Order Number 9117456

Career decision-making of Thai and American college students

Bungamongkon, Nit, Ph.D.
The University of Arizona, 1990

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

CAREER DECISION-MAKING OF

THAI AND AMERICAN COLLEGE STUDENTS

by

Nit Bungamongkon

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the

DIVISION OF EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATIONS AND ADMINISTRATION

In Partial Fulfillment of The Requirements
For The Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
WITH A MAJOR IN EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

In The Graduate College

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

1 9 9 0

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
GRADUATE COLLEGE

As members of the Final Examination Committee, we certify that we have read the dissertation prepared by Nit Bungamongkon

entitled CAREER DECISION-MAKING OF THAI AND AMERICAN COLLEGE STUDENTS

and recommend that it be accepted as fulfilling the dissertation requirement for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Lawrence M. Aleamoni	Date 11/16/90
Shitala P. Mishra	Date 11/16/90
Philip J. Lauver	Date
	Date
	Date

Final approval and acceptance of this dissertation is contingent upon the candidate's submission of the final copy of the dissertation to the Graduate College.

I hereby certify that I have read this dissertation prepared under my direction and recommend that it be accepted as fulfilling the dissertation requirement.

Dissertation Director	Date 11/16/90

STATEMENT BY AUTHOR

This dissertation has been submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements for an advanced degree at the University of Arizona and is deposited in the University Library to be made available to borrowers under the rules of the Library.

Brief quotations from this dissertation are allowable without special permission, provided that accurate acknowledgment of source is made. Requests for extended quotation from or reproduction of this manuscript in whole or in part may be granted by the copyright holder.

SIGNED Nit Bungamongkon

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author expresses her gratitude and sincere appreciation to her advisor, Dr. Lawrence M. Aleamoni, for all of his advice, editorial help, and encouragement provided while she wrote her dissertation, and also extends special thanks to him for the moral support he provided throughout. She expresses her gratitude to Dr. Shitala P. Mishra for his suggestion and support. She is especially indebted to Dr. Philip J. Lauver for his advice, helpfulness and generosity in giving permission to adapt and translate the Career Choice Factor Surveys into the Thai language, for designing the statistical data analysis program, and for collecting data from the American college students.

Special thanks to Dr. Oscar C. Christensen for his encouragement. She is indebted to Dr. Betty J. Newlon, Dr. Richard L. Erickson and John Auxier for their help, and to all of the American college students who took part in this study.

Appreciation is extended to all of the faculty members at the College of Education, Khon Kaen University who were very helpful in translating back her Thai questionnaires to check the content validity. Also, special thanks to all of the faculty at the Department of Educational Psychology and the other faculty who collected data in Thailand, and to all of the Thai students who took part in the study.

The author appreciates the editorial help from Cathy Hemler, Dede Axinn, and Mina Parish.

Appreciation is due to Karen Warren and Patricia Jones for their help in using the SPSS-X statistical computer program.

A special thank you is due to Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc., for giving permission to use and translate the Career Decision Scale into the Thai language. Appreciation is extended to the Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc., for giving permission to use and translate the Bem Inventory into the Thai language.

She is indebted to the Department of Educational Psychology, the University of Arizona for offering her a Scholarship throughout all of her study program, and to the Thai Professors who encourage her and are her role models.

Finally, she is grateful to her parents for all of their love and encouragement especially to her father who passed away.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research was to test two null hypotheses: (1) there will be no significant differences in career decision-making between Thai and American college students, and (2) there will be no significant relationship in career decision-making within the Thai and American college students in regard to: (1) gender, (2) their parental socioeconomic status as implied by the father's occupation, (3) self-efficacy, (4) interest, (5) sex-role orientation, (6) occupational expectations, (7) occupational aspirations, and (8) career certainty.

