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Abstract

Acculturation, Family Influence, and Work Volition in Latinx College Student Academic Satisfaction

Nadine Postolache

The present study integrates Social Cognitive Career Theory and Psychology of Working Theory by considering the role of work volition within a social cognitive model of academic satisfaction. Vocational psychology research has highlighted the significance of sociocultural variables on career outcomes for Latinx young adults. This study explored a collectivistic familial perspective on career development for a sample of 224 Latinx college students. Ethnic identity, acculturation, enculturation and four family influence variables were exogenous variables while career decision self-efficacy, work volition, and academic satisfaction were endogenous variables. Results from a path analysis indicated that both acculturation and enculturation were associated with academic satisfaction. Higher endorsement of informational support was positively related to career decision self-efficacy and work volition while greater endorsement of family expectations was negatively related to career decision self-efficacy and work volition. Acculturation was positively related to career decision self-efficacy while financial support was positively related to work volition. Both career decision self-efficacy and work volition were positively associated with academic satisfaction, and career decision self-efficacy was positively related to work volition. Indirect relationships and an alternative model were examined. Implications for future research and clinical practice with Latinx college populations are discussed.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

The Latinx community is one of the largest sub-ethnic groups living in the U.S., comprising roughly 18% of the national population (Lopez et al., 2020). Bustamante et al., (2020), researchers at Pew Research, reported that Latinx individuals accounted for 52% of the population growth between 2010 and 2019. Additionally, Latinx immigrants and U.S. born Latinxs make-up roughly 17% of the U.S. workforce (U.S. Department of Labor, 2015). On average the Latinx population is younger than the U.S. national population, and Latinx young adults are expected to outpace the growth of their peers in every other ethnic group by 2025 (Coulombe & Gil, 2016). Thus, Latinxs will contribute to the growth and youth of our national population in the 21st century (Blancero et al., 2018). As a result, exploring factors that impact Latinx young adult career development should be a significant focus of vocational psychology.

One correlate of successful job entry for young adults is college attendance and completion (Phinney et al., 2006; Torche, 2011). Latinx young adults have shown major increases in college attendance and completion in recent years (Aguayo et al., 2011). Still research points to a disproportionate lag in high school completion and graduate school enrollment among Latinx young adults when compared to non-Latinxs (Bauman et al., 2017; Musu et al., 2016). Recently, researchers have begun to focus on relevant career variables among Latinx college students to better understand the supports and barriers to college attendance. One such outcome of interest has been academic satisfaction (Duffy et al., 2015; Jadidian & Duffy, 2012; Lent & Brown, 2013; Navarro et al., 2019). Academic satisfaction in college has been linked with significant positive future career outcomes including academic persistence (Navarro et al., 2019) and life satisfaction (Ojeda et al., 2011). As Latinx college enrollment continues to increase, it is important to understand the specific socio-cultural variables involved in the career
development of Latinx young adults. Thus, this project will consider how cultural factors may relate to college academic satisfaction through key constructs of career development.

1.1 Integrated Career Development Theories

Since its inception, the field of counseling psychology focused on vocational development (Blustein, 2006; Borgen, 1991). Historically, career research has largely studied the limited experience of U.S. born, White, affluent individuals (Blustein, 2006). The attention has shifted in the 21st century to focus on multicultural issues surrounding work and education that contribute to career development (Fouad & Kozlowski, 2019). In response, contemporary theories such as Social Cognitive Career Theory (SCCT; Lent et al., 1994) and Psychology of Working Theory (PWT; Duffy et al., 2016) explicitly highlight the impact of culture on career development, particularly for individuals with marginalized identities.

The present study draws from SCCT and PWT, two predominant career theories to answer the call within the field of vocational psychology for more theoretically integrative approaches to career research (Duffy et al., 2014; Lent & Brown, 2013). The former, SCCT (Lent et al., 1994), based on Bandura’s (1977, 1986) social-cognitive theory, involves an empirically supported model of career development. At the root of social-cognitive theory lies the notion that a domain outcome is a result of the interaction between an individual’s environment, behaviors, and cognitions (Bandura, 1986). Implementing this tripartite model, SCCT (see Appendix I- Figure 1) hypothesized that career development is influenced by the relationships between an individual’s contextual affordances, person inputs and career related cognitions and behaviors (Lent et al., 1994; 2000). Moreover, SCCT used Bandura’s (1977) construct of self-efficacy, first applied to career development by Hackett and Betz (1981), to develop a model outlining the relationships between career self-efficacy, career outcome
expectations, career choice goals, career actions and successful career outcomes (Lent et al., 1994; 2000).

One key career self-efficacy domain frequently studied in SCCT is career decision self-efficacy (CDSE; Betz & Luzzo, 1996). CDSE (Betz & Luzzo, 1996) is defined as an individual’s confidence in their ability to make successful vocational decisions. Vocational researchers have posited that developing CDSE is crucial for young adults who, as a result of their developmental stage, are faced with having to make important career choices (Flores et al., 2008; Metheny & McWhirter, 2013). Among Latinx young adults, CDSE has been linked to positive career outcomes such as greater life satisfaction, positive outcome expectation and fewer career-related barriers. (Bonifacio et al., 2018; Piña-Watson et al., 2014; Mejia-Smith & Gushue, 2017).

Recently more attention has been given to cultural variables that may promote CDSE among Latinx young adults, specifically ethnic identity, acculturation and enculturation (Bonifacio et al., 2018; Mejia & Gushue, 2017; Ojeda et al., 2012). The present study aims to understand the role of individual (i.e., ethnic identity, acculturation, enculturation) and collective (i.e., family influence) cultural variables in promoting CDSE, and ultimately, academic satisfaction.

The second theoretical framework considered in this project is PWT (Duffy et al., 2016) Grounded in Bluestein’s (2008) Psychology of Working Framework (PWF), this theory is helpful in understanding Latinx career development because it aims to explore career development specifically among populations that have been traditionally left out of career research. PWF challenges the notion that all individuals have freedom of choice in their career development. It underscores vocational choice as a reflection of privilege awarded by social systems. Specifically, Blustein (2006) highlighted how social constraints related to class,
ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, and disability status could prevent an individual from perceiving autonomy over their career development and acquiring decent work.

Within PWT (see Appendix J- Figure 2), experiences of marginalization have been shown to influence work volition, the degree of perceived choice an individual has over career decisions, which in turn may impact successful vocational outcomes (Duffy, Bott et al., 2012; Duffy et al., 2016). Recent studies have also pointed to the importance of work volition in academic outcomes (Duffy, Diemer, et al., 2012; Jadidian & Duffy, 2012) and general well-being (Buyukgoze-Kavas et al., 2015). To summarize, among college samples an increased perception of choice in career decisions was linked to more confidence to make those decisions, greater satisfaction with academic endeavors, and increased ability to adapt to work-related transitions and barriers in employed adults. These findings suggest an important connection between career theory, academic satisfaction, and work volition for Latinx young adults.

1.2 Latinx Young Adults and Career Development

College attendance is a crucial stage of young adult career development (Duffy & Klingaman, 2009; Helwig, 2011). In college young adults often begin to fuse together personal identity (e.g., personality and interests) with vocational identity. For Latinx individuals the systemic barriers they face create obstacles to their ability to access work post-graduation (Blancero et al., 2018). More recently, the impact of the COVID-19 crisis has disproportionately affected the lives of people of color. The Latinx community is reported to have suffered disproportionate pay cuts and job loss as a result of the pandemic (Krogstad et al., 2020). The presence and awareness of these barriers may have long-standing implications for career development of current Latinx emerging young adults and their academic experiences (Bonifacio et al, 2018). For example, Latinx confidence in their ability to make career decisions and
expectations around their careers may be negatively influenced by socio-cultural factors in their environment (Quintana, 2007). Scholars have highlighted the importance of individual variables such as ethnic identity and acculturation as well as the collective variable of family influence in shaping individual identity, perceptions of education and vocational interests, goals and behaviors (Fouad et al., 2010; Mejia-Smith & Gushue, 2017).

The current study investigates three individual cultural influences and four family variables applicable to Latinx individuals. Ethnicity, race, and cultural identity are considered by counseling psychologists to be significant variables of study in vocational research among adolescents and young adults (Bonifacio et al., 2018; Gushue & Whitson, 2006b; Leong & Chou, 1994; Perron et al., 1998). Ethnic identity, a multifaceted and dynamic construct, describes the positive psychological, social and cognitive connection people form with their ethnic group (Phinney, 1998; 2006; Phinney & Ong, 2007). Often Latinx identity lies at the intersection of multiple marginalized identities (e.g., ethnicity, race and immigrant status). As such, ethnic identity is considered a salient variable for this population (Cislo, 2008; Umaña-Taylor et al., 2015). Duffy and Klingaman (2009) posited that the association between ethnic identity and self-concept may explain positive career outcomes, because ethnic identity is predictive of a clearer sense of self which may relate to confidence and satisfaction in career choices and strong vocational identity. While previous research has linked ethnic identity to academic performance (Grindal & Nieri, 2015; Supple et al., 2006), less is understood about how ethnic identity influences academic satisfaction especially among Latinx young adults.

As with ethnic identity, studies have shown that acculturation processes are also an important variable to consider for Latinx individuals (Arbona, 1995; Berry et al., 2006). Acculturation is defined as a dynamic process that begins as a result of the contact between two
different cultures: a dominant host culture and the heritage culture (Berry, 1997; Berry, 2001). The behaviors and values held by an individual may orient towards either the dominant host culture, their heritage culture or both. Generational differences in acculturation exist among Latinx individuals (Cuéllar et al., 1995; Lessenger, 1997). Among Latinxs, an integrated form of acculturation may look like an adoption of some aspects of U.S. culture while also maintaining more traditional values from their Latin American heritage (Mejia & Gushue, 2017; Blancero et al., 2018; Gomez et al., 2001). Furthermore, acculturating to mainstream U.S. society is difficult when the socio-political climate is discriminatory and hostile towards Latinx people (Rogers, 2020). Racism and xenophobia underscore the intersection between acculturation, language and skin color for many Latinx individuals (Padilla & Perez, 2003). Therefore, acculturative stress (i.e., the negative emotional impact of acculturation) may have negative psychological and physical health outcomes (Cervantes et al., 2015; Sanchez et al., 2010).

On the other hand, different processes of acculturation may promote positive psychological and cognitive effects among Latinx populations. For example, a more acculturated individual to U.S. cultures may more easily navigate the U.S college experience which is typically rooted in individualistic American values (Flores et al., 2006). Alternatively, enculturation, the process of maintaining connection to Latinx culture, has been linked to positive health outcomes (Torres, 2010). Thus, developing a bicultural identity, one that integrates both aspects of the U.S. and Latinx culture, may support Latinx young adults’ career development (Ojeda et al., 2011). In accordance with Lent et al.’s (2000) recommendation, SCCT scholars have conceptualized acculturation as a person input relating both directly and indirectly to career outcomes (Flores et al., 2008; Mejia-Smith & Gushue, 2017). The inclusion of acculturation in the model, recognizes that salient personal experiences among Latinx
identified young adults specifically how acculturative stress may impact career self-efficacy, work volition and academic satisfaction.

Thus far, SCCT research with Latinx college youth has focused primarily on ethnic identity and acculturation as individualistic person inputs within the model. This study will also consider family influence as a contextual input. The importance of family among immigrant communities of color underscores the collectivistic values in these communities (Fouad et al., 2010; Gomez et al., 2001; Kiyama & Harper, 2015). Traditionally, vocational research has often described career development as a purely individualistic process (Arevalo et al., 2015; Fouad et al., 2010; Leyva, 2011). This individual-focused conceptualization of career development may not fit experiences of Latinx young adults who often maintain the value known as familismo. 

Familismo is characterized by the expectation of loyalty and support found in Latinx families including into adulthood (Hernandez & Lopez, 2004; Marin & Marin, 1991; Mendoza et al., 2011). In other words, family may play a more active role in a Latinx young adult’s psychosocial development, and likewise in their career path (Chilman, 1993; Fuligni, 2001).

Few studies have taken a theory-driven approach to understanding family influence on college experiences and career development (Fouad et al., 2010; Kim, Ahn, et al., 2016). PWF theorists (Blustein et al., 2004) have highlighted the need to understand the relational aspects of career development. While familial support has generally been viewed as a positive influence on career development, Duffy et al. (2014) highlighted that familial expectations may decrease the sense of work volition among marginalized populations. In other words, a family may expect certain career pursuits from their young adult children in order to cope with financial and social realities. Thus, it is important to consider family influence within the theoretical frameworks to understand how it may relate to other variables in the model for collectivistically oriented
samples. According to Kim, Ahn, et al., (2016), family influence falls within the SCCT satisfaction model (Lent & Brown, 2006) as a contextual factor because of its early impact on career development in collectivistic cultures. The four factors (i.e., informational support, financial support, values/beliefs and family expectations) of the validated Family Influence Scale (FIS; Fouad et al., 2010) have been found to predict relevant SCCT and PWT variables in U.S. (majority White-American) and Asian samples. To the author’s knowledge no study to date has examined family influence using the FIS with a Latinx sample.

In summary, despite a promising rise in the presence of Latinx young adults in colleges, universities, and the workforce in the U.S., they are still significantly underrepresented in U.S. colleges and universities. In recent years, counseling psychology has challenged the privileged blind spots of earlier theories in the development and study of SCCT and PWT, insofar as SCCT explicitly addresses socio-cultural factors as crucial in shaping direct and indirect associations with career outcomes. More recently, PWT created a testable model (see Appendix K- Figure 3) to assess how variables such as work volition, a construct that describes the perceived freedom to make career-related decisions, contribute to fair attainment of an empowering career (Duffy et al., 2016). While scholars have pushed for more unification of theoretically grounded research in career development, more work needs to be done in answering this call for diverse populations. Furthermore, career research has largely focused on career development as an individualistic process. College attendance from a U.S. perspective is viewed as highly individualized experience without much consideration of the impact of family influence on students from collectivistic cultures. Furthermore, there is a gap in the literature in how academic satisfaction is shaped among students of color and what role family influence may play in their overall academic experience.
1.3 The Present Study

The present study, informed by PWT, will use an SCCT model to test variables hypothesized to be influential in Latinx young adult career development, specifically work volition, career decision self-efficacy (CDSE) and academic satisfaction (see Appendix L- Figure 4). Furthermore, it will expand on the existing literature on Latinx young adult career development with the following three principal aims. First, it will integrate PWF and SCCT by including work volition within a SCCT model. To date, no study has looked at variables of SCCT and PWT concurrently with a sample of Latinx college students. Second, it will add family influence, a collectivistic oriented variable, to the model here by attempting to validate the FIS (Fouad et al., 2010) measure for the first time for Latinx young adults. Finally, based on the SCCT model of satisfaction and key tenets of PWT this study will make a case for the significant contribution of ethnic identity, acculturation, enculturation, and family influence, work volition and CDSE on the development of academic satisfaction among Latinx college-attending young adults.

Family influence, acculturation, enculturation and ethnic identity will be considered as key predictor variables of CDSE, work volition and subsequently academic satisfaction. In other words, Latinx college students who have more family influence (i.e., from financial support, information support, and values/beliefs), fewer family expectations, are both acculturated to U.S. culture and enculturated to their Latinx culture, and also maintain a positive affiliation with their Latinx identity may be more likely to report increased confidence in and perceived freedom to make career related choices (e.g., majors they decide to study), which will in turn lead to greater academic satisfaction. In line with the SCCT model, this study posits that both personal and contextual variables are influential precursors of CDSE and work volition. In turn, CDSE and
work volition may predict academic satisfaction, thus mediating the relationship between the earlier variables in the model and academic satisfaction.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

Latinx people make up a significant part of the U.S population, yet educational, health, and economic disparities as a result of ongoing systemic oppression are well documented (Rumbaut, 2006; 2020). In 2018, the Latinx population made up 18% of the U.S. population, roughly 59 million people, and they are projected to account for 30% of the population in 2060 (Bauman, 2017). Research has shown that collectively Latinx individuals have higher high school dropout rates when compared to non-Latinx White Americans (Pew Hispanic Center, 2009). These rates parallel disproportionately higher rates of obesity, diabetes and more recently COVID-19 diagnoses and deaths within Latinx communities as a result of systemic barriers to accessing health care (Laurencin & McClinton, 2020; Velasco-Mondragon et al., 2016). The inequities facing Latinx communities in the U.S. encompass both economic (e.g., income gap) and social dimensions (e.g., discrimination) highlighting the need for studies that promote Latinx vocational identity development and social empowerment.

In this introductory section the author will begin by briefly clarifying terms and identifying the common cultural values and systemic barriers facing Latinx young adults. Finally, the author will conclude with a rationale for the study’s focus on Latinx college students and the underlying career related problems related to college satisfaction.

In the following sections the author will present a review of the existing literature of two contemporary vocational theories SCCT and PWT. Furthermore, the author will highlight the recent argument in the literature for theoretically integrative and culturally attuned vocational research with diverse populations (Duffy et al., 2014; Duffy et al., 2018; Flores et al., 2017; Fouad & Kozlowski, 2019; Fouad & Santana, 2017; Lent & Brown, 2013). The review will begin by outlining major concepts of the SCCT model (i.e., career decision self-efficacy and
academic satisfaction) and how they have been applied to Latinx college student career development. Second, the review will provide a description of the core tenants of PWT and the importance of work volition for college-aged young adults. Within the integration of PWT and SCCT, the author will also review relevant literature concerning three cultural variables ethnic identity, acculturation and family influence considering them as contextual influences on Latinx career development. Throughout the review, the author will discuss how these theories and their corresponding constructs may be used to explore Latinx college student academic satisfaction.

This study, informed by PWT, will use the SCCT model to test variables hypothesized to be influential in Latinx young adult career development, specifically the promotion of career decision self-efficacy, work volition, and academic satisfaction. The literature review will first discuss the outcome variable, academic satisfaction, followed by hypothesized mediators (i.e., career decision self-efficacy and work-volition) and the three endogenous variables (ethnic identity, acculturation, and family influence). Finally, the chapter will conclude with the statement of the problem and the research hypotheses.

### 2.1 Clarification of Terms

For the purposes of this text Latinx and Hispanic are used interchangeably. The term Hispanic or Latino is officially used by the U.S. Census Bureau and is defined as an ethnicity, independent of race, consisting of people who identify as Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, South or Central American or any culture originating from Spain (U.S. Census Bureau, 2020). It is important to keep in mind that Latinx individuals often adopt these labels specifically within the U.S. culture, but may also prefer to identify with their national ethnic identity (i.e., Puerto-Rican, Mexican American, Chilean, Peruvian etc.; Song, 2010).
In the case of this work the term *Latinx* is used to account for the intersecting diversity found in this population. Latinx is a contemporary gender-neutral term, inclusive of all genders represented in this population (Ramirez & Blay, 2017; Salinas Jr., & Lozano, 2017). To refer to Anglo-Americans or non-Latinx White Americans, the terms dominant group or dominant culture will be used to highlight the systemic power imbalances in the U.S. that afford privileges and power to this group over Latinx individuals (Furman et al., 2009).

### 2.2 Latinx Young Adults

Latinx adults comprise roughly 16% of the U.S workforce, more than any other ethnic group (U.S. Department of Labor, 2015). According to the U.S. Department of Labor (2015), Hispanics made up 27.3% of the industry sector, 23.1% of the agriculture sector, 22% of the hospitality sector, 11% of public administration, and 12% of education and health sectors combined. Moreover, individuals of Hispanic origin make up only 7% of the science, technology, engineering, mathematics (STEM) workforce (Landivar, 2013). These discrepancies in numbers among the various job sectors highlight the importance of exploring key supports and barriers to Latinx career development particularly during college years when young adults are exploring career options in order to ensure equal access to all career fields.

In 2019, immigrants made-up 17.4% of the total U.S. labor force and Latinx immigrants accounted for half of foreign-born labor force population (U.S. Department of Labor, 2015). While recent Latinx immigration into the U.S is slowing, U.S. born Latinx individuals have been outpacing the growth of other ethnic groups due to higher birth rates among the Latinx community (Livingston, 2019). Therefore, in comparison to the national median for workforce age at 44, the Latinx population has a younger workforce age median at 27 (Coulombe & Gil, 2016). As such, Latinx young adults are projected to account for the largest labor force entry rate
among any other ethnicity group by 2025. Blancero et al. (2018) stated simply that “Latinos are expected to keep America both young and growing” (pp. 5) in the 21st century. Thus, it is imperative that the field of vocational psychology continues to explore factors that contribute to this population’s career development.

**Latinx Young Adults and College Participation**

In general, considering college attendance and navigating academic life is a key developmental goal for many young adults (Krings et al., 2008; Montgomery & Cote, 2003). Research has shown that college attendance and completion may predict successful job entry (Phinney et al., 2006; Torche, 2011). Over the past several decades, Latinx young adults have made important gains in attending and completing college (Aguayo et al., 2011). Latinx enrollment in college in the U.S. has roughly doubled from 9% to 18% between 1996 and 2016. Notably, there is variance among the ethnic Latinx subgroups when it comes to college participation rates, where Cubans, Dominicans, and South Americans are consistently above and Mexicans, Salvadorans, and Guatemalans are consistently below the national average (Musu-Gillette et al., 2016).

Despite the recent gains and within-group differences, research suggests that high school completion and graduate school enrollment in the general Latinx population is still behind that of non-Latinxs (Bauman, 2017; Musu et al., 2016). Recently, researchers have begun to focus on relevant career variables among college attending Latinxs to better understand factors that support and impede college attendance. One such outcome of interest is academic satisfaction (Duffy et al., 2015; Jadidian & Duffy, 2012; Lent & Brown, 2013; Navarro et al., 2019). Previous studies have found academic satisfaction to be predictive of academic persistence (Navarro et al., 2019) and life satisfaction (Ojeda et al., 2011). To that end, academic satisfaction
may be implicated in future positive career outcomes. As Latinx college enrollment increases, continued exploration of specific socio-cultural variables in promoting successful career development despite evident barriers facing this population is warranted.

**Barriers to Latinx Young Adult Career Development**

Despite this increased visibility and education attainment, the discrepancy of existing economic and social disparities facing Latinx people remains concerning. Indeed, Latinx populations continue to be underrepresented in professional leadership roles and STEM fields postgraduation (Blancero et al., 2018; Fouad & Santana, 2017; Guadalupe, 2015). Thus, recent studies have focused on college outcomes variables in order to understand precursors to workforce entry. Research studies have long recognized that Latinx individuals face considerable barriers to both college access and career development. Pew Hispanic Center (2009) statistics reported that while 89% of Latinx high school students indicated that they would pursue a college degree, only 32% enrolled in a college. In her review of literature on barriers to college access, Gonzalez (2015) broke down these obstacles into three distinct categories, 1) systemic, 2) relational, and 3) individual.

