

ABSTRACT

Title of Document: AN INSTRUMENT DEVELOPMENT STUDY OF MEN'S PLANNING FOR CAREER AND FAMILY: CONTRIBUTIONS OF PARENTAL ATTACHMENT AND GENDER ROLE CONFLICT

Ethan H. Mereish, Master of Arts, 2008

Directed By: Dr. Karen Kurotouchi Inkelas, Department of Counseling and Personnel Services

The present study first investigated the factor structure and assessed the psychometric properties of a scale that measures the degree to which future family responsibilities are considered by men when making career decisions. The study then examined the contributions of parental attachment and gender role conflict in predicting men's career and family planning. Participants included 205 college men. The findings suggested that two subscales comprise the measure: the Incorporating Future Family in Career Plans subscale (IFFCP; $\alpha = .80$) and the Choosing a Career Independent of Future Family subscale (CCIFF; $\alpha = .80$). Convergent validity was supported through a negative correlation among the IFFCP subscale and career aspirations. Discriminant validity was supported, in which the IFFCP subscale lacked a correlation and the CCIFF subscale had a low correlation with the career decision-making self-efficacy. Attachment to father positively predicted incorporating future family considerations in career planning, and gender role conflict in the success, power and competition domain positively predicted choosing a career independent of future family considerations.

AN INSTRUMENT DEVELOPMENT STUDY OF MEN'S PLANNING FOR
CAREER AND FAMILY: CONTRIBUTIONS OF PARENTAL ATTACHMENT
AND GENDER ROLE CONFLICT

By

Ethan H. Mereish

Thesis submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the
University of Maryland, College Park, in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts
2008

Advisory Committee:

Associate Professor Dr. Karen Kurotsuchi Inkelas, Chair
Associate Professor Dr. Vivian S. Boyd
Associate Professor Dr. Karen M. O'Brien

© Copyright by
Ethan H. Mereish
2008

Acknowledgements

There are several people who supported and encouraged me throughout this research process. I thank my committee members and mentors Dr. Karen Kurotsuchi Inkelas, Dr. Vivian Boyd, and Dr. Karen O'Brien for their immense support and guidance. First, I am truly appreciative of having Dr. Karen Kurotsuchi Inkelas serve as my thesis chair and sharing with me her time, constructive and invaluable feedback, and great knowledge. Her humor and statistical expertise made this process fun, and I was certainly lucky to have had this experience with her. I am grateful to Dr. Vivian Boyd's wisdom and perspective. As my academic advisor, she has challenged my thinking and provided me much support throughout my masters program. I am indebted to Dr. Karen O'Brien for allowing me to be part of her research team. She has been a wonderful and empowering mentor and has inspired this project. I also am appreciative of her allowing me to collaborate with her and Heather Ganginis DelPino on their work with the PLAN scale. My committee members' thoughtful feedback and comments have greatly improved my thesis. They have all mentored and inspired me to continue with my graduate training and I am honored to have built a relationship with each one of them. I am truly grateful to their exceptional commitment to my personal and professional development and success.

My research assistants Heather Ganginis DelPino, Sophia Iem, Alli Glaser, Karina Reid, and Andy Webbink contributed greatly to the successful execution of this study. They have helped me with data collection and data entry, and made this study possible. This study also was funded by a Mac and Lucille McEwen Research Grant. I am grateful for Dr. Marylu McEwen for establishing this fund and appreciative for the

McEwen Research Grant Committee for funding and supporting my study. Last but certainly not least, I also have much and sincere gratitude to my family, friends and mentors for offering me their love and encouragement throughout this process.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	ii
Table of Contents.....	iv
List of Tables.....	vii
CHAPTER 1.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Purpose of the Study.....	2
Definition of Terms.....	2
Family.....	2
Dual-Career Families.....	3
Parental Attachment.....	4
Gender Role Conflict.....	4
Men/Males.....	4
Emerging Adults.....	5
Background.....	5
Dual-Careers and Multiple Roles.....	5
New Focus on Fathers.....	7
Parental Attachment and Career Development.....	8
Gender Role Conflict and Career Planning.....	8
Overview of the Methodology.....	10
Summary and Significance of Study.....	11
CHAPTER 2.....	13
Literature Review.....	13
Dual-Careers and Multiple Roles.....	13
Changes in the Work Force.....	13
Changes in Men’s Family Responsibilities.....	15
Changes in Gender Roles: Single Father Families.....	16
Changes in Gender Roles: Stay-at-Home Fathers.....	17
Gender Role Changes’ Influence on Children and Adolescents.....	18
Psychological Distress.....	20
Men’s Career and Family Planning.....	20
Parental Attachment and Career Development.....	23
Present Study’s Definition of Parental Attachment.....	25
Influences on Career Development.....	26
Gender Role Conflict and Career Development.....	30
Influences on Career Decision-Making.....	31
Influences on College Major Selection.....	33
Influences on Career Selection.....	35
Influences on Family Roles and Marital Satisfaction.....	37
Emerging Adulthood.....	39
Related Measures of Planning for Career and/or Future Family.....	41

Career and Marriage Attitude Inventory	42
Home-Career Conflict Measure	42
The Life Role Salience Scales	42
The Family and Career Scale	42
The Career Attitude Scale	43
Conclusion	43
CHAPTER 3	45
Methodology	45
Review of Purpose and Hypotheses.....	45
Research Design	48
Sampling Strategy	49
Instrumentation	50
Planning for Career and Family	50
Parental Attachment.....	52
Gender Role Conflict	53
Career Aspirations	54
Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy.....	54
Social-Desirability	55
Demographic Questionnaire	56
Data Collection	56
Reliability and Validity.....	57
Data Analyses	57
Factor Analysis	57
Regressions	59
Summary	59
CHAPTER 4	61
Results.....	61
Preliminary Analyses.....	61
Description of the Sample.....	64
Demographics	64
Sample Overall Impressions	67
Testing of the Hypotheses.....	67
Ancillary analyses.....	77
Summary	81
CHAPTER 5	82
Discussion	82
Factor Structure of the PLAN Scale	82
Psychometric Properties of the PLAN Scale	84
Contributions of Parental Attachment	86
Contributions of Gender Role Conflict.....	89
Parental Attachment and Gender Role Conflict	90
Ancillary Analyses.....	91
Limitations	94

Implications for Practitioners.....	96
Implications for Future Research.....	97
Conclusion	99
Appendix A.....	101
The Planning for Career and Family Scale.....	101
Appendix B.....	103
The Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment.....	103
Appendix C.....	105
The Gender Role Conflict Scale.....	105
Appendix D.....	106
The Career Aspiration Scale.....	106
Appendix E.....	107
The Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy Scale.....	107
Appendix F.....	108
The Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale Form C.....	108
Appendix G.....	109
Demographics.....	109
References.....	110

List of Tables

Table 1: Scale Total Means, Standard Deviations, and Cronbach Alpha Coefficients for the IPPA, GRCS, CAS, CDMSE, and MCSD	62
Table 2: Demographic Characteristics of the Sample (N=205).....	65
Table 3: Demographic Characteristics of the Sample Continued (N=205)	66
Table 4: Factor Analysis Factor Structures and Items Retained.....	70
Table 5: Intercorrelations Between the PLAN, IPPA, GRCS, CAS, CDMSE, and MCSD Scales	72
Table 6: Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Parental Attachment and Gender Role Conflict (GRC) Predicting Planning for Career and Family – Incorporating Future Family in Career Plans.....	74
Table 7: Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Parental Attachment and Gender Role Conflict (GRC) Predicting Planning for Career and Family – Choosing a Career Independent of Future Family	76
Table 8: Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for the Planning for Career and Family Scale (PLAN) for Differences in Class Standing	78
Table 9: Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for the Planning for Career and Family Scale (PLAN) for Differences in Selection of Career to Pursue after Graduation.....	79
Table 10: Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for the Planning for Career and Family Scale (PLAN) for Differences in Data Collection Locations	80

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Former U.S. Secretary of Labor, Robert Reich, resigned from his position in 1997 because he wanted to spend more time being a good father to his sons (Reich, 2001). He made this decision because he was neglecting his sons due to his time demanding career. Reich is a unique example of navigating the career and family interface in the 21st century traditional dual-career families. Most traditional dual-career families in the United States do not have the same luxury as Reich. In fact, dual-career families, in which both partners are involved in careers and individuals assuming multiple roles have become the norm in the United States (Mintz & Mahalik, 1996). Additionally, traditional family structures are not representative of all family structures in the U.S., and they have actually declined drastically over the decades (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2001). Nonetheless, the work and family interface remains a key component of both traditional and nontraditional families.

Research on the work and family interface has mainly focused on women. Some vocational psychologists have focused on the degree to which women consider future family and relationships when deciding on a career direction (Ganginis Delpino & O'Brien, 2008). However, very little research has examined men's consideration of future family roles in career decision-making. Understanding men's career and family planning is important because it could aid men in making more educated and appropriate career plans as they navigate today's dual-career society. It also is important because men's work and family roles can be significant predictors of psychological distress (Barnett, Marshall, & Pleck, 1992).

Purpose of the Study

As research investigating career and family planning has focused on women, it is pertinent to understand men's planning since, for some in dual-career families, they also are an integral part of the childrearing process. Thus, this present study first investigated the factor structure and assessed the psychometric properties of a scale that measures the degree to which future family responsibilities are considered by men when making career decisions. In addition, it is necessary to examine factors that relate to men's future career goals. Men's career planning and multiple roles have been influenced by factors such as parental attachment (Blustein, Walkbridge, Friedlander, & Palladino, 1991; Lee & Hughey, 2001; Kenny, 1990) and gender role conflict (Dodson & Borders, 2006; O'Neil, Good, & Holmes, 1995; Rochlen & O'Brien, 2002). Consequently, this study's second purpose examined the contributions of parental attachment and gender role conflict in predicting career and family planning. Findings from this study may help men better understand their career and family planning and multiple roles in the 21st century.

Definition of Terms

To clarify certain terms used in this study, the following are definitions of family, dual-career families, parental attachment, gender role conflict, men versus males, and emerging adults.

Family

Most literature by researchers of work and family relationships have primarily focused on the traditional family structure of a married husband and wife with children (Palladino Schultheiss, 2006). However, a traditional family household, defined by a married husband and wife with children, only made up 24% of the United States

population in 2000, an evident drop from 40% in 1970 (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2001). Even without children, a family consisting of a married husband and wife only made up 28.7% of the U.S. population in 2000 (U.S. Bureau of the Census). Hence, more inclusive definitions for family need to be considered and need to include both unmarried heterosexual and same sex couples when investigating career and family dynamics (Palladino Schulthesis, 2006). For this study, a family will be defined as having a romantic partner, either a heterosexual or same-sex partner. A family can be but is not limited to including children, both adopted and or biological. In this regard, the present research measured considerations of future family responsibilities when making career choices with the Planning for Career and Family Scale (Ganginis Delpino & O'Brien, 2008). The term "future family," is inclusive, in which it considers future family as both future parenting responsibilities and romantic partners.

Dual-Career Families

Dual-career families have drastically increased in the United States; thus, it is important to understand the meaning of dual-career families. Dual-career families are composed of two partners, in which "both partners have strong identification with their work, usually extended preparation for it, commitment to it, and expectations of moving up a career path" (Hansen, 1997, p. 122). These partners can be either heterosexual or same-sex couples. Dual-career families represent an evolving kind of two-earner families. According to Hansen, in two-earner families, the husband has a more dominant career role than the wife's career role. However, both partners are committed to their work to provide for the family. Dual-career families have become prevalent in today's society since women are taking a more prevalent role in the workforce.

Parental Attachment

Parental attachment is considered in this study because it is a contributing factor to career and family planning. Attachment is defined as “an enduring affectional bond of substantial intensity” (Armsden & Greenberg, 1987, p. 428). Parental attachment is defined as the psychological attachment and security an individual has to his or her parents, considered among three broad dimensions of attachment: trust, communication, and alienation.

Gender Role Conflict

Gender role conflict is another factor contributing to career and family planning. According to O’Neil, Helms, Gable, David and Wrightsman (1986), “gender role conflict is a psychological state where gender roles have negative consequences or impact on a person or others” (p. 336), thus, consequently restricting the person’s or another’s human potential. According to O’Neil et al. (1986), the roots of male socialization reside in the devaluation and fear of femininity. The fear of femininity exists for some men because they are socialized to believe that displaying traditional female behaviors (e.g., being emotionally expressive) leads to the questioning of their masculinity. Fear of femininity restricts men that adhere to gender roles from expressing themselves and results in negative consequences such as poor psychological health.

Men/Males

The terms “men” and “males” are two separate concepts (Carter, 2000). “Men” is in reference to gender, which is a socially constructed phenomenon and an internal socially constructed identity in relation to masculinity, whereas, “males” is in reference to sex, which is biologically founded. It is important to recognize that each of these

concepts is not binary and there is a spectrum of identification for each (Carter). Through a complex interaction with their culture's expectations of them, the social construction of gender and masculinity begins for males as early as they are infants (Pollack, 1999). As males become boys, they are put under many pressures to adhere to traditional definitions of masculinity. When adolescent males enter college, they experience similar pressures and continue to battle with the restrictive definitions of masculinity. Since college is a time where students continue to develop their identities, college men also are defining their masculinity and developing their gender identity. In this study, college males are referred to as men in reference to their gender socialization and gender expression.

Emerging Adults

Recently, a new developmental period has been identified for individuals between the late teens to mid-to-late twenties, called emerging adulthood (Arnett, 2000).

Individuals in this time period are called emerging adults. According to Arnett, this time period is characterized in three ways: demographically, subjectively, and through identity explorations. Emerging adulthood also is distinct in that, it is a time where individuals have several potential life directions. Emerging adults take their time in exploring their life possibilities, such as career, love and worldviews. In addition, future decisions are not definitive, but rather fluid in their developmental nature.

Background

Dual-Careers and Multiple Roles

There have been remarkable increases in the number of dual-career relationships as well as women in the work force in the United States (U.S. Department of Labor Statistics, 2005). Additionally, there have been changes in the attitudes towards gender

roles (Sayer, Cohen, & Casper, 2004). For instance, men in traditional married households are doing more housework than they did in 1965 (Bianchi, Milkie, Sayer, & Robinson, 2000) and are taking more active roles in childcare (Levine & Pittinsky, 1997). Although these changes may suggest that men are becoming more egalitarian with their gender roles over the years, it is important to recognize that gender segregation of household tasks still exists and these tasks are predominately performed by women (Bianchi et al., 2000; U.S. Department of Labor Statistics, 2005). Nonetheless, these are important changes that aid our understanding of men. Additionally, there are even changes in single men's roles. Single men are doing more household work than ever before. This indicates some changes in men's perceptions of their roles and cultural norms (Bianchi et al.). These norms have positively influenced adolescents and emerging adults.

Friedman and Weissbrod (2005) have found similarities in emerging adults' levels of work and family commitment. Although there are similarities, there are still gender differences in perceptions of work and family in relation to one another (Friedman & Weissbrod), which suggests the need for special attention to gender when researching these relationships. Changes in the work force, family and gender roles call for the need to further understand the interconnections of career and family for adolescents and adults (Palladino Schultheiss, 2006) and specifically for men.

Barnett et al. (1992) have shown that work and family roles can be significant predictors of psychological distress. These researchers also have suggested that traditional and monolithic views of men when considering career and family are inadequate (Barnett et al., 1992). These misconceptions suggest that there is a great need

to understand men's career and family planning, especially in view of research pertaining to men's perceptions of gender roles over the life span (O'Neil et al., 1995) in relationship to formation of their family roles (Mintz & Mahalik, 1996).

New Focus on Fathers

Understanding the changes in men's gender roles in relation to the career and family interface also will help clarify father roles and their implications for their children. As dual-career families are the increasing norm in the U.S., men are taking on more household responsibilities such as parenting. Recently, researchers are becoming more interested in investigating the experiences of stay-at-home-fathers and their gender roles (Doucet, 2004; Rochlen, McKelley, Scaringi, & Suizzo, 2007), and are trying to understand the experiences of men as they perform their family roles in relation to their careers.

Rates of fathers who stay at home with their children have increased 60% from 2004 to 2006 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2005, 2007). Although research on stay-at-home-fathers is limited, these men experience great gender role pressures and stigma associated with their nontraditional roles (Doucet, 2004). Nonetheless, this growing population of nontraditional men is raising questions of gender roles, and potentially influences children's perceptions of gender norms in relation to careers.

With changes in gender norms, it is clear that fathers are spending more time with their children than they did in past decades. Increased father involvement has some positive outcomes on children and young adults, including young men. Father involvement influences young adults' gender stereotyping and promotes positive psychological well-being (Marsiglio, Amato, Day, & Lamb, 2000). Additionally, positive

father-child relationships in turn have positive effects on their children's development (Marsiglio et al.). As young males are raised in dual-career households and have increased involvement with their fathers, their perceptions of family and career planning might be influenced. Thus, it is necessary to understand men's parental attachment in relation to their career and family planning.

Parental Attachment and Career Development

Substantial research exists supporting the idea that men's career planning is influenced by parental attachment (Blustein et al., 1991; Lee & Hughey, 2001; Kenny, 1990). Therefore, parental attachment is an important construct to consider when assessing men's career and family planning. Late adolescent's positive parental attachment provides a secure base, which promotes risk-taking and exploration (Kenny 1990, 1994; Rice, Cole & Lapsley, 1990). A secure attachment base is beneficial for their development and college adjustment (Armsden & Greenberg, 1987, Kenny 1990; Lee & Hughey, 2001; Rice & Whaley, 1994). Although there is some debate between adequate balance of psychological separation and parental attachment (Blustein et al, 1991; O'Brien, 1996), Lee and Hughey (2001) found that parental attachment was significantly related to career maturity and career planning compared to psychological separation. Kenny (1990) also found positive relationships among parental attachment and career planning. Additionally, men's attachment to their fathers can have positive influences on their career commitment process (Blustein et al., 1991).

Gender Role Conflict and Career Planning

Not only is parental attachment a contributing factor to career and family planning, but gender role conflict also influences career planning. Gender role conflict

has influences on career decision-making (Rochlen, Blazina, & Raghunathan, 2002), selection of traditionally male majors (Childers-Lackland & De Lisi, 2001; Dawson-Threat & Huba, 1996; Jome & Tokar, 1998), career choices (Dodson, & Borders, 2006), and family roles (Mintz & Mahalik, 1996). In their study of men's attitudes towards career counseling, Rochlen et al. (2002) found that men with high gender role conflict expressed need for self-clarity, for occupational information, and had greater indecisiveness concerns. These researchers also suggested that "gender role conflicted men may prematurely foreclose on their career choice without sufficiently researching the types of occupations and career choices being pursued" (Rochlen et al., p. 135).

Gender role conflict also has significant effects on college majors and career choices. A number of researchers found that college men's traditional gender role attitudes had significant effects on their selection of traditional majors (Childers Lackland & De Lisi, 2001; Jome & Tokar, 1998). Dawson-Threat and Huba (1996) also found that college men who were less adhering to gender norms exhibited a clear sense of purpose in terms of direction and future goals. As college men progress in their careers, men who were not gender conflicted were more willing to choose nontraditional careers in comparison to gender conflicted men (Dodson & Border, 2006). Mintz and Mahalik (1996) also found that gender role conflict is a predictor of men's family roles. Men who were not gender conflicted were more rolesharing husbands and were more likely to participate in household responsibilities compared to gender conflicted traditional husbands (Mitz & Mahalik). All of these studies make it evident that gender conflict can greatly affect men's career and family planning. It also is evident that gender conflicted men are more restricted to traditional careers. This is alarming and it highlights the need

to further understand gender conflicted men's career planning. In view of the significant increases in women in the workforce and changes in gender roles, it is important to understand men's career and family planning and help them navigate being more comfortable with nontraditional job roles.