Three measures were used in addition to demographic data: (1) a measure of career decision-making, (2) a measure of self-efficacy, and (3) a measure of sex-role orientation. The sample of this study were undergraduate students who enrolled in Introduction to Psychology classes at Khon Kaen University, Thailand, in 1990 and American undergraduate and graduate students who enrolled in Basic Skills in Counseling classes at the University of Arizona, U.S.A., in 1990. Each subject was asked to fill out the three questionnaires.

T-test analysis was used to address the first hypothesis. Multiple Regression Analysis was used to determine how well gender, parental occupations, self-efficacy, interest, sex-role orientation, occupational expectations, occupational aspirations, and career certainty could predict the

dependent variable career decision-making to address the second hypothesis.

For career decision-making, the Thai students showed higher indecision than the American college students. Finally, the predictor variables of this research were not able to predict the Thai students' career decision-making.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In general, two major questions concerning career decision were posed in former research studies. The first question focuses on the percentage of college students who were undecided regarding their career choice. The second question, which is more important, focuses on the differences between career decided and undecided students (Slaney, 1988). The results of earlier research studies showed that approximately 20-30 percent of the students were undecided. Therefore, career indecision is an important problem for adolescents.

In an early study by Williamson (1937), the differences between decided and undecided students were revealed. The study also examined the assumptions behind questions of career decision. The results showed that decided students worked harder, performed better and needed less guidance and counseling than undecided students because they already had their vocational goals. His results also indicated that decided male students did not get higher grades than undecided male students. However, undecided female students received higher grades than decided female students. This study raises a question for counselors to determine the differences between undecided and decided students, and their ability to choose a career without receiving help from a counselor (Slaney, 1988).

In two studies, Baird (1969) concluded that undecided male students were "slightly less interested in science" and undecided males and females were "not vocationally oriented" (Baird 1969, p.432). In the second study, the author suggested that the only difference between decided and undecided students was that "Undecided students more often than decided students emphasize the college goal of developing their minds and intellectual abilities and chose the goal of vocational or professional training less frequently" (Baird 1969, p.432). Furthermore, he concluded that undecided students did not significantly differ from those who were decided.

However, Lunneborg (1975) commented that Baird's (1969) study tended to emphasize the differences between decided and undecided although the results showed a lack of differences.

The importance of Baird's (1969) paper was that "it made the negative perspective held by Williamson and others toward students who were experiencing career indecision virtually untenable" (Slaney 1988, p.35). Specifically, Baird's studies challenged the perspective about undecided students.

In addition, Baird's (1969) results were consistent with important theoretical perspectives which were making a major impact on the thinking of vocational psychologists. Erikson (1957), and many other theorists such as Super (1957); Tiedeman and O'Hara (1963); Ginzberg, Ginsberg, Axelrad, and Herma (1951) had the same developmental perspective. According to this perspective, career indecision was seen in the context of normal development for youngsters. Generally, youngsters might experience some career indecision before the developmental progression of career selection. Therefore, undecided students might not differ in major ways from career decided students, which concurs with Baird's results (Slaney, 1988).

Other studies which support the idea of little difference between career decided and career undecided students also exist (i.e., Elton & Rose, 1970; Harmon, 1973). However, some studies tended to show that undecided students, rather than being nearly pathological, were actually more achievement oriented (Holland & Nichols, 1964; Watley, 1965; Williamson, 1937), more creative (Holland & Nichols, 1964), and had lower attrition risks (Abel, 1966) than decided students.

On the other hand, some research studies concluded that negative expectations were held by some career undecided students. According to these studies career undecided students tended to have lower academic achievement

(Lunneborg, 1975, 1976), lower career decision-making self-efficacy expectations (Taylor & Betz, 1983), and lower career salience (Greenhaus & Simon, 1977). With regard to personality characteristics, career undecided students seemed to have lower self-esteem (Barnett & Tinsley, 1977; Resnick, Fauble & Osipow, 1970), to be both lower in self-esteem and higher in dogmatism (Maier & Herman, 1974), more external and fearful of success (Taylor, 1982), anxious (Galinsky & Fast, 1966; Hawkins, Bradley & White, 1977; Kimes & Troth, 1974; Walsh & Lewis, 1972), dependent (Ashby, Wall & Osipow, 1966), and less self-directive (Marr, 1965).