**Systemic Barriers**

Systemic barriers, also known as institutional barriers, occur on the macrolevel using entire systems to oppress marginalized groups. For example, in education, schools continuously fail to properly communicate and include Latinx parents and families (Rios-Aguilar & Kiyama, 2012). Furthermore, departments of education have implemented practices that force Latinx students consistently into lower-level courses, through academic tracking (Werblov et al., 2013). Academic tracking has been associated with high school dropout rates among Latinx students who are of lower socioeconomic backgrounds and have Individualized Education Plans
(Werblow et al., 2013). These systemic barriers carry over into adulthood as Latinx individuals apply for college and enter the labor force (Rios-Aguilar & Kiyama, 2012). For example, Latinx employees with the same levels of education and experience are paid less than non-Latinx White counterparts (Mora & Davila, 2018). The authors attribute this discrepancy to systemic failures, specifically the unequal opportunity and distribution of resources. These statistics are further compounded by intersecting factors of identity such as race, SES, gender, and documentation status (Moradi, 2017). That is, darker skinned, lower SES, undocumented, queer, and cisgender female identified Latinx individuals may face additional systemic forces which may in turn create further obstacles for career development (Garriott et al., 2019).

**Relational Barriers**

From the collectivistic orientation of Latinx culture, relational barriers are important to acknowledge and are well documented in the literature particularly as they relate to college preparedness. For example, common Latinx family variables that have been identified as potential challenges to college readiness among young adults in this population include family’s lack of access to information regarding college planning and financial cost as well as limited time and involvement of parents in early education and career decisions due to language barriers and work obligations (Auerbach, 2004; Downs et al., 2008; Gonzalez et al., 2013; Gonzalez & Villalba, 2018, Martinez et al., 2013). Moreover, in Latinx communities, uncertain immigration/legal status, lower parental education levels and family socioeconomic status are prevalent (Gonzalez, 2015). For immigrant Latinx young adults, the desire to go to college may conflict with cultural values of familial commitment and tradition (Dennis et al., 2010). Gonzalez (2015) stipulated that the relational barriers among Latinx first- and second-generation
immigrants may serve to create interpersonal challenges as Latinx individuals pursue personal vocational goals.

**Individual Barriers**

According to Gonzalez (2015), Latinx individuals also face individual barriers to academic readiness for college. Among these barriers, exist the academic implications of English language proficiency requirements for many Latinx adults for whom Spanish is their native language or the predominant language at home (Gloria et al., 2005; Gonzalez, 2015; McWhirter, 1997). In addition, Latinx students face individual psychological barriers due to discrimination and acculturative processes which may contribute to lower levels of self-esteem and motivation when compared to the general U.S. population (Panchanadeswaran & Dawson, 2011). Similarly, instances of discrimination may impact academic readiness (Gonzalez, 2015). Discrimination may occur through the enactments of microaggressions. Microaggressions are everyday slights directed at a marginalized individual, which occur intentionally or unintentionally, that serve to perpetuate the aggressor’s superiority over the individual (Sue et al., 2007). For example, Latinx individuals are often treated as perpetual foreigners regardless of their actual citizen status, and society prescribes to them assumptions of inferior class and intelligence (Nadal et al., 2014; Rivera et al., 2010; Torres & Takning, 2015).

These barriers have negative implications for Latinx young adult career development. In a sample of Latina college and graduate students, Bonifacio et al. (2018) found that greater experiences of microaggressions were related to lower self-efficacy, more negative outcome expectations and less positive outcome expectations. Beyond college, Latinx workers in the corporate workspace face added stress from environments that allow microaggressions to go unchecked (Blancero et al., 2018). To that end, systemic oppression perpetuated on Latinx
communities generate barriers which impede career development. Given the existence of these multilayered and complex barriers, more emphasis is needed on supportive variables (i.e., ethnic identity, acculturation, enculturation, family influence) which may promote positive career outcomes (i.e., academic satisfaction).

**Summary**

Recent demographic trends support the idea that Latinx emerging adults are a significant growing part of the U.S. population and are capable of contributing substantially to the country’s economy and society. Research evidence suggests that young adulthood is a crucial stage of career development. In this period of life, young adults begin to fuse together personal identity (e.g., personality, culture, and interests) with vocational identity (Super, 1994). At the same time empirical research suggests that Latinx young adults face significant systemic barriers to attaining and maintaining meaningful work (Blancero et al., 2018) and fair college experiences (Soto & Deemer, 2018). As the new wave of Latinx young adults make gains in college participation and employment, more emphasis is needed on understanding the factors that promote successful college outcomes such as academic satisfaction. Contemporary career theories like SCCT and PWT are lauded for their consideration of contextual factors that may constrain and promote career development amongst marginalized young adults.

**2.3 Multicultural Career Research**

The study of work has been at the core of the field of counseling psychology since its inception (Blustein, 2006; Borgen, 1991). In the past half-century existing theories of career development have been highly focused on an individualistic understanding of career development (Duffy et al., 2016). For example, person-environment fit theory (Holland, 1997) viewed successful career outcomes as a result of an individual’s ability to make choices that
aligned with their own interests and personality. Other theories have taken a developmental approach to understanding career as a product of maturity (Super, 1994; Gottfredson, 2005), while more recent theories have brought in social cognitive perspective (Lent & Brown, 2013; Lent et al., 1994) and constructivist approaches (Porfeli & Savickas, 2012). One major critique of these theories is that while some may identify contextual and systemic factors in their models, those factors are largely kept at the margins of the conceptualization (Blustein, 2006; Duffy et al., 2016). As such, these aforementioned theories have historically captured a limited experience of career development in predominantly White-European and affluent groups.

A major shift of vocational research in counseling psychology in the 21st century has been its emphasis on multicultural issues important to the career development of groups of color and of lower socioeconomic backgrounds (Fouad & Kozlowski, 2019; Flores et al., 2017). Specifically, the study of cultural variables relevant to marginalized groups (i.e., ethnic identity, acculturation), systemic oppression in the workplace (e.g., microaggressions), and empowerment (i.e., work volition) have been conducted more recently (Allan et al., 2020; Bonifacio et al., 2018; Mejia & Gushue, 2017). Earlier career theories, such as Holland’s theory of career choice (Holland, 1997), do not fully capture the experiences of immigrants, first generation and lower SES populations because of the assumption that vocation is an individualistic choice involving the right person-environment fit. Studies grounded in contemporary theories of career development such as SCCT (Lent et al., 2000) and PWT (Duffy et al., 2016) have tested their generalizability to disenfranchised groups, placing more emphasis on cultural influences and contextual forces impacting career development. The following sections will explore the relevant literature connected with SCCT and PWT and how they have been applied to understanding career development in Latinx populations.
2.4 Social Cognitive Career Theory (SCCT)

SCCT (Lent et al., 1994), an empirically supported contemporary career theory is based on Bandura’s (1986, 1977) social-cognitive theory. Social-cognitive theory takes into account the reciprocal relationships between context, behavior, and self (Bandura, 1986). SCCT theorists applied the bidirectional relationship between environmental and cognitive factors posed in social-cognitive theory to career development (Lent et al., 1994; 2000). In addition, SCCT expanded on Holland’s (1997) theory which viewed career development as a process of best fit between the individual (i.e., their interests and personality) and the work-environment, by considering the individual’s context and precursors to interest. To that end, building off of the earlier career self-efficacy work of Hackett and Betz (1981), SCCT underscored the importance of the following variables: self-efficacy, outcome expectations, choice goals and actions and outlined their interactions with environmental variables in the SCCT Choice Model (Lent et al., 1994; see Appendix I- Figure 1).

According to the Choice Model, one of the several SCCT models, self-efficacy (i.e., the perceived confidence in abilities and skills pertaining to career) contributes to outcome expectations (i.e., perceptions of resulting consequences for a taken action) which together influence career related interests and choices (Lent et al., 1994; Lent & Brown, 2013; see Appendix I- Figure 1). Paths in the model have been supported by studies with different age groups and validated with people of color (Ali & Menke, 2014; Gushue, Clarke, et al., 2006; Lent et al., 2003;). Collectively, scholars argue that SCCT provides the opportunity to account for the multiple levels of influence, from the micro to a macro level.

According to the SCCT framework, person inputs (e.g., personality, race, gender, ethnicity, health status) inform both distal background contextual affordances and proximal
contextual influences on career development. Lent et al. (2003) suggest that distal contextual variables in early childhood and adolescence (e.g., quality of education, social and material resources) form learning experiences that influence career outcomes (i.e., self-efficacy, outcome expectations, goals, and actions). As individuals enter decisive phases of their career development, more proximal influences in the form of contextual supports and barriers (e.g., family influence and ethnic identity) may influence goals and actions. According to the authors, proximal forces may have direct influences on career outcomes or may play a moderating role in the relationship between earlier variables in the model and career outcomes. In other words, for individuals who have greater social support the relationship between self-efficacy and positive career decision actions is hypothesized to be greater than for individuals who experience less social support (Lent et al., 2000; Lent et al., 2001).

**Academic Satisfaction**

Academic or education satisfaction, as a positive career outcome variable, has garnered recent interest in the SCCT literature among college-aged young adult samples (Duffy et al., 2015; Jadidian & Duffy, 2012; Lent & Brown, 2013; Navarro et al., 2019). Its utility as a dependent variable is informed by the crucial link between academic satisfaction and future career outcomes including overall life satisfaction, well-being, and academic persistence (Lent, 2004; Navarro et al., 2019; Wilkins-Yel et al., 2018). In other words, a young adult’s satisfaction with academic choices is associated with increased satisfaction with other aspects of life, overall contentment, and the desire to persevere in their academic endeavors. Moreover, because Latinx college students experience disproportionate barriers to college well-being, Soto and Deemer (2018) note the importance of assessing academic satisfaction as a buffer to harmful effects of
barriers. To that end, academic satisfaction may lead to the successful decisions around areas of study and ultimately to well-adjusted career functioning (Soto & Deemer, 2018).

The study of academic satisfaction derived from the cross-sections of organizational and vocational psychology’s interest in work satisfaction (Lent et al., 2006). Long a focus of industrial-organizational psychology, job satisfaction is described as the positive affective states (e.g., enjoyment) generated by an individual’s career-related experiences and position at work (Rafferty & Griffin, 2009). The construct denotes the extent to which an individual finds pleasure in their work. In vocational psychology, which focuses on individual career outcomes rather than on organizational outcomes, job satisfaction has often been conceptualized either as an outcome variable or as a correlate of work adjustment (Duffy, Bott, et al., 2012; Judge & Bono, 2001; Lent et al., 2006).

Lent and colleagues (2006) expanded on their previous SCCT models (Lent et al., 2003, Lent, 2004) by integrating job satisfaction into a separate model, which illustrated how variables promote and impede its development. Notably, the model (see Appendix J- Figure 2) was applied to the educational context, accounting for development stages of career development, by exploring the role of academic satisfaction (Lent et al., 2007). As with job satisfaction, academic satisfaction describes the pleasure that students derive from their academic roles and experiences. Based on an SCCT perspective, academic satisfaction is positively associated with career-related supports, self-efficacy beliefs, outcome expectations, and goal progress, as well as negatively associated with career-related barriers (Lent, 2004; Lent et al., 2006; 2007). Lent et al.’s (2007) model was first tested on a sample of engineering college students; results showed overall support for the model. Environmental supports, self-efficacy and goal progress were positively associated with academic satisfaction (Lent et al., 2007) such that engineering students
who reported greater social support, endorsed more confidence in their career related skills, and reported progress towards their career goals were more likely to be academically satisfied with their engineering major. The study also included a variable of intended major persistence which was significantly and positively associated with academic satisfaction suggesting that students who were more satisfied with their academic life were more likely to report intentions to persevere with their intended major. Such findings underscore the importance of understanding factors that may promote or hinder academic satisfaction.

The SCCT model for academic satisfaction has since been successfully validated among Latinx young adult populations (Flores et al., 2014; Navarro et al., 2019; Ojeda, et al., 2011). In a sample of Mexican American college attending Hispanic-Serving Institutions (HSIs) Ojeda et al., (2011) found that self-efficacy, outcome expectations and perception of progress toward academic goals were positively associated with academic satisfaction. Moreover, 38% of the variance in academic satisfaction was accounted for by the predictor variables aforementioned as well as additional variables including enculturation, acculturation, and positive self-affect. The model held independent of gender. Similarly, Flores et al. (2014) reported that self-efficacy, outcome expectations, interests and goals were all positively associated with engineering academic satisfaction in a sample of 527 undergraduate students attending HSIs. The SCCT variables accounted for 45% of the variance in academic satisfaction and results did not differ across gender or ethnicity (i.e., Latinx vs. White undergraduate students). Thus, the academic satisfaction model is generalizable to diverse college samples and more specifically Latinx college students.

These findings were corroborated in another comparative study that tested for differences in the relationship between SCCT variables and academic satisfaction among Latinx and White
undergraduate engineering students from predominantly White institutions (PWI) and HSIs (Navarro et al., 2019). Implementing the SCCT model of academic satisfaction, researchers found positive associations between academic satisfaction and supports, person-inputs, self-efficacy, outcome expectations, interests, goal progress and academic engagement. Whereas the model held independent of ethnicity, Navarro and colleagues (2019) found that the type of institution moderated the associations for Latinx students such that the relationship between self-efficacy and academic satisfaction was stronger among Latinx engineering students enrolled in PWIs than those enrolled in HSIs. These findings show the importance of understanding how an individual’s social context (e.g., the salience of their ethnic identity) may promote academic satisfaction given that ethnic representation on a college campus appears to affect the predictive association between the confidence in one’s career abilities and academic satisfaction. Thus far, few studies have focused on academic satisfaction outside of engineering and STEM majors.

**Self-Efficacy**

This review will now examine self-efficacy, a key component of the SCCT model. Self-efficacy is a fundamental construct of Bandura’s (1986) social cognitive theory which provided the framework for SCCT. It is defined as an individual's perceived confidence in their abilities (Bandura, 1986). While highly correlated with self-esteem (Chen et al., 2004; Judge & Bono, 2001) self-efficacy is distinguished from the former construct given that it is understood as the perception of abilities and not self-worth (Bandura, 1986). Hackett and Betz (1981) expanded on social cognition theory by integrating the construct of self-efficacy into the career domain. Career self-efficacy theory came from the study of career barriers that contributed to lower self-efficacy beliefs among women (Betz & Hackett, 2006). Since then, self-efficacy has been
integrated more generally into SCCT as a predictor of various career interests and activities given that it is specific to domain and task (Lent & Brown, 2006; Lent et al., 2007).

Researchers have operationalized self-efficacy in the context of identified career related tasks (e.g., ability to cope with barriers, college preparedness, job and academic skills, and career decision making). For example, graduate school self-efficacy (i.e., confidence in research, academic and social tasks) was associated with eventual pursuit of a graduate degree among first generation, low-income college students (Tate et al., 2015). Similarly, among a sample of rural Latinx adolescents, greater vocational skills self-efficacy was associated with increased aspirations related to attaining future leadership positions and educational pursuits (Ali & Menke, 2014). In addition, career decision self-efficacy (CDSE) has been well-studied, specifically as it pertains to young adults (Betz et al., 1996; Bonifacio, et al., 2018; Kim, Ahn, et al., 2016; Metheny & McWhirter, 2013; Solberg et al., 1994). The following section will provide further rationale for the importance of studying CDSE in young adult samples.

**Career Decision Self-Efficacy**

Donald Super’s theory of career development (1953) informs why confidence in one’s ability to make career decisions is imperative for young adults. According to Super’s lifespan theory (Super, 1980), young adults typically fall within the exploration stage of career development (i.e., typically ages 14-25). Individuals in this stage are actively solidifying their career self-concept and job options according to this theory. Thus, individuals often make important choices regarding their future career paths in young adulthood. These decisions may include whether or not to attend university, choosing an area of study, and deciding work-force entry. As a result of the multitude of decision-making tasks facing young adults in regard to their careers, it is not surprising that that CDSE is a relevant variable of study.
CDSE (Betz & Luzzo, 1996) is defined as the perception of one’s ability to make successful vocational decisions. Promoting CDSE has been highlighted by vocational researchers as imperative for young adults who often are faced with having to make important career choices (Flores et al., 2008; Metheny & McWhirter, 2013). CDSE has been linked to positive career outcomes for diverse populations including Latinx adolescents and young adults. For example, higher levels of CDSE have been associated with greater life satisfaction among Mexican American women (Piña-Watson et al., 2014). The results of the hierarchical regression analysis suggested that in this sample of Mexican American women, increased confidence in their ability to make successful decisions regarding their careers was related to higher overall life satisfaction.

Moreover, Mejia-Smith and Gushue (2017) found that CDSE was negatively associated with the perception of barriers in college-aged Latinx students. In other words, perception of career related obstacles decreased as confidence in career decision making increased among Latinx college students. Additionally, college-aged Latinas who report higher CDSE have been shown to endorse more positive outcome expectations and less negative outcome expectations (Bonifacio et al., 2018). That is to say that college-aged Latinas are more likely to hold positive beliefs about the consequences of their career decisions if they have more confidence in their ability to make career related decisions. Thus, CDSE is considered a necessary variable as it relates to the promotion of positive career outcomes.

In the literature, attention has been given to factors that contribute to the development of CDSE. In their model Lent et al., (1994) propose that contextual variables may serve to promote or inhibit CDSE development. For example, acculturation, ethnic identity and family influence are cultural factors relevant to Latinx research (Hernandez et al., 2011; Mejia-Smith & Gushue,
Summary

Career development research has called for more integrative vocational research, SCCT sits at the forefront of recent empirical studies in this domain. SCCT provides the theoretical framework for the present study through its well-established Choice and Satisfaction models. According to SCCT, positive career related outcomes, such as academic satisfaction among college students, are predicted by a number of vocational constructs. One of these constructs, CDSE, is identified as central to career development in young adults. Informed by the SCCT model, the present study aims to understand the role of individual (i.e., ethnic identity and acculturation) and collectivistic cultural variables (i.e., family influence) in promoting CDSE, and ultimately, academic satisfaction. Additionally, the present study will integrate a second career theory, PWT, into the model in order to engage in the current theoretically integrative discourse in the field of vocational psychology.

2.5 Psychology of Working

Psychology of Working Theory (PWT; Duffy et al., 2016) provides the second piece of the theoretical groundwork for this study. It is a relevant contemporary and empirically supported theory for understanding Latinx career development because it explicitly aims to test variables impacting populations that have been historically left out of career research. PWT is grounded in the earlier conceptualization of Blustein’s (2006) Psychology of Working Framework (PWF). PWF aimed to challenge the existing assumption of previous theories of
career development that depicted it as simply a matter of choice. Moreover, it posits that career choice reflects privileges awarded by systems, which are often not accessible to all. Thus, individuals with marginalized identities may endorse less autonomy over their career paths due to the unjust and oppressive forces they face.

The concept of “decent work” is fundamental to Blustein’s framework (Blustein, 2006; 2008; 2013). Decent work is defined by the authors as occupations which provide secure working conditions, values that match the individual’s personal and social values, adequate health care, and meaningful compensation. For those benefiting from socio-economic privilege, work often is correlated with the talents and personality traits an individual possesses. In contrast, for individuals who must navigate significant economic and social barriers, work may serve as foremost a means of survival. Ideally, Blustein (2008) claims that while work should serve to empower, connect, and provide meaning to one’s life, to disregard the systemic factors that contribute to the disparities of employment in the U.S. is “not sufficient or morally justifiable” (Blustein, 2006; pp. 23).

Blustein (2013) summarized main core facets of PWF as follows: (1) the acquisition of work is a fundamental part of development and has subsequent implications for mental health. (2) Vocational research should be inclusive of all those who can and want to work in society (3) For many individuals, work and non-workspaces are interconnected. (4) To understand the psychological underpinnings of working, more attention must be given to economic, social, political and historical forces that support and impede career development. (5) Work can act as a vehicle for meeting human needs including social connectivity needs, survival and power needs, and self-determination needs. (6) Operationalization of work includes caregiving and other types of work that have not traditionally been socially and economically accepted as such. (7) Finally,
career theories should be given equal weight and be critically applied when exploring the psychological underpinnings of career development and working. To summarize, these tenets highlight Blustein’s (2006; 2008) argument for a more inclusive model of career development which accounts for the experiences of immigrants, working-class individuals and the poor.

The framework was adapted to an empirically testable model known as the Psychology of Working Theory (PWT) by Duffy and colleges (2016). PWT integrates knowledge from multicultural psychology, vocational psychology, intersectionality and sociological elements of work (Duffy et al., 2016). The model specifically aims to describe the career development experiences of those who live in poverty or experience marginalization as a result of discrimination and social injustice. The model depicts factors that contribute and hinder access to decent work which is linked to a host of positive outcome variables. In other words, an individual’s occupation should serve to meet the human necessities related to survival, self-determination and social connectivity. The authors outline several predictor and moderator variables which contribute to the attainment of decent work (see Appendix K- Figure 3). The successful acquisition of decent work is hypothesized to be related to an increased sense of self-determination, social connection, survival needs, work-fulfillment and over all well-being.

PWT identifies several predictors of decent work. Economic constraints, marginalization, work volition, and career adaptability are all hypothesized to affect an individual’s attainment of decent work (Duffy et al., 2016). As discussed in the introduction, economic constraints and experiences of marginalization impact a large number of Latinx individuals living in the U.S. (Gonzalez, 2015). Thus, as implied by the PWT model, Latinx individuals may have less opportunities to acquire decent work. In addition, the model takes into account several moderating variables which influence and are relevant to marginalized populations in career
research. These moderators include internal components (i.e., proactive personality and critical consciousness) and external components (i.e., economic conditions and social support).

More recently, PWT has been applied to college-age and young adult experiences as well. While attendance of an university institution implies educational and financial privilege, for many first-generation students of color there are significant barriers to not only college acceptance, but also well-being and performance once accepted as well as career outcomes available post-graduation (Allan et al., 2020). Allan et al. (2020) describe how college students from privileged cultural backgrounds are often encouraged to have more autonomy over their career decisions and college experiences without having to worry about financial constraints, family ties, and experiences of institutional and personal marginalization. The ability to have a choice (also known as work volition) is predictive of beneficial outcomes for a student's career, academics and well-being (Duffy, Diemer, et al., 2012; Jadidian & Duffy, 2012). Work volition has, in recent years, become a popular variable for understanding the career development of college students within a PWT framework.

**Work-Volition**

Grounded in PWF (Blustein, 2008), work volition was originally operationalized by Duffy et al. (2012). Autin et al., (2017) explained how Blustein (2006) first alluded to the construct of work volition through his challenge of the existing assumption of choice across all other career theories. Blustein (2006) argued that many individuals who are not afforded social privileges are consequently unable to make choices freely as a result of socio-economic barriers. Based on this concept Duffy et al. (2012) identified the variable work volition and created a scale to measure it. It is defined as an individual’s perceived freedom to make choices and decisions related to their career despite presenting barriers. The perception of choice within career
development is influenced by both internal processes and the larger environment. According to the PWT model, work volition is impacted by experiences of marginalization and socio-economic status and is a crucial variable in predicting one’s access to decent work.

