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ABSTRACT

While Hong Kong immigrant families consist of both parents living with children, Hong Kong astronaut families consist of one or both parents living in Hong Kong, with the eldest child participating in decision making and care of siblings in the country of immigration. The purpose of this study was to see if decision style (role, influence, and sources of assistance) is affected by type of decision (personal and family), family type (astronaut and immigrant), and ethnic identity (Canadian, Hong Kong Chinese, and Mixed identity). Decision style was coded into one of five pre-established categories (Unilateral-Dependent, Shared-Protective, Autonomous-Protective, Autonomous-Independent, and Mixed) adapted from Carlson and Grossbart's (1988) parental style model. Underlying themes unique to all participants and astronauts were also identified. Ten young women (4 astronauts and 6 immigrants) chose to participate in this study. Descriptive information was obtained via a screening document, and semi-structured interviews were transcribed and audio taped. A second reader was trained to ensure that the decision styles of the young women were appropriately coded. Cohen's kappa was calculated at 0.95. The independent variable that had the strongest pattern with decision style was type of decision, followed by family type. Ethnic identity did not have a pattern with decision style. Type of decision revealed that the participants had more independence in their personal decisions than their family decisions, with the exception of “Responsibilities Over Siblings” decisions. Family type revealed that astronaut parents were more likely to have shared the role and influence with their eldest daughters, while immigrant young women were more likely to have decided “Responsibilities Over Siblings” decisions on their own. Key underlying themes across all participants included: satisfaction with personal and family decisions, and quicker adaptation to Canada and the English language, which lead to their increased participation in personal and
family decisions post-migration. Key underlying astronaut themes were related to parental absence (increased young astronauts' participation in minor family decisions) and presence (reduced young astronauts' participation in family decisions), and the expectation by family members for young astronauts to provide female household tasks.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Immigration from Hong Kong to Canada increased substantially during the late Twentieth century. For example, in 1986/87 Hong Kong immigration to Canada was 6,813; however, by 1992 that number had increased to 38,000 (Le Corre, 1994). Between 1990 and 1994, the total population of Richmond increased from 85,000 to 125,000 people (Le Corre, 1994), with one-third of that number being Chinese in origin (Johnson, 1994). Further, by 1994, the Vancouver Chinese population (Canadian-born and immigrants) grew to 350,000, representing one quarter of the city's population. In fact, by 1996, 75% of all Chinese living in Vancouver were immigrants, meaning that only 25% of all Chinese in Vancouver were Canadian born (Chard & Renaud, 1999).

This recent immigration boom resulted in the influx of two types of families: Hong Kong astronaut and immigrant families. The astronaut family is a form of the immigrant family. There are two types of astronaut families: one parent present and no parents present (Lam, 1994; Pe-Pua, Mitchell, Iredale, & Castles, 1996). A one parent present astronaut family consists of a father who has returned to Hong Kong to work, while the wife and family reside in the host country (Lam, 1994; Pe-Pua et al., 1996). Often, the eldest child is expected to assist the mother as a translator and to help her take care of the household, siblings, decisions, and family finances (Pe-Pua et al., 1996). A no parents present astronaut family consists of a father and a mother who have returned to Hong Kong to work, leaving the children to reside in the host country (Lam, 1994; Pe-Pua et al., 1996). In such a situation, the eldest child alone is expected to care for the household, younger siblings, decisions, and family finances (Pe-Pua et al., 1996). This is in sharp contrast to an immigrant family in which both parents and children live in the same
household post-migration.

There has been extensive media coverage on the problems encountered by astronaut family youth in Canada. For example, there have been reports about astronaut family youth who have joined gangs or have become the victims of extortions (van den Hemel, 1996a), as well as those astronauts who have not had appropriate supervision and guidance from their astronaut parents (Swanson, 1993). Unfortunately, little attention has been directed towards the eldest child who may be expected to share responsibilities with her mother, or the eldest who has sole responsibility over the household and younger siblings. Some media reports (e.g., Olgilvie, 1996; van den Hemel, 1996b) and some research (e.g., Lam, 1994; Pe-Pua et al., 1996) have mentioned that the eldest children in such families have additional responsibilities (e.g., acting as a translator, decision making, running the household, monitoring family finances, caring for younger siblings) placed upon them, but no article or study has fully explored their role in the family post-migration. This study begins to address this void by describing the experiences of the eldest young woman who has at least one younger sibling and one parent present or no parents present in the home. This study limited the perspective to only young women because they are the ones traditionally socialized to run the household and to provide care for younger siblings.

In order to study this phenomenon, it is necessary to understand the ways in which their experiences are similar to young women who are a part of an immigrant family (has parents present in the home). Most research on immigrants has focussed on the acculturation problems they have experienced in the host country (e.g., Berry, 1988; Hong, 1989). Immigrant youth often assist their parents by acting as translators because they have been able to learn English faster than their parents (Baptiste, 1993; Hong, 1989). It has been noted that by being a translator, a young immigrant may be exposed to matters that normally may not have been
disclosed (Baptiste, 1993; Hong, 1989). However, beyond assisting their parents as a translator, it is not known how else immigrant youth assist in other matters post-migration. One area of potential involvement is decision making about one’s personal decisions or involvement in family decisions. However, whether they have autonomy or are merely carrying out parental decisions is not known.

In Western society, adolescence and young adulthood are times for independence, personal growth, and autonomous decision making. Research on North American adolescents has noted that decision making competence increases with age (Mann, Harmoni, & Power, 1989). In fact, parents have come to expect that as an individual matures into young adulthood, decision making autonomy naturally increases (Newman, 1989).

Literature regarding the decision making participation amongst Hong Kong youth has been mixed. On the one hand, a guiding principle of Chinese socialization is filial piety, which encourages absolute parental authority over children (Ho, 1994). In fact, research has confirmed that parents tend to be controlling or authoritarian in nature (Chao, 1994; Lin & Fu, 1990). On the other hand, filial piety has also been described as no longer having the same stronghold it once did in parent-child relationships (Ho, 1996). In fact, independence in personal and family decision making amongst Hong Kong youth has been found to exist (Salaff, 1976; Stewart, Rao, Bond, McBride-Chang, Fielding, & Kennard, 1998), and that as Hong Kong youth mature, they are given increased autonomy (McBride-Chang & Chang, 1998; Rosenthal & Feldman, 1990). It seems that their autonomy is granted at a later age relative to Caucasian adolescents (Greenberger & Chen, 1996; McBride-Chang & Chang, 1998).

Regardless, young women from either family type are immigrating from a culture that is collectivistic in nature (values family, obedience, and harmony) to a new culture that is
individualistic (values independence, personal achievement, and freedom) in nature (Rosenthal & Feldman, 1990). This change will require the two family types to adapt to a new culture, language, attitudes, and norms. This adaptation in turn could affect their *ethnic identity*—cognitive, moral, and affective dimensions or internal ethnic identity, as well as, observable social and cultural behaviours or external ethnic identity (Isajiw, 1990). Interestingly, past research has found that most foreign born Chinese adolescents tend to identify themselves as Chinese even post-migration (Lay & Verkuyten, 1999; Rosenthal & Feldman, 1992). Ultimately, the extent to which the young women integrate the host culture and their own ethnic culture could also be reflective of how they participate in decision making.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study is to describe, from the young women’s perspective, their decision style (role, influence, and sources of assistance) and the pattern it has with this study’s three independent variables—type of decision (personal and family), family type (astronaut and immigrant), and ethnic identity (Canadian, Hong Kong Chinese, and Mixed identity). Type of decisions explored consist of “General Personal” and “General Family” decisions, as well as the specific personal decision of “Selection of Social Relationships” and the specific family decisions of “Responsibilities Over Siblings” and “Family Crisis/Emergency”. Underlying themes (e.g., changes, disagreements, observations and perceptions, and the impact of the presence and absence of parents) are also identified.

This study is the first of its kind to describe the patterns between decision style and type of decision, family type, and ethnic identity from the perspective of young women involved in the decisions. Although young women from Hong Kong are socialized to provide care for others, it is not known how they participate in decision making post-immigration to Canada. In
other words, are they autonomous or are they simply carrying out decisions made by the parents?
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The purpose of this review of literature is to provide background information on the three independent variables of type of decision (personal and family), family type (astronaut and immigrant), and ethnic identity (Canadian, Hong Kong Chinese, and Mixed identity). In addition, it will also explain the decision style model which guides this study. Finally, this section will conclude with some research expectations based on the available literature.

Type of Decisions

The following section explores the study's first independent variable—type of decision. Both personal and family decisions will be defined, and research on decision making amongst North American and Hong Kong youth will be compared.

There are two kinds of decisions that can take place in a family: personal and family decisions. Personal decisions are decisions that are made by and primarily affect the individual. Hence, although an individual could be influenced by others, ultimately the lone individual makes the final decision (Goldsmith, 1996). Family decisions are more complex because there are more people involved in the decision. These decisions typically affect and involve the entire family. Difficulties can arise when the needs and wants of one family member are in conflict with those of another family member (Goldsmith, 1996).

Until recently, most North American studies on decision making focused primarily on the husband-wife dyad (Foxman & Tansuhaj, 1988). Research on the participation of children in decision making has focused mainly on elementary and high school aged children in consumer studies, specifically individual and family purchases (Moschis & Moore, 1979; Reid, 1979). These studies have found that as children become adolescents, they participate more in family
purchase decisions (Power, 1991; Sellers, 1989), and that adolescents not only influence the decision to buy products for themselves, but for other family members as well (Foxman, Tansuhaj, & Ekstrom, 1989).

Adolescence is a time of “physical, cognitive, social, and affective development” (Mann et al., 1989, p. 265). Beginning approximately at 10 to 13 years and ending around 18 to 20 years (Santrock, 1990), adolescence allows for the gradual developmental task of independence in which a young person can take on increasing levels of participation in decision making, such as making decisions that were previously made by adults (Coleman, 1980). These decision making skills are learnt within the context of the family (Mann et al., 1989). Specifically, it is the parents who train their adolescents to be competent decision makers (Conger & Peterson, 1984). Hence, it is also within the family context that adolescents could learn of their family’s decision style. Interestingly, family structure has been shown to affect adolescent decision making (Dornbusch, Carlsmith, Bushwall, Ritter, Leidermon, Hostorf, & Gross, 1985). Youth in one-parent families have shown greater independence in decisions than youth in two-parent families (Dornbusch et al., 1985).

North American research has found that decision making competence increases with age (Mann et al., 1989). For example, older adolescents (age 17 years) are able to exercise greater autonomy in personal decisions (choosing own friends) than younger adolescents (ages 11 and 14 years). In fact, parents of older adolescents expect their children to express greater decision making autonomy than parents of younger adolescents (Newman, 1989). As for family decisions, Liprie (1993) found that young North American adolescents (ages 11 to 13 years) had active roles in family decision making, including the expression of their own opinions and the gathering of information to assist the family in the decision making process (Liprie, 1993).
However, in the end, parents were responsible for making and carrying out final family decisions. Despite that fact, both adolescents and parents wanted adolescents to have increased participation in family decision making (Liprie, 1993).

Literature as to whether Hong Kong adolescents have autonomy in decisions is mixed. From one perspective, one can note that a guiding principle of Chinese socialization is filial piety (Ho, 1994). It prescribes how children are to behave towards their parents and ancestors. In essence, it encourages absolute parental authority over children. As a result, this principle affects communication patterns between Chinese parents and their children. Young Chinese are socialized in one-way communication from parents to children (Jim & Suen, 1995). There are neither open discussions nor intimate talks between parents and children. Children are often excluded from the decision making process within the family. Decisions are made for them by others, typically the parents or other elders (Jim & Suen, 1995).

Research has also confirmed the influence of filial piety on the decision making autonomy of Chinese adolescents. Chinese adolescents have reported that their parents are controlling or authoritarian in nature (Lin & Fu, 1990; Chao, 1994). In fact, girls more than boys have noted that their parents try to influence their decisions (Rosenthal & Feldman, 1990). As a result, since the youth have been socialized to be obedient, it comes as no surprise that Hong Kong youth value traditionalism more and individualism less than American and Australian youth (Feldman & Rosenthal, 1991).

However, from another perspective, decision making independence has also been documented amongst Chinese youth (Stewart et al., 1998). In terms of filial piety, Ho (1996) notes that in recent years “the extent to which traditional filial attitudes are reflected in actual behaviour seems rather limited” and “present day Chinese are becoming selective in their filial
beliefs and actions" (p. 161), especially amongst the young and the Hong Kong Chinese (Ho, 1996). In fact, research has found that Hong Kong adolescents are granted increasing autonomy as they grow older (McBride-Chang & Chang, 1998; Rosenthal & Feldman, 1990). It seems that their autonomy is just delayed and attained at a later age relative to Caucasian adolescents (Greenberger & Chen, 1996; McBride-Chang & Chang, 1998).

One study explored the decision making autonomy of young women in personal and family decisions in Hong Kong. Salaff (1976) interviewed 28 employed, unmarried young women living with family in Hong Kong. Most subjects were in their early 20's, were working class, and were members of families with five or more children. The majority assisted with household work and cared for younger siblings even prior to adolescence. As they grew older and became employed, responsibility for household work and child care fell to younger siblings. Personal decisions the young women made included: selecting one’s religion, picking one’s friends, boyfriends, and future husbands (although there was greater opposition from parents regarding the latter two), choosing clothing, going out with friends, attending night school, and changing jobs. As for family decisions, the employed young women helped decide the educational futures of younger siblings, disciplined siblings, and planned family affairs and rituals. With regards to family purchases, most young women had a say in such matters, however, if the families had an adult son living in the same household, then he alone decided family purchases. Seven of the young women in Salaff’s study (1976) came from families without a father present. In these families, the young women participated more in family decisions. Across all families, it was the parents who made most family decisions. Only a few families allowed family discussion or compromise.

Both general and specific personal and family decisions were explored in this study.
“General Personal” and family decisions were included in order to see how young women participated in decisions on a daily basis. Specific personal (“Selection of Social Relationships”) and family (“Responsibilities Over Siblings” and Crisis/Emergency) decisions were included to see if there were variations or consistencies relative to the decision style in general decisions. These specific personal and family decisions were selected because some of these issues have been previously explored in other research and seemed to be pertinent to young women in astronaut and immigrant families.

**Summary.**

Amongst North American adolescents, autonomy in personal decisions and participation in family decisions is seen as a natural developmental process. However, research pertaining to Chinese adolescents presents a mixed picture. Some research has indicated that the principle of filial piety dictates that parents have absolute authority over their children, hence, the parents control decision making. Other research has shown that filial piety no longer possesses a strong hold in the Chinese parent-child relationship. In fact, some research suggests that autonomy in personal decisions and participation in family decisions exists for Chinese adolescents, although their autonomy is granted at a later age relative to Caucasian adolescents. Interestingly, research also indicates that family structure could affect autonomy in youth decision making. Young women in one parent families were found to have an increased participation in decisions.

**Family Type**

The following section begins by describing Hong Kong immigration to Canada, and then explains the second variable of this study—family type, which consists of: Hong Kong astronaut and Hong Kong immigrant families. It should be noted that although they differ in terms of family type, astronaut and immigrant families both immigrated to Canada from Hong Kong,
hence, both are immigrants. Some families have decided ahead of time that they will adopt the
astronaut lifestyle, while others fall into the lifestyle because the parent(s) want to continue
working in Hong Kong and have encountered difficulties securing comparable work in Canada
(Inglis & Wu, 1994).

Hong Kong Immigration to Canada

Hong Kong flourished economically by being a dependency of Great Britain. It became a
capitalistic power, while the rest of communist China lagged behind. However, in 1997 Hong
Kong and all of its surrounding areas under British rule were returned to China (The New
Encyclopedia Britannica, 1985; Solomon, 1992). Talks began in 1982 between Great Britain and
the Chinese Government. Both sides wanted to ensure that Hong Kong would remain stable and
prosperous. According to the agreement, on July 1, 1997, Hong Kong officially became a special
administrative region of China. China has agreed to allow Hong Kong to maintain a great deal of
control over its government affairs (except foreign policy and defence) and to allow Hong Kong
to continue as a trade and financial centre. Basically, China has guaranteed "one country—two
systems"—Hong Kong is to keep its capitalistic economy within the socialist system of China
(References Services, Central Office of Information, 1992; Solomon, 1992).

Canada’s immigration policy admits people as permanent residents in one of three
categories: family, humanitarian or refugees, and economic which includes skilled workers,
business immigrants, and their spouses and dependents (Badets & Howatson-Leo, 1999). Those
who enter as skilled workers and business immigrants (investors, entrepreneurs and the self-
employed) are selected based on a point system which takes into account their age, education,
training and occupational skills, demand for their occupation in Canada, existence of pre-
arranged employment, and knowledge of one of Canada’s official languages (Badets &
Howatson-Leo, 1999). Since the mid-1980's, Hong Kong has supplied Canada with the largest number of business immigrants, with most having settled in Vancouver (Johnson, 1994). It has been estimated that in Canadian dollars the average Hong Kong investor household is worth $1.5 million, the average entrepreneur household is worth $1.0 million, and the average self-employed household is worth $400,000 (Skeldon, 1994a).

The number of Hong Kong immigrants has increased substantially during the mid-to-late 1980's (Johnson, 1992; Mak, 1991; Skeldon, 1994a). Hong Kong immigration to Canada was 6,813 in 1986/87, increased to 22,710 in 1989 (Johnson, 1992), and reached 38,000 by 1992 (Skeldon, 1994a). In comparison, Australia and the United States only attracted 15,000 Hong Kong immigrants each during 1992.

According to Johnson and Lary, (1994), the typical Hong Kong immigrant to Canada is:

in the prime productive and reproductive range of 25 to 44 years, one-sixth are over 45, and one-third are children and young adults. Typically the immigrants arrive in a family, a young or middle-aged couple with their children, and often also with some or all of their parents. There is a slight majority of females, with the male/female ratio in 1990 being about 48:52. (p. 94)

In addition, Hong Kong immigrants are educated, wealthy (Smart, 1994), and have greater facility with English than most other Chinese immigrants from other locales (Lary & Luk, 1994).