While considering career and family planning, parental attachment and gender role conflict, it is essential to recognize that these constructs are fluid in nature. Since participants in the study are emerging adults, they are currently undergoing identity exploration and are more likely to continue to explore their careers and gender socialization. Thus, it is important to remember that these constructs are not fixed or definitive for college men and will likely continue to change as they develop their identities.

Overview of the Methodology

The present study first utilized an exploratory factor analysis to investigate the factor structure and assess the psychometric properties of the Planning for Career and Family Scale (PLAN; Delpino & O'Brien, 2007), which measures the degree to which future family responsibilities are considered when making career decisions. This instrument was hypothesized to have two subscales: (a) incorporating future families in career plans, and (b) choosing career plans independent of future family responsibilities. The study also assessed the convergent and discriminant validity of these scales. Additionally, the study examined the contributions of parental attachment, measured with the Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment (Armsden & Greenberg, 1987), and gender role conflict, measured with the Gender Role Conflict Scale (O'Neil et al., 1986), in

predicting career and family planning. The study's participants included 205 undergraduate college men from classes and various student groups and organizations.

Summary and Significance of Study

The fields of psychology and higher education have historically been dominated and developed by men. Research in psychology was mainly conducted by men on samples of men and was then applied to minority groups (Hansen, 1997). The research, however, did not consider a gendered perspective when thinking about men. There have been significant changes in gender roles over the decades, calling for the need to better understand men and masculinities (Hansen; 1997; O'Neil et al., 1995) and to conduct research from a gendered perspective. With over 25 years of gender role conflict research, O'Neil (in press) identified the need to research men from a social justice perspective in an effort to liberate men, address men's sexist socialization, and determine how it victimizes women and other men (O'Neil et al., 1995). Additionally, Liu (2005) suggested that psychologists need to include issues of men and masculinity as part of multicultural competence as these issues are often overlooked. The present research is significant because it researched men from a gendered perspective to improve our understanding of men and masculinities vis-à-vis family planning and career issues.

Research has not examined college men's consideration of future family roles in career decision-making to allow for the work-family interface, and there are no existing measures that assess this construct. Thus, the present study is significant as it attempted to do so. The present study's findings aimed to provide new knowledge about college men's career development, and provided new knowledge about relationships among career development, parent attachment, and gender role conflict.

Findings from the present study should aid psychologists, career counselors, and student affairs professionals in advising, and/or counseling college students. Results of the PLAN scale could aid male college students in understanding the motivation behind their career planning, thus enabling them to make better informed and more appropriate career plans. Additionally, this scale can help men and fathers understand their attitudes and values towards their considerations of families as they navigate their careers. This knowledge also can help counseling psychologists develop vocational interventions that assist men struggling with multiple role concerns or interventions that help men consider multiple roles as they are about to enter the workforce. These interventions can aid men in recognizing their male socialization and assist them in navigating multiple roles. This in turn might aid women by possibly taking away some of the family pressures and sole caregiving expectations; allowing them to equally advance in the work force.

In subsequent chapters, each of the above topics will be discussed in greater detail. The following chapter will examine and review literature pertinent to the study. The third chapter will further explain the methodology of this study. The results of this study are reported in the fourth chapter. Finally, the fifth chapter includes a discussion of the study's findings and implications for practitioners and future research.

CHAPTER 2

Literature Review

Research on men's consideration of future family roles in career planning is lacking. However, this literature review will outline the work that does exist on men's career and family planning. The literature review will first discuss changes in the workforce and in dual-career and multiple role norms, and the influence these factors play on men's family and gender roles. Additionally, changes in men's family roles and the impact this has on children will be discussed. Next, two factors related to men's career goals and planning will be explored: parental attachment and gender role conflict. Then, emerging adulthood theory will be addressed since it provides a contextual and developmental framework in understanding college men's ongoing career planning process. Finally, an overview of measures of future family and career planning will be presented that informed the development of the Planning for Career and Family Scale (Ganginis DelPino & O'Brien, 2008) with men.

Dual-Careers and Multiple Roles

Changes in the Work Force

There have been dramatic changes in the workforce that have had implications for family structure. Changes in the work force have mainly had an influence on the role of women. In fact, women's work outside of the home from 1965 to 2000 has been the most significant contributor to the changes in traditional families (Bianchi, Robinson, & Milkie, 2006). These changes in women's work are not unique to the United States work force; they have been witnessed worldwide. In the United States, women increased their participation rate in the labor force from 43% to 59% between 1970 and 2004 (U. S.

Department of Labor Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2005). Additionally, working mothers have drastically increased their participation in work from 45% in 1965 to 78% in 2000 (Bianchi et al., 2006). Not only have women become a huge part of the workforce, they also have made strides in achieving management, professional, and related occupational status. In 2004, half of these occupations were filled by women (U.S. Department of Labor Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2005). Women also have made improvements in higher education, as 33% of women in 2004 held a college degree compared to 11% in 1970. These momentous increases of women in the labor force have instigated the evolution of work and family structures.

Increases of women in all of these employment domains have meant that once traditional families have now moved towards becoming two-earner and essentially dual-career families. Dual-earner families are traditional families, in which both partners work but usually the female has the secondary provider role (Hansen, 1997). Many dual-earner families have evolved into dual-career families, in which both partners are strongly committed to their careers (Hansen, 1997). Dual-career families have now become the norm in the United States (Mintz & Mahalik, 1996). These changes in family structure and the work force have significant implications, as seen in changes in attitudes toward gender, family, and career roles (Sayer et al., 2004). Although research has focused on changes in traditional heterosexual marital relationships, changes in the work force have implications for all families. An example of the changes in men's gender roles is their likelihood to assume more household and parenting responsibilities.

Changes in Men's Family Responsibilities

Changes in the work force and in the structure of families have influenced men's involvement with household responsibilities. These responsibilities are traditionally perceived as women's duties, but men are now more likely to take them on themselves. Multiple studies indicate that men are taking on more responsibility in both household duties and parenting (Bianchi et al., 2000; Bianchi et al., 2006; Hertz & Marshall, 2001). The Bianchi and associates studies utilized national data in addition to time diaries in assessing changes in household work. This was important in comparing national data to actual diaries. The studies also suggested that men with higher egalitarian beliefs about family roles were more likely to participate in an egalitarian way in the division of household labor.

Men are also taking on more parenting responsibilities. Fathers are spending more time with their children than they did in past decades (Marsiglio et al., 2000). Many research studies have indicated that fathers in two-parent households have significantly increased their parenting responsibilities, as well as levels of interaction and availability to their children (Marsiglio et al., 2000). Fathers are taking on nurturing responsibilities of their children, and this is often by choice (Levine & Pittinsky, 1997). As increases in fatherhood responsibilities have been linked to potential changes in gender roles, there are, however, also other reasons that help facilitate more father involvement with parenting responsibilities. Changes in commuting patterns and increases in fathers telecommuting (e.g., working from home) are both contributors to increases in fathers household involvement (Levine & Pittinsky).

Changes in men's family involvement may suggest that men are becoming more egalitarian with their gender roles over time. However, it is important to recognize that gender segregation of household tasks still exists and is predominately performed by women (Bianchi et al., 2000; U.S. Department of Labor Statistics, 2005). Concurrently, understanding men's changes in family involvement can better inform our understanding of changes in gender roles. Bianchi et al. (2000) also have found changes in the roles of single men. Single men are actively doing more household work than in the recent past. These changes might indicate that it is more acceptable for men to show competence in household chores, which would encourage them to do more work. Changes in both married and single men's involvement in the family signal some potential transformations in men's perceptions of their roles in career and family arenas.

Changes in Gender Roles: Single Father Families

As mentioned in the previous sections, the increased involvement of men in family responsibilities is potentially indicative of changes in gender roles. It is worth noting that there are also increases in single father families. This population of fathers rarely receives attention, however, single fathers represent examples of men directly and indirectly taking on nontraditional roles and balancing both family and career. In the past fifty years, single father families have increased by three million families; in 1950, there were a little over a million single father families, but in 2002, there a little over four million (U.S. Census Bureau, 2002). Within these families there also have been drastic changes in the number of offspring. According to U.S. Census Bureau (2002), in 1950 about 19% of single father families had children under the age of 18, but in 2000, 50% of these families had children under the age of 18. Although this is a unique population,

little to no research exists on how these men plan and balance their career and family roles.

Changes in Gender Roles: Stay-at-Home Fathers

Another dimension of understanding the changes in men's gender roles is exploring changes in the gender roles of fathers. Researchers have recently taken an interest in investigating the experiences of stay-at-home-fathers (Doucet, 2004; Rochlen et al., 2007). These researchers are examining the experiences of men as they perform their family roles in relation to their careers.

Rates of stay-at-home- fathers have increased 60% from 2004 to 2006 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2005, 2007). This increasing population of nontraditional men is challenging traditional gender roles. Doucet (2004) conducted a qualitative study with 70 stay-at-home fathers to investigate changes in men's gender roles. Doucet indicated that stay-at-home fathers are challenged by the intersections of home, work, community and masculinity. Doucet found that these men experience much scrutiny from their social networks and the community, and find themselves justifying their decision to be stay-at-home fathers.

Doucet (2004) also found that it is imperative to redefine our understanding of domestic work to include the nontraditional responsibilities that fathers undertake. These responsibilities include men's involvement with their children's school or sports and the community. While these responsibilities are nontraditional domestic duties, they are still meaningful contributions that fathers provide. They are roles in which men are comfortable balancing fatherhood and masculinity. Doucet calls for the need for researchers to reconsider theories regarding men and masculinity and to include a more

flexible understanding of masculinities. The researcher's findings provide a great deal of insight on the challenges and rewards men experience when taking on nontraditional roles. One limitation of this study is that it was conducted in Canada and not the United States. Nonetheless, the researcher was motivated to conduct the study due to the increases in dual-career families in Canadian culture, which is similar to U.S. changes in family dynamics. This study emphasizes the need to better understand men's career and family planning. It also raises questions regarding the influences of fatherhood on children's and adolescents' development.

Gender Role Changes' Influence on Children and Adolescents

Positive effects on children. Changes in gender roles have resulted in increases in fatherly involvement. There are various ways in which increased father involvement was found to have positive effects on young adults, including young men. Researchers indicate that father involvement influences young adults' gender stereotyping and encourages their sons' to be more emotionally sensitive (Marsiglio et al., 2000). Additionally, positive father-child relationships have positive effects on their children's development. In a unique study, researchers examined father transitions in the household in relation to their young children's injury risk (Schwebel & Brezausek, 2007). The researchers found that when a father is added into a child's home during the toddler years, the child's chances of pediatric injury is decreased. This is surprising because the study did not find comparable low injury rates when both parents are present during the entire child's lifespan. The researchers suggested multiple interpretations including an increase of financial resources, an additional support for the mother who had already taken much of the responsibility by herself, and perhaps an increase in positive parental

strategies due to the fact that a new partner is watching their strategies. Nonetheless, this study's findings are interesting and provide further support for the influence of paternal involvement on children.

Influences on adolescents. Changes in gender roles and dual-career families, such as father's increased involvement and perceptions of family roles, have influences on adolescents. In a study assessing parental influences on the expectations of adolescents in dual-earner families, Weinshenker (2005) found that fathers' household labor role-sharing behavior in a dual-career family has been found significant in predicting children's expectations of role-sharing. This is an insightful finding as indicates that fathers with more egalitarian views of family roles can influence their children's views of family roles. Additionally, the researcher found that families that challenge, which is where parents hold high expectations of their children, is related to boys having traditional attitudes towards family structures. The researcher suggested that boys might internalize high expectations and pursue high career aspirations. These are all important findings and they might relate to young men's perception of gender roles because dual-career families have been in existence for over 25 years.

The changes in the work force, multiple roles, and cultural norms call for the need to further understand interconnections of career and family for emerging adults (Palladino Schultheiss, 2006), and specifically for men. Understanding men's career and family roles is important because attempting to navigate these roles can have influences on men's mental health.

Psychological Distress

Researchers have found that men's work and family roles can be significant predictors of psychological distress (Barnett et al., 1992). The researchers found that the quality of both work and family roles for men were related to their psychological health. If men utilized appropriate career and family plans, they would most likely prevent psychological distress. Thus, it is important to help men become aware of their career and family plans.

Researchers also have advocated for society to reconsider traditional and monolithic views of men when considering men's career development (Barnett et al., 1992). The researchers indicated that monolithic views of men being solely career-focused are inadequate. There is a great need to understand men's career and family planning, in view of the lack of research pertaining to men's perceptions of gender roles over the life span (O'Neil et al., 1995) in relation to formation of their family roles (Mintz & Mahalik, 1996). Therefore, validating a scale that assesses career and planning would be an important contribution to our understanding of men's development.

Men's Career and Family Planning

Little research exists that investigates men's career and family planning. In fact, the research that does exist on this issue does not measure the construct of career and family planning, but measures similar constructs. Stickel and Bonnett (1991) developed a scale that measures career self-efficacy in combining a career with home and family. In this study, self-efficacy in combining a career with family is not operationalized in the same way as the construct of career and family planning. The researchers found that women reported higher efficacy in combining a traditional career with family. However,

men reported no differences in efficacy in combining traditionally feminine or traditionally masculine careers with family. The researchers did not report any limitations to their study. It is worth noting that they attempted to analyze the factor structure of their newly developed scale with a sample of 130 students, of which 71 were women and 59 were men. The small sample size did not permit appropriate factor analyses. Stickel and Bonnett (1991) measured career self-efficacy, which is different than the career and family planning construct under investigation in the current study.

Since there is a lack of literature in psychology and education regarding men's career and family planning, literature in the field of sociology was consulted. Sociological findings indicate mixed results regarding men's and women's career and family consideration. Friedman and Weissbrod (2005) indicate that generally emerging adult men and women have similar commitments to career but women consider family more than men do. However, many of those studies considered different measures to assess career and family expectations and they did not specifically measure career and family planning.

For example, Friedman and Weissbrod (2005) assessed work and family commitment and decision-making status among emerging adults, but not specifically career and family planning. The researchers operationalized commitment as committing personal resources to further develop specific roles such as career or family (e.g., marital, parental, or homecare) roles. The researchers considered decision-making status as the status of the participants' decision regarding their career, and family plans (e.g., marriage and having children). Considering their career and family plans, participants were asked to rate whether they made a decision, thought about but has not made a decision, or

haven't yet thought about their plans in these domains. Although commitment and decision-making status are similar constructs measured in the present study, they do not measure the extent individuals consider future family responsibilities as they decide on careers. Additionally, commitment in Friedman and Weissbrod's (2005) study is not inclusive of future unmarried romantic relationships.

Although there are differences in the constructs, the results of Friedman and Weissbrod's (2005) study point to relevant findings. The results of their study did indicate that there were similarities in emerging adults' levels of work and family commitment. Both men and women had similar levels of commitment to career and family. However, women had a negative correlation between their commitments to career and family. Additionally, the researchers found significance between commitment and decision-making: the more a participant had decided on a specific role the more he/she was committed to it (e.g., decision-making status of "decision" on career was significantly related to commitment to career). Some differences were found between decision-making status and commitment for career and family. It was found that if a participant has thought about or decided on family plans, the more committed he/she was to his/her family roles. However, only when a participant has decided on career plans the more committed he/she commit to his/her career roles. Thinking about career plans was not found significant with commitment to career goals.

Although there were no significant differences between men's and women's work decision-making status, gender differences were found in family (e.g., marriage and parenthood) decision-making status. The researchers found that "whereas men were more likely than women not yet to have thought about family roles, women were more likely

than men to have decided about family roles” (Friedman & Weissbrod, p. 317). These findings display the complexities involved in the gender differences of the career and family interface. Friedman and Weissbrod’s study did attempt to deconstruct some of these complexities; however, career and family planning has not been examined. This further indicates the need to understand work and family planning with an actual measure developed for this purpose.

Existing literature outlines changes in the work force, families, and men’s gender roles. With these changes, the literature discussion has made clear the need for a better understanding of men’s career planning in relation to family. In an effort to better understand men’s career development, it is important to consider factors that contribute to men’s career and family interface. Since affectional bonds to parents are a significant contributor to career development, the current study will first discuss parental attachment. Another contributing factor to men’s career development is male socialization. Therefore, this study will examine gender role conflict as the second contributing factor. The following section discusses pertinent literature regarding the role of parental attachment on men’s career development. It will be followed by a discussion of the contributions of gender role conflict on men’s career development.

Parental Attachment and Career Development

As mentioned in the introductory chapter, attachment is defined as “an enduring affectional bond of substantial intensity” (Armsden & Greenberg, 1987, p. 428). One of the most prominent attachment theorists and scholars described attachment as an innate behavioral system that promotes infant’s survival and security through interactions with his or her caregivers (Bowlby, 1982). According to Bowlby, infants’ interactions with

their primary caregivers provide them with a safety net of understanding regarding proximity seeking and avoidance behaviors. Based on their caregivers' responses, infants who experience positive and stable attachment develop a secure base that provides them confidence in exploring their environment. Building on Bowlby's work, Ainsworth (1989) indicated that as infants develop and mature into adolescence their attachments to others continue to provide them a secure base, and encourage exploration. Experiencing healthy attachments to others over the lifespan also allows individuals to develop more positive perceptions of others (e.g., supportive, sensitive, caring) and of their environment (e.g., secure, stable), and facilitates more positive perceptions of themselves and their abilities (Ainsworth; Bowlby).

Late adolescents' and young adults' perceptions of secure attachment to parents and peers enable them to take risks and explore their environment, which is an important developmental task that has been empirically observed (Kenny, 1990, 1994; Rice et al., 1990). Participating in risk-taking and exploring their environment is instrumental for young adults because it facilitates personal and career development (Kenny, 1994; Rice et al., 1990). Kenny (1994) conducted a study that provides empirical support indicative of the process of exploration for men, in relation to parental attachment. She studied 139 students, both men and women, between the ages of 18 and 22, who attended trade and technical school programs. She indicated that her overall sample had significant positive parental attachments. More specifically, she indicated "male students who were attending schools further away from their parents' homes described their parental attachments more positively than did students who attended schools closer to their parents' homes" (Kenny, p. 399). She suggested that her finding supports parental attachment theory, such that

males who had higher security attachment levels to their parents were more likely to feel confident to explore their environment and go further away for school, compared to males who reported a less secure attachment to their parents. Similar to the conceptual findings of Kenny's study, Rice et al. (1990) found that students' college adjustment is predicted by positive separation feelings from parents. Individuals who have secure attachments to their parents are more enabled to confidently explore their environments, and in this situation they would be comfortable with separating from their parents while still having positive feelings. Although positive separation feelings are not a direct measure of parental attachment, similar theoretical dimensions of parental attachment can be inferred. Awareness of parental attachment theoretical dimensions, more specifically confidence in environment exploration, is important because it does have implications for an individual's development. One example of such a developmental process is defining one's career trajectory.

Much research exists that suggests there is a positive relationship between parental attachment and career development. Additionally, some research exists indicating that men's career development is influenced by positive and secure attachment to parents (Blustein et al., 1991; Lee & Hughey, 2001; Kenny, 1990). Thus, parental attachment is an important construct to consider when assessing men's career and family planning.

Present Study's Definition of Parental Attachment

Before delving into literature discussing the influences of parental attachment on career development, it might be useful to become reacquainted with the present study's definition of parental attachment. Parental attachment in this study is defined as the

psychological attachment and security an individual has to his or her parents, which is considered among three broad dimensions of attachment: trust, communication, and alienation (Armsden & Greenburg, 1987). The trust dimension indicates the degree of security to parents based on their responsiveness to emotional needs. The communication dimension indicates the degree and quality of verbal communication with parents. The alienation dimension indicates the extent of emotional detachment and anger towards parents. Parental attachment can be assessed through the Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment (IPPA; Armsden & Greenburg). Individuals who have secure relationships with their parents, in which they maintain trust and communication and are less likely to feel alienated or angry towards their parents, are more likely to have a positive attachment to them.