Within the PWT model, work volition is conceptualized as a mediator variable of the relationship between person and environmental influences and career outcomes related to decent work (Duffy et al., 2016; Duffy, Diemer, et al., 2012). To that end, several empirical studies testing this proposed mediation hypothesis suggested that economic affordances and systemic privileges may increase attainment of decent work through individuals’ perceived freedom of choice in their career development (Duffy et al., 2016). Recent studies have also explored the importance of work volition in academic outcomes (Duffy, Diemer et al., 2012; Jadidian & Duffy, 2012) and general well-being (Buyukgoze-Kavas et al., 2015). The following sections will integrate recent findings of work volition and its relevance to Latinx college students and the outcome variable academic satisfaction.

**Work Volition and Career-Related Correlates**

Recent studies have tested the relationship between work volition and career-related outcomes in college students (Duffy et al., 2014; Duffy et al., 2015; Duffy et al., 2018; Duffy, Diemer, et al., 2012; Jadidian & Duffy, 2012). In their study which developed the work volition scale, Duffy, Diemer, et al. (2012) found significant correlations between work volition and core self-evaluations (.60), CDSE (.49), career locus of control (.21), and career barriers (-.25) among undergraduate students. These associations indicate that perceiving more freedom of choice may be related to an increase in positive career outcomes and a decrease in the perception of obstacles to career-related goals.
Work volition has also been found to correlate positively with variables from related career theories (i.e., SCCT and Career Constructivist Theory). Jadidian and Duffy (2012) found a strong positive correlation between work volition and CDSE (.51) and a moderate positive correlation with academic satisfaction (.35). A similar integrative study of PWT’s work volition and SCCT variables found a positive relationship between work volition and science self-efficacy among STEM undergraduate students (Duffy et al., 2014). Furthermore, Duffy et al., (2018) reported moderate positive correlations ranging from .30-.37 between work volition and all factors of Porfeli and Savickas’ (2012) career adaptability construct in a sample of employed adults. In other words, among college samples an increased perception of choice in career decisions was linked to more confidence to make those decisions, greater satisfaction with their academic endeavors and an increased ability to adapt to work-related transitions and barriers in employed adults. These findings suggest an important overlap between popular career theory variables and the positive implications of work volition for young adults’ career development.

**Work Volition and People of Color**

For individuals of marginalized or oppressed backgrounds (e.g., sexual minorities, people of color, immigrants) the assumption that one has the freedom to choose their vocation must be made with caution (Blustein, 2008; Duffy et al., 2016). The majority of studies on work volition among college samples have been conducted with predominantly White or European American students (Bouchard & Nauta, 2018; Duffy et al., 2014; Duffy et al., 2015 Jadidian & Duffy, 2012; Pesch et al., 2016). In one study that was able to compare across ethnic groups, Jadidian and Duffy (2012) found ethnicity to moderate the relationship between work volition and academic satisfaction such that the relationship was stronger for the White students when compared with students of color. These findings corroborate Duffy et al.’s (2016) theory which
posits that communities with social privilege have greater sense of choice throughout their career path and are more likely to report positive outcomes as a result of this freedom.

More recent longitudinal studies have found similar associations when considering economic privilege (Autin et al., 2017; Allan et al., 2020). Aligned with the main hypotheses of PWT, students from higher socio-economic backgrounds were more likely to report increased levels of work volition across a six-month time span than students from lower socio-economic backgrounds, which in turn was associated with more career adaptability over time (Autin et al., 2017). Additionally, Allan et al. (2020) found that college students who perceive themselves to have fewer economic resources were more likely to report lower levels of work volition. Together these studies are indicative of the role social and economic privilege play in promoting work volition. Nevertheless, it is noteworthy that few studies have explored work volition among college students of color exclusively, and to date none has explored work volition in a Latinx identified student sample. Given that work volition is such a powerful predictor of positive career outcomes in young adults, more exploration is necessary to understand the factors that promote work volition among Latinx students.

In the few studies that focus on work volition and people of color, several factors that promote and mitigate work volition among marginalized groups have been considered. In a large sample of racial-ethnic minority identified employed adults (the largest representation consisted of roughly 35% Black/African American and 30% Hispanic/Latinx-American identified participants), researchers explored the relationship between marginalization and economic resources with decent work obtainment by way of work volition (Duffy et al., 2018). The study found a direct negative association between marginalization and a direct positive association between economic resource and work volition. Furthermore, corroborating previous studies with
predominantly White samples, work volition was found to have a direct positive association with both career adaptability and decent work among a sample of racial-ethnic minority individuals. Support for the indirect association between marginalization, economic resources and decent work by way of work volition was also reported. Duffy et al.’s (2018) findings highlight the significance of promoting work volition among ethnically diverse populations, especially given its role in mediating the relationship between economic resources and decent work.

Recent cross-cultural studies have tested parts of PWT model in Korean college students. These studies underscore important similarities and differences that implicate cultural considerations within this model. In a sample of Korean undergraduates, social support was positively related to work volition and work volition mediated the relationship between social support and occupational engagement (Kim, Kim et al., 2016). In other words, individuals who reported having more social support were more likely to report higher levels of choice in their occupational development, and in turn reported higher engagement in career search-related activities. In a study that compared the application of PWT to Korean and U.S. college students, Kim et al. (2019) found that the model generally fit both undergraduate populations with some cultural differences. For instance, perceptions regarding decent work were negatively related to occupational engagement for the Korean sample only, while the relationship between economic resources and career-outcomes variables was only significant among the U.S. sample (Kim et al., 2019). That is to say, the U.S.’s values of capitalism and individualism may influence the impact of economic resources and career choice on career outcomes. These studies indicate that cross-cultural nuances exist in the application of PWT and should be considered for the Latinx population.
Only one recent qualitative study to date has focused on applying PWT to an exclusively Latinx sample (Autin et al., 2018). This study used CQR to interview 12 Latinx adults who received Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA), a policy that gives undocumented immigrants who arrived in the U.S. as children accessibility to a working permit, social security number, and driver’s license. The goal of the study was to explore supports and barriers to work volition. Across the sample, participants reported that economic strain and limited mobility was a significant challenge to work volition while social support, institutional support and public policy changes promoted work volition. These findings highlight how work volition may vary with the life experiences faced by Latinx individuals, especially in the socio-economic domain. Moreover, it highlights the importance of social support including supportive family influence in conjunction with larger systemic resources as promoters of work volition. To date, no study has looked at work volition using quantitative methods with Latinx emerging young adults.

Summary

PWT provides a complimentary theoretical framework to SCCT for the present study. Its criticism of the earlier theoretical assumption of choice in career decisions and its emphasis on the diversity make it a useful theory for understanding Latinx career development. Specifically, for Latinx young adults, work volition, defined as the freedom to make career decisions, may be influenced by specific cultural factors (i.e., acculturative processes, ethnic identity, and family influence). which in turn may have implications for their academic satisfaction. The recent creation of a testable PWT model (Duffy et al., 2016) and validation of the work volition scale (Duffy, Diemer, et al., 2012) have resulted in an increase in empirical research of this domain. This study aims to apply work volition within a SCCT model in order to understand its role in the development of academic satisfaction for a Latinx college sample.
2.6 Intersection of SCCT and Psychology of Working

Recently, vocational psychology scholars have encouraged the integration of relevant career theories in empirical studies (Lent & Brown, 2013; Duffy et al., 2014). In their theoretical paper, Duffy et al. (2016) noted areas of overlap between psychology of working theory and SCCT particularly in their recognition of social support and context. Thus, both blend well in informing hypotheses around family influence. Furthermore, Duffy et al. (2014) explored work volition within an SCCT framework in a sample of college students. In this study work volition was found to correlate with all SCCT variables which provides preliminary support for the integration of these theory driven constructs (Duffy et al., 2014). Moreover, work volition was found to moderate the relationship between career self-efficacy and outcome expectations as well as career self-efficacy and goals such that the relationship between self-efficacy and SCCT outcomes would be stronger among students with lower volition. This unexpected finding suggests that when work volition is low, confidence in career abilities may be a more important variable in predicting career outcome expectations and goals. These preliminary findings highlight the need for more theoretically integrative research in the field of career counseling.

2.7 Cultural Factors Impacting Career Identity

The following sections will define and explore four cultural variables relevant to Latinx career development. Given that both SCCT and PWT include cultural influences on individual career experiences, the present study will address ethnic identity, acculturation, enculturation and family influence. Ethnic identity, acculturation and enculturation are significant individual processes in the lives of immigrants and people of color (Leong & Chou, 1994; Roysircar & Maestas, 2002; Schwartz et al., 2007). As Latinx young adults often lay at the intersections of these two marginalized identities these constructs will be included in order to better understand
how personal inputs related to culture may impact academic satisfaction. In addition, a recent measure of career related family influence (Fouad et al., 2010) will be considered in order to include a collectivistic dimension which is often present for Latinx young adults navigating college and career decisions. The following sections will present a rationale for the importance of each construct to Latinx young adult career development and highlight important literature for each variable.

2.8 Ethnic Identity

Counseling psychologists have focused on ethnicity, race, and cultural identity as a significant variable of study in vocational research in both adolescents and young adults (Bonifacio et al., 2018; Gushue & Whitson, 2006b; Leong & Chou, 1994; Perron et al., 1998). However, the delineation of ethnicity from race and culture has posed a challenge for scholars across anthropology, sociology and psychology (Chandra, 2006; Isajiw, 1993; Quintana, 2007). Helms and Talleyrand (1997) underscored the importance of distinguishing race from ethnicity. From their perspective, while race refers to socially constructed categories based on phenotypic attributes (e.g., skin color), ethnicity encompasses a wider array of cultural attributes including nationality, language and immigration history (Horowitz, 1985; Phinney, 2006).

Antiquated definitions of ethnicity originated in the field of anthropology and sociology (Geertz, 1963; Isaacs, 1975; Stack, 1986). These fields viewed ethnicity as a fixed group identity that was defined at birth and remained permanent across the lifespan. The U.S. government’s official use of race and ethnicity has contributed to the ambiguity surrounding its definition (Quintana, 2007). On the U.S. census, explicit racial categories are applied to White, Black, Asian, and Native Americans while only one ethnic category exists for Hispanic/Latinos.
Psychology has begun to give more attention to the socially constructed factors that influence the construct of ethnicity and sense of ethnic identity.

Within psychology, ethnic identity is considered a multifaceted and dynamic construct which describes the psychological, social and cognitive connection people form with their ethnic group (Phinney, 1998; 2006; Phinney & Ong, 2007). Ethnic identity includes exploration of cultural values and commitment to community networks or religious affiliations which contribute to an individual’s self-concept (Phinney, 1992). The construct is rooted in social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1986) which posited that individuals endeavor to form positive connections with their group identity. To that end, an individual’s ethnic identity is a result of a sense of security and pride in their ethnic group membership (Phinney et al., 2006).

Phinney (1993) conceptualizes three distinct stages of ethnic identity development which include exploration, resolution, and affirmation. Ethnic identity exploration describes the extent to which an individual searches for information and connection with their ethnic background. Ethnic identity resolution is characterized by the degree to which an individual draws a clear sense of meaning from their ethnic identity. Finally, Umaña-Taylor et al. (2015) assert that the final stage of ethnic identity development describes the emotional attachment, specifically the positive affect an individual develops toward their ethnic identity. Thus, having a more developed ethnic identity reflects not only a firmer self-identification with that ethnic group but also positive engagement and sense of belonging with one’s ethnic culture through practice and affirmation (e.g., for Latinx people this may include commitment to learning Latinx traditions and customs, attachment with Latinx community, and endorsement of cultural values). In contrast, Phinney (1992) suggests that, possessing lower levels of ethnic identity may reflect a “lack of clarity” (pp. 161) or less commitment and engagement with your ethnic group.
**Ethnic Identity a Developmental Perspective**

Ethnic identity plays an important role in emerging adulthood (Phinney, 2006; Syed & Mitchell, 2016). In parallel with Erik Erikson’s (1968) model of ego identity, ethnic identity formation among part of a developmental process. Ego identity development occurs across the life span but is most significant in adolescence and emerging adulthood (Erikson, 1968). During these stages, individuals are engaged in active searching and defining of their self-concept (Super, 1994). According to his model, Erikson (1968) posits that two key processes, exploration and commitment in adolescence and young adulthood, result in identity stability. Moreover, identity stability is characterized by consistency in an individual’s opinions, attitudes, and goals as well as their life choices (Duffy & Klingaman, 2009).

Over the years there have been several developmental models of ethnic identity specifically developed for ethnic and racial minority groups in the U.S. (Cross, 1971; Cross & Vandiver, 2001; Phinney, 1990; Sellers et al., 1998; Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Phinney (1990)’s developmental model has been the most commonly used in ethnic identity studies (Quintana, 2007; Syed et al., 2013). Based on the work of Erikson (1968) and Marcia (1966) on ego identity which stressed the importance of commitment and exploration, Phinney (1990) outlined parallel phases pertaining to ethnic identity development. In this model an individual begins at the pre-encounter phase characterized by minimal interest or commitment to one’s ethnic group. In this stage an individual's perception of their ethnic group is heavily influenced by others rather than their own opinions. The following stage known as, *moratorium*, describes individuals who engage in active exploration of, but have not reached commitment to, their ethnic identity. Finally, the developmental model, similar to ego identity, concludes with achieved ethnic
identity. According to Phinney (1990) an individual who has achieved ethnic identity has reached clarity and developed confidence in their personal sense of ethnicity.

In summary, ethnic identity development occurs through the exploration of and commitment to one’s ethnic cultural heritage which parallels the development of general identity (Duffy & Klingaman, 2009; Ontai-Grzebik & Rafaelli, 2004). Initially, the developmental focus of ethnic identity was explored within adolescence (Huang & Stormshak, 2011; Kiang et al., 2010; Quintana, 1998). More recently, studies support the importance of ethnic identity examination among young adult populations as well (Arnett 2004; 2006; Umaña-Taylor et al., 2014; Syed, 2010). Young adults possess more stable cognitive abilities (e.g., executive functioning) which may allow for more developed and nuanced reflection on their ethnic identity and how it interacts with other identities they hold (Quintana, 1998; Syed, 2010; Umaña-Taylor et al., 2014). Thus, individuals in emerging adulthood may internalize values and characteristics prescribed by their ethnic group membership (Cross & Cross, 2008).

One longitudinal study among Black, Latinx, Asian American and White college students found that exploration of ethnic identity increased across all four years of undergraduate study (Syed & Mitchell, 2016). As such, Duffy and Klingaman (2009) underscore how young adult’s ethnic identity exploration often occurs simultaneously with vocational identity and the developmental task of career decision making. Indeed, for immigrant emerging adults and young adults of color ethnic identity may play a more significant role than for young adults within dominant groups (Syed & Mitchell, 2016).

**Importance of Ethnic Identity for People of Color**

Ethnic identity development is considered to be a significant and normative factor within adolescence and emerging adulthood as it pertains to marginalized groups including people of
Several longitudinal and cross-sectional studies have found an increase over time of ethnic identity exploration among individuals of color beginning in adolescence (Pahl & Way, 2006; Quintana & Vera, 1999; Whitesell et al., 2006). Quintana (2007) articulated that for racial-ethnic minority adolescents, ethnic identity development helps affirm positive group affiliation and prepare the individual to navigate oppressive systems. Quintana (2007) listed several assumptions of ethnic identity development among people of color. One key assumption identified is that experiences of discrimination promote ethnic identity exploration among individuals of color (Pahl & Way, 2006). Research demonstrates that increased exploration and commitment to ethnic identity may protect people of color from internalizing prejudice (Hipolito-Delgado, 2016). Thus, for immigrants and people of color who are exposed to higher rates of prejudice, ethnic identity becomes a salient aspect of their psycho-social development.

For immigrant groups, ethnic identity plays an important role as immigrants may have to manage their home culture identity within a new dominant host culture. Phinney et al., (2001) described how, for immigrants, external pressures from the new society may influence the way immigrants maintain connections to their heritage culture. To that end, in host societies that encourage diversity, immigrants are more likely to endorse a strong ethnic identity as it relates to their home culture. On the other hand, ethnic identity will be lower among immigrants that feel pressure to assimilate to the dominant culture (Phinney et al., 2001).

Drawing from Social Identity Theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979) which posited that developing a sense of group identity contributes to a developed self-concept, ethnic identity has been linked to higher levels of self-esteem among ethnic minorities (Phinney et al., 2001; Quintana, 2007). In their longitudinal study with a sample of Asian American 9th graders, Stein
et al. (2014) found that ethnic identity exploration was linked to greater self-esteem and less depressive symptoms in the long-term. The positive relationship between ethnic identity exploration and self-esteem has been corroborated in studies with other groups of color including indigenous groups (Corenblum, 2014), Latinx adolescents (Umaña-Taylor et al., 2009), and Black Americans (Tynes et al., 2012). Furthermore, among acculturating immigrants, ethnic identity has been linked to more positive psychological well-being (Ojeda et al., 2012; Phinney et al., 2001). In addition, in a large sample of college students of color, ethnic identity participation was found to be positively related to well-being (Syed et al., 2013).

**Latinx Ethnic Identity**

Many Latinx young adults lay in the intersections of multiple marginalized identities (e.g., ethnic and immigrant status). As such, ethnic identity is considered an important variable for this population (Cislo, 2008; Umaña-Taylor et al., 2015). Ethnic identity *affirmation* (i.e., the positive emotions associated with one’s ethnic identity) often increases between the ages of 15-19 years old (Umaña et al., 2009). Portes and Rumbaut (2001) identified four types of ethnic identities taken on by Latinx individuals ranging from more closely tied to national origins to more related to U.S. identity. These four include (1) national origin (i.e., identifying as solely Mexican, Guatemalan, (2) hyphenated identity (e.g., Mexican American, Guatemalan-American) (3) by race or ethnic group (e.g., Hispanic, Latinx), (4) solely American. For Latinx immigrants, ethnic identity may look different for first generation versus second generation immigrants.

Feliciano (2009) conducted a longitudinal study among Latinx and Caribbean youth from adolescence to adulthood to explore changes in ethnic identity identification. The study found that ethnic identities change significantly over time. In a sample of 1, 768 second-generation Latinx and Caribbean immigrants, 75% reported a change in their ethnic identity. Within those
who changed, 33% reported the changes occurring both in adolescence and adulthood. Specifically, adolescents who identified as only American were most likely to change their identity later. Those who shifted their ethnic identity were more likely to change to hyphenated identifications to include their Latin heritage. These findings support the salience of ethnic identity for Latinx adolescents and adults over time. Moreover, it underscores the developmental shift from identifying with the host culture or identities prescribed to by the host culture towards a more nuanced ethnic identity.

Multiple studies have found positive correlations between ethnic identity and self-esteem among Hispanic Americans (Cislo, 2008; Umaña-Taylor et al., 2015; Umaña-Taylor & Updegraff, 2007). Across genders, Umaña-Taylor and Updegraff (2007) found that ethnic identity was related to higher self-esteem in Latinx adolescents. In another study, Cislo (2008) reported within-group differences across Latinx nationalities (i.e., Cuban and Nicaraguan) in the relationship between ethnic identity and self-esteem. In the sample of Cuban and Nicaraguan young adults, stronger ethnic identity was more prevalent among Cubans than Nicaraguans. Moreover, the positive link between ethnic identity and self-esteem only held for Cubans but not Nicaraguans, where self-esteem was negatively correlated with ethnic identity (Cislo, 2008). These within-group differences in the Latinx categorization highlight how constructs like ethnic identity might differ depending on social class, geographic location, and social power. In a more recent study Umaña-Taylor et al. (2015) found support for ethnic identity’s role as a protective variable against the negative outcomes of discrimination (e.g., lower self-esteem). Additionally, Latino adult’s ethnic identity resolution was significantly associated with a reduction of psychological distress as a result of discrimination (Torres et al., 2011). Together, these studies highlight the importance of ethnic identity for Latinxs nearing adulthood.
There is no dearth of research highlighting the importance of ethnic identity for Latinx adolescents and emerging adults. It is an important developmental component of education and career development. To that end, Duffy and Klingaman (2009) posited that the relationship between ethnic identity and self-concept may underlie its positive associations with career outcomes, insofar as ethnic identity is associated with a clearer sense of self-concept which may in turn solidify vocational identity, confidence in career choices and more exploration.

**Ethnic Identity in Career Development**

Including measures of ethnic identity has been a growing focus of vocational and counseling research, given its social and psychological impact on adolescents and young adults of color (Bonifacio et al., 2018; Gushue & Whitson, 2006b; Lee et al., 2017). For young adults who pursue a college degree, the university environment has been described by researchers as an opportunity for identity exploration (Phinney, 2006). For example, students may find opportunities to take classes on their ethnic heritage, language or engage and form clubs that center on ethnic identity. Additionally, Phinney (2006) posited that the vast new experiences that characterize young adulthood (i.e., occupation choice, living decisions, and new interpersonal relationships) jumpstart identity development and exploration.

Initially, research on ethnic identity within career development centered on its association with vocational identity, vocational maturity and career goals (Carter & Constantine, 2000; Jackson & Neville, 1998; Leong & Chou, 1994). Specifically, Jackson and Neville (1998) have found that a more developed racial identity in Black college students is associated with increased career goal setting. In addition, among Black and Asian American college students, racial/ethnic identity was linked to more community-oriented life roles and increased career maturity in each of the populations respectively (Jackson & Neville, 1998). Parallel studies of racial identity
provide support for the influence of race and awareness of the racial climate on individual career choice (Helms & Piper, 1994). In a more recent study in a sample of Black college students, ethnic identity development was found to moderate the relationship between racism-related stress and college career aspirations (Johnson & Arbona, 2006). For Black students who had a less developed sense of ethnic identity, racial stress was associated with fewer career aspirations. In contrast, for students who had a more developed sense of ethnic identity, stress caused by racism predicted more career aspirations such that ethnic identity appeared to serve as a protective factor against psychological and social stressors that are harmful for people of color (Johnson & Arbona, 2006). These researchers suggested that a greater sense of ethnic identity may contribute to an individual forming a clearer sense of career interests, outcome expectations and self-efficacy.

More recently, ethnic identity has been integrated in contemporary career models like SCCT (Bonifacio et al., 2018; Mejia & Gushue et al., 2017). The SCCT model and its emphasis on sociocultural influences on career development lends itself to the study of the specific role of ethnic identity on individual career development in that ethnic identity is an individual perception of a larger social identity. Ethnic identity has been integrated into the SCCT model as a person-input which integrates social contextual influences (Bonifacio et al., 2018; Gushue, 2006). It has thus, been implicated in relationships with vocational outcomes including career self-efficacy, career outcome expectations, and perceptions of supports and barriers among college students of color (Bonifacio et al., 2018; Gloria & Hird, 1999; McWhirter et al., 1998; Mejia-Smith & Gushue, 2017). Indirect associations between ethnic identity and outcome expectations by way of CDSE have been found in Black and Latinx high school samples (Gushue, 2006; Gushue, Scanlan et al., 2006). In other words, individuals who have an increased
sense of ethnic identity report perceiving more positive consequences about their career interests and decisions. Ethnic identity’s association with CDSE is a driving force for its relationship with career outcomes.