A study by Alberta Career Development and Employment, Hong Kong Institute of Personnel Management, and Canada Employment and Immigration (1991) tried to form a profile of Hong Kong immigrants in Canada. They found that 33% of the household heads had a university degree, compared to only 9% of Canada's population. Many had left Hong Kong because they wanted the freedom to travel outside of their country, had concerns about the 1997 handover, and wanted their children to be educated in Canada. Most household heads were able to find their first job in Canada within three months. Unfortunately, most could not find jobs in
fields similar to the positions they had in Hong Kong. As a result, many experienced a drop in income and job rank. Once in Canada, the majority found employment in technical, secretarial, clerical, and manual occupations, whereas, only 33% had been employed in those sectors in Hong Kong. A bit over half (53%) had no intentions of returning to Hong Kong to work, compared to 16% who were planning to return. In contrast, 33% were undecided at the time of the survey.

The two largest centres of Hong Kong immigrants in Canada are Toronto and Vancouver. While Toronto has a larger business locale, Vancouver is more favourable to many Chinese because it is only twelve hours away from Asia by plane, and it has a milder climate. Vancouver's social and financial fabric has changed so much that it has become known as the "Asian capital" of North America--nicknamed "Hongcouver" (Le Corre, 1994). According to 1993 data, the Chinese population of Vancouver was at 350,000, representing one quarter of the city's population (Le Corre, 1994).

**Astronaut Families**

In this section, the astronaut family will be defined. In addition, research and media reports regarding the problems encountered by the families, as well as, the additional responsibilities of elder siblings will be addressed.

Two types of *astronaut families* exist. One type has the husbands and/or fathers as occasional visitors to North America and Australia because they have chosen to continue working in their native Hong Kong (Mak, 1991), while their wives and children live and remain in the host country (*one parent present*). Fathers and husbands within these nuclear families end up visiting their families several times a year--some as often as every weekend. According to Skeldon (1994b) the Chinese call astronauts *taikongren*—this translates into men who live
without their wives, people who travel in space (meaning aeroplane), and house without a wife (in Hong Kong) or house without a husband (at the destination). The rest of the family has set up home in their new adoptive country as "hostages" or as the Chinese call it *ren zhi*, in order to fulfill residence requirements for citizenship (Wickberg, 1994). In fact, areas in which large numbers of these families live have been referred to as "widow streets" or *gua fu jia* (Mak, 1991). A second type of astronaut family, consists of both parents remaining in Hong Kong (*no parents present*), while the eldest child is placed in charge of younger siblings in the host country (Lam, 1994). This latter type is not the common pattern, since most astronaut families have at least one parent present (Pe-Pua et al., 1996).

Research has documented problems amongst astronaut families. Mak (1991) noted that counsellors working within Chinese communities in North America and Australia have found high occurrences of "marital discord, divorce, parent-child difficulties, and behavioural problems of children in these 'split' families" (p. 152). Inglis and Wu (1994) found that fathers felt alienated because their children prefer speaking English and not Cantonese. Likewise, the wives lacked strong English skills-- making their adjustment to the host country more difficult. Further, the distance between husbands and wives placed a strain on the marital relationship (Inglis & Wu, 1994). It would seem that while some astronauts are able to maintain their high paying jobs and luxurious lifestyles, it has come at the cost of strained family relations.

Some may wonder why any family would choose the astronaut family lifestyle. Research suggests that it was due to the fear of communism (Wong, 1994). By moving the family to a non-communist country such as Canada, it ensured safety and freedom. Fathers/husbands chose to remain in Hong Kong and work because this allowed them to continue earning their high incomes (Mak, 1991; Skeldon, 1994b), and allowed their families to maintain affluent lifestyles.
(Mak, 1991). This was possible because unlike Canada, Australia, or the United States, Hong Kong has a high Gross Domestic Product (GDP), low unemployment rates, and low taxes.

Lam (1994) conducted a study on twenty-five Chinese immigrant families who arrived in Toronto in 1988. Those who were a part of an astronaut family were especially dissatisfied with the lack of a normal life. Wives complained about disrupted husband-wife relationships. All of these women in astronaut families indicated how much they missed having hired help or assistance from in-laws. In fact, sometimes the disagreements and lack of emotional support between couples got to the point that it resulted in the disruption of the family. For those astronaut families in which both parents returned to Hong Kong (no parents present), family life for the children was even more disrupted. All stated that they were unhappy with their situation. The eldest child in charge complained about having to live without both parents, being expected to handle situations on their own, and having younger siblings refusing to obey them (Lam, 1994).

Some other research has also briefly noted the additional responsibilities bestowed upon the eldest child in the family. For example, amongst no parents present astronaut families in Australia, elder siblings were expected to care for the household and their younger siblings (Pe-Pua et al., 1996). Some reported difficulties with their new responsibilities, and felt overwhelmed and wished their parents could be in Australia with them. Others were able to adjust to the absence of their parents without any problems. They reported that they learned how to run a household and were able to make many decisions on their own without turning to parents or other relatives for help. If the need for assistance did arise, the elder siblings turned to friends or a local Chinese church for assistance. For those astronauts in one parent present astronaut families, the elder siblings had to provide a lot of assistance to their mothers by acting as a
translator, assisting with banking and bureaucracy, doing household chores and repairs around the house, and driving family members. While the addition of these household and decision making responsibilities contributed to the maturity of the elder astronaut children, it did force them to adjust to their new lifestyles.

The astronaut phenomenon has also received negative press in the media. For example, in the June 21, 1993 edition of The Province an article entitled “Left behind: Parents in Asia, kids home alone,” described how many Hong Kong children lived without supervision and guidance from parents for weeks to several months at a time, and how one parent present and no parents present astronaut families were very susceptible to divorces (Swanson, 1993, p. A1). Another article entitled, “Satellite families raise concerns” noted that while the youngsters had BMW’s and lavish homes, they suffered from high levels of anxiety by being emotionally neglected by their parents who were away in Asia (van den Hemel, 1996a, p. 3). In fact, some of these astronaut youths had been known to join gangs or to become victims of extortions.

Media reports have also briefly noted the additional responsibilities given to the eldest child in the family. For example, in The Review dated September 14, 1996, an article entitled, “Satellite kids say teens shouldn’t be left alone” noted how the elder astronaut children had additional responsibilities once their parents returned to Hong Kong (van den Hemel, 1996b, p. 3). An astronaut female who was interviewed noted that although she did not have adolescent related troubles, she had a “more demanding role in the family” (van den Hemel, 1996b, p.3). Life in Hong Kong had been easier for her because there “children have little say in day-to-day decision-making” and, hence, “didn’t have a lot of decision power” (p. 3). However, once her family moved to Canada, she had new responsibilities as an interpreter who also had to deal with family finances, legal matters, daily interactions with the community, etc. Another article
entitled "Life's a struggle for the 'satellite students'" in the November 21, 1996 issue of The Province interviewed a young woman left in charge of two younger siblings (Olgilvie, 1996, p. A25). She noted that after immigrating to Canada, she had become "the parent herself". By being left in charge of the household, she had to do many things on her own, and often wished that she could have had her parents present to consult with concerning family matters.

Immigrant Families

Research on immigrant families has focussed primarily on the difficulties that immigrants have faced in their newly adopted country. Little is known about the immigrant young women who have additional responsibilities post-migration.

In Hong Kong, parental authority is rarely challenged, with children usually not arguing back (Pe-Pua et al., 1996). However, following immigration to Western society, parents have noticed that their children are more difficult to control. The parents believe that these changes occur because Western society does not regard parental authority as highly as in Hong Kong. As a result, the children assert themselves more often by expressing their opinions or refusing to do things as their parents ask. While the children view their behaviour as expressing their self-confidence or independence, their parents see their behaviour as disrespectful. Chin (1990) and Lam (1994) have reported difficulties amongst Chinese families following immigration to North America. Parents have reported increased parent-child conflicts because children have demanded increased autonomy in their new country.

Bai (1995) interviewed 15 adolescent males and 10 adolescent females regarding the challenges they encountered in adapting to life in Canada. Forty-eight percent of the participants were Hong Kong Chinese, 36% were Taiwanese, and 16% were mainland Chinese. Almost all parents of the Hong Kong and Taiwanese Chinese families immigrated to Canada as investment
immigrants or entrepreneurs, implying that they were more financially secure than the immigrant families from mainland China. Common problems encountered were the English language, cultural barriers (e.g., making friends, understanding the behaviour of Canadian peers), and discrimination. Those who arrived in Canada at an older age (13 years and over) experienced more problems in assimilating than those who were younger (under 13 years). Those who were members of astronaut families (52%) reported that the “loosened” family bonds increased their adjustment difficulties (Bai, 1995).

Immigrant families, in general, face certain problems when they immigrate to a new country. Baptiste (1993) noted that immigrant families may experience transitional problems in adjusting to their new country. First, families may experience the loosening of family boundaries. Such a situation arises when children adapt to the culture more quickly than the parents. For example, a family from a collectivistic culture (valuing the needs of the group, harmony, and obedience) may experience distress when their children begin to engage in more individualistic thought (valuing the needs of the individual, independence, and autonomy) and behaviour (Rosenthal & Feldman, 1990). As a result, parents may engage in enmeshment or a closure of familial boundaries to external systems in an attempt to restrict their children's interactions with the new culture and to preserve their own ethnic culture. Second, because children adapt quicker to a new culture than adults do, there is an expectation that they will help their parents by acting as translators. Hence, the children will have an elevated status or power within the family. Children will be exposed to matters that may normally not be disclosed to them. Parents may try to regain some of their lost power by being more strict towards their children. This could lead to parent-child conflicts. Third, even though parents want their children to succeed in the new country, they do not like the increasing amount of conflict that
exists between themselves and their children. The children feel as though they are in a bind because they need to acculturate in order to succeed in the new country, and that means learning English and making new friends.

Hong (1989) also noted the difficulties that immigrant Chinese may face. First, some families may face isolation. They lack support networks in the form of families, friends, or agencies. Second, some immigrants may experience problems with relocation. They may have a reduced circle of friends, unrecognized education credentials, limited employment opportunities, and restricted entertainment and leisure activities (limited to Chinatowns). Such situations may result in "cultural dislocation", or the subjective feeling of being displaced in a sociocultural environment (Ishiyama, 1995). Third, some families may experience increased cultural gaps between parents and children (Hong, 1989). Children automatically have greater exposure to the new culture because they attend school. Fourth, there may be differences in language acquisition between parents and children. Children tend to pick up a language faster than their parents due to exposure from school, and television.

Based on what Baptiste (1989) and Hong (1989) have determined about immigrant families, the main responsibility of the eldest child in an immigrant family is to be a translator for their parents because of their ability to learn the English language faster. This new responsibility may expose the young person to matters that they normally would not have been told about (e.g., decisions, financial and bureaucratic matters).

Summary.

Hong Kong immigration to Canada (especially Vancouver) increased substantially during the mid-to-late 1980's and the early 1990's, with many of these immigrants reported as being quite educated and affluent compared to others who have sought Canadian citizenship from other
countries. This influx has resulted in the emergence of two family types: Hong Kong astronaut and immigrant families. Although both are technically immigrant families, they differ by family form, with immigrant families being intact and astronaut families having only one or no parents living with the children in Canada. Much of the existing research and media coverage on both family types seems to be negative, highlighting the problems the families have encountered post-migration (e.g., marital problems, divorce, parent-child conflicts, behavioural problems amongst children, English language difficulty, and role reversals between spouses and parents and children). However, research and media reports on astronauts have acknowledged that the eldest child often has increased responsibilities post-migration. Duties have consisted of being a translator for their mother, assisting with the running of the household, making and carrying out decisions, and caring for younger siblings. Astronauts in no parents present astronaut families would be in charge of the household, decision making, and siblings in Canada by themselves. In contrast, although immigrant children also assist their parents as translators, it is not known what additional responsibilities they have post-migration.

Ethnic Identity

Before delving into the third independent variable of ethnic identity, this section begins by discussing Chinese culture. From there, it will proceed to the concept of ethnic identity—how there is a lack of a consensus on the definition of ethnic identity, what variables can affect ethnic identity, and what is the ethnic identity of foreign-born Chinese.

Culture

According to Tepperman and Richardson (1991), culture is all of the “human produced values, behaviours, and symbols that a group of people share” (p. 75). It is distinct from ethnicity because “a person does not belong to an ethnic group by choice; rather, he or she must
be born into such a group and becomes related to it through emotional and symbolic ties (Smith, 1991, p. 181-182). Unlike race which pertains to physical traits, ethnicity focusses on cultural group membership or shared dimensions such as feelings, beliefs, values, customs, or practices of a specific group (Yeh & Huang, 1996).

Two concepts play major roles in Chinese culture: a) family, and b) face (Hsu, 1985; Wong, 1986; Yiu, 1989). For the Chinese family, its hierarchy is based on the following in descending order: a) generation, b) age, and c) sex (Baker, 1979). Hence, one's role in the family is ascribed and predetermined rather than achieved. By not respecting the pre-established hierarchy, one threatens the harmony in the family (Mei, 1967). For example, a child never disrespects a parent or another elder. To prevent conflict, the Chinese are taught at an early age to suppress one's own needs and wishes in favour of maintaining a harmonious state of affairs between oneself and others (Bond & Wang, 1983). This takes a great deal of emotional control for an individual (Tseng, 1973). While this act of conformity to harmonious relations is acted out, Hiniker (1969) has found that not all individuals truly believe in actions to maintain harmony. However, in terms of face, the Chinese perceive the family as being more important than the individual. If one family member experienced a loss of face, this would result in the loss of face for the entire family (King & Bond, 1985). As a result, one must act in a socially responsible manner in order to maintain the integrity of the entire family. However, while the inhabitants of Hong Kong are Chinese, there may be slight differences in familism due to its modern context relative to the rest of China.

Further, the terms ethnic identity and acculturation have often been used interchangeably, however, these terms are not the same. Acculturation determines how immigrants adjust to life in a new country. According to Berry (1980, 1983), in order for acculturation to occur, one
needs two autonomous cultural groups to come into contact with one another, and there must be a change in one of the cultural groups as a result of the contact. Typically, the dominant group's cultural elements has a greater influence, and can illicit more change than a weaker cultural group.

What is Ethnic Identity?

According to Phinney (1990), there is no agreed upon definition of ethnic identity. Some researchers have defined ethnic identity as a component of social identity, or as consisting of feelings and attitudes (Phinney, 1990), or as cultural aspects such as language, behaviour, values, and knowledge of group history (Rogler, Cooney, & Oritiz, 1980). Based on the above, it is apparent that there is great diversity in how the concept of ethnic identity is defined. Perhaps the best way to explain ethnic identity is to see it as consisting of two aspects: internal ethnic identity and external ethnic identity (Isajiw, 1990). Internal ethnic identity refers to the cognitive, moral, and affective dimensions of one's identity, whereas, external ethnic identity refers to observable social and cultural behaviours.

Ethnic identity is affected by several factors. For example, ethnic identity is lower amongst those who have immigrated at an earlier age and amongst those who have lived longer in a new country (Rogler et al., 1980). For example, some Chinese immigrant young women have reported feeling trapped between two cultures (Lee & Cochran, 1988). Over the course of three years in Canada, these young women described a conflict between the pursuit of personal development and maintenance of family traditions and relationships. In addition, Sue and Zane (1985) found that recent immigrants (less than six years in the United States) reported greater adjustment difficulties (e.g., language, social contacts, etc.) than longer-term Chinese immigrant students or American-born Chinese students. Longer residence in North America increased
acceptance of individualistic values, such as not accepting authority without criticism and standing up for one’s rights (Wolfgang & Josefowitz, 1978).

Other research has noted that socioeconomic status and gender can also have an impact on ethnic identity. Some research suggests that people with lower levels of socioeconomic status often had higher levels of ethnic identity than those with higher socioeconomic statuses (Ho, 1996). In addition, research has found that women tend to be more oriented to their ethnic culture than men. Martinez and Dukes (1997) found that Asian females had higher ethnic identities than males, and Ting-Toomey (1981) found that female Chinese-American college students reported higher levels of ethnic orientation than male Chinese-American college students.

Social context has also been noted to have an impact on ethnic identity (Rosenthal & Hrynevich, 1985). This could have an effect on the Chinese of Vancouver because since 1967 Chinese immigration to Vancouver has commercially revived Vancouver's Chinatown, and dispersed the residential area of Vancouver's Chinese population (Johnson, 1992). In fact, Chinatown has expanded to "satellite centres offering an array of commercial and professional services in new areas of Chinese settlement" (Johnson, 1992, p. 167). According to Johnson (1994) and Le Corre (1994), a perfect example of a satellite centre is the suburban municipality of Richmond. Richmond has increasingly taken on a Hong Kong atmosphere. All of this has been done to cater to the new Hong Kong immigrants. All over Richmond are high class Cantonese restaurants, Chinese supermarkets, movie theatres, and shopping malls. In fact, two Cantonese radio stations and one television station have been established. These are big changes to a suburb that was basically rural twenty years ago (Johnson, 1994). Between 1990 and 1994, Richmond's population has increased from 85,000 to 125,000 people (Le Corre, 1994), with one-
third of that increase representing those who were Chinese in origin (Johnsón, 1994). In addition, Triandis, Kashima, Shimada, and Villereal (1986) have noted that the more power an immigrant group has in their new adopted setting, the less likely they will acculturate to or integrate with the host culture. Further, the greater or denser the population of immigrants, the slower acculturation will be.

What is the ethnic identity of the Hiong Kong yan or Hong Kong people (Kuah, 1996)? Ethnically and politically the Hong Kong people are Chinese much like their mainland counterparts, yet they have a distinct culture. One must remember that Hong Kong is modern, industrialized, and urbanized with a high standard of living. There has been a greater exposure to and acceptance of Western concepts and ideas. Hence, it comes as little surprise that a 1985 survey found that almost 60% of Hong Kong respondents identified themselves as “Hongkongese” when given the option to choose between that and Chinese (Lau & Kuan, 1988). While the selection of “Hongkongese” was not a rejection of China or the Chinese people, it does indicate that the Hong Kong Chinese see themselves as a distinctive group of Chinese.

