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Abstract

The present study examined the influence that father's residency status and father-child relational qualities have on adolescent psychological adjustment, behavioral outcomes, scholastic achievement, self-identity acculturation, and the subjective well-being of Chinese male immigrants from intact, two-parent households. The relational qualities of interest under investigation consisted of father-son attachment, father involvement, and father acceptance-rejection, from the phenomenological perception of children. A total of 86 participants were included in the overall multivariate analyses – 53 in the father present and 33 in the father absent group, respectively. Results indicate that father attachment positively predicts adolescent psychological adjustment in the father present group, independent of mother-child attachment. However, the importance of peer attachment to psychological health and subjective well-being is also observed. The protective effect that father attachment has against psychological maladjustment or personality disposition development is neutralized after adjusting for peer attachment, but not vice versa. In addition, father acceptance also positively associates with adolescent psychological adjustment, whereas father rejection increases the risks of negative personality dispositions. These findings are preliminary due to the small sample size and an overrepresentation of participants with higher educational background.
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Chapter One: Introduction

Background and Rationale for Study

The continued influx of Chinese immigrant families to the United States has resulted in a sizable percentage of households consisting of mothers and children, with fathers maintaining their employment in the country of origin. The long-term ramifications of this father absence in the psychological, emotional, and behavioral developments of the children and the family life cycle have major lasting impacts in society. The purpose of this study was to determine the effects that absent fathers have on their sons' characterological or personality development, psychological health, academic achievement, outcomes in behavior, and subjective well-being in intact, two-parent immigrant Chinese families.

The importance of father influence in children’s development received little attention prior to the 1960s. The increasing numbers of women with children entering the workforce and the subsequent high divorce rates in the United States prompted and fueled emerging studies on fathering and its effects on child psychopathology. The societal transformation resulting in the necessity to have dual family earners to maintain a functioning household positively promoted women’s upward economic mobility and autonomy, and the convergence of sociopolitical and cultural forces associated with the feminist movement in the 1970s encouraged and facilitated the reevaluation and reexamination of gender role construction and gender role identity.

Earlier research in the clinical field attempted to study father influence on children’s outcomes in father absent families, relying mostly on fathers’ self-report of involvement as related to quantity and frequency of interaction with their children after
divorce. It is not until more recently that qualitative aspects of father involvement received considerable attention. In addition to measuring the frequency and duration of contact that nonresident fathers have with their children after marital separation or dissolution, researchers have expanded their studies to include the family dynamics, structure and marital relationship prior to and after separation. Moreover, the quality of father-child attachment relationship, interaction and involvement, and the perceived paternal warmth, acceptance, and love from the children’s phenomenological perceptions or points of view in particular in both intact or father absent households have been meticulously examined. It is suggested that security attachment in the father-child relationship and the extent and quality of fathers’ positive involvement, particularly as it relates to the fathers’ emotional availability, accessibility, responsivity, warmth, nurturance, and acceptance domains, from the perspective or perception of the children play critical roles in mitigating the negative consequences that could occur during the developmental years.

The role of the father in child development has received an ever increasing amount of attention in psychological studies in the last two decades. A wealth of information generated from the vast literature on divorce and parental separation have contributed to our understanding of the importance of fathers in the development of children. The results have suggested that children from fatherless families tend to exhibit a myriad of maladies such as delinquency, criminality, poor educational attainment or success, alcohol and substance abuse, psychological maladjustment, and mental illness when compared to children from intact families. Given the varied contextual and methodological parameters utilized in these studies, it is difficult to extrapolate the causal
or protective factors intrinsic in the father-child relationship that serve to mediate the emotional, psychological and behavioral outcomes reported in the findings. Although the importance of the role of fathers is underscored, it appears that their mere physical presence or absence does not adequately explain the phenomenon.

It is worthwhile to point out that most of the research has been done with boys born in the United States. It is uncertain whether the same process also applies to immigrant youths where the fathers are either separated from their sons during adolescence or physically present but emotionally unavailable due to the stresses of having to adjust to a new culture. Although the impact of fathers on boys’ development is well documented in the native population, we don’t really know the effects that father absence have on immigrant children, particularly as it relates to physical separation due to paternal employment or other reasons other than divorce. This study attempted to explore and examine the effects that father presence, father-son attachment, father involvement, and father acceptance have on immigrant sons’ psychological, behavioral and scholastic development and well-being during adolescence using a retrospective, ex post facto approach.

Chapter Two: Review of the Literature

Adolescence is a distinct phase of development during which youths confront the stage-salient challenges of transitioning from childhood to adulthood (Pinsof & Lebow, 2005). It is characterized by a period of great change and reorganization. According to Erikson (1963), one of the major challenges of adolescence is the development of an adult identity. He theorized that adolescents in general experience a developmental crisis
of ego identity versus role diffusion. Erikson viewed adolescence as a critical period in life that involves the constant negotiating and renegotiating of values and beliefs with respect to roles and expectations. A successful outcome, in his view, is the development of the sense of an individual self and what that stands for. And the resolution of the crisis leads to the formation of a positive ego identity. Confusion, insecurity, self-doubt, and increased susceptibility to the influence of others are likely consequences if adolescents fail to develop the achievements or meanings in their respective identities. Thus, instead of positive ego identity formation, these adolescents may experience role diffusion. The lack of proper reconciliati on or resolution of this stage-salient crisis is believed to have profound impacts or ramifications into adulthood.

Key developmental tasks during adolescence that relate to this transition include, in addition to establishing a positively defined self-identity, progressing through puberty and becoming mature sexually in a responsible manner, developing interpersonal or intimate relationships beyond the family, and developing the educational and occupational skills or repertoires required to promote one’s own economic and financial capacity, viability, and independence (Burt, 2002). Identity formation, aside from being one of the major developmental tasks during adolescence, has been implicated to affect adjustment as well (Waterman, 1992). The process of identity formation might be interpreted as a “parallel psychological process of re-evaluating one’s life-goals and commitments to specific values” (Zimmermann & Becker-Stoll, 2002, p. 110). In this respect, the identity status achievement as proposed and operationally defined by James Marcia (1980) is regarded as, and represents the successful outcome of, this undertaking, culminating in the development, integration, consolidation and coherency of the self-
system or identity structure that is based on self-exploration, personal experiences, and the active, effortful utilization of mental faculties to examine and evaluate previously held identifications via informational processing strategies (Berzonsky & Adams, 1999). Hence, “A personal sense of synchronic and diachronic self-consistency emerges as the ego selects childhood identifications, engages in reality testing, and organizes and synthesizes self-representations into a personally coherent and viable structural configuration” (Berzonsky & Adams, 1999, p. 570).

**Adolescent Attachment and Ego Identity**

Marcia (as cited in Zimmermann & Becker-Stoll, 2002) suggested that the achievement of ego-identity status would be promoted with secure attachment due to the adolescent having a secure base within the family organization or structure to permit or encourage the exploration of his or her environment and to enable or facilitate the discussion or sharing openly with their family the experiences and attitudes he or she developed or consolidated. Adolescents with insecure attachment organizations on the other hand, as he postulated, would be expected to exhibit disinclination, hesitancy or ambivalence to engage in exploratory activities, resulting either in the development of ego-identity status diffusion, in the case of an avoidant or dismissing attachment, or into foreclosure, in the case of an insecurely-ambivalent attachment pattern.

From the perspective of attachment theory, empirical evidence has shown that a secure attachment organization during infancy and a concurrent secure attachment organization during adolescent development positively promote adaptation, adjustment, and affect regulation in adolescence (Zimmermann & Becker-Stoll, 2002). Kobak and
Sceery (1988), in their study investigating attachment organizations in late adolescence using the Adult Attachment Interview (AAI), reported that overall, individuals in the secure group maintained a consistent and accurate recall of distressing experiences in childhood involving parent-child relationship in an integrated, coherent manner absent of idealization. Despite the negative experiences during childhood, parents in the secure group were represented positively as loving, supporting and available at times of distress in their internal working models. Their findings suggested that individuals with secure attachment representations reported less distress and more social competence and support on measures of self-assessment, and were rated by their peers to have demonstrated greater ego-resiliency, less anxiety and less hostility.

Longitudinal studies have shown a high stability of infant attachment organization from infancy to childhood. The stability of the attachment patterns developed during adolescence would be expected when these childhood attachment representations are internalized and maintained in coherently, integrated internal working models. It is worthy to point out that although the quality of attachment relationship between adolescents and parents may undergo significant changes during adolescence, the continuity in the affectively toned mental encapsulations of the parent-child attachment bond have been shown to be relatively stable over time. It is best summarized by Zimmermann and Becker-Stoll (2002), in which the authors stated:

Based on the organizational-developmental approach, one classic stage-salient issue for the adolescent should be related to attachment security, although attachment patterns in adolescence, the development of the ego-identity-status achievement as a measure of adjustment in adolescence, as assessed by means of the AAI, may not be the direct result of attachment patterns of infancy it has been shown empirically that there is a continuity at the procedural level of emotion regulation strategies (i.e. attachment behavior as emotion related behavior) from early attachment patterns to later emotion
Traditionally, most studies of attachment have focused on the affectional bond between infants and their primary caretakers (Buist et al., 2002). Major emphasis was placed on the extent to which the attachment figures are used for support, responsivity, and proximity by examining the behavioral dimension of attachment using observational measures (Hinde, 1982; Parkes & Stevenson-Hinde, 1982). Adolescent attachment studies on the other hand focus primarily on the cognitive-affective aspect or dimension of attachment representation, with particular attention paid to “the affectively toned cognitive expectancies that are part of the individual’s internal working model of attachment” (Buist et al., 2002, p.167).

The working model of attachment is theoretically conceptualized by Bowlby (1982) as the template in which the individual forms expectations of responsivity of attachment figures to his or her needs. It is the mental representation of the individual’s self, of attachment figures and of their relationships, based on the interactions or experiences with various attachment figures over the span of time (Colin, 1996). Although the behavioral dimension of attachment is more subject to changes due to the individual’s cognitive development or maturation, the working model of attachment is generally believed to be more or less stable throughout adolescence (Bretherton, 1985).

**Adolescence and Family Dynamics**

Carter & McGoldrick (2005) state that while “the adolescent’s demands for greater independence tend to precipitate structural shifts and renegotiation of roles in families,” the families during this period are “also responding and adjusting to the new
demands of other members, who themselves are entering new stages of the life cycle.” “Most parents with adolescents in the mainstream culture,” they contend, “focus on such midlife issues as reevaluating their marriages and careers.” Furthermore, “the marriage emerging from the heavy caretaking responsibilities of young children may be threatened as parents review personal satisfaction in the light of the militant idealism of their adolescent children” (p. 280). Therefore, the notion that families must reorganize to accommodate to the change and growth of their members and that developments in any of the family’s generations may have an impact on one or all of the family’s members cannot be underestimated (Nichols & Schwartz, 2003).

The difficulties associated with this phase of individual and family reorganization are further complicated by the immigration experience. Adolescents are particularly vulnerable due to the loss of stability, comfort and security with individuals in their peer relationship with whom they shared developmental histories and experiences, as well as, established reciprocal trust and companionship (Carter & McGoldrick, 2005). “They are often forced to start relationships in new environments that are dangerous and threatening,” according to Carter and McGoldrick, “All this occurs while the parents, bound up in their own adaptive struggles or difficulties understanding their new context, are understandably less available sources of support” (p. 172). Moreover, even if the family’s earning potential may have improved in the host country, they typically experience a downward mobility in hierarchical status socioeconomically and politically as compared with their culture of origin.

Furthermore, difficulties and conflicts in acculturation may develop as a consequence of the dichotomy of perceived values, belief systems, and worldviews
between the country of origin and the country of immigration. And the differences in the level of adjustment and acculturation between parents and children may adversely affect, if not, intensify or exacerbate the normative tasks in adolescence development. Empirical studies have well demonstrated the positive association in parent-child conflict or dissynchrony in affecting a myriad of maladies seen in adolescents including, but not limited to, maladjustment, substance use and/or abuse, low self-esteem, antisocial behavior, mental or psychological disorders, and negative well-being. Immigrant youths unfortunately may find themselves in the precarious position having to focus not only in the inherent challenges associated with the stage – salient developmental task of separation and individuation from their family of origin in their bid to achieving a consolidated, coherent sense of self and identity structure, but having to accomplish it in a personalized, meaningful way that also incorporates and integrates the nature and saliency of the significant self-representations and identifications across cultures. It is without question that the change and reorganization during adolescence development is further complicated by the immigration experience.

Adolescent Characterological and Personality Development

Clausen (1995) believes that young people develop a special set of characteristics or qualities in what he termed “planful competence” – dependability, intellectual involvement, and self-confidence - by the end of their high school years that strongly influence the direction and outcome in the life course or trajectories of their adult life. Even though an individual’s biological and genetic endowments certainly play a significant role in personality development, such influences are by no means the sole
determinant of adult personality traits. The multiplicity of pathways connecting and intersecting the contextual, social, environmental, and experiential factors, the continuities and discontinuities of the significant relational interplay, and the course and outcome of major transitions across the life span, are all important variables that would either mitigate or amplify the effects or expressions of the constitutional variables or dispositions (Rutter, 1989; Ge & Conger, 1999).

Ge and Conger (1999) conducted a 6-year longitudinal study of the contextual influences on adolescent adjustment problems by examining relationships between adolescent emotional and behavioral problems and late adolescent personality of more than 400 high school-age youths from grades 7th to 12th. They hypothesized that experiences of emotional and behavioral problems during early and mid-adolescence assume a particular role in shaping adult personality. They premised that “the experience of these adjustment problems involves a complex interactive process between the growing adolescent’s family, community, and school environment and the dispositional characteristics the adolescent brings to these environment” (p. 430). Moreover, the authors believed that the sustained, deleterious adolescent experiences within the emotional and behavioral domains would contribute significantly to the solidification of more increasingly stable, enduring, and problematic personality traits. They further posited that “these consequential emotional and behavioral manifestations at a particular time in their development provide a basis for later reactivity and adaptability to environmental events” (Ge & Conger, 1999, p. 433). It is therefore expected that the unsuccessful attempt to intervene, remedy or reconcile the maladjustment experiences during this critical period of development would predispose the affected individual to the
expression, formation, or crystallization of negatively associated personality characteristics in adulthood.

It is well recognized in the literature that an individual’s movement toward competence or distress involves the subtle, intricate and reciprocal interplay between the environmentally and socially constructed, organized and defined contexts and his or her intrinsic, constitutionally determined attributes or factors (Rutter, 1989; Ge & Conger, 1999). Hence, adolescent experiencing persistent and disturbing emotional and behavioral experiences would be expected to exhibit greater adjustment difficulties or problems, further complicating their chance to achieve competence and psychological well-being. The results in Ge and Conger (1999) study suggest that psychological distress and behavioral problems experienced during the adolescent years (7th-10th grades) are significantly related to personality structure during the final year of high school, and that “both the initial level and changes in distress and problem behaviors were predictive of late adolescent or early adult personality” (p. 429).

A study by Simonoff et al. (2004) also reported the long-term effects of childhood conduct and hyperactivity disorders in predicting antisocial behavior and criminality well into middle adulthood. Their findings extended and reinforced the results from other research in that a longitudinal linkage between childhood behavioral experiences and adult personality characteristics was evident. Colman et al. (2009), in their research investigating the long-term outcomes of adolescent externalizing behavior in a population sample consisting of 1946 birth cohort in Great Britain, reported that conduct problems during adolescence is positively associated with pervasive social and mental health impairments throughout adult life.
As such, the authors support the importance of timely intervention efforts directed at childhood and early adolescence emotional and behavioral experiences to address, mitigate or ameliorate the risk for long-term problems in personality characteristics. Moreover, to promote the development of competence and well-being and the formation of stable and enduring positive personality traits and qualities, the intervention program should focus on social and environmental contexts during this developmental period, as well as on the formative nature of adolescence itself (Ge & Conger, 1999).

**Parent-Child Relationship on Adolescent Development**

The extant research has explored the predictive value of parental practices and behaviors (i.e., warmth, love, support, and interaction) on children and adolescent well-being and development. The absence or weakness in these variables has been shown to strongly correlate with negative outcomes during childhood and adolescence. For instance, inadequacy in parental support positively associated with higher levels of anxiety and depression in African American adolescents (Zimmerman et al., 2000). A considerable body of research suggests that they are one of the best prognosticators in predicting behavioral difficulties in boys, the onset of delinquency in children, and adult criminality (Tremblay, Tremblay, & Saucier, 2004). However, disparate and conflicting findings from empirical studies were noted in the literature. While some studies have also suggested the particular role of the father in affecting outcomes in children such as their moral development, the quality of peer relationships during adolescence, the use or abuse of illegal substance, and the status of mental or psychological health, others do not find any significant impacts (Tremblay et al., 2004).
King (1994a, 1994b), in her studies examining the effects of nonresident father on the well-being of children using a child supplement sample from the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth (NLSY), reported that there was no association between children with frequent visitation from nonresident fathers and those whose fathers made no or occasional visits in the past year with respect to the measured scales on well-being. However, she stated that the absence of significance might be attributed to the neutralization of effects between the groups of children who benefited from the continued father-child interaction and the children who had little or no experience with father involvement. Further analysis revealed that the frequency of visitation was positively correlated with child birth status (King, 1994b). This result is consistent with earlier report by Seltzer (1991) in that the children born within marriage experience significantly higher level of involvement in all dimensions including visitation than those children born outside of marriage. Based on her findings, King suggested that the quality of the parent-child relationship may be more important and beneficial for the child than the frequency of contacts (1994a, 1994b). Such premise was confirmed in a subsequent study by King and Sobolewski (2006) in that high quality father-child relationships and children’s report of father involvement and responsive fathering were positively associated with adolescent well-being, as demonstrated in fewer internalizing and externalizing problems among adolescents reported by their custodial mothers.

Similarly, in her longitudinal study, McCord (1990) reported that the behavior of parents had more of an impact than the particular family structure, arrangement or constellation in the development of children. This finding was supported by Zimmerman, Salem, and Maton (1995) in that the authors concluded no significant association was
found linking family type or organization to measures of delinquency, abuse of substance, or the psychological well-being of young African-American adolescent males. Moreover, results from McCord’s study suggested that father involvement had a positive, enduring effect on the children in areas related to delinquency, juvenile deviance, crime and achievement into adulthood, and “Boys from intact homes were more likely to be juvenile delinquents, deviants, or criminals if their father’s interactions were bad than if those interactions were good (p < .001)” (p. 128). Comparable findings were identified in a study conducted by Flouri and Buchanan (2002), in their examination of the longitudinal relationship between father involvement in childhood and juvenile delinquency. The authors concluded that involvement by the father with the children at age 7 was inversely associated with juvenile delinquency and trouble with the police at age 16, particularly in boys.