These studies need replication because the authors seemed to overemphasize differences between decided and undecided students. Ashby, Wall, and Osipow (1966) conducted a research study with decided, undecided, and tentatively decided undergraduates. The results indicated that the decided and undecided students were academically superior to the tentative group. Only two variables were found significantly different between decided and undecided students: (1) high school grades, and (2) dependence scores (Slaney, 1988).

It is notable that career-decided students have better personalities than those who are undecided (i.e., Lunneborg, 1975, 1976). However, Baird (1969) in his research, found no differences between decided and undecided students.

Interestingly, Baird (1969); Elton and Rose (1970); Harmon and Watley (1965) in later reviews interpreted the survey of the literature differently. These confusing results do not indicate that the authors of career indecision are careless in their reviews of the research, but that the literature presents results which reviewers find ambiguous and difficult to interpret accurately. One difficulty in presenting accurate conclusions is that the sample sizes of the studies vary from less than 10 to 60,000 students, and furthermore, students and researchers have different views of career indecision. Finally, the research has been characterized by the measurement of career indecision or the categorization of career-decided and career-undecided students (Slaney, 1988).

In summary, research studies comparing career-decided and undecided students do not present coherent findings. Two general conclusions from the studies are reported which seem inconsistent with each other. The first conclusion tends to show that there are no differences between career-decided and undecided students. The other conclusion tends to suggest personality differences between decided and undecided students that favor the decided students (Slaney, 1988).

Background of Thai Educational System

According to Thai Educational Planning System, Thai children are required to go to school at least through the sixth grade level but most Thai parents expect their children to be educated at the university because Thai university graduates like those in the United States find jobs more easily. Because the number of universities in Thailand is limited, Thai students must compete with other applicants for admittance into the university of their choice. Each year, about 100,000 students graduate from high school, and of these, approximately 10 percent pass the entrance examination and are accepted into the universities in Thailand. Half of these accepted are male and half are female students. Ninety percents of the students who do not pass the entrance examination may study in the open universities or private universities according to their interest.

Khon Kaen University in Northeastern Thailand serves a population of approximately 18 million people and enrolls about 20,000 full time students. Since the students can apply to any university in the country, each year half of Khon Kaen University's enrollment is from the local region and the other half from other parts of the country. There are 15 different schools or colleges in Khon Kaen University, including the college of medicine, the college of education etc. Twenty five percent of the faculty members have doctoral degrees, sixty percent have master's degrees, and fifteen percent have bachelor degrees. Each year, there are about 1,500 students who graduate from the University and expect to be employed in the work place (Thailand. Division of Planning, 1987).

Employment in Thailand is highly competitive. It is important for the applicants to have a degree from a university or college. Approximately 40 percent of Thai women and 60 percent of Thai men are in the work force. Most Thai women work in the predominantly female occupations (i.e., secretary). In contrast, most of Thai men work in the predominantly male occupations (i.e., engineer).

Statement of the Problem

Although the research results concerning career decision-making are confusing, there is evidence which implies differences between decided and undecided students. Williamson (1937), for example, was more skeptical about the status of undecided students. He wrote a book, How to counsel students (Williamson, 1939), in which he concluded that the causes of vocational choice uncertainty are (1) fear and lack of aptitude, (2) fear of displeasing parents and friends, and (3) fear of failure in the chosen occupation. His suggestion might be useful both in educational and counseling service. The concept of indecisiveness is in need of adequate empirical support. Furthermore, research studies don't answer whether or not differences exist between career decided and career undecided students (Slaney, 1988). This study will address this question.