Amongst foreign born Chinese adolescents in Australia and the United States, most have identified themselves as Chinese, have had primarily or only Chinese friends, and have engaged in more Chinese type behaviours (Rosenthal & Feldman, 1992). In addition, they have perceived themselves as less integrated into the host culture’s social context. Lay and Verkuyten (1999) also found that foreign born Chinese adolescents were more likely to identify themselves as Chinese rather than Chinese-Canadian, compared to Canadian-born Chinese adolescents.

Interestingly, Locke (1992) has noted that despite the fact that the Chinese have been migrating to the United States for over a century, they have not totally assimilated into the mainstream culture of North America. They have maintained a distinctive Chinese community.
(Chinatown), language, culture, behaviour, and traditions. Amongst more recent Chinese immigrants, parents have encouraged a blending of cultures—Chinese and American. Huhr and K. Kim (1984) have stated that immigrant Asians often engage in adding aspects of the American culture to their Asian culture without replacing or altering any part of their traditional culture. Hurh and K. Kim have referred to this as "adhesive adaptation". In fact, despite the educational, occupational, and economic advances that second- and third-generation Chinese- and Japanese-Americans have made, they too still experience some form of "adhesive adaptation" due to being a racial minority in the American social structure.

Summary.

Ethnic identity can be best explained as consisting of both internal ethnic identity (cognitive, moral, and affective dimensions) and external ethnic identity (observable social and cultural behaviours). It is affected by several factors such as: age at immigration, years of residence in the host country, socioeconomic status, gender, and social context. Although the Chinese have been immigrating to Canada for more than a century, they have engaged in adhesive adaptation or just added aspects of the American culture to their ethnic identity without altering their traditional culture. In fact, Chinese immigrants have tended to identify themselves as Chinese rather than Canadian or American.

Decision Style Model

The purpose of this section is to explain the derivation of the decision style model for this study from the parental style model by Carlson and Grossbart (1988). Modifications to the parental style model were necessary to make it more appropriate for describing the personal and family decision style of young women. Carlson and Grossbart’s (1988) basis for their parental style model was from

An Authoritarian style indicates that parents have high levels of control over their children. In other words, the parents play the role of the superiors, while the children play the role of the subordinates. Verbal discussions concerning matters do not occur between parents and children because the children must do as their parents say. Children have few rights, and are expected to behave responsibly. They are to be obedient and have restricted autonomy. Willful behaviour is punished (Carlson & Grossbart, 1988).

A Rigid Controlling style is like the Authoritarian style except parents maintain a more calm emotional detachment in the socialization of their children (Carlson & Grossbart, 1988).

An Authoritative style indicates a democratic balance between parents and children. Children can exercise autonomy, providing they behave in a mature manner. If necessary, parents will exercise control to confront disobedience. Parents enjoy being supportive and teaching their children about responsibility. They encourage their children to contribute their opinions in discussions (Carlson & Grossbart, 1988).

A Permissive style allows the children to exercise autonomy providing they do not bring harm to themselves or others. Parents encourage their children to be independent. Parents do not see themselves as teachers, but rather as resources that the children can use if they want. Reasoning is the preferred method of parents, rather than control (Carlson & Grossbart, 1988).

A Neglectful style allows children to have complete autonomy. The parents do little to monitor the behaviour of their children because the children are seen as capable of handling
things on their own. Some parents are either too self-absorbed nor want to provide guidance for their children (Carlson & Grossbart, 1988).

Because little theoretical or empirical differences existed between the first two parental styles of Authoritarian and Rigid Controlling, the researcher of this study felt it was appropriate to collapse the two decision style categories into a single parental style category of Authoritarian. Overall, the parental styles ranged along a continuum from only parents wielding control to only children wielding control (autonomy) in the consumer socialization process.

Unlike the purpose of the original model, the goal for this study was to describe the role and influence of both parents and children from the perspective of the children (young women) in personal and family decisions, with sources of assistance being extrapolated from the four styles. Since the desired perspective was of the young women and not the parents, some modifications to the model had to be made by the researcher.

One of the modifications was changing the names of the four decision styles to use a more neutral, less negative terminology. Authoritarian was changed to Unilateral-Dependent, Authoritative was changed to Shared-Protective, Permissive was changed to Autonomous-Protective, and Neglectful was changed to Autonomous-Independent. Note that each decision style name was changed from a single descriptor to a hyphenated one. Hyphenated decision styles better reflected the role and influence of both young women and parents/others in decisions. The first descriptor in the hyphenated decision style described the young woman’s perception of her decision style, while the second descriptor described her perception of her parents’/other’s decision style. For example, if a young woman had an Autonomous-Protective decision style, then she perceived that she had autonomy in decisions, and also perceived that her parents were protective over her (for details, see Table 1). Abbreviations for the decision styles
appear beside the updated terms.

Table 1

Conversion of Names: Parental Style to Young Woman’s Decision Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Carlson &amp; Grossbart (1988)</th>
<th>Updated Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian</td>
<td>Unilateral-Dependent (U-D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritative</td>
<td>Shared-Protective (S-P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permissive</td>
<td>Autonomous-Protective (A-P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neglectful</td>
<td>Autonomous-Independent (A-I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Second, the move to hyphenated decision style names required that the definitions be modified to reflect the perspective of the young women and how they viewed their involvement in decision making relative to their parents/others. This was achieved by integrating the concepts of decision style (role and influence) with Carlson and Grossbart’s (1988) model of parental style. According to the researcher, *role* describes who makes and carries out the decisions and *influence* refers to who guides or sways decisions in their favour through the suggestion of ideas or opinions. Role and influence can vary from only parents/others having the role and influence in decisions to only the young woman having the role and influence in decisions. The end result was a continuum of decision styles from the young women’s perspective that moved from young women dependent on parents to young women independent from parents in personal and family decisions.

A third modification made by the researcher was the addition of a fifth category of Mixed decision style. This acknowledged that decision style could be a combination of two of the decision styles. This step was deemed necessary because of the questions in the interview. Not
only were the young women asked for their perspective on the participation of their parents in decisions, they were also asked for their perspective on the participation of others (e.g., friends, boyfriends) in decisions. If the participation of the parents/others named were the same, then it would be possible to classify the young women into one decision style category. If the participation of the parents and the others named differed, then it would be necessary to classify the young women into two categories, hence the need for a Mixed decision style category.

The final alteration to the decision model was the inclusion of the sources of assistance of others. According to Goldsmith (1996), reference groups are "the people who influence an individual or provide guidance or advice" (p. 100)—in other words they are sources of assistance. The original parental style model only consisted of parents and children. Others referred to friends, boyfriends, relatives, church community, etc. By adding others as a source of assistance, it acknowledged that young women would have larger social networks to draw upon for assistance in decisions than the children of Carlson and Grossbart’s (1988) original study. A continuum of sources of assistance was established and ranged from: only parents (Unilateral-Dependent); mainly parents, but also others (Shared-Protective); mainly others, but also parents (Autonomous-Protective); and only others (Autonomous-Independent). Unlike role and influence, sources of assistance did not have the fifth category of Mixed. By reading the young women’s responses, it could be determined who provided the young women with the greatest source of assistance in decisions (for details, see Table 2).
### Summary of Decision Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision Style</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Influence</th>
<th>Sources of Assistance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unilateral-Dependent (U-D)</strong></td>
<td>Only parents/others make the decisions and young women may carry them out.</td>
<td>Only parents/others have influence in decisions.</td>
<td>Only parents are a source of assistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shared-Protective (S-P)</strong></td>
<td>Parents/others and young women share in making and carrying out decisions. Parents/others intervene if young women behave irresponsibly.</td>
<td>Parents/others and young women share influence in decisions.</td>
<td>Mainly parents, but others can be a sources of assistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Autonomous-Protective (A-P)</strong></td>
<td>Young women make and carry out decisions. Parents/others intervene if young women behave irresponsibly.</td>
<td>Young women have a lot of influence in decisions.</td>
<td>Mainly others, but parents can be a sources of assistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Autonomous-Independent (A-I)</strong></td>
<td>Only young women make and carry out decisions. Parents/others do not care about decision outcomes.</td>
<td>Only young women have influence in decisions.</td>
<td>Parents are not a source of assistance. Young women turn only to others for assistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mixed</strong></td>
<td>Coded into two of the above.</td>
<td>Coded into two of the above.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Expectations

Qualitative research can range from testing ideas and hypotheses to generating ideas, propositions, and theories from the data (Mason, 1996). Based on the decision style model and the literature discussed in this chapter, some research expectations about the three independent variables were formed. Although the research expectations are phrased in terms of comparison, the intention of the research expectations is to identify patterns between the two groups.

Type of Decision

Although research is mixed as to whether Chinese adolescents participate in decision making, it would make sense that the young women of this study would have greater independence in personal decisions than family decisions. For example, note that because the young women are older, they would naturally have more independence in decision making than adolescents. In addition, filial piety is no longer considered an absolute principle that guides parent-child relationships (Ho, 1996). Further, decision making autonomy has been documented amongst Chinese youth (Rosenthal & Feldman, 1990; Stewart et al., 1998; McBride-Chang & Chang, 1998), except that autonomy is usually granted at a later age relative to Caucasian adolescents (Greenberger & Chen, 1996; McBride-Chang & Chang, 1998). Finally, according to Salaff (1976), young Hong Kong women have independence in a lot of their personal decisions, although parents usually control family decisions. Hence, it is expected that:

**Research Expectation 1:** Young women in both forms of families will report having more independent decision styles with personal decisions than with family based decisions.

Also since personal decisions typically affect and are made by the individual, and family decisions pertain to and affect family members, it is expected that:
Research Expectation 2: Young women in both forms of families will report having a wider range of sources of assistance for personal decisions, and more family based sources of assistance for family decisions.

Family Type

The most obvious difference between astronaut and immigrant families is that astronaut families have absent parents. Without parents around on a consistent basis, young women in astronaut families may have a more independent role and influence in family decisions than young women in immigrant families. Research does seem to indicate that family structure could have an impact on the participation of youth in family decision making. Amongst one-parent families (e.g., Dornbusch et al., 1985; Salaff, 1976) and both forms of astronaut families (Pe-Pua et al., 1996), youth seem to have increased participation in family decision making. Therefore, it is expected that:

Research Expectation 3: Young women in astronaut families will have a decision style that allows them to participate more in family decisions, while young women in immigrant families will be less likely to participate in family decisions.

Without parent(s) present, it is also possible that astronaut young women could have different sources of assistance compared to immigrant young women. For example, astronaut young women have noted that they have encountered difficulties in having to handle some family situations on their own (Lam, 1994; van den Hemel, 1996b; Olgilvie, 1996; Pe-Pua et al., 1996). If parents are not available to assist with family decisions, it is unlikely they will be available to assist with personal decisions either. In fact, the media has reported that some astronaut youths lack proper supervision and guidance from parents (Swanson, 1993), and often turn to friends or the church community for assistance (Pe-Pua et al., 1996). Therefore, it is expected that:
**Research Expectation 4:** Young women in astronaut families will be less dependent on parental sources of assistance in decisions than young women in immigrant families.

**Ethnic Identity**

Ethnic identity may also have an impact on one's decision style. Research has found that as immigrant children become more acculturated, parental authority is regarded less highly (Pe-Pua et al., 1996). In addition, Wolfgang and Josefowitz (1978) have found that the longer an individual resides in North America, the more accepting that individual becomes of individualistic values. Hence, it is expected that:

**Research Expectation 5:** Young women in both family types who have a high Canadian Identity/Preferences will report having greater participation in decisions. Young women in both forms of families who have a high Hong Kong Chinese Identity/Preferences will report having less participation in decisions.

and

**Research Expectation 6:** Young women in both family types who have a high Canadian Identity/Preferences will be less dependent on family as a source of assistance than young women in both forms of families who have a high Hong Kong Chinese Identity/Preferences.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The decision to use semi-structured interviews was based on the following factors: a) previous research on astronaut and immigrant families in Canada had used interviews (e.g., Lam, 1994; Man, 1996); b) it was anticipated that the sample for this study would not be random, nor large enough to justify the use of quantitative methodology; c) the study was exploratory in nature; and d) it allowed the young women to articulate their own point of view on their decision style in general and with regards to specific personal (e.g., “Selection of Social Relationships”) and family (e.g., “Responsibilities Over Siblings” and “Family Crisis/Emergency”) decisions.

Interviews capture “meanings and other subjective information that may not normally be available through other research approaches” (Rosenblatt & Fischer, 1993, p. 171). While it is impossible to “know” what another person’s experience is “really” like, the goal is to come as close to the actual experience as possible (Locke, Spirduso, & Silverman, 1993). In order to achieve that goal, it was necessary for the researcher and participants to interact with one another, hence, interviews were used.

Participants

The researcher created a screening document to obtain a description of the participants (see Appendix B). The screening document covered information on the participant, family composition, one’s place within the family, amount of time in Canada, exposure to Western society, language ability, school/employment, and ethnic identity.

To ensure that all the questions of the screening document were clear and appropriate, pre-testing was done with three people: one who was a Family Studies graduate student and a member of a Hong Kong astronaut family, another who was a member of a Hong Kong
immigrant family, and one person who was Chinese-Canadian born and raised. After pretesting, the best questions were retained, while others were refined.

Participants had to meet certain criteria to participate in the study. First, they had to be between the ages of 19-25. The focus was limited to women of this age range for the following reasons: a) little is known about their decision style, b) they are of age to give consent to participate in this study, and c) rapport may be more easily established between the young women and the researcher because both are approximately of the same age and race. Second, participants had to be the eldest daughter currently living in the household, regardless of birth order (participants could have an elder brother or sister living in another household). Third, the young women had to be living with at least one younger sibling in the household. The reason for this was to get an idea of the young woman's responsibilities over her younger brother or sister. Fourth, the young women had to reside in the Greater Vancouver area. This was for convenience in terms of time and expense. Fifth, the young women must have arrived in Canada between 1990-1994. This provided a range of "length of time" in Canada (4 to 8 years), and allowed for a comparison among the young women. Finally, the young women had to be comfortable with being interviewed in English, since the interviewer did not speak Cantonese.

Participants were recruited via announcements through advertisements in campus newspapers, flyers posted and circulated to campus clubs/associations, undergraduate Family Science classes, community agencies and organizations, and friends and acquaintances (see Appendix A). In addition, individuals who completed interviews were asked to name at least one other young woman who would want to participate. The snowball method of sampling was used because it locates "cases of interest from people who know people who know what cases are information rich, that is, good examples for study, good interview subjects" (Patton, 1990, p.
It is most useful when the people wanted in the study are unusual in the population, and when there is no listing of such individuals available (Weiss, 1994).

Those interested in participating contacted either the Principal Investigator or Co-Investigator. At that time, the interested participant was screened via a screening document to see if they met the requirements of the study. In total, a sample of 10 participants was obtained. Four participants were the eldest young women present within Hong Kong astronaut families (one with no parents present and three with one parent present), and the other six participants were the eldest young women present within Hong Kong immigrant families. Due to time and monetary constraints and to a low participant turnout, the size of the sample was limited to ten young women. Kvale (1996) notes that most interview studies have 15±10 participants. This number varies according to the amount of time and resources available and the achievement of a saturation point or the moment during data collection when additional interviewees add little or no new information (Rubin & Rubin, 1995).

Some individuals were probably reluctant to take part in this study because it required their time and willingness to disclose personal information. No monetary compensation was offered. In addition, the interviews were audio taped. This might have made some feel uncomfortable. Further, North American studies have found that women and minorities speak on average 30% less in the classroom and in laboratory situations even when they make up 50% or more of the class size (Centre for Faculty Development and Instructional Services, University of British Columbia, 1996). Hence, the researcher was not surprised by the low sample size of this study.

**Interviews**

In order to meet the goals of the study, interview questions were created by the
researcher. The interview covered the young women's decision style (role, influence, and sources of assistance) in “General Personal” and “General Family” decisions and in specific personal (“Selection of Social Relationships”) and family (“Responsibilities Over Siblings” and “Family Crisis/Emergency”) decisions, as well as underlying themes (for details of the actual interview questions see the interview guide in Appendix C).

Like the screening document, the interview guide was pretested prior to use (for details see Participants), with the best questions retained and the probes refined. The interview guide was semi-structured; the researcher introduced a topic and asked the participants specific questions about the topic (Rubin & Rubin, 1995). Questions were open-ended (respondents could answer in their own words) and closed-ended (respondents were limited to a predetermined set of responses) in nature.

Young women who passed the screening and wanted to participate were asked to select a time and place for an interview. Face-to-face interviews were conducted either in the homes of the young women or at the researcher’s office at the University of British Columbia. The interview began with the researcher introducing herself. The researcher then reviewed the consent form to be signed by the participant. The consent form covered issues such as the purpose of the study, informed consent, the right of the participant to withdraw from the study at any time, the right of the participant to refuse to answer certain questions, the fact that the answers were confidential, and the fact that excerpts of the interview (without the names of the participants) were to be part of the final thesis. Once everything was settled, the researcher asked the participant to sign the consent form.

Each of the ten interviews lasted between 45 minutes to 3 hours. All interviews proceeded according to the interview guide. According to Patton (1980), an interview guide
ensures the following: 1) respondents are asked the same questions in the same order, 2) it makes data analysis easier to locate the questions and respondents' answers; and 3) it allows future researchers to easily replicate the study.

All interviews were audio taped and transcribed so that themes and quotes were easily identifiable. While an audio-tape recorder may make respondents feel constrained with what they can say, it does have some valuable use (Weiss, 1994). An audio tape can capture the "vividness" of speech (the pauses, false starts, etc.), and it is superior to note taking as it prevents the loss of content in an interview. In addition, if the intent is to include quotes in the report, then an audio taping is a must.

During and following the interview, the researcher's observations were recorded in the form of notes. Notes on how each respondent reacted to questions, non-verbal behaviour, and omissions were recorded in order to capture the true happenings and occurrences during each interview. For this study, none of the notes yielded any pertinent information about the respondents because no problems nor significant reactions to the interview questions were encountered.

Once the interview was completed, the researcher asked the participant if she had anything else she would like to add, if she had any questions, if she had any comments about the interview, or if she wanted to discuss anything else. The interview concluded with the interviewer thanking the participant for her time.

As suggested by Patton (1990), each audio taped interview was transcribed verbatim. Transcripts ranged between 11 to 47 pages in length. The transcriber encountered some problems in transcribing the interviews: the Cantonese accent, quick speech of the participants, and background noise on a few of the tapes. As a result, this left some parts of the transcript
with incomplete passages. Fortunately, the researcher was able to determine and restore the missing responses.