Influences on Career Development

Researchers have found that parental attachment has an influence on career development. Some of this literature discussion will first discuss the role of parental attachment in career self-efficacy (Ryan, Solberg, & Brown, 1996; O'Brien, 1996) and career commitment (Blustein et al., 1991). Then, the influence of parental attachment on career planning and career maturity (Lee & Hughey, 2001; Kenny, 1990) will be explored.

Career self-efficacy. Positive relationships have been observed between parental attachment, and career self-efficacy. With a sample of 220 community college students, Ryan et al. (1996) investigated relationships among family dysfunction, parental attachment and career search self-efficacy. Congruent to other literature in this area of research, the researchers found “attachment to mother and father, and degree of family

dysfunction combined to account for 14% of the variance in career search self-efficacy” (Ryan et al., p. 84). However, the researchers found gender differences and indicated that attachment to mother was the sole predictor for men’s career search self-efficacy. Although this is an insightful and significant finding, men’s attachment to mothers accounts for only 9% of the variance. This finding also is different from women since the combination of both parental attachment and family dysfunction were significant predictors of career search self-efficacy for women. Nonetheless, this study indicates the need to further investigate men’s parental attachment and career development, particularly because there has been more attention paid to women’s parental attachment in relation to career development than men’s attachment.

Career commitment. Parental attachment has been found to have influences on career commitment (Blustein et al., 1991). In their study, Blustein et al. found that career development is influenced by both psychological separation from parents and parental attachment. More specifically, they found that a balance of secure attachment to parents and psychological separation is positively correlated with the progress of committing to a career choice and negatively correlated to premature career selection. The researchers did control for age in this study in an effort to understand developmental changes of the participants; however, age was found not to be significant. Additionally, the researchers found that men’s attachment to their fathers and certain dimensions of their psychological separation from their fathers have the most robust positive influences on their career choice commitment. Considering the career search self-efficacy study (Ryan et al., 1996) cited earlier and the findings of this study reflects differences in researchers conclusions regarding maternal and paternal attachments and their varied

influences on men's career development. This illustrates the complexities and the need to further understand the relationships between men's parental attachments and career development.

Career maturity and career planning. Two studies have investigated influences of parental attachment on career maturity (Kenny, 1990; Lee & Hughey, 2001). Kenny (1990) found that secure attachment to parents was related to career planning for college seniors. This connects with parental attachment theory in regards of exploration. Having positive attachments to parents provides college seniors a secure base and the support to explore and engage in the challenging developmental tasks of career planning. Gender differences also were present in this study: women expressed greater attachment to their parents as an emotional support source than did men. These findings are similar to findings in studies discussed earlier. They also reinforce potential effects of men's gender socialization on perceptions of parental attachment.

Lee and Hughey (2001) examined psychological separation and parental attachment constructs as contributing factors to career maturity. The researchers were most interested in whether these two constructs were separately or simultaneously contributors to career maturity. With their sample of 82 freshmen, the researchers found that parental attachment was significantly more related to career maturity than psychological separation. Differences within gender were not found in this study. The findings of the study are different from others discussed earlier (Blustein et al., 1991; O'Brien, 1996); in brief, parental attachment had greater influence on career development compared to an appropriate balance between psychological separation and secure attachment to parents. The lack of gender differences and balance between parental

attachment and psychological separation certainly raises some questions regarding the study's methodology. The study's sample only had 82 participants, all of whom were White college freshmen. The lack of diversity in this sample and potential developmental stages of freshmen might have led to the differences in this study's finding.

Most of the studies mentioned in this discussion utilized samples of individuals who came from intact families where both parents were still married. This fact raises questions regarding researchers' exclusion of participants from divorced parents or single-parent families. Although this might further increase confounding variables, it is important to understand the experiences of those students. It also is important to contribute to research in this area since there is a great lack of understanding of their experiences in regards to parental attachment and career development. Additionally, all of the studies were heterosexist in nature, in which they looked at participants' attachment to their heterosexual married parents and none examined attachment to same-sex parents.

It is evident that parental attachment has multiple effects on various dimensions of career development. The above studies discussed multiple gender differences in parental attachment, which increases the need to further understand men's parental attachment in relation to their career development. Furthermore, multiple researchers indicated that, overall, women expressed more attachment to parents than did men. Several researchers suggested that these gender differences might be influenced by men's gender socialization as a contributing effect to their findings. However, none of the researchers actually measured gender socialization but rather postulated on its influences. Thus, this present study will consider gender role conflict as another contributing factor to men's

career development. A discussion of the contributions of gender role conflict on career and family planning is presented in the following section of this literature review.

Gender Role Conflict and Career Development

As mentioned in the introductory chapter, men's gender role conflict occurs when men experience strain in adhering to traditional and rigid masculine gender roles (O'Neil et al., 1986). Men who experience gender role conflict sacrifice basic components of humanity (e.g., expression of emotions, being intimate with others) to adhere to masculine roles. This conflict is rooted in the devaluation and fear of femininity (O'Neil et al.), since some of these basic human components are associated with feminine roles.

According to O'Neil and associates (1995), there are different direct and indirect ways in which men experience gender role conflict. These ways are unique and are contextual to their life experiences and gender socialization. Men experience gender role conflict differently based on "generational, racial, sexual orientation, class, age, and ethnic differences" (O'Neil et al., p. 166). Regardless of differences, men's gender role conflict can be experienced as a personal, internal conflict, as a conflict stimulated by others' conflict, or as a conflict expressed towards others (O'Neil et al.). Overall, gender role conflict is a multidimensional construct that affects individuals' "cognitions, affective experiences, behaviors, and unconscious experiences" (O'Neil et al., p. 166) due to socialized gender roles. Gender role conflict is dynamic because it is an ongoing process which is experienced over the life span.

In an effort to operationalize gender role conflict, a prominent scholar of men and masculinity, James O'Neil, and a team of researchers developed the Gender Role Conflict Scale (GRCS-I; O'Neil et al., 1986). The GRCS defines gender role conflict within four

dimensions: (a) success, power, and competition; (b) restrictive emotionality; (c) restrictive affectionate behavior between men; and (d) conflict between work and family relations (O'Neil et al.). There have been many critiques of the GRCS and its uses with diverse samples and cultures of men (Heppner, 1995). However, the GRCS has been empirically used in over 231 studies over the past 25 years and has been found empirically sound with diverse samples and cultures of men (O'Neil, in press). With these studies, gender role conflict has been found to be significantly associated with multiple dimensions of men.

It has been empirically found that gender role conflict serves as a contributing factor to men's career and family planning in various dimensions. Researchers have found that men's gender role conflict has influences on their career planning and career counseling (Rochlen et al., 2002; Rochlen & O'Brien, 2002), selection of traditionally male majors (Childers-Lackland & De Lisi, 2001; Dawson-Threat & Huba, 1996; Jome & Tokar, 1998), selection of traditionally male career male careers (Dodson & Borders, 2006), and roles within the family (Mintz & Mahalik, 1996).

Influences on Career Decision-Making

Several empirical research studies have investigated the influences of gender role conflict on men's career development and attitudes towards career counseling. In their study of men's attitudes towards career counseling, Rochlen et al. (2002) found relationships between gender role conflict and career decision-making. The researchers found that "high gender role-conflicted men expressed a greater need for occupational information and for self-clarity and greater general indecisiveness than men with low and moderate levels of gender role conflict" (p. 135). These findings elucidate the importance

of considering men's gender role conflict when considering career planning. Career planning for gender role conflicted men would be an arduous process when deciding on a career is complicated with having little career information. Consequently, self-clarity in career decision-making would contribute to indecisiveness and further complicate the career planning process.

Rochlen et al. (2002) explained their findings regarding gender role conflicted men's decision making by suggesting that "gender role conflicted men may prematurely foreclose on their career choice without sufficiently researching the types of occupations and career choices being pursued" (p. 135). Their suggestions are a logical explanation because gender role-conflicted men would more likely adhere to masculine gender roles such as being self-reliant, and avoiding help-seeking. In fact, researchers have indicated that gender role-conflicted men express more stigma towards career counseling services compared to men with lower gender conflict (Rochlen & O'Brien, 2002).

The above research findings regarding men's decision-making and attitudes towards seeking counseling are indicative of the complex influences of gender role conflict on career development. Unfortunately, these studies did not specifically measure relationships between men's career planning and gender role conflict. Nonetheless, the findings from these studies clarify how gender role conflict can serve as a barrier for men by keeping them from seeking career advice or counseling and becoming more informed about their career planning and career decision-making. Rochlen et al. (2002) indicated that gender role-conflicted men may appear to be confident about their career decisions or planning due to adhering to masculine gender roles. However, these men actually have many insecurities in their career development and do need career counseling, but do not

seek it due to their beliefs about masculine gender roles. Indeed, the suppositions of Rochlen et al. are echoed in work by Dawson-Threat and Huba (1996), who found that college men who adhered less to gender norms exhibited a more clear sense of purpose in terms of direction and future goals (e.g., careers). These findings illuminate how gender role conflict can have evident complications for men's career development, but also make evident the need to understand career planning in better detail.

Influences on College Major Selection

In addition to having influences on career decision-making, traditional gender roles have influences on college men's selection of traditional academic majors. Various research studies addressed these influences, and significant effects were found between college men with traditional gender roles and their major selection (Childers-Lackland & De Lisi, 2001; Dawson-Threat & Huba, 1996; Jome & Tokar, 1998). Childers-Lackland and De Lisi (2001) found that men's and women's gender role orientation is predictive of college major choice. Findings from their study indicated that men who endorsed more traditional masculine sex roles selected more traditional majors such as science. Additionally, they found similar results with women. Women who endorsed more traditional feminine sex roles selected helping profession majors (Childers-Lackland & De Lisi). Similar to this study, Dawson-Threat and Huba (1996) found that college seniors who endorsed traditional sex roles chose majors dominated by their gender. Both of these studies provided empirical findings relevant to men's academic major selection. However, the researchers in both studies utilized a sex role inventory to determine men's endorsement of sex roles and did not consider gender role conflict. Utilizing the sex role

inventory measured more gender expressive personality traits and did not specifically measure adherence to gender roles.

Jome and Tokar (1998) investigated various dimensions of masculinity and academic major choice, and one of these dimensions was gender role conflict. The researchers determined traditional and nontraditional academic majors based on percentages of men's and women's enrollment in various majors with a sample of a 100 participants. Traditional majors included engineering and nontraditional majors included nursing and education. Jome and Tokar found that college men in traditional academic majors expressed significantly higher levels of gender role conflict than men in non-traditional academic majors. Additionally, the researchers found that men in traditional majors expressed more homophobic attitudes. This is congruent with gender role conflict's root of fear of femininity. Although this study does explain significant findings, the researchers' criteria in selecting traditional and nontraditional careers was limited to the institution where the study was conducted. Utilizing their criteria, traditional and nontraditional careers may vary at other institutions based on an institution's gender demographics. Additionally, the sample ($N = 100$) was heterogeneous (i.e., 90% of the sample were White) and there were no reports of the sexual orientation of the participants. Race, ethnicity, and sexual orientation can all have significant effects on the findings of this study. Nonetheless, the findings from this study elucidate how gender role conflict can serve as a barrier from allowing some men to enter nontraditional majors. It is important for men to be able to enter nontraditional male fields since there have been drastic changes in the work force that expect them to take on nontraditional work roles.

Although these studies provide relevant findings, they fail to include family considerations for major selection. Considering men's career development with family roles is important in today's dual-career society. However, most of the attention of career and family has actually been focused on women. In a study of 249 college women who were enrolled in academic majors who were traditionally more populated with women and gender-neutral majors, Savage and Fouad (1994) found that women in traditional majors had lower career aspirations and career commitment than women in gender-neutral majors. Additionally, the researchers found that women in traditional majors were more likely to have plans to combine family and work than gender-neutral majors. The findings of this study are important in helping us understand women's family and career planning. These findings also are indicative of the lack of knowledge we have about men's career and family planning. It is highly possible that men in nontraditional careers might more likely consider family when planning for a career.

Influences on Career Selection

Not only does gender role conflict have an influence on academic major selection for college men, it also plays a role in career selection. Researchers studying men in traditional (mechanical engineering) and nontraditional careers (elementary school counseling) found that men in traditional careers were more gender conflicted than men in nontraditional careers (Dodson & Border, 2006). In their study, Dodson and Border indicated that the engineers endorsed high gender role conflict in all four dimensions measured by the Gender Role Conflict Scale (GRCS; O'Neil et al., 1986). Additionally, the researchers in this study found that high scores on the conflict between work and family dimension of the GRCS indicated lower job satisfaction for both groups.

However, the study does indicate a low R^2 as this dimension of the GRCS only accounts for 12% of the variance for the school counselors (Dodson & Border). This might be indicative of this study's findings regarding men in nontraditional careers as inconclusive. Nonetheless, the school counselors (a nontraditional field) were found to have a higher job satisfaction than the engineers (a traditional field). This study explains important connections between gender role conflict, career selection, and job satisfaction. It can be concluded from this study that gender role conflicted men select traditional careers to adhere to the traditional masculine gender roles, but they ultimately are not satisfied with their choices. The studies reviewed above neglected to consider another important dimension of men's career development: men's consideration of family.

Once again the attention of career selection in consideration of family has focused on women. Multiple studies have indicated that in order to better balance their work and family roles, women select careers that are traditionally considered "feminine" in society, and which are usually low-status and believed to be less prestigious (Farmer, Wardrop, Anderson, & Risinger, 1995; Savage & Fouad, 1994). Additionally, it has been found that women consider family to be more important than career (O'Brien, Friedman, Tipton, & Linn, 2000). The above studies shed knowledge on the complexities of women's career and family planning. It is clear that the intersections of women's perceptions of vocational environments, gender expectations, and pressures that women experience to raise a family hinders career development. Although this is harmful for women, it also can have implications for men. Vocational environments also can be oppressive for men who want to raise family but are pressured to focus on careers. The findings from research on women's career and family planning also are indicative of the

lack of information we have on men's career and family planning, as family is not always considered for men's career development research. Understanding men's career and family planning can help educate men on their male socialization, which in turn take away some of the family pressures women experience. This might allow women better opportunities to advance in the work force in a more egalitarian way.

Influences on Family Roles and Marital Satisfaction

Family roles. Gender role conflict has been found to be a predictor of men's family roles. Mintz and Mahalik (1996) studied men in 71 married dual-career couples to examine gender role orientation and conflict as predictors of family roles. The researchers utilized three theoretically driven categories to classify the men in the study: traditional, participant, and role-sharing. According to the researchers, traditional men were focused on their careers and did not partake in either parenting or household responsibilities. Participant men shared parenting responsibilities but left household responsibilities to their wives. Role-sharing men were involved in both parenting and household responsibilities. The researchers found that men who were less gender conflicted were more role-sharing husbands, compared to gender conflicted traditional husbands. More specifically, they found traditional men were more likely to be conflicted on the success, power and competition dimension of the Gender Role Conflict Scale (O'Neil et al., 1986) than participant or role-sharing men.

These findings illuminate a relationship between men's focus on success, power and competition, which is usually found in their careers, and their family roles. Furthermore, the researchers found that traditional men scored significantly higher on the conflict between work and family dimension of the GRCS than role-sharing men. This

finding makes clear the struggle of gender role conflicted men as they attempt to balance their family and careers. This also is echoed theoretically by O'Neil, Fishman, and Kinsella-Shaw (1987), as they indicated that men in dual-career families who are active fathers and share household responsibility are more likely to experience gender role dilemmas. It is important to note that researchers in the above study only considered married, mostly White, middle-class heterosexual couples with at least one child. This illustrates the lack of being inclusive and considering other definitions of family.

Marital satisfaction. O'Neil et al. (1987) have theoretically postulated that gender role conflict has an influence on marital satisfaction. Considering this suggestion, Campbell and Snow (1992) empirically found relationships between gender role conflict and marital satisfaction in their study of 70 married men with spouses. The researchers found that men who displayed less gender role conflict within the restrictive emotionality and between work and family relations dimensions of the GRCS (O'Neil et al., 1986) expressed more marital satisfaction and family cohesion. Although their sample was racially heterogeneous (i.e., 79% were White), these findings suggest that men who are emotionally restrictive and experience conflict between work and family are more likely to express lower levels of marital satisfaction. Similar to the Mintz & Mahalik (1996) study, it is important to note that researchers in this study only considered married heterosexual men.

It is evident that gender conflicted men are more restricted to traditional careers and family roles, and experience less marital satisfaction. This is alarming in that it highlights the need to further understand gender conflicted men's career and family planning. Yet, gender role conflict is not a fixed trait of men, but instead it is a dynamic

process experienced over the life span. Thus, it becomes important to understand the developmental concerns of men, especially as they may relate to career and family planning. The next section discusses a new term to the literature on this subject matter—namely, emerging adulthood.

Emerging Adulthood

As the transition to adulthood has been increasingly prolonged over the past century, Arnett (1998; 2000) proposed a new theory, which captures the developmental period from the late teens (adolescence) through the twenties (adulthood). This period is called emerging adulthood, which Arnett defined as: “a period of development bridging adolescence and young adulthood, during which young people are no longer adolescents but have not yet attained full adult status” (1998, p. 312). During emerging adulthood, emerging adults are searching for and developing skills that will help prepare them for adulthood. Hence, Arnett states that this developmental period is rooted in transition where emerging adults are moving from adolescence to adulthood. An emerging adult recognizes reaching adulthood as a time where he or she has become self-sufficient, in which he/she can accept responsibility for him/herself, can make independent decisions, and is becoming financially independent (Arnett, 2000). It is pertinent to note that emerging adult theory is restricted only to cultures in which adulthood is obtained in mid-to-late twenties and which are often industrialized societies.

Arnett (2000) characterized the emerging adulthood developmental time period in three ways: demographically, subjectively, and through identity explorations. Understanding emerging adults demographically means becoming cognizant of the great deal of demographic diversity and instability among the years of emerging adulthood.

Since they are not restricted by adult responsibilities, emerging adults are known to have a wider scope of activities and have the highest rates of residential change than any other age group. Arnett considers the demographic diversity in transitions and heterogeneity of this period as a reflection of emerging adults' emphasis on experimentation, change and exploration. Contrary to the assumptions that emerging adults might perceive demographic transitions as important to reaching adulthood, it is actually their subjective sense and perception of becoming self-sufficient that is the hallmark of attaining adulthood. Thus, another characteristic of emerging adults is their subjective sense of ambiguity, in which they do not perceive themselves as adolescents and not yet as an adult. The third distinction of emerging adults is identity exploration.

According to Arnett (2000), emerging adults are exploring their identities in three main areas: love, career, and worldviews. Unlike adolescence, individuals in emerging adulthood are exploring love in ways in which they can become more intimate and serious with their partners. Emerging adults are exploring their love opportunities with the goal of finding a life partner and so they are looking for more long-term and serious partners. Another aspect of identity exploration is careers. Emerging adults consider work experiences as opportunities for focused preparation and exploration of adult careers. Therefore, they have a long track record of exploring a range of educational and work experiences prior to making more serious career decisions that they pursue into adulthood. The third component of identity exploration is developing worldviews. Developing their own beliefs and values is perceived by emerging adults as an essential factor to attaining adulthood status. Thus, emerging adults spend much time in examining and challenging their own beliefs.

This knowledge of emerging adulthood theory is relevant and needed in conceptualizing the fluid process of emerging adult male's career and family planning. Based on the developmental nature of their time period, emerging adults have a subjective perception of their future self. Thus, they might consider their career and family planning in an ambiguous manner. Additionally, emerging adults are still exploring their careers, intimate partners and self-concepts. Due to this stage of exploration and experimentation, it is implied that emerging adults' career and family planning is an ongoing and dynamic process. Furthermore, it can be suggested that emerging adult men also are exploring their own definitions of masculinity, questioning their gender socialization and traditional masculinity, and are developing their own self-concepts of being a man. This critical understanding of emerging adults provides a framework to better and contextually understand men's career and family planning and masculinity. The next section of the literature review explores measures that attempt to assess constructs similar to planning for career and family.

