors noted an underlying issue for Filipino American children: they not only live in two worlds (being Filipinos and being Americans) (Bautista, 2002), but are also taking on multiple identities (Espiritu, 2003; Lott, 2006). This is especially the case in the current era because many Filipino Americans are multiracial and are growing up in an America whose social world is different from that of their immigrant ancestors.

Csikszentmihalyi and Schneider (2000, as cited in Lott, 2006) noted that for most young Americans, what will be marketable is higher education and intelligence: “Perhaps for the first time in human history, this is a generation that will make its living from the manipulation of abstract symbols rather than material energy” (p. 210). Lott writes that career choices are now more complicated and that one implication that arises from the current environmental context is that “education will be a large factor in [third and fourth generation Filipino Americans’ and children of post-1965 immigrants’] ability to compete for jobs that pay a living wage” (p. 96). The prevalence of Filipinos in the health care industry is well-known. But Filipino Americans have excelled in other fields, including literature, the media, politics and government, and the arts (Bautista, 2002).

Conclusion

Along with the increase in research on Asian American career development is an increase in the examination of contextual variables and other vocational constructs aside
from career interest and career choice. Chinese Americans comprise the majority of Asian American samples. Therefore, research focusing on other Asian American subgroups is needed to dispel the appearance of homogeneity among Asian Americans and to increase understanding of each of these groups’ unique worldviews. Filipino Americans are the least researched of all the Asian American groups. Like other Asian American subgroups, however, Filipino Americans have a history unique to themselves. This history includes colonialism and the idea of colonial mentality, which may in turn influence the rate and process of acculturation, and perhaps identification with Western culture. Indeed, Chun and Akutsu (2003) suggested that acculturation can occur prior to migration due to exposure to U.S. culture in one’s country of origin. This phenomenon holds significance for career choice and potentially other vocational constructs. As Hardin et al. (2001) and others have noted, however, certain career constructs such as career maturity may not be applicable to the Asian American population. Acculturation and the idea of interdependence are important considerations in studying the Filipino American population. Additionally, generational influences may be an important consideration with Filipino Americans. Their history of immigration reveals differences in Filipino mentality regarding the extent to which they embrace the new culture while preserving their own.

The Filipino culture is a collectivistic one, and interdependence values likely influence family dynamics and expectations within many Filipino American families. One study has assessed aspects of family environment (Leong et al., 2004), and two others have assessed Asian parents’ parental values and their influence on career choice (Tang, 2002; Tang et al., 1999). No study to date, however, has assessed the influences of
parental attachment and psychological separation on Asian American or Filipino American career development. And, as previously discussed, Asian Americans have not been a focus within the separation-attachment and career development literature. They have either been excluded or included as a small contingent in the overall sample. Given the interdependent aspects of the Filipino culture and the value on family it shares with other Asian American subgroups, it is likely that Filipino Americans will score high on parental attachment. Andres (1989) has noted the authority Filipino parents exercise over their children, an influence that may direct a path toward occupations high in prestige. The majority of Filipino students from more privileged backgrounds may be fairly independent in choosing a major. However, familial and SES influences can not be ruled out, especially since parental approval was one influence on choice on major. Cimmarusti (1996) asserted that second-generation Filipino Americans can exercise individuality as long as the importance of family is not challenged in the process. This indicates that career or major compromise between Filipino American parents and their children is possible. Thus, psychological separation may be influenced by acculturation and generational status. Given the various contextual variables that may play a role in Filipino American career development, the career commitment construct captures the process involved in committing to, and feeling confident about, a career choice.

Overview of the Present Study

In the present study, I investigated the influence of psychological separation and attachment on selected career development constructs among Filipino Americans, specifically career maturity and career commitment. This study also assessed career
preference and prestige, as well as participants’ willingness to compromise with parents on a career choice.

Based on the review of the literature, I tested the following hypotheses:

**Psychological Separation and Attachment**

**Hypothesis 1.** In Filipino Americans, greater psychological separation (CI, PSI composite) from parents will be associated with:

a) Greater acculturation (AAMAS-EA)

b) Greater generational status (1\textsuperscript{st}, 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 3\textsuperscript{rd})

c) Lower interdependence (SCS)

**Rationale.** The longer that Filipino Americans are exposed to US culture, the more they should come to internalize Western values and behaviors related to individuation and become less interdependent.

**Hypothesis 2.** In Filipino Americans, degree of attachment (IPPA) will be unrelated to participants’ acculturation (AAMAS-EA), generational status (1\textsuperscript{st}, 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 3\textsuperscript{nd}), or interdependence (SCS).

**Rationale.** Secure attachment has been shown to be modal in most cultural groups. Because of the universal nature of attachment processes in many different cultures, it is proposed that attachment will be unrelated to acculturation, generational status, or interdependence.

**Career Development Process**

**Hypothesis 3.** In Filipino Americans, greater career maturity (CMI) will be associated with:

d) Greater acculturation (AAMAS-EA)
e) Greater generational status ($1^{st}$, $2^{nd}$, $3^{rd}$)

f) Lower interdependence (SCS)

Rationale. With this hypothesis, I seek to replicate the finding that career maturity is influenced by high acculturation level and lower interdependence among Asian Americans. It is expected that individuals who are second generation or greater will be more acculturated and endorse lower interdependence. Thus, career maturity will have a positive relationship with generational status.

Hypothesis 4. The positive relationship of psychological separation (CI, PSI composite) with career commitment (CCCS-VECS) and career maturity (CMI) will be stronger for more highly acculturated Filipino Americans (AAMAS-EA).

Rationale. In Western theory, psychological separation is expected to be associated with greater career maturity and career commitment. More highly acculturated Filipino Americans are more individuated than lesser acculturated Filipino Americans. Therefore, for Filipino Americans who are higher in acculturation, the relationship between psychological separation and career maturity and career commitment will be a positive one.

Hypothesis 5. For Filipino Americans, the positive relationship of attachment (IPPA) to career commitment and career maturity will not be a function of acculturation.

Rationale. It is expected that attachment influences developmental progress for individuals regardless of how acculturated participants are (i.e., attachment processes are universal).
Career Content

Hypothesis 6. Filipino Americans who are less acculturated (AAMAS-EA) and are first or second generation will prefer careers higher in prestige (prestige index).

a) Filipino Americans’ level of acculturation will be negatively associated with the prestige level of career preference.

b) First and second generation Filipino Americans will prefer careers with higher prestige than Filipino Americans of later generations.

Rationale. Some immigrant parents have experienced a history of difficulty in overcoming employment obstacles. Therefore, less acculturated participants and first or second generation Filipino Americans may be attracted to careers high in prestige because of the desire for financial security and familial influence from Asian immigrant parents.

Hypothesis 7. Filipino Americans who are more acculturated (AAMAS-EA) will be less willing to compromise with their parents on a career choice than will less acculturated (AAMAS-EA) Filipino Americans.

Rationale. Tang (2002) has shown that Asian Americans are less willing to compromise on an occupational choice than Caucasian Americans. High acculturated Filipino Americans are expected to resemble Caucasian Americans in this regard.

Hypothesis 8. Career preferences for more acculturated (AAMAS-EA) Filipino Americans will be more evenly distributed among the six Holland scales than will the career preferences of less acculturated Filipino Americans.

Rationale. Research with Asian Americans has shown a relationship between greater acculturation and less stereotypical or traditional career interests.
CHAPTER THREE

Methodology

Participants

The final sample consisted of 164 Filipino American college students, 48 of whom responded via an on-line survey. Inventories that were discarded either had too many missing data or the participants were not at least 18 years of age. A majority of the participants in the final sample \((n = 114)\) were recruited from a four-year university on the west coast. Participants who identified as Filipino American or were of Filipino ancestry were offered partial credit in a social psychology course for their involvement. Students in the course who did not identify as Filipino Americans were given the option of soliciting participation from Filipino American friends in order to receive course credit. The rest of the participants were recruited from various parts of the country through Survey Monkey and through the help of personal connections of the primary researcher. The primary researcher submitted and was granted IRB approval from targeted universities. A majority of the online participants were members of Asian or Filipino clubs and associations in two-year colleges and four-year universities; others were members of community organizations. The study targeted students who were likely to be developing their career identity and it was assumed that students optimally engage in this process during the college years. Therefore, participants who were 31 years old or older \((n = 9)\) were excluded from all but one analyses (Hypothesis 8).