In reviewing of the literature, the role of the father and its impacts on a child's development have primarily focused on the extent of the father involvement and the quality of father-child relationship from the point of reference of the fathers or other adult reporters; few have attempted to engage in the examination of the perceptions of children of their parent-child interactions and the association with their developmental outcomes (Tremblay et al., 2004). A study by Paterson, Field, and Pryor (1994) reported that adolescents not only rated lower on the quality of affect toward their fathers, but they depended less on fathers for support and proximity. However, the absence of such findings was evident in the relationship adolescents have with their mothers and peers. Moreover, there was stability and continuity in the affective qualities in the relationship with their mothers from early to late adolescence. The results were consistent with past
research by Youniss and Smollar (1985) in which the authors concluded that the relationship adolescents had with their fathers was less satisfactory than the ones they had with their mother and friends overall, and they “generally perceived fathers as being judgmental or disrespectful of their point of view and maintaining an asymmetrical authoritative type of communication, and felt more distant, uncomfortable, and shy with their fathers compared to other important people in their lives (Tremblay et al., 2004, p. 410).”

Similarly, Johnson (1987) reported that the affective bond with the father in particular was significantly more determinant in predicting delinquency in boys than the one between mother and child, and that “the parent-child bond, the feelings of being loved and respected by the parent, and anger toward the parent are more valuable indicators to predict delinquency than the affection reported by the parents or parental behavior observed by the researcher” (p. 409).

Tremblay, Tremblay, and Saucier (2004), in their longitudinal study examining the development of perceptions of parent-child relationship of boys with or without problem behaviors from 9 to 15 years of age from working class neighborhoods in Montreal in 1984, reported that children from both groups generally felt less loved and appreciated by their fathers than by their mothers in adolescence but not in earlier childhood. They perceived that their parents loved and appreciated them significantly less at 15 than at ages 9 and 11, respectively, and boys in the disruptive behavior group considered they were less loved by their parents than the boys in the non-disruptive group overall. The authors concluded from their results that the differences in the boys’ perceptions concerning the quality of relationships with their parents appeared to have
developed during adolescence, findings that are consistent and congruent with other studies reviewed in this section.

**Research on Father Absence**

The importance of the father influence in children’s development received little attention prior to 1960s. The increasing numbers of women with children entering the workforce and the subsequent high divorce rates in the United States prompted and fueled emerging studies on fathering and its effects on child psychopathology. The societal transformation resulting in the necessity to have dual earners to maintain a functioning household positively promoted women’s upward economic mobility and autonomy, and the convergence of sociopolitical and cultural forces associated with the feminist movement in the 1970s encouraged and facilitated the reevaluation and reexamination of gender role construction and gender role identity.

Earlier research in the clinical field attempted to study father influence on children’s outcomes in father absent families, relying mostly on the fathers’ self-report of involvement as related to quantity and frequency of interaction with their children after divorce. It is not until more recently that qualitative aspects of father involvement received considerable attention. In addition to measuring the frequency and duration of contact that nonresident fathers have with their children after marital separation or dissolution, researchers have expanded their studies to include the family dynamics, structure and marital relationship prior to and after separation. Moreover, the quality of father-child attachment relationship, interaction and involvement, and the perceived paternal warmth, acceptance, and love from the children’s phenomenological perceptions
or points of view in particular in both intact or father absent households have been meticulously examined. It is suggested that security attachment in the father-child relationship and the extent and quality of the fathers’ positive involvement, particularly as it relates to the fathers’ emotional availability, accessibility, responsivity, warmth, nurturance, and acceptance domains, from the perspective or perception of the children play critical roles in mitigating the negative consequences that could occur during the developmental years.

Studies on father absence due to family breakdown associated with divorce or parental conflict or discord suggest that fathers play a crucial role in children’s psychological development, and their presence has positive or protective effects on children’s and adolescents’ well-being, development of self-concept, and adaptive behavioral adjustment. Moreover, it has been reported that father absent children tend to display a myriad of maladies including behavioral or conduct problems, delinquency, poorer academic achievement or educational underperformance, personality or psychological adjustment difficulties, mental health issues, substance abuse, early sexual activity, and lower life satisfaction, compared to children from intact, two-parent families.

Pfiffner et al. (2001), in their study examining the residency and contact status of biological fathers and family antisocial characteristics reported members from families with fathers at home exhibited lower antisocial behaviors. Furthermore, the higher antisocial symptoms in children with absent fathers were not ameliorated or mitigated by the presence of another adult male figure (i.e., stepfather).

Other research on effects of parental presence or absence indicates the presence of the fathers has a positive influence in children’s cognitive and educational outcomes
(Lang & Zagorsky, 2001). Their findings supported and reinforced previous conclusions reported from Biller and Kimptom’s study (1997) on the role of the father in children’s cognitive development and academic performance. Biller and Kimptom suggested not only do fathers influence their child’s cognitive development, “It seems that in earlier development, they have more of a direct impact on their sons than on their daughters” (p.150), based on the proclivity or tendency on the part of the son to model after his father. The increased time spent with the father was believed to be instrumental in promoting the son’s problem solving abilities and certain cognitive capacities.

Cooksey and Fondell (1996), in their study comparing the academic performance of boys with the types of households they reside based on data obtained from a national survey, found boys living with both biological parents showed better performance in school than boys residing in other family arrangements. Moreover, significant improvement in children’s grades was noted with increased participation in certain family activities by the fathers.

Still more empirical research on father absence has demonstrated that male children are precariously affected in a negative way, and that the lack of father presence in their lives contributed to the increased development of delinquency (Well & Rankin, 1991), substance and alcohol use (Brook, Whitman, & Gordon, 1985), behavioral problems (Peterson & Zill, 1986), and incarceration or criminal arrests (Harper & McLanahan, 2004; Juon et al., 2006), as well as deficits in moral attributes and conscience development (Hoffman, 1971).

A study conducted by Jensen et al. (1989) on the effects of the absent resident father suggested a significant increase in self-reported depression and anxiety in children
from relatively healthy families whose father absence was of relatively short duration and under routine conditions due to employment in the military. The negative symptoms were not indicated however, when confounding variables of maternal psychopathology and stressors in the family were controlled. Although the deleterious ramifications were significantly reduced or not demonstrated in children whose father absence was temporary and not related to parental relationship or family instability or breakdown in some studies, the results must be interpreted with caution. The need for longitudinal studies is warranted in this respect so to facilitate clarification and understanding of the effects that prolonged absence by resident fathers have on child psychology.

**Father-Child Attachment Research**

The scope of attachment studies has traditionally focused on infancy, with particular emphasis on the affectional bond between infants and their mothers (Buist et al., 2004). This definition has adaptively broadened over the years, culminating in the development of a life-span perspective (Bartholomew, 1993; Rice, 1990). Although what constitutes core of attachment continues to be debated amongst theorists, it is generally agreed and accepted that attachment is defined as an emotional or affectional bond of substantial importance and intensity that is enduring over time irrespective to the situational or environmental contexts or contingencies (Ainsworth, 1989; Armsden & Greenberg, 1987; Buist et al., 2002, 2004; Paterson et al., 1995; Rice, 1990).

Studies examining the behavioral dimension of attachment during adolescence suggest notable changes in parent-child relationship. They generally show a decrease in physical closeness, an increase in frequency and intensity of conflict, and emotional
distancing due to the adolescent becoming more mature and autonomous and attempting to exert or exercise greater control over his or her decision making process and independence. The Buist et al. (2002) study, examining the developmental patterns in adolescent attachment, reported a steadily and gradual, yet linear decline over time in the quality of attachment relationship by the adolescents to their same-sex parent. They posited that their findings may be attributed to the deidealization of parents, a phenomenon noted in the psychoanalytical literature where adolescents attempt to develop their own individual identity and autonomy, and become less reliant on the same-sex parent as a guide or reference for identification. Although adolescence is a period where a notable decline in seeking physical proximity, nurturance and comfort is observed, adolescents’ psychological health and well-being are influenced nevertheless, at least in part, upon their “confidence in the availability and commitment of parental figures to them” (Arbona & Powers, 2003, p. 40).

Research on attachment representations on the other hand has shown stability and continuity of individuals’ affective-cognitive dimension during adolescent development (McCormick & Kennedy, 1994). Moreover, the internal working models are believed to be more predictive of adolescent functioning than the behavioral dimension of attachment particularly as it relates to self-esteem and interpersonal relationship (Paterson, Pryor, & Field, 1995). In this regard, the internalization of early parent-child experiences assumes substantial importance not only as it relates to expectancies for future interpersonal relationships but also to the development of self-concept as well.

Positive correlations have been identified between healthy parent-child relational processes with self-esteem, identity development, emotional adjustment, social
competence, interpersonal functioning, and general life satisfaction (Rice, 1990). Furthermore, it has been reported that parent-child attachment protects against internalizing and externalizing behavior. A study by Jacobsen & Hoffman (1997) examining security in attachment also points to the protective factor that parent-child bond contributes to academic competency. Extant researches on disruptive parent-child attachment styles or organizations have shown that the absence of positive relational processes are associated with depression (Graham & Easterbrooks, 2002) and aggressive behaviors (Pinzi et al, 2001) in children, and suicide (Adams, Sheldon-Keller, & West, 1996) and psychological symptomatology and negative self-concept (Cooper, Shaver, & Collins, 1998) in adolescents. While some studies indicated that systemic differences exist in the quality of attachment in adolescents’ relationships with their mothers as compared to with their fathers, others did not support this conclusion.

Mackey (2001) characterized the father and child relationship as a unique and distinct bond and attachment, one that is separate and independent from the relationship the child has with his or her mother. This premise is supported by empirical evidence which suggests that security in the father-child attachment is responsible for a “significant proportion of the variance in internalizing, externalizing, and total behavioral problems” in a study conducted by Williams and Kelly (2005, p. 189). Other researches examining the influence of fathers on child development report adolescent males’ antisocial behavior was associated with negative father-son attachment quality (Marcus & Betzer, 1996), and the attachment to parents in two-parent households mitigates severity in delinquency particularly in male adolescents (Anderson, Holmes, & Ostresh, 1999).
Based on the voluminous body of literature on parent-child attachment, it can be reasonably extrapolated that the internalized mental representations of early and concurrent parent-child experiences play an instrumental role in affecting multiple areas of child development. Furthermore, the presence of healthy father-child relational processes in particular is believed to contribute significantly to the sons’ subsequent adaptive functioning both intrapersonally and interpersonally during adolescence. The constancy and stability of the sons’ internal working models, ones based on nurturing, loving, and accepting father-son interactive experiences and quality of attachment are expected to buffer or mitigate the negative outcomes associated with father absence.

**Studies on Father Involvement**

The role of the father has been relegated traditionally to that of a breadwinner, protector, disciplinarian, teacher, or moral preceptor, and was rarely mentioned in the popular press until 1920s (Atkinson & Blackwelder, 1993; Rohner & Veneziano, 2001). Parsons and Bales (1955, p. 315), in their classic work *Family, Socialization and Interaction Process*, stated, “If the nuclear family consists in a defined ‘normal’ complement of the male adult, female adult, and their immediate children, the male adult will play the role of instrumental leader and the female adult will play the role of the expressive leader.” They organized and separated the roles and responsibilities of parenting into two distinct and independent categories: instrumental and affective dimensions.

A study by Finley and Schwartz (2006) on the young adult’s characterization of the fathering role using a retrospective method reported that fathers received higher
ratings in instrumental than expressive involvement irrespective of the types of the family structure or form and ethnic identity of the participants, based on an ethnically diverse sample of university students in Miami, Florida. They found that the five most enduring, traditionally recognized fathering elements received the highest endorsement and accounted for the largest discrepancies between intact, two-parent households and divorced families consisted of the following, in descending order: providing income, moral/ethical development, discipline, protection, and developing responsibility. This general finding may reinforce the percept that fathering is largely concerned with instrumental functions, a conclusion previously reported by Parsons and Bales more than a half century ago. However, a thorough examination of the analyses from their work also revealed that fathers from intact families received statistically significant higher endorsement in sixteen out of the twenty domains in the Father Involvement Scale (Finley & Schwartz, 2004) as compared to divorced households, and the largest discrepancies in expressive domains were linked to caregiving and companionship, which were ranked in sixth and seventh in order of significance, respectively. Moreover, discrepancies in all eight expressive domains also reached significance at .001 level.

It can be reasonably extrapolated from their data that although children’s perception of fathering remains largely confined to traditionally identified gender roles and responsibilities, participation in the expressive dimension of parenting by fathers is believed to contribute substantially and collectively in positively affecting the developmental trajectories of children, adolescents, and young adults. This premise underscores the salient importance of fathers to be consistently involved in the lives of
their children in a manner that conveys their warmth, nurturance, love and acceptance regardless of their residency status.

Recent studies on father involvement have adopted a child-centered approach, relying on children’s own assessments and phenomenological perceptions of the content and quality of father-child relational transactions, utilizing yet expanding from the multidimensional perspective advocated by Hawkins & Palkovitz (1999), which only focused on the various fathering domains and the content of father-child interactions from the perspective of the fathers. This emphasis is also a substantial departure from the earlier time-based conceptualizations which were concerned primarily with measurements of actual time participation in parent-child interactions, accessibility and responsivity, and fulfillment of responsibility on the part of the fathers proposed by Lamb, Pleck, and Levine (1985).

The use of the phenomenological method has been successfully reported in studies examining the impact of perceived parental acceptance-rejection on children’s development (Rohner & Britner, 2002; Rohner & Veneziano, 2001), with evidence from research employing this perspective suggesting that individuals’ perceptions are particularly predictive of the actual experiences they report (Harter, Whitesell, & Kowalski, 1992; Hagborg, 1992). The encapsulation or internalization of the mental representation of parent substrate or residue as perceived by the child or adolescent with regard to the parent and the parent-child relationship is believed to contribute significantly to the development of his or her current and future behavior and developmental outcomes, a premise where core conceptualizations identifying “what is most important is not the amount of time a father actually spends with his child but rather
the child’s perception of the father’s level of involvement” and “the long-term impact that the father has on his child is a function of the child’s perception” is based (Finley & Schwartz, 2004, p. 145-146).

Research on father involvement has suggested that fathers provide a distinct and independent contribution to the development of children and adolescents. It has been shown to positively associate with children’s well-being (Lamb, 2004), happiness (Flouri & Buchanan, 2003), positive school attitude (Flouri et al., 2002), educational attainment (Flouri & Buchanan, 2004), intellectual development (Williams & Radin, 1993), behavioral outcomes (Carlson, 2006), and moral development (Hoffman, 1981), as well as playing an influential role in sex role development in boys in particular (Biller, 1981). The positive child outcomes are noted even though involvement was provided by a nonresident father (Amato & Gilbreth, 1999). It has been reported that higher father involvement by nonresident fathers is inversely related to adolescent delinquency, “particularly for youth with initial engagement in delinquent activities” (Coley & Medeiros, 2007, p. 132). Furthermore, children of highly involved and nurturant fathers have been found to demonstrate social competence, internal locus of control, ability to empathize (Amato, 1994) and self-confidence (Biller, 1993), while negative self-concept and feelings of personal insecurity have been shown in children with paternal distance or deprivation (Biller, 1993).

The Finley and Schwartz (2007) study examining paternal involvement and long-term young adult outcomes indicated that reported father involvement was positively associated with subjective well being primarily in children from intact, two-parent households, whereas desired father involvement was related primarily in children with
divorced families in both the expressive and instrumental dimensions of fathering. Another study by Culp et al. (2000) has shown that involvement by fathers was positively associated with feelings of paternal acceptance in children, a critical factor that is believed to contribute to the development of self-concept and self-esteem. Research conducted by Williams and Kelly (2005) exploring the nature of parent-child relationship and child behavioral outcomes during early adolescence revealed significantly less involvement in parenting by nonresident fathers as compared with fathers who reside at home, and that the father-adolescent involvement in particular accounted for a unique proportion of variance noted in teacher-reported adolescents’ externalizing and total behavioral problems at school. A study comparing the influence of father involvement of native-born and immigrant families on adolescent behavioral risk suggested that involvement by fathers predicts a decrease in likelihood of adolescents’ subsequent engagement in delinquent activity and use of substance above and beyond the effects of mother involvement, and this finding is particularly salient for sons than for daughters in two-parent, father present households, and is independent of immigration status (Bronte-Tinkew et al, 2006).

All in all, the extant research on father involvement underscores the fathers’ unique and independent contribution to their children’s outcomes. Fathering, as a progressively evolving, reinventing, and deconstructed cultural construct, is not limited to solely providing instrumental support. Its conceptualization has been expanded to encompass a multiple and significantly broadened domains or dimensions. Fathers’ participation in expressive role functions, operationally defined as the intimate engagement on an affective-emotional level with direct caregiving, sharing activities, and
offering companionship for their children, has been suggested to play a significant role in ameliorating or mitigating maladaptive or negative psychological, emotional, or behavioral maladies during development. Moreover, the content and quality of father-child involvement as encapsulated by the phenomenological perceptions of the child in particular, irrespective of the fathers’ place of residence and verity of perceptions, are of substantial importance to children’s developmental trajectories and outcomes in the long run.

**Perception of Child of Father-Child Relationship – Importance of Father Acceptance**

The quality of personal relationships with parents and the mental representations of salient transactional processes or experiences derived from the subjective views, perspectives or perceptions of the individual of the parent-child affective interactions or bonds have been reported to influence psychosocial functioning and developments in children and adults. Together they form the very premise of which parental acceptance and rejection theory (PARTheory) and specifically, the warmth dimension of parenting, were formulated (Rohner, 2005a). Parental behaviors, particularly as related to the internalized, encapsulated residues of affectively-toned feelings expressed by parents conveying warmth, nurturance, support, comfort, affection, and love that form parental acceptance at one end of the continuum, or the withdrawal or absence of positively expressed feelings by parents that may or may not include physically or psychologically damaging or hurtful effects or behaviors that form parental rejection at the opposite end of the continuum and of which can be experienced by children in any one or a
combination of four principle dimensions (i.e., cold and unaffectionate; hostile and aggressive; indifferent and neglecting; and/or undifferentiated rejecting), have been implicated to associate with specific psychological and behavioral outcomes in children. Moreover, there exists a universal, generalizable correlate that children regardless of race, culture, gender, or language share or experience in common their response toward acceptance and rejection from their parents (Rohner & Veneziano, 2001).

Research on parental acceptance or love indicated that father acceptance is as important as mother acceptance in explaining certain child outcomes. Furthermore, it has been reported that perceived acceptance from fathers is responsible for a distinct and independent portion of the variance in specific child outcomes far and beyond the variance explained by mother acceptance or love. Some studies even suggested that father acceptance is the sole determining factor or predictor of particular child outcomes. While acceptance or love from fathers have been demonstrated to positively associate with children’s development of prosocial behavior, cognitive and intellectual competence, adaptive psychological functioning, academic achievement, subjective well-being and interpersonal relationships, father rejection have been correlated with the development of personality problems, psychopathology, mental health issues, adjustment difficulties, attachment disorders, behavioral or conduct problems, academic underperformance, substance abuse, poor self-esteem, and impaired self-concept (Rohner & Veneziano, 2001).

Based on PARTheory, it is postulated that children who perceive themselves to be rejected by their parents are at a greater risk of developing one or a constellation of seven personality predispositions than children who perceive themselves to be loved or
accepted. The existence of personality disposition(s) – hostility, aggression, passive aggression, or problems with the management of hostility and aggression; immature dependence, or defensive independence; impaired self-esteem; impaired self-adequacy; emotional unresponsiveness; emotional instability; and negative worldview – suggests significant psychological maladjustment problems or mental health issues (Rohner & Britner, 2002). The negative child outcomes or consequences can be explained by significant antecedents, attributable to the most part to the absence, deprivation, or inadequate positive response from parents to their emotional needs, in addition to the form, frequency, duration, and intensity of perceived parental rejection.