Objective

The objective of this study is to test the following null hypotheses:

1. There will be no significant differences in career decision-making status between Thai and American college students.

2. There will be no significant relationship in career decision-making status within the Thai and American students in regard to: (1) gender, (2) their parental socioeconomic status as implied by the father's occupation, (3) self-efficacy, (4) interest, (5) sex-role orientation, (6) occupational expectations, (7) occupational aspirations, and (8) career certainty.

In addition, this study sought answers to the following questions:

1. Who influences each group of students in making career decision?

2. Which independent variable is different between the American and Thai college students?

Significance of The Problem

Traditionally, in Thai society, students' career decision-making was influenced by their families. More recently Thailand has developed social changes that allow Thai students today to take more responsibility for making their own career choices. In order to provide appropriate career counseling in Thailand, information is needed regarding Thai students self-efficacy, occupational expectations, and occupational aspirations as they related to career decision-making.

Assumption

Career decision-making (Osipow, Carney, Winer, Yanico & Koschier, 1987), self-efficacy (Lauver & Jones, 1990), and sex-role orientation (Bem, 1981) scales can be translated into Thai language without loss of purpose and content.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Approaches to Career Indecision

Two approaches used in recent research on the measurement of career indecision attempt to make sense of the inconsistencies in the research results. The first approach focused on a developmental viewpoint, that being career-undecided students is not a sign of personality problems. Rather, being undecided is a part of normal development. Most students can easily solve their problem of career indecision themselves or with the help of the others. For a minority of students, this problem is referred to as indecisiveness which has no quick resolution (Slaney, 1988).

Most students, however, can make their career decisions without problems. Whereas those who have difficulty in making a decision on career choice may be different from both career-decided and "developmentally" undecided students. The major point is that there are no differences between decided and undecided students for most researchers.

The second approach to the measurement of career indecision suggests that the lack of clarity in previous research results is caused by simplistic approaches to the measurement of career indecision. Therefore, there is a need to develop instruments that approach the assessment of career indecision with appropriate psychometric sophistication (Slaney, 1988).

The Structure of Choice and Decision

Choice and decision making are interrelated concepts because both are defined in terms of each other. An important distinction, however, exists between choice and decision making which should have more effect on the study of the decision making process than has been the case (Tiedeman & Miller-Tiedeman, 1979).

In psychology, "choice" and "decision" are not synonymous. "A choice is a preference; a choice involves the processes of selection and election among specified options" (Tiedeman & Miller-Tiedeman, 1979, p.162). "Decision on the other hand is a conclusion; a decision involves the processes of forming and acting upon an opinion" (Tiedeman & Miller-Tiedeman, 1979, p.162).

Thus an understanding of both choice and decision processes is required in the study of decision making processes.

Definition of The Concept of Self-Efficacy

Bandura's theory predicts that self-efficacy expectations, which is defined as "beliefs about one's ability to perform successfully a given task or behavior, may be important mediators of behavior and behavior change" (Lent, Brown & Larkin, 1987, p.293). Two components of self-efficacy are outcome expectations and efficacy expectations. An outcome expectation is the probability that a specific behavior will produce a specific outcome (Bandura, Adams & Beyer, 1977). It is the perception one has that a given act will cause a particular consequence or effect. An efficacy expectation is the belief that the behavior needed to obtain the outcome can be performed successfully (Bandura, 1977b). Expectations of personal efficacy are hypothesized to influence one's choice of behavioral settings and activities, as well as how much effort will be expended and how long one will continue to pursue an action while coping with obstacles (Bandura, 1977a). Self-percepts of efficacy not only affect current behavior but also predict the individual's future behavior (Bandura, 1982b).