Of the remaining 155 participants, 59% percent \((n = 91)\) were female and 41% were male \((n = 64)\). The mean age was 20.97 years. For those who indicated their year in school, 80% percent were between their 1\textsuperscript{st} and 4\textsuperscript{th} year of college, 10% were in their 5\textsuperscript{th}
year or higher, and 9% were graduate students. Fifteen percent identified as Filipino, 59% identified as Filipino Americans, 3% Asian American, 5% Pacific Islander, 7% Biracial/Multiracial, and 12% Other. For analyses purposes, individuals who indicated being Filipino or Filipino American in addition to another option (e.g., Biracial) were coded as “Other”. Twenty-four percent \( (n = 37) \) were first generation, 65% \( (n = 100) \) were second generation, and 11% \( (n = 16) \) were third generation. Two participants did not indicate generational status.

**Instrumentation**

*Demographic Questionnaire.* Participants were administered a demographic questionnaire (Background Information: See Appendix A) that assessed background information such as age, gender, ethnic identity, and major in college. Participants were also asked to indicate to what extent they will compromise with their parents on a career choice on a 5-pt. Likert scale, ranging from “Not likely to compromise” to “Will be willing to compromise”.

*Psychological Separation Inventory (PSI).* The Psychological Separation Inventory (Hoffman, 1984) was used to assess psychological separation from parents based on psychoanalytic and structural family relations perspectives, the PSI contains 138 items for the combined mother and father scales. Each parent scale is comprised of four subscales measuring aspects of psychological separation: *functional independence* (FI, 13 items), which assesses an individual’s efforts at managing practical and personal matters without parental help (e.g., “My mother’s/father’s wishes have influenced my selection of friends”); *attitudinal independence* (AI, 14 items), which assesses the extent to which one’s own beliefs, values, and attitudes are perceived as unique from one’s parents’ (e.g.,
“My beliefs regarding how to raise children are similar to my mother’s/father’s’”); emotional independence (EI, 17 items), which assesses freedom from excessive approval, closeness, togetherness, and emotional support from parents (e.g., “I sometimes call home just to hear my mother’s/father’s voice”); and conflictual independence (CI, 25 items), which assesses freedom from excessive guilt, anxiety, mistrust, responsibility, inhibition, resentment, and anger towards one’s parents (e.g., “When I don’t write my mother/father often enough I feel guilty”). Due to the length of the participant questionnaire, only the conflictual, emotional, and attitudinal subscales were used, resulting in a total of 112 items. For both males and females, the mother functional independence scale has shown less stability over time. Participants responded on a 5-pt. Likert type scale, ranging from not at all true of me (1) to very true of me (5). Participants who had more than one person acting as their mother or father (e.g., a natural mother and a step-father) were asked to answer the questions for the one they felt has most influenced them. As specified by the test author, the total score for each subscale was subtracted from the total possible score for that scale. Higher scores indicate greater psychological separation. Hoffman reported adequate to good internal consistency reliability, ranging from .84 to .92. Test-retest reliability coefficients over two or three weeks ranged from .49 to .91 (median of .83) for males and from .70 to .96 for females (median of .83). For this study, inter-item reliabilities were .95 for the full scale, .92 for emotional independence [mother subscale (EI-MA) .87, father subscale (EI-PA) .89], .95 for attitudinal independence (AI-MA .88, AI-PA .90), and .94 for conflictual independence (CI-MA .89, CI-PA .93). The conflictual independence (CI) subscale has shown little or no correlation with the three other scales. Therefore, following Tokar et
al.’s (2003) suggestion, I analyzed conflictual independence as a separate indicator of separation, while the attitudinal independence (AI) and emotional independence (EI) subscales were combined to provide a separation composite score.

Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment (IPPA). The IPPA (Armsden, 1986; Armsden & Greenberg, 1987) was used to assess Filipino American attachment to parents. The authors drew from the conceptual framework of Bowlby’s (1988) attachment theory and subsequent research on attachment involving parents and peers. Bowlby’s theory asserts that maintenance of affectional bonds throughout the lifespan is a means of providing comfort and security during times of vulnerability. Greenberg encouraged utilizing the revised version of the inventory which separately assesses perceived quality attachment to mothers and fathers (M. T. Greenberg, personal communication, November 29, 2007). In this study I combined scores for both parents and analyzed a total parental attachment score. The mother and father subscales are each comprised of 25 items measuring three aspects of attachment: Trust (10 items); Communication (9 items); and Alienation (6 items). Sample items from the IPPA include: “When we discuss things, my mother cares about my point of view”; “My father accepts me as I am”; and “I can count on my parents when I need to get something off my chest.” Armsden and Greenberg (1989) reported Cronbach alphas for internal consistency of .91, .91, and .86, respectively. For the revised version, they reported Cronbach alphas of .87 for Mother attachment and .89 for Father attachment. O'Brien et al. (1996) reported internal consistencies of .96 and .95 for the total mother and father subscales, respectively. For my study, internal consistency reliability was .95, reliability for the mother scale was .93, and reliability for the father scale was .94. On a 5-point
Likert scale, participants indicated how often each statement was true for them: *Almost Never or Never, Seldom, Sometimes, Often, and Almost Always or Always*. The authors established convergent validity for the IPPA and showed its strong correlations with well-being, depression, and anxiety.

*Asian American Multidimensional Acculturation Scale (AAMAS)*. This instrument was used to measure Filipino Americans’ level of acculturation. Developed by Chung, Kim, and Abreu (2004), the AAMAS is a 15-item acculturation inventory, the development of which was guided by three principles. First, the authors sought an orthogonal measure that captures the bidimensional model of acculturation that “[distinguishes] between the dimensions of acculturation to host culture and Asian culture of origin” (p. 67). Second, the authors wished to include a measure of pan-ethnic Asian American culture. This third dimension is unique to the AAMAS and takes into account a sociopolitical perspective—that of the affiliation of one ethnic subgroup to other ethnic subgroups. Third, the authors sought a measure that is applicable for use with different Asian subgroups. The authors selected items from the SL-ASIA to compose the scale and conducted 3 studies to assess the validity, reliability, factor structure of the scale, and internal consistency. The Culture of Origin (AAMAS-CO) dimension assesses acculturation to one’s own culture of origin, the Asian American culture dimension (AAMAS-AA) assesses pan-ethnic Asian American culture, and the European American dimension (AAMAS-EA) assesses the host society’s European American culture. Each of the dimensions shares a similar four-factor structure, which is the basis for four subscales: Language (4 items), Food Consumption (2 items), Cultural Knowledge (3 items), and Cultural Identity (6 items). Participants indicated which number best
represented their view for each statement on a 6-point Likert scale, with anchors that include *Not Very Well, Somewhat, and Very Well*. These anchors did not appear to clearly capture the response needed for certain items, so I changed these anchors to *Not Very, Somewhat, and Well* for the present study. The authors provided evidence for divergent, convergent, and construct validity, and good reliabilities for the three general dimension scales: .87 to .91 for the AAMAS-CO, .78 to .83 for the AAMAS-AA, and .76 to .81 for the AAMAS-EA. The authors reported two-week interval test-retest reliabilities of .89, .75, and .78, respectively. Only scores for the AAMAS-EA were analyzed for the present study. In the present study, alpha reliability was .79 for the AAMAS-EA.

_Self-Construal Scale (SCS)_: The Self-Construal Scale (Singelis, 1994) was developed to assess the strength of an individual’s interdependent and independent self-construals. Confirmatory factor analyses demonstrated the orthogonality, rather than bipolarity, of the independent and interdependent dimensions. Six more items have been added in the recent version of the SCS, resulting in a total of 30 items. Singelis reported that these items clearly load on the two subscales, with each subscale containing 15 items. Participants indicated to what extent they agreed with a statement on a 7-point Likert-type scale, ranging from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 7 = *strongly agree*. An example of an interdependent item is, “My happiness depends on the happiness of those around me.” An example of an independent item is, “My personal identity, independent of others, is very important to me.” Singelis reported high face validity and good construct validity. Hardin et al. (2001) reported α reliabilities between .61 and .73 for the subscales, with slightly higher reliabilities for European Americans than Asian Americans. For the recent version, Singelis reported reliabilities with the 15 items ranging from the high
68’s to the middle .70’s, which he deemed adequate because the self-construal construct is broad and the scales assess an array of thoughts, feelings, and behaviors. In the present study, I used only the Interdependent dimension to assess interdependence. Alpha reliability was .79.