It has been demonstrated that rejection by parents generally precedes the development of psychological and behavioral problems in children and adolescents; and the “disruptions in the father-son relationship may be particularly disturbing for adolescents” (Rothbaum & Weisz, 1994, p. 69). Although the reciprocal influences between parents and children have also been documented and should not be minimized, converging evidence suggests the causative role that parental rejection plays in the development and maintenance of child negative outcomes.

A study by Videon (2005) exploring the psychological well-being of children and the parent-child relationship from intact, two-parent families in a nationally representative sample of adolescents grades 7 to 12 has shown that fathers contribute a unique and significant portion of variance in adolescents’ psychological well-being independent and beyond the influence of mothers. In addition, it was found that fluctuations in subjective well-being reported by adolescents were positively associated with changes in perceived satisfaction of father-child relationship.
Research by Jones (2004) examining psychological separation and academic performance in adolescent males with resident and non-resident fathers revealed that academic performance was positively associated with the quality of perceived father-son relationship as well as the psychological dependence on fathers in boys from non-resident father households. These correlations were not found in resident-father boys however. No associations between quality of mother-son relationship or psychological separation from mother and academic achievement were evident in either father-resident or non-father resident groups. Jones concluded, based on the assessment of the group as a whole that “a significant correlation between the functional and attitudinal dimensions of connectedness and academic performance for father-son only relationships…Given that no associations were found in regard to mother, findings from this study suggest that the father-son relationship may play a unique role in facilitating academic performance” (p. 348-349).

The wealth of research on children’s perceptions of quality of parent-child relationships suggests the enduring nature of internalized mental residues or representations of parents’ positive or affective response to their children’s emotional needs as antecedents rudimentary to their subsequent adaptive and psychosocial functioning during adolescence and adulthood. More specifically, it is the encapsulation of such qualitative conveyance of warmth, nurturance, support, comfort, care, and affection particularly on the part of fathers known as father love or acceptance that is of substantial and instrumental importance to promoting the positive psychological, emotional, and behavioral trajectories and developments in their children. On the contrary, the repeated absence, deprivation, withdrawal or inadequate response to meet
their children’s needs is likely to trigger a cascade of emotional reactions such as anxiety, insecurity, and anger. Parental rejection and rejection by fathers in particular, as perceived by the children, when expressed in sufficient frequency, duration and intensity, has profound ramifications. It has been suggested to play a role in construing or inducing cognitively altered or distorted information processing, selective attention or perception, and faulty attribution (Rohner, 1999). Moreover, it also contributes to children’s internalization of affectively charged, negative mental representations of themselves, their fathers or parents, their interpersonal relationships, and the world at large (Rohner & Britner, 2002). The absence of counter-information is likely to enforce the encapsulated cognitive misrepresentation or faulty construal associated with perceived father rejection, with evocation of certain personality predispositions and/or psychological, emotional, and behavioral problems in children. Hence, the extent and quality of father-child relationship and father acceptance, from the phenomenological perceptions of the children are particularly salient, if not essential, in their normative development.

Effects of Cultural Values on Asian Adolescent Development

Asian Americans (AA) represent one of the fastest growing and largest minority groups according to the 2000 U.S. Bureau of the Census, with its population projected to increase 213% between 2000 and 2050 (Willgerodt & Thompson, 2005). Based on the figures, individuals who reported being Chinese accounted for up to 23% of the overall Asian Pacific American population, with 63% of them being foreign-born. Unfortunately, empirically based studies on Chinese Americans or Asians in general have not generated the vast attention or interest in the field of psychology. The preponderance of existing
research on Asian Americans, and Asian adolescents in particular, tends to focus on East Asians (Chinese, Japanese, and Koreans) and assumes a rather narrowly defined, incomplete and unidimensional approach, with greater emphasis placed on academic performance and cultural adaptation, and less on psychosocial factors that have been identified and implicated in the literature to significantly affect adolescents’ emotional, behavioral or mental health functioning. The paucity of empirical studies with Asian American families and Asian adolescents as a whole has limited the development of effective treatment recommendations to systematically and comprehensively address the unique challenges and mental health needs of AA youths. Moreover, the use of convenience samples involving mostly undergraduate students in higher education, and the tendency to racialized the disparate Asian ethnicities into a homogenous racial identity without making a concerted effort on the part of some researchers to distinguish the uniqueness or differences within and between the ethnic groups have significantly curtailed the applicability or generalizability of their findings.

Although parenting style within the Chinese culture has been detailed in the literature, few of these studies explore the adolescents’ perceptions of their relationships with parents and within their families (Willgerodt & Thompson, 2005). While it is generally recognized that the styles of parenting among Asian Americans differ from those of Euro-American (EA) parents, multiple studies have demonstrated that emotional closeness and intimacy in the parent-child relationship are just as important to AA adolescents, as they are to adolescents of European ancestry. However, the dearth of research on minority adolescents has focused mainly on mother-adolescent relationships, and little attention has been directed to examining the relationship adolescents have with
their fathers. Yet, it has been reported that the quality of the father-child relationship was more predictive of adolescent well-being than the quality of the mother-child relationship particularly in Chinese male adolescents (Shek, 2000).

The differences in cultural values and parental expectations may have a particular impact on Asian youth (Lorenzo et al., 2000). Even though the formation of an autonomous self or an adult identity is considered as one of the quintessential tasks in adolescence and that the establishment of one’s own independence a crowning and successful achievement of this developmental challenge, the influence and emphasis in Asian culture on interdependence and not independence, where the individual is considered “not as separate from the social context but more connected and less differentiated from others" (Markus & Kitayama, 1991), may complicate an already difficult process of negotiation and reorganization involved in this period of extraordinary change and transition. It is important to point out however that such interdependent self emphasis in no way suggests a willful, complete or indiscriminate subjugation, sacrifice or surrendering of one’s assertion or ownership of inner abilities or attributes for the purpose of establishing and preserving peace, respect, and harmony in interpersonal transactions in a manner that connote a fusion or merging of self and other. Moreover, it should not be confused or inaccurately interpreted from the behaviors that the individuals “do not have a sense of themselves as agents who are the origins of their own action” (Markus & Kitayama, 1991, p. 228). Rather, the ability to adaptively adjusting oneself to the particular interpersonal contingencies that are situationally or contextually specific require a substantial degree of self-restraint, control, and agency, as
well as tolerance, flexibility, and maturity given that the construal of interdependent self is very much contingent upon the role of the “relevant” others.

Although Asian families have been found to be more control oriented, interdependent, less encouraging or facilitative of individual autonomy, and emotionally inexpressive, factors that may or may not increase the immigrant’s chance of successful adjustment to the host culture, it is nevertheless noteworthy to point out that the experience of immigration and acculturation varies widely within and between groups depending upon the sociocultural, psychological, and demographic variables involved. As such, Asian immigrants may find themselves in a psychologically precarious position. They face the difficult task of balancing and integrating the values and expectations of their families of origin with those of their American-born peers. As a consequence of this developmental quandary, they may appear to excel or function normally in some respects and poorly in others. In their assessment of the social and emotional functioning of older Asian American adolescents, Lorenzo, Frost, and Reinherz (2000) concluded that AA youth reported higher levels of depressive symptomatology, including withdrawn behavior and increased social problems. They also perceived themselves in a less positive light and were less satisfied with the social support system available to them.

Summary

Adolescence, as discussed, is a period of great transition where adult roles are developed and tested. Significant changes and reorganization must be negotiated and positively attained at the level of the individual and at the level of the family system as a whole if success in the transition is to be realized. This is true as well with emotional and
behavioral outcomes. The difficulties associated with this developmental phase are mitigated if there is continuity in the emotional regulation from early attachment representations to later emotional regulation patterns or adaptation. Therefore, the more stable the patterns of attachment from infancy through childhood, the more consistent the integration of the cognitive-affective representations in the internal working model would be expected throughout adolescence and into adulthood. It is important to note that the psychological distress and behavioral problems that arise during this period of development provide the basis for negative reactivity and maladaptability to environmental events later in life if they are not resolved or rectified.

Empirical studies have suggested that the protective factor of father presence, specifically, the positive perception on the part of the son of the father-son relationship and the affective quality in the patterns of interaction and involvement in this dyadic family subsystem, promotes adolescents’ well-being, development and adaptation. It is essential that the efficacy of the father-son relationship in facilitating the normative emotional and characterological developments during adolescence be recognized. The absence of the father, therefore, particularly with immigrant male adolescents, given the contextual variables involved, would suggest an inverse correlation with respect to their psychological, emotional and behavioral outcomes. It is not uncommon to observe the multiple dysfunctional or problematic behaviors manifested in the areas of delinquency, criminality, alcohol and substance abuse, and mental illness.

What is clear from the research concerning the role of father in child outcomes is that the mere physical presence of the fathers in the lives of their children is in itself inadequate to affect the positive developmental trajectories. The relational qualities in the
father-son relationship, specifically, the affirmative mental encapsulation of earlier transactional processes or experiences of the affectively-toned bonds between that of the father and child, the consistency in the level of engagement and involvement demonstrated by the father in both the expressive and instrumental fathering domains, and the subjective feelings of father warmth, acceptance, and love in particular from the phenomenological perceptions of the children are quintessential to encourage and promote positive emotional, psychological, and behavioral adjustment and development during adolescence. It can be extrapolated that the absence or weakness in the role of the father in these dimensions adversely contributes to children’s maladies during the developmental years.

It is important to point out that the studies cited in the literature review, particularly as they relate to father-son research, are mostly concerned with heterosexual men of European ancestry, unless otherwise explicitly stated. While some do include participants of other racial identities, Asians are either not included or underrepresented in the sampling. Moreover, I did not find any father-child research relating to immigrant Chinese fathers or families. While a wide array of demographic variables were considered in most of the longitudinal studies reported, it is difficult to ascertain whether or not the fathers who participated in the research also include non-native born fathers. This is particularly important due to the fact that immigrant fathers and families tend to be, on average, in lower socioeconomic class. The downward mobility in status hierarchy socioeconomically and politically as compared with their culture of origin also applies those affluent immigrant families, even though they may have broader access to financial and social support in U.S. It is conceivable that for a majority of Chinese immigrant
fathers the stress and frustration associated with migration may facilitate their steadfastly endorsement or retention of culturally defined, traditionally conservative or stereotypical male gender roles or values espoused by Confucian principles, and the emphases on interpersonal harmony and interdependence based on adherence to prescribed family hierarchy, duties, and obligations will in turn reinforce their ethnic identity identification as they attempt to achieve meaningful self-construal or definition in the host country. The outcome of this process is the likelihood that these immigrants fathers will show less proclivity to challenge the rigidity in the masculine role assignments to acknowledge, accommodate, embrace or participate in the multitude and disparate facets of fathering desired by their children. Hence, the absence of qualitatively positive father-child relationship from the phenomenological perception of the child will increase or reinforce parent-child conflict or dissonance, and that the failure to resolve or reconcile the relational difficulty is believed to have profound, enduring impact on the child's developmental trajectories well into adulthood.

Given the continued influx of Chinese immigrant families to the United States, with a significant number consisting of mothers and their children with fathers maintaining their employment in their country of origin, it is important to note the potential and long-term ramifications of father absence and presence in the normative developmental processes during adolescence, as well as its implications on the family life cycle and society in general.

Chapter Three: Statement of the Problem
Main Research Questions and Hypotheses

Research Question 1:
Does father presence predict psychological adjustment, academic attainment, prosocial behaviors, and positive subjective well-being in male adolescents in general?
Hypothesis: Father presence will be related to higher levels of psychological adjustment (i.e., decrease in the number of personality dispositions identified), academic achievement/attainment, prosocial behavior, and positive subjective well-being in male adolescents in general, and reaching greater statistical significance when it is associated with qualitatively positive father-child attachment relationship, father involvement, and father acceptance from the phenomenological perceptions of children.

Research Question 2:
Does father absence predict psychosocial maladjustment, academic underachievement/underperformance, deviancy/delinquent behavior, and lower subjective well-being in male adolescents in general?
Hypothesis: Father absence will be related to overall psychological maladjustment, lack of academic attainment, deviancy/delinquent behavior, and negative subjective well-being in male adolescents in general, and reaching greater statistical significance when it is associated with qualitatively negative father-child attachment relationship, absence or lack of father involvement, and father rejection from the phenomenological perceptions of children.

Research Question 3:
Does the influence of father-child attachment on children’s outcomes differ for male adolescents who reside in father present versus father absent households?

Hypothesis: Adolescents who reported qualitatively positive father-child attachment relationship will likely be associated with adaptive psychological, emotional, and behavioral outcomes irrespective to the residency status of their fathers, although father present adolescents will likely report higher attachment scores than father absent adolescents. The stability and enduring nature of internalized mental representation of cognitive-affective dimension of secure father-child attachment relationship is likely maintained even in the absence of concurrent or reinforced physical bond with the fathers, as long as such encapsulation is based on the phenomenological perceptions of the adolescents.

Research Question 4:

Does the influence of father involvement on children’s outcomes differ for male adolescents who reside in father present versus father absent households?

Hypothesis: Adolescents’ perceptions of father involvement will positively promote adaptive psychological, emotional, and behavioral outcomes regardless of their fathers’ residency status. However, adolescents from father present homes will likely report higher satisfaction in reported father involvement, whereas adolescents from father absent homes will desire more father involvement in both instrumental and expressive dimensions of parenting.

Research Question 5:
Does the influence of father acceptance on children’s outcomes differ for adolescents who reside in father present versus father absent homes?

Hypothesis: Perceived father acceptance will have positive effect on adolescents’ overall outcomes whether or not fathers are present or absent in the households. However, increased levels of maladaptive or negative psychological, emotional, and behavioral outcomes in father absent adolescents will likely result when father absence is combined with perceived father rejection.

Research Question 6:
Does residency status of fathers influence adolescent immigrants’ development of self-identity acculturation?

Hypothesis: No specific prediction is made in reference to the above-mentioned research question. However, it is suggested that father presence, when combined with perceived qualitatively positive father-child attachment relationship, father involvement, and father acceptance will likely encourage adolescents’ exploratory activities in the host country, promoting the differentiation, synthesis and integration of different and contrasting sociopolitical and cultural beliefs or perspectives that will enable the development of an acculturation identity representative of the individual’s experiences. It is with this conceptualization in mind that adolescent immigrants with the aforementioned relational qualities are likely to embrace collectively the positives of two cultures that promote the development of “bicultural” or “bicultural, bicultural self-identity” acculturation identification. Adolescents who report negative or problematic father-child attachment relationship, absence or lack of father involvement, and father rejection will likely adopt
or occupy an identity that is either “Asian identified or low Western fit,” “Western identified or low Asian fit,” or “No identification, low Asian and low Western fit.”

**Objectives**

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effects of father’s physical absence on the psychological, behavioral, scholastic, and self-identity acculturation development of Chinese immigrant males. Moreover, I hoped to identify the salient factors or characteristics pertinent to the father-son interpersonal relationship that promoted or facilitated the normative developmental processes; specifically, aspects or dimensions of father-child attachment, paternal involvement, and father acceptance from the phenomenological perceptions of children. Given the continued influx of Chinese immigrant families to the United States, with a significant number consisting of mothers and their children with fathers maintaining their employment in their country of origin, it is important to note the potential and long-term ramifications of father absence and presence in the normative developmental processes during adolescence, as well as its implications on the family life cycle and society in general.

**Chapter Four: Research Design and Methodology**

A total of 112 participants agreed to take part in this retrospective, ex post facto quantitative study. However, only 86 were included in the final sample due to non-receipt of response sets. All subjects were at least 18 years of age and over, with the majority between the ages of 18 and 35 (79.0%). Participants were mostly foreign born nationals
of Chinese heritage who emigrated to the United States (US) from Taiwan, China, Hong Kong and other geographic region in the East or Southeast Asia prior to the age 12 on average. A few U.S.-born individuals were also included in the overall sample due to their report of having been raised in Asia since birth before returning to the States as children.

Subjects were recruited primarily through campus-based student organizations in colleges or universities in and out of the greater Los Angeles area, community-based programs in predominantly Chinese American communities in San Gabriel valley, religious organizations, as well as via direct solicitation. Respondents who identify themselves as non-English speaking at the time of immigration, who were from intact families, and who met all other selection criteria were included in this study. Participants were then assigned, based on the family arrangement since immigration, to either continuous father present or continuous father absent group. The final sample consisted of 53 individuals in father present and 33 in father absent category, respectively.

To test the hypotheses that the main and interaction effects of continuous father presence, father-son attachment, father involvement, and adolescents’ perception of father acceptance positively predict the psychological, behavioral, scholastic, self-identity, and subjective well-being developments in Chinese male immigrants, each participant was instructed to complete a demographic questionnaire as well as a battery of measures including The Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment (IPPA), Father Involvement Scale (FIS), Deviant Behavior Questionnaire (DBQ), Parental Acceptance Rejection Questionnaire (PARQ), Personality Assessment Questionnaire (PAQ), and The Suinn-
Lew Asian Self-Identity Acculturation Scale (SL-ASIA) after determining their eligibility for inclusion in this study.

**Instrumentation**

**Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment – Mother, Father, and Peer**

**Attachment Revised Version (IPPA-R).** The original IPPA (Parent and Peer Attachment Version) was developed by Armsden and Greenberg (1987) based on the theoretical premise and formulation of Bowlby’s attachment theory and designed to assess adolescents’ subjective evaluations of affective and cognitive dimensions of relationships with their parents and peers. It is a self-report questionnaire consisting 28 parents and 25 peers items on a five-point Likert-scale response format producing two attachment scores. The parent scale did not distinguish father attachment from mother attachment however. The non-published revised version used for this study is comprised of 25 identical items in each section arranged in the same chronological order with the exception of referent, yielding three total scores measuring separately attachment to father, mother, and peers, respectively. Each section retains the original three subscales: trust (T), communication (C), and alienation (A). Participants are asked to indicate their level of agreement with respect to their subjective feeling (i.e., almost never or never true = 1 , not very often true = 2, sometimes true =3, often true = 4 , or almost always or always true = 5) to statements about their relationships with father/mother/peers such as “My (father/mother/peers) trust my judgment,” “I tell my (father/mother/peers) about my problems and troubles,” and “Talking over my problems with my (father/mother/peers) makes me feel ashamed or foolish.” Total scores on IPPA-R for each section ranges from
25 to 125, and is obtained by summing all response values after reverse-scoring the negatively worded items. Higher scores indicate more positive or favorable perception and thereby more attachment. While IPPA was initially designed for late adolescence, normed after samples of 16 to 20 years of age, it has been used successfully in studies for ages 10 to 20.