**Ethnic Identity and Career Decision Self-Efficacy**

Several studies have found support for a positive relationship between ethnic identity and CDSE among college-aged samples (Bonifacio et al., 2018; Gushue, 2006; Lewis et al., 2018; Mejia-Smith & Gushue, 2017). Consistent with the theoretical understanding of the importance of cultural variables on vocational development, Gushue (2006) found that among Latinx high school students’ ethnic identity was positively related to CDSE. These findings provide initial support for the hypothesis that an ability to form an integrated sense of cultural identity may also lead to more confidence in one’s ability to make career related decisions. Similarly, more recent findings by Mejia-Smith and Gushue (2017) and Bonifacio et al. (2018) support the positive influence that ethnic identity has on CDSE development in Latinx college students. While Mejia-Smith and Gushue (2017) found a direct positive link between ethnic identity and the perception of career related barriers, they also found that ethnic identity was associated with increased CDSE which in turn was negatively associated with perception of career related barriers. In other words, the promotion of CDSE through a more salient ethnic identity may buffer the direct effect that ethnic identity may have on the perception of career related barriers. Interestingly, reportedly higher integrated ethnic identity in Latinx college students was found to be positively correlated to negative outcome expectations regarding career pursuits and yet, it was also positively associated with CDSE (Bonifacio et al., 2018). The authors explain that while Latinx college students who endorse higher sense of ethnic identity may possess a greater awareness of systemic barriers which may in turn lead to higher perception of career related obstacles, they
may also make an adequate appraisal of these challenges and thus, develop greater confidence in their ability to make appropriate career decisions. To summarize it has been fairly consistent in the literature that ethnic identity may promote CDSE for Latinx populations.

Additionally, CDSE also plays a mediating role in the indirect relationships that ethnic identity has with other career outcome variables. Among a sample of Black and Latina high school girls, CDSE fully mediated the association between ethnic identity and traditionally gendered career choice goals (Gushue & Whitson, 2006b). In other words, Black and Latina girls who reported higher levels of ethnic identity were more likely to also report greater confidence in their own ability to make career decisions, which in turn was associated with vocational goals in male dominated fields. Similarly, Mejia-Smith and Gushue (2018) found that CDSE played a mediating role in the relationship between ethnic identity and career barriers among Latinx college students such that a more positive endorsement of ethnic identity was related to more confidence in the ability to make career related decision and thus, fewer perception of career-related barriers. However, when barriers were conceptualized as negative outcome expectations, higher ethnic identity was indirectly related to more perception of career barriers through CDSE (Bonifacio et al., 2018). Bonifacio et al. (2018) found that CDSE, supported by ethnic identity, was associated with positive outcome expectations. In summary not only is the link between CDSE and ethnic identity well established in the literature but it’s indirect role in the promotion of related career outcomes has also been supported.

Summary

Developing a sense of ethnic identity is a key process for many Latinx young adults. Ethnic identity is defined as the positive affiliations an individual forms with their ethnic group. The reviewed literature has supported the benefits of ethnic identity endorsement and subsequent
career outcomes among Latinx young adults. Specifically, a more developed and positive relationship with one’s ethnic identity may be indicative of more solidified sense of self that may contribute to a young adult’s sense of confidence in their ability to make career decisions, have control over their careers and ultimately contribute to their college satisfaction. Whereas ethnic identity’s influence on Latinx adolescent academic performance has been previously studied (Grindal & Nieri, 2015; Supple et al., 2006;), less is known about how ethnic identity influences Latinx academic satisfaction in young adults attending college. This study hopes to expand on literature by exploring how ethnic identity may impact CDSE and ultimately academic satisfaction for a sample of Latinx adults.

2.9 Acculturation

As with ethnic identity, studies have shown that acculturative processes including both acculturation and enculturation are important to consider for Latinx individuals (Arbona, 1995; Berry et al., 2006). This section will outline the theoretical underpinnings of a bidirectional understanding of acculturation (i.e., acculturation and enculturation) and its relevance to Latinx young adults, and its role in influencing career outcomes.

Theory of Acculturation

Acculturation has been defined as the dynamic process resulting from the interaction between a dominant host culture and an individual’s heritage culture (Berry, 1997; 2001). Culture has been defined by acculturation researchers as a collective understanding and traditions of a group of people (Schwartz et al., 2010; Shore, 2002; Triandis, 1995). In the literature, acculturation often focuses on migrant populations including immigrants and their descendants (Mainous et al., 2008; Portes & Rumbaut, 2001; Schwartz et al., 2006).
Berry’s (1980; 2001) model of acculturation added to the complexity of society’s understanding of immigration which traditionally accepted assimilation as the norm, where immigrants engaged in a linear adaptation of new culture and distancing of their heritage culture. In contrast, the bi-dimensional model identifies four process outcomes related to acculturation along two different spectrums -- ways in which immigrants and their families choose to relate to their host culture versus their cultures of origins (Berry et al., 2006). The processes are organized across two axes, one for the heritage culture and one for the host culture. Each represents a range of orientation from accepting to rejecting. If a Latinx individual falls on the positive side of the heritage culture axis this would indicate more integration of Latinx cultural behaviors and values while falling on the negative side of the host culture axis signifies a rejection of U.S. culture.

The two axes break down into four quadrants, each named for one kind of acculturative process. First, assimilation, is defined by the desire to leave behind the home culture entirely in order to adopt and fit in completely to the host culture. Separation on the other hand, is the complete maintenance of the home culture through intentional isolation from the dominant culture. Marginalization is defined by the loss of home culture and yet, an inability to adapt to the new culture (Berry, 2001). Finally, integration also known as biculturalism is the ability to hold onto aspects of the heritage culture while also adapting to life in the host culture. Berry’s model does not view acculturation as an individual process alone, but rather recognizes the group and society’s response in his model of acculturation (Berry, 2001). For example, the host culture’s treatment and reaction to immigrant groups influences their acculturative process (e.g., discrimination). Moreover, social policies that are enacted by the dominant culture can establish acculturative expectations for immigrants in terms of obtaining citizenship, housing, and healthcare. Those who are unable to meet the social expectations of the dominant culture, may
tend to separate or risk marginalization from both cultures with negative psychological outcomes (Morrison & James, 2009). The U.S., historically, was characterized as a melting pot endorsing the expectation that all immigrants attempt to blend into the dominant American culture. On the other hand, a multicultural society, supports and advocates for symbiotic relationships between immigrant’s heritage culture and their new host culture. Segregation and exclusion are linked to the earlier defined processes of separation and marginalization respectively, where the receptive society uses oppressive forces to isolate and differentiate immigrant groups (Berry, 2001).

Since its development, researchers within counseling psychology have expanded the model of acculturation to include a multidimensional definition (Schwartz et al., 2010). These authors note that while acculturation occurs across receiving and heritage cultures for immigrants, the different components of acculturation may change at different rates and not linearly as initially proposed. The components include behavioral, value, and identity aspects of acculturation. One illustrative example of this is language acquisition which for many years was a dominant measure of acculturation in non-English speaking immigrants. A push away from language competence as sole measure of acculturation came when Unger et al., (2007) found that language explained only 20% of the variance in behavioral and value-based acculturation. In other words, while some immigrants may learn and speak English as they adapt to living in the U.S., their behaviors regarding social affiliations, cultural customs and values may be indicators of ways they maintain their heritage culture over their dominant culture. The process of maintaining one’s heritage culture is known as enculturation (Weinreich, 2009). As theoretical conceptualizations of acculturation have expanded to account for its complexities, studies have found contrasting results in regard to the psychological implications of acculturation.
Berry’s model of acculturation recognizes that acculturation and enculturation may have different implications for different immigrant groups, irrespective of their ethnic background. Generation level of immigration impacts acculturation to the dominant culture for most immigrant families, where first-generation individuals are less acculturated and more enculturated than future generations (Rumbaut, 2008). Berry (2001) also recognized the nuances of diverse motivations for migrating, identifying the following categories: voluntary immigrants, refugees, asylum seekers, and sojourners. Thus, acculturation processes may differ in response to the reasons for immigrations. Acculturation in particular is closely tied to the development, maintenance, and change in ethnic identity for immigrant groups. In the present times, most acculturation and immigration literature focus on the acculturation processes of non-European immigrants of color who have tended to resist pressures to assimilate (Schwartz et al., 2010).

The impact of acculturation and enculturation may be greater on marginalized groups, specifically racial and ethnic minorities (Berry, 2001). Racial oppression and discrimination may push some immigrants to distance themselves from their heritage, while pushing others to preserve their threatened sense of ethnic identity through enculturation (Rumbaut, 2008). Thus, acculturation processes has drawn greater attention among Latinx immigrants in the U.S. in recent years (Lee et al., 2017).

**Acculturation, Enculturation and the Latinx Population**

Across generations of Latinx individuals living in the U.S., acculturation patterns may differ (Cuéllar et al., 1995; Lessenger, 1997). More recently, Aguayo et al. (2011) found that immigrant generational status significantly correlated with higher acculturation and lower enculturation among a sample of Mexican American college students such that U.S. born Latinx identified individuals are more likely to endorse more U.S. cultural values and less Latinx ones.
In addition, among Latinx individuals an integrated form of acculturation may look like an adoption of some aspects of U.S. culture while also maintaining more traditional values from their Latin American country (i.e., simultaneous enculturation). For example, a Latinx identified individual may use English as their dominant language and endorse individualistic and capitalist values in the workspace while also maintaining Latino customs such as *familismo* (commitment to family), *respeto* (respect) for elders and speaking Spanish at home (Blancero et al., 2018; Gomez et al., 2001; Mejia & Gushue, 2017). Latinx focused research has found conflicting consequences of acculturation. Adaptation to a new culture as an immigrant ethnic minority can add undue stress and result in negative health outcomes (Cervantes et al., 2015; Sanchez et al., 2010). Discrimination, hostility and lack of support from the receptive culture add acculturative stress that increase health risks for immigrant populations (Rudmin, 2009). For example, greater levels of acculturation were associated with more substance abuse among Latinx adolescents (Fosados et al., 2007) and increased likelihood of engaging in risky sexual behavior (Deardorff et al., 2010).

On the other hand, psychological and cognitive benefits have also been linked to acculturative processes among Latinx populations. Specifically, enculturation, where the individuals seek to maintain their Latinx culture has been linked to health benefits over acculturating to the U.S. culture (Torres, 2010). Torres (2010) found that an individual who held a more Latinx bound orientation to their acculturative process were more likely to be protected against symptoms of depression. Similarly, enculturation has shown benefits within the career domain (Ojeda et al., 2011). Thus, researchers make an argument for the development of bicultural or integrated identity, through simultaneous engagement in acculturative and enculturative processes (Chen et al., 2008). Bicultural identity was predictive of better life
satisfaction among first generation Latinx immigrants (Marsiglia et al., 2013). Within career development, bicultural identity has been considered to be an asset for Latinx professionals (Ojeda et al., 2011; Blancero et al., 2018).

**Acculturation and Enculturation in Career Research**

Only recently has vocational research increasingly looked at the impact of acculturation on career development among Latinx individuals (Flores et al., 2008; Mejia-Smith & Gushue 2017; Ojeda et al., 2011). A majority of these studies have used Cuéllar et al.’s (1995) Acculturation Rating Scale for Mexican Americans-II (ARSMA-II) that accounts for both acculturation towards U.S. culture and enculturation towards Latinx culture. It has since been adapted recently for the Latinx population more broadly (Céspedes & Huey, 2008; Mejia-Smith & Gushue, 2017).

In accordance with Lent et al.’s (2001) recommendation, researchers that ground their studies in SCCT have conceptualized acculturation as a person-input in the model (Flores et al., 2008; Mejia-Smith & Gushue, 2017). As such, it may directly and indirectly affect career outcomes in the traditional SCCT model. To that end, Padilla and Perez (2003) noted that intersectionality and social cognition must be addressed in the understanding of acculturation especially for a population for whom language differences and skin color may expose the population to stigma and microaggressions.

Building off of earlier research (Flores et al., 2006; McWhirter et al., 1998), Flores et al., (2008) found a positive association between acculturation toward U.S. culture, educational goal expectations, and aspiration among Mexican high school students. The authors posit that a degree of comfort with the U.S. values and social norms may lend itself well to visualizing goals and anticipating positive consequences of attending university in the U.S. To date no study has
looked explicitly at acculturation and its effect on academic satisfaction in a Latinx college sample.

The associations between acculturation and career self-efficacy domains are varied in the literature. Several studies have found that acculturation does not predict nontraditional career self-efficacy among Latina girls (Flores & O’Brien, 2002; Rivera et al., 2007). Yet, other studies have found a positive relationship between U.S. oriented acculturation and CDSE (Flores et al., 2006; Flores et al., 2008; Mejia & Gushue, 2017). In addition, a more recent study with a Latinx college sample found that greater levels of U.S. orientation in acculturation was associated with increased CDSE (Mejia & Gushue, 2017). These findings corroborated an earlier study which explored the relationship of both acculturation, enculturation and CDSE. In their path model, Ojeda et al. (2011) found that both acculturation and enculturation subscales positively related to college self-efficacy, and only U.S. oriented acculturation was positively related to college outcome-expectations. These findings support the idea that while adopting aspects of U.S. culture may help adapt to a college setting, biculturalism or the orientation to both heritage and dominant culture may increase one’s confidence in their ability to succeed in college which in turn may indirectly affect academic goals, satisfaction and life satisfaction.

Notable within-group differences have also been highlighted in recent findings. Aguayo et al. (2011) found that among immigrant Mexican women in college, only enculturation and not acculturation was related to college performance, and this relationship did not hold true for U.S. born immigrants. In a sample of Mexican American 7th grade students, gender differences in the association between acculturation and enculturation were found. Specifically, girls tend to report higher levels of both acculturation and enculturation than boys (Ojeda et al., 2012). Moreover, acculturation predicted CDSE for girls and not boys. The authors suggested that traditional
gender roles for girls and women known as *marianismo* (i.e., the culture bound role of the women as selfless caretakers and subservient to men) may influence girls who are less acculturated to have less confidence in their career decisions. These findings are indicative of the different ways acculturation’s influence may manifest across different subgroups within the Latinx population.

**Acculturation versus Ethnic Identity**

The concepts of acculturation and ethnic identity have often been conflated because they both describe cultural processes (Quintana, 2007; Schwartz et al., 2010). Since both are considered in the present study it is important to note that these terms, while similar in their cultural importance to immigrant and ethnic minority groups, are distinct and unique variables (Cuéllar et al., 1997; Mejia-Smith & Gushue, 2017; Phinney & Ong, 2007). For example, Latinx immigrants who adopt ideals and norms of the dominant culture may still maintain strong ethnic ties. Indeed, Mejia-Smith and Gushue (2017) found differences in the effects of ethnic identity and acculturation on CDSE. Specifically, ethnic identity may have had a more significant effect on CDSE than acculturation. These statistical differences highlight the possibility that these constructs may impact career outcomes to different degrees and in unique ways. Thus, in order to continue to thoroughly investigate career development among Latinx young adults, the present study will include both ethnic identity, acculturation and enculturation as contextual factors impacting Latinx career development.

**Summary**

Among immigrant populations, acculturative processes have been redefined as a multi-dimensional process by which individuals orient to both their heritage culture (i.e., enculturation) and host culture (i.e., acculturation) over time as these two orientations interact. This orientation
may be expressed through behaviors (i.e., language competence), social networks and an endorsement of cultural values and practices. For Latinx immigrants and their future generations navigating acculturation to the U.S. culture and enculturating, preserving their Latinx heritage, has been shown to have implications for career development. Latinx young adults who are simultaneously engaged with acculturative and enculturative forces may have a more developed sense of confidence in their ability to make career decisions and/or sense of autonomy to make career choices because of the flexibility. While the literature supports the benefits of developing a bicultural identity through orientation to both U.S. and Latinx cultures, more studies are needed to explore how the dimensions of acculturation may work to promote academic satisfaction through work volition and CDSE in Latinx young adult college samples.

2.10 Family Influence on Career Development

Up to this point in the review, the cultural variables considered - ethnic identity and acculturation- refer to individual inputs. Previous studies often include ethnic identity and acculturation variables together because of their importance to ethnic minority groups that have both immigrant and nonimmigrant populations (Bonifacio et al., 2018; Leong & Chou, 1994; Mejia-Smith & Gushue, 2017; Ojeda et al., 2012). This study will add a third culturally relevant factor to consider as a contextual input within the SCCT model: family influence.

The significant developmental role family plays in an individual career development has been largely supported across the general population. Yet, scholars argue that for some ethnic-cultural populations the quality and nature of the family’s role may differ across cultures (Fouad et al., 2008; Fouad et al., 2010; Fuligini, 2001). For example, in collectivistic communities, the family may have a more salient influence on an individual’s career development when compared
with individuals from an individualistic oriented community. Before delving further into the role of families in career development a definition of family is presented.

**Definition of Family**

The definition of family may vary across individuals and cultures. For some it may refer to immediate family while for others it may include extended family and community members. Fouad et al. (2010) used a broad definition of family to include the people that surrounded an individual during their formative developmental years and contributed to raising them. This author will use a similar definition of family which is not constricted to biological parents and family, but rather takes into account the diverse family configurations and influence.

**Individualism vs. Collectivism and Impact on Family Influence**

Triandis (1995) researched the main differences between individualistic and collectivistic cultures articulating the different values and social hierarchies that exist within them. In collectivistic cultures the identity of the individual members is formed by the group, and the community typically focuses on group rather than individual goals (Triandis, 1995). Thus, collectivistic cultures prioritize relationships and interpersonal duties. These two categories were later broken down into horizontal and vertical types of individualism and collectivism (Singelis et al., 1995). Horizontal type is defined by the characteristic of equality across the group in collectivistic societies and individuals across individualistic society. Vertical societies typically create hierarchical structures among themselves irrelevant of whether they are individually or collectivistically oriented. Within counseling psychology studies have found that individualism and collectivism orientations have varying effects on behaviors, cognitive processes, and emotional expression (McCarthy, 2005)
While in most western cultures, career is thought of as an individualistically oriented process, in other cultures career decisions carry a more collectivistic weight, such that the family has more input and influence in career interests and choices (Fouad et al., 2010; Fouad et al., 2016; Mendoza et al., 2011; Tate et al., 2015). In response, some scholars have challenged the assumption that career development is solely experienced by the individual, citing that for collectivistic cultures, family and community may have a much larger impact on career development (Fouad et al., 2010; Kim, Ahn et al., 2016).

Within career research, Fouad et al. (2010) found that vertical collectivism was associated with more reported family influence on career development in a sample of college-aged young adults. These results indicate that individuals who hold group-oriented values and yet recognize hierarchical structures of power are more likely to perceive more influence from family on career related decisions. These findings support earlier studies that have found family to be a guiding factor in career decisions (Flores et al., 2010; Fouad & Bingham, 1995). In a more recent study with Korean college students Kim, Ahn, et al. (2016) found that the measure of family influence they used was significantly correlated with both horizontal and vertical forms of collectivism corroborating previous studies (e.g., Fuligni, 2001). The authors posited that family influence is a more salient variable among collectivistic cultures such as among their Korean sample. To that end, Latinx families who may vary in their acculturation to U.S. values of individualism may be more likely than European-American families to endorse collectivistic values (Fuligni, 2001). Thus, an exploration of family influence on career development is indicated for this population.
The Role of Family in Latinx community

The role of the family within immigrant communities of color is significant given propensity for collectivism in these communities (Gomez et al., 2001; Fouad et al., 2010; Kiyama & Harper, 2015). Qualitative and quantitative research points to the cultural importance of family among Latinx individuals. In the Latinx community, the term *familismo* characterizes the expectation of strong emotional ties, loyalty, and familial support found in Latinx families (Hernandez & Lopez, 2004; Marin & Marin, 1991; Mendoza et al., 2011). Commitment to *familismo* and Latinx cultural values has been linked with positive mental health outcomes (Kim et al., 2009; Strunin et al., 2015). In other words, the family can be an important cultural element in a Latinx identified person’s psychosocial development (Chilman, 1993; Fuligni, 2001). As a result, it is necessary to consider the role of family in an individual’s career development.

There are several notable cultural differences between middle-class White European-American families and Latinx immigrant families. While the former often views college as a developmental stage of independence from family, Latinx young adults who attend college often carry significant responsibilities related to their family and an expectation of remaining close and involved (Fuligni, 2001; Covarrubias et al., 2015). In a sample of first-generation Mexican college students, these added expectations led to experiences of stress and guilt as a result of the internal conflict between the individualistic need to succeed in school and the collectivistic need to be present for their families (Covarrubias et al., 2015).

Latinx immigrant parents are more likely to report language barriers to their ability to support their child’s academic endeavors, less knowledge about how education systems operate in the U.S. and limited socio-economic resources than middle-class White Americans (Witkowsky et al., 2018). Despite these barriers, studies have shown that Latinx parents are able
to provide comparable motivation and support for their children’s educational and career
development (Ceja, 2004; Fuligni, 2001; Witkowsky et al., 2018). In fact, contrary to other
findings, familial obligation was linked to more motivation to achieve academically in Latinx
adolescents than compared with the ethnically dominant European-American youth (Fuligni,
2001). Ceja (2004)’s qualitative study highlighted the way that Mexican parents used consejos,
advice giving, to encourage their children to pursue education as a means to acquire socio-
economic stability they were unable to attain. Many of the students interviewed reported that the
struggles of their parents were a motivating factor to succeed.

Within the Latinx community parental influence may vary depending on socioeconomic
status, immigration status, individual family values and gender of the child. Important gender
differences in parental influence on career development have been identified in the literature
(Gomez et al., 2001; Leyva, 2011; Metheny & McWhirter, 2013). Latina college students often
must navigate competing values of education and traditional gender roles. Gomez et al. (2001)
noted conflicting familial career aspirations ascribed by parents in a qualitative study of a sample
of professional Latinas. While some families encouraged their children to strive academically,
strict gender roles and commitment to familismo pressured some Latina women into traditional
career fields (Gomez et al., 2001). In their qualitative study with first generation Latina graduate
students, Leyva (2011) found that while parents encouraged educational pursuits, their daughters
were also convinced to choose between completing their degree and contributing to their family
financially. Still other studies have found that Latinx men are more likely than Latina women to
feel achievement guilt as a result of their pursuit of higher education (Covarrubias et al., 2015).
This finding has been attributed to patriarchal values known as machismo within Latinx cultures
which pressure men to be economic providers for their families (Ojeda & Liang, 2014). These
differences point to the various ways that family influence may operate to impact career development among Latinx young adults.

**Types of Family Influence on Career Development**

It is important to note that family influence on career occurs throughout the life span vary in quality and salience across different life stages (Whiston & Keller, 2004). At the same time environmental and individual aspects of a family may have profound influence on an individual’s career formation. Splete and Freeman-George (1985) identified some characteristics of family influence including (a) geographic location, (b) family background, (c) parenting style, d) SES, e) family composition, f) parental work-related attitudes and g) genetic inheritance. These characteristics together help determine an individual’s career-related interests, resources, values and experiences which ultimately may impact the careers they pursue.