*Attitude Scale of the Career Maturity Inventory (CMI).* The Career Maturity Inventory—Attitude Scale (Crites, 1978) was used to assess Filipino Americans’ career maturity. This instrument is a revised version of the 1973 CMI, which reflects the process dimension of occupational choice, including the individual’s feelings, reactions, and dispositions toward making a career choice. The CMI contains two forms, the Counseling Form (B-1) which was used in this study, and the Screening Form (A-2). Form B-1 is composed of 75 items organized into 5 attitudinal subscales: Decisiveness, Involvement, Independence, Orientation, and Compromise. The scale utilizes a dichotomous true-false response format. Participants indicated a 1 if they felt a statement was true for them (“agree/true”) or a 0 if they disagreed with a statement (“disagree/false”). The number of “correct” responses (1) was counted to create a raw score ranging from 0 to 75. The $\alpha$ reliability for Form B-1 was .86.

*Commitment to Career Choices Scale (CCCS).* The Commitment to Career Choices Scale was developed by Blustein and colleagues (1989) to examine how individuals commit to career choices. The CCCS is composed of two subscales. The first subscale, the Vocational Exploration and Commitment Scale (VECS), contains 19 items and measures a continuum of the career commitment process. This continuum ranges from the early, uncommitted phase to the later phase in which individuals are more confident about their career choice. An example of a VECS item is, “I feel uneasy in
committing to a career goal because I do not have as much information about the fields
that I am considering as I probably should.” The second subscale, Tendency to Foreclose
(TTFS), contains 9 items and captures a continuum that measures intrapersonal
differences in how individuals foreclose on a career choice. This continuum ranges from
a “strong tendency to foreclose” (p. 347) to being more open to varied experiences
throughout the commitment process. An example of a TTF item is, “I believe that a sign
of maturity is deciding on a single career goal and sticking to it.” High scores indicate an
uncommitted stance on the VECS and a strong tendency to foreclose on the TTF. The
CCCS is a 7-point Likert scale, to which participants responded from 1 = Never true
about me to 7 = Always true about me. Individuals without a specific career goal were
instructed to respond “in a way that would reflect [their] behavior and attitudes if [they]
did have an occupational preference” (p. 355). Blustein and colleagues reported
acceptable reliabilities in their validation and cross-validation samples, with Cronbach
alpha coefficients of .82 and .87 for the TTFS and .92 and .91 for the VECS, respectively.
Test-retest reliabilities over a 2-week and 4-week interval were .82 and .84 for the TTFS
and .90 and .92 for the VECS, respectively. Only the Commitment Scale (VECS) was
scored for the present study. Alpha reliability was .92 for the VECS.

**Prestige Index.** The prestige level of each occupation mentioned as a career
choice by respondents was coded based on the 1989 Nakao-Treas Prestige Scores, which
were obtained from the Socioeconomic Indexes for Occupations by Hauser and Warren
(1996). The prestige scores were computed by rating the social standing of occupational
titles from the 1989 NORC General Social Survey and were created in accordance with
the 1980 Census Occupational Classification (Nakao & Treas, 1989). Values ranged from 16.78 to 86.05. Higher scores indicated greater prestige level.

**Procedure**

Solicitation of participants took place via email, direct phone contact, and, for individuals who completed the survey in partial fulfillment for a course, posted sign-up sheets. In the case of course participation, students received partial course credit. A packet of all instruments was administered to individual participants and groups. Non-Filipino American students who solicited participation from Filipino American students for course credit took home the inventories. Upon completion, these inventories were returned to the class instructor who was the co-investigator. In the case of online participation, participants were provided a link that would take them directly to the first page of the survey. Personal contacts of the researcher also distributed the packets to additional participants who self-administered the instruments. These participants were given a stamped manila envelope to return the packets to the researcher. Packets and the online survey included a consent form, the demographic form, and the inventories.

**Data Analyses**

Descriptive statistics were computed for all scales and each of the demographic variables. Reliability estimates were computed for all scales. An alpha level of .05 was set in the tests of hypotheses. Scores for missing items were replaced by each participant’s mean score across other items in the respective scale. Only participants who had completed 80% of an instrument received a score.

Preliminary analyses were conducted using Pearson \( r \) correlations to examine the intercorrelations among the PSI subscales. Based on previous research, it was expected
that two subscales of the PSI (EI, AI) would be strongly correlated, and that the CI subscale would have little to no correlation with the other two subscales. This was justified by the scale intercorrelations. Consistent with previous research, the AI and EI for this study were highly correlated (.60, \(p < .001\)). Conflictual independence was not as highly correlated with EI (.29, \(p < .001\)) or AI (.21, \(p < .01\)). The scores for the EI and AI subscales were standardized and averaged to create a composite score for psychological separation. Two scores derived from the PSI were then used for psychological separation, the composite score (COMP) and the score for the CI subscale.

For Hypotheses 1 (greater psychological separation will be associated with greater acculturation and lower interdependence), multiple regression analyses and Pearson correlations were conducted to examine the relationships between AAMAS-EA and SCS as predictor variables and conflictual independence (CI) and the PSI composite as the criterion variables. Gender was included as a control variable. The hypothesis would be supported if there were significant positive beta weights for AAMAS-EA and significant negative beta weights for SCS. In a follow-up analysis, separation from mothers and fathers were examined as separate outcome variables. A MANOVA was conducted to examine the influence of the predictor variable generational status on the outcome variables of CI and PSI composite. Because there were too few 3rd generation participants to analyze separately, first-generation participants were compared with a combined group of second- and third-generation participants.

To test Hypothesis 2 (attachment will be unrelated to participants’ acculturation, generational status, or interdependence), a multiple regression analysis and Pearson correlations were computed to examine the ability of AAMAS-EA and SCS scores (and
gender as a control variable) to predict total attachment (IPPA) scores. The relevant beta weights were not expected to be statistically significant. An ANOVA was conducted to examine the influence of generational status on attachment (IPPA).

For Hypothesis 3 (career maturity will be associated with greater acculturation and lower interdependence), multiple regressions were conducted with AAMAS-EA and SCS as predictors and career maturity (CMI) as the criterion variable. Gender was included as a control variable. The hypothesis would be supported if there was significant positive beta weight for AAMAS-EA and a significant negative beta weight for SCS. A MANOVA was conducted to examine the influence of generational status on career maturity.

For Hypothesis 4 (the relationship between psychological separation and career maturity and career commitment will be stronger for highly acculturated Filipino Americans) and Hypothesis 5 (the relationship between attachment and career commitment and career maturity will be positive regardless of acculturation level), moderated hierarchical regressions were conducted with the criterion variables as career maturity (CMI) and career commitment (VECS). All variables were centered before assessment of interactions to reduce multicollinearity. The cross-products of the moderator and predictor variables were then computed. For Hypothesis 4, gender, AAMAS-EA, CI, separation composite, and the cross-products of the separation scales with acculturation scores were used to predict CMI and VECS scores. These cross-product variables were expected to have significant positive beta weights for the CMI criterion and negative beta weights for the VECS criterion. For Hypothesis 5, gender, IPPA, AAMAS-EA, and the cross-product of IPPA and AAMAS-EA were used to
predict CMI and VECS. The interaction variables were not expected to have significant beta weights in predicting CMI or VECS scores. If interaction terms were statistically significant, moderated relationships exist.

To test Hypothesis 6, Pearson’s $r$ statistic was computed between the AAMAS-EA scores and the prestige level of the participants’ career preference. An ANOVA was conducted to assess the relationship between generational status and prestige level of career preference.