The original IPPA had internal consistency alphas of .91, .91, and .86 for T, C, and A subscales on parent attachment scale and .91, .87, and .72 for T, C, and A subscales on the peer attachment scale, respectively, with a three-week test-retest reliability coefficients of .93 for parent attachment and .86 for peer attachment. For the revised version, the internal reliabilities were comparable to that of the original version with mother attachment, .87, father attachment, .89, and peer attachment, .92. Armsden and Greenberg (1987) reported moderate to high correlation of parental attachment scores to Family and Social Self scores from the Tennessee Self Concept Scale and to most subscales on the Family Environmental Scale. Furthermore, IPPA has also been demonstrated to have excellent concurrent validity with several other measures of psychological well-being, with attachment to parents positively correlated with self-esteem, positiveness, life satisfaction, problem-solving coping strategies, self-management skills, and locus of control, and negatively correlated with depression and loneliness in studies with middle or late adolescents. Moreover, it is found to discriminate delinquent adolescents from non-delinquent adolescents between ages 12 to 17 (Redondo, Martin, Fernandez, & Lopez, 1986).
**Father Involvement Scale.** Developed by Gordon Finley and Seth Schwartz (Finley & Schwartz, 2004), the Father Involvement Scale (FIS) lists 20 distinct domains of involvement typically associated with fathering. It is a self-report measure consisting of two scales, the reported and desired involvement scales, where the participants were asked to indicate the level of involvement their fathers participated or demonstrated (i.e., never involved = 1, rarely involved = 2, sometimes involved = 3, often involved = 4, or always involved = 5) and how they perceived the involvement to be in relation to what it actually was (i.e., much less involved = 1, a little less involved = 2, it was just right = 3, a little more involved = 4, or much more involved = 5) in each of the domains using a 5-point Likert-scale response format. Total scores for each scale are obtained by summing all response values and it ranges from 20 to 100. Analysis of the reported involvement scale reveals linearity with higher scores indicating more involvement. The desired involvement scale on the other hand appears curvilinear in that “it was just right” response style in the items reflects high degree of satisfaction for the involvement received (i.e., reported involvement). Thus a higher score on the desired involvement scale would indicate a wish for more involvement and a lower score indicate the desire for less involvement than what is actually reported. A sample item from FIS reads, “_______ developing independence _______,” where the participant will be asked to provide their subjective rating for reported father involvement into the blank left of the item and rating for desired father involvement into the blank right of the item.

Three subscales were created for the reported involvement scale: Expressive Involvement; Instrumental Involvement, and Mentoring/Advising Involvement subscales, respectively, based on the analyses conducted by Finley and Schwartz (2004). Internal
reliabilities (Cronbach’s alphas) scores on all three subscales and for the total reported
father involvement score are as followed: Expressive Involvement, .93; Instrumental
Involvement, .91; Mentoring/Advising Involvement, .90; and Total Reported
Involvement, .97. Two subscales were created on the desired involvement scale, the
Expressive Desired Involvement and Instrumental Desired Involvement subscales.
Internal consistency tests also revealed high Cronbach’s alphas for scores on the
subscales and for the total desired father involvement score, with Expressive Desired
Involvement, .93; Instrumental Desired Involvement, .92; and Total Desired
Involvement, .96, respectively.

Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire (PARQ) - Adult: Father

Long/Standard Version. The Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire (PARQ) is a
self-reported measure designed to assess individuals’ perceptions of parental acceptance-
rejection, in particular, the warmth dimension of parenting that is an integral component
of the parental acceptance-rejection theory (PARTheory) formulated by Ronald Rohner
(2005b). The standard adult version contains 60 items. Participants are asked to indicate
their level of agreement with regard to each statement about their fathers’ behaviors by
endorsing one of the four choices given: Almost always true, sometimes true, rarely true,
or almost never true. PARQ consists of four scales: Warmth/affection (W/A), 20 items;
hostility/aggression (H/A), 15 items; indifference/neglect (I/N), 15 items; and
undifferentiated rejection (U/R), 10 items. Sample questions on the instrument read,
“(My father) made it easy for me to tell him things that were important to me,” “Talked
to me about our plans and listened to what I had to say,” “Made me feel unloved if I misbehaved,” and “Let me know I was not wanted.”

A total acceptance-rejection score (PARQ score) is obtained by summing all individual scale scores. Each scale score is determined by adding all values in the response set (i.e., almost never true = 1, rarely true = 2, sometimes true = 3, or almost always true = 4) in the direction indicated with the exception of the indifference/neglect scale, of which seven of the fifteen items in this response set needed to be reverse scored, and with the entire warmth/affection scale reverse scored to create the form of rejection designated as coldness or lack of affection. Possible total scores range from 60 to 240. According to Rohner (2005b), higher scores (>140) indicate perception of qualitatively more rejection from their fathers, whereas scores 90 to 110 typically reflect respondents’ subjective feelings or experiences of their fathers’ loving acceptance in an analysis of sample population in the United States.

Although the reliability and validity of the standard Adult PARQ: Father Version was not tested, they are expected to be comparable to that of Adult PARQ: Mother version with internal consistency alphas ranged from .86 to .95, with a median reliability of .91 from a validation study conducted in 1975. Subsequent meta-analysis of reports about the reliability and validity of standard PARQ from published and non-published studies revealed Cronbach’s alphas ranging from .81 to .97 for Adult PARQ: Father Version and from .76 to .97 for Adult PARQ: Mother Version, all exceeding the minimum threshold of acceptance criterion (.70) for reliability estimates recommended for basic research employing multi-item measures (Cournoyer & Klein, 2000).
**Personality Assessment Questionnaire (PAQ) – Adult Version.** Personality Assessment Questionnaire (PAQ) is a self-report measure designed to assess individuals’ self-perceptions of the seven personality dispositions associated with PARTheory’s personality subtheory formulated by Ronald Rohner (2005c). It is used to ascertain or predict the personality or psychological sequelae or consequences as related to perceived parental acceptance and rejection. The seven personality dispositions are: Hostility and aggression, dependency, self-esteem, self-adequacy, emotional responsiveness, emotional stability, and worldview.

Adult PAQ consists of 63 items, with nine items in each of the scales: Hostility/aggression, dependency, negative self-esteem, negative self-adequacy, emotional unresponsive, emotional instability, and negative worldview. The hostility/aggression scale can be further divided into five subscales: Hostility, verbal aggression, physical aggression, passive aggression, and problem managing hostility and aggression. As with PARQ, participants are asked to endorse from one of four choices based on their level of agreement with the statement (i.e., almost always, sometimes true, rarely true, or almost never true). Sample items from the measure read, “I feel I am a good person worthy of the respect of others,” “I would rather keep my problems to myself than seek sympathy or comfort,” “I feel inept in many of the things I try to do,” “I have trouble controlling my temper,” and “My mood is fairly constant throughout the day.”

With the exception of the hostility/aggression scale, one or more items in the other scales needed to be reverse scored before the scale scores can be ascertained. Potential scale scores range from 9 to 36 with 22.5 as the midpoint for each of the seven
scales. Possible total PAQ scores range from 63 to 252, and are obtained by summing all the scale scores. Whereas lower PAQ scores indicate excellent psychological adjustment, high overall PAQ scores at or above the midpoint of 158 usually reflect significant psychological adjustment impairment or psychological maladjustment, and high PAQ subscale scores at or above the midpoint of 23 points to psychological difficulty with the particular personality dispositions assessed. The average scores on the Adult PAQ from the sampling in the United States ranged from 90 to 110. However, it has been found that college students tend to score higher than the general population, with mean scores at or around 124.

Internal consistency tests of Adult PAQ revealed Cronbach’s alphas ranged from .73 to .85, with a median reliability of .81 based on initial analysis in 1975-1976. Subsequent meta-analysis of reports conducted in 2003 by Rohner about the reliability and validity of PAQ from published and non-published studies revealed Cronbach’s alphas ranging from .79 to .96 for Adult PAQ, all exceeding the minimum threshold of acceptance criterion (.70) for reliability estimates recommended for basic research employing multi-item measures (Cournoyer & Klein, 2000). Moreover, PAQ has been demonstrated to have excellent convergent and discriminant validity.

**Deviant Behavior Questionnaire – Long Version (DBQ-L) from Measuring Adolescent Social and Personal Adaptation in Quebec (MASPAQ) by Le Blanc (1996).** Deviant Behavior Questionnaire – Long Version (DBQ-L) is a self-reported instrument designed to assess a wide range of externalizing, conduct, and/or deviant behaviors during adolescence. It consists of 63 questions with each item divided into
three disparate categories. Adolescents are asked to indicate whether or not they’ve engaged in the specific types of behaviors measured, the age or onset of initial violation or infraction of the indicated behaviors, and the frequency of the endorsed deviancy committed during the past twelve months (i.e., never, once or twice, several time, or very often). DBQ-L is divided into two categories: Problem behavior and criminal delinquency. The Problem behavior scale assesses domains involving family rebellion, school rebellion, maladjustment at work, sexual promiscuity, sexual relations, prostitution, drug use, aggression against the family and victim of sexual aggression. Criminal delinquency scale on the other hand measures aggression outside the family, vandalism, minor theft, serious theft, and serious delinquency. A sample item on the measure reads, “Having drank a bottle of beer, a glass of wine, a glass of hard liquor?” The respondent is asked to indicate “Have you ever done this?” “If so, how old were you the first time you did this?” and “During the past 12 months, have you drank a bottle of beer, a glass of wine, a glass of hard liquor?”

In the section pertaining to the referent offense committed during the past 12 months, a score of 0 is assigned for a response style indicating “never” and a score of 1 for the remaining choice selected (i.e. once or twice; several times; or very often). For the purpose of the current study, this language has been modified with the intent to assess the frequency of endorsed reoffending behavior during adolescence, specifically, the number of times the participant has engaged in the referent misbehavior or delinquent act since the age of initial offense and between ages 11 to 18. This alteration does not affect the validity of the measure due to the fact that meticulous care and due diligence have been
applied to ensure consistency and adherence to the theoretical formulation of delinquency proposed by the author.

Total, scale, and/or subscale scores are obtained by summing all the endorsed items pertinent to the referent scale (i.e., 1 for yes; 0 for no), with scores greater than zero indicate previous and/or cumulative participation in the particular domain assessed, and of which suggest behavioral deviancy. Le Blanc reported internal consistency alphas ranged from .64 (family rebellion) to .91 (minor theft) for all subscales and more than adequate reliability and validity of the MASPAQ scales overall.

The Suinn-Lew Asian Self-Identity Acculturation Scale (SL-ASIA) is a self-reported measure designed to assess the level of acculturation of Asian populations. The updated version consists of 26 questions, five new items in addition to twenty-one found in the original format. The additional items (questions #22-26) are intended to assist in refining the delineation or classification process, thereby enabling the capture with greater sensitivity of participants’ self-defined cultural identity based on qualitatively multi-dimensional and orthogonal theorizations on acculturation. Participants are asked to indicate their level of agreement with each item.

The original SL-ASIA employs a 5-option response scale (1, 2, 3, 4, 5). Acculturation score is obtained by summing all response values from all twenty-one items and then divided by 21. Hence, scores can range from 1 (Asian identification / low acculturation / low assimilation) to 5 (Western identification / high acculturation / high assimilation) with scores at or around 3 indicate “Bicultural identification.” With the
newer version, reclassification or recategorization can be ascertained by evaluating the response set gathered from the additional items. Specifically, participants’ values orientation from questions #22 and #23 are used to assess; behavioral competencies or fit with questions #24 and #25; and with self-statement on cultural identity on question #26, respectively. It is conceivable to extract from such analyses several different classification of acculturation: one based solely on acculturation score from the original 21 items; values orientation; behavioral competencies or fit; or using different combination of scores.

Internal consistency estimates for SL-ASIA ranged from .88 (pilot study by Suinn et al., 1987) to .91 (replication study by Suinn, Ahuna, and Khoo, 1992). In addition, it has been reported to have concurrent validity, demonstrating positive correlations of statistical significance with demographic information assessed in the Suinn et al (1992) replication study in relation to years of school attendance in United States, years residing in US, years residing in non-Asian neighborhood, and self-rating of acculturation, respectively. SL-ASIA was found to be negatively correlated with age of school attendance in US and age of arrival to US.

**Participant Demographic Questionnaire (PDQ).** The Participant Demographic Questionnaire (PDQ) is designed to assist the principle investigator in gathering essential information pertaining to the participants’ age at time of immigration to US, family constellation, father and mother physical presence or absence; educational status, and perception of family relationships. Moreover, it also contains seven items measuring participants’ perceived well-being as defined in terms of self-
efficacy/mastery/competency, self-esteem, and happiness utilizing a 5-point Likert-scale response format (i.e., extremely dissatisfied = 1; mostly dissatisfied = 2; neither satisfied nor dissatisfied = 3; mostly satisfied = 4; or extremely satisfied = 5) with high total scores indicate positive well-being. The inclusion in this measure of all of the above-referenced domains is premised on the assumption that in addition to providing relational demographic background information, they may independently and/or in combination act as potential confounds and need to be effectively neutralized to permit unobtrusive analyses of the data gathered. However, the psychometric properties of these items have not yet been tested and are unknown at this time. A sample item on measure of perceived well-being reads, “In general, how satisfied are you with your authority to determine your own life course, even though it may be against/contrary to the expectation of others?

Based on review of studies, only IPPA-R, PARQ, PAQ and SL-ASIA have been used with non-White populations, but none with immigrant Chinese. In addition, PAQ was used in a study with Korean Americans, no other ethnicities of East Asian origin were included.

Procedure for the Study

1. Recruitment of participants through distribution of flyer and recruitment letter to members of student-based associations in colleges or universities in the greater Los Angeles area, community-based programs or groups in the San Gabriel valley, Chinese American religious organizations or chapters, as well as via direct, in-person solicitation.
Prospective candidates interested to participate in the study were asked to contact the principle investigator by phone or via electronic communication to enable the screening of eligibility requirements for inclusion for this study. Respondents who satisfactorily met the recruitment criteria and who wished to participate were then asked whether or not they would like to arrange a face-to-face meeting for the administration and collection of the measures. The exact location was to be determined and mutually agreed upon by both parties to ensuring the privacy and confidentiality of the participant were protected and maintained. Candidates had the option to decline this in-person meeting and to request the receipt of instruments by mail with a postage-paid return envelope attached. The latter option was the preferred choice selected by the vast majority of the participants. Subjects who wished to receive the instruments by mail were advised to complete and return all measures including the consent form within 7-10 days after receipt of the materials. All subjects were asked to provide their contact information on a separate contact information sheet (CIS) to permit future communication between the principle investigator/researcher and participants for the sole purpose of providing them timely notification and dissemination of information of any risk factor that had been identified while the study was ongoing or after its completion. Participants were informed that no such contact would be made in the absence of such circumstance. Demographic information and self-reported measures completed and obtained at the time of the initial meeting or via return envelop were stored in a file cabinet under lock in the principle investigator’s home office. The key to the lock is kept under
storage at a separate location but in the general vicinity of the office accessible only to the researcher.

3. Participants who elected to have a face-to-face contact for administration of measures discussed with the investigator to determine a convenient or suitable time, date, and location for such meeting.

4. Each participant, at the time of administration, received a consent form and a letter describing the nature of the study and the expectations for their involvement, in addition to the measures. Only those participants who signed and returned the written consent were included in the study.

5. A battery of scales was administered to the participants at the meeting. Subjects who declined the in-person arrangement would have the measures mailed to them directly as previously stated. Data were collected from 7 paper-and-pencil questionnaires. Participants had the option to discontinue their participation at any time as indicated in the informed consent without liability and/or penalty. Incomplete measures obtained will not be used in quantitative analyses.

6. Data collected were analyzed using SPSS and SAS software in accordance to the standard quantitative data analysis protocol.

**Data Processing Techniques**

Data obtained from each participant were entered and stored on file using IBM Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) 19.0 version software. SPSS was used to determine the frequencies of descriptive statistics and bivariate correlations amongst all of variables in the study. The entire sampling data were then converted to Microsoft
Excel format and transferred to Statistical Analysis System (SAS) for further analyses due to SPSS did not provide a non-parametric version of multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA). Participants with missing data score for any variable were excluded from the analyses.

MANOVA was selected as the method of choice to analyze the relationship between each continuous experimental variable (father presence, father attachment, father involvement, and father acceptance) and the outcomes variable of interest (psychological adjustment, criminal delinquency, problem behavior, and subjective well-being). Univariate tests were performed if significance was observed on the multivariate level. Multiple regression was applied to ascertain the contribution made by each predictor, as well as the interaction effect between predictor variable and father presence to self-identity acculturation total score. For categorical variables in this study, specifically, academic achievement (ENDDGREE), self-identity acculturation values score (SL-ASIA2223), self-identity acculturation behavioral competencies score (SL-ASIA2425), and the Suinn-Lew Asian Self Identity Acculturation self-identity score (SL-ASIA26), the relationship between experimental and each of the aforementioned outcome factor was assessed utilizing logistic regression analysis.

**Methodological Assumptions and Limitations**

It is important to note that the results obtained in this research may lack the external validity or the ability to generalize given the relative homogeneity of the subject population examined; only immigrant males of Chinese heritage in and out of the greater Los Angeles area are recruited to participate in this study. The high percentage of
participants are current students or graduates from of higher learning, and an
overrepresentation of individuals from families that have more available financial
resources as a result of their higher socioeconomic status is noted. The absence of a
representative sample, even with an established internal validity of construct in this case,
suggests that the findings deduced may have rather limited applicability. Furthermore, the
reliance on the subjects’ recollection of past feelings and experiences may not accurately
reflect or represent the state of cognitive-emotional-behavioral dimensions that this study
was intended to measure. Despite this limitation, the perception of recollection is
presumed to be accurate when if only it is believed by the subjects to be accurate.

**Ethical Assurances**

This study was conducted in accordance to the strict guidelines and standards
devised by the American Psychological Association in its ten principles governing the
conducting of research with human participants. The privacy, confidentiality, and dignity
of each participant were protected and maintained in accordance to all applicable laws or
statutes. Participants were informed of their right to decline or withdraw participation at
any time under any circumstance. Each participant was provided with a general
description of the study and consented to participate with full knowledge that deeply felt
emotions might be aroused as he worked on sensitive items relating to the father-son
relationship. Participants were protected from any physical or emotional harm or
discomfort at all times.

**Chapter Five: Results**
Descriptive Statistics

Table 1 presents descriptive characteristics for the sample population. The data shows that 71.1% of the participants emigrated from Taiwan, followed by 11.6% from the People's Republic of China, and another 2.3% from other States or geographic regions in east or Southeast Asia. A small percentage of the respondents (7%) are U.S.-born nationals. They were included in the overall sample due to having been raised in East Asia since birth before returning to U.S. as children. The age of participants ranged from 18 to 43, with a mean of 28.6 in years. The average age at the time of immigration was 9.5 years (8.1 for father present group and 11.7 for father absent group). All levels of educational attainment were represented: High school diploma/GED, 26.6%; associate degree, 8.1%; bachelor degree, 33.7%; master's degree, 15.1%; doctorate degree, 8.1%; trade or technical certification after high school, 3.5%; and none of the above, 5.8%. It is noteworthy to point out that participants in the last category are current high school students who have reached the age of majority and indicated either they are in the process of applying or have already submitted their applications for admissions to a four-year college or university. For those remaining respondents who have yet attained a degree in higher education since graduating from high school, the vast majority of them (75%) indicated that they are undergraduate students in a regionally accredited institution and are working on completing the requirements for a bachelor degree. Another 19% of participants who already obtained a bachelor or master's degree are presently enrolled in an advanced degree program. Based on the frequency distribution, a considerable overrepresentation of individuals with achievement in higher education is noted. As a
result, the study sample is by no means reflective or representative of the male immigrant population of Chinese heritage overall in the U.S.