Related Measures of Planning for Career and/or Future Family

Currently, there are no scales that exist that measure the degree to which men consider future families when deciding on careers, except the Planning for Career and Family Scale (PLAN; Ganginis Delpino & O'Brien, 2008). The PLAN scale has not been developed with men in mind, but may nevertheless be applicable to the male experience. There are multiple scales that assess related constructs to family and career planning, and they are discussed below. These related scales were considered in creating the PLAN scale and they prevail the importance of developing the PLAN scale with men.

Career and Marriage Attitude Inventory

The Career and Marriage Attitude Inventory (Parker, 1966) is an outdated scale that measured attitudes of college women towards career and marriage. This measure is specific for women and has traditionally outdated women career roles such as Housewife, and Home Economics Teacher. Thus, this scale fails to measure men's attitudes towards career and family planning.

Home-Career Conflict Measure

The Home-Career Conflict Measure (Farmer, 1984) assesses women's subconscious dimensions of home and career development. Once again, this is another measure that fails to consider men experiencing home and career conflicts.

The Life Role Salience Scales

The Life Role Salience Scales (Amatea, Cross, Clark, & Bobby, 1986) measure men's and women's role salience in various roles. These included personal expectations concerning occupational, marital, parental, and homecare roles. The attributed value and level of commitment to each of these roles are measured by this scale to indicate each role's salience. However, measuring role salience is not the same as measuring men's career and family planning.

The Family and Career Scale

The Family and Career Scale (Battle & Wigfield, 2003) measured women's family and career orientation and attitudes towards women's roles. This is another scale that does not consider the complexities of the career and family interface with men.

The Career Attitude Scale

The Career Attitude Scale (Stickel & Bonnett, 1991) was created to assess men's and women's career self-efficacy in combining career with home and family. Although this scale might seem similar to the PLAN scale (Ganginis Delpino & O'Brien, 2008), it is measuring the degree to which individuals combine traditional and nontraditional careers with home and family. This scale does not measure men's career and family planning. Additionally, the scale was not developed appropriately as there were some questionable analytical procedures.

Other than the Planning for Career and Family Scale, there are no other scales that measure the degree of considering future families when deciding on a career. Some of the scales mentioned above measure related constructs but do not specifically measure career and family planning. Furthermore, many of the scales mentioned above were specific to women. This is not surprising because traditional ways of understanding men did not perceive men as having multiple roles and experiencing career and family conflict. Additionally, this was present in the creation of the PLAN scale as it was originally intended to measure women's career and family planning. Nonetheless, it is a gender-neutral scale that this present study developed with men.

Conclusion

Changes in the workforce, family structures, and gender roles call for the need to further understand the career and family interface with men. This literature review has discussed the remarkable increases in women in the work force and the evolution of dual-career families. These transformations influenced changes in gender roles. Men are now more involved with their families in both household and parenting responsibilities.

Additionally there are increases in both single father families and stay-at-home fathers. Changes in gender roles can have an influence on young men's family role perceptions based on their father's family role. All of these factors bring the need to consider men's career and family planning to help them make more informed career and family decisions. Furthermore, the literature review discussed influences of two contributing factors of men's career development and family roles: parental attachment and gender role conflict. Researchers have provided cogent empirical findings that support the influences of both of these factors on men's career development in relation to future families. Additionally, emerging adulthood theory was discussed to provide a contextual and developmental framework to better understand today's college men's on-going career planning process. Finally, an overview of related measures of future family and career planning was presented indicating the lack of instruments that assess men's career planning inconsideration of future families. This further supported the lack of sensitivity towards men's career and family interface. An instrument is needed to assess men's career and family planning. This would provide men with more accurate information to make better and informed career and family decisions. This also is important because it would contribute to men's understanding of their gender socialization and allow them to make more egalitarian plans. The next chapter will explain details of this study's methodology.

CHAPTER 3

Methodology

The following chapter first presents the research design and methodology of this study. The study's hypotheses are then identified, as well as the research design that was used. Additionally, the sampling strategy and instrumentation are provided. Lastly, reliability and validity testing are discussed, and the study's procedures and methods of analysis are described.

Review of Purpose and Hypotheses

As mentioned in earlier chapters, the purpose of this instrument development study was twofold. First, this study investigated the factor structure and the psychometric properties of the Planning for Career and Family Scale (PLAN; Ganginis DelPino & O'Brien, 2008) with college men at a large mid-Atlantic university. The PLAN scale assesses the degree to which individuals consider future families when making career decisions. This was achieved by conducting a preliminary exploratory factor analysis that examined the factor structure of the PLAN scale with college men. In addition, convergent and discriminant validity estimates were obtained. Second, this study examined the contributions of parental attachment and gender role conflict in predicting considerations of future family when planning for a career with men.

Based on the first purpose of the study of investigating the factor structure and psychometric properties of the Planning for Career and Family Scale (PLAN), the following hypotheses were proposed:

Hypothesis 1a: The PLAN scale will have two subscales: Incorporating Future Family in Career Plans subscale (IFFCP) and Choosing a Career Independent of Future Family subscale (CCIF).

When originally developed with women, the PLAN scale was expected to have two subscales. In fact, two robust factors emerged when testing the factor structure and psychometric properties of the PLAN scale with women (Ganginis DelPino & O'Brien, 2008). This similar assumption was examined with men. Given this, the PLAN scale was expected to have the same two subscales with men in this present study.

Hypothesis 1b: Convergent validity will be demonstrated through correlations between career and family planning and career aspirations. More specifically, convergent validity for the Incorporating Future Family in Career Plans subscale (IFFCP) will be demonstrated through a negative correlation with career aspirations, and convergent validity for the Choosing a Career Independent of Future Family subscale (CCIFF) will be demonstrated through a positive correlation with career aspirations.

Hypothesis 1b will be demonstrated through correlations between the Planning for Career and Family Scale (PLAN) total and subscale scores with the Career Aspirations Scale (CAS) total. The IFFCP subscale will negatively correlate with CAS because it is assumed that men with high career aspirations will be more inclined to pursue a career and consider future family roles less than men with low career aspirations. An example of this would be a man who has high career aspirations of becoming a lawyer and beginning his career may be less inclined to consider other future responsibilities such as family than a man who does not have any career aspirations or plans. Similar to the reasons behind the correlation between IFFCP and CAS, the CCIFF will positively correlate with

CAS because it is assumed that men with high career aspirations will be more inclined to pursue a career independent of considering future family roles.

Hypothesis 1c: Discriminant validity will be demonstrated through a lack of correlation between career and family planning and career decision-making self-efficacy.

This hypothesis will be demonstrated through a lack of correlation between the Planning for Career and Family Scale (PLAN) and the Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy Scale (CDMSE). PLAN will lack a correlation with CDMSE because men's decisions to consider future family as they make their career choices should not relate to career decision-making confidence. Although a relationship might exist between these two constructs, it is not a significant relationship indicating a lack of correlation.

Based on the second purpose of the study, which was to examine the relationships among parental attachment, gender role conflict, and consideration of family when planning for a career with men, the following hypotheses were proposed:

Hypothesis 2a: Greater quality of overall parental attachment will positively predict greater considerations of future family when making career choices.

Researchers explained that individuals who have greater quality of attachment to parents would be more likely to be involved in career planning (Lee & Hughey, 2001; Kenny, 1990). Therefore, men's quality of parental attachment will positively predict men's incorporating future family when making career choices.

Hypothesis 2b: Examined separately, quality of attachment to one's mother or father will not predict men's considerations of future family when making career choices.

There are no clear indications from researchers regarding the relationships of attachment to a specific parent and career planning. Thus, a null hypothesis is proposed.

Hypothesis 2c: Parental attachment will not be correlated to gender role conflict.

Researchers have found that parental involvement has influences on young adults' gender stereotyping (Marsiglio et al., 2000). Therefore, greater parental involvement and attachment might provide for fewer gender stereotypes and less gender role conflict. However, researchers have not provided clear findings regarding men's attachment to gender role conflicted fathers and its influences on gender stereotyping. Since there are no clear research directions regarding the complex relationships between parental attachment and gender role conflict, a null hypothesis is considered.

Hypothesis 2d: Greater overall gender role conflict will positively predict a greater degree of selecting a career independent of considerations of future family.

Multiple research findings indicate that gender role conflicted men are more likely to select traditional majors (Childers-Lackland & De Lisi, 2001; Dawson-Threat & Huba, 1996; Jome & Tokar, 1998), careers (Dodson & Borders, 2006), and family roles (Mintz & Mahalik, 1996). Thus, gender role conflicted men are less likely to consider future family when making career choices.

Research Design

The present study utilized a non-experimental and descriptive quantitative research design. This design was appropriate for the first purpose of the study in applying the PLAN scale with college men to understand the psychometric properties of the scale

with men. The second part of the study was executed with multiple regressions as the analysis technique. This was appropriate for the second purpose of the study in examining the contributions of parental attachment and gender role conflict in predicting considerations of family when planning for a career with men.

Sampling Strategy

The present research utilized a data set ($N = 205$) that was collected with the original goal of obtaining 200 undergraduate college men. This data set was utilized because it contains the appropriate measures and constructs that would fulfill all the purposes of this study. A sample of 200 men was appropriate as it met the sample requirements for a factor analysis as identified by factor analysis researchers (Tinsley & Tinsley, 1987; Worthington & Whittaker, 2006). Participants included adult men over 18 years of age and varied from freshmen to seniors. Developmental differences in this age range were analyzed in their differences on the PLAN scale scores.

The sample was recruited through a convenience sample of the introductory psychology courses (e.g. PSYC100, PSYC221) pool. The researchers requested from instructors and professors of various psychology, education (e.g. UNIV100), and engineering (e.g. ENES100 and ENES160) courses the ability to invite students to participate in the study. In addition, participants were recruited through cluster sampling from various student groups and organizations, including fraternities, and academic and cultural organizations. To increase participation, incentives in recruitment included everyone having the opportunity to be entered in a lottery to win one of five monetary awards of 50 dollars. In addition, participants from the psychology pool and the three

engineering courses received course credit for their participation in the study. The final response rate of the sample was 82.64%.

Instrumentation

The data set collected utilized six research measures represented on one survey form that assessed the following: (1) planning for career and family, (2) parental attachment, (3) gender role conflict, (4) career aspirations, (5) career decision-making self-efficacy, and (6) social desirability. In addition to these six measures, a demographics questionnaire was utilized in this study.

Planning for Career and Family

The Planning for Career and Family Scale (PLAN; see Appendix A) is a 52-item measure newly developed by Ganginis Delpino and O'Brien (2008). The present research proposes to validate this scale's psychometric properties with men. The measure was intended to assess the degree to which women consider future family, more particularly future romantic partners and parenting responsibilities, when planning for a career. Since this measure is gender neutral, it was an appropriate instrumentation for men as well. Items in this instrument were developed in consideration of relevant instruments in the fields of psychology of career development, multiple roles, and theoretical and empirical research.

A research team of doctoral level graduate students and a licensed psychologist reviewed the instrument and provided feedback, which was used to revise the measure. Once modifications were made, a counseling psychologist specializing in assessment reviewed the instrument to provide additional feedback. By the end of this process, the researchers had 52 items that comprised the PLAN scale, in which 26 items are

hypothesized for considering future parenting responsibilities and 26 items are hypothesized for considering future partners. Five psychologists with expertise in women's career development then were presented with the scale to determine the content validity of the PLAN scale and they validated the instrument with the 52 items.

Data collected by the two researchers assessed the factor structure of the scale and validated this instrument's reliability and validity with a sample of 325 undergraduate women. Their factor analyses suggested that two subscales emerged from the data, the Incorporating Future Family in Career Plans (IFFCP) Scale and the Choosing a Career Independent of Family (CCIF) Scale. Example items on the IFFCP scale include "I will find a career where I do not have to work full-time after I have children" and "I will not pick a career where I will be stressed by managing work and parenting responsibilities." Example items on the CCIF scale include "I will never change my career plans for a relationship" and "I will make my career plans independently of what my partner might need." The IFFCP subscale assessed the degree to which individuals considered future family responsibilities while planning for careers. The CCIF subscale measures the degree to which individuals' career planning independent of considering future family responsibilities. Participants responded to the items on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 4 (*strongly agree*). Internal consistency reliability analyses were measured with a test-retest reliability analysis of 40 undergraduate women in upper-level psychology courses.

Test-retest reliability estimates of the subscales ranged from alpha coefficients of .79 to .78, and ranging from .76 to .83 at the two-week test-retest. Additionally, convergent validity was supported through negative relations among the IFFCP subscale,

career orientation, and career aspiration. Furthermore, convergent validity was supported for the CCIF subscale as it correlated positively with career orientation and correlated negatively with feeling the need to immediately plan for involvement in multiple roles. The PLAN scale's discriminant validity was supported through the absence of correlations among the IFFCP and the CCIFP subscales with career decision-making self-efficacy, life satisfaction, and subjective happiness.

Parental Attachment

The Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment (IPPA; Armsden & Greenberg, 1987; see Appendix B) was utilized to assess levels of attachment to parents based on the degree of mutual trust, quality of communication, and extent of anger and alienation. The IPPA contains three subscales, mother, father, and peer, but only the mother and father subscales will be used in this study. The mother and father subscales consisted of 25 items respectively. Example items on the IPPA include "My mother accepts me as I am" and "My father respects my feelings." Participants responded to items on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 0 (*almost never or never true*) to 4 (*almost always or always true*). Participants were instructed to answer the items for their mother and father, or the person who served in those roles. If multiple individuals served in those roles (e.g. biological mothers or fathers, step-fathers or step-mothers), participants were instructed to answer the items for the individuals who had most influenced them. Scores for each of the two subscales are summed independently and high scores on each subscale indicate strong attachment to parents. Internal consistency scores of .89 for the mother subscale and .88 for the father subscale were reported (Papini, Roggman, & Anderson, 1991) and test-retest reliability estimate of .93 for parental attachment was found (Armsden &

Greenberg, 1989). The IPPA total reliability (Cronbach alpha) in this study was .80, more specifically .72 for the mother subscale and .77 for the father scale.

Gender Role Conflict

Gender role conflict was operationalized using the Gender Role Conflict Scale (GRCS; O'Neil et al., 1986; see Appendix C). The GRCS is a 37-item scale developed to assess college men's thoughts and feelings regarding gender roles. The measure consists of four factors: Success, Power, Competition (13 items), Restrictive Emotionality (10 items), Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men (8 items), and Conflict Between Work and Family Relations (6 items). Items are summed with a high score indicating greater degree of conflict with the gender role conflict factors. For example, a high score on the Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men factor would indicate a man being uncomfortable sharing feelings, thoughts, and physical contact with other men. Some sample items for the four factors are: Success, Power, Competition: "I worry about failing and how it affects my doing well as a man," Restrictive Emotionality: "I have difficulty expressing my tender feelings," Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men: "Affection with other men makes me tense," and Conflict Between Work and Family Relations: "My work or school often disrupts other parts of my life (home, health, leisure)." Participants responded to items on a 6-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 6 (*strongly agree*). Factor analyses demonstrated that the measure explained 36% of the total variance. Internal consistency scores for the GRCS ranged from .75 to .85 and test-retest reliabilities ranging from .72 to .86 for each factor (O'Neil et al., 1986). In this study, item number 35 was changed to be more culturally sensitive. When this scale was administered, the item read as "men who are overly friendly to me,

make me wonder about their sexual orientation” and not as “sexual preference” as previously listed in the original scale. The GRCS in this study displayed adequate reliability, with Cronbach alpha coefficients scores ranging from .81 to .92 for the four subscales.

Career Aspirations

The Career Aspiration Scale (CAS; Gray & O’Brien, 2007) is an eight-item scale that assesses the degree of career aspirations. The measure assesses career aspirations based on two factors, leadership and achievement aspirations (i.e., leadership, promotions, and training/managing others) and educational aspirations. This scale was originally a ten-item scale developed by O’Brien (1996) to assess women’s career aspirations in aspiring for leadership positions and continued education within their careers. Although the gender neutral scale has been consistently reliable and valid with women, it has never been tested with men. Example items of this scale include “I hope to become a leader in my career field,” “When I am established, I would like to train others,” and “I think I would like to pursue graduate training in my occupational area of interest.” Participants responded to items on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 0 (*not at all true of me*) to 4 (*very true of me*). Scores on all items are summed with a high score indicating high career aspirations. Internal consistency scores for this scale ranged from .72 to .77 and test-retest reliability estimate of .84. In this study, the internal consistency score for the total CAS was .67.

Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy

This study utilized the short form of the Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy Scale (CDMSE; Betz, Klein & Taylor, 1996; see Appendix E), which is a 25-item

measure that assesses the degree to which individuals have confidence in their ability to successfully complete tasks related to making career decisions. The scale assesses items based on five constructs, which are self-appraisal, occupational information, goal selection, planning, and problem solving. Examples of the items in this scale include “Make a plan of your goals for the next five years,” “Choose a career that will fit your preferred lifestyle,” and “successfully manage the job interview process.” Participants responded to items on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*no confidence at all*) to 5 (*complete confidence*). Scores on all 25 items are summed and high scores indicate high self-efficacy for career decision-making. This study utilized the short form of the original CDMSE scale, and the short form was negatively correlated with a measure of career indecision, and has a reported internal reliability estimate of .94 for the total short form measure (Betz et al., 1996). The CDMSE scale’s internal consistency score in this study was .92.

Social-Desirability

The Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (MCSD; Reynolds, 1982; see Appendix F) is a 13 item short form of the Marlowe and Crowne Social Desirability Scale (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960) and was used to assess the impact of social desirability on participants’ response to items. Some sample items of this scale include “I sometimes feel resentful when I don’t get my way,” “there have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of others,” and “I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget.” Participants respond either true or false to 13 items on the short form of the MCSD scale. Some items were reverse coded and then the scores were summed to produce a total social desirability score. High scores indicate high impact of social

desirability when responding to scale items. The short form of this scale is correlated with the long form of the Marlowe and Crowne Social Desirability scale and has a reported internal consistency reliability estimate of .76 (Reynolds, 1982). This study's internal consistency for the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability scale was .64.

Demographic Questionnaire

The demographic questionnaire (see Appendix G) was developed by the research team that developed the PLAN scale. Participants were asked to indicate their age, race/ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, status in school, grade point average, relationship status, whether a participant wants to be married or be in a committed relationship, and career plans.

Data Collection

Participants completed the measures, which were represented on a paper survey form, individually or in small groups. Some participants completed the survey around women as different data were being collected for women. They were first asked to sign a consent form, and then they completed the survey. Two different forms of the survey were administered in alternating order to the participants to counterbalance instrument order effects as they took the study. One form of the survey had all the scales in the following random order: Gender Role Conflict Scale, Inventory of Parental and Peer Attachment, PLAN, Marlowe-Crowne Social-Desirability Scale, Career-Decision Making Self-Efficacy Scale, and the Career Aspirations Scale. The second form of the survey had the scales in reverse order. Once the participants completed the survey, they were thanked for their participation and received a description of the study to serve for

debriefing purposes. Participants were then invited to complete a monetary awards form to enter the study's \$50 cash prize raffles.

Reliability and Validity

The study assessed construct validity by testing for convergent and divergent validity. The study utilized the Career Aspiration Scale (Gray & O'Brien, 2007) to assess convergent validity and Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy Scale (Betz et al., 1996) to assess discriminant validity. Additionally, the study assessed the presence of social desirability when responding to items by utilizing the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (Reynolds, 1982). Reliability tests also were conducted on all of the scales and the subscales in the study and the PLAN scale using Cronbach alpha. Furthermore, the GRCS still reported high reliability even though one of the items was changed to make it more culturally sensitive. One final reliability check included correlating some responses in the demographic forms (e.g., plan to get married/be in a committed relationship, plan on having children, and decision on future career after graduation) to the PLAN scale. Descriptive statistics such as the means, standard deviations, and reliabilities, in addition to a correlation matrix were computed for all the scales and subscales in this study.