To test Hypothesis 7 (Filipino Americans who are more acculturated will be less willing to compromise with their parents on a career choice than less acculturated Filipino Americans) a Pearson $r$ statistic was conducted between the AAMAS-EA score and participants’ degree of compromise (as indicated on a 5-point Likert scale). A significant positive correlation was expected.

Hypothesis 8 (career preferences for more acculturated Filipino Americans will be more evenly distributed among the six Holland scales) was tested with a $\chi^2$ statistic. In a contingency table, participants were categorized into high and low acculturation groups based on a median split of AAMAS-EA scores and their career choices were entered as frequencies for each Holland theme based on the first letter of the Holland code for their first choice of career. A statistically significant $\chi^2$ statistic would indicate that acculturation level and career preferences are associated. Participants’ career preferences (Holland theme) were coded using the O*NET Online (National Center for O*NET Development, 2010), an online database that utilizes Holland’s interest codes. I used O*NET Online rather than other sources, such as the DHOC (The Dictionary of Holland Occupational Codes; Gottfredson, Holland, & Ogawa, 1992) because O*NET is more
comprehensive and better enabled me to code specific occupational titles within a given field.
CHAPTER FOUR

Results

Descriptive Statistics

Table 1 shows the means and standard deviations for the variables in the study. The mean total score for conflictual independence ($M = 137.42$) indicates that participants averaged toward 3 (i.e., 2.75) on the 5-point rating scale, corresponding to a response between “A little bit true of me” and “Moderately true of me.” This indicates that the average participant was reporting slightly below a moderate amount of conflictual independence from parents. For the separation composite of emotional and attitudinal independence, the mean item score was 2.42, indicating that the average participant was reporting between a little and a moderate amount of emotional and attitudinal independence from parents. For the AAMAS-EA, the mean score of 4.84 on a 6-point scale indicates that the sample is highly acculturated on average. For the SCS, the mean score ($M = 4.77$ on a 7-point scale) indicates that the average participant endorsed interdependent attitudes and behaviors “somewhat.” For the IPPA attachment measure, the mean score ($M = 3.33$ on a 5-point scale) indicated that the average participant reported being moderately attached to their parents. For the career maturity measure, the mean score ($M = 47.72$) indicated that participants were toward the positive direction on career maturity. The mean score for vocational exploration and commitment ($M = 3.38$) indicates that the average participant reported being relatively high on career commitment on the 7-point scale, as lower scores reflect higher commitment. Lastly, on the Compromise measure, the average participant ($M = 3.07$) reported being “somewhat likely to compromise” on a career choice with their parents.
Table 1

Descriptive Statistics for Study Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>Maximum Possible Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSI-Conflictual Independence</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>137.42</td>
<td>31.55</td>
<td>[132.14, 142.70]</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSI-Emotional and Attitudinal</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>149.73</td>
<td>40.39</td>
<td>[143.25, 156.21]</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence Composite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAMAS-European American</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>72.62</td>
<td>9.14</td>
<td>[71.16, 74.08]</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCS-Interdependence</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>[4.65, 4.89]</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPPA</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>166.52</td>
<td>34.14</td>
<td>[161.04, 172]</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Maturity Inventory</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>47.72</td>
<td>9.17</td>
<td>[46.24, 49.2]</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCCS-Vocational Exploration and</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>64.14</td>
<td>20.54</td>
<td>[60.84, 67.44]</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to Comprise</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>[2.86, 3.28]</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. Based upon raw scores with participants 30 years old and younger. PSI- Psychological Separation Inventory; AAMAS– Asian American Multidimensional Acculturation Scale; SCS– Self-Construal; IPPA – Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment; CCCS– Commitment to Career Choices Scale.

To assess for gender differences, I ran three sets of MANOVAs among the variables with gender as an independent variable. One MANOVA tested for gender differences on PSI conflictual independence, the PSI composite, and attachment (IPPA scores). The main effect for gender was statistically significant (Wilks’ Λ = .943; F(3, 139) = 2.83; p < .05). Follow-up ANOVAs indicated that men and women differed in both conflictual independence (Female M = 131.69, Male M = 145.13; F(1, 141) = 6.60, p < .01) and on the separation composite (Female M = 142.89, Male M = 155.66; F(1, 141) = 3.77, p < .05). Another MANOVA was run to examine gender differences on the cultural variables of acculturation and interdependence. The main effect for gender was significant (Wilks’ Λ = .942; F(2, 144) = 4.42; p < .01). Follow-up ANOVAs indicated that only the gender
effect for acculturation was statistically significant ($F(1, 145) = 7.82, p < .01$), with greater mean scores for females ($M = 74.31$) than males ($M = 70.11$). The last MANOVA examined gender differences on the career variables. No gender differences for career maturity or career commitment were found (Wilks’ $\Lambda = .996; F(2, 150) = .284; p = .75$). Because mean gender differences were found for the psychological separation variables and acculturation, gender was controlled in subsequent analyses.

**Hypothesis 1: Predicting Psychological Separation from Acculturation, Interdependence, and Generational Status**

For Hypothesis 1, Pearson correlation and multiple regression analyses were conducted to test whether greater psychological separation, as measured by conflictual independence (CI) and the separation composite (COMP), can be predicted by greater acculturation and lower interdependence. Table 2 shows the relevant correlations. Acculturation to European American culture was a modest predictor of the psychological separation variables, but in the wrong direction. That is, greater acculturation was associated with less separation from parents. Interdependent self-construal was a significant predictor of the emotional and attitudinal separation composite but was not a significant predictor of conflictual independence from parents. That is, greater interdependence was associated with less emotional and attitudinal separation from parents, as hypothesized.
Table 2

Pearson Correlations Relating Separation, Attachment, Career, and Cultural Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>PSI-C</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>PSI-COMP</td>
<td>.26***</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>AAMAS-EA</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>SCS-INTER</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.35***</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>IPPA</td>
<td>.46***</td>
<td>-.43***</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>CMI</td>
<td>.30***</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>CCCS-VECS</td>
<td>-.32***</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.30***</td>
<td>-.59***</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>COMPR</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>-.30***</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.32***</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. PSI-CI – Psychological Separation Inventory – Conflictual Independence Subscale; PSI-COMP – Psychological Separation Inventory – Attitudinal and Emotional Subscales Combined; AAMAS-EA – Asian American Multidimensional Acculturation Scale – European American Subscale; SCS-INTER – Self-Construal Scale – Interdependence Subscale; IPPA – Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment; CMI – Career Maturity Inventory; CCCS-VECS – Commitment to Career Choices Scale – Vocational Exploration and Commitment Scale; COMPR – Willingness to Compromise.

* p < .05. ** p < .01. ***p < .001.

Table 3 shows the results of the hierarchical multiple regression analyses, with gender as a control variable in Step 1. Gender accounted for 7% of the total variance for conflictual independence and 3% of the total variance for the separation composite. Specifically, males were shown to possess greater psychological independence than females. In Step 2, acculturation and interdependence combined significantly predicted conflictual independence ($\Delta R^2 = 4\%$) and the separation composite (COMP) ($\Delta R^2 = 14\%$) above and beyond gender differences. However, only interdependence, in the prediction
of the separation composite, provided significant incremental prediction beyond gender
($\beta = -.60$). Thus, Hypothesis 1 was partially supported.

Table 3

*Prediction of Psychological Separation by Acculturation and Interdependence, with
Gender as a Control Variable*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Psychological Separation</th>
<th>PSI-CI</th>
<th>PSI-COMP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Predictor</td>
<td>$\Delta R^2$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>.07**</td>
<td>.03*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.65**</td>
<td>0.48*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>.04*</td>
<td>.14***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdependence</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>-0.60***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $R^2$</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>.17***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$n$ 141 142

*Note. CI = Confictual Independence Subscale (PSI). COMP = Separation Composite (PSI-Attitudinal Subscale & Emotional Subscale).
$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$.