Table 2 presents the bootstrap means and standard deviation for all independent and dependent variables of interest for both father present and absent groups. Although definitive conclusions cannot be made without first examining the main and interaction effects of the experimental factors may have on the outcome variables statistically, it is nevertheless important to discern any notable trend in the data collected.

Father absent group showed lower level of instrumental, mentoring, and overall total father involvement – 25.97, 12.45, and 60.03, compared with 27.37, 13.44, and 62.40 for father present group. The reported expressive involvement was comparable between groups - 21.61 for father absent versus 21.40 for father present. However, a pattern contrary to what was expected emerged that showed the father absent group exhibiting higher satisfaction in the attachment relationship with father, mother, and peers, as well as greater paternal acceptance when compared with father present group.

For all of the outcome variables in the analysis, between-group variability was observed with respect to psychological adjustment, deviancy, self-identity acculturation, and subjective well-being. Based on the means presented, father absent group exhibited slightly elevated scores in most of the personality dispositions - dependency, negative self-esteem, negative self-adequacy, emotional instability, and negative worldview - as well as in the total PAQ, which measures psychological adjustment or maladjustment, when compared with the father present group. In contrast, father present group was higher in hostility/aggression and emotional unresponsiveness dispositional styles.
Distinct but inconsistent patterns were also noted in relation to residency status of father with deviant behavior and subjective well-being. Presence of father was associated with elevated scores in all of the delinquency and problem behavior scales and subscales in the MASPAQ measure. The mean difference was most prominent in the alcohol/drug use subscale in the problem behavior category - 0.87 for father present group, compared with 0.39 for father absent group. The only exception was a negligible lower score on the family rebellion subscale – 1.06 for father present group, compared with 1.09 for father absent group. Moreover, father presence was associated with lower reported subjective well-being, although the mean difference was very minimal at best - 26.54 for father present group, compared with 27.13 for father absent group.

Lastly, on the measure of self-identity acculturation, SL-ASIA, discernible between-group difference was also observed. The average score was higher for father present group and lower in father absent group, 58.62, compared with 52.71.

**Statistical Analyses**

Before applying the multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) on the outcome variables of interest, the assumptions of MANOVA must first be checked and satisfactorily met. First, all dependent variables - psychological adjustment (PAQTOTAL), deviancy (criminal delinquency, DELIQTOTAL; and problem behavior, PROBEHTOTAL) and subjective well-being (WELLBEINGTOTAL) – were individually tested for normality using Shapiro-Wilk’s test. All of the variables had p-values reaching significance, p < 0.0001, suggesting that the null hypothesis of the outcome variables are normally distributed was rejected. Therefore, a Box-Cox
transformation was applied to the four variables with lambda values 0.00, 0.25, 0.35, and 3.13 for psychological adjustment, criminal delinquency, problem behavior, and subjective well-being, respectively. The Box-Cox transformation is given by the formula

\[
\text{Tr}(Y) = \frac{Y^\lambda - 1}{\lambda}, \text{ when } \lambda \neq 0
\]

\[
\text{Tr}(Y) = \log(Y), \text{ when } \lambda = 0
\]

Consequently, the transformed outcome variables were used in all of the following analyses. Next, homogeneity of the covariance matrices among the four outcome variables was ascertained. A Box’s M test was used and a chi-square p-value of 0.4973 was obtained, suggesting the null hypothesis of homogeneity in the covariance matrices was not rejected. Hence, the assumptions of normally distributed outcomes, homogeneity among the outcomes, and the independence of subject observations in order to perform MANOVA were met.

All of the multivariate tests conducted in this study were based on the 86 observations obtained - 33 in father absent group and 53 in father present group. A total of 8 MANOVA tests were applied and the alpha threshold was adjusted to 0.00625. Hence, significance was reached in the main and/or interaction effect of interest in the multivariate test if the p-value was less than this cutoff threshold. Based on the overall significance noted, another 13 univariate (ANOVA) tests were conducted to ascertain the specific interaction effect between the experimental factors and the outcome variables of interest. In order to achieve significance in the ANOVA tests, the alpha threshold was also adjusted and the p-values must not exceed 0.0038.

*Does father presence predict psychological adjustment, academic attainment, prosocial behaviors, and positive subjective well-being in male adolescents in general?*
A MANOVA model was used in which psychological adjustment, criminal
delinquency, problem behavior, and subjective well-being were compared with father
present and father absent groups (FAPRESENCE, treated as a continuous variable) to
examine whether the effects of psychological adjustment (i.e., decrease in the number of
personality dispositions identified), prosocial behavior, and positive subjective well-being
in male adolescents differ between these two groups. The Pearson correlation matrix
among the dependent variables suggested independence. The model produced a Wilks’
Lambda p-value of 0.5475, which failed to reject the null hypothesis that there are no
differences between father present and absent groups concerning psychological
adjustment, prosocial behaviors, and positive subjective well-being in male adolescents.

The effect of father presence was further examined by dichotomizing the
psychological adjustment, criminal delinquency, problem behavior, and subjective well-
being outcome variables, resulting in the two groups being separated into those with high
or low values. The ‘high’ group was chosen based on the following cutoff threshold: 90% quantile was used to label those exceeding this value as “high” for psychological
adjustment, criminal delinquency, and problem behavior; and a score at or above the 25th percentile (> 25) for subjective well-being. The ‘low’ group cutoff was based on the 10% quantile threshold for all the outcome variables except for problem behavior, and those underachieved this value were labeled as ‘low’. The cutoff value for problem behavior in the “low” group was a score at or below the 50th percentile, which happened to
 correspond to the median value score (< 2) on this scale. The values in between ‘low’ and
‘high’ were labeled as missing values and not included in the following analysis.
Since the interest was in the possible effect of father presence on the four dichotomized variables of psychological adjustment (di_PAQTOTAL), criminal delinquency (di_DELIQTOTAL), problem behavior (di_PROBEHTOTAL), and subjective well-being (di_WELLBEINGTOTAL), four 2 x 2 contingency tables were constructed: FAPRESENCE x di_PAQTOTAL, FAPRESENCE x di_DELIQTOTAL, FAPRESENCE x di_PROBEHTOTAL and FAPRESENCE x di_WELLBEINGTOTAL. However, this created a multiple testing problem as the number of pair-wise contingency tables increased. Instead, a log linear model including all 5 variables was implemented to investigate whether there were any associations.

The final reduced model produced a LRT p-value of 0.899 that was still greater than 0.05 cutoff thresholds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>Pr &gt; ChiSq</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>di_PAQTOTAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>di_DELIQTOTAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.3414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>di_WELLBEINGTOTAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>di_PROBEHTOTAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.3414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAPRESENCE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17.32</td>
<td>0.8993</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above model was selected due to it had the most reduced terms. Yet, the absence of any significant interaction term with father presence in the most reduced model suggested that the four dichotomized variables of psychological adjustment, criminal delinquency, problem behavior, and subjective well-being were not associated with father presence in this categorical data analysis.

In order to investigate whether father presence, FAPRESENCE, is associated with academic achievement, ENDDEGREE, a 2 x 7 table was constructed (ENDDEGREE has 7 levels) and a Fisher’s exact test was performed. Academic achievement was not included in the overall MANOVA test given it is a categorical variable. The resulting test
had a p-value of 0.087 that again failed to reject the null hypothesis that there is no
difference in academic achievement between father present and absent groups. However,
since this p-value was getting closer to the alpha threshold of 0.05, it was likely that the
current sample size was underpowered and a true significance might be reached with
increasing sample size beyond 86 observations.

*Does father absence predict psychosocial maladjustment, academic
underachievement/underperformance, deviancy/delinquent behavior, and lower
subjective well-being in male adolescents in general?*

The MANOVA and Fisher’s exact test results from Question 1 suggested no
associations of father absence with psychosocial maladjustment, academic
underachievement/underperformance, delinquent or problem behaviors, and lower
reported subjective well-being in male adolescents. By looking at the univariate analysis
of variance (ANOVA) for each dependent variable in the MANOVA model,
psychological adjustment, criminal delinquency, problem behavior, and subjective well-
being had p-values of 0.734, 0.311, 0.434 and 0.543, respectively, which indicated that
no marginal effect of father absence was found in any of the dependent variables of
interest.

*Does the influence of father-child attachment on children’s outcomes differ for male
adolescents who reside in father present versus father absent households?*

To examine whether psychological adjustment, criminal delinquency, problem
behavior, and subjective well-being in male adolescents differ between father present and
absent groups after adjusting for father-child attachment influences, and whether there is
an interaction effect between father presence and father-child attachment, the following MANOVA model was tested.

\[
\text{PAQTOTAL DELIQTOTAL PROBEHTOTAL WELLBEINGTOTAL} = \text{FAPRESENCE|TOTALIPPAFA}
\]

The main effect of father presence, after adjusting for father attachment (TOTALIPPAFA) and father presence and father attachment interaction effects, had a non-significant Wilks’ Lambda p-value of 0.013, which failed to reject the null hypothesis that there are no differences between father present and absent groups concerning psychological adjustment, prosocial behaviors, and positive subjective well-being in male adolescents after adjusting for father attachment and father presence and father attachment interaction terms. Therefore, it suggested that psychological adjustment, prosocial behaviors, and positive subjective well-being were not affected by father presence after accounting father attachment and father presence and father attachment interaction terms.

The main effect of father attachment, after adjusting for father presence and father presence and father attachment interaction effects, had a significant Wilks’ Lambda p-value of 0.0061, which rejected the null hypothesis of there are no associations relating father attachment with psychological adjustment, prosocial behaviors, and positive subjective well-being in male adolescents after adjusting for father presence and father presence and father attachment interaction terms. Hence, psychological adjustment, prosocial behaviors, and positive subjective well-being were influenced by father attachment after accounting for father presence and father presence and father attachment interaction terms.
The interaction effect between father presence and father attachment, after adjusting for father presence and father attachment main effects, had a non-significant Wilks’ Lambda p-value of 0.0064, which failed to reject the null hypothesis that there are no associations of effect modification by father presence on father attachment influences with psychological adjustment, prosocial behaviors, and positive subjective well-being in male adolescents after adjusting for father presence and father attachment main effects. It is therefore concluded that psychological adjustment, prosocial behaviors, and positive subjective well-being were not influenced by father attachment differently between father present and father absent groups after accounting for father presence and father attachment main effects.

Since the overall multivariate test was significant for the father attachment term, univariate test for each of the outcome variables was applied. The following models were used and the marginal effects for each outcome variable are presented in Table 3.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{PAQTOTAL} & = \text{FAPRESENCE} \mid \text{TOTALIPPAFA} \\
\text{DELIQTOTAL} & = \text{FAPRESENCE} \mid \text{TOTALIPPAFA} \\
\text{PROBEHTOTAL} & = \text{FAPRESENCE} \mid \text{TOTALIPPAFA} \\
\text{WELLBEINGTOTAL} & = \text{FAPRESENCE} \mid \text{TOTALIPPAFA}
\end{align*}
\]

The results of ANOVAs suggested that the main and interaction effects of father presence and father attachment were significantly associated with psychological adjustment. As the residency status of father (FAPRESENCE) switched from absent to present, increasing unit by 1 from 0, after adjusting for father attachment score, psychological adjustment total score (PAQTOTAL; higher score indicates maladjustment or negative personality dispositions) will increase by 0.46, suggesting an increase in maladjustment. However, when the group membership is father present, one unit increase in the father attachment score will lead to a decrease in psychological adjustment total score by 0.006.
Therefore, as father attachment increases in the father present group, psychological maladjustment decreases. No significance was found involving the main and interaction effects of father presence and father attachment with delinquency, problem behavior, or subjective well-being.

Due to the potential influence that mother and peer attachments may have in mediating or moderating the effects of father attachment on the outcome variables, mother attachment (TOTALIPPAMO) and peer attachment (TOTALIPPAPEER) were tested in separate multivariate analysis. The main and interaction effects of father presence and mother attachment terms were non-significant - Wilks’ Lambda p-values of 0.577, 0.084, and 0.547 for the main father presence, main mother attachment, and father presence and mother interaction terms, respectively. Given there were no associations found as related to mother attachment in the overall multivariate test, univariate tests were not performed on the outcome variables. The main father presence and peer attachment terms were non-significant as well, Wilks’ Lambda p-values of 0.844 and 0.092, respectively. However, the interaction between father presence and peer attachment, after adjusting for the main effects of father presence and peer attachment, reached statistical significance, Wilks’ Lambda p-value of 0.0004, which rejected the null hypothesis that there are no associations of effect modification by father presence on mother attachment influences with psychological adjustment, prosocial behaviors, and positive subjective well-being in male adolescents after adjusting for father presence and peer attachment main effects. Therefore, it is suggested that psychological adjustment, prosocial behaviors, and positive subjective well-being were influenced by peer
attachment similarly between father present and father absent groups after accounting for father presence and peer attachment main effects (Table 4).

Since the multivariate test was significant in the father presence and peer attachment interaction term, univariate tests were performed on the outcome variables. The results suggested significance of peer attachment effect alone in affecting psychological adjustment and subjective well-being. Specifically, one unit increase in the peer attachment score will decrease psychological adjustment total score by 0.005, and increase the subjective well-being score by 4.28. Since peer attachment was associated with psychological adjustment as well, one additional multivariate test was performed to ascertain the genuine effect of father attachment on the outcome variables. The results provided Wilks’ Lambda p-values of 0.517, 0.590, and < 0.0001 for father presence, father attachment, and peer attachment main terms, respectively. Hence, peer attachment, after adjusting for or neutralizing father presence and father attachment main effects, was found to significantly associate with the outcome variables in the multivariate test. Further univariate analyses revealed one unit increase in peer attachment decreased the overall psychological maladjustment and increased subjective well-being scores (Table 5).

To investigate the main and interaction effects of father presence and father attachment on academic achievement, a multinomial logistic regression was applied. Based on the analysis of maximum likelihood estimates utilizing academic achievement class 1 as the reference group (participants who reported having had attained a high school degree or GED), none of the parameters were significant based on the cutoff threshold established (alpha = 0.0063). Therefore, it was concluded that father presence,
father attachment, and the interaction term between father presence and father attachment did not influence academic achievement.

The same conclusion was also reached when examining the effects of father presence and peer attachment on academic achievement in a separate multinomial logistic regression analysis. Even though no association was found, there was one interaction term that almost reached the threshold of significance with p-value of 0.0085. Specifically, for those participants in the father absent group, the ratio of the relative risk of obtaining a degree class 3 (bachelor’s degree) vs. degree class 1 was 0.922 per one unit increase in peer attachment score. Hence, an inverse relationship was noted with regard to peer attachment and the attainment of a bachelor degree in father absent group. It was likely that this effect was non-significant due to the current sample size was underpowered.

*Does the influence of father involvement on children’s outcomes differ for male adolescents who reside in father present versus father absent households?*

To examine whether psychological adjustment, criminal delinquency, problem behavior, and subjective well-being in male adolescents differ between father present and absent groups after adjusting for father involvement influences, and whether there is an interaction effect between father presence and father involvement, the following MANOVA model was tested.

\[
\text{PAQTOTAL DELIQTOTAL PROBEHTOTAL WELLBEINGTOTAL} = \text{FAPRESENCE|REPINVTOTAL}
\]

The main effect of father presence, after adjusting for father involvement (REPINVTOTAL) and father presence and father involvement effects, had a non-
significant Wilks’ Lambda p-value of 0.101, which failed to reject the null hypothesis that there are no differences between father present and absent groups concerning psychological adjustment, prosocial behaviors, and positive subjective well-being in male adolescents after adjusting for father involvement and father presence and father involvement interaction terms. Therefore, it was concluded that psychological adjustment, prosocial behaviors, and positive subjective well-being were not affected by father presence after accounting for father involvement and father involvement interaction terms.

The main effect of father involvement, after adjusting for father presence and father presence and father involvement interaction effects, had a non-significant Wilks’ Lambda p-value of 0.145, which failed to reject the null hypothesis that there are no associations relating father involvement with psychological adjustment, prosocial behaviors, and positive subjective well-being in male adolescents after adjusting for father presence and father involvement interaction terms; hence, it suggested that psychological adjustment, prosocial behaviors, and positive subjective well-being were not influenced by father involvement after accounting for father presence and father involvement interaction terms.

The interaction effect between father presence and father involvement, after adjusting for father presence and father involvement main effects, also had a non-significant Wilks’ Lambda p-value of 0.116, which failed to reject the null hypothesis that there are no associations of effect modification by father presence on father involvement influences with psychological adjustment, prosocial behaviors, and positive subjective well-being in male adolescents after adjusting for father presence and father involvement main effects. Therefore, psychological adjustment, prosocial behaviors, and
positive subjective well-being were influenced by father involvement similarly between father present and father absent groups after accounting for father presence and father involvement main effects. Due to the overall multivariate test being non-significant, no univariate test was performed on each outcome variable.

To investigate the main and interaction effects of father presence and father involvement on academic achievement, a multinomial logistic regression was too applied. Based on the analysis of maximum likelihood estimates utilizing academic achievement class 1 as the reference group, none of the parameters was significant based on the cutoff threshold established. Therefore, it was concluded that father presence, father involvement, and the interaction term between father presence and father involvement did not influence academic achievement. Although no association was found, there was one interaction effect that almost reached the threshold of significance with p-value of 0.0086. Specifically, for those participants in the father absent group, the ratio of the relative risk of obtaining a degree class 4 (master’s degree) vs. degree class 1 was 0.919 per one unit increase in father involvement score. Therefore, an inverse relationship was noted in relation to father involvement and the attainment of a master’s degree, compared with those with high school diploma or GED, in the father absent group. Again, it was likely that the current sample size was underpowered and this effect might have been statistically significant with increasing sample size beyond 86 observations.

Does the influence of father acceptance on children’s outcomes differ for adolescents who reside in father present versus father absent homes?

To examine whether psychological adjustment, criminal delinquency, problem behavior, and subjective well-being in male adolescents differ between father present and
absent groups after adjusting for father acceptance influences, and whether there is an interaction effect between father presence and father acceptance, the following MANOVA model was tested.

$$\text{PAQTOTAL DELIQTOTAL PROBEHTOTAL WELLBEINGTOTAL} = \text{FAPRESENCE} | \text{PARQTOTAL}$$

The main effect of father presence, after adjusting for father acceptance-rejection (PARQTOTAL) and father presence and father acceptance-rejection effects, had a non-significant Wilks’ Lambda p-value of 0.010, which failed to reject the null hypothesis of there are no differences between father present and absent groups concerning psychological adjustment, prosocial behaviors, and positive subjective well-being in male adolescents after adjusting for parental acceptance-rejection and father presence and father acceptance-rejection interaction terms. The finding suggested that psychological adjustment, prosocial behaviors, and positive subjective well-being were not affected by father presence after accounting for parental acceptance-rejection and father presence and father acceptance-rejection interaction terms.