Self-efficacy expectations vary in magnitude, strength. and generality. Magnitude or level of self-efficacy expectations refers to the degree of difficulty of the tasks the individual feels capable of attempting and is postulated to influence the kinds of behavior attempted or avoided. The strength of self-efficacy expectations, that is, the person's confidence in his or her capability, is postulated to influence persistence of behavior when discouraging experiences are confronted. Efficacy expectations are dissimilar in generality. Some experiences help to generate expectations of mastery. Others introduce a more generalized sense of efficacy that expands well beyond the particular situation (Bandura, 1977a). When the effect of mastering the task can be assigned to other tasks and situations, generality is high. If mastery of the task is limited in its effects, efficacy expectations are limited also (Bandura, 1982a).

Self-Efficacy and Career Decision-Making

According to the research studies (i.e., Fitzgerald & Crites, 1980), there is a need for increased understanding of women's career development. Most research in this area has focused on the applicability of the theories of career development to women (i.e., Holland, 1973). Although such research (i.e., Doty & Betz, 1979; Matthews & Walsh, 1978) has considerable utility for both theoretical and applied purposes, there is a need for more adequate applied research in women's career development (Betz & Hackett, 1981). Focusing on applied utility, Hackett and Betz(1981) have proposed a "self-efficacy" approach to women's career development. They have found that social learning theory (Bandura, 1977; Krumboltz, Mitchell & Jones, 1976), has particular relevance for both understanding and facilitating women's career development.

In extending the self-efficacy theory to vocational behavior, Hackett and Betz(1981) suggested that feelings of self-efficacy help determine the career decisions and achievement of men and women, and that they may be especially useful in understanding women's career development because the sex-role socialization of females is less likely than that of males to facilitate development of strong career related, self-efficacy expectations. Females are not encouraged to engage in many activities which would increase expectations of personal efficacy (i.e., Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974; Sherman, 1971, 1976) and their capabilities and talents (i.e., Farmer, 1976). Further, their continuing under-representation in many professions, such as law and medicine, mathematics, science, engineering, skill trades, and managerial/administrative positions, is postulated to be due to low or weak self-efficacy expectations. Thus, low self-efficacy may be a major factor in the restriction of women's career options, particularly in women's failure to consider occupations traditionally viewed as more appropriate for males (Betz & Hackett, 1981).

In vocational psychology, a major difference is found between the content and the process of career choice (Crites, 1969, 1981). The "content" of career choice refers to what the individual considers or selects as his or her career. The "process" refers to how decisions are made (i.e., the nature of the exploration and decision-making activities engaged in) (Betz & Hackett, 1986). Most of Betz and Hackett's research program has emphasized career choice content. Only one study investigated the usefulness of self-efficacy in the understanding of process variables (Betz & Hackett, 1986). Self-efficacy has been used to predict career indecision (Taylor & Betz, 1983).

Taylor and Betz (1983) investigated self-efficacy expectations with regard to the skills and activities necessary for effective career decision-making. Based on Crites' (1981) system of career choice competencies from his theory of career maturity, self-estimates of capability were appraised according to (1) goal selection, (2) occupational information, (3) problem solving, (4) planning, and (5) self-appraisal. Self-efficacy for career decision-making was significantly predictive of career indecision; that is, subjects who reported low levels of career decision-making self-efficacy were also more career-indecisive. No overall gender differences in self-efficacy for career decision-making were shown, nor was there a relationship between career decision-making self-efficacy and academic ability.

In another study, Foss and Slaney (1986) examined whether eighty college women, grouped according to their scores on the Attitudes Toward Women Scales (AWS), were differentially affected by a videotape career intervention. A variety of outcome measures were used, including a brief measure of career decidedness, a measure of the traditionalism in the women's own career choices, and of the career choices they selected for their daughters. In addition, two measures of self-efficacy were used, the Vocational Self-Efficacy Scales (VSES) (Hackett & Betz, 1981) and the Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy Scales (CDMSES) (Taylor & Betz, 1983). The results suggested that AWS scores were related to the traditionalism of the career chosen for the subjects' daughters and to self-efficacy. Increases were found for the CDMSES and on career decidedness. Careers selected by the women for themselves and for their daughters were more nontraditional after the videotape intervention. The present results also seem to suggest that the CDMSES may be a more sensitive instrument than the VSES for measuring changes in self-efficacy because the CDMSES appears to measure a wider range of dimensions related to self-efficacy.