In this study, I assessed overall psychological separation from, and attachment to, both parents. Some researchers have recommended investigating whether there are unique influences or effects involving separation and attachment from mother and father separately (e.g., Tokar et al., 2003). Accordingly, I conducted additional hierarchical multiple regression analyses for mothers and fathers separately (see Table 4). Gender accounted for 4% of the total variance of conflictual independence from mother and 5%
of the total variance of conflictual independence from father, with males possessing
greater conflictual independence than females from both mother ($\beta = .27$) and father ($\beta = .38$). Gender also accounted for 3% of the total variance of the separation composite from
mother, with males again reporting greater separation or independence from mother ($\beta = .46$). Acculturation and interdependence combined did not significantly predict
psychological separation from either mother or father beyond gender (see $\Delta R^2$ values). However, there was a modest relationship between acculturation and conflictual
independence from mother ($\beta = -.18, p < .05$). There were also significant relationships
between interdependence and the separation composite from mother ($\beta = -.61, p < .001$)
and between interdependence and the separation composite from father ($\beta = -.48, p < .001$). As in the overall results for both parents combined, greater interdependence was
associated with lower separation from both parents individually for the separation
composite.

A MANOVA was conducted to assess the hypothesized relationship between
psychological separation and generational status. Because the number of third generation
participants was small ($n = 16$), I ran the MANOVA with the 2nd and 3rd generation
participants combined, resulting in two groups for generational status. My hypothesis was
not supported (Wilks’ $\Lambda = 1.00, F(2, 143) = .282, p = .76, \eta_p^2 = .00$) for either conflictual
independence, $F(1, 144) = .111, p = .74, \eta_p^2 = .00$, or for the separation composite, $F(1, 144) = .545, p = .46, \eta_p^2 = .00$. That is, second- and third-generation participants did not
report greater psychological separation from parents than first-generation participants
(see Table 5).
In summary, for Hypothesis 1, the results indicated a consistent gender difference for both psychological separation variables, with males possessing greater psychological separation from parents in general. When assessing for effects of separation on mother and father separately, males exhibited greater psychological separation from mother on both separation variables but only greater conflictual independence from father. Among the cultural variables, there was a significant predictive relationship between interdependence and attitudinal and emotional independence from parents, and a modest and unexpected negative relationship between acculturation and conflictual independence from mother. The most definitive finding was the association between greater interdependence and reduced separation from parents on the separation composite (i.e., emotional and attitudinal independence).
## Table 4

### Separate Parental Contributions to Psychological Separation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Mother PSI-CI</th>
<th>Mother PSI-COMP</th>
<th>Father PSI-CI</th>
<th>Father PSI-COMP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \Delta R^2 )</td>
<td>( \beta )</td>
<td>( \Delta R^2 )</td>
<td>( \beta )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>.04**</td>
<td>.03*</td>
<td>.05**</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.46*</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.12***</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.10***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdependence</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.61***</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.48***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total ( R^2 )</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.15***</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.12***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( n = 144 \) for both parents, \( n = 143 \) for father.

*Note. CI = Conflictual Independence Subscale (PSI). COMP = Separation Composite (PSI-Attitudinal Subscale & Emotional Subscale). *\( p < .05 \). **\( p < .01 \). ***\( p < .001 \).*
Table 5

ANOVA Comparing Different Generations on Attachment, Career Maturity, and Prestige Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>1st Generation</th>
<th>2nd/3rd Generation</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conflictual Independence</td>
<td>5.53 1.17</td>
<td>5.45 1.30</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separation Compositea</td>
<td>.15 1.24</td>
<td>-.04 1.40</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment</td>
<td>6.70 1.34</td>
<td>6.88 1.21</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Maturity</td>
<td>.64 .14</td>
<td>.64 .12</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige Level</td>
<td>64.78 8.13</td>
<td>61.73 10.40</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Second- and third-generations were combined for these analyses. First-generation (n = 37); second- and third-generation (ns ranged from 109-133). aSeparation Composite (PSI-Attitudinal Subscale & Emotional Subscale); scores based on combined Emotional and Attitudinal Subscale standardized scores.
Hypothesis 2: Predicting Attachment from Acculturation, Interdependence, and Generational Status

Because attachment processes are considered to be universal among most cultural groups, it was expected that attachment would be unrelated to acculturation and interdependence. I conducted a hierarchical multiple regression analysis with gender entered in Step 1 and acculturation and interdependence entered in Step 2. There was no relationship between gender and attachment. As seen in Table 2, neither acculturation nor interdependence was significantly correlated with attachment to parents. Given the non-significant Pearson correlations, it is not surprising that attachment was not predicted by either acculturation or interdependence in the hierarchical multiple regression analysis (see Table 6). I then conducted an ANOVA to determine whether there exists a relationship between attachment and generational status. There was no relationship between the variables, $F(2, 144) = 0.264, p = .608, \eta^2_p = .002$. Thus, Hypothesis 2 was supported.
Table 6

Predicting Attachment from Acculturation and Interdependence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdependence</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $R^2$</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>142</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $p = ns$

Hypothesis 3: Predicting Career Maturity from Acculturation, Interdependence, and Generational Status

In Hypothesis 3, it was expected that career maturity would be related to greater acculturation and lower interdependence. This hypothesis was not supported. Indeed, the relevant Pearson correlation (see Table 2) showed no relationship between career maturity and acculturation ($r = .05, ns$). In addition, there was a non-significant relationship between career maturity and interdependence ($r = -.05, ns$). Table 6 shows the results of the hierarchical multiple regression analyses. Gender was not related to career maturity ($\beta = -.01$), and neither acculturation ($\beta = .01$) nor interdependence ($\beta =$
-.01) contributed unique prediction of career maturity. Finally, I ran an ANOVA to examine whether higher generational status (again combining second- and third-generation participants) was associated with greater career maturity. This hypothesis was not supported, \( F(2, 148) = 0.03, p = .88, \eta^2_p = .00 \) (see Table 4).

Table 7

*Predicting Career Maturity from Acculturation and Interdependence*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>( \Delta R^2 )</th>
<th>( \beta )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdependence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total ( R^2 )</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( n )</td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* \( p = ns \)

**Hypothesis 4: Acculturation as a Moderator of the Ability of Psychological Separation to Predict Career Maturity and Career Commitment**

Two hierarchical regression analyses were conducted to determine whether acculturation moderates the relationship between (a) psychological separation and career maturity, and (b) psychological separation and career commitment. It was expected that both career commitment and career maturity would be predicted by psychological separation, and that these relationships would be stronger for participants who are more
highly acculturated. In both analyses, gender was entered in Step 1 as a control variable. Conflictual independence and the separation composite were entered in Step 2. Acculturation was entered in Step 3, and interaction terms for each separation variable with acculturation were entered in Step 4. The predictor variables were centered for these analyses. The results are displayed in Table 8. Because a higher score on career commitment indicates an uncommitted stance, a positive beta weight reflects prediction of lower career commitment. In Step 1, gender accounted for 1% of the variance for career maturity, but this was not significant. Gender did not account for any of the variance for career commitment. In Step 2, the two psychological separation variables accounted for 11% of the variance in career maturity and 13% of the variance in career commitment. Only conflictual independence had a positive relationship with career maturity (β = .32) and a negative relationship with (high) career commitment (β = -.38). That is, conflictual independence was related to both higher career maturity and higher career commitment. A moderation effect was only found for career maturity. The moderator effects accounted for 4% of the variance. The cross-product of the separation composite and acculturation (β = -.21) was a significant predictor. However, the direction (sign) of the effect was not consistent with the hypothesis. The negative β-weight indicates that the relationship between the separation composite and career maturity was stronger for low, not high, acculturated participants.
Table 8

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analyses Testing the Ability of Acculturation to Moderate the Prediction of Career Maturity and Career Commitment from Psychological Separation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Career Maturity</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Career Commitment</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ΔR²</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>ΔR²</td>
<td>β</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>.11***</td>
<td>.32***</td>
<td>.13***</td>
<td>-.38***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSI-Conflictual Independence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSI-Composite</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 4</td>
<td>.04*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSI Conflictual Independence x Acculturation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSI Composite x Acculturation</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total R²</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.
Hypothesis 5: Acculturation as a Moderator of the Ability of Attachment to Predict Career Commitment and Career Maturity

Two hierarchical multiple regression analyses were conducted to determine whether acculturation moderates the relationship between attachment and the criterion variables of career commitment and career maturity. Gender was entered in Step 1. The attachment score was entered in Step 2, followed by acculturation in Step 3, and the interaction term for attachment and acculturation in Step 4. The results are shown in Table 9. The analyses did not support a moderator effect for acculturation. In the only predictive relationship, attachment accounted for 9% of the variance in career commitment ($\beta = -.30$), suggesting that greater attachment is related to higher career commitment.
Table 9

*Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analyses Testing the Ability of Acculturation to Moderate the Prediction of Career Maturity and Career Commitment from Attachment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Career Maturity</th>
<th></th>
<th>Career Commitment</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\Delta R^2$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$\Delta R^2$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.09*</td>
<td>-.30*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 4</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment x Acculturation</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $R^2$</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
<td>147</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* *p* < .001.