Data Analyses

Factor Analysis

Criteria to assess factorability. The Bartlett's test of sphericity and the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sample adequacy was used to evaluate the factorability and appropriateness of using factor analyses on the sample. Bartlett's test of sphericity is used to test the degree a sample's correlations in a matrix are random. This test has case

per variable requirements and is best used with a case to variable ratio between 3:1 and 5:1. Since this study recruited 205 men and there are 52 items on the PLAN scale, Bartlett's test of sphericity was expected to be significant due to a case to variable ratio above 3:1. The KMO assesses the adequacy of factorability by indicating the degree a data set actually contains factors rather than meaningless correlations. This test reports a score between 0 and 1, in which values closest to 1 indicate the likelihood for the presence of actual factors. Values of .60 or higher on KMO are required to conduct a factor analysis.

Factor-extraction method. A preliminary exploratory factor analysis was conducted to examine the factor structure of the PLAN scale with college men. The study utilized an exploratory principal-axis factor analysis (PAF) as a method of factor extraction. A PAF is most appropriate for this study because the essence of a PAF is to investigate latent factors that account for the shared variance among variables (Worthington & Whittaker, 2006).

Rotation method. A Promax rotation is most fitting for this study. The Promax rotation first starts with an orthogonal rotation and then continues on to an oblique rotation; whether if the factors are related or unrelated, the Promax rotation will reflect this (Kahn, 2006).

Criteria for determining factors and items. The analysis of the factors considered the comprehensibility of the factors by utilizing the scree plot and the percentage of variance accounted for in determining the factor structure of the PLAN scale. First, the scree plot was examined to identify possible number of factors. Then, the percentage of variance accounted for was examined. After rotating the matrix and determining the

factors, items that had multiple loadings greater than .30 or that loaded less than .30 on any of the factors were considered for elimination, and the factor analysis was rerun. Additionally items that loaded less than .50 on any of the factors were considered for elimination to ensure a robust factor solution.

Regressions

Two linear hierarchical multiple regression analyses were conducted to assess the contributions of parental attachment and gender role conflict in predicting career and family planning. Preliminary analyses were conducted to test for violations of the assumptions of normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity. These tests were conducted by examining the Normal Probability Plot of the Regression Standardised Residual and the Scatterplot, inspecting the Mahalanobis distances, and utilizing the casewise diagnostics. Additionally, multicollinearity threats were assessed by obtaining the tolerance and variance inflation factors (VIF) values for each block. According to Cohen, Cohen, West and Aiken (2003), the tolerance levels of .10 or less or VIF values of 10.00 or higher indicate that the multiple correlation with other variables is high, suggesting serious risks for multicollinearity. When multicollinearity was found not to exist in the analyses, the results of regressions were analyzed.

Summary

This chapter has explained the research design, hypotheses, and methods that were utilized to execute this quantitative study of men's career and family planning. The chapter discussed the methodology of this study, which included a sampling strategy that recruited 205 men, identified and discussed the reliability for six research measures and a demographics form, and presented procedures and analyses tests. Some of these analyses

tests include a principal-axis exploratory factor analysis and two linear hierarchical regressions.

CHAPTER 4

Results

The purpose of this instrument development study was twofold. The first purpose of the present study was to investigate the factor structure and the psychometric properties of the Planning for Career and Family Scale (PLAN; DelPino & O'Brien, 2008) with college males. For the first purpose of the study, three hypotheses were tested by conducting a preliminary exploratory factor analysis and by assessing convergent and discriminant validity estimates. The second purpose of this study was to examine the contributions of parental attachment and gender role conflict in predicting career and family planning. For the second purpose of the study, four hypotheses were tested by conducting two hierarchical multiple regressions. The results of the analyses for all the hypotheses are reported in this chapter. First, results of the preliminary analyses are presented and demographics of the participants in this study are described. Then, the results of the data analyses are presented in this chapter, according to the hypotheses and methods outlined in the previous chapter. Finally, the findings of ancillary analyses are reported.

Preliminary Analyses

Missing values were analyzed using SPSS16.0. Upon examination of the data, a total of 18 cases were eliminated. One of these cases was eliminated due to the violation of the participants' minimum age criteria of 18 years old. The remaining cases were eliminated for missing complete measures and or for questionable survey completion. The next preliminary analysis conducted was imputing mean substitutions for any missing values of the 219 participants. Each individual item's sample mean score was

utilized for imputing the values. Only two variables had a maximum of five values missing while the remaining missing values for any variable was fewer than three missing values. The data file was then examined for outliers, and 14 were identified and eliminated. The final sample size was 205 college male students.

An additional preliminary analysis conducted involved testing the reliability alpha coefficients of all scales and subscales. The results of the reliabilities tests are reported in Table 1. All scales and subscales were highly reliable, except for the Career Aspirations Scale ($\alpha = .67$) and the Marlow-Crowne Social Desirability Scale ($\alpha = .64$).

Table 1

<i>Scale Total Means, Standard Deviations, and Cronbach Alpha Coefficients for the IPPA, GRCS, CAS, CDMSE, and MCSD</i>				
Scale	Mean	SD	α	
Inventory of Parental and Peer Attachment (total)	124.32	17.44	.80	
Mother	65.40	9.64	.72	
Father	58.92	11.75	.77	
Gender Role Conflict Scale (total)	140.16	22.98	.89	
Success, Power, and Competition	56.17	9.41	.92	
Restrictive Emotionality	33.25	9.43	.87	
Restrictive Affectionate Behavior between Men	27.05	8.02	.81	
Conflict Between Work and Family Relations	23.69	5.94	.82	
Career Aspirations Scale (total)	25.15	4.68	.67	
Leadership and Achievement Aspirations	19.50	3.65	.65	
Educational Aspirations	5.65	1.99	.48	
Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy Scale	97.59	14.29	.92	
Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale	7.60	2.67	.64	

Data collection locations were classified into four categories: psychology pool/courses ($n = 38$), fraternities ($n = 81$), University 100 courses ($n = 51$), and other student groups ($n = 35$). A one-way between-groups multivariate analysis of variance was conducted to investigate differences between locations of data collection on all 11 dependent variables in the study. Preliminary assumption testing was conducted to check for normality, linearity, univariate and multivariate outliers, homogeneity, and multicollinearity. No serious violations were noted from these tests. A statistically significant difference was found between data collection locations and the dependent variables, $F(33, 563) = 2.39, p = .00$; Wilks' Lambda = .68; partial eta squared = .12. To reduce the chance of a Type 1 error, the Bonferroni adjustment was utilized to set a higher alpha level value. Examining the dependent variables separately, Gender role conflict's restrictive emotionality, $p = .01$, and gender role conflict's conflict between work and family relations, $p = .00$, reached statistical significance. Data collection locations represented 6.2% of the variance, partial eta squared = .06, in restrictive emotionality. Additionally, data collection locations represented 8.6% of the variance, partial eta squared = .09, in conflict between work and family relations. According to Cohen (1988), this suggests a medium effect size. Thus, a follow-up one-way univariate analysis of variance was conducted on these two dependent variables, and Tukey' HSD post-hoc analyses were conducted to identify where the significance differences among the data collection locations were. It was found that participants from fraternities ($M = 35.99, SD = 10.03$) endorsed higher levels of restrictive emotionality than participants from psychology courses/pool ($M = 30.26, SD = 10.34$). Additionally, participants from fraternities ($M = 25.27, SD = 5.67$) reported higher levels of gender role conflict between

work and family relations than participants from University 100 courses ($M = 21.09$, $SD = 6.48$), and participants from University 100 courses ($M = 21.09$, $SD = 6.48$) endorsed lower levels than participants from student groups ($M = 24.79$, $SD = 5.18$). These findings suggest that fraternity males are more gender role conflicted than the other participants. This is not surprising because fraternities tend to foster a culture of traditional masculine roles. In fact, O'Neil et al. (1995) found that fraternity males tend to be more gender conflicted than their peers. Since these were the only differences on the 11 scales, the data from all the data collection locations was aggregated into one data set and were utilized for subsequent analyses.

Description of the Sample

Demographics

The study's final sample consisted of 205 participants. A detailed description of the sample's demographics is presented in Table 2 and Table 3. Table 2 presents information regarding the age and grade point average (GPA) of the sample. Table 3 presents the class standing, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, and some of the other information reported on the demographics questionnaire. Participants that selected multiple racial/ethnic groups on the demographics questionnaire were recoded and were considered as multiracial in Table 3. The average age of the sample is 19.35 ($SD = 1.43$) and had a mean GPA of 3.32 ($SD = 0.43$). The sample's age range of 18 to 25 is reflective of the emerging adulthood period. The sample is predominately composed of participants that identified as White, non-Hispanic (66.3%) and that identified as heterosexual (92.2%). Most participants have already selected a major (79%), while 20% have not selected one. The sample's participants were almost split in their selection of

post-graduation careers, in which 53.7% of the participants indicated that they have selected a career to pursue post-graduation compared to 45.5% of who have not yet selected a career.

Table 2

Demographic Characteristics of the Sample (N=205)

Variable	<i>N</i>	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	<i>SD</i>
Age	201	18	25	19.35	1.43
GPA	156	1.90	4.0	3.32	0.43

Note. GPA's total sample (N = 156) is low due to incomplete survey responses to the GPA item on the demographics form.

Table 3

Demographic Characteristics of the Sample Continued (N=205)

Variable	N	%
Class Standing		
Freshman	84	41.0
Sophomore	39	19.5
Junior	36	17.6
Senior	41	20.0
Race/ethnicity		
African American	23	11.2
Asian/Asian American	24	11.7
Biracial/Multiracial	12	5.9
Hispanic, Latino	1	0.5
Middle Eastern	3	1.5
White, non-Hispanic	136	66.3
Other:		
Ashkenazi	1	0.5
Hawaiian	1	0.5
German	1	0.5
Sexual orientation		
Heterosexual	189	92.2
Gay	10	4.9
Location		
Psychology	38	18.5
Fraternities	81	39.5
UNIV100 courses	51	24.9
Student groups	35	17.1
Plan to get married/be in a committed relationship		
No	9	4.4
Yes	160	78.0
Plan to have Children		
No	13	6.3
Yes	186	90.7
Maybe/Not Sure	2	1.0
Major selected		
No	41	20.0
Yes	162	79.0
Post-graduation career selected		
No	93	45.4
Yes	110	53.7

Note. Columns do not add up to 100% due to missing data.

Sample Overall Impressions

Overall, the participants in the sample were between moderately to highly attached to their parents. The participants seemed to exhibit moderate levels of gender role conflict. Additionally, they had moderately high career aspirations and had much confidence in making their career decisions. Lastly, it appeared that the participants had moderate levels of social desirability when responding to the items of the survey.

Testing of the Hypotheses

The study was comprised of a total of seven hypotheses: three in relation to the first purpose of the study and four for the second purpose of the study. This section will present the results of the analyses conducted to test each of the hypotheses.

Based on the first purpose of the study of investigating the factor structure and psychometric properties of the Planning for Career and Family (PLAN) Scale, the following hypotheses were tested:

Hypothesis 1a: The PLAN scale will have two subscales: Incorporating Future Family in Career Plans subscale (IFFCP) and Choosing a Career Independent of Future Family subscale (CCIF).

Prior to conducting a factor analysis to test this hypothesis, the factorability of the sample was assessed utilizing the Bartlett's test of sphericity and Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sample adequacy. Bartlett's test of sphericity has case per variable requirements and is best used with a case to variable ratio between 3:1 to 5:1. The case to variable ratio for the study was 205 cases to 52 items of the PLAN scale, which is about a 4:1 ratio. Thus, the study met Bartlett's test of sphericity requirements and the test was conducted. The results of Bartlett's test reached significance, $\chi^2 (df = 1326, N = 205) =$

4490.64, $p < .001$. The study's KMO value was .86, which exceeded the recommended value of .6, indicating an increased likelihood for a presence of actual factors. Thus, the Bartlett's test and the KMO value supported the factorability of the sample.

An exploratory principal-axis factor analysis (PAF) was utilized as the method of factor extraction to examine the factor structure of the PLAN scale. A Promax rotation was conducted in an effort to extract the latent factors of the PLAN scale. After running the PAF with a Promax rotation, the comprehensibility of the factors was considered by utilizing the scree plot and the total variance explained. The scree plot was first examined and three factors were identified. These three factors accounted for 35.97% of the total variance. There were many multiple loadings on the three-factor solution. Thus, a two-factor solution was examined and the researchers selected the two-factor solution as the best fit for the sample. The two-factor solution accounted for 31.51% of the total variance, and it included only 19 items from the original 52-item scale.

Given a low correlation ($r = .002$) between the two factors, the Structure Matrix was examined to identify the individual item loadings for each factor solution. After running another factor analysis with the two-factor solution, one item loaded greater than .3 on both factors and one item loaded less than .3 on any of the factors. The factor analysis was rerun after removing the first item, and the second item still loaded less than .3 on any factor. The item was removed and another factor analysis was rerun; thus two items were eliminated and 17 items were retained.

In order to retain only the most robust items in the two-factor solution, all items loading below .5 on either factor were eliminated. This resulted in the retention of 14 items, in which eight items comprised the first factor and six items comprised the second

factor. Not to compromise the second factor's subscale reliability, the item closest to .5 on the second factor was retained. Thus, the final PLAN scale consisted of a total of 15 items, with one factor having eight items and the other with seven items. A final factor analysis was run with only the final 15 items, which yielded the same items for the two factors.

The final items and factor loadings from the last factor analysis are reported in Table 4. The first factor, Choosing a Career Independent of Future Family (CCIFF; $M = 20.24$, $SD = 4.01$), appears to assess the degree to which men's career planning is independent of future family responsibilities. In fact, future family responsibilities mainly relate to future partner responsibilities since only one item included parenting responsibilities. The CCIFF subscale accounted for 26.15% of the variance.

The second factor, Incorporating Future Family in Career Plans (IFFCP; $M = 15.71$, $SD = 3.61$), appears to measure the degree to which men's future family responsibilities is incorporated with their career planning. Contrary to the first factor, future family responsibilities in the second factor mainly relate to future parenting responsibilities since only one item included future partner responsibilities. The IFFCP subscale accounted for 18.14% of the variance.

After confirming both factors, they were tested for scale reliability. CCIFF ($\alpha = .80$) and IFFCP ($\alpha = .80$) reported high coefficient alphas. Additionally, the variability values between items and the subscales of the PLAN scale were computed. Participants had average scores in both of the PLAN scale's subscales on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (4). More specifically, participants reported an average score of 20.24 ($SD = 4.01$) on the eight-item CCIFF scale, which has a

possible minimum scale value of eight and maximum value of 32. Participants reported an average score of 15.71 ($SD = 3.61$) on the seven-item IFFCP scale that has a possible minimum value of seven and maximum value of 28. Although low variability was found, two factors did emerge; thus, hypothesis 1a was retained.

Table 4

Factor Analysis Factor Structures and Items Retained

Item	Factor Loadings
FACTOR 1: Choosing a Career Independent of Future Family	
	$\alpha = .80$
30. I will make my career plans independently of what my partner might need.	.66
46. My career choice will be based on my goals, not on my ability to balance work and love.	.65
26. Any relationship that I am in will need to realize that my career plans come first.	.62
32. I would rather have a more fulfilling career than one that allows me to focus on parenting responsibilities.	.61
40. I will not consider responsibilities I have to my future partner when I plan my career.	.54
48. Having a satisfying relationship is not as important as picking a career I love.	.53
5. Having a fulfilling career will be very important to me, even at the expense of future responsibilities to my partner.	.51
21. Taking a less demanding job to have more energy for my partner will not be an option.	.51
FACTOR 2: Incorporating Future Family in Career Plans	
	$\alpha = .80$
37. When selecting a career, I will choose one where I can slow down after I have a serious romantic relationship.	.68
20. I will choose a career that is perceived as having a light workload because I want to focus on my children.	.66
18. I will find a career where I do not have to work full-time after I have children.	.64
38. I will not pick a career where I will be stressed by managing work and parenting responsibilities.	.59
25. I will select a career that can be put on hold when my children are young.	.59
49. I will not select a career where I feel exhausted when I come home to my children.	.58
39. My future career will allow me to have time off in the summer so I can be with my children.	.49

Hypothesis 1b: Convergent validity for the Incorporating Future Family in Career Plans subscale (IFFCP) will be demonstrated through a negative correlation with career aspirations, and convergent validity for the Choosing a Career Independent of Future Family subscale (CCIFF) will be demonstrated through a positive correlation with career aspirations.

A correlation matrix was produced to test this hypothesis. The results of the correlation matrix are reported in Table 5. After examining the correlations between the PLAN subscales and the Career Aspirations Scale (CAS), it was found that the IFFCP subscale had a low statistically significant negative correlation with CAS ($r = -.25, p < .01$) and the CCIFF subscale was not significantly correlated with CAS ($r = .11$). Thus, hypothesis 1b is partially rejected due to a low negative correlation between IFFCP and CAS, and a statistically insignificant relationship between CCIFF and CAS.

Hypothesis 1c: Discriminant validity will be demonstrated through a lack of correlation between career and family planning and career decision-making self-efficacy.

Upon examining correlations between the PLAN subscales and the Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy Scale (CDMSE), it was found that the IFFCP subscale lacked a statistically significant correlation with the CMDSE scale ($r = -.02$), and the CCIFF subscale had a low statistically significant positive correlation with the CDMSE scale ($r = .20, p < .01$). Since the IFFCP subscale lacked a correlation and the CCIFF subscale had a very low correlation with the CMDSE scale, hypothesis 1c is retained.

Table 5

Intercorrelations Between the PLAN, IPPA, GRCS, CAS, CDMSE, and MCSD Scales

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1. PLAN - CCIFF	1										
2. PLAN - IFFCP	-.18*	1									
3. IPPA - Mother	.03	-.04	1								
4. IPPA - Father	-.04	.15*	.32**	1							
5. GRCS - SPC	.31**	-.09	.02	.05	1						
6. GRCS - RE	.16*	.05	-.13	.01	.16*	1					
7. GRCS - RABBM	.13	.10	-.15*	.05	.28**	.51**	1				
8. GRCS - CBWFR	.09	-.07	-.03	-.05	.37**	.32**	.25**	1			
9. CAS	.11	-.25**	.19**	.03	.30**	-.11	.00	.11	1		
10. CDMSE	.20**	-.019	.16*	.13	.26**	-.11	.05	.04	.37**	1	
11. MCSD	.05	-.13	.02	-.04	.19**	.07	-.00	.14*	-.08	-.09	1

Note. $N = 205$. PLAN-CCIFF = Choosing a Career Independent of Future Family; PLAN-IFFCP = Incorporating Future Family in Career Plans; IPPA-Mother = Inventory of Parental Attachment – Mother; IPPA-Father = Inventory of Parental Attachment – Father; GRCS = Gender Role Conflict Scale; SPC = Success, Power, and Competition; RE = Restrictive Emotionality; RABBM = Restrictive Affectionate Behavior between Men; CBWFR = Conflict Between Work and Family Relations; CAS = Career Aspirations Scale; CDMSE = Career Decision-Making Self-efficacy; MCSD = Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Based on the second purpose of the study, which was to examine the contributions of parental attachment and gender role conflict predicting career and family planning, the following hypotheses were tested:

Hypothesis 2a: Greater quality of overall parental attachment will positively predict greater considerations of future family when making career choices.

To test this hypothesis, a linear hierarchical multiple regression analysis was conducted to assess the contributions of parental attachment to the prediction of the criterion variable, Incorporating Future Family in Career Plans subscale of the PLAN scale. Preliminary analyses were conducted to test for violations of the assumptions of normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity; no violations were found. These tests were conducted by examining the Normal Probability Plot of the Regression Standardised Residual and the Scatterplot, inspecting the Mahalanobis distances, and utilizing the casewise diagnostics. Additionally, multicollinearity threats were assessed by obtaining the tolerance and variance inflation factors (VIF) values for each block. According to Cohen, Cohen, West and Aiken (2003), the tolerance levels of .10 or less or VIF values of 10.00 or higher indicate that the multiple correlation with other variables is high, suggesting serious risks for multicollinearity. Since all the tolerance levels were higher than .69 and the VIF values were no higher than 1.45, it was safe to assume multicollinearity was not present.