More recent review of family influence on career development across the lifespan summarized the variables of family influence into three major components, family structure variable, family process variables and family contextual variables (Whitson & Keller, 2004). In their review of relevant literature, Whitson reported that while family structure (e.g., parent work division) are more salient for young children, among adolescents and young adults, family process, relational and contextual variables become increasingly important. For example, in attachment studies, parent and child relationships which reflect a secure attachment have been linked to more vocational exploration on the part of the adolescent child, as well as more support for the child’s career development on the part of the parent (Palos et al., 2010).

A more recent study developed a broader approach to defining and operationalizing family influence (Fouad et al., 2010). The authors conducted a thorough literature review of family influence variables and its relationship to career-related outcomes. Fouad et al. (2010)
summarized 10 themes of family influence into four major categories: 1) informational support; 2) family expectations and 3) financial support and 4) beliefs and values. The categories were captured in the four factor Family Influence Scale (FIS; Fouad et al., 2010). Using these four subscales the author’s highlighted the breadth of family involvement in an individual’s career decision. To that end, while some factors for the FIS are associated with positive career outcomes, other factors may yield insignificant or negative links. The following two sections will identify common family influences that serve as supports and barriers to career development.

**Supports**

As mentioned above, family influence has been demonstrated as a major contributing factor to individual’s successful career development, specifically in adolescence and young adulthood (Fouad et al., 2008). First and foremost, family resources including but not limited to financial status, parent’s education levels and family network may impact an individual’s accessibility to college and certain careers opportunities (Whiston & Keller, 2004). For example, an upper-class family where both parents graduated with college degrees may have the ability to provide college tuition aid, support the individual through the college application process, and help the individual navigate job networks of interest to their child. These elements are captured in both the financial support and the informational support subscales of the FIS.

In addition, parents may also influence their children’s career development in emotional and psychological ways. This may occur through attachment styles (Whiston & Keller, 2004; Palos & Drobot, 2010). An individual that is securely attached to their parents, may feel like they can be honest with their parents regarding their career decisions and explorations. Moreover, the individual may assume that their parents will be supportive of their career choice. Parents who are securely attached may exhibit unconditional support, interest in their children’s career
interests and endeavors as well as provide ample space for the child to come to their own decisions (Palos & Drobot, 2010). Finally, parents can use their own career development and share their interests, perseverance, and resilience in their careers to influence their child’s interests and career identity (Ceja, 2004; Fuligni, 2001). These elements are most characterized by the values and beliefs scale of the FIS.

**Barriers**

Whiston and Keller (2004) noted families can also compromise their children’s career development intentionally and unintentionally. Evidently, if families have less socio-economic resources, college attendance decreases (Nam & Huang, 2009; Rowan-Kenyon et al., 2008). For example, in first-generation low-income college students, family career values were negatively associated with the pursuit of graduate school (Tate et al., 2015). In other words, contradicting familial expectations, obligations and financial pressure may also serve as a limiting influence on career development among marginalized young adult populations (Bui, 2002; Gardner & Holley, 2011; Leyva, 2011). Moreover, first generation and immigrant college students can experience affective dissonance and psychological isolation related to the pursuit of individualistic career goals which may contribute to guilt and mental health issues (Covarrubias et al., 2015). In other words, engaging in personal career goals may appear to stand at odds with familial expectations regarding which careers are valuable and will benefit the family at large. Family expectations around career choices has been linked with lower CDSE for South Korean college students (Kim, Ahn, et al., 2016) Additionally, family demands may serve to hinder an individual’s sense of volition over their career development (Duffy & Diemer, et al., 2012; Fouad et al., 2016). The FIS subscale, family expectation, assess the impact of familial pressures.
Family Influence within Theoretical Frameworks of Career Development

Recently, several studies have pointed to the limited theory-driven understanding of family influences on academic outcomes related to career development (Fouad et al., 2010; Kim, Ahn, et al., 2016). Additionally, while several studies have focused on family influence on specific elements of career development (i.e., math and science exploration; Ferry et al., 2000; Turner et al., 2004), fewer studies have measured family influence on career development more broadly among people of color. Thus, it is important to contextualize family influence within the theoretical frameworks of the present study in order to understand how it may relate to other variables in the model.

First, as described in the earlier sections on SCCT, Lent and Brown (2001) identified contextual factors in career research that fall into proximal and distal categories. According to Kim, Ahn, et al. (2016), family influence lies at the intersection of key contextual factors including social persuasion, physiological and affective states, personal achievements and vicarious learning. These authors operationalized family influence within the SCCT life satisfaction model as a distal contextual factor among Korean college students because of its active presence in collectivistic cultures. Second, PWF theorists (Blustein et al., 2004) have highlighted the need to understand the relational aspects of career development. Duffy et al. (2014) highlighted that family pressures may add to mitigate work volition among marginalized populations who also face other systemic barriers. While the use of the family influence scale (FIS; Fouad et al, 2010) has only been implemented over the past decade, several studies, have found significant associations between the Fouad et al.’s (2010) four factors of family influence (i.e., family expectation, beliefs and values, informational support, and financial support) and relevant SCCT and PWT variables.
In their cross-cultural validation study, Fouad et al. (2016) found that family influence was related to occupational engagement in both U.S. and Indian participants. Additionally, Kim, Ahn et al., (2016) found that family informational support was significantly positively correlated with CDSE and indirectly associated with career preparation satisfaction and life satisfaction through CDSE. Moreover, informational support was found to be positively associated with career preparation satisfaction. These findings suggest that family influences may benefit an individual by increasing their confidence in career decision making, and subsequently improving the individual’s sense of satisfaction in career and life domains. In a separate cross-cultural study, Fouad et al., (2016) also found a significant positive relationship between family influence and work volition within a sample of Indian young adults and not in the majority European-White American sample. These findings suggest that while family influence is generally relevant to career development, it may be more salient to an individual’s sense of control over their career decisions when the individual comes from a collectivistic culture.

**Summary**

Family influence on career development is particularly salient for young adults from collectivistic backgrounds. Broadly speaking, Latinx cultures value closeness to family and career-based decisions that consider family goals and expectations. Informational support, financial support, and family values may benefit career development for Latinx college students while family expectations may add pressure and restrict options. To date, no study has explored family influence grounded in SCCT nor PWT with a Latinx sample. Furthermore, while quantitative studies using Fouad et al.’s (2010) scale have been validated with majority White samples in the U.S. and cross culturally with Asian samples, this scale has yet to be validated with a Latinx sample. The present study seeks to gain more understanding about how family
influences career development in Latinx young adults using a validated measure. Moreover, the study will further expand on existing literature by exploring the relationship between family influence and academic satisfaction, a vital career outcome in young adult career development.

2.11 Statement of the Problem

Despite Latinx young adults contributing to a significant portion of the U.S national population growth, they face significant barriers to their career development. Additionally, while Latinx young adults have made recent gains in college access and employment opportunities, they are often still underrepresented on college campuses and report psychological, social, and institutional challenges that are implicated in career development outcomes. Current vocational research has begun to explore culturally relevant factors that may serve as protective buffers against oppressive systems. Specifically, career theorists have encouraged the exploration of ethnic identity, acculturation, and enculturation as three culturally relevant processes that may impact young adult Latinx college students who are beginning to navigate major career decisions.

As the literature review has explored, SCCT and PWT have challenged the privileged blind spots of earlier vocational development. The former explicitly addressed socio-cultural factors as crucial in shaping direct and indirect associations between cognitive factors and career outcomes. More recently, PWT identified the construct known as work volition and a testable working model to understand ways in which freedom of choice in vocational development may benefit specific social groups over others. While recent literature has made the call for more empirical studies that integrate contemporary career theories, it remains to be answered for diverse populations.
Additionally, career research has largely focused on career development as an individualistic process. College attendance from a U.S. perspective is one developmental stage when the focus is often solely on the individual. In previous studies with majority White college students, academic satisfaction is an outcome that is often linked with positive career outcomes and life satisfaction results. For some immigrant cultures in the U.S., like the Latinx community, more collectivistic orientations may exist around career interests and goals. Thus, for Latinx young adults there may be a host of cultural factors, including familial influence, that may impact career variables and outcomes. There is a need for additional theoretically grounded career research that explores the impact of family on career outcomes among Latinx young adults.

This study aims to expand on the existing vocational research with Latinx college students, first by integrating two major career theories SCCT and PWT as the theoretical backdrop. Currently, no study has looked at variables of SCCT and PWT concurrently with a sample of Latinx young adults. Second, this study aimed to add family influence as a distal contextual variable to ethnic identity, acculturation, and enculturation using a validated scale not yet applied exclusively to Latinx young adults. The study will draw upon SCCT’s satisfaction model to investigate how socio-cultural and vocational variables predict academic satisfaction among Latinx college students.

Based on the SCCT model of satisfaction and key tenets of PWT this study makes a case for the significant contribution of work volition and CDSE on the development of academic satisfaction among Latinx college-attending young adults. Family influence, acculturation and ethnic identity are endogenous variables. In line with previous research ethnic identity is conceptualized as person input while acculturation and family influence are conceptualized as
contextual affordances. Aligned with the SCCT model, this study posits that the personal and contextual variables impact the development of CDSE and work volition. In turn, CDSE and work volition would each directly associate with academic satisfaction, thus mediating the relationship between the earlier variables in the model and academic satisfaction (see Appendix L-Figure 4).

**Hypotheses**

Based on the proposed SCCT and PWT it is proposed that the hypothesized model (See Appendix L - Figure 4) will show good fit to the sample of 224 Latinx college students such that:

*Hypothesis 1:* Ethnic identity would be directly and positively associated with work volition and CDSE

*Hypothesis 2:* Both acculturation and enculturation would have a positive and direct association with work volition and CDSE.

*Hypothesis 3:* Family informational support, family financial support and family beliefs and values would have a direct and positive association with work volition and CDSE while family expectations would have a direct negative relationship with work volition and CDSE.

*Hypothesis 4:* CDSE would be directly and positively associated with work volition.

*Hypothesis 5:* CDSE and work volition were hypothesized to be directly and positively associated with academic satisfaction.

*Hypothesis 6:* Ethnic identity, acculturation, enculturation, and family influence variables would have an indirect association with academic satisfaction through CDSE, such that, CDSE would be a mediating variable for the relationship between the exogenous variables and academic satisfaction.
**Hypothesis 7:** Ethnic identity, acculturation, enculturation and family influence variables would have an indirect relationship with academic satisfaction through work volition such that, work volition would be a mediating variable for the relationship between the exogenous variables and academic satisfaction.

**Hypothesis 8:** Ethnic identity, acculturation, enculturation and family influence variables would have an indirect relationship with academic satisfaction through CDSE and work volition such that, both CDSE and work volition together would mediate the associations between the exogenous variables and academic satisfaction.
Chapter 3: Method

While Latinx young adults continue to make gains in education and the labor force as one of the largest ethnic subgroups in the U.S., they still face significant barriers to accessing fair and just education and career opportunities. Furthermore, Latinx young adults continue to be underrepresented on college campuses and report psychological, social, and institutional challenges which may impact their career development in a formative stage of their life. Despite recent attention given to the ethnic and cultural variables that may promote Latinx career development (Bonifacio et al., 2018; Flores et al., 2014; Mejia & Gushue, 2017; Ojeda et al., 2011), few empirical studies have accounted for the collectivistic influences (e.g., family influence) on career development using an SCCT framework for this group. Moreover, while there has been a call for more integrated theoretical career research within vocational psychology, few studies have attempted to include PWT variables within SCCT. To address these gaps in the literature, the following study included family influence and work volition within SCCT’s established model of academic satisfaction for a sample of Latinx college students (see Appendix L - Figure 4).

A path model was used to explore the relationship between cultural variables (i.e., ethnic identity, acculturation, enculturation, and family influence variables) on college-aged Latinxs’ career development. It was predicted that the model proposed in Appendix L- Figure 4 would show evidence of good fit. The exogenous variables were the three cultural variables (i.e., ethnic identity, acculturation, enculturation) and the four family variables (i.e., informational support, financial support, values and beliefs, and expectations). The endogenous variables were CDSE, work volition, and academic satisfaction. Based on prior studies, it was hypothesized that ethnic identity, acculturation, and enculturation would be directly positively associated with work
volition and CDSE (*Hypotheses 1-2*). In addition, three subscales of family influence – informational support, financial support, values and beliefs- were hypothesized to positively relate to CDSE and work volition, while the fourth subscale, family expectations, was hypothesized to negatively relate to CDSE and work volition (*Hypothesis 3*). Furthermore, CDSE was predicted to be directly and positively associated with work volition (*Hypothesis 4*). It is also expected that work volition and CDSE would each have a direct positive effect on academic satisfaction (*Hypothesis 5*). Lastly, it is hypothesized that CDSE and work volition would mediate the relationship between the cultural and family exogenous variables (i.e., ethnic identity, acculturation, enculturation, informational support, financial support, values and beliefs, and expectations) and academic satisfaction, such that each of the seven exogenous variables would have an indirect relationship with academic satisfaction via paths from CDSE and work volition individually as well as through both CDSE and work volition (*Hypotheses 6-8*).

### 3.1 Participants

Participants included 224 Latinx individuals ages 18-30 years old who were enrolled in a college or university (See Appendix A - Table 1 for demographic breakdown). The mean age of the sample was 23.42 (SD = 3.63). Regarding representation of ethnicities in the sample, 15.6% identified their ethnicity as South American (e.g., Peruvian, Bolivian, Ecuadorian), 49.1% identified their Latinx ethnicity as Mexican, 11.2% identified as Caribbean (e.g., Dominican, Puerto Rican), 6.3% identified as Central American other than Mexican (Nicaraguan, Guatemalan), 9.4% identified as other, and 8.5% did not report their Latinx ethnicity. The sample consisted of 68.8% women, 28.1% men, 2.2% gender non-binary or non-conforming and .9% did not report their gender. Regarding SES, 11.6% of participants reported their SES to be upper class, 63.4% reported middle class, and 25% reported lower class. Over half of the
participants identified with a religious affiliation (54.9%), some did not (37.9%), and some did not wish to specify (6.3%).

Participants were comprised of individuals who were 1st generation- born outside of the U.S. (22.3%), 2nd generation -born inside the U.S. but with at least one parent born outside of the U.S. (46.9%), 3rd generation – at least one set of grandparents were born outside of the U.S. and parents and participant were born in the U.S. (26.3%), other (4%) and missing (.4%). Individuals who reported feeling comfortable in speaking only English accounted for 30.4% of participants, 1.7% of the participants reported feeling comfortable speaking only Spanish/Portuguese, 33% reported greater comfort speaking English than Spanish/Portuguese, 5.4% greater comfort with Spanish/Portuguese than English, 26.7% English and Spanish/Portuguese equally, 2.7% did not report. Participants reported their current academic major as creative/performing arts (6.7%), language and culture (12.5%), education (5.4%), social sciences (38.8%), STEM (25%), other major (10.7%) and missing (.9%). Participants reported that their highest degree completed was a high school degree/GED (37.9%), Bachelor’s degree (43.8%), graduate degree (11.6%), and other (6.3%). At the time of survey completion, 5.8% of participants reported that they were completing a 2-years associate degree, 58.9% were completing a 4-year undergraduate degree, 19.2% a Masters level program, 11.6% a doctoral program, and 4.5% reported completing another degree. In the sample, 42.4% reportedly were enrolled in a HSI, and 37.9% were not, while 19.6% were not sure.

3.2 Procedure

Prior to recruitment, the Institutional Review Board of Teachers College, Columbia University approved this study. Upon approval, a survey with the relevant measures was posted on Qualtrics, an online secure database system. The study did not exclude individuals based on
race, class, gender, or sexual orientation; however, based on the research questions and hypotheses the sample was limited to individuals who self-report their ethnicity as Latinx or Hispanic. The study included Latinx young adults living presently in the U.S., independent of immigrant generation status. Because of the study’s interest in emerging young adults and academic satisfaction in college participants, only young adults between the ages of 18-30 were recruited from undergraduate and graduate institutions in the U.S. Requirements to participate were outlined in the recruitment materials.

Participants were recruited to participate via emails, college listservs, flyers, and community web pages focused on Latinx college students on college campuses. The recruitment materials were sent out via these mediums in order to reach a diverse group of Latinx young adults currently living in the U.S. and enrolled in various academic institutions. Participants between the ages of 18-30, who self-reported their ethnicity as Hispanic/Latinx, and were currently enrolled in a U.S. post-secondary academic institution were invited to participate in the study. The participants were able to access the Qualtrics survey via a link or QR code on the recruitment materials. The study criteria were outlined on the first page of the survey so that those who met the full criteria were allowed to proceed to the survey. Those who did were presented with the informed consent page (see Appendix P) which they electronically signed in order to participate further. If individuals did not meet the eligibility to participate or did not wish to sign the informed consent form, they were directed to a page thanking them for their consideration.

Participants who met the criteria and signed the informed consent were able to complete the survey. Participants were notified in the informed consent of the survey’s duration and their ability to drop out at any time or not answer any item without penalty. Upon completion of the
survey, the participants were thanked for their time and given the contact of the principal investigator should they have any questions regarding the study. Finally, participant responses were stored on the secure Qualtrics platform.

3.3 Instruments

**Demographic Information**

A demographic questionnaire was used to obtain relevant information regarding the sample including age, gender, race/ethnicity, SES, country of origin, immigrant generation status, college or university status, socioeconomic status and religion. Participants were also asked if they were enrolled in an HSI, their current major of study, and language confidence in Spanish/Portuguese and English.

**Academic Satisfaction**

The 7-item Academic Satisfaction Scale (Lent et al., 2007) is used to measure the level of satisfaction college students feel with their current major and academic experiences. The scale uses a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) where higher number values indicate more academic satisfaction. Sample items include “I enjoy the level of intellectual stimulation in my courses” and “I feel enthusiastic about the subject matter of my intended major.” The mean of the scores was calculated by dividing the sum of the item scores by seven. Academic satisfaction has been shown to have good convergent validity given that previous studies have found positive associations with well-being and life satisfaction (Lent et al., 2005). Moreover, Flores et al. (2013) found a positive relationship between engineering self-efficacy, outcome expectations, interest, goals and engineering academic satisfaction in both White and Latinx samples. In a sample of Mexican American college students, academic satisfaction was positively associated with positive affect, acculturation, outcome expectations
and goal progress (Ojeda et al., 2011). Previous studies with undergraduate students found an internal consistency of .94 indicating high reliability (Lent et al., 2005). Furthermore, in a mixed ethnic sample of White and Latinx identified undergraduates, Flores et al. (2013) reported robust reliability of .91 and Ojeda et al. (2011) reported an alpha coefficient of .86 for a sample of Mexican American college students. More recently, Allan et al. (2020) found internal consistency between .89-.90 across three different time points for an undergraduate sample. The Cronbach’s alpha for this sample was .88.

**Acculturation and Enculturation**

Both acculturation and enculturation were measured using a modified version of the 30-item Acculturation Rating Scale for Mexican Americans-II (ARSMA-II; Cuéllar et al., 1995; See Appendix Q). The modification involved similar changes made in previous studies (Basañez et al., 2013; Céspedes & Huey, 2008; Mejia & Gushue, 2017) where items addressing Mexicans explicitly will be reworded to Latinx, such that the scale will apply to Latinx more broadly. This widely used scale assesses acculturation from a bi-dimensional perspective; it takes into account the ability for immigrants to orient to the host culture independent of their orientation to the heritage culture (Berry, 1980). The two dimensions (i.e., acculturation and enculturation) are captured in two separate subscales: the 17-item Mexican Orientation Scale (MOS; modified for the purposes of this study as the Latinx Orientation Scale; LOS) and the 13-item Anglo orientation scale which refers to White non-Hispanic culture (AOS). The items of each subscale will measure the degree to which an individual engages with Latino (enculturation) or Anglo cultures (acculturation) via social/ethnic ties, language proficiency and preferences, and cultural practices. Sample items of the LOS and AOS subscales include “*My thinking is done in Spanish*” and “*I enjoy listening to English language music*” respectively. The scale uses a 5-
point Likert scale from 1 (*not at all*) to 5 (*extremely often or almost often*). The subscale mean is calculated by obtaining the average across the items in each subscale. Higher average scores on the LOS are indicative of greater enculturation while higher average scores on the AOS represent higher acculturation. While a unidimensional score, computed by subtracting the mean of the MOS score from the mean of the AOS score, has been supported in the literature (Cuéllar et al., 1995), recently studies have increasingly included two separate dimensions of this construct in order to capture a more nuanced bicultural assessment of acculturative processes (Jones & Mortimer, 2014).

In career development research, often, the separate scores for each subscale have been used (Flores et al., 2006). Previous studies have found high internal consistency across both subscales. Cuéllar et al. (1997) reported an alpha level of .80 for AOS and .92 for the MOS in a large sample of undergraduates. Moreover, Mejia and Gushue (2017) reported a Cronbach’s alpha of .87 for LOS and .74 for AOS and a total reliability of .77 for the full scale in a sample of Latina college students. Convergent validity has been demonstrated in the correlations between scores on the ARSMA-II and generation level (Cuéllar et al., 1995) where MOS scores decrease with each generation born in the U.S. and AOS scores increase. In addition, Stephenson (2000) found that both MOS and AOS correlated with respective cultural group subscales of the Stephenson multigroup acculturation scale. Moreover, acculturation scores have resulted in expected correlations with ethnic identity such that higher levels of total acculturation were linked to lower levels of ethnic identity (Mejia & Gushue, 2017). Similarly, in previous career research Anglo-oriented acculturation has been linked as expected with increased educational goals and CDSE among adolescent high schoolers (Flores et al., 2006). Among a sample of Mexican college students, an anticipated relationship between the AOS scale and independent
self-construal as well as the MOS and interdependent self-construal were indicated (Ojeda et al., 2014). Together these previous findings provide strong evidence for the validity of using the subscales to measure both acculturation and enculturation. For this sample, the Coefficient alpha for the LOS was .90 and .77 for the AOS.

**Career Decision-making Self-Efficacy**

The 25-item career decision self-efficacy scale - short form (CDSE-SF; Betz et al., 1996; See Appendix R) was used to assess an individual’s confidence in their ability to complete tasks related to career decisions. The scale implements a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*no confidence at all*) to 5 (*complete confidence*). Previous studies have used the total CDSE scale score (e.g., Bonifacio et al., 2018; Creed & Patton, 2003; Gushue & Whitson, 2006a; McWhirter et al., 2000) given that the reliability has been shown to be more robust (Betz et al., 1996). In order to minimize problems with scaling and make the variance of CDSE comparable to the smaller variances in the other scales used in this study the mean of the total score was used. The mean was calculated by summing all the item values and dividing it by 25, the number of items in the scale. Higher average scores are indicative of greater confidence in career decision-making abilities.