*Hypothesis 6: Prestige Level and its Relationship to Acculturation and Generational Status*

In Hypothesis 6, I predicted that Filipino Americans who are less acculturated and who are first or second generation will prefer careers that are higher in prestige. A Pearson correlation indicated that there was no relationship between acculturation and the prestige level of occupational choices ($r = .02$; $p > .05$). To assess the relationship between generational status and prestige of occupational choices, I again combined the
second- and third-generation participants. I ran an ANOVA to test whether there were gender differences in prestige level and found none $F(1, 147) = .449, p = .504, \eta^2_p = .00$.

An ANOVA was conducted to compare prestige levels of first-generation participants versus second- and third-generation participants combined (see means in Table 5). No significant effect was found, $F(1, 145), = 2.63, p = .11, \eta^2_p = .02$. Thus, Hypothesis 6 was not supported.

**Hypothesis 7: Relationship between Acculturation and Compromise**

In Hypothesis 7, I predicted that more acculturated Filipino Americans would be less willing to compromise with their parents on a career choice than would less acculturated Filipino Americans. A Pearson correlation indicated that there was no relationship between acculturation (i.e., AAMAS-EA scores) and willingness to compromise ($r = .07; p > .05$). Therefore, Hypothesis 7 was not supported.

**Hypothesis 8: Relationship between Acculturation and Career Choice**

In Hypothesis 8, I predicted that the career preferences of more acculturated Filipino Americans would be more evenly distributed among the six Holland scales than the career preferences of low acculturated Filipino Americans. A $\chi^2$ statistic was computed to determine whether acculturation is significantly related to career choice. Participants were categorized into high and low acculturation groups based on a median split. The Holland themes were used to code the participants’ career choices. The first letter of each theme code was used to categorize each career choice into one of the six Holland themes. The difference in proportions between high and low acculturated participants and their career choices was not significant, $\chi^2 (5, n = 161) = 3.88, p = .57$. 
Thus, Hypothesis 8 was not supported. Indeed, the pattern of career choices for both high- and low-acculturated Filipino Americans was similar (see Table 10).

In a supplemental analysis, I found that the pattern of career choices for female and male participants were significantly different, $\chi^2 (5, n = 161) = 14.74, p = .01$. Social, Investigative, and Enterprising occupations were the top three Holland areas of career choice for both genders. The most definitive gender difference involved the Social theme. Females (50%) chose Social occupations with greater frequency than males (35.8%).

Table 10

_Holland Code Frequencies of Participant Occupational Choices by Acculturation Level and Gender_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Holland Codes</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Discussion

Summary of Findings

The findings of this study revealed a relationship between greater interdependence and lower separation from parents, as assessed by the emotional and attitudinal independence composite. This provided partial support for Hypothesis 1. When analyzing mother and father separately, there was a relationship between higher acculturation and lower psychological separation, as assessed by conflictual independence, but for mother only. This result was in the opposite direction to what was expected. Consistent with Hypothesis 2, there was no relationship between attachment and the two cultural variables, acculturation and interdependence. Neither acculturation nor independence predicted career maturity, so Hypothesis 3 was not supported. For Hypothesis 4, there was a moderator effect of acculturation only for career maturity, and in a direction opposite to expectations. That is, the relationship between the separation composite and career maturity was stronger for low, not high, acculturated participants. Hypothesis 5 was partially supported, as there was no moderator effect of acculturation on the strength of the relationship between attachment and the career variables. Greater conflictual independence did predict greater career maturity and career commitment, but attachment only predicted career commitment. Acculturation did not influence Filipino American students’ prestige scores, willingness to compromise, or career preferences. Thus, Hypotheses 6, 7, and 8 were not supported. Gender differences were revealed for psychological separation and choice of occupations. Specifically, males were more
psychologically independent from their parents than females and females tended to choose Social occupations with greater frequency than males.

**Interpretation and Implications for Theory**

*Acculturation, interdependence, psychological separation, and attachment.*

Overall, the Filipino Americans in my sample were fairly high acculturated. Although this might be due to the greater number of second-generation participants in this study, Chung et al. (2004) found that generational status among Asian Americans is unrelated to acculturation to European American culture (Chung et al., 2004). Thus, another plausible explanation for the high acculturation level of my sample may be Filipinos’ history of being colonized by the United States, through which they have been exposed to aspects of American culture. Contrary to expectation, acculturation had a modest negative relationship to conflictual independence when parents were assessed separately, but for mother only. The negative correlation suggests that the process of acculturation for Filipino Americans does not necessarily entail becoming more conflictually independent; rather, the acculturation process may lead Filipino American students to experience guilt, anger, responsibility, or resentment. A possible explanation for this can be inferred from a study by Lucas (1997), who found that lower psychological separation predicted higher levels of career self-exploration and commitment to various dimensions of identity. As over half of Lucas’ sample was comprised of participants from different cultural groups, Lucas concluded that, for specific cultural groups, “‘coming into one’s own’ cannot succeed outside of the relational structure of the family” (p. 130).

Thus, it may be that the modest negative relationship between acculturation and conflictual independence is a reflection of how participants reconcile potential conflicting
issues associated with growing up in two cultures. For Filipino Americans, and perhaps for other ethnic minority groups, acculturation may not necessitate an increase in independence. Gaining greater conflictual independence may be, as Lucas (1997) suggested, more of a dynamic process, not a “one dimensional dependence-independence process” (p. 130). It may mean continuously navigating cultural differences between the majority group and family culture in such a way that developing greater independence is preserving of, rather than detrimental to, relationships with parents and pakikisama (i.e., getting along with others).

When parents were combined and when they were analyzed separately, the strongest relationship was between interdependence and the separation composite. The moderate relationship found between greater interdependence and lower separation in this study may reflect the relational structure of the Filipino family. In both analyses, participants whose self-construals were more interdependent were less psychologically separated from parents. Culturally, this could be a reflection of the importance of family for emotional support and approval, as well as identification with parents’ values and beliefs. For example, religiosity may be one value and belief that is passed on through generations. This is reminiscent of Santos’s (1997) discussion regarding the core values that “underlie the socialization of Filipinos and Filipino Americans” (p. 130), which includes emotional closeness, security in a family, and approval by authority figures and society. The relationship between self-construal and the separation composite may reflect participants’ awareness of how their decisions and behaviors may impact their parents or the family in a given situation. Perhaps potential negative consequences of disrupting parental ties lead Filipino American students to maintain current ties. It may be that
having internalized parents’ beliefs and desiring parental closeness or approval maintains smooth interpersonal relationships, a valued characteristic within Filipino families and collectivistic cultures.

Males possessed greater psychological separation than females. Males and females may experience differential treatment from parents such that there may be more expectations for daughters. Daughters’ lower attitudinal independence and their need for more approval and support can potentially lead to a conflictual relationship with their parents if adhering to parental expectations prevents them from exercising more autonomy or deviating from established familial norms. As some of the participants identified as biracial/multiracial/other (12%), this result can only be discussed in relation to Filipino American female students without the assumption that their mother is also of Filipino ancestry. However, the possibility of having a mother of Filipino ancestry was high.