The main effect of father acceptance-rejection, after adjusting for father presence and father presence and father acceptance-rejection interaction effects, had a significant Wilks’ Lambda p-value of 0.004, which rejected the null hypothesis of there are no associations relating father acceptance with psychological adjustment, prosocial behaviors, and positive subjective well-being in male adolescents after adjusting for father presence and father presence and father acceptance-rejection interaction terms. Hence, it concluded that psychological adjustment, prosocial behaviors, and positive
subjective well-being were influenced by father acceptance after accounting for father presence and father presence and father acceptance-rejection interaction terms.

The interaction effect between father presence and father acceptance-rejection, after adjusting for father presence and father acceptance-rejection main effects, also had a significant Wilks’ Lambda p-value of 0.0057, which rejected the null hypothesis that there are no associations of effect modification by father presence on parental acceptance-rejection influences with psychological adjustment, prosocial behaviors, and positive subjective well-being in male adolescents after adjusting for father presence and parental acceptance main effects. Therefore, psychological adjustment, prosocial behaviors, and positive subjective well-being were indeed influenced by parental acceptance-rejection differently between father present and father absent groups after accounting for father presence and parental acceptance-rejection main effects.

Since the overall multivariate test was significant in father acceptance-rejection and father presence and father acceptance-rejection interaction effects, univariate test for each outcome variable was performed. The marginal effect of each outcome variable from the ANOVA test is illustrated in Table 6.

The finding suggested that the main and interaction effects of father presence and father acceptance-rejection were significantly associated with psychological adjustment. As the residency status of father switched from absent to present, increasing unit by 1 from 0, after adjusting for father acceptance-rejection score, psychological adjustment total score will decrease by 0.42. Moreover, when the group membership is father present, one unit increase in the father acceptance-rejection total score (higher PARQTOTAL score suggests greater father rejection than acceptance) will lead to an increase in
psychological adjustment total score by 0.003. Therefore, as father acceptance-rejection total score increases in the father present group, psychological maladjustment increases as well. No significance was found with respect to the main and interaction effects of father presence and father acceptance with delinquency, problem behavior, or subjective well-being.

To examine the main and interaction effects of father presence and father acceptance-rejection on academic achievement, a multinomial logistic regression was again applied. Based on the analysis of maximum likelihood estimates utilizing academic achievement class 1 as the reference group, none of the parameters were significant based on the cutoff threshold established. Therefore, it was concluded that father presence, father acceptance, and the interaction term between father presence and father acceptance-rejection did not influence academic achievement.

Does residency status of fathers influence adolescent immigrants’ development of self-identity acculturation?

To examine the effect that residency status of father has on participants’ development of acculturation self-identity (SLASIATOTAL) or identification based on the 21-items in the original SL-ASIA measure, and whether or not difference exist between father present and absent groups after adjusting for father-child attachment, father involvement, and father acceptance, the following multiple regression model was tested.

\[
\text{SLASIATOTAL} = \text{TOTALIPPAFA} \cdot \text{REPINTOTAL} \cdot \text{PARQTOTAL} \cdot \text{FAPRESENCE} \\
\text{TOTALIPPAFA} \cdot \text{FAPRESENCE} \cdot \text{REPINTOTAL} \cdot \text{FAPRESENCE} \\
\text{PARQTOTAL} \cdot \text{FAPRESENCE}
\]
No significance was found in any of the terms assessed from the regression analysis. It concluded that the residency status of father did not affect the development of an acculturation self-identity and no discernible between-group difference was noted after adjusting for father-child attachment, father involvement, and father acceptance influences.

For the categorical variables labeled “SL-ASIA values score” (SLASIA2223), “SL-ASIA behavioral competencies score” (SLASIA2425), and “SL-ASIA self-identity score” (SLASIA26), multinomial logistic regression was applied. No significance was noted in any of the parameters in the analysis of maximum likelihood estimates except for an association between father attachment and SL-ASIA values score. The finding suggested that for one unit increase in the father attachment score, the ratio of the relative risk of being in category 2 (Western-identified), compared to the reference group in category 1 (Asian-identified), increased by 0.9359. Hence, positive attachment with father was inversely related to Western-identified self-identity acculturation.

A final MANOVA analysis in which all the covariates from research questions 1-6 were inputted in the following model to examine whether the effects of psychological adjustment, prosocial behavior, and positive subjective well-being in male adolescents differ between father present and absent groups after adjusting for father-child attachment, father involvement, parental acceptance, and self-identity acculturation revealed no significant effect.

\[
\text{PAQTOTAL DELIQTOTAL PROBEHTOTAL WELLBEINGTOTAL} = \text{FAPRESENCE TOTALIPPAFA REPINVTOTAL PARQTOTAL SLASIATOTAL} \\
\text{FAPRESENCE*TOTALIPPAFA FAPRESENCE*REPINVTOTAL}
\]
Table 7 presents a summary of the Wilks’ Lambda p-values for all the terms in the final MANOVA model.

Retrospective power analyses were conducted on all MANOVA, multiple regression, and logistic regression tests applied in this study. The retrospective power or "observed power" was calculated by taking the sample mean from 86 observations as the population mean to determine the estimated effect size. One must be aware however that the sample mean could be very different from the population mean. Hence, the sample effect size might be biased estimator for the population effect size.

Significant findings reported in father attachment and father acceptance-rejection variables resulted in a large effect size (eta squared values of 0.16 and 0.17) with power estimates of 0.29 and 0.30, respectively. It would require 276 participants in father attachment and 270 participants in father acceptance-rejection sample to achieve a power of 0.8. Observed power was not calculated for peer attachment predictor variable presumably as a result of sample size being too small to have meaningful sample mean assumption. For father presence and absence variables, a small sized effect (eta squared value of 0.03) was obtained and yielded a power estimate of 0.08. In order to determine if statistically significant results were available, the sample size would need to be increased to 1983 participants to achieve a power of 0.8. For mother attachment predictor variable, it too resulted in a small effect size (eta squared value of 0.04) and a power of 0.09. It would require 1381 participants in the sample to ascertain a power of 0.8 in order to determine if statistically significant outcomes were available. For father involvement variable, a medium effect size was observed (eta squared value of 0.09) with an estimated
power of 0.16. The sample size required to determine if statistically significant findings were available at the level of observed power of 0.8 would have been 556 participants.

Based on the 7 terms (4 predictor variables and 3 interaction effects) in the multiple regression analysis used to examine the effect that residency status of father had on participants’ development of acculturation self-identity, the interaction term between reported father involvement and father presence yielded a medium sized effect with the least observed power, 0.16. In order to ascertain statistically meaningful results in this application, if available, it would require 774 participants in the sample to obtain an actual power estimate of 0.84.

For the logistic regression tests applied in the study assessing the interaction effect between residency status of father and father, mother, and peer attachment and father acceptance-rejection on the academic achievement outcome variable, the results yielded non-significant but large sized effects (eta squared > 0.140) with power estimates of 0.998, 0.998, 0.999, and 0.993, respectively. Academic achievement based on father presence or absence and father involvement interaction term resulted in a medium effect size and an estimated power of 0.4. It would require 151 participants in the sample to achieve an observed power of 0.8 to determine if statistically significant outcomes were available. Lastly, with the exception of residency status of father and father attachment main effects on the self-identity acculturation values score, and father acceptance-rejection main effect on the Suinn-Lew Asian Self Identity Acculturation self-identity score, no other predictor variable resulted in a large effect size and an estimated power greater than 0.8 in the self-identity acculturation values score, self-identity acculturation behavioral competencies score, and the Suinn-Lew Asian Self Identity Acculturation self-
identity score outcome variables. However, medium sized effects and power estimates between 0.32 to 0.75 were obtained for all other main effects on the aforementioned self-identity acculturation outcome variables of interests. Father attachment in particular yielded the least observed power, 0.32, on the self-identity acculturation behavioral competencies score variable. Hence, in order to determine if statistically significant results were available, it would require 304 participants in the sample to achieve an observed power of 0.8.

Based on the retrospective power analyses, it is reasonable to conclude that the lack of support for certain hypotheses may be due to the inadequate sample size or low power reported in the study.

Chapter Six: Discussion

The premise of this ex de facto, retrospective study was to examine the influences that father presence, father attachment, father involvement, and father acceptance have on adolescent psychological adjustment, behavioral outcomes, academic attainment, self-identity acculturation development, and subjective well-being. I hypothesized that the presence of the father would positively affect the aforementioned outcome variables of interest, particularly when it was associated with qualitatively affirmative father-child attachment relationship, high levels of father involvement, and an encapsulated belief of father acceptance from the phenomenological perception of the participants. On the contrary, father absence was hypothesized to have deleterious ramifications that increased the risks of developing psychological maladjustment or personality dispositions,
greater criminal delinquency or problem behaviors, academic underachievement or
underperformance, and negative sense of well-being during adolescence. Although the
residency of father was believed to have great influence on psychological, behavioral,
educational outcomes, I also hypothesized that the stability and enduring nature of the
internalized mental representation of the cognitive-affective dimension of a secure father-
child relationship, the perceived positive involvement from the father, and the sense that
father is warm, encouraging, and accepting, were better prognosticators in determining
the adolescents’ developmental outcomes than that of residency status of father alone.
Furthermore, the presence of these salient factors would positively promote immigrant
youths' engagement in exploratory activities in the host country, providing them the
opportunity for examination, differentiation, synthesis, and integration of disparate and
contrasting cultural norms, beliefs, or perspectives and encouraging their development of
a cultural identity or identification representative of their unique, individual experiences –
an acculturation self-identity that was likely than not to embrace the constructive,
valuable, and positive aspects of the two cultures in a complementary, integrated, and
holistic manner that was personally significant and meaningful. Based on the results of
the analyses, partial but inconsistent support for certain hypotheses was obtained.

First, attachment relationship between father and child is positively associated
with adolescents’ psychological adjustment, independent of mother-child attachment
relationship. Also consistent with previous literature, the stability and enduring nature of
the internalized mental representation of the attachment relationship is generally
maintained overall and in the father present group in particular. However, inconsistent
with the prediction, the observed effect is more prominent for those participants in the
father present group and not in the father absent group. Moreover, given peer attachment is also a protective factor against psychological maladjustment, attachment with father appears to have no significant impact on psychological outcome after adjusting for or neutralizing the effect of peer attachment.

Although no other statistically viable observations between father-child attachment and the other outcome variables of interest are noted, the importance of this cognitive-affectional bond should not be overlooked. It is noteworthy to point out that the quality of father attachment positively correlates with the expressive, instrumental and mentoring/advising fathering domains, as well as the overall reported father involvement, mother attachment and subjective well-being. Not surprisingly, an inverse association is observed linking father attachment with father rejection (noted in the lack of warmth, hostility, neglect, and undifferentiated rejection domains), desired father involvement, and serious criminal delinquency. In addition, a negative correlation is also noted between attachment with father and self-identity acculturation. Therefore, it can be inferred that high levels of father attachment are likely to influence the development of a bicultural identification in a manner that encourages not just the negotiation and adoption of new norms, values, beliefs, ideologies or practices of the host country, but most importantly, the preservation and honoring of personally esteemed traditions of the home country in a mutually respectful and inclusive way representative of the individual’s acculturation experience.

Second, perceived father acceptance is associated with psychological adjustment, and higher levels of father rejection increase the risks of developing maladjustment or personality dispositions. This observation is particularly salient with the father present
group, contrary to the direction of the prediction. However, similar to the results obtained for father attachment variable, no other observations reached significance in the other outcomes of interest. Nonetheless, the importance of father rejection is underscored due to its inverse correlations with father attachment, reported father involvement overall and in each of the reported fathering domains, and subjective well-being. Elevated levels of rejection are associated with lack of affection and warmth, hostility, neglect, and undifferentiated rejection on the part of the father, in addition to certain deviancy outcomes such as total criminal delinquency committed and aggression against the family. Moreover, the lack of father acceptance is positively correlated with desired father involvement overall, in addition to the instrumental and expressive domains of desired fathering. Although no significance is observed in the corresponding relationship between father rejection and acculturation self-identity based on the model analysis, a positive correlation suggests that as the level of rejection increases, the probability of adopting the values and practices of the host country also increases. The end outcome may be that of an individual who is likely to assume a bicultural identification yet with a greater propensity or emphasis on the western identity development or acquisition.

In the examination of the relationship between the residency status of father and the level of father involvement with psychological adjustment, behavioral outcomes, academic achievement, and subjective well-being, no observation of significance is found. Inconsistent with the initial hypotheses, the multivariate analyses revealed that neither father presence nor father involvement positively predicts adaptive adjustment, prosocial behavior, academic attainment, or subjective well-being. The mere physical absence or separation by the father, on the other hand, fails to predict psychological maladjustment
or maladies, criminal delinquency or problem behaviors, academic underperformance, underachievement or failure, or overall subjective unhappiness or dissatisfaction, irrespective to whether or not father absence is associated with qualitatively unsatisfactory father-child relationship, perceived absence or lack of father involvement, and father rejection.

Even though no support for the mediating effect of father involvement on adolescent psychological or behavioral outcomes is reported, high quality involvement by the father is by no means unimportant or inconsequential. In fact, father involvement is significantly correlated with father attachment and reported expressive, instrumental, and mentoring/advising fathering, and negatively correlated with father rejection overall and in each of the four rejecting domains, desired father involvement, and certain personality dispositions such as dependency, negative self-esteem, and negative worldview. This inverse relationship is also noted as it relates to cultural identity as well. It appears the same inference can be drawn from the father attachment reference in that in the course of developing an acculturation self-identity, individuals engage in this process in a way that maintains or upholds the essential or salient norms, values or perspectives of the home country that are personally important, significant or meaningful while they continue to negotiate and adopt the culturally accepted beliefs, ideologies or traditions of the host country.

Lastly, even though no specific prediction was made with regard to residency status of father and the development of self-identity acculturation, the results from the model analyses provide no support linking father presence to “bicultural” or “bicultural, bicultural self-identity” development if presence of father is associated with qualitatively
high father-child attachment, father involvement, and father acceptance. Similarly, the absence of father does not predict the development of an acculturation identity that is “Asian identified or low Western fit”, “Western identified or low Asian fit” or “no identification, low Asian and low Western fit” if father absence is associated with negative or problematic father-child attachment relationship, the lack or absence of father involvement, and father rejection. However, the positive correlations noted in attachment, involvement, and acceptance on the part of the father with self-identity acculturation may suggest that the premise for which the initial hypothesis is predicated on is not without merit. The presence of such paternal qualities in the parent-child relationship is extremely important in that it encourages adolescents’ exploration, experimentation, assessment, comparison, and evaluation of the differentness in beliefs, ideologies, and perspectives between the two cultures. By having engaged in this invaluable process with the support and encouragement of their fathers it allows adolescents the opportunity to develop, through synthesis, integration and consolidation, the meaning, appreciation, and understanding of their unique experiences; and the precipitating outcome of this journey will likely be that of a self-identity acculturation identification that is harmonized, balanced and complementary, one that accurately reflects and represents their individualized experiences.

It is noteworthy to point out that participants from lower socioeconomic and educational backgrounds are underrepresented in the sample. It is possible for individuals in the lower brackets of the socioeconomic status to report fathers who are absent more, participate less in the fathering domains, and not as warm or accepting due to having to work long hours or to be away from the family on work-related assignments. The
everyday stress these fathers experience may preoccupy their focus on addressing the basic needs of the family to ensuring its survival, as opposed to the wishes, interests, or desires of their children and to set good examples or role modeling for them.

Extant research has demonstrated that children from disadvantaged status are at greater risks of developing psychological, emotional, and behavioral maladies. Moreover, they also tend to report poorer self-worth, lower self-esteem, greater dissatisfaction in life, and higher levels of unhappiness. The perception of their fathers being distant, unloving, uncaring, disinterested, uninvolved, or rejecting may further debilitate an already compromised or tenuous self structure critical to establishing of an internally derived sense of self-affirmation. The unfortunate consequence of such experiences often than not contribute to or precipitate their outward search for comfort, stability, acknowledgment or acceptance; and the outcome in majority of the situations is that of a revolving negative cycle characterized by self-disregard, self-loathing, and self-destruction. In addition, the particular emphasis placed on higher education and academic success or achievement in the Chinese community may increase their risks of criminal delinquency, problem behavior, psychological maladjustment, personality disposition expression, and low subjective well-being due to the reinforcement or perpetuation of their perception of self as inadequate or lacking the skills or abilities to competently “measure up” to the performance of their peers scholastically.

**Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research**

The results of this study provide evidence into the importance of father attachment and father acceptance in adolescent psychological adjustment in intact, two-
parent households. However, the generalizability in the interpretation and application of the preliminary findings must be considered in the context of several limitations. First, majority of participants in the present sample are immigrants from Taiwan. The fact all respondents are of Chinese heritage should not lead one to presume that they share or hold similar attitudes, judgments, and perceptions with regard to customs, norms, values, beliefs and ideologies, as they may be quite disparate and distinctive from one geographic region or location to another.

Second, the ability to recall experiences related to the cognitive-affective dimensions of father-child relationship that this study is intended to measure and the susceptibility of social desirability response style on the part of the participants are potential factors that may affect the results of this research. Although participants between the ages 18-25 are the preferred or target population, as individuals in this age group are presumed to better retain, retrieve and recall the mental encapsulation or perceptions they developed during adolescence of their father-son relationship with fair clarity and accuracy, this specification is not an absolute or mandatory requirement for inclusion however. With older respondents, it is possible that the very meaning or significance they assigned to those earlier unpleasant or traumatic experiences may have undergone much transformation or transcendence due to having developed the acceptance, understanding, forgiveness or appreciation for what had happened. If this is the case and point, then the response sets they provided may in fact represent the current views and attitudes they have for the events today, as opposed to the true reflection of the cognitive-emotional-behavioral state connected with the original experiences. This of course may not be generalizable to those adverse or pernicious effects that have left indelible marks
on the individuals that are not likely or necessarily made better, mitigated, or ameliorated even with continued personal growth or maturation.

In addition to the potential bias associated with poor or inaccurate recall, the results obtained may contain social desirability response styles in which participants’ propensity to respond to items on the measures, particularly as they relate to negative or disaffirming relational qualities in father-son interaction or dynamics, in a manner that conveys an unauthentic, yet favorable portrayal of the self and of the father-child relationship cannot be ruled out. The denial, minimalization or under-reporting of how one truly feels about the negativistic father-child relational items may actually reflect the desires of the individual for greater attachment, involvement, or acceptance from his father; hence, the inclusion of the response sets containing these biases may precipitate to an inaccurate conclusion that no relation exists between measures when in fact there is.

Third, the study is cross-sectional in design and thus causal relationship between the experimental and outcome variables of interest cannot be identified or ascertained. Despite these limitations, however, the findings of this study underscore the importance of father attachment and father acceptance in the psychological adjustment of Chinese male immigrants. Moreover, there is consistency and continuity in the internalized mental representation or encapsulation of the cognitive-affective dimensions of working model of father-son attachment from childhood to adolescence, congruent with previous literature. Although no support is found linking physical absence of father to adolescent psychological, behavioral, scholastic, and well-being outcomes, a decrease in the level of satisfaction in the father-child relationship during adolescence, as well as an increase in desired instrumental and expressive domains of fathering and desired
father involvement overall in the father absent group, as compare with father present group are noted. Father involvement, although non-significant in the findings as well, are highly correlated with father attachment and father acceptance. Despite the absence of support, father presence may confer protection against adverse outcomes when it is associated with qualitatively high father attachment, father involvement, and father acceptance from the phenomenological perception of adolescents.