The researcher made five copies of the transcripts. Patton (1990) suggested that at least four copies of the transcripts be made. One copy, called an archive (Weiss, 1994), was kept aside for safe keeping. Two copies were used throughout the analysis for coding. The fourth copy stayed intact and acted as a guide. The fifth copy was returned to the young women for discussion and review (for details see Analysis: Coding Decision Style and Underlying Themes).

Analysis: Coding Decision Style and Underlying Themes

For this particular study, some codes were established ahead of time (decision styles), and others emerged from the data as they arose (underlying themes). While codes in qualitative research can be established anytime in the research process (Mason, 1996), some may see this study as having a mixture of research methods. Pre-established codes are used in content analysis, a quantitative method involving the “counting of the number of instances when those categories are used in a particular item of text” (Silverman, 1993, p. 59). In contrast, allowing codes to emerge from the data represents a qualitative method. Patton (1980) notes that it is possible and preferable to mix research methodologies.

The four step data analysis method of coding, sorting, local integration, and inclusive integration by Weiss (1994) was used in this study. Coding involved reading the transcripts literally (analyzing for content) and interpretively (extrapolating meaning and representation). Transcripts were read twice, once to code for decision style and a second time to code for underlying themes. Since categories for decision style were pre-established, the participants’ decision style responses were read and coded according to one of the decision style categories (Unilateral-Dependent, Shared-Protective, Autonomous-Protective, and Autonomous-
Independent). Names of the appropriate decision style were written in the margin beside the coded segment. Often only one category emerged as the young woman’s decision style; however, in a few instances two categories emerged. In these situations, two categories were noted and written in the margin of the transcript and given an overall category of Mixed. Unlike role and influence, sources of assistance did not have the fifth category of Mixed. By reading the young women’s responses, it could be determined who provided the young women with the greatest source of assistance in decisions. The following is an example of how decision style influence was coded:

Immigrant #6 named three people who influenced her in her “General Personal” decisions: boyfriend, parents, and research supervisor. When asked to describe the influence she received from each, she stated the following:

Regarding her boyfriend (Shared-Protective influence)

“...he does influence me...since we decide to be together...when we make personal decisions we do have to consider each other's opinion...”

Regarding her parents (Autonomous-Protective influence)

“...I don’t usually consult my parents...they would express their opinions...I think it does raise some questions in my head...they would not force me to do anything...”

Regarding her research supervisor (Autonomous-Protective influence)

“...when he does say something...I do value it...but I would listen to my boyfriend...”

Therefore, Immigrant #6 had a Mixed influence in her “General Personal” decisions. It is Shared-Protective with her boyfriend, and Autonomous-Protective with her parents and research supervisor.

Once decision style was coded, underlying themes were coded next. Underlying themes were identified in the coded sections of decision style and in responses to other interview guide
questions. Underlying themes emerged from the data on their own. Their codes were also written in the margin beside the responses. Codes that emerged included: thoughts and opinions, changes, disagreements, and impact of the presence or absence of parents (for details see Results).

It should be noted that a second reader was included to ensure that the researcher coded consistently. A code book was created by the researcher to train the second reader. The code book provided numerous examples on coding decision style and underlying themes. To ensure that the second reader understood the coding process, an interview, separate from the others she was to code, was coded for practice. Silverman (1993) suggested having inter-rater reliability or a ratio of agreement to disagreement in coding between the researcher and second reader. Instead, the researcher used Cohen’s kappa because it corrected the percent agreement for chance and normalized the value so the coefficient ranged between -1 to +1 (Norusis, 1996). The practice session yielded a Cohen’s kappa of 0.97. The second reader then coded 50% of all interviews (5/10) and approximately 33% of all segments per interview (48/129). Subsequent coding of the five interviews resulted in a Cohen’s kappa of 0.95.

Sorting involved dividing up the transcript into folders and sub-folders. Each participant had a set of five folders created for her: “General Personal” decisions, “General Family” decisions, “Selection of Social Relationships”, “Responsibilities Over Siblings”, “Family Crisis/Emergency”, and underlying themes. Each folder represented one of the five decisions. Within each folder were two sub-folders: decision style and underlying themes. This folder system kept all of the coded data together and nicely separated decision style codes from underlying codes.

Local integration organized and summarized each folder. Two summaries were written
for every folder, one for decision style and another for underlying themes. This resulted in each participant having a total of 10 summaries (2 summaries x 5 folders). For each participant, trends and patterns were identified within personal (“General Personal” and “Selection of Social Relationships”) and family (“General Family”, “Responsibilities Over Siblings”, and Crisis/Emergency) decisions and underlying themes. In addition, data from the screening documents were compiled into tables and summaries. This allowed the researcher to obtain a description of the sample. Further, it assisted the researcher in identifying patterns and trends across all participants and by the study’s three independent variables: type of decision (personal and family), family type (astronaut and immigrant), and ethnic identity (Canadian, Hong Kong Chinese, and Mixed).

Inclusive integration concluded the data analysis. This organized all of the folders together, and noted key trends and patterns by the study’s underlying themes and the study’s three independent variables: type of decision (personal and family), family type (astronaut and immigrant), and ethnic identity (Canadian, Hong Kong Chinese, and Mixed) on decision style. The creation of additional summaries and tables based on the independent variables assisted the researcher in identifying patterns in the data.

Following data analysis, the young women received a copy of their transcript and a summary of the preliminary findings. All were asked to review the information as soon as possible, and were contacted by the researcher via phone within ten days. The phone allowed each respondent to discuss the information. This final step of validation ensured that a truthful depiction of each subject was presented.

Validity and Reliability

As with all research, validity needs to be addressed. There are two types of validity:
internal and external. Internal validity refers to whether the measures are measuring or explaining what they claim or purport (Mason, 1996). In this study, internal validity was enhanced by pre-testing the screening document and interview guide. Further, validation of the transcripts helped alleviate misrepresentations of what the participants had said. External validity refers to the generalizability of the study's findings. Exploratory qualitative research often has a small sample size and consequently the results cannot be generalized to the population at large. However, the goal of qualitative research is not to generalize findings, but rather form a unique interpretation of events (Creswell, 1994).

Reliability was also addressed in this study. Reliability is the ability for a study to be replicated (Creswell, 1994). The researcher ensured that a detailed description of sample selection, interview procedure, and analysis were written so this study can be replicated in the future. In addition, a second reader was included in the study and Cohen’s kappa (0.95) was calculated.
CHAPTER 4
FINDINGS

The following chapter will note the findings of this study. It will begin by reviewing the demographic information collected by the screening document. Next, the decision style of the young women will be presented in relation to the study’s three independent variables: type of decision, family type, and ethnic identity. Additional findings on underlying themes identified during data analysis will also be included.

Screening Document

Information about the participants and their families is presented in Table 3. Of the ten participants, six were immigrants and four were astronauts. The average participant was 21.8 years old. Almost all were the eldest child in their family; only one was a middle child. On average, the young women had lived in Canada for 5.5 years, with astronauts having lived here slightly longer. Only four worked part-time during the school year, with this pattern somewhat more prevalent amongst immigrants.

All immigrants (N=6) lived with both parents. Amongst the astronauts (N=4), three lived with their mothers (although one lived with her mother part-time) and one lived without her parents. Five participants had one sibling, and the other five had two siblings. Immigrants had a tendency to have one sibling, while astronauts more often had two siblings. Only four participants, mainly immigrants, had relatives nearby.

As for parents, only two mothers and three fathers had a post-secondary education; interestingly, all were immigrants. Wives were predominantly homemakers, while only three-immigrant fathers were retired. Few noted that their family’s income was higher than the average Canadian or Hong Kong income. All were Canadian citizens or had Permanent Resident Status.
Table 3

Descriptive Characteristics of the Astronauts (N=4), Immigrants (N=6), and their Families

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Immigrant</th>
<th>Astronaut</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Living arrangements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lives with 2 parents</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lives with mother only</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lives with mother part-time</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lives without both parents</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Siblings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatives living nearby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's level of education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary or less</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-secondary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's Employment Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's level of education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary or less</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-secondary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's occupation/ or Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First language Cantonese</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average years of English schooling before Canada</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average years been able to speak English fluently</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother can speak English as well as young women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father can speak English as well as young women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary language with parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantonese and other</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary language with siblings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantonese and other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In terms of language abilities, all participants reported Cantonese as their first language. Although they had studied English for an average of 16 years, the astronauts reported being fluent somewhat longer than the immigrants (5.9 years versus 4.4 years). The majority were fluent in English using only Cantonese to communicate with their parents and siblings. With friends, the young women used Cantonese and other languages (e.g., English, Mandarin).

Astronauts have cared for their siblings for about 4.2 years. Although mothers visited less frequently than fathers, they stayed for longer periods of time (3 to 9 months). Fathers visited more frequently than mothers, but stayed for shorter periods of time (2 weeks to 2 months). The most common forms of communication were telephone and e-mail, with faxes and letters used infrequently.

Ishiyama’s Ethnic Identity Measure (1998) was used to assess ethnic identity (for details, see Screening Document in Appendix B). The measure consists of four nine-point Likert scales: Asian Identity (one item), Canadian Identity (one item), how Asian was one’s childhood social environment (one item), and Preferences (nine items). Preferences examined both internal and external ethnic identity items (arts & music, language, food, traditional events & celebrations, local community to belong to, manners/customs, values, friends, and counsellors/advisors). Scores at the extremes (1 to 3 and 7 to 9) represent a preference for either Canadian or Asian (Hong Kong Chinese in this particular study) identities, while mid-range scores (4 to 6) represent
Mixed or Ambivalent identities.

Ishiyama’s Ethnic Identity Measure (1998) has been tested on university students (N=295) at the University of British Columbia. Reliability for the scale on Preferences was calculated using an alpha coefficient. The nine items had a coefficient of 0.86. This indicates that there is a high level of internal consistency amongst the nine items. To ensure that the Preferences scale and the three single item scales (Asian Identity, Canadian Identity, and Asian childhood social environment) fit together as a composite score, correlations were calculated to determine construct validity. Correlations were as follows: a) Asian Identity, r = 0.63; b) Canadian Identity, r = -0.42; and c) Asian childhood social environment, r = 0.46 (Ishiyama, 1997). Correlations were also calculated between Ishiyama’s Ethnic Identity Measure (1998) and an established measure called the Suinn-Lew Self-Identity Acculturation Scale (Suinn, Rickard-Figueroa, Lew, & Vigil, 1987) to determine criterion related validity. Moderately high correlations (Asian Identity, r = 0.67; Canadian Identity, r = 0.63; Asian childhood social environment, r = -0.61; and Preferences, r = -0.61) with Suinn-Lew’s total scale score were found (Ishiyama, 1997).

In order to classify ethnic identity, scores from the Hong Kong Chinese Identity and the Canadian Identity scales of Ishiyama’s Ethnic Identity Measure (1998) were applied to Ishiyama’s Bi-cultural Attitudinal Grid (1992, revised 1996). This model is based on a three by three matrix which highlights three attitudes towards the young women’s host (e.g., Canada) and home (e.g., Hong Kong) cultures: positive, ambivalent or mixed, and negative (for details, see Figure 1). Based on the young women’s attitudes towards their host and home cultures, they can be placed into one of nine possible ethnic identities. Within the nine ethnic identities, five are ambivalent or mixed and fall along the middle row and column of the matrix. In essence, the model is similar to Berry’s (1988) model of acculturation (a two dimensional, orthogonal model),
in which he described four levels of acculturation: Assimilation (one rejects one's ethnic culture and wants to adopt the host culture), Integration (one embraces both one's ethnic culture and the host culture), Separation (one rejects the host culture, and remains grounded in one's ethnic culture), and Marginalization (one rejects both the host culture and one's ethnic culture).

However, Ishiyama’s Bi-cultural Attitudinal Grid (1992, revised 1996) differs from Berry’s (1988) model because it is a more complex measure. For example, Ishiyama’s Bi-cultural Attitudinal Grid (1992, revised 1996) acknowledges that Hong Kong Chinese identity and Canadian identity are two independent dimensions, and that many mixed or ambivalent ethnic identities can exist.

Results from Ishiyama’s Ethnic Identity Measure (1998) showed that there was a range in scores for Hong Kong Chinese Identity (44% to 89%), Canadian Identity (22% to 78%), Cultural Preferences (35% to 69%), and Childhood Social Environment (56% to 100%). Overall, participants had a Mixed status of High Hong Kong Chinese and Mixed Canadian Identity. Cultural Preferences were also Mixed (58%). With Berry’s (1988) categories of acculturation (Assimilation, Integration, Separation, or Marginalization), Integration was most prevalent; hence, parents and young women believed it was important to maintain one’s cultural and ethnic identity and to interact with other ethnic groups.
Figure 1. Ishiyama’s Bi-cultural Attitudinal Grid (1992, revised 1996). Positive and negative scores are in the corners, while the Mixed or ambivalent scores are in the horizontal and vertical centre of the chart.

Bi-cultural Attitudinal Grid
(Ishiyama, 1992, revised 1996)
Type of Decision: Personal and Family

Decision style consists of three elements: role, influence, and sources of assistance. The purpose of this section is to highlight the trends across all 10 participants in personal and family decisions. This study has two personal decisions: “General Personal” decisions and “Selection of Social Relationships”, and three family decisions: “General Family” decisions, “Responsibilities Over Siblings”, and “Family Crisis/Emergency” (for a detailed summary, see Table 4). Quotes have been included in this section to help illustrate the decision styles.

Role in Personal Decisions

With “General Personal” decisions, all of the young women perceive that they made and carried out such decisions on their own, with parents/others only intervening if they thought it was necessary (Autonomous-Protective). For example, Immigrant #1 stated:

“Okay for personal...like whatever I want to do they [parents] let me to do. But I have my, my own mind. I won’t do something wrong. I, I already got decision here in my mind and, um, like I have total control of myself. They don’t say No, you can’t do it. They just, if you want to do it, if you think it right, go ahead.”

Similarly, Astronaut #3 added:

“...usually discuss with my friends actually,...mainly I control it...Hmm, my dad will not and my mom, my mom, um, sometimes if I encounter a big thing, like I will tell my mom about it, but usually she’ll ask me to make some, make my own decision, yeah.”

This same pattern of autonomy existed with the role of nine young women in the “Selection of Social Relationships” (Autonomous-Protective). For example, Immigrant #3 noted:

“...I usually choose my own friends because my parents...they trust me and they think that I'm mature enough to know, um, who's good and who's bad...but for boyfriends, um, I usually, I make, I make my own decision but, um, when I bring him back to, to my, to my house to see my family, um, my parents would, would be very kind to them but...they don't want me to think that a boyfriend is gonna be a future husband, or something.”
Astronaut #1 added:

“Yeah, I make and carry out such decisions...maybe my mom will talk to him [father] about the friends. Uh, or sometimes when we talk on the phone or when he comes over we'll bring our friends home. So he'll know some of our friends too or some of my closest friends also.”

Table 4

Type of Decision: Personal versus Family (N=10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Personal Decisions</th>
<th>Family Decisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-D</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-P</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-P</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-I</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-D</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-P</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-P</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources of Asst.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-D</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-P</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-P</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-I</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only one of the participants shared in making and carrying out relationship decisions (Shared-Protective) with her parents. Immigrant #5 explained:

“Initially, yeah, I select them. Yeah, and how we get, get closer...they [parents] interfere...They screen them like by personality...how their grades are (laughter)...they worry that, um, my friends would put, um, bad influence on me...sometimes I’m not happy because I don’t think they [friends] can influence me...Cause I already knew their, their problems or whatever.”

Her parents often intervened because they felt it was necessary. In fact, her parents have tried to restrict the development of her social relationships:
"...like for this summer—I, haven't been out, out with friends much...cause she [mom] doesn't want me to go out...they're immigrants you know...they [parents] have no jobs here...they're just housewife and house, house husbands (laughter)...I think they are bored but, but I have social life. They don't want me to go out. I have to stay home. I don't want to.”

Immigrant #5 is deeply affected by the control her parents try to impose on this aspect of her life. It has forced her to secretly go against her parents’ wishes:

"Emotionally it affects a lot. Like when they...talk about it again and again, again...The only way you can stop it is just to do the way they want it, then they will stop whining and stuff. So, that’s why I did it (laughter)...I have to, yeah, surrender...Or, I’ll have to do it like secretly.”

Role in Family Decisions

In contrast to personal decisions, the young women perceived their parents as the one’s who made and carried out “General Family” decisions. Seven of the young women commented that their parents alone made the “General Family” decisions (Unilateral-Dependent). Often the young women were relegated to only “carrying out” decisions. For example, Immigrant #3 noted that:

"...they always ask me and my siblings to sit around dining table and say, ‘Hey, we're gonna do this. What do you think about this?’...Uh, we, put opinions but, um, if we really think that it's a good decision then we'll ask our parents to res(pect), reconsider our suggestion but they are the one who make the final decision.”

Similarly, Astronaut #4 added:

"...sometimes my mom will ask me...my opinion. And my dad will ask me about that but, but the final decision it's made by them...sometimes they take my opinion but sometimes they don't.”

Three participants reported having a Shared-Protective role which allowed them to share in making and carrying out “General Family” decisions, with frequent intervention from parents/others. For example, Immigrant #1 stated:

"We work as a group...my parents they won’t say...you must do it, or we must do this. He will say ‘Do you think it’s better if we do it like this way?’"
Astronaut #1 added:

"...I guess with family decisions like, um buying a house or buying a car--big items, but I do more like helping and small things that kind of thing--particularly when my parents are not here. I need to like buy certain items, like household items and I have to make up my own mind on things like that."

The first specific family decision explored in this study was the decision related to "Responsibilities Over Siblings". Interestingly, the role of the young women in "Responsibilities Over Siblings" decisions better resembled personal decisions than "General Family" decisions. There was a pattern towards role independence for the participants when it came to deciding "Responsibilities Over Siblings". Half of the participants had an Autonomous-Independent role, which indicated that the young women made and carried out these decisions completely on their own. Parents/others were not concerned with decision outcomes. For example, Immigrant #4 cited:

"Yep, I made that decision...I decided on my own that I would just do the drawing for him [brother]."