Unlike psychological separation, attachment was viewed as a universal construct and not dependent upon an individual being acculturated or assimilated to Western culture. As expected, attachment had no significant relationship to acculturation and interdependence. On the whole, Filipino American students were moderately attached to their parents. Because attachment was assessed as a total attachment score, it is unknown whether assessing particular subscales (Trust, Communication, Alienation) would have garnered differing results. Unlike the findings of Blustein et al. (1991), no differences were found on attachment between Filipino American females and males. Overall, these results suggest that attachment is a construct independent of cultural variables, specifically acculturation and interdependence, for Filipino American students.
Career maturity and career commitment. Low career maturity outcomes have consistently been found with Asian Americans (e.g., Luzzo, 1992). Hardin et al. (2001) found that, with the CMI, cultural differences explained these outcomes, as interdependence and acculturation were associated with career choice attitudes for Asian Americans in their study. In my study, I sought to determine what relationships may exist between career maturity and the cultural variables of acculturation and interdependence for Filipino Americans. Acculturation and interdependence, assessed as continuous variables, did not appear to predict career maturity in Filipino Americans, unlike for the combined Asian American group in Hardin et al.’s (2001) sample, which averaged lower than their European American sample. Unlike Hardin et al.’s (2001) study, the present study did not include a comparison group, nor did it assess for independent self-construal, which might have helped to determine why there was no significant relationship between interdependence and the CMI scores. However, it could be that for Filipino Americans, having an interdependent self-construal does not influence total career maturity scores, but may influence facets or subscales of career maturity or other aspects of vocational identity. Another plausible explanation for the lack of relationship between career maturity and interdependence is that, although participants may refer to or be guided by their families throughout the career planning process, they may ultimately make independent decisions that may be supported by family.

As in previous studies, psychological separation influenced the career development variables in this study. Cimmarusti (1996) noted that second-generation Filipino Americans can follow independent pursuits and experiment with self-expression as long as the importance of family is not challenged. One of these pursuits may be
deciding on a career. It appears that Filipino American students in general exercise some degree of independence in the career development process. Of particular interest was the positive relationship between conflictual independence and both career maturity and commitment. Researchers (e.g., O’Brien, 1996; Rice, 1992) have long argued that the conflictual independence subscale may measure a construct different from the other separation subscales. Absence of excessive negative feelings toward parents, or freedom from anger, resentment, responsibility and inhibition from parents, clearly appears to have a strong relationship with the career variables for Filipino American students. In a test of one of the moderator hypotheses, this relationship was found to be even stronger for low acculturated Filipino Americans. Filipino Americans who are low acculturated may have relative unfamiliarity with certain aspects of European American culture, which may require them to gain even greater separation or independence from parents in order to adequately master the steps toward becoming more career mature.

Unlike in the current study, previous studies have found attachment to be better than separation as a predictor of career maturity (e.g., Kenny, 1990; Lee & Hughey, 2001; Thomason & Winer, 1994). In previous studies, subscales and total scores for the Career Development Inventory (CDI; Super et al., 1981) were used to assess career maturity, whereas I used the attitude scale of the CMI. Swanson and D’Achiardi (2005) noted the controversy surrounding the definition and measurement of career maturity. It is possible that separation and attachment variables relate differently to different operationalizations of career maturity. More generally, it is possible that the limited results involving career maturity in my study may be due to (a) using all 75 items on the CMI, which may have introduced some fatigue, rather than the shorter Screening Form
utilized by Hardin et al., (b) my focus on one particular Asian American group, (c) my relatively high acculturated sample, and (d) the utilization of a different acculturation scale (AAMAS-EA versus the SL-ASIA). These studies should be replicated, with use of more consistent measures and perhaps a comparison group, to further delineate differences in career maturity, acculturation, and self-construal between Filipino Americans and other Asian American groups.

Contrary to previous research, where attachment was shown to relate to most career constructs, including career maturity (e.g., Kenny, 1990; Lee & Hughey, 2001), attachment only predicted career commitment in this study. It is possible that attachment to parents, in “fostering security and promoting competence” (Kenny & Donaldson, 1991, p. 480), becomes more facilitative when Filipino American students are in the process of exploring and committing to a career. The career commitment stage may be a time when participants turn to their parents for emotional support and perhaps seek advice for practical matters related to careers.

To summarize, this study provided only limited support for psychological separation and attachment’s influence on career development constructs. Conflictual independence appears to facilitate career maturity in Filipino Americans. Both conflictual independence and attachment contribute to the process of committing to and pursuing a vocational goal, which is similar to the findings of Scott and Church (2001). Blustein et al. (1991) found similar results when they analyzed the conjoint influences of conflictual independence and attachment on career commitment. Contrary to expectations, generational status did not influence psychological separation or career maturity. Thus,
for Filipino American students, generational status does not appear to relate to constructs hypothesized to embody independence.

*Prestige, compromise, and career choice.* Hypotheses related to prestige, compromise, and career preferences were not supported in this study. The lack of support for the hypothesized relationships between acculturation and career preferences and prestige may lie in the greater proportion of highly acculturated Filipino Americans in the study, which reduced variability on the acculturation measure. These results might also be explained by Filipinos’ history of excelling in Social occupations, especially for professionals who were post-1965 immigrants. There was, however, a gender difference in career choice. In general, Social occupations were the most chosen, followed by Investigative, Enterprising, Artistic, Conventional, and Realistic occupations. Females chose Social occupations with greater frequency than males. The preference for Social occupations supports Filipino Americans’ proclivity towards the helping professions. As previously discussed, nursing, which is primarily a Social occupation, has long been a targeted career among Filipinos because of the security it provides. Fifteen percent indicated nursing as their career preference, indicating that nursing continues to be a popular choice among Filipino American students. A few (6%) chose other careers in the medical field and only 3 participants chose engineering. Some common preferences within each Holland theme include teaching for Social, research-related fields for Investigative, management or entrepreneurship for Enterprising, literary careers for Artistic, and accountant for Conventional. If representative of choices for Filipino Americans generally, these occupations reflect Bautista’s (2002) observation that despite
Filipinos’ high prevalence in the health care field, they have also been known to excel in other fields.

On the whole, participants were “somewhat likely to compromise” with their parents. Filipino American students’ willingness to compromise could be a reflection of exercising their autonomy in choosing a vocational goal while considering the familial expectations associated with an interdependent self. Their varied range of occupational preferences may indicate a consideration of parents’ expectations as well as their own.

Unlike studies with Chinese Americans or Asian American students in general, Investigative occupations did not rank above Social occupations for Filipino American students in this sample (Park & Harrison, 1995; Tang, 2002; Tang et al., 1999). Leong et al. (2004) found that Chinese Americans, most of whom were low in acculturation, most preferred Enterprising occupations, followed by Investigative and Social. Because acculturation did not significantly influence the career preferences of Filipino Americans in the present study, my findings differ from other studies where acculturation was related to a decrease in “typical” (Investigative and Realistic) occupations (Park & Harrison, 1995; Tang, 2002; Tang et al., 1999). One implication is that we cannot generalize to Filipino Americans the results with other Asian American subgroups.

**Implications for Practice**

Researchers have speculated that Asian Americans may internalize or be socialized to pursue traditional occupations such as engineer or mathematician (Leong & Hayes, 1990). The myth of the model minority reinforces the perception of Asian Americans as excelling in these careers and not needing as much attention within the mental health system. Filipino Americans are themselves described as the “invisible
minority” because of how well they are perceived to assimilate to American culture. Indeed, this study suggests that many Filipino American students are, in fact, well-acclimated. It is possible that inclusion of a greater number of low acculturated Filipino Americans would have changed some results. However, given the mixed findings relating acculturation to career choice and interest, practitioners will do well to not assume that low acculturated individuals will have narrower career interests, as Leong et al. (2004) suggested. The same can be said for higher acculturated individuals, who may not necessarily have broader career interests than less acculturated individuals. Filipino American students report varied career interests. There are also between group differences among Asian Americans. Thus, practitioners will also do well to keep in mind that not all individuals who are regarded as Asian American will have similar interests and to be aware of social perceptions that stereotype Asian Americans as excelling in more traditional fields.