In college samples, previous literature has found evidence for good reliability. Betz et al. (2005) reported an internal consistency level of .95. Similarly, among exclusively Latinx college samples Mejia and Gushue (2017) reported a Cronbach’s alpha of .95. CDSE has been previously shown to be positively associated with several career outcome variables including career maturity (Creed & Patton, 2003), career decision outcome expectations and vocational identity (Choi et al., 2012). Moreover, CDSE has been found to be negatively correlated as expected with career indecision (Choi et al., 2012) and positively with career choice certainty.
Moreover, in various Latinx samples, CDSE has been found to positively relate with differentiated vocational identity and career exploration (Gushue, Scalan, et al., 2006), outcome expectations (Gushue, 2006) and less perception of barriers and microaggressions (Bonifacio et al., 2018). In combination these studies support the convergent validity of the CDSE scale for Latinx samples. The measure yielded a .95 Cronbach’s alpha for this sample.

**Ethnic Identity**

The 6-item revised multigroup ethnic identity measure (MEIM-R, Phinney & Ong, 1997; See Appendix S) based on the earlier 14-item MEIM (Phinney, 1992) examines the degree of affiliation an individual feels toward their respective ethnic group. Additionally, the scale consists of two factors: exploration of one’s ethnic identity (e.g., “I have often done things that will help me understand my ethnic background better”) and commitment to one’s ethnic identity (e.g., “I fell a strong attachment towards my own ethnic group”). The scale uses a 4-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) with higher scores indicating a more positive relationship with one’s ethnic identity. The scale is preceded with an open-ended question that allows participants to self-identify their ethnic group. It concludes with a list of ethnic backgrounds from which the participant may indicate their biological parents’ ethnic backgrounds and their own. Scores for each of the three items per subscale are calculated by averaging the item values and total scores have also been used by calculating the average score across the whole scale (Phinney & Ong, 1997).

Support for this scale’s convergent validity showed that both factors strongly correlated with each other ($r = .56;$ Mills & Murray, 2017; $r = .74;$ Phinney & Ong, 2007) Moreover, both subscales correlated as expected with another validated measure of ethnic identity among
students of color (Yoon, 2011). Similarly, in a study comparing African American adults to European American adults, African American adults reported larger levels across both subscales than European American Adults (Chakawa et al., 2015). Studies have indicated internal consistency ranging from .76 to 91 for the subscales and from .81 to .91 for the entire scale (Phinney & Ong, 2007; Yoon, 2011). In samples with Latinx adults, previous studies have shown good reliability (Brown et al., 2014; Torres & Ong, 2010) reporting internal consistency (Cronbach’s Alpha) of between .84 -.86 for exploration, .86 -.91 for commitment and .88 for the overall scale. In this study the combined total score was used which is indicative of the overall salience of ethnic identity (Phinney & Ong, 1997). In the present sample, this scale Cronbach coefficient was .87.

**Family Influence**

The 22-item Family Influence Scale (FIS; Fouad et al., 2010; See Appendix T) was used to measure the perceived influences a family of origin has on an individual’s career choices and decisions. It is the first validated measure in the field of vocational psychology which explores different ways family influence may impact an individual’s career decision. The four factors and sample items for each factor include values/beliefs (e.g., “*My family expects that I will consider my religion/spirituality when making career decisions*”), family expectation (e.g., “*My family expects me to select a career that has a certain status*”), financial support (e.g., “*My family has not been able to financially support my career decisions*”) and informational support (e.g., “*My family shared information with me about how to obtain a job*”). The measure uses a 6-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 6 (*strongly agree*). Higher scores on each subscale indicate more family influence on career decisions for each domain. Previous studies have looked at the four subscales separately in their analyses (Fouad et al., 2010; Fouad et al.,
The mean score for each subscale was used for this study.

Regarding convergent validity, Fouad et al., (2010) found racial/ethnic differences in the family expectation subscale where Asian Americans endorsed significantly higher levels of family influence than Black and White Americans. Moreover, expected correlations between related constructs of family influence including positive associations with parental attachment, well-being and CDSE as well as negative association with age support the convergent validity for the FIS (Fouad et al., 2010). In a cross-cultural sample Fouad et al. (2016) found that the four subscales were correlated as expected with family obligation across both cultures, but these correlations were statistically stronger for an Indian college sample than the U.S.-born sample. Furthermore, work volition was shown to positively correlate with the four subscales of the FIS in the Indian sample and not in the U.S.-born sample which was comprised of over 60% White-identified participants.

Studies with U.S.-born samples and Asian samples have reported good internal consistency. Fouad et al. (2010) reported Cronbach’s Alphas between .75-.89 across the four subscales and .88 for the total FIS scores in a college sample. More recently, Kim, Ahn, et al. (2016) reported internal consistency between .82 and .89 in a Korean college sample. The Cronbach’s alphas for the four subscales were as follows for this sample: Values and beliefs (.88), financial support (.77), expectations (.89), and informational support (.94).

**Work Volition**

To measure work volition, the current study used the 16-item work volition scale-student version (WVS-SV; Duffy, Diemer, et al., 2012; See appendix U) which examines how much freedom an individual perceives they have over career choices. The scale is comprised of two
subscales: the nine-item constraints subscale and the seven-item volition scale. Given the robust reliability for the total scale (Cronbach’s alpha = .84; Duffy, Diemer et al., 2012) the full scale was used in order to assess the perceived ability to make decisions despite potential constraints. To calculate the total WVS score, the constraint subscale items were reverse coded and added to the volition subscale items. For the present analyses, the average of the total scores was used to account for the smaller variances in the other measures of this. Greater perception of choice is indicated by higher scores. The scale uses a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Several sample items include “In order to provide for my family, I will have to take jobs I do not enjoy” and “Discrimination will not affect my ability to choose a job.”

Duffy, Diemer, et al. (2012) reported expected positive correlations among an ethnically diverse undergraduate sample between work volition and related constructs including core self-evaluations (i.e., measure of the positive feeling and individual has towards themselves) and CDSE. In addition, the work volition scale has been positively associated with career adaptability in a mixed ethnic/racial undergraduate sample (Autin et al., 2017.) Furthermore, the scale has recently been positively associated with bicultural self-efficacy in a sample of adults of color (Marks et al., 2020). Moreover, prior research has supported the scale’s reliability. Internal consistency for the total scale has been reported at .92 (Duffy, Diemer, et al., 2012) and ranging from 89-.90 across three different time points for a large sample of undergraduate students in a longitudinal study (Allan et al., 2020). The internal consistency for this study’s sample for this measure was .87.
Chapter 4: Results

This chapter presents the findings of the study. First, preliminary analyses are summarized including tests of normality, outliers, and missing values. Subsequently, results of several MANOVAs comparing outcome variables across significant demographic variables are described. Finally, primary analyses are presented, including the results of the path analyses of the hypothesized model as well as the second model specified post-hoc.

4.1 Preliminary Analyses

Normality and Outlier Tests

Normality assumptions for each of the variables were examined in the final sample of 224 participants using the macro created by DeCarlo (1997) for univariate and multivariate tests of skewness and kurtosis, stem-and-leaf, histograms with a normal curve, and Q-Q plots. Results from the macro indicated no extreme non-normality (see Appendix B-Table 2 for descriptive statistics for each variable). The sample size (N=224) fell between the minimum ratio of five participants per free parameter estimated (for this model, 20 x 5 = 100) as suggested by Bentler and Chou (1987; see Hatcher & Stepanski, 1994) and Kline’s (2016) suggested 10-20 participants per free parameter for path analysis.

Missing Values

The initial sample consisted of 255 Latinx identified college students. Thirty-one participants did not complete the entire survey and 6.4% of the data were missing. Utilizing Little’s (1988) missing at random test, missing items were not found to be missing completely at random (i.e., not systematically missing) nor not missing at random, given that the null hypothesis was not rejected, $\chi^2 (5676, N = 255) = 5775.50, p = .18$. Thus, maximum likelihood
estimates were determined (Arbuckle, 2009). As a result, cases with incomplete survey responses were not considered in the analyses.

**MANOVA Results**

Correlations, means, and standard deviations for the variables used in the preliminary and principal analyses may be found in Appendix B - Table 2 and Appendix C - Table 3. A series of multivariate analyses using the proposed endogenous variables (i.e., CDSE, work volition and academic satisfaction) as dependent variables and significant demographic variables (college type, ethnicity, gender, generation status, HSI enrollment, and SES) as independent variables were conducted for the sample to test for effects of relevant demographic variables.

**College Type**

A MANOVA was run to assess significant mean score differences between career variables by student’s present college enrollment type. Using college type (e.g., four-year college, two-year associates degree, masters level, doctoral level) as independent variables and the career outcome variables as dependent variables the results showed that students’ institution type had a significant effect, Wilks’ Lambda = .86 F (12, 574.42) = 2.75, p < .01, η² = .05. Univariate analyses were conducted and results conveyed that institution type had a significant effect on work volition F(4, 219) = 3.22, p < .05, η² = .06. and CDSE F(4, 219) = 5.04, p < .001, η² = .08.

A Bonferroni post-hoc test indicated significant mean differences in work volition and CDSE between Latinx college students enrolled in 2-year associates program (n = 13), 4-year undergraduate institutions (n = 132), masters level programs (n = 43), and doctoral level programs (n = 26). In regard to work volition, students who were enrolled in masters level program reported significantly higher levels of work volition (M = 4.97, SD = .95) than students
enrolled in 4-year undergraduate institutions \((M = 4.41, SD = 1.00)\). Additionally, Latinx students who were enrolled in 4-year undergraduate institutions \((M = 3.53, SD = .71)\) endorsed significantly lower levels of CDSE than those who enrolled in doctoral programs \((M = 3.99, SD = .58)\).

**Ethnicity**

Research has shown within-group differences in career outcomes among different Latinx ethnicities (Musu-Gillette et al., 2016). Thus, a MANOVA was used to explore possible ethnic differences in the endogenous career variables (i.e., CDSE, work volition and academic satisfaction). Ethnicity was identified as a categorical independent variable (i.e., South America, Mexico, Caribbean, Central America, Other, Mixed) and the endogenous career variables were the dependent variables. The results showed significant ethnic difference across the main study variables Wilks’ Lambda = .87, \(F(15, 544.23) = 1.90, p < .05, \eta^2 = .05\). Since the MANOVA was significant for ethnicity, univariate analyses of variance were conducted. The results of the univariate analyses conveyed that ethnicity had a small but significant effect on work volition \(F(5, 199) = 3.22, p < .01, \eta^2 = .08\) and academic satisfaction \(F(5, 199) = 1.36, p < .05, \eta^2 = .07\).

A Bonferroni post-hoc test indicated significant mean differences in work volition and academic satisfaction between South American \((n= 35)\), Mexican \((n = 110)\) and Other \((n = 13)\) identified Latinx college students. Overall, students who identified their ethnicity as “South American” (e.g., Ecuadorian, Colombian) endorsed higher levels of work volition \((M= 5.06, SD = .94)\) than those that identified their ethnicity as “Other” \((M = 3.96, SD = .19)\). Additionally, those who identified themselves as “South American” \((M = 4.16, SD = .59)\) and “Mexican” \((M = 3.98, SD = .61)\) endorsed higher levels of academic satisfaction than those that identified their ethnicity as “Other” \((M = 3.32, SD = .56)\).
Gender

Another MANOVA was used to test for significant mean score differences in career variables (i.e., CDSE, work volition and academic satisfaction) by gender. The results indicated that students of different genders did not significantly differ across the main study variables, Wilks’ Lambda = .93, $F (9, 530.71) = 1.69$, $p = .09$, $\eta^2 = .02$.

Generation Status

Given that immigration generation has been shown to moderate career outcomes (Gonzalez, 2015), a MANOVA was used to test for significant mean score differences in career variables (i.e., CDSE, work volition and academic satisfaction) by immigrant generation status. While multivariate results indicated a small effect of immigration generation status variables, Wilks’ Lambda = .92, $F (9, 528.27) = 2.17$, $p = .02$, $\eta^2 = .03$, univariate analyses showed no statistically significant differences in CDSE, work volition, and academic satisfaction by immigration generation status for this sample.

HSI enrollment

Previous studies have suggested the importance of HSI enrollment on career outcome variables among Latinx populations (Navarro et al., 2019). Using HSI enrollment as a categorical independent variable and the career outcome variables as dependent variables, a multivariate analysis was conducted. HSI enrollment was found to be significant, Wilks’ Lambda = .81, $F (6, 438) = 8.05$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .10$. The results of the univariate analyses showed that HSI enrollment had a significant but small effect on work volition, $F(2, 221) = 19.69$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .15$ and academic satisfaction, $F(2, 221) = 5.30$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .05$.

A Bonferroni post-hoc test indicated significant mean differences in work volition and academic satisfaction between Latinx college students enrolled in HSIs ($n = 95$), not enrolled in
HSIs ($n = 85$), and those not sure ($n = 44$). In regard to work volition, students who were enrolled in HSIs endorsed significantly lower levels of work volition ($M = 4.15, SD = .75$) than those not enrolled in HSIs ($M = 4.97, SD = .97$) and those that were unsure of their enrollment ($M = 4.78, SD = 1.07$). Similarly, Latinx students who were enrolled in HSIs endorsed significantly lower levels of academic satisfaction ($M = 3.79, SD = .67$) than those who were not ($M = 4.08, SD = .65$) or not sure of their enrollment in an HSI ($M = 4.08, SD = .72$).

**Major of Choice**

Using academic major as a categorical independent variable and the career outcome variables as dependent variables, the results of a MANOVA indicated a significant effect of academic major, Wilks’ Lambda = .84 $F(15, 591.16) = 2.61, p < .001, \eta^2 = .06$. The results of univariate analyses showed that academic major had significant but small effects on work volition, $F(5, 222) = 5.33, p < .001, \eta^2 = .11$ and academic satisfaction, $F(5, 222) = 4.16, p < .01, \eta^2 = .09$.

A Bonferroni post-hoc test indicated significant mean differences in work volition and academic satisfaction between Latinx college students whose were pursuing a STEM major ($n = 56$), creative/performing arts ($n = 15$), Language/culture ($n = 28$), education, ($n = 12$), social sciences ($n = 87$), and other ($n = 24$). In regard to work volition, students who were pursuing a STEM major endorsed significantly higher levels of work volition ($M = 5.00, SD = .95$) than those pursuing creative/performing arts ($M = 4.12, SD = .78$), language/cultural studies ($M = 4.19, SD = .71$) and social studies ($M = 4.39, SD = .99$). Additionally, Latinx students who were pursuing a major in STEM also endorsed higher levels of academic satisfaction ($M = 4.16, SD = .61$) than those who were pursuing majors in creative/performing arts ($M = 3.43, SD = .66$) and language/cultural studies ($M = 3.67, SD = .77$).
**SES**

Research has suggested that career outcomes may be moderated by social class (Garriott et al., 2019; Umaña-Taylor et al., 2015). A MANOVA was used to test for significant mean score differences in career outcome variables (i.e., CDSE, work volition and academic satisfaction) by SES. Using SES (i.e., upper, middle and lower class) as a categorical independent variable and the career variables as dependent variables the results showed that SES was significant, Wilks’ Lambda = .85, F (6, 438) =6.42, p < .001, η² = .08. Given that SES was significant in the MANOVA, univariate analyses were examined. The results of the univariate analyses conveyed that SES had a significant effect on work volition, F(2, 224) = 7.14, p < .001, η² = .06 and academic satisfaction, F (2, 224) = 8.06, p < .001, η² = .07.

A Bonferroni post-hoc test indicated significant mean differences in work volition and academic satisfaction between upper class (n = 26), middle class (n = 142), and lower class (n = 56). In regard to work volition, students who identified their SES as “Middle Class” (M = 4.76, SD = .95) endorsed significantly higher levels than their “Lower Class” (M = 4.22, SD = 1.02) counterparts. Latinx students who identify themselves as “Upper class” (M = 3.51, SD = .76) endorsed significantly lower levels of academic satisfaction than those who identified as part of the “Middle Class” (M= 4.06, SD = .64) and “Lower Class” (M= 3.89, SD = .67).

**Summary of Preliminary Analyses**

Preliminary analysis showed that conditions for multivariate normality were met. Missing data was examined and determined to be missing at random. MANOVAS were conducted to assess for demographic differences. Results showed no differences in outcome variables across generation status and gender while small differences were noted across major of choice, college
type, HSI enrollment, SES, and ethnicity. Insofar as the differences were small and given the small sample size, the differences were not accounted for in the primary analysis.

4.2 Primary Analysis

Using Lavaan’s package in R, a path analysis was conducted to test the hypothesized model. Path analysis is helpful in examining direct and indirect effects simultaneously (Kline, 2016). In path analysis a model is specified a priori which predicts the directionality of direct and indirect effects between variables (see Hypotheses 1-8). Regarding sample size, 10-20 participants per parameter are ideal to test a path model, (Kline, 2016). The sample size of 224 participants met the lower bound of sample size for the 20 free parameters estimated.

Model Identification

It was determined that in the proposed model there were 48 parameters (7 exogenous variances, 21 exogenous covariances, 17 paths, three endogenous covariances) and 20 free parameters (17 paths and three endogenous covariances). Using the formula \[\text{number of observed variables} \times (\text{number of observed variables} + 1)/2\], it was calculated that there were 55 total observations and 7 degrees of freedom \((df = 55-48)\) in the proposed model. This model satisfies the recursive rule (i.e., when the directions of the paths in the model are unidimensional) which is necessary for identification (Bollen & Davis, 2009).

In the model there were seven exogenous variables (ethnic identity, acculturation, enculturation, family informational support, family financial support, family values and beliefs, and family expectations) and three endogenous variables (CDSE, work volition and academic satisfaction). In the proposed model direct paths were tested from all 7 exogenous variables to CDSE and work volition respectively, from CDSE to work volition, and from CDSE and work volition to academic satisfaction (see Appendix L-Figure 4). The model was recursive (when
there are no feedback loops in the directionality of the effects) and identified (i.e., all coefficients in a model are defined by a single Beta and can be estimated by the data with a large enough sample and no collinearity).

**Hypothesized Model**

In the hypothesized model, CDSE, and work volition were proposed to mediate the effects of ethnic identity, acculturation, enculturation and the family influence variables on academic satisfaction (see Appendix M-Figure 5). The proposed model chi-square statistic was statistically significant $X^2(7, N = 224) = 38.18$, $p < .001$, suggestive of a poor fit. The following indices of fit were examined: Comparative fit index (CFI), the Tucker Lewis fit index (TLI), standardized root mean squared residual (SMRM), and the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA). Generally, a model is retained if the CFI and TLI are larger than .95, the SRMR is less than .08 (Hu & Bentler, 1999) and RMSEA is less than .05. The results of the path analysis and the goodness of fit indices did not indicate optimal fit of the hypothesized model for the data. The CFI was .90 and the TLI was .67, values below the recommended cut-off of .95. While the SRMR was below the cut-off at .05, the RMSEA was above the acceptable cut-off, .14, 90% CI [.10, .19]. For this reason, the full model was rejected. Despite the less-than-optimal fit, direct and indirect relationships are discussed below.

**Direct Paths**

All direct path coefficients are presented in Appendix E- Table 5 and in Appendix M-Figure-5. It was predicted that acculturation and enculturation would be directly and positively associated with work volition and CDSE (*Hypothesis 1*). This prediction was only partially supported. While enculturation was not related to CDSE ($\beta = .03$, ns) or work volition ($\beta = -.08$, ns) and acculturation was not related to work volition ($\beta = .02$, ns), acculturation did have a direct
positive relationship with CDSE ($\beta = .28, p < .001$). Additionally, it was hypothesized that ethnic identity would be directly and positively associated with work volition and CDSE (Hypothesis 2). Ethnic identity was not associated with CDSE ($\beta = .003, \text{ns}$) or work volition ($\beta = -.01, \text{ns}$).

It was posited that family informational support, financial support and beliefs and values would have a direct positive association with CDSE and work volition, while family expectations would have a direct negative association with CDSE and work volition (Hypothesis 3). Results of the path analysis indicate partial support for this hypothesis. Family financial support ($\beta = -.05, \text{ns}$) and family values and beliefs ($\beta = .002, \text{ns}$) were not associated with CDSE. Similarly, work volition was not associated with family values and beliefs ($\beta = -.02, \text{ns}$). In regard to significant effects, informational support had a direct and positive relationship with CDSE ($\beta = .19, p < .001$) and work volition ($\beta = .09, p < .05$) while family expectations had a direct and negative relationship with CDSE ($\beta = -.11, p < .01$) and work volition ($\beta = -.22, p < .001$) as hypothesized. Moreover, family financial support had a direct and positive effect on work volition ($\beta = .19, p < .001$). See Appendix E- Table 5 and in Appendix M-Figure-5.

CDSE was predicted to have a positive and direct relationship with work volition (Hypothesis 4). This hypothesis was fully supported in that CDSE did have a direct and positive association with work volition ($\beta = .53, p < .001$). Furthermore, it was expected that CDSE and work volition would both have direct and positive associations with academic satisfaction (Hypothesis 5). This hypothesis was also fully supported; both CDSE ($\beta = .54, p < .001$) and work volition ($\beta = .09, p < .05$) were positively associated with academic satisfaction. Standardized and unstandardized coefficients of direct paths are depicted in Appendix E-Table 5.

**Indirect Paths**
As recommended by Shrout and Bolger (2002) when testing mediation in small samples, indirect effects were analyzed using a bootstrap sample of 1,000, and 95% confidence intervals were generated. The following paragraph will summarize significant indirect effects (see Appendix F-Table 6 for all indirect effect coefficients). It was hypothesized that all seven exogenous variables would have indirect effects on academic satisfaction through CDSE (Hypothesis 6). The indirect paths from acculturation, informational support, and expectations to academic satisfaction through CDSE were all significant. The coefficient of the indirect path from acculturation to academic satisfaction through CDSE was .15, \( p < .01, 95\% \text{ CI} = [.07, .26] \). The coefficient of the indirect path from informational support to academic satisfaction through CDSE was .10, \( p < .001, 95\% \text{ CI} = [.06, .16] \). The coefficient of the indirect path from family expectations to academic satisfaction through CDSE was -.06, \( p < .05, 95\% \text{ CI} = [-.10, -.01] \). Thus, acculturation and informational support had positive indirect associations with academic satisfaction through CDSE while family expectations had a negative indirect association with academic satisfaction through CDSE. All other indirect paths from exogenous variables to academic satisfaction through CDSE were nonsignificant.