Immigrant #5 recalled:

"Yeah, I decided to clean and give advice."

Three participants perceived themselves as having a lot of independence in determining "Responsibilities Over Siblings" decisions. They were responsible for the majority of these decisions on their own (Autonomous-Protective), with little parental/other intervention. For example, Immigrant #3 explained:

"...my parents will be the one who decide when and what I should do for my sisters. But I'll be the one who tell them whether I can do it because if I have something...they'll find another alternative. They'll say, maybe we'll ask aunty to pick up my sister instead of asking me. They won't say, uh, 'Hey, XXX, you can't go to that party because you have to pick up your sister.'"

Astronaut #3 added:
"...sometimes my dad will ask me to do something because my mom complained, but that's not very often..."

Only two participants shared "Responsibilities Over Siblings" decisions with their parents. Often, parents/others intervened because they thought it was necessary (Shared-Protective). For example, Astronaut #3 shared the role with her mother and the Bible. She commented about her mother:

"Well half/half...my mom ask me do that also but some, some of the things my mom would not ask me to do...I just do it....especially for the school, she, because she doesn't speak English that, that well so I have to do, talk to the counsellor, talk to the principal, talk to the teacher, go to the teacher conference, yeah...Maybe not translating, maybe I'll just go as a parent..."

With regards to the Bible, Astronaut #3 added:

"Yeah, um, I will listen to the Bible and try to do what they ask me to do, yeah. They help make it but not carry it out because I have to carry it out".

Astronaut #4 stated:

"Uh huh. We both, we decided together...my mom, and me...like we share, 50/50...Sometimes, sometimes they say I have to do it...And sometimes, I know, I know they expect you to do when they didn't say it, but I, I, I will sometimes do it automatically.”

The second specific family decision explored in this study was "Family Crisis/Emergency". The role pattern of "Family Crisis/Emergency" decisions fell in between "General Family" and "Responsibilities Over Siblings" decisions. While "General Family" decisions leaned more towards parental control only, "Family Crisis/Emergency" decisions consisted more of role sharing between the young women and their parents/others. Five participants shared the role in a "Family Crisis/Emergency" decisions, with parents/others intervening because they felt that it was necessary (Shared-Protective). For example, although Immigrant #3's parents made the initial decision to leave and care for the grandfather, Immigrant #3 was left in charge of "Responsibilities Over Siblings" decisions. She described:
“...my father just like booked, um, flight ticket in the morning and then they left at night...both my parents went back so, um, they just left me with two of my sisters...I have to drive them home, drive them school, um, they have to learn piano, uh, math, ballet, swimming (laugh)...Yeah, so, um, it, it was kinda, it was kinda hard for me because...Grade 12 it's, it's real important...I was the one who made all the decision because, um, two of my sisters are younger than me and my parents are not home...”

Similarly, Astronaut #1 encouraged her mother to return to Hong Kong to care for her injured father:

“I told my mom to go back. Even my, actually my mom, uh, in those kind of situations she listen to me. She's, she's afraid that we, she kind of refuse to leave us alone here. But then it's no choice for her. And I was, I think at that time we were still in school, uh, so we cannot go back with her. So she's the only available person to go back...”

Four participants noted that it was the parents/others who made the “Family Crisis/Emergency” decisions (Unilateral-Dependent), although the young women were sometimes asked to help carry decisions out. For example, Immigrant #4, her father, and her uncle (mother’s brother) advised her mother to get the surgery to stop her dizzy spells. Although they gave advice, the decision was ultimately her mother’s:

“Well, me and my dad gave advice, but my mom made the decision by herself...she know someone who can do the, what’s that called, uh what’s that called, acupuncture?...she’s fine right now.”

Similarly, Immigrant #6 had little say in the decisions related to the death of her grandmother:

“Um, that, that was at Christmas time and I was actually not home. I was in Ottawa with my boyfriend and his family...it was only my parents who, who flew back. Um, me and my brother and my sister did not go and, um, there was not even a question to whether we should be going because we have to go to school.”

Only one participant reported an Autonomous-Protective role in her “Family Crisis/Emergency” decisions, which allowed her to make and carry out a lot of the decisions on her own, with little parental/other intervention. For example, Immigrant #1 explained:

“The knife is about this long and pointing at me...the money drawer...He took the whole thing...No one see anything or no one call police, or no one, everyone seems blind—they don’t see...but the guy got into a taxi...I remember the plates number of the taxi so I go in,
I went back to the store...dial 911...by that time my mom came, came out from the washroom, said, ‘What’s going on?’ And I said, ‘Just got robbed.’ And my mom said, ‘Ah,’ and then ask me if I’m, I got hurt. I said, ‘No, I didn’t.’ And I, I went outside to pick up the coins, there’s, there’s some coins but many people pick them and walk away...about 10 minutes later my father came back from...restaurant...We didn't lose a lot of money but, but after that we learned a lesson -- never put too much money in the drawer.”

Following the robbery, her father had a more prominent role in dealing with the situation. She commented:

“Afterwards--uh, yeah, he came with some idea how to, actually how to protect yourself...after that, that robber, robbery, uh, he, he actually he called the insurance company, not me, cau(se), cause, um, insurance company already got the record from police so they don't need me to talk about it again...He didn't talk with my sister and brother, maybe because I am in that place so he said, ‘Oh, maybe we should change the counter too.’”

Influence in Personal Decisions

With “General Personal” decisions, most of the young women had independent influence in such decisions. Six of the participants noted having a lot of influence in such decisions, with parents/others only intervening if they thought it was necessary (Autonomous-Protective).

According to Immigrant #3, she commented:

“Uh, well once again, personal I’m the one who make the decision but...before I make a decision, like a major decision, I’ll always ask my parents’ suggestions...usually their personal influence is very helpful...what they usually say is, ‘Okay, XXX, this is my suggestion, but...you should do whatever you think is right...’”

Astronaut #2 added:

“I make the decision by myself. Well sometimes I listen to my friends...Um, if I tell them [parents] they may give me some advice...But I would think about it.”

Three of the young women had a Mixed approach in their personal decisions. Interestingly, despite the Mixed status of these three participants, all had an Autonomous-Protective influence as a part of their Mixed status. For example, with her parents, Immigrant #2 had a Shared-Protective influence, but an Autonomous-Protective influence with her boyfriend
and friends. Immigrant #2 commented about sharing the influence with parents who intervened often in decisions:

“Well in the personal decision, in, in, in the case of they would give me advice I would say the influence 50/50--cause I really need their advice.”

In contrast, with friends and boyfriends, she wielded most of the influence, with little intervention from them:

“If, it is academic, then I will say that I make the decision and their advice, I'll just listen to it but I don't pay a lot of attention to it.”

Immigrant #6 had the same pattern except it was reversed. With regards to her boyfriend, she shared personal influence with him, allowing him to intervene often because he thought it was necessary (Shared-Protective). She cited:

“He, I believe he is a very intelligent person so...I do value it and ... I do think about it a lot...”

In comparison, she described having a greater influence relative to her parents and research supervisor in “General Personal” decisions. Neither source of assistance intervened often (Autonomous-Protective). For example, Immigrant #6 recalled about her parents:

“Yes, I do think about it...Um, I think it does raise some questions in my head...they [parents] would not force me to do anything but they would give opinions...would always raise some question in my head...”

And with her research supervisor, she stated:

“...He [research supervisor] is a very intelligent person so I trust his opinions...Um, he does give comments on my relationship with my boyfriend...Um, I found them negative (laughter)...at the end I, well I considered his opinion but, um, no I did not listen to him.”

Only Astronaut #3 noted having a Mixed influence of Unilateral-Dependent and Autonomous-Protective in her “General Personal” decisions. Relative to Astronaut #3, her boyfriend and church community wielded all of the influence in her “General Personal” decisions, while she was relegated to the role of carrying decisions out (Unilateral-Dependent):
“[church community] Yeah, a pretty big influence. Yeah, about like 80/90%...Well he [boyfriend] has a like 70 to 80%.”

In contrast, her parents and friends only intervened if they thought it was necessary. This allowed her to wield a lot of influence in decisions (Autonomous-Protective):

“...has an effect but not a quite strong effect...at least I listen and may consider...Yeah, may not always cause I think they [parents] might not really understand what I'm doing. For example, my school they may not understand that...but for other stuff I cannot like get the, yeah, I cannot get advice from my friends because they may not experience that before...”

Finally, only one of the participants perceived herself as having wielded all of the influence in her personal decisions. Parents/others were not concerned about her decision outcomes (Autonomous-Independent). Immigrant #1 stated:

“Okay, for personal I think I would give myself 80% that I can decide; and um, the rest 20% I usually like listen to my friends or family. Um, I, but mostly I, I listen to myself more. And I'm quite confident over myself. I, I, I think, usually my decisions are right so, so I usually take, take more account of myself.”

The specific personal decision of “Selection of Social Relationships” had a somewhat stronger pattern of independent influence. In fact, seven had an Autonomous-Protective influence, which allowed the young women to have a lot of influence and little intervention from parents/others in relationship decisions (Autonomous-Protective). For example, according to Immigrant #3:

“...for friends they don't really have any opinion, but for boyfriends...they say, 'Hey, XXX, I think here's a very difficult person...you have to be smart more in front of him in order not to be cheated by him...Or,...they always, uh, remind me not to, not to change my personality because of my boyfriend...”

Astronaut #2 commented:

“Um, no my parents aren't involved with this...No my friends don't pick my friends for me. They just give me advice.”

Another two participants perceived that they had complete influence in relationship
decisions, with no intervention from parents/others (Autonomous-Independent). For example, Immigrant #1 cited that her parents “don’t influence”, and her friends influence her “very little”. Astronaut #4 added:

“They [parents] don’t do anything...Hmm, my friends don’t have a role in personal decisions...usually it was my own decision...”

Only one of the participants had a Shared-Protective influence in her “Selection of Social Relationships” decisions. This allowed her to share the influence in such decisions, with frequent parental intervention. She stated:

“I select my friends and boyfriends. I select them and then they [parents] scream (laughter). That’s why I don’t like to bring my friends home...they have always thought that, um, being a student should not, uh, go out dating. Um, they start to get, um, loose with that’s when I get to second year...I think,...they would like it better if my boyfriend is smarter than me.”

Influence in Family Decisions

Amongst “General Family” decisions, a lot of parental influence was evident. There was no evidence that the young women wielded the influence independently on their own relative to all of their sources of assistance. Half of the young women cited their parents/others as the ones who wielded all the influence in family decisions (Unilateral-Dependent). For example, Immigrant #6 noted that “…my father does think that I, I’m an intelligent person so he does take my opinion seriously…”; however, if he has his own ideas “…he’ll go his own way...”. Similarly, Immigrant #5 added:

“…family decisions, it’s mainly my parents. I don’t have as much influence as them...my parents have greater influence than me.”

Another four participants noted sharing “General Family” influence, with parents/others intervening often because they felt it was necessary (Shared-Protective). For example, Immigrant #1 explained:
“For family decisions, I think, um, my parents are really liberal. They, they listen to every kid, no matter you are the eldest or the youngest.”

Astronaut #2 agreed and added:

“She [mother] always listens to them [Astronaut #2's opinions]. Well sometimes we have different ideas but we discuss it.”

Only one of the participants had a Mixed style of influence in her “General Family” decisions. Astronaut #1 had a Shared-Protective and Autonomous-Independent influence in “General Family” decisions. She shared the influence in “General Family” decisions with her parents. She and her parents participated in an open discussion together (Shared-Protective). She stated:

“Uh, yeah. We’ll bring it to the table.”

However, Astronaut #1’s influence was Autonomous-Independent with her siblings. This meant that relative to her siblings, she wielded the influence in “General Family” decisions. In her situation, her siblings only influenced where the family would eat for dinner. She felt that:

“Sometimes they’re [siblings] no good to me...It’s kind of pressure on them when–make up their mind, yeah...sometimes they help carry out.”

The first specific family decision explored in this study was “Responsibilities Over Siblings”. Interestingly, the influence in “Responsibilities Over Siblings” decisions better resembled both personal decisions than “General Family” decisions. There was a pattern towards independent influence when it came to deciding “Responsibilities Over Siblings” decisions. Half of the participants wielded all of the influence in deciding “Responsibilities Over Siblings” decisions (Autonomous-Independent). Parental/other intervention did not occur. For example, Immigrant #5 explained:

“It’s, uh, I think I decide myself, so for me it’s pretty high.”

Immigrant #6 agreed:
“Yes, that’s all my in(fluence), influence on my own. Nobody else...It’s, uh, mainly my responsibility.”

Another three participants wielded a lot of influence in “Responsibilities Over Siblings” decisions, which allowed little parental/other intervention (Autonomous-Protective). For example, Immigrant #3 cited:

“Uh, when it comes to a family thing then my parents will basically be the main people to decide what I should do but I'll be the one who tell them whether I can do it or not. If I can't do it then they don't force me to.”

Astronaut #1 added:

“It was pretty high...what they [parents] thought it's, um, um, if possible we should share the work. Um, that's what most of the time they wanted us to do...but sometimes it's just, uh, the time and the work load...and then I'll try my best to like handle the household stuff.”

Only two participants perceived themselves as having a Shared-Protective influence in deciding “Responsibilities Over Siblings” decisions. This indicated that these women shared the influence with parents/others in such decisions, and allowed parents/others to intervene often because they thought it was necessary. Astronaut #3 and #4 maintained a Shared-Protective influence. Astronaut #3 commented that she shared “about 50/50 influence” with her mother and the Bible. Astronaut #4 stated that with her parents “we share together”.

The second specific family decision explored in this study was “Family Crisis/Emergency” decisions. The influence pattern of “Family Crisis/Emergency” decisions fell between “General Family” decisions and “Responsibilities Over Siblings”. While “General Family” decisions leaned more towards parental influence, there was a greater tendency towards influence sharing between the young women and their parents/others in “Family Crisis/Emergency” decisions. Six perceived themselves as having shared the influence in such decisions, with parents/others having intervened often (Shared-Protective). For example, with
Immigrant #3’s situation, although her parents made the initial decision to return to care for her dying grandfather, she shared the task of making and carrying out decisions regarding her siblings while her parents were away. She stated:

“I was the one who make all the daily decision...when they were gone...whether YYY should stop taking piano lessons because I can’t handle it, then I'll phone them and say, um, should I do this and should I do that. Um, I did the daily decisions because I had to...”

Similarly, Astronaut #2 informed her mother about her sister’s excessive weight loss:

“Yeah, they listened to me a lot. My influence was strong. Because my mom didn’t aware. But I, I aware so I told my mom. My mom thought some things, and I would give her advice too. It was like 50/50.”

Another four participants reported having a *Unilateral-Dependent* influence in decisions related to “Family Crisis/Emergency” decisions, indicating that the parents/others of the young women were the ones who made such decisions. For example, Immigrant #4’s mother was faced with surgery. Although she received advice from others, ultimately she wielded the greatest influence in her decisions. For Immigrant #5 and Immigrant #6, both had no say in the decision related to the funerals of their grandparents. They just did as their parents instructed them. Their parents had all of the influence in such decisions.

**Sources of Assistance in Personal Decisions**

Young women turned to both parents and others for assistance in “General Personal” decisions. Half of the participants turned mainly to parents (*Shared-Protective*), with the rest having turned mainly to others (*Autonomous-Protective*).

The same pattern existed with the specific personal decision of the “Selection of Social Relationships”. Half of the participants turned mainly to parents (*Shared-Protective*), and three turned primarily to others (*Autonomous-Protective*). Only one was solely dependent on her parents (*Unilateral-Dependent*), while another was solely dependent on others for assistance.
Sources of Assistance in Family Decisions

Parental sources of assistance were predominant in “General Family” decisions. Most (seven) young women were solely dependent on parents (Unilateral-Dependent), and a few (three) turned mainly to their parents rather than to others for assistance (Shared-Protective).

Similarly, participants turned mainly to parents for assistance in deciding “Responsibilities Over Siblings” decisions. Six had Unilateral-Dependent assistance in which they were completely reliant on only parents, and three had Shared-Protective assistance consisting mainly of dependence on parents, but also others. Only one reported greater dependency on others than parents for assistance (Autonomous-Protective).

“Family Crisis/Emergency” decisions followed the same pattern as all family decisions. Parents were the main source of assistance for the young women. Four noted that they were dependent only on parents for assistance (Unilateral-Dependent), while four had a Shared-Protective assistance consisting mainly of dependence on parents, but also others. Only one commented that she relied more on others than her parents (Autonomous-Protective).

Research Expectations

Recall that research expectations were stated at the end of the review of literature. With regards to type of decision and decision style the following research expectations were formed:

Research Expectation 1: Young women in both forms of families will report having more independent decision styles with personal decisions, than with family based decisions.

This research expectation was supported, with the exception of “Responsibilities Over Siblings”. Roles for both personal decisions (“General Personal” and “Selection of Social
Relationships") were predominantly independent in nature (Autonomous-Protective). In contrast, roles in “General Family” and “Family Crisis/Emergency” decisions consisted of greater parental participation, either as parents only (Unilateral-Dependent) or in a sharing capacity (Shared-Protective). In contrast, only roles in “Responsibilities Over Siblings” demonstrated an independent (Autonomous-Protective or Autonomous-Independent) pattern in which most of the young women made these decisions on their own.

Influence for “General Personal” and Selection of Social Relationship decisions was independent (Autonomous-Protective or Autonomous-Independent) in nature. “General Family” and “Family Crisis/Emergency” decisions had an influence pattern consisting of parental participation either as parents only (Unilateral-Dependent) or in a sharing capacity (Shared-Protective). Only influence in “Responsibilities Over Siblings” resembled the independent pattern of personal decisions (Autonomous-Protective or Autonomous-Independent).

**Research Expectation 2:** Young women in both forms of families will report having a wider range of sources of assistance for personal decisions, and more family based sources of assistance for family decisions.

This research expectation was supported. Both “General Personal” and Selection of Social Relationship decisions had the young women turning primarily to parents, but also others (Shared-Protective) or primarily to others (Autonomous-Protective) for assistance. “General Family”, “Responsibilities Over Siblings”, and “Family Crisis/Emergency” decisions consisted mainly of parental sources of assistance, either as parents only (Unilateral-Dependent) or mainly parents, but also others (Shared-Protective).