Other variables seem to influence an individual's career decision-making and career choice. Sex-role socialization is a major factor affecting women in every society which varies from culture to culture.

A Sociological Model of Career Choice and Work Behavior

Astin (1984) proposed a need-based "sociological" model for two reasons: (1) "because it incorporates the influence of the social context on the person" and, (2) "because work behavior is a social behavior" (Astin, 1984, p.117). Motivation, expectations, sex-role socialization, and the structure of opportunity are four major constructs of this model.

The first construct, motivation, includes three kinds of needs: (1) the survival needs, which are related to physiological survival; (2) the pleasure needs, which refer to the intrinsic pleasure of the work activities, and to the intellectual and emotional pleasure which is derived from the performance and accomplishment of some goal; and (3) the contribution needs, which refer to human beings' need to believe that they are working for good and well-being of others such as family, friends, or society (Astin, 1984).

The second construct, expectation, which is applied as a mediating variable, covers a variety issues about career choice and work behavior. An individual's answer to the question, "what types of work activities am I capable of performing?", might influence his or her career choice (Astin, 1984).

According to the model, an individual's expectations are a function of both sex-role socialization and the perceived structure of opportunity. To understand how expectations develop in an individual's life, it is necessary to know about the socialization process, which relates to the structure of opportunity (Astin, 1984).

The third construct, socialization process, is the source of developing an individual's expectations during childhood. Social values are acculturated both directly and through modeling by parents, teachers, and others. Huston (1983) reviewed literature on "Sex Typing" and his conclusions regarding family influence were that "Parents treat boys and girls differently in ways that appear to have long-term implications for interests, skills, independence, achievement and interpersonal relationships in their children" (Huston, 1983, p.438). Boys and girls are reinforced in different work activities according to their gender. Sex-typed activities provide an individual's environment for developing personal-social behaviors (Huston, 1983).

The fourth construct, opportunity structure, determines an individual's work expectations. The structure of opportunity and the socialization process are interactive; each influences the other. The socialization process sets limits to changes in the structure of opportunity, whereas the structure of opportunity has impact on the values that are inculcated through the socialization process (Astin, 1984).

The dramatic changes in female youngsters' occupational aspirations and work behavior can be explained by this conceptualization. Considering female college freshmen in

1970, 46 percent had their career plans in predominantly female occupations (i.e., teacher, nurse); in 1982, however, only 15 percent had their career plans in predominantly female fields, whereas 28 percent aspired to predominantly male occupations for women such as engineering, law, and medicine (Astin, 1984).

According to Astin (1984), gender differences can be explained by a sociopsychological model. Moreover, recent changes in women's occupational behavior can be explained by the same model as well. Currently, family, education, and work trends have an impact on work expectations. Some of these trends result from "proliferation of nontraditional lifestyles" which have become more widely accepted. Women have more freedom in their lives. They can "deviate from traditional sex roles and standards" (Astin, 1984, p.123). Both women and men can have the same professions and women have a larger variety of careers open to them (Astin, 1984).

In summary, sociostructural trends have decreased the barriers which have impeded women in the past. Women have a wider range of career choices. These changes in the structure of opportunity cause improvements in the work expectations of women: expectations which were originally formed by socialization experiences and were initially perceptions of the opportunity structure. This wider range of choices may increase women's self-efficacy regarding their beliefs about their own ability to complete work activities (Astin, 1984). Consequently, they may realize their choices and become aware that "they can satisfy their survival, pleasure, and contribution needs through paid employment as well as through family work" (Astin, 1984, p.124).