No indirect paths between the exogenous variables and academic satisfaction through work volition were found to be significant in Model 1. Hypothesis 7 was not supported by Model 1. Finally, indirect paths from all seven endogenous variables to academic satisfaction through first CDSE and then work volition were also analyzed (Hypothesis 8). The coefficients of the indirect path from all endogenous variables to academic satisfaction through both CDSE and work volition were not significant. Hypothesis 8 was not supported by Model 1. See Appendix F-Table 6 for all indirect effect coefficients.
4.3 Post hoc Analysis

Weston and Gore (2006) underscored the importance of testing alternative models to the proposed model when conducting path analysis. Given that the a priori hypothesized model yielded suboptimal fit and that vocational research has only recently focused on family influence within the framework of SCCT, one additional model was proposed post hoc. Prior SCCT research has also suggested that contextual variables may have proximal effects on career outcomes such as academic satisfaction in addition to distal effects (Lent et al., 2000; Lent et al., 2003). Thus, while Model 1 assessed for a pure mediation it did not consider any direct effects of exogenous variables on academic satisfaction. Thus, an alternative model was tested to include direct paths between certain cultural variables and academic satisfaction. Model 2 added direct paths from acculturation and enculturation to academic satisfaction while also dropping the direct paths between individual cultural variables (e.g., ethnic identity, acculturation and enculturation) and work volition given that these paths were not significant in Model 1.

Model 2

As previously described, career development literature has also supported proximal direct effects of cultural person-inputs on academic satisfaction (Lent et al., 2003). For example, several studies have supported a positive relationship between the endorsement of ethnic identity, acculturation, enculturation and outcome variables such as general life satisfaction, job satisfaction and well-being (Meca et al., 2017; Valdivia & Flores, 2011). In addition to theoretical support, the added paths in Model 2 were supported by the results of the modification index (MI) produced in Model 1. Consultation of the MI is useful in post-hoc model identification because the MI estimates the degree to which the chi-square will decrease if a parameter is added (Weston & Gore, 2006). Both the MI and high standardized residuals
between acculturation (standardized residual = 2.86) and enculturation (standardized residual= 5.01) and academic satisfaction yielded in the analysis of Model 1 supported the inclusion of direct paths between both acculturation and enculturation to academic satisfaction in model 2 (See Appendix N-Figure 6).

Furthermore, in Model 1, none of the individual cultural variables (i.e., ethnic identity, acculturation and enculturation) were directly related to work volition. Additionally, work volition is the perceived freedom to make career choices and decisions which may be characterized by an external appraisal versus CDSE which looks at a more internal appraisal of one’s confidence to make career choices (Duffy et al., 2012; Duffy et al., 2014). Thus, family influence, which is an external variable in comparison to ethnic identity, acculturation, and enculturation which assess an individual’s appraisal and behaviors, may be more significant for work volition (Kim, Kim et al., 2016; Duffy et al., 2018). Given this theoretical understanding as well as the nonsignificant paths in Model 1, the three direct paths from ethnic identity, acculturation, and enculturation to work volition were dropped.

Identical to Model 1, it was predicted that personal variables (i.e., ethnic identity, acculturation, and enculturation) and contextual variables (i.e., the four family influence variables) would be associated with CDSE. The four family influence variables were predicted to have direct relationships with work volition. In addition, it was also predicted that higher levels of acculturation, and enculturation would be directly associated with higher levels of academic satisfaction among Latinx college students. The second model also retained the three positive hypothesized relationships between the three endogenous variables, such that CDSE was directly associated with work volition and both CDSE and work volition were positively associated with academic satisfaction.
The alternative model was recursive and identified (See Appendix N-Figure 6). A path analysis of Model 2 determined significantly improved fit than the originally hypothesized model; the chi-square statistic was not statistically significant $X^2 (8, N = 224) = 12.70, p = .12$, suggestive of good fit (See Appendix D-Table 4). The results of the path analysis indicated that the goodness of fit indices for the hypothesized model fit the data better than Model 1. The CFI was .99 and the TLI was .96. The SRMR was .02, the RMSEA was .05, 90% CI [.00, .10]. For this reason, Model 2 was retained. Again, a bootstrapped sample of 1,000 and 95% confidence intervals were used to analyze indirect paths. Given the significant improvement in fit of Model 2 direct and indirect path coefficients are discussed (See Appendix G-Table 7, Appendix H – Table 8, and Appendix N-Figure 6).

**Direct Paths**

In Model 2, the coefficients of all direct paths between the seven exogenous variables and CDSE were identical to Model 1 and are not repeated here (See Appendix G-Table 7). In this section the direct paths between the family variables and work volition, the added paths between cultural exogenous variables (acculturation and enculturation) and academic satisfaction, and the direct paths between endogenous variables (CDSE, work volition and academic satisfaction) will be discussed.

Results of the Model 2 indicated that work volition was not associated with family values and beliefs ($\beta = -.02$, ns). In regard to significant effects, informational support had a direct and positive relationship with work volition ($\beta = .11, p < .05$). Moreover, family financial support had a direct and positive effect on work volition ($\beta = .18, p < .001$). Finally, family expectations had a direct and negative relationship with work volition ($\beta = -.23, p < .001$).
Both acculturation ($\beta = .13, p < .05$) and enculturation ($\beta = .21, p < .001$) were positively related to academic satisfaction. Similar to Model 1, CDSE was positively associated with work volition ($\beta = .52, p < .001$), and both CDSE ($\beta = .49, p < .001$) and work volition ($\beta = .11, p < .01$) were positively associated with academic satisfaction in Model 2.

Indirect Paths

As with Model 1 the following paragraph will summarize only significant indirect effects. The indirect paths from acculturation, informational support, and expectations to academic satisfaction through CDSE were all significant. The coefficient of the indirect path from acculturation to academic satisfaction through CDSE was $-.14, p < .01$ 95% CI = [.06, .22]. The coefficient of the indirect path from informational support to academic satisfaction through CDSE was $-.09, p < .001$, 95% CI = [.05, .15]. The coefficient of the indirect path from family expectations to academic satisfaction through CDSE was $-.05, p < .05$, 95% CI = [-.10, -.01]. Thus, acculturation and informational support had a positive indirect effect on academic satisfaction through CDSE while family expectations had a negative indirect effect on academic satisfaction through CDSE. All other indirect paths from ethnic identity, enculturation, family values and beliefs, and financial support on academic satisfaction through CDSE were nonsignificant.

In regard to indirect paths through work volition, only family expectations had a significant indirect effect on academic satisfaction through work volition. In Model 2, the coefficient of the indirect path from family expectations to academic satisfaction through work volition was $-.02, p < .05$ 95% CI = [-.05, -.004]. Thus, family expectations had a negative indirect effect on academic satisfaction through work volition. All other indirect paths from
ethnic identity, acculturation, enculturation, informational support, financial support, and family values and beliefs on academic satisfaction through work volition were nonsignificant.

Finally, indirect paths from all seven endogenous variables to academic satisfaction through first CDSE and followed by work volition were also analyzed. The indirect path from informational support to academic satisfaction through CDSE and work volition was also significant $p < .05$, $95\% \text{ CI } = [.002, .02]$. Thus, informational support had a positive indirect effect on academic satisfaction through CDSE and work volition. All other indirect paths from ethnic identity, acculturation, enculturation, family financial support, family expectations, family values and beliefs to academic satisfaction through CDSE were nonsignificant (see Appendix H-Table 8).

### 4.4 Summary of Results

In summary, the results of the path analysis of the hypothesized Model 1 indicated suboptimal fit. Thus, an additional model was specified post hoc which added two direct paths from acculturation and enculturation to academic satisfaction and removed direct paths between ethnic identity, acculturation and enculturation and work volition. Model 2 showed significant improvement in fit. In Model 2, acculturation and informational support were positively associated with CDSE while family expectations was negatively associated with CDSE. Furthermore, CDSE was positively associated with work volition. Moreover, CDSE and work volition were each positively associated with academic satisfaction. Informational support and financial support were positively related to work volition while family expectation was negatively related to work volition. The two added paths from acculturation and enculturation to academic satisfaction were also significant and positive. CDSE mediated the relationship between acculturation, informational support and family expectations and academic satisfaction,
while work volition mediated the relationship between family expectations and academic satisfaction. Finally, the association between informational support and academic satisfaction were also mediated first by CDSE and work volition. Thus, overall support was provided for the integration of work volition within a SCCT model of academic satisfaction and family influence played a distal association with academic satisfaction by way of work volition and CDSE while acculturation and enculturation were more proximally related to academic satisfaction.
Chapter 5: Discussion

5.1 Introduction

The objective of the present study was to explore the relationships between individual variables (e.g., ethnic identity, acculturation and enculturation), collectivistic cultural variables (e.g., family influence), CDSE and academic satisfaction of college-aged Latinxs. Furthermore, this study investigated the role of work volition, a Psychology of Working Theory (PWT) variable, as a possible mediator within a Social Cognitive Career Theory (SCCT) model of academic satisfaction. To the best of this researcher’s knowledge this is the first study to test family influence variables and integrate work volition into a SCCT study for Latinx college students. These variables were tested in order to underscore the importance of collectivistic cultural variables and perceived freedom to make career decisions in the development of academic satisfaction. The researcher proposed a model to test the direct effects of seven cultural variables (exogenous variables) on both CDSE and work volition (mediators). Additionally, the direct effect of CDSE and work volition as well as the direct effects between both CDSE and work volition and academic satisfaction were tested. Given that the path analyses showed less than optimal fit, an additional model was tested post hoc, which added direct paths from acculturation and enculturation to academic satisfaction and removed the direct paths between ethnic identity, acculturation, and enculturation and work volition. This model evidenced good fit for this sample of Latinx students (see Appendix N-Figure 6).

In this chapter the researcher summarizes significant findings in the context of the aforementioned hypotheses and discusses potential interpretations of the findings as they pertain to PWT and SCCT. Subsequently, future directions for research and implications based on the
findings across theory, research, practice and training are explored. Finally, this chapter will end with a consideration of the study’s limitations.

5.2 Overview of Significant Findings

Bivariate Correlations

The correlation patterns among the variables of interest in this study were mostly consistent with prior career development research concerning Latinx college students (Bonifacio et al., 2018; Mejia & Gushue, 2017). Acculturation, family informational support, and family financial support were positively correlated with CDSE, work volition, and academic satisfaction. Enculturation was positively correlated with academic satisfaction, but not with CDSE and work volition. Family expectations was negatively correlated to all career outcome variables, as anticipated. Additionally, the positive correlations between career CDSE, work volition, and academic satisfaction identified in previous studies were also supported (Duffy et al., 2014; Jadidian & Duffy, 2012). Contrary to expectation, ethnic identity was not related to any of the career outcome variables.

Exploratory Analyses

Several MANOVAs were conducted to assess for group differences among variables of interest in the present study. Findings indicated that work volition and academic satisfaction differed by major of choice. Specifically, Latinx students in the STEM fields reported higher levels of perceived freedom to make career decisions and academic satisfaction than Latinx students in creative and performing arts and language/cultural studies. This is notable, given that previous literature has looked predominantly at college students in the STEM fields (Duffy et al., 2014; Lent & Brown; 2006; Navarro et al., 2019). Furthermore, differences in average work volition and average academic satisfaction were found across attendance of a Hispanic Serving
Institution (HSI). Surprisingly, academic satisfaction and work volition were lower in students enrolled in HSIs than for Latinx students not enrolled. These findings have been corroborated by a previous study that showed that the relationship between CDSE and academic satisfaction was weaker in Latinx students enrolled in HSI versus not (Navarro et al., 2019). These findings could suggest that Latinxs who actively seek out HSIs for college may be more aware of barriers to their career development and thus, perceive less freedom in their ability to make career choices. Furthermore, students who attend HSIs may be less acculturated which may impact navigation of career pursuits and impact overall satisfaction with college experience insofar as greater acculturation is associated with increased confidence to navigate the U.S. college environment (Flores et al., 2008; Navarro et al., 2019). Additionally, as supported by PWT, Latinx students who reported their SES to be middle class endorsed higher levels of work volition than students who reported their SES to be lower class (Blustein, 2013; Duffy et al., 2016; Gonzalez, 2015). Finally, work volition and academic satisfaction also differed across ethnicity such that Latinx who reported their family’s country of origin to be South America” endorsed higher levels of work volition than other Latinx groups which points to potential within-group ethnic differences previously supported in the literature (Cislo, 2008; Garriott et al., 2019; Musu-Gillette et al., 2016). While some within-group differences in career outcomes were noted across demographic variables (i.e., major of choice, HSI enrollment, and SES) these differences were not tested in the path analysis given the small sample size.

**Primary Analyses**

Overall, the results suggest that greater family informational support was related to higher CDSE and more work volition (*Hypothesis 3*, see Appendix N-Figure 6). In other words, Latinx students who endorsed greater family involvement through the provision of resources
about career options and facilitation of relevant career connections also experienced greater self-confidence in their ability to make career decisions and perceived more freedom in their ability to make career choices. On the other hand, higher levels of family expectations were related to both lower CDSE and lower work volition (Hypothesis 3). Thus, Latinxs who reported higher career related expectations set by their family expressed lower levels of self-confidence in their ability to successfully complete career decision-making tasks and perceived less freedom to make career choices. In addition, financial family influence was associated with work volition but not with CDSE underscoring how Latinx college students who reported increased ability to depend on financial assistance from their family in regard to their career pursuits also perceived more freedom of career choice, but that financial influence was not related to their self-confidence in their ability to make career decisions.

Taken together, these findings concerning the significance of family influence for Latinx college students align with existing vocational development theory which underscores the importance of family in career development specifically among immigrant collectivistic cultures (Blustein et al., 2004; Fouad et al., 2010; Fuligini, 2001; Whiston & Keller, 2004). The positive role of family informational support builds on the understanding of family influence as a distal contextual factor in the SCCT model that potentially promotes self-efficacy and work volition (Fouad et al., 2010; Kim, Ahn et al., 2016) and ultimately may lead to increased academic satisfaction. Previous literature has also suggested that family expectations may increase pressure on college students and diminish volition (Duffy & Diemer et al., 2012; Fouad et al., 2016). Of note, family influence variables had greater associations with work volition than the other individual cultural variables (i.e., acculturation, enculturation, and ethnic identity) which may
suggest that collectivistic familial influences rather than individual processes may have more of an impact on the freedom Latinx college students perceive they have over their career choices.

For this Latinx college sample, greater levels of acculturation were associated with higher CDSE (*Hypothesis 2*) and more academic satisfaction while higher levels of enculturation were solely associated with greater academic satisfaction. Therefore, Latinx students who reported greater adoption of U.S. cultural practices also reported more self-confidence in career-decision making abilities. Furthermore, Latinx students who both expressed greater adoption of U.S. cultural practices and maintained more Latinx cultural practices were also more satisfied with their academic experience.

Indeed, the bicultural positive associations between acculturation, enculturation and career outcomes have been previously observed in Latinx samples (Blancero et al., 2018; Chen et al., 2008; Marsiglia et al., 2013; Ojeda et al., 2011). Flores et al. (2008) suggested that familiarity with English and U.S. values and social norms may increase Latinx students’ confidence in their ability to successfully navigate university culture, and ultimately improve academic satisfaction.

In addition, Latinx students who simultaneously maintain their Latinx culture through enculturative processes have been shown to report lower levels of depression, and greater overall life satisfaction (Marsiglia et al., 2013; Torres et al., 2010). For this sample, a bicultural approach to acculturation appears significant in the promotion of academic satisfaction. Contrary to previous studies (Bonifacio et al., 2018; Gushue, 2006; Lewis et al., 2018; Mejia-Smith & Gushue, 2017) ethnic identity was not associated with any career outcomes for this Latinx sample (*Hypothesis 1*). This surprising finding may be suggestive of limitations in measurement, specifically the limited power to detect associations in a small sample of a 6-item instrument in which the sample overwhelming endorsed higher ethnic identity.
The results build on previous SCCT studies that have found CDSE to mediate the association between person input, contextual variables and career outcomes such as academic satisfaction (Flores et al., 2014; Lent et al., 2007; Navarro et al., 2019; Ojeda et al., 2011). As expected, indirect relationships were found between acculturation and informational support and academic satisfaction through CDSE (Hypothesis 6). Thus, as levels of acculturation increased so did CDSE which subsequently was related to higher levels of academic satisfaction for this sample. Similarly, as family informational support augmented CDSE, it was ultimately associated with greater academic satisfaction. In other words, Latinx college students’ who endorse greater adaptation of U.S. culture through language, social interaction, and interests as well as receive informational guidance and resources from their family may develop greater confidence in their ability to make career related decisions, which in turn may lead to greater satisfaction with their academics.

Family expectations was indirectly related to academic satisfaction through CDSE and work volition respectively (Hypotheses 6-7). Thus, as family expectations increased, students also reported lower CDSE and lower work volition and both ultimately were associated with lower academic satisfaction. This indirect relationship involving work volition supports previous findings which suggest that work volition, like CDSE, may mediate the relationship between contextual and person-input variables and vocational outcomes (Duffy et al., 2018; Kim, Kim et al., 2016). Furthermore, it is important to note that while academic satisfaction may be conceptualized as an individual appraisal for most college students, among Latinx students, family expectations may indirectly impact academic satisfaction by way of lowering perceived freedom to make career choices. For example, if a Latinx young adult believes that their career choices must meet familial expectations of traditional gender roles, responsibility, or geographic
proximity to family this may impact their sense of volition and ultimately have implications for their academic satisfaction (Covarrubias et al., 2015; Gomez et al., 2001; Ojeda & Liang, 2014).

In agreement with the integration of PWT and SCCT, family informational support was indirectly related to academic satisfaction through both CDSE and work volition such that higher levels of informational support was associated with increased CDSE which subsequently was associated with higher work volition and ultimately strengthened academic satisfaction (hypothesis 8). This finding is particularly significant because it highlights the distal importance of family knowledge in promoting three important career outcomes. That is to say that greater family informational resources may be related to an increased sense of confidence in one’s ability to make career choices which subsequently may be associated with greater perceived freedom of choice and ultimately higher academic satisfaction among Latinx youth. It adds to previous correlational findings which showed a positive relationship between CDSE, work volition and academic satisfaction (Jadidian & Duffy, 2012; Duffy et al., 2014). Moreover, it speaks to the apparent combined effects of CDSE and work volition in the promotion of academic satisfaction.

Finally, in regard to associations between the three career outcome variables (i.e., CDSE, work volition, and academic satisfaction) the results support and build off previous literature on vocational theory for this Latinx college sample (Duffy et al., 2015; Jadidian & Duffy, 2012; Lent & Brown, 2013; Lent et al., 2006; Lent, 2004; Lent et al., 2006; 2007; Navarro et al., 2019). Specifically, increased levels of CDSE were associated with higher levels of work volition and both higher levels of CDSE and work volition were each associated with increased academic satisfaction. Thus, Latinx students who endorsed greater confidence in their abilities to make career decisions were also likely to perceive more freedom in their ability to make career choices
and have higher academic satisfaction. Lastly, Latinx students who reported they had greater freedom to make career choices were also more likely to endorse greater academic satisfaction.

5.3 Implications

Theoretical Considerations

Several studies have provided support for the application of SCCT models to Latinx young adult career development (Flores et al., 2014; Mejia & Gushue, 2017; Navarro et al., 2019; Ojeda et al., 2011). Additionally, previous literature in vocational development has pointed to the importance of cultural factors in career outcomes for Latinx college students (Aguyao et al., 2011; Bonifacio et al., 2018; Mejia-Smith & Gushue, 2017; Ojeda et al., 2011). This study contributes to previous literature by examining the role of individual person inputs and collectivistic familial variables within a SCCT model for academic satisfaction for a Latinx college student sample. Specifically, different forms of family influence were measured and found to predict CDSE and ultimately academic satisfaction. This finding builds on previous studies (Fouad et al., 2010; Kim, Ahn et al., 2016) acknowledging the important role of family influence in developing self-confidence in college-aged Latinxs who may hold more collectivistic world beliefs and values (e.g., familismo). Furthermore, it underscores the importance of a broadened perspective of career development as not only a purely individual process. Career theories should continue to examine and consider cultural contextual variables, specifically how family support and family expectations may contribute to college students’ self-efficacy, perception of choice and academic satisfaction among culturally diverse college students.

Additionally, the significant role of work volition in promoting academic satisfaction for this sample underscores the importance of theoretical integration in the field of vocational
psychology (Duffy et al., 2014; Lent & Brown, 2013). Given that PWT puts a strong emphasis on promoting social justice by acknowledging cultural factors, experiences of marginalization and SES status impacting career development for communities of color (Duffy et al., 2016), integrating PWT variables, like work volition, within SCCT models may add to the understanding of how career interests, goals, and satisfaction are developed within Latinx young adults. Moreover, this study provides further support of the relationship between CDSE and work volition (Jadidian & Duffy, 2012; Duffy et al., 2014). One potential theoretical understanding of the positive relationship between CDSE and work volition is the conceptualization of work volition as a potential outcome expectation which is defined as the expected consequences that may arise from taking action toward one’s career (Lent et al., 2003). Within the SCCT model of satisfaction (Lent et al., 2003), self-efficacy has been shown to predict outcome expectations and together, both self-efficacy and outcome expectations contribute to domain-specific satisfaction. In the case of this study, the positive relationships between CDSE, work volition and academic satisfaction as well as the mediating role that CDSE and work volition played in the relationships between cultural variables and academic satisfaction support the consideration of work volition within an SCCT model for Latinx samples.

**Research Considerations**

In regard to future research, vocational psychology should continue to address and explore cultural and environmental factors that may be important for Latinx career development. This is the first study to use the FIS scale with a Latinx population adding to previous cross-cultural validation studies with Asian samples (Fouad et al., 2010; Kim, Ahn et al., 2016). To date few studies have focused on collectivistic influences on career development among Latinx
young adults, despite the cultural salience of *familismo* (i.e., commitment and respect to family). Future studies might consider creating a culturally specific scale to measure the impact of *familismo* on vocational development. Furthermore, the scale used to measure CDSE specifically measures self-confidence in individually focused decision-making tasks. Future studies may also consider including a measure of self-efficacy that is related to making career decisions related to or informed by family.

Vocational development research within the field of counseling psychology should continue to conduct research that recognizes multicultural and environmental factors. Given, the importance of both greater acculturation and greater enculturation in promoting academic satisfaction in this sample of Latinx college students, future studies should consider bicultural identity, potentially by using latent profile analysis (person-centered approach) to explore how different configurations of orientation to U.S. culture and Latinx culture might impact career outcomes.

Moreover, additional studies are needed to replicate these results since the alternative model was identified post hoc. Future studies may test moderations caused by differences across demographic variables of Latinx college students. For example, as supposed in PWT, SES may serve a moderating role in the development of work volition such that the relationship between work volition and acquisition of decent work may be stronger for individuals from lower SES than from higher SES (Duffy et al., 2016). Additionally, given that this present sample overwhelming identified as U.S.-born, future studies may want to explicitly investigate the relationship between cultural variables, CDSE, work volition and academic satisfaction for first generation Latinx college students or may recruit Latinxs from HSIs or community colleges in order to test for generalizability of these findings.
Lastly, given the significance of work volition within an SCCT model in this study, future research may want to continue to explore theoretically integrative models of career development in order to better understand environmental and cognitive factors that impact college experiences among Latinx students. In the future, studies may build off these findings by integrating other PWT variables (i.e., decent work, needs, fulfillment, and well-being) within a developmental social-cognitive perspective in order to better understand what variables may promote increase sense of agency and access to fair and just work.