The present study explores how residency statuses of father and father-child relationship qualities relate to adolescents’ psychological, behavioral, academic, self-identity acculturation, and subjective well-being outcomes in intact, two-parent immigrant households. Certain findings, although significant, have limited applicability and are not generalizable to the male immigrant population of Chinese heritage in U.S. at large. In note of these limitations, the positive influence of father attachment and father acceptance on psychological adjustment of children in particular is well documented. It is hoped that future research will expand from the empirical basis this study has established to further explore and explicate the influences of physical presence, attachment, involvement, and acceptance of father have on adolescent outcomes in all family structure or organization categories based on an experimental design using time-sensitive longitudinal data.

In conclusion, the take home message for immigrant fathers and families is that the qualitative conveyance of father warmth, nurturance, support, involvement, comfort, care, affection, and acceptance is particularly salient and essential to facilitating the positive psychological, emotional, and behavioral trajectories and developments in their children. And the significance of the internalized mental representation or encapsulation
of these fathering qualities on the part of the children are not likely diminished or mitigated despite the presence of difficulty or conflict between father and child in their identification or endorsement of potentially disparate cultural value orientation, role expectation, and/or self-identity construal or definition.
Table 1

Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of Origin</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>79.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Degree Completed</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School Diploma/GED</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Degree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor Degree</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Degree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate Degree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade/Technical Certification</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the Above</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year In School If Presently In School</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1 Undergraduate</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2 Undergraduate</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3 Undergraduate</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4 Undergraduate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beyond Year 4 Undergraduate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1 Graduate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2 Graduate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3 Graduate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4 Graduate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 5 Graduate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beyond Year 5 Graduate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

*Bootstrap Means and Standard Deviation for all Independent and Dependent Variables of Interest for Both Father Present and Absent Groups*

**Father Present Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTALIPPAFA</th>
<th>REPINVTOTAL</th>
<th>PARQTOTAL</th>
<th>DELIQTOTAL</th>
<th>PROBEHTOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>84.75 (17.668)</td>
<td>62.40 (11.464)</td>
<td>115.83 (25.908)</td>
<td>3.40 (3.466)</td>
<td>2.96 (2.401)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAQTOTAL</th>
<th>DESINVTOTAL</th>
<th>SLASIATOTAL</th>
<th>WELLBEINGTOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>124.42 (25.216)</td>
<td>67.54 (9.960)</td>
<td>58.62 (8.754)</td>
<td>26.54 (4.612)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Father Absent Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTALIPPAFA</th>
<th>REPINVTOTAL</th>
<th>PARQTOTAL</th>
<th>DELIQTOTAL</th>
<th>PROBEHTOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>86.87 (18.781)</td>
<td>60.03 (16.094)</td>
<td>109.16 (27.868)</td>
<td>2.32 (2.495)</td>
<td>2.19 (1.778)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAQTOTAL</th>
<th>DESINVTOTAL</th>
<th>SLASIATOTAL</th>
<th>WELLBEINGTOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>126.55 (23.570)</td>
<td>69.32 (10.641)</td>
<td>52.71 (7.573)</td>
<td>27.13 (4.064)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTALIPPAFA = father attachment total score
REPINVTOTAL = reported father involvement total score
PARQTOTAL = father acceptance-rejection total score (high score indicates rejection)
DELIQTOTAL = criminal delinquency total score
PROBEHTOTAL = problem behavior total score
PAQTOTAL = psychological adjustment total score (high score indicates maladjustment/negative personality dispositions)
DESINVTOTAL = desired father involvement total score
SLASIATOTAL = self-identity acculturation total score (high score indicates Western-identified)
WELLBEINGTOTAL = subjective well-being total score
Table 3

*ANOVA for Father Attachment and Father Presence Main and Interaction Effect on Psychological Adjustment, Criminal Delinquency, Problem Behavior, and Subjective Well-Being*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>FAPRESENCE Beta (SE)</th>
<th>TOTALIPPAFA Beta (SE)</th>
<th>Interaction Beta (SE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PAQTOTAL</td>
<td>0.46 (0.13)*</td>
<td>-0.00002 (0.00014)*</td>
<td>-0.006 (0.001)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELIQTOTAL</td>
<td>1.89 (1.71)</td>
<td>0.0021 (0.0019)</td>
<td>-0.01 (0.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROBEHTOTAL</td>
<td>0.87 (1.21)</td>
<td>0.0017 (0.00135)</td>
<td>-0.006 (0.013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WELLBEINGTOTAL</td>
<td>-7305.84 (2856.26)</td>
<td>-0.48 (3.18)</td>
<td>79.40 (31.78)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < 0.0038; Beta = beta coefficient; SE = standard error

FAPRESENCE = father present
TOTALIPPAFA = father attachment total score
PAQTOTAL = psychological adjustment total score (high score indicates maladjustment/negative personality dispositions)
DELIQTOTAL = criminal delinquency total score
PROBEHTOTAL = problem behavior total score
WELLBEINGTOTAL = subjective well-being total score

For those betas with big SE, this is because the sample size is small and we may have couple values that are outliers which will then increase the SE.
Table 4

ANOVA for Peer Attachment and Father Presence Main and Interaction Effect on Psychological Adjustment, Criminal Delinquency, Problem Behavior, and Subjective Well-Being

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>FAPRESENCE Beta (SE)</th>
<th>TOTALIPPAPEER Beta (SE)</th>
<th>Interaction Beta (SE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PAQTOTAL</td>
<td>0.17 (0.27)</td>
<td>-0.005 (0.002)*</td>
<td>-0.002 (0.002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELIQTOTAL</td>
<td>2.78 (3.77)</td>
<td>0.01 (0.03)</td>
<td>-0.02 (0.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROBEHTOTAL</td>
<td>2.73 (2.64)</td>
<td>0.03 (0.02)</td>
<td>-0.03 (0.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WELLBEINGTOTAL</td>
<td>-799.09 (5973.07)</td>
<td><strong>109.09 (52.04)</strong>*</td>
<td>4.28 (62.55)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < 0.0038; Beta = beta coefficient; SE = standard error

FAPRESENCE = father present
TOTALIPPAPEER = peer attachment total score
PAQTOTAL = psychological adjustment total score (high score indicates maladjustment/negative personality dispositions)
DELIQTOTAL = criminal delinquency total score
PROBEHTOTAL = problem behavior total score
WELLBEINGTOTAL = subjective well-being total score

For those betas with big SE, this is because the sample size is small and we may have couple values that are outliers which will then increase the SE.
Table 5

ANOVA for Father Attachment, Peer Attachment, and Father Presence Main and Interaction Effect on Psychological Adjustment, Criminal Delinquency, Problem Behavior, and Subjective Well-Being

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>FAPRESENCE Beat (SE)</th>
<th>TOTALIPPAFA Beat (SE)</th>
<th>TOTALIPPAPEER Beat (SE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PAQTOTAL</td>
<td>-0.03 (0.04)</td>
<td>-0.0001 (0.0001)</td>
<td>-0.0006 (0.0001)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELIQTOTAL</td>
<td>0.644 (0.542)</td>
<td>0.002 (0.002)</td>
<td>-0.005 (0.018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROBEHTOTAL</td>
<td>0.42 (0.38)</td>
<td>0.0017 (0.0013)</td>
<td>0.015 (0.013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WELLBEINGTOTAL</td>
<td>-342.67 (862.29)</td>
<td>0.89 (3.02)</td>
<td>112.46 (28.89)*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < 0.0038; Beta = beta coefficient; SE = standard error

FAPRESENCE = father present
TOTALIPPAFA = father attachment total score
TOTALIPPAPEER = peer attachment total score
PAQTOTAL = psychological adjustment total score (high score indicates maladjustment/negative personality dispositions)
DELIQTOTAL = criminal delinquency total score
PROBEHTOTAL = problem behavior total score
WELLBEINGTOTAL = subjective well-being total score

For those betas with big SE, this is because the sample size is small and we may have couple values that are outliers which will then increase the SE.
Table 6

ANOVA for Father Acceptance-Rejection and Father Presence Main and Interaction Effect on Psychological Adjustment, Criminal Delinquency, Problem Behavior, and Subjective Well-Being

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>FAPRESENCE Beta (SE)</th>
<th>PARQTOTAL Beta (SE)</th>
<th>Interaction Beta (SE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PAQTOTAL</td>
<td>-0.42 (0.12)*</td>
<td>0.000077 (0.0002)*</td>
<td>0.003 (0.001)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELIQTOTAL</td>
<td>-1.48 (1.59)</td>
<td>0.0012 (0.0027)</td>
<td>0.018 (0.013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROBEHTOTAL</td>
<td>0.72 (1.14)</td>
<td>0.0016 (0.0019)</td>
<td>-0.003 (0.009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WELLBEINGTOTAL</td>
<td>5383.95 (2668.73)</td>
<td>-2.66 (4.46)</td>
<td>-51.35 (21.44)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < 0.0038; Beta = beta coefficient; SE = standard error

FAPRESENCE = father present
PARQTOTAL = father acceptance-rejection total score
PAQTOTAL = psychological adjustment total score (high score indicates maladjustment/negative personality dispositions)
DELIQTOTAL = criminal delinquency total score
PROBEHTOTAL = problem behavior total score
WELLBEINGTOTAL = subjective well-being total score

For those betas with big SE, this is because the sample size is small and we may have couple values that are outliers which will then increase the SE.
Table 7

Wilk’s Lambda P-Values for the Main and Interaction Effect for Each Independent Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wilks’ Lambda P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FAPRESENCE</td>
<td>0.8933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALIPPAFA</td>
<td>0.4220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPINVTOTAL</td>
<td>0.5884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARQTOTAL</td>
<td>0.2954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAPRESENCE*TOTALIPPAFA</td>
<td>0.4768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAPRESENCE*REPINVTOTAL</td>
<td>0.7243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAPRESENCE*PARQTOTAL</td>
<td>0.7381</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

None of the Wilks' Lambda p-value reached statistical significance ($p < 0.00625$).

FAPRESENCE = father present
TOTALIPPAFA = father attachment total score
REPINVTOTAL = reported father involvement total score
PARQTOTAL = father acceptance-rejection total score
Addendum A

*Significant Correlations Between Father Attachment and All Other Variables Studied*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTALIPPAMA</th>
<th>REPINVTOTAL</th>
<th>REPINVEXP</th>
<th>REPINVINS</th>
<th>REPINVMEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.460**</td>
<td>0.623**</td>
<td>0.661**</td>
<td>0.514**</td>
<td>0.506**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PARQTOTAL</th>
<th>PARQWARM</th>
<th>PARQHOST</th>
<th>PARQNEGLECT</th>
<th>PARQREJECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.775**</td>
<td>-0.761**</td>
<td>-0.515**</td>
<td>-0.713**</td>
<td>-0.555**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PAQTOTAL</th>
<th>PAQAGGRESS</th>
<th>PAQESTEEM</th>
<th>PAQADEQUACY</th>
<th>PAQUNRESP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.387**</td>
<td>-0.459**</td>
<td>-0.391**</td>
<td>-0.298**</td>
<td>-0.405**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PAQWORLD</th>
<th>DESINVTOTAL</th>
<th>DESINVEXP</th>
<th>DESINVINS</th>
<th>MASPAQSDELIQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.368**</td>
<td>-0.291**</td>
<td>-0.288**</td>
<td>-0.256**</td>
<td>-0.192*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SLASIATOTAL</th>
<th>WELLBEINGTOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.224*</td>
<td>0.306**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.05; ** p < 0.01

TOTALIPPAMA = mother attachment total score
REPINVTOTAL = reported father involvement total score
REPINVEXP = reported father expressive involvement score
REPINVINS = reported father instrumental involvement score
REPINVMEN = reported father mentoring/advising involvement score
PARQTOTAL = father acceptance-rejection total score (high score indicates rejection)
PARQWARM = father warmth-lack of affection score (high score indicates absence of warmth)
PARQHOST = father hostility score
PARQNEGLECT = father neglect score
PARQREJECT = father undifferentiated rejection score
PAQTOTAL = psychological adjustment total score (high score indicates maladjustment/negative personality dispositions)
PAQAGGRESS = personality disposition - hostility/aggression score
PAQESTEEM = personality disposition - negative self-esteem score
PAQADEQUACY = personality disposition - negative self-adequacy score
PAQUNRESP = personality disposition - emotional unresponsiveness score
PAQWORLD = personality disposition - negative worldview score
DESINVTOTAL = desired father involvement total score
DESINVEXP = desired father expressive involvement score
DESINVINS = desired father instrumental involvement score
MASPAQSDELIQ = serious delinquency score
SLASIATOTAL = self-identity acculturation total score (higher score indicates Western-identified)
WELLBEINGTOTAL = subjective well-being total score
Addendum B

*Significant Correlations Between Reported Father Involvement and All Other Variables Studied*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable 1</th>
<th>Variable 2</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTALIPPAFA</td>
<td>TOTALIPPAFA</td>
<td>0.623**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALIPPAFA</td>
<td>TOTALIPPAMA</td>
<td>0.302**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALIPPAFA</td>
<td>TOTALIPPAPEER</td>
<td>0.241**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALIPPAFA</td>
<td>REPINVEXP</td>
<td>0.882**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALIPPAFA</td>
<td>REPINVINS</td>
<td>0.930**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPINVEXP</td>
<td>REPINVINS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPINVEXP</td>
<td>REPINVMEN</td>
<td>0.892**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPINVEXP</td>
<td>PARQTOTAL</td>
<td>-0.515**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPINVEXP</td>
<td>PARQWARM</td>
<td>-0.559**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPINVEXP</td>
<td>PARQHOST</td>
<td>-0.202*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPINVEXP</td>
<td>PARQNEGLECT</td>
<td>-0.586**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPINVMEN</td>
<td>PARQTOTAL</td>
<td>-0.285**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPINVMEN</td>
<td>PARQWARM</td>
<td>0.233*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPINVMEN</td>
<td>PARQHOST</td>
<td>-0.267**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPINVMEN</td>
<td>PARQNEGLECT</td>
<td>-0.379**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARQREJECT</td>
<td>PAQDEPEND</td>
<td>-0.285**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARQREJECT</td>
<td>PAQESTEEM</td>
<td>0.233*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARQREJECT</td>
<td>PAQWORLD</td>
<td>-0.267**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARQREJECT</td>
<td>DESINVTOTAL</td>
<td>-0.200*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAQDEPEND</td>
<td>DESINVTOTAL</td>
<td>-0.379**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAQESTEEM</td>
<td>DESINVTOTAL</td>
<td>-0.399**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAQWORLD</td>
<td>DESINVTOTAL</td>
<td>-0.225*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESINVTOTAL</td>
<td>SLASIATOTAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.05; ** p < 0.01

TOTALIPPAFA = father attachment total score
TOTALIPPAFA = mother attachment total score
TOTALIPPAPEER = peer attachment total score
REPINVEXP = reported father expressive involvement score
REPINVINS = reported father instrumental involvement score
REPINVMEN = reported father mentoring/advising involvement score
PARQTOTAL = father acceptance-rejection total score (high score indicates rejection)
PARQWARM = father warmth-lack of affection score (high score indicates absence of warmth)
PARQHOST = father hostility score
PARQNEGLECT = father neglect score
PARQREJECT = father undifferentiated rejection score
PAQDEPEND = personality disposition - dependency score
PAQESTEEM = personality disposition - negative self-esteem score
PAQWORLD = personality disposition - negative worldview score
DESINVTOTAL = desired father involvement total score
DESINVTOTAL = desired father expressive involvement
DESINVTOTAL = desired father instrumental involvement
SLASIATOTAL = self-identity acculturation total score (higher score indicates Western-identified)
Addendum C

*Significant Correlations Between Father Acceptance-Rejection and All Other Variables Studied*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTALIPPAFA</td>
<td>-0.775**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALIPPAMA</td>
<td>-0.287**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPINVTOTAL</td>
<td>-0.515**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPINVEXP</td>
<td>-0.474**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPINVINS</td>
<td>-0.486**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPINVMEN</td>
<td>-0.421**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARQWARM</td>
<td>0.856**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARQHOST</td>
<td>0.810**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARQNEGLECT</td>
<td>0.893**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARQREJECT</td>
<td>0.826**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAQTOTAL</td>
<td>0.372**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAQAGGRESS</td>
<td>0.452**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAQESTEEM</td>
<td>0.385**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAQADEQUACY</td>
<td>0.276**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAQUNRESP</td>
<td>0.301**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAQINSTAB</td>
<td>0.207*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAQWORLD</td>
<td>0.351**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESINVTOTAL</td>
<td>0.220*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESINVEXP</td>
<td>0.217*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELIQTOTAL</td>
<td>0.198*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASPAQAGRFAM</td>
<td>0.200*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLASIATOTAL</td>
<td>0.189*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WELLBEINGTOTAL</td>
<td>-0.275**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < 0.05; ** p < 0.01

TOTALIPPAFA = father attachment total score
TOTALIPPAMA = mother attachment total score
REPINVTOTAL = reported father involvement total score
REPINVEXP = reported father expressive involvement score
REPINVINS = reported father instrumental involvement score
REPINVMEN = reported father mentoring/advising involvement score
PARQWARM = father warmth-lack of affection score (high score indicates absence of warmth)
PARQHOST = father hostility score
PARQNEGLECT = father neglect score
PARQREJECT = father undifferentiated rejection score
PAQTOTAL = psychological adjustment total score (high score indicates maladjustment/negative personality dispositions)
PAQAGGRESS = personality disposition - hostility/aggression score
PAQESTEEM = personality disposition - negative self-esteem score
PAQADEQUACY = personality disposition - negative self-adequacy score
PAQUNRESP = personality disposition - emotional unresponsiveness score
PAQINSTAB = personality disposition - emotional instability score
PAQWORLD = personality disposition - negative worldview score
DESINVTOTAL = desired father involvement total score
DESINVEXP = desired father expressive involvement
DELIQTOTAL = criminal delinquency total score
MASPAQAGRFAM = aggression against family score
SLASIATOTAL = self-identity acculturation total score (higher score indicates Western-identified)
WELLBEINGTOTAL = subjective well-being total score
Addendum D

Bootstrap Means and Standard Deviation for Satisfaction Ratings of Father-Child, Mother-Child, and Peer Relationships Prior to Immigration and During Adolescence for Father Present and Father Absent Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Father-Child¹</th>
<th>Mother-Child¹</th>
<th>Peer Relationship²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prior to US</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP</td>
<td>3.50ª (1.074)</td>
<td>3.82ᵇ (0.896)</td>
<td>3.83 (0.868)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>3.91ª (0.879)</td>
<td>4.24ᵇ (0.792)</td>
<td>4.06 (0.747)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>During</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adolescence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP</td>
<td>3.58 (0.785)</td>
<td>3.80 (0.881)</td>
<td>3.79 (0.907)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>3.55 (1.063)</td>
<td>4.27ᵇ (0.876)</td>
<td>3.97 (0.728)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ = based on 50 father present and 33 father absent participants; ² = based on 47 father present and 33 father absent participants.