The Family's Influence on Vocational Development

Developmentalists would agree that adolescents' vocational aspirations and achievements are influenced by their families. Occupational status tends to remain constant from generation to generation. Family influence is the most reliable predictor of youngsters' future vocational decisions regarding their career choice (Nielsen, 1987).

Females' Vocational Development

Distinctions between males and females

In addition to family influence, the female adolescent's vocational ambitions and achievements are related to gender. Females are reinforced in their occupational roles and aptitudes differently from males due to socialization in their families. There are significant differences between the vocational accomplishments, income, and job status of U.S. males and females. Females limit their occupational choices to traditional sex-typed jobs. For example, 84 percent of elementary school teachers, and 78 percent of librarians are women (U.S. Department of Commerce, 1980).

According to traditional sex-roles, female adolescents tend to choose careers that are service or education oriented.

In fact, female adolescents with high educational and vocational aspirations are independent, assertive, and unafraid to show their intellectual, academic, and vocational competence. In addition, these adolescents' vocational aspirations seem to be the same as their mothers' attitudes. Young adolescents who have the highest vocational and educational aspirations endorse nontraditional views of male and female sex-roles, the same as their mothers. For instance, adolescent girls who have career oriented mothers tend to have higher occupational goals and choose nontraditional occupations more often than adolescents who have unemployed mothers (Nielsen, 1987).

The Family Socioeconomic Status

The family's socioeconomic status is the most powerful influence on male vocational attitudes and achievements. According to research studies (i.e., Schulenberg, Vondracek & Crouter, 1984), "if one were permitted only a single variable with which to predict an individual's occupational status, it would surely be the SES of the individual's family orientation" (Schulenberg, Vondracek, & Crouter, 1984, p.11). The implication is that if one tries to predict an adolescent's future status and income, the parents' socioeconomic status is the most reliable predictor. The higher the family's income the more likely the adolescent will attend college (Nielsen, 1987).

In order to study the vocational similarities between parents and children, Mortimer and Kumka (1982) conducted a ten-year investigation of the vocation of college males. They found that most male college students selected the same professions as their fathers. Although some selected different occupations, the characteristics and status of their chosen careers were very similar to their fathers'. Furthermore, the fathers and sons tended to have the same attitudes towards work. Sons from professional families focused on the value of the work itself, whereas sons from white-collar or business families focused on values such as the salaries they might obtain from their chosen career. A son's attitudes were most similar to his father's when they had a close relationship with each other and when the father had a high status-job. Finally, ten years after the son's college graduation, these vocational similarities between fathers and sons continued to exist (Nielsen, 1987).

Research studies with male high school students supported the results of the studies of college men. Bachman, O'Malley, and Johnston (1978) reported that "in many ways the most basic predictor variable in the Youth in Transition study is family socioeconomic level" (Bachman, O'Malley & Johnston, 1978, p.21). A constant relationship remains between a family's socioeconomic level and the son's academic abilities, college plans, vocational goals, and self-concept. Boys from high socioeconomic status families tended to enter high-prestige, high income jobs like their fathers, and boys from lower socioeconomic status entered less prestigious, lower-paid professions like their fathers'.

In contrast to the research with male students, studies with female adolescents indicate a more ambivalent relationship. Although many studies have indicated relationships between family income and a girl's educational aspirations, a study by Martin (1978) showed that female adolescents' vocational decisions are less influenced by their family's socioeconomic status than are those of male adolescents. However, the attitudes of fathers towards vocations influenced both male and female twelfth graders more than the attitudes of their mothers (Wijting, Arnold & Conrad, 1978).

In another study, Houser and Garvey (1985) proposed that "the factors affecting a woman's career choice are not solely economic; they are complex and interrelated, being both personal and social in nature" (Houser & Garvey, 1985, p.106). Two major factors are (1) external influences (i.e., support anticipated from her social network), and (2) internal influences (i.e., personality characteristics).