**Type of Family: Astronauts and Immigrants**

The following section compares the decision styles of Hong Kong astronauts and
immigrants in their personal and family decisions (for a detailed summary, see Table 5). Since living arrangements differed between the two families, it is possible that the presence or absence of parents may affect the young women's decision style. To avoid redundancy, quotations were not included in this section. Quotations can be seen in the previous section (for details see Type of Decision: Personal and Family).

Role

Consistently, the two types of young women tended to have Autonomous-Protective roles in both their “General Personal” and “Selection of Social Relationships” decisions. In comparison, family decisions displayed differences between astronauts and immigrants. “General Family” and “Family Crisis/Emergency” decisions appeared to have a pattern of immigrants more dependent on parents alone (Unilateral-Dependent) than astronauts who modelled more role sharing (Shared-Protective). Interestingly, “Responsibilities Over Siblings” decisions had immigrants tending to express greater role independence (Autonomous-Independent or Autonomous-Protective) than astronauts who had a propensity towards either sharing with parents (Shared-Protective) or independence (Autonomous-Protective).

Influence

The same trend towards independence (Autonomous-Protective or Autonomous-Independent) also existed in the influence of both personal decisions. In contrast, immigrants had an inclination towards sole dependency on parental role and influence (Unilateral-Dependent) in “General Family” and “Family Crisis/Emergency” decisions, while astronauts leaned more to shared influence (Shared-Protective) with parents. In addition, immigrants were more oriented to independent (Autonomous-Independent or Autonomous-Protective) influence than astronauts (Autonomous-Protective or Shared-Protective) in decisions about
Responsibilities Over Siblings.

Table 5

Type of Family: Astronaut (N=4) versus Immigrant (N=6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Personal Decisions</th>
<th>Selection of Social Relationships</th>
<th>Family Decisions</th>
<th>Resp. Over Siblings</th>
<th>Family Crises/Emergencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I A</td>
<td>I A</td>
<td>I A</td>
<td>I A</td>
<td>I A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-D</td>
<td>— —</td>
<td>— —</td>
<td>5 2</td>
<td>— —</td>
<td>4 —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-P</td>
<td>— —</td>
<td>1 —</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>— 2</td>
<td>1 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-P</td>
<td>6 4</td>
<td>5 4</td>
<td>— —</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>1 —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-I</td>
<td>— —</td>
<td>— —</td>
<td>— —</td>
<td>5 —</td>
<td>— —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>— —</td>
<td>— —</td>
<td>— —</td>
<td>— —</td>
<td>— —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-D</td>
<td>— —</td>
<td>— —</td>
<td>5 —</td>
<td>— —</td>
<td>4 —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-P</td>
<td>— —</td>
<td>1 —</td>
<td>1 3</td>
<td>— 2</td>
<td>2 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-P</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>4 3</td>
<td>— —</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>— —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-I</td>
<td>1 —</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>— —</td>
<td>5 —</td>
<td>— —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>2 1</td>
<td>— —</td>
<td>— —</td>
<td>— —</td>
<td>— —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources of Assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-D</td>
<td>— —</td>
<td>1 —</td>
<td>5 2</td>
<td>5 1</td>
<td>3 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-P</td>
<td>4 1</td>
<td>3 2</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-P</td>
<td>2 3</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>— —</td>
<td>— 1</td>
<td>1 —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-I</td>
<td>— —</td>
<td>1 —</td>
<td>— —</td>
<td>— —</td>
<td>— —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>— —</td>
<td>— —</td>
<td>— —</td>
<td>— —</td>
<td>— —</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources of Assistance

In comparing immigrants and astronauts, astronauts seemed to be more dependent on others (Autonomous-Protective) instead of parents in their “General Personal” and “Selection of Social Relationships” decisions. Immigrants appeared to share more (Shared-Protective) with parents in both personal decisions. Similarly in all family decisions, immigrants tended to be even more dependent on only parents (Unilateral-Dependent), while astronauts displayed a pattern of dependency on mainly parents, but also others (Shared-Protective) in their family decisions.
Research Expectations

Recall that research expectations were stated at the end of the review of literature. With regards to family type and decision style, the following research expectations were formed:

**Research Expectation 3:** *Young women in astronaut families will have a decision style that allows them to participate more in family decisions, while young women in immigrant families will be less likely to participate in family decisions.*

This research expectation was supported, with the exception of “Responsibilities Over Siblings”. Astronauts and immigrants seemed to have a pattern of independence in their role and influence in both personal decisions (*Autonomous-Protective*). However, with “General Family” and “Family Crisis/Emergency” decisions, immigrants tended to have a greater inclination towards dependency on parents (*Unilateral-Dependent*), but displayed more independence in decisions about “Responsibilities Over Siblings” (*Autonomous-Independent* or *Autonomous-Protective*).

**Research Expectation 4:** *Young women in astronaut families will be less dependent on parental sources of assistance decisions than young women in immigrant families.*

This research expectation was supported. Astronauts leaned more towards others in personal decisions (*Autonomous-Protective*), while immigrants appeared to be dependent more on parents in family decisions (*Unilateral-Dependent*).

**Ethnic Identity: Canadian, Hong Kong Chinese, and Mixed**

The following section describes how ethnic identity was classified in this study. In addition, it addresses the absence of a pattern between ethnic identity and decision style, distinctions between astronaut and immigrant scores, and the absence of a pattern between ethnic identity and age and years spent in Canada by the participants. To avoid redundancy, quotations
were not included in this section. Quotations can be seen in a previous section (see Type of Decision: Personal and Family).

The Ethnic Identity Questionnaire (Ishiyama, 1998) was incorporated into the screening document (see Appendix B) and used to measure ethnic identity in this study. The questionnaire consisted of four nine-point Likert scales: Hong Kong Chinese Identity, Canadian Identity, how Hong Kong Chinese was one’s childhood social environment, and Preferences (arts & music, language, food, traditional events & celebrations, local community to belong to, manners/customs, values, friends, and counsellors/advisors). Preferences examined both internal and external ethnic identity items. The young women’s responses to the questionnaire items of Hong Kong Chinese Identity and Canadian identity determined how their ethnic identities were classified on Ishiyama’s Bi-cultural Attitudinal Grid (1992, revised 1996).

Overall, Ishiyama’s Bi-cultural Attitudinal Grid (1992, revised 1996) consists of nine categories. Of the nine categories, four categories represent scores at the extremes and five categories represent scores that were Mixed or Ambivalent. Scores at the extremes (1 to 3 and 7 to 9) represented a preference for either Canadian or Hong Kong Chinese categories. Participants could have one of four categories: High Canadian and High Hong Kong Chinese identity (towards bi-cultural integration or host positive and home positive), High Canadian and Low Hong Kong Chinese identity (towards exclusive host culture assimilation and home culture rejection or host positive and home negative), High Hong Kong Chinese and Low Canadian identity (toward ethnocentrism and host culture rejection or home positive and host negative), or Low Canadian and Low Hong Kong Chinese identity (toward bi-cultural rejection or host negative and home negative). Scores that were mid-range (4 to 6), represent Mixed or Ambivalent categories. Participants could have one of five categories: High Hong Kong
Chinese and Mixed Canadian (home positive, host ambivalent), Mixed Hong Kong Chinese and Low Canadian (home ambivalent, host negative), Mixed Canadian and Low Hong Kong Chinese (host ambivalent, home negative), High Canadian and Mixed Hong Kong Chinese (host positive, home ambivalent), and Mixed Canadian and Mixed Hong Kong Chinese (home ambivalent, host ambivalent).

Overall, three had non-Mixed ethnic identities, while seven had Mixed ethnic identities. Amongst those who had non-Mixed ethnic identities, two had High Hong Kong Chinese and Low Canadian ethnic identities, and one had a High Hong Kong Chinese and High Canadian ethnic identity. For those who had Mixed ethnic identities, four had Mixed Hong Kong Chinese and Mixed Canadian ethnic identities, two had High Hong Kong Chinese and Mixed Canadian ethnic identities, and one had a Mixed Hong Kong Chinese and Low Canadian ethnic identities (for details, see Figure 2).

As a whole, the young women averaged a High Hong Kong Chinese Identity (72%) and also saw themselves as having a Mixed Canadian Identity (51%). They perceived Hong Kong (childhood social environment) as very Hong Kong Chinese (83%) in nature and preferred a mixture of Canadian and Hong Kong Chinese behaviours, values, and customs (58%). In other words, the young women averaged a Mixed ethnic identity of High Hong Kong Chinese identity and Mixed Canadian identity. In addition, almost all (nine) had Cultural Preferences of a Mixed Status.

No distinct patterns between ethnic identity and decision style in personal and family decisions were found, although one minor pattern emerged (for details, see Table 6). It seemed that those who had a Mixed Hong Kong Chinese Identity were slightly more dependent on parental sources of assistance than those who had a High Hong Kong Chinese Identity.
Figure 2. Ethnic identities (N=10) according to Ishiyama’s Bi-cultural Attitudinal Grid (1992, revised 1996).

Bi-cultural Attitudinal Grid
(Ishiyama, 1992, revised 1996)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOME CULTURE Attitude toward Culture, Race, or Ethnic Group of Origin</th>
<th>HOST CULTURE Attitude toward Host, Adopted, or Alien Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Toward bi-cultural rejection</td>
<td>Toward exclusive host culture assimilation and home culture rejection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toward ethnocentrism and host culture rejection</td>
<td>Toward bi-cultural integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toward exclusive host culture assimilation and home culture rejection</td>
<td>Toward bi-cultural rejection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toward bi-cultural integration</td>
<td>Toward ethnocentrism and host culture rejection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High Hong Kong Chinese Low Canadian</th>
<th>High Hong Kong Chinese Mixed Canadian</th>
<th>High Hong Kong Chinese High Canadian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>N = 2 (I = 2)</td>
<td>N = 2 (A = 1; I = 1)</td>
<td>N = 1 (A = 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambivalent</td>
<td>Mixed Hong Kong Chinese Low Canadian</td>
<td>Mixed Hong Kong Chinese Mixed Canadian</td>
<td>Mixed Hong Kong Chinese High Canadian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 1 (A = 1)</td>
<td>N = 4 (A = 1; I = 3)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Low Hong Kong Chinese Low Canadian</td>
<td>Low Hong Kong Chinese Mixed Canadian</td>
<td>Low Hong Kong Chinese High Canadian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6

**Ethnic Identity and Decision Style for the Participants (N=10)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>1-1</th>
<th>1-2</th>
<th>1-3</th>
<th>1-4</th>
<th>1-5</th>
<th>1-6</th>
<th>A-1</th>
<th>A-2</th>
<th>A-3</th>
<th>A-4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Role</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>S-P</td>
<td>U-D</td>
<td>U-D</td>
<td>U-D</td>
<td>U-D</td>
<td>U-D</td>
<td>S-P</td>
<td>U-D</td>
<td>S-P</td>
<td>U-D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crises/emergency</td>
<td>A-P</td>
<td>U-D</td>
<td>S-P</td>
<td>U-D</td>
<td>U-D</td>
<td>U-D</td>
<td>S-P</td>
<td>S-P</td>
<td>S-P</td>
<td>S-P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Influence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>A-I</td>
<td>Mix</td>
<td>A-P</td>
<td>A-P</td>
<td>A-P</td>
<td>Mix</td>
<td>A-P</td>
<td>A-P</td>
<td>Mix</td>
<td>A-P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sel. of soc. Rel.</td>
<td>A-I</td>
<td>A-P</td>
<td>A-P</td>
<td>A-P</td>
<td>S-P</td>
<td>A-P</td>
<td>Mix</td>
<td>S-P</td>
<td>S-P</td>
<td>S-P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>S-P</td>
<td>U-D</td>
<td>U-D</td>
<td>U-D</td>
<td>U-D</td>
<td>U-D</td>
<td>S-P</td>
<td>U-D</td>
<td>S-P</td>
<td>U-D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crises/emergency</td>
<td>S-P</td>
<td>U-D</td>
<td>S-P</td>
<td>U-D</td>
<td>U-D</td>
<td>U-D</td>
<td>S-P</td>
<td>S-P</td>
<td>S-P</td>
<td>S-P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sources of assistance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>S-P</td>
<td>S-P</td>
<td>S-P</td>
<td>S-P</td>
<td>S-P</td>
<td>A-P</td>
<td>A-P</td>
<td>A-P</td>
<td>A-P</td>
<td>S-P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sel. of soc. Rel.</td>
<td>A-I</td>
<td>S-P</td>
<td>S-P</td>
<td>A-P</td>
<td>U-D</td>
<td>S-P</td>
<td>S-P</td>
<td>A-P</td>
<td>A-P</td>
<td>S-P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>U-D</td>
<td>U-D</td>
<td>U-D</td>
<td>S-P</td>
<td>U-D</td>
<td>U-D</td>
<td>S-P</td>
<td>U-D</td>
<td>S-P</td>
<td>U-D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resp. over sibs.</td>
<td>U-D</td>
<td>U-D</td>
<td>S-P</td>
<td>U-D</td>
<td>U-D</td>
<td>U-D</td>
<td>S-P</td>
<td>A-P</td>
<td>S-P</td>
<td>S-P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crises/emergency</td>
<td>U-D</td>
<td>A-P</td>
<td>U-D</td>
<td>S-P</td>
<td>U-D</td>
<td>S-P</td>
<td>U-D</td>
<td>S-P</td>
<td>S-P</td>
<td>S-P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.K.C. Identity</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cdn. Identity</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.K.C. Preferences</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Soc. Env.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since no major trends between ethnic identity and decision style were found, scores from the four scales of the Ethnic Identity Questionnaire (Ishiyama, 1998) were compared by family type. Little difference was found in the Hong Kong Chinese and Canadian identities of astronauts and immigrants, although the astronauts scored slightly higher for both. There were stronger distinctions in the average scores of Preferences and childhood social environment between astronauts and immigrants. Astronauts (65%) seemed to have somewhat more Hong Kong Chinese Preferences than immigrants (54%). Immigrants (87%) saw Hong Kong as more Hong Kong Chinese in nature than astronauts (78%).

Patterns were also sought by comparing the age of the participants and the number of...
years they had lived in Canada with their scores from the questionnaire. No patterns emerged.

Research Expectations

Recall that research expectations were stated at the end of the review of literature. With regards to ethnic identity and decision style, the following research expectations were formed:

**Research Expectation 5:** Young women in both family types who have a high Canadian Identity/Preferences will report having greater participation in decisions. Young women in both forms of families who have a high Hong Kong Chinese Identity/Preferences will report having less participation in decisions.

None of the participants had a high Canadian Identity/Preferences scores, their scores fell more in the Mixed region. Even though Hong Kong Chinese Identity scores were in the high range, no consistent pattern existed between ethnic identity and decision style. Hence, this research expectation was not supported.

**Research Expectation 6:** Young women in both family types who have a high Canadian Identity/Preferences will be less dependent on family as a source of assistance than young women in both forms of families who are have a high Hong Kong Chinese Identity/Preferences.

This research expectation was not supported. Instead, with regards only to Identity, young women with a Mixed Hong Kong Chinese Identity were more dependent on parental sources of assistance than those with a High Hong Kong Chinese Identity. This pattern is in the opposite direction of the hypothesis. No consistent pattern seemed to exist between Preferences and sources of assistance though.

**Underlying Themes**

The following section will address six underlying themes across all participants and
seven underlying themes unique to astronauts. Underlying themes refer to the coding of items other than role, influence, and sources of assistance. They may consist of the young women’s observations and perceptions on: decision style, disagreements, changes, and the impact of the presence and/or absence of parent(s). Underlying themes will be divided into two types: key underlying themes and additional underlying themes. Key underlying themes are reported by the majority of participants, while additional underlying themes are reported by fewer individuals. To better illustrate these themes, participant quotations have been included in this section.

Key Underlying Themes for All Participants

Three key underlying themes were documented amongst most of the young women. First, most of the young women (eight) were satisfied with their participation and independence in all of their decisions. Many reported that they felt things were “fine”, and wanted “no changes” to be made. Even when asked about specific disagreements, most noted that the situations did not affect their future opportunities for decision making. Second, eight of the participants in “General Personal” decisions and all of the participants in “General Family” decisions experienced increased decision making since immigrating to Canada. For example, Immigrant #3 stated:

“...I’ve become more mature...my parents really don’t...worry about the decision that I’m making myself. But when I was in Hong Kong they always think ‘Are you sure that’s the right decision? Are you sure what you’re doing?’...I think I’ve grown up a lot since I came to Canada.”

Astronaut #1 added:

“...I have to deal with it [decision making] on my own more cause my, since we got the citizenship, uh...actually my mom and my dad were present in Hong Kong more...it’s not like very convenient with time in Hong Kong...if the decision is kind of urgent...I have to like make it up myself...”

Finally, seven of the young women reported that this increased decision making was due to the
fact that they were able to learn the English language and to adapt more quickly to Canadian society than their parents. Immigrant #2 described her role as an English translator for her parents:

"...since we move here, they don’t speak English that well and it’s all new to me and to them. So my, my role as a, as a older daughter, I have responsi(ble), responsibility to take care of some of the things..."

Immigrant #1 mentioned that although she felt that her father’s English was superior to hers, he preferred having her check things for him:

"...he [father] is actually better than me now, because he talk everyday, uh with customer, over the phone do the ordering, or with the salesperson that comes to the store...even in...writing, but, but now still when there’s some document has to be done, he ask me to do it. I say, ‘You better, right?’ And he say, ‘You will do it. You will do it and then I will proof read’ (laugh)."

Astronaut #3 explained that her ability to adapt more quickly contributed to her increased participation in decision making. She noted:

"I’m more in the Canadian culture...Yeah, cause I know more in that area...that’s why my parents will listen to my opinions on the area they do not know."

Additional Themes for All Participants

Three additional underlying themes were noted amongst a few of the young women. First, with regards to changes since coming to Canada, three immigrants mentioned that it was their increased knowledge and age which resulted in their greater participation in decision making. According to Immigrant #4:

"...I’m older right now...I have more life experience."