Parental attachment, based on the attachment to mother and attachment to father independent variables, was entered at Step 1 and then gender role conflict, based on its four subscales, was entered at Step 2 of the hierarchical regression equation with the Incorporating Future Family in Career Plans subscale as the dependent variable. Table 6

summarizes the results of this regression. Step 1 was significant, $F(2, 202) = 3.10, p = .05$, and parental attachment explained 3.0% of the variance in incorporating considerations of future family responsibilities in career planning. More specifically, attachment to father had a statistically significant beta value ($\beta = .18, p = .02$). Due to the significance of the first model and the beta value of attachment to father, this hypothesis is partially retained, in that attachment to father was the only predictor in the model that contributed to incorporating considerations of future family responsibilities in career planning.

Table 6

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Parental Attachment and Gender Role Conflict (GRC) Predicting Planning for Career and Family – Incorporating Future Family in Career Plans

Variable	B	SE B	β	<i>df</i>	R^2	ΔR^2	ΔF
Step 1				2, 202	.03	.03	.05*
Parental Attachment							
Mother Attachment	-.04	.03	-.09				
Father Attachment	.06	.02	.18*				
Step 2				6, 198	.06	.03	.27
Parental Attachment							
Mother Attachment	-.03	.03	-.07				
Father Attachment	.05	.02	.17*				
Gender Role Conflict							
SPC	-.04	.03	-.11				
Restrictive Emotionality	-.01	.03	.02				
RABBM	.06	.04	.12				
CBWFR	-.03	.05	-.06				

Note. $N = 205$. SPC = Success, Power, and Competition; RABBM = Restrictive Affectionate Behavior between Men; CBWFR = Conflict Between Work and Family Relations.

* $p < .05$.

Hypothesis 2b: Examined separately, quality of attachment to one's mother or father will not predict men's considerations of future family when making career choices.

Utilizing the above regression analysis to test this hypothesis, it appears that attachment to father differed than attachment to mother in predicting men's considerations of future family when planning for a career. Thus, this null hypothesis is rejected.

Hypothesis 2c: Parental attachment will not be correlated to gender role conflict.

The correlation matrix, presented in Table 5, was examined to test this hypothesis. One statistically significant relationship among parental attachment and gender role conflict existed among attachment to mother and restrictive affectionate behavior between men/homophobia ($r = -.15, p < .05$). Thus, this hypothesis was rejected.

Hypothesis 2d: Greater overall gender role conflict will positively predict a greater degree of selecting a career independent of considerations of future family.

Another linear hierarchical multiple regression analysis was conducted to assess the contributions of gender role conflict to the prediction of the criterion variable, Choosing a Career Independent of Future Family subscale of the PLAN scale. Similar to the first regression, preliminary analyses were conducted to test for violations of the assumptions of normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity; no violations were found. Multicollinearity threats were also assessed by obtaining the tolerance and variance inflation factors (VIF) values for each block. Based on these values, it was safe to assume that multicollinearity was not present.

Parental attachment, both attachment to mother and attachment to father independent variables, was entered at Step 1 and then gender role conflict, based on its

four subscales, was entered at Step 2 of the hierarchical regression equation. Table 7 summarizes the results of this regression. The final model, which is at Step 2, explained 11.8% of the variance ($F(6, 198) = 4.42, p = .00$) in planning for a career independent of considering future families. However, only one of the independent variables was statistically significant, Gender Role Conflict Scale: Success, Power, and Competition ($\beta = .32, p = .00$). Since a statistically significant amount of the variance was explained when entering gender role conflict to the regression, hypothesis 2d was retained.

Table 7

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Parental Attachment and Gender Role Conflict (GRC) Predicting Planning for Career and Family – Choosing a Career Independent of Future Family

Variable	B	SE B	β	<i>df</i>	R^2	ΔR^2	ΔF
Step 1				2, 202	.01	.00	.70
Parental Attachment							
Mother Attachment	.02	.03	.04				
Father Attachment	-.02	.03	-.06				
Step 2				6, 198	.12	.11	.00*
Parental Attachment							
Mother Attachment	.03	.03	.06				
Father Attachment	-.03	.02	-.09				
Gender Role Conflict							
SPC	.14	.03	.32*				
Restrictive Emotionality	.06	.03	.13				
RABBM	.00	.04	.01				
CBWFR	-.05	.05	-.07				

Note. $N = 205$. SPC = Success, Power, and Competition; RABBM = Restrictive Affectionate Behavior between Men; CBWFR = Conflict Between Work and Family Relations.

* $p < .001$.

Ancillary analyses

In addition to testing the hypothesis, some ancillary analyses were conducted to assess differences on the PLAN scale with: (a) developmental differences among the sample, (b) participants that have or have not already selected a career to pursue after graduation, and (c) among data collection locations. Three one-way analyses of variance were utilized to test for these differences.

The first one-way ANOVA tested developmental differences among the sample by considering freshmen and sophomores as one group (underclassmen), and juniors and seniors as another group (upperclassmen). Results of this one-way ANOVA are reported in Table 8. There were no statistically significant differences between underclassmen and upperclassmen in the Choosing a Career Independent of Future Family subscale of the PLAN scale. However, statistically significant differences were found among underclassmen and upperclassmen in the Incorporating Future Family in Career Plans subscale of the PLAN scale. After comparing the means of the two groups, the significant differences indicated that underclassmen scored higher than upperclassmen on incorporating future family responsibilities in career planning. It is important to note that the partial eta squared for this significance is .02, which is a small effect size (Cohen, 1988). Additionally, the mean values for the PLAN scale's subscales for underclassmen and upperclassmen were computed. Both underclassmen (CCIFF: $M = 20.64$, $SD = 3.96$; IFFCP: $M = 16.14$, $SD = 3.59$) and upperclassmen (CCIFF: $M = 19.63$, $SD = 4.06$; IFFCP: $M = 14.97$, $SD = 3.61$) had average scores in both of the PLAN scale's subscales on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (4).

Nonetheless, to better understand this small significant difference, further one-way analyses of variance were conducted to test for differences among underclassmen and upperclassmen in parental attachment, gender role conflict, and career aspirations. No significant differences were found in parental attachment and class standing. Statistically significant differences were found for gender role conflict, more specifically for conflict between career and family relations, $F(1, 198) = 4.49, p = .04, \eta^2 = .02$. When comparing the means, it was found that upperclassmen experienced higher career and family relations conflict ($M = 24.81, SD = 5.87$) than underclassmen ($M = 23.02, SD = 5.79$). However, there was a small effect size. Career aspirations differences among class standing were also significant, $F(1, 198) = 3.90, p = .05, \eta^2 = .02$. It was found that upperclassmen had higher career aspirations ($M = 26.0, SD = 4.59$) than underclassmen ($M = 24.65, SD = 4.78$). Once again, a small effect size was found.

Table 8

Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for the Planning for Career and Family Scale (PLAN) for Differences in Class Standing

Source	Mean	SD	F (df)	p	η
Choosing a Career Independent of Future Family			3.01(1, 198)	.08	.02
Underclassmen – Freshmen/Sophomores ($n = 123$)	20.64	3.96			
Upperclassmen – Juniors/Seniors ($n = 77$)	19.63	4.06			
Total ($N = 200$)	20.25	4.02			
Incorporating Future Family in Career Plans			4.97(1, 198)*	.03	.02
Underclassmen – Freshmen/Sophomores ($n = 123$)	16.14	3.59			
Upperclassmen – Juniors/Seniors ($n = 77$)	14.97	3.61			
Total ($N = 200$)	15.69	3.63			

Note. * $p < .05$.

The second one-way analysis of variance tested differences among participants who reported that they have selected a career to pursue after graduation (career deciders) compared to participants that have not yet selected a career to pursue after graduation (career non-deciders). Results of this one-way ANOVA are reported in Table 9. There were no statistically significant differences between career deciders and career non-deciders in both the Choosing a Career Independent of Future Family and the Incorporating Future Family in Career Plans subscales.

Table 9

Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for the Planning for Career and Family Scale (PLAN) for Differences in Selection of Career to Pursue after Graduation

Source	Mean	SD	<i>F</i> (<i>df</i>)	<i>p</i>	η
Choosing a Career Independent of Future Family			3.36(1, 201)	.07	.02
Career non-deciders (No; <i>n</i> = 93)	19.71	4.12			
Career deciders (Yes; <i>n</i> = 110)	20.74	3.88			
Total (<i>N</i> = 203)	20.27	4.02			
Incorporating Future Family in Career Plans			0.37(1, 201)	.55	.00
Career non-deciders (No; <i>n</i> = 93)	15.54	3.89			
Career deciders (Yes; <i>n</i> = 110)	15.85	3.79			
Total (<i>N</i> = 203)	15.71	3.61			

Finally, a third one-way analysis of variance was utilized to test differences among data collection locations and the PLAN subscales. The data collection differences were divided into four groups, which were: psychology pool/courses (*n* = 38), fraternities (*n* = 81), University 100 courses (*n* = 51), and other student groups (*n* = 35). Results of this one-way ANOVA are reported in Table 10. Statistically significant differences were not found among data collection locations and the Choosing a Career Independent of Future Family subscale, $F(3, 201) = 2.11, p = .10$. However, differences among data

collection locations and the Incorporating Future Family in Career Plans subscale were found significant $F(3, 201) = 3.52, p = .02$. This significant difference had small to almost medium effect size. Since there are multiple levels of data collection locations, Tukey HSD post-hoc analyses were conducted to identify where the significance differences were. To reduce the chance of a Type 1 error, the Bonferroni adjustment was utilized to set a higher alpha level value by dividing the standard alpha value of .05 by the four levels of comparisons producing .0125 as the new alpha comparison value. It was only found that participants at University 100 courses ($M = 16.67, SD = 3.18$) endorsed higher scores on the Incorporating Future Family in Career Plans subscale than the other student groups ($M = 14.31, SD = 4.06$). Since University 100 courses consisted of all freshmen students and student groups were predominately upperclassmen, this finding is congruent with the previous one-way ANOVA's finding, in which underclassmen scored higher than upperclassmen on this subscale.

Table 10

Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for the Planning for Career and Family Scale (PLAN) for Differences in Data Collection Locations

Source	Mean	SD	$F(df)$	p	η
Choosing a Career Independent of Future Family			2.11(3, 201)	.10	.03
Psychology pool/courses ($n = 38$)	18.85	3.84			
Fraternities ($n = 81$)	20.47	3.59			
UNIV100 courses ($n = 51$)	20.34	3.97			
Student groups ($n = 35$)	21.04	4.90			
Total ($N = 205$)	20.24	4.01			
Incorporating Future Family in Career Plans			3.52(3, 201)	.02	.05
Psychology pool/courses ($n = 38$)	15.16	3.86			
Fraternities ($n = 81$)	15.97	3.36			
UNIV100 courses ($n = 51$)	16.67	3.18			
Student groups ($n = 35$)	14.31	4.06			
Total ($N = 205$)	15.71	3.61			

Summary

This chapter reported the results of the analyses that were conducted to address the two purposes of this study. Many of the hypotheses proposed in this study were partially retained, while others were rejected. The subsequent chapter will discuss these results and their implications for research and practice, present the limitations of the study, and then suggest future directions for research.

CHAPTER 5

Discussion

The primary purposes of this study were to investigate the factor structure and the psychometric properties of the Planning for Career and Family Scale (PLAN; Ganginis DelPino & O'Brien, 2008) when utilizing a sample of men, and to examine the contributions of parental attachment and gender role conflict in predicting considerations of family when planning for a career with men. This chapter will present a summary and discussion of the results of the study, as well as the results of some relevant ancillary analyses. Next, the limitations of the study will be discussed. Lastly, implications for practice and research are suggested.

Factor Structure of the PLAN Scale

In examining the factor structure of the PLAN scale, the first hypothesis of the study proposed that the PLAN scale will have two subscales: Incorporating Future Family in Career Plans subscale (IFFCP) and Choosing a Career Independent of Future Family subscale (CCIFF). This hypothesis was retained because two factors emerged after factor analyzing the PLAN scale. As hypothesized, these two factors created two robust subscales, CCIFF and IFFCP. The CCIFF subscale explained 26.15% of the variance in the factor structure and indicated a high coefficient alpha ($\alpha = .80$), and the IFFCP subscale explained 18.14% of the variance and also reported a high coefficient alpha ($\alpha = .80$).

Although the IFFCP and CCIFF subscales might appear to assess similar constructs, in reality, they are two distinct subscales that are not the inverse of the other. This is supported by the finding that the two subscales have a low and negative

correlation ($r = -.18$). Additionally, the IFFCP mostly focuses on career planning in consideration of future parenting responsibilities while the CCIFF mostly focuses on career planning independent of future partner responsibilities.

It is clear that the PLAN scale has factored into two subscales. This is a significant finding because it promotes our understanding of the PLAN scale with men. Since the Incorporating Future Family in Career Plans scale did emerge, it might be implied that, for some men, the incorporation of future partners and children does factor into career decision making.

The Choosing a Career Independent of Future Family subscale factored first and explained the most variance, while the Incorporating Future Family in Career Plans subscale factored second and explained the second most variance. The same two factors that emerged with men also emerged when the PLAN scale was factored with women; however, the factors that loaded in the sample of men were in reverse order of the factors that loaded with the sample of women. Nonetheless, this finding might suggest similarities in the factor structures of the PLAN scale when investigated with men and women.

It is worth noting that even though the same factors emerged for both the men and women samples, many of the individual items that loaded in each factor in the men sample were different from the items that loaded in the two factors of the women's sample. These differences suggest implications for the uses of the PLAN scale with men. Using only the items that factored with the female sample on future male samples might be perilous, since they won't fully measure the same constructs for men. Therefore,

assessing the validity of the factors that emerged in the women sample with men is necessary to best understand the uses of the PLAN scale in mixed gender studies.

Psychometric Properties of the PLAN Scale

Investigating the psychometric properties of the PLAN scale involved assessing convergent and discriminant validity. The hypothesis regarding convergent validity was partially supported for the PLAN scale. The Incorporating Future Family in Career Plans subscale's convergent validity was supported since the scale was negatively correlated with career aspirations. As originally hypothesized and found in the data, this negative correlation might indicate that men with high career aspirations are more inclined to plan a career largely irrespective of considerations of future family roles. Since there is a negative relationship between incorporating future family in career plans and career aspirations, this finding might also indicate that men who want to incorporate future family considerations in their career plans could potentially have less strong career aspirations. Reduced career aspirations can possibly imply that men who want to incorporate future family into their plans might be struggling with their multiple role planning and the career and family interface. Although, similar results have been found with women (Ganginis DelPino & O'Brien, 2008), future research is needed to further understand these complex relationships. Additionally, even though a negative relationship existed, it is important to note that the correlation was a weak to moderate correlation ($r = -.25$). Thus, future research is needed to illuminate this finding.

Convergent validity was not supported for the Choosing Careers Independent of Future Family Plans subscale due to a statistically insignificant relationship with career aspirations. This finding is conceptually meaningful because it indicates that men's career

decisions independent of future family considerations may not relate to career aspirations. It is possibly indicative of the idea that when men's focus is solely on the career, men's career aspirations are potentially not influenced. Conversely, when the competing priorities of career and family and multiple role planning are considered in career planning, career aspirations are possibly lowered, which was found in this study. It appears that the relationship among men's career decisions independent of future family considerations and career aspirations should be assumed with discriminant validity in future studies.

It was hypothesized that discriminant validity will be demonstrated through a lack of correlation between career and family planning and career decision-making self-efficacy. Discriminant validity was demonstrated for the PLAN scale through the absence of relations between incorporating future family in career planning and the measure of career decision-making self-efficacy. As hypothesized and found, men's decisions to incorporate future family considerations as they make their career choices did not relate to their career decision-making confidence.

Discriminant validity was further supported for the PLAN scale through a low correlation ($r = .20, p < .01$) between choosing a career independent of future family roles and the measure of career decision-making self-efficacy. Although a significant correlation exists, it was a low correlation, which can be seen as supportive of discriminant validity. However, since significance in this low correlation exists, it could be implied that men who plan their careers independent of future family considerations are more efficacious in their career decision-making as well as the converse.

Overall, the results of this study elucidate that the PLAN scale is a reliable and valid measure of planning for career and family for men. However, it is important to recognize that it was only found reliable and valid with a sample of predominately White, heterosexual and traditionally aged college male emerging adults. Therefore, future studies need to examine the scale with more heterogeneous samples in various age groups.

Additionally, it is pertinent to note that low variability was found between items and the subscales of the PLAN scale. Thus, participants had average scores in both of the PLAN scale's subscales on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (4). In particular, participants reported an average score of 20.24 ($SD = 4.01$) on the eight-item CCIFF scale, which has a possible minimum scale value of eight and maximum value of 32. Participants reported an average score of 15.71 ($SD = 3.61$) on the seven-item IFFCP scale that has a possible value range from a minimum of seven to a maximum of 28. Although participants were neither in strong agreement nor strong disagreement with statements on both scales, this is not a surprising finding because it is congruent with emerging adulthood theory. Since the theory suggests that college men are continuously exploring their identities and exploring their future career and family plans (Arnett, 2000), they may not be confident in either direction of career and family planning. This finding also raises the need to investigate the PLAN scale items that elicit diversity of responses with future samples.

Contributions of Parental Attachment

Various research studies have found significant relationships between parental attachment and career planning for men (Blustein et al., 1991; Lee & Hughey, 2001).

Thus, this study hypothesized that quality of parental attachment will positively predict greater considerations of future family when making career choices. The *F*-value for the block in the regression analysis that examined the relationship between parental attachment and the scale representing Incorporating Future Family in Career Plans did reach statistical significance. However, only attachment to father was statistically significant. Due to the significance of parental attachment to one's father, the hypothesis was retained.

The finding suggests that a college male's greater quality of attachment to his father or someone who served in that role predicts a higher degree of likelihood of him incorporating future family responsibilities into career planning. Since parental attachment was assessed across three areas: communication, trust and alienation, this finding indicates that greater levels of communication and trust between father and son predict a greater degree of incorporating future family responsibilities in career plans. Thus, college men that maintain high levels of communication and trust with their fathers are more likely to consider future family roles in their career planning. This could be attributed to fathers' communicating to their sons about ways they have attempted to balance their multiple roles in the career and family interface, which could provide comfort to their sons and might make it seem manageable for them to plan for future multiple roles of career and family responsibilities. It also can be attributed to fathers' role modeling the career and family interface, which might make it feasible for their sons to aspire to do the same.

Since parental attachment is a complex construct to assess, it is necessary to consider this finding with its appropriate domain of parental attachment, which is only

parent and child communication, trust and alienation as assessed by the Inventory of Parental and Peer Attachment (Armsden & Greenberg, 1987). Thus, not many affective components of parental attachment were considered in this study. For example, a father can communicate to his son the value of the work and family enrichment but possibly could not be expressively affectionate with his son. It also is worth mentioning that attachment to father only explained 3% of the variance in the regression model; hence, there are many other variables that could contribute to men's career and family planning.

Nonetheless, this finding is important because it illuminates new information about our understanding of parental attachment in predicting men's career and family planning. It elucidates a critical role fathers play in the career planning process of their sons, especially in their career and family planning. Previous studies have only found relationships between parental attachment and career planning (Lee & Hughey, 2001; Kenny, 1990), while this study has shed some light on the unique father-son attachment relationship and career planning. However, since the *F*-value was significant only for attachment to father, more research is needed to examine the complex relationships between men's parental attachment and their career planning.