Although Filipino Americans in this sample appear to be making independent career choices, they seem to also be willing to consider their parents’ opinions. Exploring familial influences in career counseling, including relationship to parents, issues related to acculturation and interdependence, and role within the family, may be one focus when addressing issues and possible barriers to Filipino American career development. Filipino American females in particular may be more influenced by parents throughout the career development process. Family influences will also be important to explore when working with Filipino American students in personal counseling. Many Filipino American students are 1st or 2nd-generation and have likely navigated bicultural experiences. Even if many Filipino Americans are highly acculturated, practitioners should not assume that
they are highly individuated or that their experience living in a Western society has been
smooth. A particular focus in counseling may be to explore the extent and manner to
which Filipino American students identify with their parents in the process of creating a
cultural and ethnic identity. This may be particularly relevant for Filipinos of mixed
ethnic and cultural ancestry.

Limitations

One limitation of this study was the composition of the sample. There were
limited numbers of 1st and 3rd generation participants. There were also more participants
who are highly acculturated, which may have restricted correlations with other variables
in the study. It should also be noted that I have defined “Filipino Americans” as students
with Filipino ancestry who live in the United States. Those who did not identify as
Filipino Americans may have an ethnic identity that differs from those who identified as
Filipino Americans.

With respect to study design, a limitation was the correlational nature of the
study, which prevents definitive conclusions about cause and effect. Additionally, only
this researcher coded the occupations into Holland themes. Participants were asked to
indicate occupations they were considering and were not asked to check off occupations
on a list. Also, some occupations were specific (e.g., pediatric nurse) as opposed to
general (e.g., nurse). Thus, coding required the researcher to draw on her knowledge of
Holland’s (1985) theory to make a judgment for a small number of occupations that were
not easily categorized into an interest theme. Additional coders may have improved
reliability of the coding process. Similar judgments were required in coding the prestige
level of the students’ career preferences. Another limitation was that I used the careers
participants were currently considering as a proxy for actual career choices. Tang et al. (1999) found that career interest was not congruent with career choice among Asian Americans.

**Future Directions**

The purpose of this study was to assess psychological separation from, and attachment to, parents by assessing the total score of each variable for both parents combined. Because there were a few specific findings between mother and father for psychological separation, researchers may want to assess psychological separation from and attachment to each parent separately, utilizing specific subscales from the inventories versus a total score. For example, it is unclear whether one of the subscales in the separation composite (attitudinal or emotional independence subscale) had a stronger relationship to interdependence. Researchers may also want to examine psychological separation and attachment to other areas of Filipino American identity. It may also be useful to include a comparison group to assess cultural differences between Filipino Americans and Caucasian Americans or other Asian Americans. In addition, more studies similar to Tang’s (2002) could be conducted. Tang also assessed parents’ occupational preferences for their children, allowing an assessment of the extent to which parents’ preferences are congruent with student preferences.

Filipinos’ unique experience with colonization differs from other Asian American groups’ experiences, which may have some implications for acculturation and self-construal. Chung et al. (2004) found that generational level did not relate to the Asian American and European American cultural dimensions but was related to a decrease in adherence to Culture of Origin (AAMAS-CO). They argued that both enculturation to
culture of origin and acculturation to the host culture should be examined, as these processes may be different for each ethnic group. Therefore, it will be interesting to determine how Filipino Americans score on the AAMAS-CO subscale and how this relates to their experience in the United States, for example, in developing a bicultural identity. Researchers may also wish to assess generational conflict, which may be present due to navigating different cultures, especially with 1st- and 2nd-generation families and those of mixed heritage. Another future research direction would be to assess the presence of a colonial mentality, a culture-specific variable that can possibly have implications for acculturation to American culture and enculturation to one’s culture of origin. If some Filipinos do indeed come to the United States believing that they were almost already Americans (Bergano & Bergano-Kinny, 1997), it is likely that issues related to colonial mentality will influence Filipino Americans’ choices in various areas of life (e.g., friendship patterns) and identity.

Additionally, a measure of independent self-construal was not included in this investigation. Because each person possesses both an independent and interdependent self-construal, Singelis (1994) recommends examining both self-construals and their influence in different contexts and situations. Given the influence of American culture on Filipino culture, as well as participants’ high acculturation, it may not be surprising if Filipino American students are adept in drawing on both independent and interdependent self-construals with relative ease. Studies can also assess the contributions of self-construals to a bicultural identity.

While these future research directions can add important knowledge, the present study also made meaningful contributions to the literature. Although only a few
hypotheses were supported, I showed that culture informs the interpretation of psychological separation for Filipino American students. Although higher psychological separation (CI) was shown to relate to career development, lower psychological separation appears to suggest an adaptive quality in relation to familial relationships. In some cases, lower separation may prevent problems within familial relationships during the process of acculturation as Filipino American students navigate two different cultures. Lower separation can also maintain and preserve cultural values related to interdependence, such as maintaining smooth interpersonal relationships. Additionally, characteristics that have thus far been attributed to Asian Americans in general, such as the proclivity toward choosing traditional occupations, do not seem to characterize the career development patterns of Filipino American students.
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APPENDIX A

Background Information
Participant Number: ________

Background Information

Dear Participant,

The following questions ask you to provide some background information about yourself. Please print clearly.

1. Gender: _____ Female   _____ Male

2. Age: ______

3. Year in School: _____ 1st  _____ 2nd  _____ 3rd  _____ 4th  _____ 5th or greater  _____ Graduate Student

4. Major in School: ________________
   Undecided: ________________
   If you’re Undecided but are considering a major, please indicate the major: ________________
   Minor: ________________

5. Where were you born?
   _____ United States   Specify city and state   ________________
   _____ Philippines   Specify town and province   ________________
   _____ Other   Specify   ________________

6. If you were born outside of the U.S., please indicate how many years you have been living in the U.S.: _____ years

7. If you, your parents, or ancestors immigrated to the U.S., please indicate your generational status:
   _____ First generation = I was born in the Philippines or in another country other than the U.S.
   _____ Second generation = I was born in the U.S., and at least one of my parents was born in the Philippines or a country other than the U.S.
   _____ Third generation or greater = I was born in the U.S., both my parents were born in the U.S., and one or more of my grandparents were born in the Philippines or a country other than the U.S.
8. Ethnicity: Please circle the ethnic identity with which you identify. If none of these categories appropriately best describes your ethnic identity, please indicate your response under ‘Other’.

(Please Circle One)
Filipino/a
Filipino/a American
Asian American
Pacific Islander
Biracial or Multicultural (Please specify the different ethnicities and circle which ethnic category you identify with the most.) __________________________
Other (Specify) __________________________

9. Which city and state do you live in currently?
____________________________

10. Which city and state do your parents live in currently?
____________________________

11. Which city and state do your grandparents live in currently?
____________________________

Items 12-19 ask you to respond to some information about your parents. If you have more than one mother or father (e.g., father and stepfather), please answer the questions for the one you feel has most influenced you or has acted as a primary guardian. These individuals will be the parents to whom you will refer when filling out subsequent inventories.

12. Parents’ country of origin:
Mother: ______________________ Father: ______________________

Parents’ education in school: Please indicate the highest level of schooling your mother and father have completed.

13. Mother:  ____Elementary  ____Some High School  ____High School Graduate
  ____Some College  ____College Graduate  ____Some Graduate School
  ____Graduate School  ____Don’t Know

14. Mother’s area of specialty/training: ______________________
15. Father: _____ Elementary  _____ Some High School  _____ High School Graduate  
  _____ Some College  _____ College Graduate  _____ Some Graduate School  
  _____ Graduate School  _____ Don’t Know 

16. Father’s area of specialty/training: __________________

17. Parents’ Occupations: Please indicate the specific position and type of institution (e.g., paralegal secretary at a law firm; elementary school teacher at a public school). 
  
  Mother or Stepmother: ________________________________________________  
  (Please circle one)  
  
  Father or Stepfather: ________________________________________________  
  (Please circle one)  

18. Parents’ Marital Status: _____ Married  _____ Divorced  _____ Separated  
  _____ Never Married  _____ Cohabitating/Partnered  

19. Please write the career(s) you think your parent(s) would prefer you to pursue: 
   First choice  _________________________  
   Second choice _________________________  
   Third choice  _________________________  
   No Preference  _________________________

20. On a scale of 1 – 5, please indicate how likely you are to compromise with your parent(s) on a career choice by circling one of the following: 

   1 2 3 4 5  
   Not at all likely to compromise  Slight chance I will compromise  Somewhat likely to compromise  Very likely to compromise  Will definitely compromise