Second, regarding “Responsibilities Over Siblings”, another three immigrants cited that they were socialized by their parents to provide care for their younger siblings. For example, Immigrant #1 described:

"...when I was really small when my parents keep telling me, ‘You’re the eldest, you’re"
responsible for your sisters and brothers...one day whenever they, they need help you should go and help them, whenever they don’t know how to do the homework you should help them...”

Finally, four young women cited that their “Responsibilities Over Siblings” had decreased over time. This was due to the fact that their siblings had grown older and more self-sufficient.

Astronaut #1 mentioned:

“...I think when they were still in high school, my siblings...I did more for them...”

Key Underlying Themes for Astronaut

Three key underlying themes were found amongst all of the astronauts. First, the absence of their parent(s) increased their participation in minor family decisions. Astronaut #2 noted:

“I think I become more important to do the decisions...for the family decisions...I just make the decision by myself. If it is a minor one...”

Astronaut #4 agreed:

“...those kind of decisions that is daily decisions are made by me...when she's [mother] not here of course I will do more, more decision making and do more, much more...”

Second, the presence of parents reduced the astronauts’ participation in family decisions. For example, Astronaut #1 commented:

“...if they’re here then most of the jobs I leave it to them [parents]...And I know that like she’ll [mother] do it. More relaxing...I just, uh, don’t bother (laugh).”

Astronaut #2 stated:

“...I think it didn’t change a lot for the personal decisions. But for the family decisions I have less responsibilities to do...”

Finally, unlike the immigrant young women, the astronaut young women were expected to carry out more female household tasks for their siblings. Immigrant young women mainly drove siblings to and from school and activities and provided them with emotional support and advice. Astronaut young women had to carry out: “cleaning”, “cooking”, “doing laundry”, “assisting
siblings with homework”, and “driving siblings to and from school and activities”. Only Astronaut #1 mentioned being also responsible for family finances and Astronaut #2 noted that she also provided her sister with guidance and advice.

**Additional Themes for Astronauts**

Four additional themes were reported amongst the astronauts. First, regarding social relationships, two astronauts turned to religious sources of assistance. For example, besides her parents, Astronaut #1 sometimes turned to her church fellowship counsellor. Astronaut #3 looked more to the guidance of God and her church community (friends and elders) than to her own parents. Second, in terms of thoughts on their “Responsibilities Over Siblings”, two astronauts mentioned that it was normal for the eldest child to look after their younger siblings. Astronaut #1 commented:

“...I guess that's kind of routine for elder sisters. Because I have some friends, she is the eldest at home whether it's the boy, or well boys maybe different, but girls they handle more household stuff. Like household routine...I think that's normal.”

Astronaut #4 added:

“Well I'm thinking I have to do it because no one, if I don't do it then nobody's going to...I talk to other big sisters...they say the same thing happens...”

Third, two explained that “Responsibilities Over Siblings” decisions were stressful for them. Astronaut #1 noted that in the beginning, adjusting to her new responsibilities was difficult; however, over time she adjusted:

“At the beginning it does...I guess it’s a big change kind of...Yeah, a new school and environment, new friends and at the same time I had to handle the household–house stuff.”

Finally, with regards to “Family Crisis/Emergency” decisions, two astronaut young women mentioned that their parent who had to be hospitalized during a “Family Crisis/Emergency” tried to hide the situation from their spouse.
Astronaut #1 described how her father tried to hide his hospitalization:

“...my dad didn’t let us know...after two days he stayed in the hospital...we usually talk on the phone...my mom felt a strange feeling that how come we don’t have a call...so my mom call back Hong Kong...actually they kinda hide everything. Even my grandparents hide it.”

Similarly, Astronaut #4’s mother tried to hide her hospitalization from her father:

“...I believe it’s 7 o’clock my dad call us...then he ask, ‘Where’s mom?’...we says, ‘She’s in the washroom.’...my mom say, ‘Oh don’t tell him.’...I say, ‘Why not...call forward...the phone line to...her room.’”

In closing, key underlying themes for all participants included: satisfaction with their participation and independence in all decisions, increased participation in “General Personal” and “General Family” decisions since immigrating to Canada; and quicker adaptation to the English language and Canadian lifestyle compared to their parents. Additional underlying themes for a few participants were: the impact of increased age and knowledge on decision making since immigrating to Canada, the effect of socialization on the provision of care for younger siblings, and decreased “Responsibilities Over Siblings” across time.

Key underlying themes for the astronauts included: absence of parent(s) increased the astronaut young women’s participation in minor family decisions, presence of parent(s) reduced the astronaut young women’s participation in family decisions, and the expectation that astronaut young women would carry out more female household tasks. Additional underlying themes for a couple of astronauts were: dependency on religious sources of assistance in social relationships, the expectation by parents for elder siblings to care for younger siblings, the experience of stress in caring for siblings, and attempts by hospitalized parents to hide the situation from their spouse.
The purpose of this study was to identify, through the use of semi-structured interviews, the decision style (role, influence, and sources of assistance) patterns of young women from Hong Kong astronaut and immigrant families. Specifically, the patterns between three independent variables—type of decision (personal and family), family type (astronaut and immigrant), and ethnic identity (Hong Kong, Mixed, or Canadian identity) and decision style were sought. In addition, underlying themes (across all participants and amongst astronauts) which emerged from the interview transcripts were also identified.

**Type of Decision**

Type of decision had the strongest pattern with decision style. Autonomy in both personal decisions did exist for the young women of this study. Amongst “General Personal” and “Selection of Social Relationship” decisions, the young women seemed to have an independent role and influence (*Autonomous-Protective*). Although this study’s findings do not agree with the literature that suggests Chinese parents are controlling or authoritarian in nature (Chan 1994; Lin & Fu, 1990; Jim & Suen, 1995), the findings do agree with the literature which states that young women have decision making autonomy in personal decisions (Goldsmith, 1996; Ho, 1996; McBride-Chang & Chang, 1998; Salaff, 1976; Rosenthal & Feldman, 1990; Stewart et al., 1998). The findings could be interpreted as filial piety no longer having the stronghold it once did in parent-child relationships, or it could be that because the participants of this study are young women, they naturally have autonomy in their personal decisions.

In contrast, the role and influence in “General Family” and Crisis/Emergency decisions appeared to be controlled by parents (*Unilateral-Dependent*) or shared (*Shared-Protective*)
between the young women and their parents. This finding agrees with previous research in that parents primarily control family decisions (Chan, 1994; Lin & Fu, 1990; Jim & Suen, 1995; Salaff, 1976), although young women can participate in the family decision making process (Liprie, 1993; Salaff, 1976). This finding seems to agree with what most families do in dealing with family decisions. From another angle, this finding may also illustrate the Chinese belief in hierarchy (respect of elders) and one's place within the family. In addition, this study's finding can also be viewed as filial piety having a stronger impact in family decisions than personal decisions.

Interestingly, the role and influence of “Responsibilities Over Siblings” did not follow the same pattern as other family decisions. Instead, the young women wielded all (Autonomous-Independent) or most of (Autonomous-Protective) the role and influence. It is not completely clear as to why this particular family decision was different from the others, although four participants in this study noted that their “Responsibilities Over Siblings” decisions decreased over time because their siblings were grown up and no longer required much care. Another explanation given by two of the four young women was that since almost all of the families had at least one parent present (except Astronaut #1), it would be the parents who would be primarily responsible for “Responsibilities Over Siblings” decisions. Most of the young women were providing back up or secondary assistance to their parents.

Sources of assistance varied between personal and family decisions. Both personal decisions consisted of sources of assistance which were mainly parents (Shared-Protective) or also others (Autonomous-Protective). This seems normal because there are different types of personal questions. For some personal decisions, parents may be the better source of assistance because they can provide wisdom. For other personal decisions, friends may provide better
assistance because they have had first hand experience with the same issues the young women are going through. In contrast, all three family decisions had only parents (Unilateral-Dependent) or mainly parents and sometimes others (Shared-Protective) for sources of assistance. This seems natural because research indicates that parents are primarily responsible for family decisions (Jim & Suen, 1995; Salaff, 1976). Hence, the young women would likely name their parents as their only or main source of assistance.

**Family Type**

This second independent variable of family type also had a pattern with decision style. This section will elaborate upon the main differences in decision style of young women in astronaut and immigrant families.

No differences existed between the astronauts and immigrants in personal decisions, but there were some differences between the two groups in family decisions. For example, with role and influence in “General Family” and “Family Crisis/Emergency” decisions, only immigrant parents controlled (Unilateral-Dependent) decisions, while astronaut parents shared (Shared-Protective) decision making responsibilities with the astronaut young women. Family type may help explain this distinction. Recall that young women in immigrant families have both parents present in the household. This could explain why only their parents are responsible for “General Family” and Crisis/Emergency decisions. In contrast, young women with absent fathers may be expected to assist their mothers. In fact, amongst Hong Kong young women who lived without fathers (Salaff, 1976) and astronauts in Australia, both were allowed to participate in family decisions (Pe-Pua et al., 1996). Amongst the young women in Hong Kong, they often made minor family decisions, and assisted with more important family decisions (Salaff, 1976). With astronauts in Australia, Pe-Pua et al. (1996) noted that they either assisted with decisions (one
parent present) or were solely responsible for decisions (no parents present).

Role and influence in “Responsibilities Over Siblings” indicated that immigrants wielded the role and influence (Autonomous-Independent) in such decisions, while astronauts either shared (Shared-Protective) or wielded most of the role and influence (Autonomous-Protective). Although it is not certain why immigrants are more likely to decide their “Responsibilities Over Siblings”, it could again be because of the presence of both parents in the immigrant household. In other words, both parents can look after the children without relying on the eldest child for much help. Astronauts on the other hand were more likely expected to help their parents with younger siblings. For example, Pe-Pua et al. (1996) noted that no parents present astronauts were expected to run the household and to make decisions on their own, whereas one parent present astronauts had to provide a lot of assistance to their mothers in a multitude of areas.

As for sources of assistance, astronauts tended to turn more to others (e.g., Autonomous-Protective) for assistance in personal decisions, while immigrants tended to turn more to parents (e.g., Unilateral-Dependent) for assistance in family decisions. Again the answer could be related to family type. For example, the absence of parent(s) forces the young astronauts to look outside their family for guidance and advice in decisions. Unlike astronaut families, the immigrant family is intact and this factor could encourage better parent-child assistance patterns. In fact, young astronauts reported turning more to friends or a local Chinese church for assistance than to their parents (Pe-Pua, et al., 1996).

Ethnic Identity

Unlike the other two independent variables, ethnic identity did not yield any major trends or patterns with decision style. The following section will try to address why this was the case in this study.
Ethnic identity and decision style did not seem to have a pattern with one another, although one minor pattern emerged-- young women who had a Mixed Hong Kong Chinese identity were more dependent on parental sources of assistance than young women who had High Hong Kong Chinese identities. Initially, it was hypothesized by the researcher that those with more Hong Kong Chinese Identity/Preferences would have more parental dependent decision styles than those who displayed more Canadian Identity/Preferences. It was assumed that those who had more Hong Kong Chinese Identity/Preferences would be more traditional and obedient in nature, hence, they would have decision styles that would illustrate patterns of filial piety. In addition, it was hypothesized that young women who had a higher Canadian Identity/Preferences would be less dependent on family as sources of assistance than young women who have higher Hong Kong Chinese Identity/Preferences. It is not known for certain as to why these patterns did not show up in this study. It is possible that the sample size of this study (N=10) was too small to reveal such patterns. On the other hand, recall that the young women of this study have been in Canada for 4 to 8 years. Perhaps if they had lived in Canada for either a shorter (less than 4 years) or a longer (greater than 8 years) period of time, they would have had a non-Mixed ethnic identity and Preferences, hence, they may have leaned towards either extreme (Hong Kong Chinese or Canadian Identity/Preferences) and displayed the hypothesized decision styles. Or it could be that the young women of this study engage in “adhesive adaptation” (Huhr and K. Kim, 1984) and are able to add aspects of Canadian culture to their Hong Kong Chinese culture without losing any elements of their Asian culture. In other words, although the young women of this study have Mixed Hong Kong Chinese identities, they still maintain respect for their parents (hence, consider them a source of assistance) which is a traditional practice within Chinese culture.
Interestingly, the young women of this study had a Mixed ethnic identity of High Hong Kong Chinese and Mixed Canadian Identity. This study's findings is in contrast with previous research which found that foreign born Chinese adolescents tend to identify themselves as strictly Chinese (e.g., Lay & Verkuyten, 1999; Rosenthal & Feldman, 1992), rather than as Canadian or Chinese-Canadian. Note that having a Mixed ethnic identity is very possible because of the social context of Vancouver. Not only are there high numbers of Hong Kong Chinese in Vancouver, but many commercial and professional services which provide assistance in their mother tongue, Cantonese (Johnson, 1994), as well as, exposure to a new language and a new culture. In order to actively participate in society, one would naturally add Western aspects to their Asian identity, hence, the young women of this study would have a Mixed Canadian identity.

In addition, astronauts reported having somewhat higher Hong Kong Chinese Preferences than immigrants. This could be due to the fact that the youth in astronaut families have stronger feelings towards Hong Kong than the youth in immigrant families. In other words, knowing that their father and/or mother is in Hong Kong might make them feel closer to things which are Hong Kong Chinese in nature. Interestingly, immigrants of this study also perceived Hong Kong to be more Chinese in nature than astronauts. It could be that since Hong Kong immigrants have intact families, they see their former home as more distant or foreign to them now that they are in Canada. Astronauts may not have the same feelings because part of their family, father and/or mother is in Hong Kong.

Key Underlying Themes for All Participants

The following section will discuss the three key underlying themes found across the majority of participants. The three key themes were as follows: satisfaction with current
participation and independence in all decisions, increased participation in “General Personal” and “General Family” decisions since immigrating to Canada; and quicker adaptation to the English language and Canadian lifestyle compared to parents.

Interestingly, most of the young women were quite satisfied with their participation and independence in all of their decisions. In other words, the young women were satisfied with their current role, influence, and sources of assistance in their decision making. There were no reports of parent-child conflicts as in other studies (Hong, 1989; Chin, 1990; Mak, 1991; Baptiste, 1993; Inglis & Wu, 1994; Lam, 1994). In addition, most of the young women have also noted that since immigrating to Canada, they have had increased participation in “General Personal” and “General Family” decisions. This finding agrees with other research on astronaut (Ogilvie, 1996; Pe-Pua et al., 1996; van den Hemel, 1996b) and immigrant (Baptiste, 1993; Hong, 1989) youth. Increased participation in decisions is also related to the third major finding across all participants: quicker adaptation by the young women to the English language and Canadian lifestyle compared to their parents. Because younger immigrants adapt faster to the English language and host country than older immigrants (Baptiste, 1993; Hong, 1989), the young women would no doubt have been turned to for assistance in decisions by their parents. However, other research has shown that Hong Kong immigrants are more likely to hold a university degree (Alberta Career & Development Employment et al., 1991) and have a greater facility with the English language than most other Chinese immigrants (Lary & Luk, 1994). In this particular study, only two mothers and three fathers had a post-secondary education, and only three participants reported having one parent who could speak English as well as themselves. If more parents of the young women had higher levels of education and greater fluency with the English language, perhaps fewer young women would have reported increased
participation in "General Family" decisions post-migration because the parents would not have had to depend on their children as translators.

**Key Underlying Themes for Astronauts**

The following section will discuss the three main underlying themes found across astronauts in this study. The three main underlying themes found in this study were: absence of parent(s) increased the young women's participation in minor family decisions, presence of parents reduced the young women's participation in family decisions, and astronaut young women were responsible for more female household tasks than immigrants.

Amongst astronaut families, the young astronaut women have noted that when their parent(s) were away they participated more in minor family decisions. This finding makes sense because the young women would be the ones left in charge of the household and younger siblings. With the parent(s) gone, the young women would have to add additional responsibilities to their routine. In essence, the young women would have to become the parent (Olgilvie, 1996). This finding agrees with other research on astronaut families (Olgilvie, 1996; Pe-Pua et al., 1996; van den Hemel, 1996). Pe-Pua et al. (1996) also noted that some were able to cope with their new responsibilities, while others were not (Lam, 1994, Pe-Pua et al., 1994). In this study, two astronaut young women felt the stress, while the other two were fine with their additional responsibilities.

In a similar regard, presence of parent(s) reduced the young women's participation in family decisions. With the parent(s) in the home, they would make the family decisions. The young women would naturally have reduced responsibilities. This supports research that indicates that parents control family decisions (Jim & Suen, 1995; Liprie, 1993; Salaff, 1976), or that young astronauts in *one parent present* families assist their mothers in making decisions (Pe-
Pua et al., 1996).

Finally, the astronaut young women were expected to provide more female household tasks for siblings than immigrants. This difference could be due to household structure—intact versus not intact families. Immigrants are fortunate in that the entire family immigrates from Hong Kong to Canada as an entire unit. If the wife needs help or assistance, the husband can provide support. Unfortunately, for the astronaut families, usually one or both parents are missing from the household in Canada. In the case that there are no parents present, the young woman would have to take on parental responsibilities by herself (Olgilvie, 1996; Pe-Pua et al., 1996; van den Hemel, 1996). For those young women in one parent present astronaut families, the eldest young woman would naturally be expected to help her mother run the household. Pe-Pua et al. (1996) found that elder siblings had to provide a lot of assistance to their mothers by acting as a translator, assisting with banking and bureaucracy, doing household chores and repairs around the house, and driving family members.

Summary and Conclusions

Overall, the independent variable which had the strongest pattern with decision style was type of decision (personal and family), followed by family type (astronaut and immigrant), while ethnic identity (Canadian, Hong Kong Chinese, or Mixed identity) did not yield a pattern with decision style at all. With regards to type of decision, young women had more decision style independence in personal decisions than their family decisions, with the exception of “Responsibilities Over Siblings” decisions. Family type revealed that astronaut parents were more likely to share the decision style with their eldest daughter, while immigrant young women were more likely to decide “Responsibilities Over Siblings” decisions on their own. Key underlying themes across all participants indicated that most were satisfied with their personal
and family decisions, and noted that their quicker adaptation to Canada and the English language contributed to their increase in decision making post-migration. Key underlying themes for astronauts were related to parental absence and presence, with absence increasing their participation in minor family decisions and parental presence reducing their participation in family decisions. In addition, unlike immigrant young women the astronaut young women were responsible for more female household tasks for siblings than immigrants. Further, unlike previous research and media reports that have been “problem” focused, this study has acknowledged that some positive aspects exist for the young women who are the eldest in either family type (e.g., satisfaction with participation and independence in decisions across all participants and the existence of increased autonomy in personal and family decisions since immigrating to Canada; and the opportunity for young astronaut women to participate in minor family decisions, increasing their decision making experience beyond the realm of personal decisions).