Since there are no clear indications from researchers regarding the relationships of attachment to a specific parent and career planning, a null hypothesis was proposed to indicate that when examined separately, quality of attachment to one's mother or father will not predict men's considerations of future family when making career choices. This null hypothesis was rejected due to the significance found with attachment to fathers. Thus, attachment to father differed than attachment to mother in predicting men's considerations of future family when planning for a career. This finding clarifies the role

of fathers in sons' career planning. It also raises questions about potential ways attachment to mother can influence their sons' career planning; thus, future research is needed to further understand the differences among men's attachment relationships to fathers and mothers and influences on their career planning.

Although not hypothesized, it is interesting to recognize that parental attachment was not found as a significant predictor in contributing to career planning independent from future family responsibilities. This is a significant finding because it elucidates that there is no clear relationship among parental attachment and career planning independent from future family responsibilities.

Contributions of Gender Role Conflict

In addition to parental attachment, the study also examined the contributions of gender role conflict in predicting career and family planning. The study hypothesized and found that greater degrees of gender role conflict will positively predict greater degrees of career planning independent of considerations of future family. Gender role conflict was considered with four factors: (a) Success, Power, and Competition, (b) Restrictive Emotionality, (c) Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men (homophobia), and (d) Conflict Between Work and Family Relations. When gender role conflict was added to the regression model, 11.8% of the variance was explained in career planning independent of considering future families. Only the success, power, and competition factor of the gender role conflict factors was statistically significant. This finding suggests that men who were gender role conflicted in the success, power and competition domain were more likely to make career decisions independent of future family responsibilities. Men who endorsed success, power and competition tend to be very

career driven and oriented; hence, they might have reported greater degrees of career planning independent of future family responsibilities. It is important to recognize that the success, power and competition gender role conflict construct had the highest mean compared to the other factors of gender role conflict. Since the men in the sample were most conflicted on this construct, this might be indicative of reasons why it was the only significant factor in predicting career planning independent of future family responsibilities. Thus, it might be possible that the other factors of gender role conflict also might predict career planning independent of future family in more heterogeneous gender role conflicted samples.

According to the findings, 11.8% of the variance in career planning independent of future families was explained by gender role conflict when it was added to the regression model. This significant finding expounds on the considerable contributions that gender role conflict can have on men and their career planning. It also elucidates the powerful restrictive impact of men's gender socialization can have on their career development, and how it minimizes men's freedom in their career considerations. Nonetheless, it is important to remember that college males are emerging adults and so their gender socialization is evolving as they continue to explore various life directions.

Parental Attachment and Gender Role Conflict

The relationships between parental attachment and gender role conflict were examined in the study to better understand their contributions to career and family planning. When examining parental attachment and gender role conflict, a null hypothesis was proposed indicating that parental attachment will not be correlated to gender role conflict. This hypothesis was rejected because a statistically significant

relationship among the parental attachment and gender role conflict scales existed between attachment to mother and restrictive affectionate behavior between men/homophobia ($r = -.15, p < .05$). This finding could suggest that men who had lower quality of attachment to their mothers were found to be more homophobic and affectionately restrictive between men. A possible explanation of the finding can imply that men who have poor attachment relationships with their mothers are less likely to feel comfortable with femininity and possibly even fear femininity. Since gender role conflict is rooted in the fear of femininity, homophobic and restrictive affectionate behavior among men could be instigated. Although restrictive affectionate behavior between men did not significantly predict career and family planning, this is an interesting finding as it reveals a relationship between son's attachment to their mothers and their gender role conflict. Nonetheless, it is important to recognize that this was a weak significant correlation ($r = -.15$). Therefore, additional research is needed to further support these relationships and interpretations.

Ancillary Analyses

Three ancillary analyses were conducted to assess various differences on the PLAN scale. The first ancillary analysis examined developmental differences among the sample by considering freshmen and sophomores as one group (underclassmen), and juniors and seniors as another group (upperclassmen). No statistically significant differences between underclassmen and upperclassmen were found in the Choosing a Career Independent of Future Family subscale. However, statistically significant differences were found among underclassmen and upperclassmen in the Incorporating

Future Family in Career Plans subscale, where underclassmen scored higher than upperclassmen on this scale.

Albeit a small effect size, underclassmen were more likely than upperclassmen to consider future family responsibilities in their career planning. More ancillary analyses were conducted to understand this difference. It was found from these analyses that upperclassmen had higher career aspirations than underclassmen, and they were more likely to experience gender role conflict between work and family relations. This finding is congruent with previous findings, in which higher career aspirations were related to lower considerations of future families in career planning. Although both underclassmen and upperclassmen are considered emerging adults, these findings can be explained by considering some developmental and maturation differences between these two groups. Upperclassmen might have reported higher career aspirations because they are closer to graduation. Additionally, they might have a better understanding of their future career plans and consequently have stronger career aspirations. It also was interesting that upperclassmen experienced greater levels of work and family relations gender role conflict. This could be associated with them being older and experiencing stronger gender socialization. Additionally, upperclassmen might be becoming more aware of the career and family interface and their future multiple roles, where they are recognizing the conflicting priorities and difficulties in managing these multiple roles. Nonetheless, it is important to be cautious of these findings as they all had small reported effect sizes. Additionally, both underclassmen and upperclassmen reported average scores in both of the PLAN scale's subscales on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree to

strongly agree. Therefore, even though a difference did exist, the two groups still reported similar scores on both subscales.

The second ancillary analysis examined differences among participants who reported that they have selected a career to pursue after graduation (career deciders) compared to participants that have not yet selected a career to pursue after graduation (career non-deciders). No statistically significant differences among career deciders and career non-deciders were found for either subscale of the PLAN scale. Thus, both career deciders and career non-deciders reported similar scores on both PLAN subscales. This finding is in support of the PLAN subscales, in that both subscales assess career and family planning. Individuals could or could not have considered future family responsibilities before selecting a career. Therefore, regardless if a participant has reported whether he has or has not selected a career, the PLAN scale would have assessed his degree of career and family planning. Additionally, emerging adulthood theory can also elucidate this insignificant finding. Males in the sample are still exploring and continue exploring their careers even after they decide on a career; thus, indicating whether they have or have not selected a career to pursue after graduation is not definitive in their actual career choices.

Finally, a third ancillary analysis was conducted to investigate differences among data collection locations and the PLAN subscales. The only statistical significant finding found was that participants from University 100 courses were more likely to incorporate future family in career plans than participants from the other student groups. Since University 100 courses consisted of all freshmen students and the portion of the sample comprising student groups were predominately upperclassmen, this finding is congruent

with the first ancillary analysis, in which underclassmen scored higher than upperclassmen on this subscale. Thus, interpretations of this finding are similar to the above finding.

In summary, the ancillary analyses suggested that maturation differences might potentially exist among underclassmen and upperclassmen, in which underclassmen report higher scores on the Incorporating Future Families in Career Plans than upperclassmen. Possible explanations of these findings indicate that upperclassmen consider future families in career plans less than underclassmen because they have higher career aspirations and are more likely to experience gender role conflict between work and family relations. Small effect sizes were reported; thus, these findings might be perilous to interpret. Additionally, ancillary analyses indicated that the PLAN scale is a valid instrument because no differences emerged between career deciders and non-deciders.

Limitations

Although this study has found multiple significant findings, it is important to consider several limitations of the study. The first limitation is the sampling strategy because it was a convenience sample. Although a convenience sample is not as desirable as other sampling strategies, reality constraints such as access led to the determination of the sampling approach. Introductory psychology courses, however, fulfill one of the required social sciences core courses for all undergraduate students at the university, which likely contributed to the overall representativeness of the sample. Nonetheless, the sample was predominately comprised of participants who identified as White and

heterosexual. This limits the generalizability of the study to other racial/ethnic and sexual orientation groups.

Another limitation is the study's data collection method. Since the study utilized four locations for data collection, this could have been a major threat. However, significant differences were mostly found with fraternities, in which participants from fraternities were more gender role conflicted. Similarly, maturation of the participants in the sample appeared to be a limitation. As underclassmen reported higher scores than upperclassmen in the scale representing incorporating future family in career plans, it is clear that maturation can be a limitation that raises some complex questions regarding our understanding of men's career and family planning.

In addition to data collection methods, another limitation to this study is scale reliability of a specific scale. The Career Aspirations Scale ($\alpha = .67$) reported lower scale reliability than expected. Although the scale had modest reliability, it could have had implications for the validity tests of the PLAN scale.

Similar to the limitations in the PLAN scale study with women (Ganginis Delpino & O'Brien, 2008), the PLAN scale does not apply to everyone because it is developed for individuals who do not have a family yet. Some men might already have families or might be involved in family responsibilities (e.g., parenting responsibilities), and may not have the choice in selecting a career independent of family considerations. Hence, it is important to recognize the uses of the PLAN scale with appropriate populations.

When considering the measures used in this study, it is clear that the parental attachment scale was not an inclusive scale in capturing the experiences of students from single parent families. Participants were not provided the option to skip one or both of the

attachment subscales if they did not have anyone in that role. Additionally, participants were not provided an opportunity to indicate whether if they are or are not from a single parent family. This is problematic because there was no definitive way of understanding the variance that could have been explained by participants from single parent families. Furthermore, the demographics form did not provide participants the opportunity to report their socioeconomic status (SES). Therefore, the overall data are limited in our understanding of participants from single parent homes and participants from low SES backgrounds.

Moreover, the gender role conflict scale only captured gender role conflict and not other aspects of the participants' gender socialization. Other aspects of gender socialization and gender identity development might offer a clearer understanding of the relationships of men and masculinities in relation to their career and family planning.

Implications for Practitioners

The study provides multiple useful applications for psychologists, career counselors, and student affairs professionals when engaging with, advising, and/or counseling college students. Career counselors can utilize the PLAN scale with their male students and clients to aid them in understanding motivations behind their career planning. This would allow them to make more educated and appropriate career plans. Additionally, psychologists and student affairs professionals can collaborate to develop and execute effective interventions that could help college men become more aware of their gender socialization and make more appropriate career plans.

Additionally, career counselors can utilize the PLAN scale to develop interventions that could help men and fathers understand their attitudes and values

towards their considerations of future families as they navigate their careers. This knowledge also can help counseling psychologists to develop vocational interventions to assist men struggling with multiple role concerns or to help men consider multiple roles as they are about to enter a multiple role workforce.

Furthermore, career counselors could combine the uses of the PLAN scale with measures of parental attachment, gender role conflict, and career aspirations to holistically aid men's understanding of the career and family interface. Career counselors can better understand their clients through these measures and help communicate to their clients the complexities of career and family planning. Additionally, they can help men in recognizing their male socialization, parental attachment, and career aspirations and help them navigate future multiple roles.

Implications for Future Research

Multiple directions for future research have already been suggested throughout this discussion chapter. Overall, the sample was comprised of traditionally aged emerging adult males that identified as White and heterosexual. Hence, it is important to assess the factor structure and the psychometric properties of the PLAN scale with multiple heterogonous samples to ensure that the PLAN scale is sensitive to the experiences of various populations. For example, it would be important to understand the factors and psychometric properties of the PLAN scale with racial/ethnic and gay and bisexual men. It also is important to assess the internal reliability of the PLAN scale with men over multiple periods of time.

In addition, it is necessary to replicate this study with heterogeneous samples of parental attachment and gender role conflict levels. Such heterogeneous samples should

include participants from cultural groups where family roles are salient and closely tied to the culture and/or where gender roles are strictly defined; thus, including varying levels of parental attachment and gender role socialization in the sample. Other heterogeneous samples should include participants from single parent households and participants from low SES backgrounds. These various samples would provide more avenues to better understand how these contributing factors predict career and family planning.

Additionally, it is important to include in future studies measures of other factors of gender socialization in order to better understand the effects of gender socialization on career and family planning.

Furthermore, future research should explore the complex relationships of parental attachment and career and family planning. Since parental attachment is a complex construct to holistically measure with quantitative research methods, future directions for research should utilize qualitative approaches to better understand men's conceptualization of parental attachment. Such methods could include open-ended descriptive questions such as, "describe your relationship with your father." With these qualitative methods, it would be helpful to explore the unique relationships between fathers and sons and mothers and sons and their effects on career and family planning. It also would be useful for future studies to investigate fathers' role modeling behaviors and the methods through which they communicate and influence their sons in career and family planning.

Moreover, future research should examine the PLAN scale with adult men, both single and partnered. Although adult men might have already selected careers, it would be helpful to understand their motivations towards their career planning. It also would be

interesting to examine how adult men navigate the career and family interface and communicate with their partners.

Finally, longitudinal studies can serve to better understand men's career planning processes as they develop through emerging adulthood. These longitudinal studies should attempt to study the relationships among men's career and family planning, parental attachment, gender socialization and career aspirations over their emerging adulthood lifespan. This can provide an excellent empirical understanding of developmental effects on men's career development as they develop from emerging adults to young adults. Furthermore, additional longitudinal studies can try to assess the subjective well-being of men in the career and family interface, subsequent to their career and family planning in emerging adulthood.

Conclusion

Men's career development has been often studied without considerations of the career and family interface. This study attempted to understand men's career development from this interface and studied men from a gendered perspective. The study analyzed the factor structure and psychometric properties of the Planning for Career and Family Scale and found two robust subscales. Reliability and validity were demonstrated in support of the PLAN scale. The PLAN scale assesses the degree to which men take in consideration future family responsibilities in their career planning process. This scale has multiple applications for practitioners in enabling men to better navigate the career and family interface. The PLAN scale also provides several directions for future research.

Additionally, this study elucidated significant findings regarding the contributions of parental attachment and gender role conflict in predicting career and family planning.

The findings suggested that fathers play a role in men's career and family planning and gender role conflict is negatively predictive of career and family planning. These findings expanded our understanding and provided a more holistic and gendered approach to investigating men's career development.

Appendix A

The Planning for Career and Family Scale

The following are a number of statements that reflect the extent to which you think about your future family when deciding on a career. Rate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement using the following scale.

	Strongly Disagree 1	Disagree 2	Agree 3	Strongly Agree 4
1. I will select a career that allows me to slow down after I have children.	1	2	3	4
2. When selecting a career, I will consider the needs of my partner.	1	2	3	4
3. When making career plans, I will take a job with lesser pay so I can focus on future parenting responsibilities.	1	2	3	4
4. I will give up some of my career goals for my relationship.	1	2	3	4
5. Having a fulfilling career will be very important to me, even at the expense of future responsibilities to my partner.	1	2	3	4
6. I will not plan my career around future parenting responsibilities.	1	2	3	4
7. When choosing a career, I will think about whether the work load will hinder my ability to care for my children.	1	2	3	4
8. I will never change my career plans for a relationship.	1	2	3	4
9. I will take a job that I find less satisfying if it means having more time for my partner.	1	2	3	4
10. Future parenting responsibilities will be an important factor in making my career plans.	1	2	3	4
11. When planning for my career, I will think about how much energy I will have for my children.	1	2	3	4
12. When selecting a career, I will take a lesser paying job if it means I am able to prioritize my relationship.	1	2	3	4
13. My partner's career will take priority over mine.	1	2	3	4
14. I will choose a career that allows me to spend time with my partner.	1	2	3	4
15. I will choose a career that allows me to provide for my family financially even if it means spending less time with them.	1	2	3	4
16. I will have a career with flexible hours so that I can be home for the children I plan to have.	1	2	3	4
17. The wishes of my partner will not figure into my career plans.	1	2	3	4
18. I will find a career where I do not have to work full-time after I have children.	1	2	3	4
19. When planning for my career, I will think about how to balance my career with my partner's work.	1	2	3	4
20. I will choose a career that is perceived as having a light workload because I want to focus on my children.	1	2	3	4
21. Taking a less demanding job to have more energy for my partner will not be an option.	1	2	3	4
22. My job will need to be flexible so I can help my partner's career advancement.	1	2	3	4
23. Future plans for children will not affect my career plans.	1	2	3	4
24. When selecting a career, I will be flexible so I can make room for a relationship.	1	2	3	4
25. I will select a career that can be put on hold when my children are young.	1	2	3	4
26. Any relationship that I am in will need to realize that my career plans come first.	1	2	3	4
27. Any career that I will select must enable me to be home when my children come home from school.	1	2	3	4
28. I will not alter my career plans because I might have children.	1	2	3	4
29. When considering a future career, I will look for a job that will allow me the flexibility of being able to stay at home when my children are sick or out of school.	1	2	3	4
30. I will make my career plans independently of what my partner might need.	1	2	3	4

Appendix A Continued

Strongly Disagree 1	Disagree 2	Agree 3	Strongly Agree 4	
31. My career plans will not be as important as my relationship.	1	2	3	4
32. I would rather have a more fulfilling career than one that allows me to focus on parenting responsibilities.	1	2	3	4
33. Having quality time for raising children will be the most important consideration in my career choice.	1	2	3	4
34. My career choice will have nothing to do with whether or not I want to be in a serious romantic relationship.	1	2	3	4
35. Having time for a romantic relationship will be important when I choose my future career.	1	2	3	4
36. When considering a future career, I will choose a job that does not include travel so that I can be home with my children.	1	2	3	4
37. When selecting a career, I will choose one where I can slow down after I have a serious romantic relationship.	1	2	3	4
38. I will not pick a career where I will be stressed by managing work and parenting responsibilities.	1	2	3	4
39. My future career will allow me to have time off in the summer so I can be with my children.	1	2	3	4
40. I will not consider responsibilities I have to my future partner when I plan my career.	1	2	3	4
41. I will choose a career that allows for a satisfying romantic relationship.	1	2	3	4
42. I will eliminate intense careers from my consideration because I want to have energy to parent my children.	1	2	3	4
43. I will choose the best career for me even if it may interfere with my ability to parent my children.	1	2	3	4
44. I want a career where I do not experience conflict between my work and caring for my partner.	1	2	3	4
45. I will not select a career that leaves me feeling overwhelmed and too tired to enjoy my children.	1	2	3	4
46. My career choice will be based on my goals, not on my ability to balance work and love.	1	2	3	4
47. I want a career where I do not experience conflict between work and my relationship.	1	2	3	4
48. Having a satisfying relationship is not as important as picking a career I love.	1	2	3	4
49. I will not select a career where I feel exhausted when I come home to my children.	1	2	3	4
50. Selecting a stressful career that interferes with my relationship is unappealing to me.	1	2	3	4
51. I will pick the best career for me because others will help me care for my children.	1	2	3	4
52. I want a career where I do not experience conflict between my work and parenting my children.	1	2	3	4

Appendix B

The Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment

Each of the following statements asks about your feelings about your **mother** or someone who has acted as your mother. If you have more than one person acting as your mother (e.g. a natural mother and a step-mother), answer the questions for the one you feel has most influenced you. Please read each statement and circle the **ONE** number that tells how true the statement is for you now.

	Almost never or never true 0	Not very often true 1	Sometimes true 2	Often true 3	Almost always or always true 4
1. My mother respects my feelings.	0	1	2	3	4
2. I feel my mother does a good job as my mother.	0	1	2	3	4
3. I wish I had a different mother.	0	1	2	3	4
4. My mother accepts me as I am.	0	1	2	3	4
5. I like to get my mother's point of view on things I'm concerned about.	0	1	2	3	4
6. I feel it's no use letting my feelings show around my mother.	0	1	2	3	4
7. My mother can tell when I'm upset about something.	0	1	2	3	4
8. Talking over my problems with my mother makes me feel ashamed or foolish.	0	1	2	3	4
9. My mother expects too much from me.	0	1	2	3	4
10. I get upset easily around my mother.	0	1	2	3	4
11. I get upset a lot more than my mother knows about.	0	1	2	3	4
12. When we discuss things, my mother cares about my point of view.	0	1	2	3	4
13. My mother trusts my judgment.	0	1	2	3	4
14. My mother has her own problems, so I don't bother her with mine.	0	1	2	3	4
15. My mother helps me to understand myself better.	0	1	2	3	4
16. I tell my mother about my problems and troubles.	0	1	2	3	4
17. I feel angry with my mother.	0	1	2	3	4
18. I don't get much attention from my mother.	0	1	2	3	4
19. My mother helps me to talk about my difficulties.	0	1	2	3	4
20. My mother understands me.	0	1	2	3	4
21. When I am angry about something, my mother tries to be understanding.	0	1	2	3	4
22. I trust my mother.	0	1	2	3	4
23. My mother doesn't understand what I'm going through these days.	0	1	2	3	4
24. I can count on my mother when I need to get something off my chest.	0	1	2	3	4
25. If my mother knows something is bothering me, she asks me about it.	0	1	2	3	4

This part asks about your feelings about your **father** or the man who has acted as your father. If you have more than one person acting as your father (e.g. natural and step-fathers), answer the questions for the one you feel has most influenced you.