**Practice Considerations**

This study emphasizes several clinical implications for clinicians and vocational counselors who work with Latinx college students. When Latinx clients present with academic or vocational stressors, counselors should assess for how culture, specifically acculturative forces and family influence, may be impacting confidence in their ability to make career decisions and what beliefs their clients hold about their agency to make choices related to their careers. Vocational therapists who work with students that report low academic satisfaction may consider a dual approach to therapy: 1) support factors that increase sense of self-confidence in career decision making abilities and perceived freedom to make career choices and 2) recognize and validate the acculturative and familial contributions to academic satisfaction among Latinx students.

In addition, clinicians should be curious about their clients’ acculturative processes both the ways they integrate and adapt to the U.S. culture and how they maintain their Latinx traditions and culture. Given that a bicultural acculturative process, where an individual adopts aspects of the mainstream culture while sustaining connection to their Latinx culture, appears important for career development barriers and supports to acculturation and enculturation should
be identified in therapy with Latinx clients. A college counselor might provide resources for Latinx students to engage with the campus community at large through involvement in campus organizations, student leadership or teaching assistant positions, and mentorship programs while also putting an emphasis on connecting with specific classes, campus clubs, colleagues and faculty that promote Latinx identity.

Despite the emphasis on the individual which characterizes the college experience and individual therapy within the U.S., the results of this study point to the significant influence of family on Latinx career development. Given the strong associations between informational family support and CDSE, college counselors may include an assessment of family involvement in college students’ career interests and academic pursuits. Furthermore, the importance of several aspects of family influence on work volition is notable. When working with Latinx students who endorse lower family influence on their career development, counselors in college settings may promote the creation of “academic families” through involvement in Latinx campus clubs or faculty mentorship (Gloria & Castellanos, 2012). Research on “family capital” has shown that students of color have successfully applied family values to academic relationships with peers, faculty and staff which promote collectivism and support academic resilience (Fernández et al., 2021). Finally, the negative association between family expectations and self-efficacy, work volition, and ultimately satisfaction is a powerful finding. Clinicians should be attuned to the influence of family expectations before promoting individualistic career goals. In practice, clinicians may help Latinx college students identify family expectations, validate feelings associated with meeting those expectations, and facilitate dialogue on the familial significance of these expectations. In other words, a clinician may ask a Latinx student to reflect on how family values and beliefs may inform career expectations (e.g., *my parents expect that I*...
pursue a specific career because of my gender) and explore the affect related to having to carry those expectations as the student navigates college life (e.g., I feel the pressure to pursue a certain major and worried it is not what I really want to do).

Training Considerations

Within the context of clinical training, continued emphasis is needed on teaching future clinicians to identify, assess, and be curious about environmental and contextual factors that may contribute to distress for diverse clients. Specifically, career development courses should continue to teach career development theories that consider the role of culture on career development. Clinical trainees should be encouraged to consider the strengths and limitations of career development theory and discuss applications to clinical work. For example, the reigning assumption that career is the result of individual choices may not hold for many collectivistically oriented communities. It should be explicit in the course work how systemic barriers and cultural values create differences in the approach to career development for Latinx young adults.

The findings associated with acculturation and family influence in this study are important to consider in developing course work for vocational development and immigrant psychology courses. First, in the teaching of acculturation it is important to conceptualize the acculturation as a bi-dimensional construct where increasing acculturation does not negate one’s ability to increase enculturation simultaneously. When learning about broad Latinx cultural values and practices, professors should speak to the nuance of intersectionality within this group and the different approaches to interacting in a bicultural environment. Furthermore, trainees should be encouraged to evaluate their assumptions on career development based on their own experiences, cultural identities, and social location. For example, a trainee who holds the belief that career should be an individual choice should consider what it would be like to work with a
Latinx college student whose career path appears inextricably linked to family expectations. Thus, the consideration of family influence should be discussed within career development courses.

5.4 Limitations of the Study

The limitations of the present study must be discussed despite the contribution of the present study’s findings to the vocational development research of Latinx college students. First, the recruitment was self-selection and self-report. Thus, there may be subgroups who were less likely to participate and social desirability may have impacted the way in which individuals responded. For example, Latinx college students who endorsed lower levels of association with their ethnic identity or perceived less volition, confidence in their ability to make career decisions, and academic satisfaction may have been less likely to agree to participate in the study. This may potentially explain the surprising nonsignificant findings between ethnic identity and career outcomes in this study, given that a majority of participants reported strong connections to their Latinx identity. Second, while the sample size met lower bound criteria for path analysis, the study would have been more robust with an increased sample size. Future studies should replicate this model with a larger and more diverse sample in order to account for the number of parameters in the model. Given the small sample, within-group comparisons based on demographic features were not feasible. The sample largely consisted of Latinx participants who identified as heterosexual, middle class, undergraduate students, Mexican, English dominant and female. These proportions are mostly representative of the Latinx college attending population in the U.S. presently (Bustamante, 2019; Parker, 2021). In addition, roughly 47% of the participants identified as 2nd generation while another 26% identified as 3rd generation. Thus, the majority of the participants were born within the U.S. capturing an overall more acculturated
sample that is also representative of the current Latinx population in the U.S. (Livingston, 2019; Columbe & Gil, 2016). Provided that the sample was demographically skewed, the findings may not be representative of diverse Latinxs outside these groups which constrains generalizability to subgroups of Latinxs.

While path analysis is useful for testing simultaneous effects, these results cannot be attributed to causal relationships between variables. Furthermore, the significant findings of Model 2 must be interpreted with caution as this model was identified post-hoc. Ultimately, replication of these findings with a new sample is needed to make generalizations based on these correlational results. In addition, despite all scales showing fair reliability (\(\alpha > .77\)), when using manifest variables, it is important to interpret findings cautiously, given the possibility of measurement error. Moreover, most studies exploring academic satisfaction to date have been focused on college students within the STEM field. This study assessed academic satisfaction more broadly across all majors. It is possible that the findings did not account for a possible moderation of the relationships between cultural variables and academic satisfaction by type of major. Finally, while the FIS has been validated in U.S. and Asian samples this is the first known study to use the FIS with an entirely Latinx sample. Thus, the FIS may not account for culture specific family influences (i.e., familismo) which may have been more relevant to this sample.

5.5 Summary and Conclusions

Historically, career development has been conceptualized from a Eurocentric individualistic perspective, informed by research with middle-class, White young adults. This study integrated two multiculturally informed contemporary theories, Social Cognitive Career Theory and Psychology of Working Framework, in order to better understand how three individual cultural variables (i.e., ethnic identity, acculturation, and enculturation) and four
collectivistic family influence variables (i.e., informational support, financial support, expectations, and values & beliefs) were associated with career outcomes for a Latinx college sample. Results from this study may have important implications for career counseling with Latinx college students, for example the consideration of acculturative resources and family when striving to promote career decision self-efficacy, work volition, and academic satisfaction. Thus, accounting for collectivism by way of family influence, in addition to a bicultural acculturative orientation, may contribute to the understanding of strengthening academic satisfaction in Latinx young adults. Finally, in this study work volition played a significant role within a SCCT model for academic satisfaction. Indeed, future integration of empirically supported career development theories may further contribute to the exploration of acculturation, family influence and the relationships between career outcomes among Latinx college students.
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## Appendix A

### Table 1

**Demographics Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>68.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-binary/gender non-conforming</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sexual Orientation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbian</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queer</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>60.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Class</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Class</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>63.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Class</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of College</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-year associate degree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-year undergraduate institution</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>58.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s level program</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral level program</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HSI Enrollment</strong></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South America</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribbean</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central America</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Generational Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(^{st}) Generation</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2(^{nd}) Generation</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>46.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3(^{rd}) Generation</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Demographic Information (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major of Study</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative/Performing Arts</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language and Culture</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEM</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language Preference</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English only</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish/Portuguese only</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English more than Spanish/Portuguese</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish/Portuguese more than English</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English and Spanish/Portuguese equally</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 224*
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Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>1.17-4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>-.47</td>
<td>1.77-5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enculturation</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>-.47</td>
<td>1.35-5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.87</td>
<td>1.00-6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>1.00-6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-1.23</td>
<td>1.00-6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectation</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-.99</td>
<td>1.00-6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDSE</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>-.44</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>1.08-5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volition</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>2.00-6.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>-.48</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>1.71-5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3

Summary of Variable Intercorrelations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ethnic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Acculturation</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Enculturation</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Information</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Financial</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Values</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Expectation</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. CDSE</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Volition</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>-.42**</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Satisfaction</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *indicates that the correlation is significant at the .05 level; ** indicates that the correlation is significant at the .01 level. Ethnic = Ethnic Identity, Information = Family Informational Support, Financial = Family Financial Support, Expectation = Expectations, Values = Values and Beliefs, CDSE = Career Decision Self-efficacy, Volition = Work Volition, Satisfaction = Academic Satisfaction.
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Table 4

Summary of Model Fit Indices for Proposed Models (N = 224)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>AIC</th>
<th>BIC</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>38.18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>1287.70</td>
<td>1355.93</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.10-.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>12.70</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>1260.22</td>
<td>1325.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.00-.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $X^2$ = chi square; CFI = Comparative Fit Index; TLI = Tucker-Lewis Index; SRMR = Standardized Root Mean Square Residual; RMSEA = Root Mean Square Error of Approximation; CI = 90% Confidence Interval.
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### Table 5

*Parameter Estimates for Direct Paths of Model 1 (N = 224)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>( \beta )</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic ( \rightarrow ) CDSE</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation ( \rightarrow ) CDSE</td>
<td>.28***</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enculturation ( \rightarrow ) CDSE</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information ( \rightarrow ) CDSE</td>
<td>.19***</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial ( \rightarrow ) CDSE</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values ( \rightarrow ) CDSE</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectation ( \rightarrow ) CDSE</td>
<td>-.11**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic ( \rightarrow ) Volition</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation ( \rightarrow ) Volition</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enculturation ( \rightarrow ) Volition</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information ( \rightarrow ) Volition</td>
<td>.09*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial ( \rightarrow ) Volition</td>
<td>.19***</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values ( \rightarrow ) Volition</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectation ( \rightarrow ) Volition</td>
<td>-.22***</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDSE ( \rightarrow ) Volition</td>
<td>.53***</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDSE ( \rightarrow ) Satisfaction</td>
<td>.54***</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volition ( \rightarrow ) Satisfaction</td>
<td>.09*</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


* \( p < .05 \), ** \( p < .01 \), *** \( p < .001 \); \( N = 224 \).
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### Table 6

**Parameter Estimates for Indirect Paths of Model 1 (N = 224)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Mediator → Criterion</th>
<th>( \beta )</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>CI</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic→</td>
<td></td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.08-.10</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation→</td>
<td></td>
<td>.15***</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.07-.26</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enculturation→</td>
<td></td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.06-.09</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information→</td>
<td>CDSE→ Satisfaction</td>
<td>.10***</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.06-.16</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial→</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.08-.02</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values→</td>
<td></td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.04-.04</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations→</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.06*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.11(-.01)</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic→</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.02-.02</td>
<td>-.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation→</td>
<td></td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.02-.02</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enculturation→</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.03-.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information→</td>
<td>Volition→ Satisfaction</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.002-.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial→</td>
<td></td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.001-.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values→</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.01-.01</td>
<td>-.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectation→</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.05(-.001)</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic→</td>
<td></td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.01-.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation→</td>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.001-.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enculturation→</td>
<td></td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>-.01-.01</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information→</td>
<td>CDSE→Volition→ Satisfaction</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.001-.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial→</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>-.01-.003</td>
<td>-.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values→</td>
<td></td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>-.004-.004</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectation→</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>-.01-.00</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.06-.37</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \( \beta \) = standardized coefficient, SE = standard error, B = unstandardized coefficient. Ethnic = Ethnic Identity, Information = Family Informational Support, Financial = Family Financial Support, Expectation = Expectations, Values = Values and Beliefs, CDSE = Career Decision Self-efficacy, Volition = Work Volition, Satisfaction = Academic Satisfaction.

\( * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001; N = 224. \)
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Table 7

Parameter Estimates for Direct Paths of Model 2 (N = 224)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic→CDSE</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation→CDSE</td>
<td>.28***</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enculturation→CDSE</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information→CDSE</td>
<td>.19***</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial→CDSE</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values→CDSE</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectation→CDSE</td>
<td>-.11**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information→Volition</td>
<td>0.11*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial→Volition</td>
<td>.18***</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values→Volition</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectation→Volition</td>
<td>-.23***</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDSE→Volition</td>
<td>.52***</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation→Satisfaction</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enculturation→Satisfaction</td>
<td>.21***</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDSE→Satisfaction</td>
<td>.49***</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volition→Satisfaction</td>
<td>.11**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Ethnic = Ethnic Identity, CDSE = Career Decision Self-efficacy, Volition = Work

Volition, Satisfaction = Academic Satisfaction. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$; $N = 224$. 
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### Table 8

**Parameter Estimates for Indirect Paths of Model 2 (N = 224)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Mediator → Criterion</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$SE$</th>
<th>CI</th>
<th>$B$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic→</td>
<td></td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.07-.09</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation→</td>
<td></td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.06-.22</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enculturation→</td>
<td></td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.05-.08</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information→</td>
<td>CDSE→ Satisfaction</td>
<td>.09***</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05-.15</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial→</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.08-.02</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values→</td>
<td></td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.04-.04</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations→</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.05*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.10-.01</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information→</td>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.001-.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial→</td>
<td>Volition→ Satisfaction</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.003-.04</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values→</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.01-.01</td>
<td>-.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectation→</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.02*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.05-.004</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic→</td>
<td></td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.01-.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation→</td>
<td></td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.003-.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enculturation→</td>
<td></td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>-.01-.01</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information→</td>
<td>CDSE→Volition→ Satisfaction</td>
<td>.01*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.002-.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial→</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>-.01-.002</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values→</td>
<td></td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.01-.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectation→</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>-.02-.00</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.12-.42</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $\beta$ = standardized coefficient, $SE$ = standard error, $B$ = unstandardized coefficient. CI = 95% CI for unstandardized indirect relation. Ethnic = Ethnic Identity, Information = Family Informational Support, Financial = Family Financial Support, Expectation = Expectations, Values = Values and Beliefs, CDSE = Career Decision Self-efficacy, Volition = Work Volition, Satisfaction = Academic Satisfaction. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$; $N = 224$. 
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Figure 1

Social Cognitive Career Theory Choice Model
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Figure 2

*Social Cognitive Career Theory Model of Satisfaction*
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Figure 3

Psychology of Working Framework Model

Appendix L

Figure 4

Hypothesized Model

Note. This model illustrates the hypothesized model.
Appendix M

Figure 5

Estimated Model

Note. Standardized parameter estimates shown * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001; N = 224. Paths with dashed lines indicate non-significant direct effects.
Appendix N

Figure 6

Estimated Model 2

Note. Standardized parameter estimates shown * \( p < .05 \), ** \( p < .01 \), *** \( p < .001 \); \( N = 224 \). Paths with dashed lines indicate non-significant direct effects.
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Informed Consent

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Nadine Postolache

INTRODUCTION: You are invited to participate in a study examining how contextual factors influence your career development. You will be asked to complete self-report questions about demographic information, academic satisfaction, ethnic identity, confidence, family influence, acculturation, and work volition. Information provided may be presented at conferences, meetings, articles, or used for educational purposes. The research will be conducted online through Qualtrics-secure database. To participate in this survey, you must meet the below criteria:
(1) Identify as Latino/Latina/Latinx/Hispanic (2) Be between the ages of 18-30 (3) Currently, attending post-secondary academic institution in the U.S.

This study is being conducted by Nadine Postolache who is a Doctoral Student in the department of Counseling Psychology at Teachers College, Columbia University. This study has been approved by the Institutional Review Board of Teachers College, Columbia University (Protocol #____)

RISKS AND BENEFITS: No more than minimal risks are anticipated with this study. Such risks may include mild discomfort when thinking about personal reactions to events or beliefs and experiences. There are no assured benefits from participating in this study. While completing the surveys you may skip any questions you are uncomfortable answering and end the survey at any time.

DATA STORAGE TO PROTECT CONFIDENTIALITY: All data will be kept confidential and will only be reported in a conglomerate format (only reporting combined results and never reporting individual results).

TIME INVOLVEMENT:
Completion of all measures will take approximately 20 to 45 minutes and can be completed at the participants’ leisure.

HOW RESULTS WILL BE USED:
Results may be presented at meetings or conferences, and data may be published in journals, or articles, or used for educational purposes.

Selecting “I agree” below indicates that you have read and reviewed the research description provided above, and further indicates that you agree to participate in the following study. You have the right to withdraw from participation at any time without penalty. Should you have any questions about this study, please contact the principal investigator:

Nadine Postolache
Department of Counseling and Clinical Psychology
Teachers College, Columbia University
525 W. 120th Street
New York, NY 10027
np2629@tc.columbia.edu

Should you have comments, or concerns regarding the conduct of the research or questions about your rights as a research subject, you should contact the Teachers College, Columbia University Institutional Review Board/IRB. The phone number for the IRB is (212) 678-4105. Or, you can write to the IRB at Teachers College, Columbia University, 525 W. 120th Street, New York, NY, 10027, Box 151.
## Appendix P

**Modified Acculturation Rating Scale for Mexican Americans-II**

Circle a number between 1-5 to each item that best applies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Very little or not very often</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Much or very often</th>
<th>Extremely often or almost always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I speak Spanish
2. I speak English
3. I enjoy speaking Spanish
4. I associate with Anglos
5. I associate with Latinos and/or Latino Americans
6. I enjoy listening to Spanish language music
7. I enjoy listening to English language music
8. I enjoy Spanish language TV
9. I enjoy English language TV
10. I enjoy English language movies
11. I enjoy Spanish language movies
12. I enjoy reading (e.g., books in Spanish)
13. I enjoy reading (e.g., books in English)
14. I write (i.e., letters/emails in Spanish)
15. I write (e.g., letter/emails in English)
16. My thinking is done in the English language
17. My thinking is done in the Spanish language
18. My contact with Latinx has been
19. My contact with the U.S. has been
20. My father identifies or identified himself as Latino
21. My mother identified herself as Latina
22. My friends, while I was growing up were of Mexican origin
23. My friends, while I was growing up were of Anglo origin
24. My family cooks Mexican foods
25. My family cooks Anglo foods
26. My friends now are of Mexican origin
27. I like to identify myself as an Anglo American
28. I like to identify myself as a Latinx American
29. I like to identify myself as Latin
30. I like to identify myself as an American.
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Career Decision Self-Efficacy-Short Form (CDSE-SF)

Confidence Questionnaire

Instructions: 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 following 5-point continuum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Confidence at all</th>
<th>Very Little Confidence</th>
<th>Some Confidence</th>
<th>Much Confidence</th>
<th>Complete Confidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HOW MUCH CONFIDENCE DO YOU HAVE THAT YOU COULD:

1. Find information in the library about occupations you are interested in. 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 troubles 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 chosen major. 1 2 3 4 5
8. Persistently work at you 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 about 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 the field are you interested in. 1 2 3 4 5
20. Choose major or career that will fit your interests. 1 2 3 4 5
21. Identify employers, firms, 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
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Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure--Revised (MEIM--R)

In this country, people come from many different countries and cultures, and there are many different words to describe the different backgrounds or ethnic groups that people come from. Some examples of the names of ethnic groups are Hispanic or Latino, Black or African American, Asian American, Chinese, Filipino, American Indian, Mexican American, Caucasian or White, Italian American, and many others. These questions are about your ethnicity or your ethnic group and how you feel about it or react to it.

Please fill in: In terms of ethnic group, I consider myself to be ____________________

Use the numbers below to indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

(5) Strongly agree (4) Agree (3) Neutral (2) Disagree (1) Strongly disagree

1. I have spent time trying to find out more about my ethnic group, such as its history, traditions and customs
2. I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group.
3. I understand pretty well what my ethnic group membership means to me
4. I have often done things that will help me understand my ethnic background better
5. I have often talked to other people in order to learn more about my ethnic group.
6. I feel a strong attachment towards my own ethnic group

13- My ethnicity is
   (1) Asian or Asian American, including Chinese, Japanese, and others
   (2) Black or African American
   (3) Hispanic or Latino, including Mexican American, Central American, and others
   (4) White, Caucasian, Anglo, European American; not Hispanic
   (5) American Indian/Native American
   (6) Mixed; Parents are from two different groups
   (7) Other (write in): _____________________________________

14- My father's ethnicity is (use numbers above)
15- My mother's ethnicity is (use numbers above)
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Family Influence Scale

Answer to what extent you agree with the statement below ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (6).

1. My family shared information with me about how to obtain a job
2. My family discussed career issues with me at an early age
3. My family showed me how to be successful in choosing a career
4. My family showed me what was important in choosing a career.
5. Watching my family work gave me confidence in my career
6. My family provided guidance on which careers would be best for me
7. My family has given me information about obtaining education/training
8. My family supported me asking career-related questions
9. My family expects me to select a career that has a certain status
10. My family expects me to make career decisions so that I do not shame them
11. My family is only willing to support me financially if I choose a career of which they approve
12. My family expects that my choice of occupation will reflect their wishes
13. My family expects people from our culture to choose certain careers
14. My family’s career expectations for me are based on my gender
15. My family expects me to contribute financially to my career education and training
16. Because my family supports me financially, I can focus on my career development
17. My family has not been able to financially support my career decisions
18. If I wanted to get additional education after high school, my family would provide financial support
19. If I were to experience a difficult career situation, my family would support me financially
20. My family expects that I will consider my religion/spirituality when making career decisions
21. My family explained how our values and beliefs pertain to my career choices
22. My family expects my career to match our family’s values/beliefs
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Work Volition Scale-Student Version

Answer to what extent you agree with the statement below ranging from *strongly disagree* (1) to *strongly agree* (7).

1. I will be able to change jobs if I want to.
2. Discrimination will not affect my ability to choose a job.
3. Once I enter the work world, I will easily find a new job if I want to.
4. I will be able to choose jobs that I want.
5. I will learn how to find my own way in the world of work.
6. I feel total control over my future job choices.
7. I will be able to do the kind of work I want to, despite external barriers.
8. What I want has little impact on my future job choice.
9. In order to provide for my family, I will have to take jobs I do not enjoy.
10. Due to discrimination, I do not feel I have complete control over my ability to get a job.
11. Due to my financial situation, once I get a job, I couldn’t change jobs even if I wanted to.
12. I feel that my family situation limits the types of jobs I might pursue.
13. I worry that my life circumstances will prevent me from achieving my long term career goals.
14. Due to my financial situation, I will need to take any job I can find.
15. The only thing that matters in choosing a job is to make ends meet.
16. I know I won’t like my future job, but it will be impossible for me to find a new one.