Limitations

All research has limitations, and this study is no different. For example, there is the issue of sample size and its non-random nature. The sample of this study was a small snowball sample (N=10), therefore, it was not possible to generalize this study’s findings to the Hong Kong astronaut and immigrant population at large. Also note that there was diversity within the astronaut category in terms of absence of one or both parents. Had the astronaut participants been only of families with no parents present, it is possible that this study’s findings could have been different (immigrants would have had two parents, while astronauts with no parents present would have had zero parents). In addition, since the interviews were audio taped and transcribed, this could have made the participants feel nervous or uncomfortable and lead to a social
desirability bias in the responses given by the participants. Further, had the researcher been able to speak Cantonese, afford to hire bilingual interviewers, or offer participants monetary compensation, then perhaps participant turnout may have been higher.

However, this study does have some strengths. For example, this study is the first of its kind to note the impact of type of decision, family type, and ethnic identity on the decision style of young women who have immigrated from Hong Kong to Canada. In addition, unlike other research or media reports, this study has not focussed only on the problems these families have encountered, but has also acknowledged the positive aspects of both family types from the perspective of the eldest child in the household (e.g., satisfaction and autonomy with decisions post-migration; and expanding astronauts' decision making beyond the realm of personal decisions). Further, by employing a qualitative research method, underlying themes across all participants and those unique to astronauts were identified. This would not have been possible with a quantitative study.

Future research should continue in the area of astronaut and immigrant families, especially if the goal is not just to focus on the problems of each family type. It is the responsibility of the researchers to focus not only on the negative, but also the positive aspects that the two family types have. Ideally, future research should consist of larger samples of both astronaut and immigrant families, so that more generalizable results can be obtained. For example, more participants from the family types (immigrant, one parent present astronaut, no parents present astronaut families) may reveal more specific differences between decision style and family type. In addition, studies that consist of astronaut and immigrant families from different countries (e.g., Taiwan and the Philippines), those which have a young man as the eldest sibling, and families with younger children need to be considered. Perhaps differences in
ethnicity, gender, and age of the child in charge could affect decision style. Demographic variables of the parents should also be considered. For example, other research suggests that Hong Kong immigrants tend to be highly educated (Smart, 1994) and more proficient in English than other Chinese immigrants from other locales (Lary & Luck, 1994). However, within this study, the parents of the young women did not seem to match this description. Future research should consider comparing the different levels of education and English language proficiency of the participant’s parents to see if this has an impact on the young person’s decision style in “General Family” decisions. Future studies should also consider capturing the decision style perceptions of the parents/others and compare it to the decision style perceptions of the eldest child in the family. It would be interesting to see if their perceptions are the same or different. Further, future research should also consider longitudinal studies instead of only cross-sectional ones. It would be interesting to see if decision style remains static or changes over time, and to see what effects (if any) decision style of an eldest child has on decision style later in life.

Hopefully, these suggestions for future research will contribute to increasing the knowledge about the eldest child in charge of siblings in astronaut and immigrant families. In addition, by acknowledging that positive aspects do exist in both family types, it is hoped that future research and media reports are not just intent on focussing on the “problems”. From this study it is hoped that the voices of the eldest young women in charge of younger siblings have been heard. Ideally, this study’s findings can be used to assist and guide research exploring similar and new questions on astronaut and immigrant families. In addition, the findings from this study may provide professionals with additional background information on the young people within these two types of families.

In closing, transferring the use of the decision style model from the consumer
socialization of children to young women in Hong Kong astronaut and immigrant families did not result in any classification difficulties. In the researcher's opinion, the modifications made achieved the purposes of the study. In other words, it was possible to clearly see who possessed the role and influence in decisions, and who were sources of assistance. However, from a macro-perspective, the above mentioned concepts of decision style only represented two steps (planning and implementing) in the larger process of systems management (Deacon & Firebaugh, 1988).

The model in this study did not account for other steps in the management process such as goals, values, and resource identification; adjustment post-implementation of decisions; nor evaluation of outcomes. But if a micro-perspective (planning and implementing) is desired, then the model used in this study is sufficient. In fact, the next step could be to apply this model to quantitative research. This would be achieved by developing measures and testing it in relation to the five decision styles in the model. If successful, this would contribute not only to decision style research in Hong Kong astronaut and immigrant families, but also research on young adults within other types of families.
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APPENDIX A

FLYER, NEWSPAPER ADS, CLUB/COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION AND CLASS
APPROACH LETTERS, AND PARTICIPANT INFORMATION LETTER WITH CONSENT
FORM
September, 1998

<club/community organization>
Attention: <president/director>

Dear Sir/Madam:

I am a graduate student at UBC and the purpose of my thesis is to explore decision styles (role, influence, and sources of assistance) of young women in Hong Kong immigrant and astronaut families. Decisions in general, and specifically personal (e.g., selection of social relationships) and family decisions (responsibility over siblings and family emergencies) will be examined. The effect of acculturation, family form, and type of decision on the young women's decision making will be assessed.

My research requires a minimum of five women per family form. Participants in the study do not need to be the eldest, but are young women with at least one younger and no older siblings in the home. Families in which the parents are living mainly in Hong Kong are called astronaut families and those with parents living with them in Canada are immigrant families. In addition, participants must be between the ages of 19-25; a resident within the Greater Vancouver area; have arrived in Canada between 1990-1994; and comfortable with an interview in English.

The study consists of two parts. A short screening document will be completed prior to an interview. The interview will be audio-taped, and will take approximately one to two hours to complete. The interview will take place in the participant's home or at another location selected by the participant. The interviews will be transcribed and participants will be asked to review the transcript and a case analysis of the interview to ensure that the information has been presented accurately. Upon the completion of the study, a summary of the study's findings will be sent to those who request it.

Any information resulting from this research study will be kept strictly confidential. All documents will be identified only by code number and kept in a locked filing cabinet. Excerpts of the interview may be made part of the final report, but under no circumstances will a participant's name or identifying characteristics be included in this research report. Participants who request it will be sent a summary of the study's findings once the research is complete.
APPENDIX B

SCREENING DOCUMENT
SUBJECT ID: ___

Screening Document

Please complete the following screening document. Answers can be written beside the questions or checked off. Most questions can be answered with a "yes" or "no", unless otherwise specified.

Family composition, demographic information, time in Canada, and school/employment

1. Do your parents live with you? yes no

2. How many brothers and sisters live with you in your home in Canada (specify number of brothers and number of sisters)? brothers (ages ________) sisters (ages ________)

3. How old are you (years/months)? __ years __ months

4. How long have you lived in Canada (years/months)? __ years __ months

5. Are you the eldest, middle, or youngest child in your family? __________

6. Do you have relatives who live nearby and can give your family assistance? yes no

7. My major is __________, and I attend __________ (name school)?

8. What year of studies are you currently in at school? year __

9. Are you currently working as well as going to school? yes no

10. What is your mother's level of education? (Ask for specific grade/year)

   ____ elementary  ____ junior high school  ____ secondary school

   ____ technical school (received trades certificate or diploma)

   ____ college (received certificate, diploma, or associates degree)

   ____ university (received Bachelor Degree)

   ____ other e.g., MD, PhD (please specify) ______________________________________

11. What is your mother's occupation? Give a brief job description.

   ____________________________________________________________
12. My mother has which of the following:

____ Canadian citizenship  _____ permanent resident status  _____ visitor status

_____ none of the above

13. What is your father's level of education? (Ask for specific grade/year)

_____ elementary  _____ junior high school  _____ secondary school

_____ technical school (received trades certificate or diploma)

_____ college (received certificate, diploma, or associates degree)

_____ university (received Bachelor Degree)

_____ other e.g., MD, PhD (please specify)

14. What is your father's occupation? Give a brief job description.


15. My father has which of the following:

____ Canadian citizenship  _____ permanent resident status  _____ visitor status

_____ none of the above

16. Relative to other families in Hong Kong, how does your family's income compare to Hong Kong's average annual income ($224,000HK = $40,276.92CDN)?

_____ lower  _____ same  _____ higher

17. Relative to other families in Canada, how does your family's income compare to Canada's average annual income ($54,161CDN)?
Language abilities

18. What was your first language?

19. Before coming to Canada, how much English schooling did you receive (years/months)?
   _____years _____months

20. How long have you been able to speak English fluently (years/months)?
   _____years _____months

21. Can your parents speak English as well as you do? _____yes _____no

22. What language do you primarily use to communicate with
   -- your parents?
   -- your siblings?
   -- your friends?

Western society exposure and acculturation

23. Before immigrating to Canada, did you live in any other Western nation?
   -- If yes, where did you live?
   -- How long did you live there (years/months)? _____years _____months
   -- Between what ages were you when you lived there (years/months)?
     _____years _____months to _____years _____months
   -- While there, how much education did you receive in English (years/months)?
     _____years _____months

24. Do you consider it to be of value to maintain one's Cultural Identity and characteristics?
   _____yes _____no

25. Do you consider it to be of value to maintain relationships with larger society?
   _____yes _____no

26. Do your parents consider it of value to maintain Identity and characteristics?
   _____yes _____no

27. Do your parents consider it of value to maintain relationships with larger society?
   _____yes _____no

Please note: "Asian" refers to your specific ethnic/cultural background.

28. How strong is your Cultural Identity as Asian (e.g., Chinese, Japanese, Korean,
Vietnamese, East Indian, etc.)?

1---2---3---4---5---6---7---8---9
not at all moderately extremely strong as Asian

29. How strong is your Cultural Identity as Canadian or North American (N. Am)?

1---2---3---4---5---6---7---8---9
not at all moderately extremely strong as Canadian (N. American)

30. How Asian (e.g., Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese, East Indian, etc.) was the social environment in which you grew up for the most part of your childhood?

1---2---3---4---5---6---7---8---9
not at all Asian moderately completely Asian

31. What would your preferences be like, if you were to choose between Asian and Canadian (or North American)? "Asian" refers to your particular ethnic/cultural background. Please use the following scale:

Scale: 1---2---3---4---5---6---7---8---9
Mostly Canadian about Mostly
or N. American < 50-50 >Asian

"I prefer__________" Canadian/N. Am< >Asian (my ethnic culture)

(1) arts and music,
1---2---3---4---5---6---7---8---9

(2) language
1---2---3---4---5---6---7---8---9

(3) food
1---2---3---4---5---6---7---8---9

(4) traditional events and celebrations
1---2---3---4---5---6---7---8---9

(5) local community to belong to
1---2---3---4---5---6---7---8---9

(6) manners and customs
1---2---3---4---5---6---7---8---9

(7) values
1---2---3---4---5---6---7---8---9

(8) friends
1---2---3---4---5---6---7---8---9

(9) counsellors/advisors
1---2---3---4---5---6---7---8---9

Questions 32-35 are for young women in astronaut families ONLY:

32. How long have you been looking after your siblings in Canada (years/months)?
33. How many times on average in a year do your parents visit you and your siblings?
   --Mother? _____ times/year
   --Father? _____ times/year

34. How long do your parents stay when they visit you?
   --Mother? _____ months _____ days
   --Father? _____ months _____ days

35. How often do you have contact with your parents via:
   --phone (times/week)? _____ times/week
   --fax(times/week)? _____ times/week
   --e-mail(times/week)? _____ times/week
   --letters(times/week)? _____ times/week

Thank you for completing the screening document. The second part of this study consists of a 1-2 hour interview, that will be audio taped and transcribed. All responses will be kept anonymous and strictly confidential, and participants can withdraw from the study at any time without consequence. You will be contacted by Kimi Tanaka (Co-Investigator) to set up a date and time for an interview.
APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW GUIDE
INTERVIEW GUIDE
Instructions

- ask the participant to pick a location in which she feels comfortable sitting, but also quiet enough to allow audio-recording of the interview
- go over the consent form with the participant, answer any questions, and have the participant sign the letter
- give a brief overview of how each section of the interview will proceed and define terms

Items in regular print represent interview questions. Items in italics represent probes and follow-up questions.

Introductory Questions

PART I--General Questions on Personal and Family Decision Style

1. In general, describe what you do when faced with a) personal and b) family decisions.
   -- What role do you play in a) your personal and b) family decisions?
   -- Describe your level of influence in a) your personal and b) family decisions?
   -- In what ways would you like your participation in you’re a) personal and b) family decisions changed? Why?

2. In general, describe what your parents do when dealing with a) your personal and b) family decisions?
   -- What role do your parents play in a) your personal and b) family decisions?
   -- Describe your parents’ level of influence in a) your personal and b) family decisions?
   -- In what ways would you like your parents’ participation in you’re a) personal and b) family decisions changed?

3. In general, besides your parents who else assists you in a) your personal and b) family decisions on a regular basis (specify name and relation to yourself).
   -- Describe what _____ does when dealing with a) your personal and b) family decisions?
   -- What role does _____ play in a) your personal and b) family decisions?
   -- Describe _____’s level of influence in a) your personal and b) family decisions?
   -- In what ways would you like _____’s participation in a) your personal and b) family decisions changed? Why?

4. Compared to when you first came to Canada, how has your participation in you’re a) personal and b) family based decisions changed?
   -- What do you think has brought about these changes?
   -- In your opinion, how have these changes affected you? Why?

5. Describe an incident in which you and your parents or someone else (person named in #3) had a disagreement about a decision you made.
   -- What happened?
PART II--Personal Decisions

Selection of Social Relationships

1. Describe the ways in which you participate in selecting your friends and your boyfriends.
   --What role do you play in selecting your friends and boyfriends?
   --What is your level of influence in selecting your friends and boyfriends?
   --In your opinion, in what ways would your like your participation in selecting friends and boyfriends changed? Why?

2. Describe the ways in which your parents' participate in selecting your friends and your boyfriends.
   --What role do your parents play in selecting your friends and boyfriends?
   --What is your parents' level of influence in selecting your friends and boyfriends?
   --In what ways would you like your parents' participation changed? Why?

3. Who else participated a lot in selecting your friends and boyfriends (specify name and relations to yourself)?
   --Describe the ways in which ______ participates in selecting your friends and boyfriends?
   --What role does ______ play in selecting your friends and boyfriends?
   --What is ______'s level of influence in selecting your friends and boyfriends?
   --In what ways would you like ______'s level of assistance changed? Why?
   (If more than one person is named, repeat the follow-up questions).

4. As an adult, can you describe a time when your parents or someone else (person named in #3) did not approve of a friend or boyfriend of yours?
   --What happened?
   --Why did they not approve of ______ (specify name and relation to yourself)?
   --How did this situation affect other decisions related to friends or boyfriends?
   --How was the situation resolved?

PART III--Family Decisions

Responsibility Over Siblings

1. How would you describe the extent of your responsibilities over your siblings?
   --What do you do for them?
   --What are your thoughts on your responsibilities over your siblings? Why?

2. Describe the ways in which you participated in deciding what responsibilities you have over your siblings?
   --What role did you play in deciding your responsibilities over your siblings?
--What was your level of influence in deciding your responsibilities over your siblings?
--In what ways would you have liked your participation in the decision changed? Why?

3. Describe the ways in which your parents participated in determining your responsibilities over your siblings?
--What role did your parents play in deciding your responsibilities over your siblings?
--What was your parents' level of influence in deciding your responsibilities over your siblings?
--In what ways would you have liked your parents' participation in the decision changed? Why?

4. Who else participated a lot in the decision (specify name and relation to yourself)?
--Describe the ways in which ______ participated in the decision of your responsibilities over your siblings?
--What role did ______ play in deciding your responsibilities over your siblings?
--What was ______'s level of influence in deciding your responsibilities over your siblings?
--In what ways would you have liked ______'s participation in the decision changed? Why?
(If more than one person is named, repeat the follow-up questions).

5. Describe an incident in which you had a conflict with your parents or someone else (person named in #4) concerning the responsibilities you have over your siblings?
--What happened?
--How did the incident affect other decisions related to responsibilities over your siblings?
--How was the situation resolved?

Family Emergencies

1. Think back to the last time your family faced and had to deal with a crisis or emergency. What was the crisis? Describe how the crisis was handled.

2. Describe the ways in which you participated in any of the decisions related to the crisis or emergency?
--What role did you play in addressing the crisis or emergency?
--What was your level of influence in addressing the crisis or emergency?
--In what ways would you have liked your participation in such decisions changed? Why?

3. Describe the ways in which your parents participated in any of the decisions related to the crisis or emergency?
--What role did your parents play in addressing the crisis or emergency?
--What was your parents' level of influence in addressing the crisis or emergency?
--In what ways would you have liked your parents' participation in such decisions changed? Why?
4. Who else contributed a lot to decisions related to the crisis or emergency (specify name and relation to yourself)?
   -- Describe the ways in which _____ participated in any of the decisions related to the crisis or emergency?
   -- What role did _____ play in addressing the crisis or emergency?
   -- What was _____'s level of influence in addressing the crisis or emergency?
   -- In what ways would you have liked _____'s participation in such decisions changed? Why?
   (If more than one person is named, repeat the follow-up questions).

5. Describe an incident in which a conflict arose between you and your parents or someone else (person named in #4) regarding a decision related to the crisis or emergency.
   -- What happened?
   -- How did this situation affect other decisions related to crises or emergencies?
   -- How was the situation resolved?

The following three questions (1-3) is for young women in astronaut families ONLY:

1. How does the presence of your parents affect your decision making?

2. In general, how do you think the absence of your parents affected your role and influence in decisions?

3. Since your parents are absent, to whom do you turn to for advice on a regular basis (specify name and relation to yourself)?
   -- In general, what are your thoughts on the assistance you receive from _____ (specify name and relation to yourself)? (If more than one person is named, repeat the follow-up question).

Conclusion

1. Do you have any questions?

2. Is there anything else you would like to add to your answers?

3. Would you like to discuss anything else?

4. What did you think of the interview?

Thank you for your participation.