ª = On average, father absent group reported higher father-child satisfaction rating prior to immigration (M = 3.91, SE = 0.153) than the father present group (M = 3.55, SE = 0.185). This difference is significant t(81) = -1.82, p < 0.05, and represents a small to medium sized effect r = 0.20.

ᵇ = higher mother-child satisfaction rating was found in father absent group prior to immigration (M = 4.24; SE = 0.138) as compared with father present group (M = 3.82; SE = 0.127). The difference is statistically significant t(81) = -2.20, p < 0.05, r = 0.24.

c = higher mother-child satisfaction rating reported in father absent group during adolescence (M = 4.27; SE = 0.153), as compared with father present group (M = 3.80; SE = 0.125). This difference is significant t(81) = -2.40, p < 0.05, and represents approximately medium sized effect, r = 0.26.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Father-Child¹</th>
<th>Mother-Child²</th>
<th>Peer Relationship²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Combined</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior to US</td>
<td>3.66 (1.015)</td>
<td>3.98 (0.871)</td>
<td>3.93 (0.823)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During Adolescence</td>
<td>3.57 (0.900)</td>
<td>3.93 (0.849)</td>
<td>3.86 (0.838)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ = based on 83 observations
² = based on 80 observations

Satisfaction rating based on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = extremely dissatisfied; 2 = mostly dissatisfied; 3 = neither satisfied nor dissatisfied; 4 = mostly satisfied; and 5 = extremely satisfied).
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Appendix A

Consent Form

Project Title: The well-being of Chinese immigrant sons: Importance of father-son attachment, father involvement, father acceptance and adolescents’ phenomenological perceptions of father-son relationship

Project Investigator: Ray Hwang, M.A.

Dissertation Chair: Juliet Rohde-Brown, Ph.D.

1. I understand that this study is of research nature. It may offer no direct benefit to me.

2. Participation in this study is voluntary. I may refuse to enter it or may withdraw at any time without creating any harmful consequences to myself. I understand also that the investigator may drop me at any time from the study.

3. The purpose of this study is to examine the effects of father-son relationship have in their sons’ development during adolescence using retrospective self-report measures.

4. As a participant in the study, I will be asked to take part in the following paper-and-pencil measures or procedures:

   A. Demographic questionnaire
   B. The Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment - Revised Version (IPPA-R)
   C. Father Involvement Scale
   D. Parental Acceptance Rejection Questionnaire (PARQ) – Adult: Father Version
   E. Personality Assessment Questionnaire (PAQ) – Adult Version
   F. Deviant Behavior Questionnaire (DBQ) from Measuring Adolescent Social and Personal Adaptation in Quebec (MASPAQ) – Long Version
   G. The Suinn-Lew Asian Self-Identity Acculturation Scale (SL-ASIA) – Updated Version

Participation in the study will take approximately 60-80 minutes of my time and will take place in a secured location arranged mutually by the principle researcher and I. I will be notified of the date, time, and location of the meeting by the investigator. If I decide against a face-to-face contact with the researcher, I will have the option of having the measures mailed to me with a postage paid return envelop enclosed. I will complete
and return all instruments including this consent form to the investigator within 7-10 days after receipt of the materials.

5. The possible risks, discomforts and inconveniences of the above procedures might be:

The measures may contain items that are sensitive in nature and may arouse deeply felt emotions that are unbeknown to me previously. In addition, it is likely that I may become frustrated due to the redundancy of the questions inquired in some of the measures.

6. The possible benefits of the procedures might be:

a. Direct benefit to me:

I may gain an understanding of the psychological constructs as related to the normal developmental processes during adolescence, and the effects father-son attachment, father involvement, and my perception of the relationship I have with my father have in my later well-being.

b. Benefits to others:

The results from this research will contribute to the body of knowledge on adolescent development. The findings will facilitate our understanding of the immigrant sons’ well-being in the context of father-child relationship.

7. Information about the study was discussed with me by Ray Hwang, M.A.
If I have any questions, I can call him at (310) 266-3031 or via email correspondence at rhwang@antioch.edu.

Date: _________________________         Signed: _______________________________

Printed Name: _________________________
Appendix B

Form B

Insuring Informed Consent of Participants in Research: Questions to be answered by AUSB Researchers

The following questions are included in the research proposal.

1. Are your proposed participants capable of giving informed consent? Are the persons in your research population in a free-choice situation? Are they constrained by age or other factors that limit their capacity to choose? For example, are they adults or students who might be beholden to the institution in which they are enrolled, or prisoners, or children, or mentally or emotionally disabled? How will they be recruited? Does the inducement to participate significantly reduce their ability to choose freely or not to participate?

Participants in my study will be capable of giving informed consent. They will be at minimum 18 years of age and are emotionally and mentally stable. Participants reserve the right and are free to decline or withdraw participation at any time under any circumstance without penalty. They will be recruited through university-based student affiliated organizations and solicitations via bulletin announcement and advertisement in the school newspaper.

2. How are your participants to be involved in the study?

Participants will be asked to complete 7 paper-and-pencil measures or procedures including a demographic questionnaire, The Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment (IPPA), Father Involvement Scale (FIS), Parental Acceptance Rejection Questionnaire (PARQ), Personality Assessment Questionnaire (PAQ), Deviant Behavior Questionnaire (DBQ), and the Suinn-Lew Asian Self Identity Acculturation Scale (SL-ASIA).

3. What are the potential risks – physical, psychological, social, legal, or other? If you feel your participants will experience “no known risks” of any kind, indicate why you believe this to be so. If your methods do create potential risks, say why other methods you have considered were rejected in favor of the method chosen.

I feel the participants in my study will experience no known risks. However, the measures may contain items that are sensitive in nature and may arouse deeply felt emotions that are unbeknown to the participants previously. Participants may likely to become frustrated due to the redundancy of the questions inquired in some of the measures as well.
4. What procedures, including procedures to safeguard confidentiality, are you using to protect against or minimize potential risks, and how will you assess the effectiveness of those procedures?

The full names of the participants will not be used in this study. Each participant will be asked to provide his/her first and last initials and be given a code number for identification purpose. To ensure confidentiality is maintained, any and all materials obtained from the participants during the course of this study will be kept in a locked cabinet.

5. Have you obtained (or will you obtain) consent from your participants in writing? (Attach a copy of the form.)

Informed consent will be obtained from the participants in writing. Please see attached Consent Form (Appendix A).

6. What are the benefits to society, and to your participants that will accrue from your investigation?

Participants may gain an understanding of the psychological constructs relating to the normal developmental processes during adolescence. The results from this study will contribute to the body of knowledge on adolescent development and facilitate our understanding of the immigrant son’s well-being in the context of parent-child relationship.

7. Do you judge that the benefits justify the risks in your proposed research? Indicate why.

The benefits of this study include contributions to the body of knowledge on adolescent development in particular and the field of psychology in general. The findings are likely to enhance our understanding of the mediating and moderating factors contributing to the immigrant sons’ well-being in the context of father-son relationship. As stated earlier, I feel the participants in this study will experience no known risks except that the measures may contain items that are sensitive in nature and may potentially arouse deeply felt emotions that are unbeknown to the participants previously.
Both the student and his / her Dissertation Chair must sign this form and submit it before any research begins. Signatures indicate that, after considering the questions above, both students and faculty persons believe that the conditions necessary for informed consent have been satisfied.

Date: ____________________ Signed: ______________________________________
Ray Hwang, M.A., Doctoral Student

Date: ____________________ Signed: ______________________________________
Juliet Rohde-Brown, Ph.D., Dissertation Chair
Appendix C

Demographic Questionnaire

Name: (First & Last Initial) _____________________                  Code No: ___________

Date of Birth: _____________________

Age: _____________

Country of Origin: _________________________

Number of Years in Current Residence: ____________

Your Primary Language at Time of Immigration: ____________

Primary Language at Home: ______________________________

Your Preferred Language: ____________________________________

Your Preferred Cultural Practice: _____ Mainstream US
                                            _____ Bi/Multicultural
                                            _____ Traditional Chinese/Taiwanese/Cantonese

Your Age at Time of Immigration: _______

Did All Members in Your Family Immigrate to US at the Same Time:
      _____ Yes; _____ No

If No, Please Explain:
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________

Your Birth Order: ___________

Are You the Eldest Son: _____ Yes; _____ No
Are You the Youngest Son: _____ Yes; _____ No
Are You the Only Child: _____ Yes; _____ No

Total Number of People in Your Family: ___________

Number of Siblings: _____ Brother(s); _____ Sister(s) in US
                    _____ Brother(s); _____ Sister(s) in Country of Origin
Father’s Occupation: _______________________________

Mother’s Occupation: ______________________________

**Between Ages 11 and 18:**

Was Your Father Employed in US: _____ Yes; _____ No

If No, Where Was He Employed: _________________________________

Has Your Father Ever Maintained Continuous Residence in US: _____ Yes; _____ No

If No, Please Indicate the Longest Time He Had Spent With You and Your Family in US:
________________________________________________________________________

If Your Father Has Maintained Employment/Residence in Your Country of Origin, How Often Does He Visit You and Your Family in US and for How Long Each Time Approximately:
________________________________________________________________________

How Do You Feel About Your Father Not Maintaining Continuous Residence With You and Your Family At The Time:

- _______ Extremely Dissatisfied
- _______ Mostly Dissatisfied
- _______ Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied
- _______ Mostly satisfied
- _______ Extremely Satisfied

Your Father’s Mastery/Proficiency of English Language:

- _____ No Mastery/Proficiency
- _____ Below Average
- _____ Average
- _____ Above Average
- _____ Excellent Mastery/Proficiency

**Since Arriving in US and Between Ages 11-18:**

Has Your Mother Ever Been Employed in US: _____ Yes; _____ No

Has Your Mother Maintained Continuous Residence With You in US:

- _____ Yes; _____ No

If No, Please Indicate the Longest Time That She Was Away From You:
________________________________________________________________________

Your Mother’s Mastery/Proficiency of English Language:

- _____ No Mastery/Proficiency
- _____ Below Average
- _____ Average
- _____ Above Average
- _____ Excellent Mastery/Proficiency
Household Income (Family of Origin):
   _____ Under $25K
   _____ $25K-$44,999
   _____ $45K-$64,999
   _____ $65K-$84,999
   _____ $85K-$119,999
   _____ Above $120K

Highest Degree Completed by You:
   _____ High School Diploma/GED
   _____ Associate Degree (2-Year College)
   _____ Bachelor Degree
   _____ Master Degree
   _____ Doctorate Degree
   _____ Trade/Technical Certification After High School
   _____ None of the Above

If Presently in School, What is the Name of Your School/College/University:
________________________________________________________________________

If Presently in a College/University, What Year Are You In:
   _____ Year 1 Undergraduate
   _____ Year 2 Undergraduate
   _____ Year 3 Undergraduate
   _____ Year 4 Undergraduate
   _____ Beyond Year 4 Undergraduate
   _____ Year 1 Graduate
   _____ Year 2 Graduate
   _____ Year 3 Graduate
   _____ Year 4 Graduate
   _____ Year 5 Graduate
   _____ Beyond Year 5 Graduate

Are You on Financial Aid: ___ Yes; _____ No
If Not, Who Finances Your Education:_______________________________________

What is Your Current Cumulative GPA: __________________
How Do You Describe Your Parents’ Relationship With One Other When You Were An Adolescent?

- __________ Extremely Dissatisfied
- __________ Mostly Dissatisfied
- __________ Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied
- __________ Mostly Satisfied
- __________ Extremely Satisfied

How Do You Describe Your Relationship With Your *Mother* When You Were An Adolescent?

- __________ Extremely Dissatisfied
- __________ Mostly Dissatisfied
- __________ Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied
- __________ Mostly Satisfied
- __________ Extremely Satisfied

How Do You Describe Your Relationship With Your *Father* When You Were An Adolescent?

- __________ Extremely Dissatisfied
- __________ Mostly Dissatisfied
- __________ Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied
- __________ Mostly Satisfied
- __________ Extremely Satisfied

How Do You Describe Your Relationship With Your *Sibling(s)* When You Were An Adolescent (if applicable)?

- __________ Extremely Dissatisfied
- __________ Mostly Dissatisfied
- __________ Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied
- __________ Mostly Satisfied
- __________ Extremely Satisfied

How Do You Describe Your Relationship With Your *Peers* When You Were An Adolescent?

- __________ Extremely Dissatisfied
- __________ Mostly Dissatisfied
- __________ Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied
- __________ Mostly Satisfied
- __________ Extremely Satisfied
How Do You Describe Your Parents’ Relationship With One Other Prior to Coming to US?

_________ Extremely Dissatisfied
_________ Mostly Dissatisfied
_________ Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied
_________ Mostly Satisfied
_________ Extremely Satisfied

How Do You Describe Your Relationship With Your Mother Prior to Coming to US?

_________ Extremely Dissatisfied
_________ Mostly Dissatisfied
_________ Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied
_________ Mostly Satisfied
_________ Extremely Satisfied

How Do You Describe Your Relationship With Your Father Prior to Coming to US?

_________ Extremely Dissatisfied
_________ Mostly Dissatisfied
_________ Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied
_________ Mostly Satisfied
_________ Extremely Satisfied

How Do You Describe Your Relationship With Your Sibling(s) Prior to Coming to US (if applicable)?

_________ Extremely Dissatisfied
_________ Mostly Dissatisfied
_________ Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied
_________ Mostly Satisfied
_________ Extremely Satisfied

How Do You Describe Your Relationship With Your Peers Prior to Coming to US?

_________ Extremely Dissatisfied
_________ Mostly Dissatisfied
_________ Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied
_________ Mostly Satisfied
_________ Extremely Satisfied
How Do You Describe Your Parents’ Relationship With One Other Now?

_________ Extremely Dissatisfied
_________ Mostly Dissatisfied
_________ Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied
_________ Mostly Satisfied
_________ Extremely Satisfied

How Do You Describe Your Relationship With Your *Mother* Now?

_________ Extremely Dissatisfied
_________ Mostly Dissatisfied
_________ Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied
_________ Mostly Satisfied
_________ Extremely Satisfied

How Do You Describe Your Relationship With Your *Father* Now?

_________ Extremely Dissatisfied
_________ Mostly Dissatisfied
_________ Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied
_________ Mostly Satisfied
_________ Extremely Satisfied

How Do You Describe Your Relationship With Your *Sibling(s)* Now (if applicable)?

_________ Extremely Dissatisfied
_________ Mostly Dissatisfied
_________ Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied
_________ Mostly Satisfied
_________ Extremely Satisfied

How Do You Describe Your Relationship With Your *Peers* Now?

_________ Extremely Dissatisfied
_________ Mostly Dissatisfied
_________ Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied
_________ Mostly Satisfied
_________ Extremely Satisfied
Indicate Your Religiosity/Spirituality:

___ Catholicism
___ Christianity
___ Buddhism
___ Hinduism
___ Muslim
___ Other; Please Specify ___________________________
___ No Preference/Not Applicable

How Religious/Spiritual Are You:

___ Extremely Religious/Spiritual
___ Moderately Religious/Spiritual
___ Somewhat Religious/Spiritual
___ Occasionally Religious/Spiritual
___ Not At All Religious/Spiritual

In General, How Confident Are You With Respect to Having the Skills/Abilities to Achieve Your Goals/Aspirations?

___________ Extremely Dissatisfied
___________ Mostly Dissatisfied
___________ Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied
___________ Mostly Satisfied
___________ Extremely Satisfied

In General, How Do You See Yourself In Relation to Other People?

___________ Extremely Dissatisfied
___________ Mostly Dissatisfied
___________ Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied
___________ Mostly Satisfied
___________ Extremely Satisfied

In General, How Do You Feel About Yourself and Your Experiences?

___________ Extremely Dissatisfied
___________ Mostly Dissatisfied
___________ Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied
___________ Mostly Satisfied
___________ Extremely Satisfied
In General, How Do You Describe Your Relationships With Others?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly Dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly Satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Satisfied</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In General, How Satisfied Are You With Your Authority to Determine Your Own Life Course, Even Though It May Be Against/Contrary to the Expectation of Others?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly Dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly Satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Satisfied</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In General, How Satisfied Are You With Your Competence/Mastery?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly Dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly Satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Satisfied</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In General, How Do You Rate Your Overall Happiness?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly Dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly Satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Satisfied</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D

Recruitment Letter

Dear Prospective Participant:

I am a doctoral student in the Department of Clinical Psychology at Antioch University Santa Barbara. At this time, I am working on my research study titled: *The Well-Being of Chinese Immigrant Sons: Importance of Father-Son Attachment, Father Involvement, Father Acceptance, and Adolescents’ Phenomenological Perceptions of Father-Son Relationship*. This study will be conducted in accordance to the strict guidelines and standards devised by the American Psychological Association, and is under the direction and supervision of the chairperson of my dissertation committee, Juliet Rohde-Brown, Ph.D., licensed psychologist and core faculty at Antioch University Santa Barbara.

I am seeking male participants from intact, two-parent families (biological) between ages 18 to 25 who immigrated to the United States from China, Hong Kong or Taiwan prior to age 11 but have since attained US permanent residency or citizenship status. Participation in this study will involve completion of seven paper-and-pencil measures in addition to a demographic questionnaire designed for this project. The self-report measures used in this study are as followed: The Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment (IPPA), Father Involvement Scale (FIS), Deviant Behavior Questionnaire (DBQ), Parental Acceptance Rejection Questionnaire (PARQ), Personality Assessment Questionnaire (PAQ), and The Suinn-Lew Asian Self-Identity Acculturation Scale (SL-ASIA).

In each measure, you will be asked to indicate based on your level of agreement or congruence your perception of individual items in a retrospective manner. The total time required to complete all the instruments is approximately 60-80 minutes.

If you are interested or would like to be considered for participation in this important research study, please do not hesitate to contact me at (310) 266-3031 or via electronic correspondence at rhwang@antioch.edu. I will contact you by phone to review the eligibility requirements for inclusion and all pertinent procedures for this study including informed consent, privacy, and confidentiality.

I look forward to speaking with you soon. I thank you in advance for your consideration of this request.

Very Sincerely Yours,

Ray Hwang, M.A.
Principle Investigator/Researcher
Appendix E

Flyer

Participants Needed For Research On Father-Son Relationship

You May Be Eligible

If You Are Male

Of Chinese Heritage

From China, Hong Kong, or Taiwan
Or East or Southeast Asia

Who Immigrated to United States Prior to Age 11 (Preferred)

Who is 18 Years and Over
Or Now Between Ages 18 and 25 (Preferred)

From Intact, Two-Parent Families (Biological)

Participants Who Meet Eligibility Requirements And Selected For This Project Will Have The Opportunity To Enter A Drawing For Two $50 BestBuy Gift Certificates At The Completion of This Important Study

If Interested, Please Contact Ray Hwang at (310) 266-3031 or by E-mail at rhwang@antioch.edu