	Almost never or never true 0	Not very often true 1	Sometimes true 2	Often true 3	Almost always or always true 4
1. My father respects my feelings.	0	1	2	3	4
2. I feel my father does a good job as my father.	0	1	2	3	4
3. I wish I had a different father.	0	1	2	3	4
4. My father accepts me as I am.	0	1	2	3	4
5. I like to get my father's point of view on things I'm concerned about.	0	1	2	3	4
6. I feel it's no use letting my feelings show around my father.	0	1	2	3	4

Appendix B Continued

	Almost never or never true 0	Not very often true 1	Sometimes true 2	Often true 3	Almost always or always true 4
7.					
8.					
9.					
10.					
11.					
12.					
13.					
14.					
15.					
16.					
17.					
18.					
19.					
20.					
21.					
22.					
23.					
24.					
25.					

Appendix C

The Gender Role Conflict Scale

In the space to the left of each sentence below, write the number which most closely represents the degree that you Agree or Disagree with the statement. There is no right or wrong answer to each statement; your own reaction is what is asked for.

	Strongly Disagree					Strongly Agree
	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Moving up the career ladder is important to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. I have difficulty telling others I care about them.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. Verbally expressing my love to another man is difficult for me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. I feel torn between my hectic work schedule and caring for my health.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. Making money is part of my idea of being a successful man.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. Strong emotions are difficult for me to understand.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. Affection with other men makes me tense.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. I sometimes define my personal value by my career success.	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. Expressing feelings makes me feel open to attack by other people.	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. Expressing my emotions to other men is risky.	1	2	3	4	5	6
11. My career, job, or school affects the quality of my leisure or family life.	1	2	3	4	5	6
12. I evaluate other people's value by their level of achievement and success.	1	2	3	4	5	6
13. Talking (about my feelings) during sexual relations is difficult for me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
14. I worry about failing and how it affects my doing well as a man.	1	2	3	4	5	6
15. I have difficulty expressing my emotional needs to my partner.	1	2	3	4	5	6
16. Men who touch other men make me feel uncomfortable.	1	2	3	4	5	6
17. Finding time to relax is difficult for me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
18. Doing well all the time is important to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
19. I have difficulty expressing my tender feelings.	1	2	3	4	5	6
20. Hugging other men is difficult for me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
21. I often feel that I need to be in charge of those around me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
22. Telling others of my strong feelings is not part of my sexual behavior.	1	2	3	4	5	6
23. Competing with others is the best way to succeed.	1	2	3	4	5	6
24. Winning is a measure of my value and personal worth.	1	2	3	4	5	6
25. I often have trouble finding words that describe how I am feeling.	1	2	3	4	5	6
26. I am sometimes hesitant to show my affection to men because of how others might perceive me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
27. My needs to work or study keep me from my family or leisure more than I would like.	1	2	3	4	5	6
28. I strive to be more successful than others.	1	2	3	4	5	6
29. I do not like to show my emotions to other people.	1	2	3	4	5	6
30. Telling my partner my feelings about him/her during sex is difficult for me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
31. My work or school often disrupts other parts of my life (home, family, health, leisure).	1	2	3	4	5	6
32. I am often concerned about how others evaluate my performance at work or school.	1	2	3	4	5	6
33. Being very personal with other men makes me feel uncomfortable.	1	2	3	4	5	6
34. Being smarter or physically stronger than other men is important to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
35. Men who are overly friendly to me, make me wonder about their sexual orientation.	1	2	3	4	5	6
36. Overwork and stress, caused by a need to achieve on the job or in school, affects/hurts my life.	1	2	3	4	5	6
37. I like to feel superior to other people.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Appendix D

The Career Aspiration Scale

In the space next to the statements below please circle a number from “0” (not at all true of me) to “4” (very true of me). If the statement does not apply, circle “0”. Please be completely honest. Your answers are entirely confidential and will be useful only if they accurately describe you.

	Not at All True of Me 0	Slightly True of Me 1	Moderately True of Me 2	Quite a Bit True of Me 3	Very True of Me 4
1. I hope to become a leader in my career field.	0	1	2	3	4
2. When I am established in my career, I would like to manage other employees.	0	1	2	3	4
3. I do not plan to devote energy to getting promoted in the organization or business I am working in.	0	1	2	3	4
4. When I am established in my career, I would like to train others.	0	1	2	3	4
5. I hope to move up through any organization or business I work in.	0	1	2	3	4
6. Once I finish the basic level of education needed for a particular job, I see no need to continue in school.	0	1	2	3	4
7. I think I would like to pursue graduate training in my occupational area of interest.	0	1	2	3	4
8. Attaining leadership status in my career is not that important to me.	0	1	2	3	4

Appendix E

The Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy Scale

For each statement below, please read carefully and indicate how much confidence you have that you could accomplish each of these tasks by marking your answer according to the key. Mark your answer by filling in the correct circle on the answer sheet.

How much confidence do you have that you could:

No confidence at all 1	Very little confidence 2	Moderate confidence 3	Much confidence 4	Complete confidence 5
1. Use the internet to find information about occupations that interest you.	1	2	3	4 5
2. Select one major from a list of potential majors you are considering.	1	2	3	4 5
3. Make a plan of your goals for the next five years.	1	2	3	4 5
4. Determine the steps to take if you are having academic trouble with an aspect of your chosen major.	1	2	3	4 5
5. Accurately assess your abilities.	1	2	3	4 5
6. Select one occupation from a list of potential occupations you are considering.	1	2	3	4 5
7. Determine the steps you need to take to successfully complete your chosen major.	1	2	3	4 5
8. Persistently work at your major or career goal even when you get frustrated.	1	2	3	4 5
9. Determine what your ideal job would be.	1	2	3	4 5
10. Find out the employment trends for an occupation over the next ten years.	1	2	3	4 5
11. Choose a career that will fit your preferred lifestyle.	1	2	3	4 5
12. Prepare a good resume.	1	2	3	4 5
13. Change majors if you did not like your first choice.	1	2	3	4 5
14. Decide what you value most in an occupation.	1	2	3	4 5
15. Find out about the average yearly earnings of people in an occupation.	1	2	3	4 5
16. Make a career decision and then not worry whether it was right or wrong.	1	2	3	4 5
17. Change occupations if you are not satisfied with the one you enter.	1	2	3	4 5
18. Figure out what you are and are not ready to sacrifice to achieve your career goals.	1	2	3	4 5
19. Talk with a person already employed in a field you are interested in.	1	2	3	4 5
20. Choose a major or career that will fit your interests.	1	2	3	4 5
21. Identify employers, firms, and institutions relevant to your career possibilities.	1	2	3	4 5
22. Define the type of lifestyle you would like to live.	1	2	3	4 5
23. Find information about graduate or professional schools.	1	2	3	4 5
24. Successfully manage the job interview process.	1	2	3	4 5
25. Identify some reasonable major or career alternatives if you are unable to get your first choice.	1	2	3	4 5

Copyright ©2001, Nancy Betz & Karen Taylor. Not to be used without permission.

Appendix F

The Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale Form C

Listed below are statements concerning personal attitudes and traits. Please read each item and decide whether the statement is *true* or *false* as it pertains to you personally.

Please respond to the following items as being either True (T) or False (F).

1. It is sometimes hard for me to go on with my work if I am not encouraged.	T	F
2. I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way.	T	F
3. On a few occasions, I have given up doing something because I thought too little of my ability.	T	F
4. There have been times when I felt like rebelling against people in authority even though I knew they were right.	T	F
5. No matter who I'm talking to, I'm always a good listener.	T	F
6. There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone.	T	F
7. I'm always willing to admit it when I make a mistake.	T	F
8. I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget.	T	F
9. I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable.	T	F
10. I have never been irked when people expressed ideas very different from my own.	T	F
11. There have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of others.	T	F
12. I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favors of me.	T	F
13. I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings.	T	F

Appendix G

Demographics

AGE: _____

GENDER:
_____ Female
_____ Male

STATUS IN SCHOOL:

_____ Freshman
_____ Sophomore
_____ Junior
_____ Senior

RACE/ETHNICITY:

_____ African American
_____ Asian/Asian American
_____ American Indian
_____ Biracial/Multiracial
_____ Hispanic, Latina
_____ Middle Eastern
_____ White, non-Hispanic
_____ Other (Please Specify) _____

RELATIONSHIP STATUS:

_____ Single
_____ Married/Partnered
_____ Separated
_____ Divorced
_____ Widowed

SEXUAL ORIENTATION:

_____ Heterosexual
_____ Gay
_____ Lesbian
_____ Bisexual
_____ Queer
_____ Unsure

If Single: Do you plan to get married/be in a committed relationship?

Yes _____ No _____

Do you plan on having children? _____ Yes _____ No

Have you chosen a major? _____ Yes _____ No

If YES, what major have you chosen? _____

If NO, what majors are you considering?

- 1. _____
- 2. _____

What is your overall GPA? _____

What are your educational plans?

_____ Undergraduate degree
_____ M.S./M.A. degree
_____ Ph.D. degree
_____ Medical degree
_____ Law degree
_____ Other (Please Specify) _____

Have you chosen a career which you plan to pursue after graduation?

Yes _____ No _____

If YES, what career have you selected? _____

If NO, what careers are you considering?

- 1. _____
- 2. _____
- 3. _____
- 4. _____

THANK YOU!!!

References

- Ainsworth, M. D. S. (1989). Attachments beyond infancy. *American Psychologist, 44*, 709–716.
- Amatea, E. S., Cross, G. E., Clark, J. E., & Bobby, C. L. (1986). Assessing the work and family role expectations of career-oriented men and women: The life role salience scales. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 48*, 831-838.
- Armsden, G. C., & Greenberg, M. T. (1987). The inventory of parent and peer attachment: Individual differences and their relationship to psychological well-being in adolescence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 16*, 427-455.
- Arnett, J. J. (1998). Learning to stand alone: The contemporary American transition to adulthood in cultural and historical context. *Human Development, 41*, 295-315.
- Arnett, J. J. (2000). Emerging adulthood: A theory of development from the late teens through the twenties. *American Psychologist, 55*(5), 469-480.
- Barnett, R., Marshall, N., & Pleck, J. (1992). Men's multiple roles and their relationship to men's psychological distress. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 54*, 358-367.
- Battle, A., & Wigfield, A. (2003). College women's value orientations toward family, career, and graduate school. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 62*, 56-75.
- Betz, N.E., Klein, K.L., & Taylor, K.M. (1996). Evaluation of a short form of the career decision-making self-efficacy scale. *Journal of Career Assessment, 4*, 47-57.
- Bianchi, S. M., Milkie, M. A., Sayer, L. C., & Robinson, J. P. (2000). Is anyone doing the housework? Trends in the gender division of household labor. *Social Forces, 79*(1), 191-228.

- Bianchi, S. M., Robinson, J. P., & Milkie, M. A. (2006). *Changing rhythms of American family life*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Blustein, D., Walbridge, M., Friedlander, M., & Palladino, D. (1991). Contributions of psychological separation and parental attachment to the career development process. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 38*, 39-50.
- Bowlby, J. (1982). *Attachment and loss: Vol. 1. Attachment* (2nd ed.). New York: Basic Books.
- Campbell, J. L., & Snow, B. M. (1992). Gender role conflict and family environment as predictors of men's marital satisfaction. *Journal of Family Psychology, 1*, 84-87.
- Carter, K. A. (2000). Transgenderism and college students: Issues of gender identity and its role on our campuses. In V. A. Wall, N. J. Evans (Eds.), *Towards acceptance: Sexual orientation issues on campus* (pp. 261 - 282). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Childers Lackland, A., & De Lisi, R. (2001). Students' choices of college majors that are gender traditional and nontraditional. *Journal of College Student Development, 42*, 39-48.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavior sciences*. Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum Associates.
- Cohen, J., Cohen, P., West, S. G., & Aiken, L. S. (2003). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 24*, 349-354.

- Dawson-Threat, J., & Huba, M. E. (1996). Choice of major and clarity of purpose among college seniors as a function of gender, type of major, and sex-role identification. *Journal of College Student Development, 37*, 297-308.
- Dodson, T., & Borders, L. (2006). Men in traditional and nontraditional careers: Gender role attitudes, gender role conflict, and job satisfaction. *Career Development Quarterly, 54*, 283-296.
- Doucet, A. (2004, Fall). It's almost like I have a job, but I don't get paid: Fathers at home reconfiguring work, care, and masculinity. *Fathering: A Journal of Theory, Research, & Practice about Men as Fathers, 2*(3), 277-303.
- Farmer, H. S. (1984). Development of a measure of home-career conflict related to career motivation in college women. *Sex Roles, 10*, 663-675.
- Farmer, H. S., Wardrop, J. S., Anderson, M. Z., & Risinger, F. (1995). Women's career choices: Focus on science, math, and technology careers. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 42*, 155-170.
- Friedman, S., & Weissbrod, C. (2005). Work and family commitment and decision-making status among emerging adults. *Sex Roles, 53*(5/6), 317-325.
- Ganginis Delpino, H., & O'Brien, K. M. (2008). *Planning for career and family: An instrument development study*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Maryland at College Park.
- Gray, M. P., & O'Brien, K. M. (2007). Advancing the assessment of women's career choices: The career aspiration scale. *Journal of Career Assessment, 15*(3), 317-337.
- Hansen, L. S. (1997). *Integrative life planning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

- Heard-Hinderlie, H., & Kenny, M. E. (2002). Attachment, social support, and college adjustment among Black students at predominantly White universities. *Journal of College Student Development, 43*, 327-340.
- Jome, L. A., & Tokar, D. M. (1998). Dimensions of masculinity and major choice traditionality. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 52*, 120-134.
- Kenny, M. E. (1990). College seniors' perceptions of parental attachments: The value and stability of family ties. *Journal of College Student Development, 31*, 39-46.
- Kenny, M. E. (1994). Quality and correlates of parental attachment among late adolescents. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 72*, 399-403.
- Levine, J., & Pittinsky, T. L. (1997). *Working fathers: New strategies for balancing work and family*. New York: Harcourt Brace & Company.
- Liu, W. M. (2005). The study of men and masculinity as an important multicultural competency consideration. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 6*, 685-697.
- Lee, H., & Hughey, K. F. (2001). The relationship of psychological separation and parental attachment to the career maturity of college freshmen from intact families. *Journal of Career Development, 27*, 2001.
- Marsiglio, W., Amato, P., Day, R. D., & Lamb, M. E. (2000). Scholarship on fatherhood in 1990s and beyond. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 62*, 1173-1191.
- Mintz, R. D., & Mahalik, J. R. (1996). Gender role orientation and conflict as predictors of family roles for men. *Sex Roles, 34*, 805-821.
- O'Brien, K. M. (1996). The influence of psychological separation and parental attachment on the career development of adolescent women. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 48*, 257-274.

- O'Brien, K. M., Friedman, S. M., Tipton, L. C., & Linn, S. G. (2000). Attachment, separation, and women's vocational development: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 47*, 301-315.
- O'Neil, J. M. (in press). Summarizing twenty-five years of research using the gender role conflict scale: New research paradigms and clinical implications. *The Counseling Psychologist*.
- O'Neil, J. M., Fishman, D. M., & Kinsella-Shaw, M. (1987). Dual-career couples' career transitions and normative dilemmas: A preliminary assessment mode. *The Counseling Psychologist, 15*, 50-96.
- O'Neil, J. M., Helms, B. J., Gable, R. K., David, L., & Wrightsman, L. S. (1986). Gender role conflict scale: College men's fear of femininity. *Sex Roles, 14*, 335-350.
- O'Neil, J. M., Good, G. E., & Holmes, S. (1995). Fifteen years of theory and research on men's gender role conflict: New paradigms for empirical research. In R. Levant & W. Pollack (Eds.), *The new psychology of men* (pp. 164-206). New York: Basic Books.
- Palladino Schulthesis, D. E. (2006). The interface of work and family life. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 37*, 334-341.
- Papini, D. R., Roggman, R. L., & Anderson, J. (1991). Early-adolescent perceptions of attachment to mother and father: A test of emotional-distancing and buffering hypothesis. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 11*, 258-275.
- Parker, A. W. (1966). Career and marriage orientation in the vocational development of college women. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 50*, 232-235.

- Pollack, W. S. (1999). *Real boys: Rescuing our sons from the myths of boyhood*. New York: Henry Holt and Company, LLC.
- Reich, R. B. (2001). *The future of success*. New York: A Knopf Publishing Group.
- Reynolds, W. M. (1982). Development of reliable and valid short forms of the Marlowe-Crowne social desirability scale. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 38*, 119-125.
- Rice, K. G., Cole, D. A., & Lapsley, D. K. (1990). Separation–individuation, family cohesion, and adjustment to college: Measurement validation and test of a theoretical model. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 37*, 195–202.
- Rice, K. G., & Whaley, T. J. (1994). A short-term longitudinal study of within-semester stability and change in attachment and college student adjustment. *Journal of College Student Development, 35*, 324-330.
- Rochlen, A., Blazina, C., & Raghunathan, R. (2002). Gender role conflict, attitudes toward career counseling, career decision-making, and perceptions of career counseling advertising brochures. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 3*, 127-137.
- Rochlen, A. B., & O'Brien, K. M. (2002). The relation of male gender role conflict and attitudes toward career counseling to interest in and preferences for career counseling styles. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 3*, 9-21.
- Rochlen, A. B., McKelley, R. A., Scaringi, V., & Suizzo, M. A. (2007, August). Stay at home fathers: Predictors of psychological well-being and relationship satisfaction. Presented in K. Oren's, "New directions in fatherhood research." Symposium conducted at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco.

- Ryan, N. E., Solberg, S. V., & Brown, S. D. (1996). Family dysfunction, parental attachment, and career search self-efficacy among community college students. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 43*, 84-89.
- Savage, C. T., & Fouad, N. (1994). Traditionality of college major and attitudes towards work-family balance: Vocational correlates. *Journal of Career Assessment, 2*, 163-178.
- Sayer, L. C., Cohen, P. N., & Casper, L. M. (2004). *The American people: Census 2000*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Stickel, S. A., & Bonnett, R. A. (1991). Gender differences in career self-efficacy: Combining a career with home and family. *Journal of College Student Development, 32*, 297-301.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2001, May). *Census 2000 Brief*. Washington: U.S. Department of Commerce.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2002, November). *Demographic Trends in the 20th Century*. Washington: U.S. Department of Commerce.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2005, June). *Current Population Survey: 2004 Annual Social and Economic Supplement*. Retrieved October 10, 2007, from <http://www.census.gov/population/www/socdemo/hh-fam/cps2004.html>
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2007, March). *Current Population Survey: 2006 Annual Social and Economic Supplement*. Retrieved October 10, 2007, from <http://www.census.gov/population/www/socdemo/hh-fam/cps2006.html>

U. S. Department of Labor Bureau of Labor Statistics (2005, May). *Women in the labor force: A databook*. (Report No. 985). Retrieved September 30, 2007, from <http://www.bls.gov/cps/wlf-databook-2005.pdf>

Weinshenker, M. N. (2005). Imagining family roles: Parental influences on the expectations of adolescents in dual-earner families. In B. Schneider & J. Waite (Eds.), *Being together, working apart: Dual-career families and the work-life balance* (pp. 365-338). Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.