Research indicates that both male and female adolescents' occupational choices are affected by the support they receive from important persons in their lives--their parents, counselors, teachers, and peers (Brown, 1970; Horner, Buterbaugh & Carefoot, 1967; Mitchell, 1977; Penn & Gabriel, 1976; Rehberg & Sinclair, 1970; Sewell & Shah, 1968a, 1968b). Haber (1980), for example, concluded that female college seniors, described as innovative (i.e., who selected a nontraditional career) and career-oriented, perceived their parents to be highly supportive of their careers, whereas traditional, career oriented students described their parents as placing equal importance on both career and family. Traditional, noncareer oriented students, however, reported their parents as favoring a family and opposing a career (Houser & Garvey, 1985).

CHAPTER 3

METHODS

Subjects. The samples for this study were undergraduate Thai students who enrolled in Introduction to Psychology classes at Khon Kaen University, Thailand, in 1990 and American undergraduate students who enrolled in Basic Skills in Counseling classes at University of Arizona, U.S.A., in 1990. Each subject was asked to fill out a questionnaire that seeks demographic information regarding: (1) gender, (2) age, (3) class, (4) GPA, (5) parental occupations, (6) occupational expectations, (7) role model, and (8) occupational aspirations.

Data Collection. Data were collected during May-July 1990. Analyses of the data were conducted in August-September 1990.

Instruments and Procedures. Three measures were used in addition to the demographic data: (1) a measure of career decision-making, (2) a measure of self-efficacy, and (3) a measure of sex-role orientation.

(1) The Career Decision Scale (CDS) (Osipow, Carney, Winer, Yanico & Koschier, 1987) includes a 19-item measure of career indecision. Items 3 through 18 were developed to measure an individual's degree of indecision. All items are designed on 4-point scales ranging from "like me" to "not like me." A higher score indicates higher level of

indecision. This scale can be used with high school and college students. For test reliability, Osipow, Carney, and Barak (1976) reported two test-retest correlations of .90 and .82 for CDS Scale for two separate samples of college students. For test validity, a significant correlation between Indecision scores on the Career Decision Scale and the Assessment of Career Decision Making (ACDM) was reported ($r = -.265$, $p < .004$) (Osipow, 1987). Significant negative correlations between Factor 1 (which reflected elements involving lack of structure and confidence with respect to dealing with vocational decision-making) on the Career Decision Scale and the Assessment of Career Decision Making (ACDM) intuition, dependency, and planfulness were found. The Career Decision Scale was negatively correlated with planfulness which confirmed previous research (Osipow, 1987).

(2) Career Choice Factors Survey, a survey of career related self-efficacy, designed by Lauver and Jones (1990), measures the level of perceived self-efficacy and range of self-efficacy. Subjects will be asked about a specific career choice and whether they believe they can successfully complete a job performance (on a 6 point scale). Reliability coefficients of self-efficacy for job training and job performance ranged from r .94 to r .96 for males and females for both traditional and nontraditional occupations

(Lauver & Jones, 1990). Reliability coefficients of this scale, for self-efficacy for an occupation designated predominantly female (PFO) for jobs and training as reported by Lauver and Jones(1990), are .75 and .77 and for an occupation as designated predominantly male (PMO) are .72 and .76. Range of interest coefficients for PFOs and PMOs were both .66, and for level of interest PFOs and PMOs were both .75 (Lauver & Jones, (1990). Ten predominantly female occupations (i.e., dietician) and ten predominantly male occupations (i.e., electrical engineering) which were similar to Clement's (1987) study were used. Definitions of these twenty occupations also were provided (U.S. Department of Labor, 1988; U.S. Department of Labor, 1977; U.S. Department of Labor, 1986).

Demographic Information. Questions regarding the subjects' gender, age, class, GPA, and parental occupations were used.

For parental occupation, a measure of prestige scores assigned to jobs designed by Hodge, Siegel, and Rossi (1964) were used to assess parental socioeconomic status. According to Hauser and Featherman (1977), an individual's socioeconomic status (or occupational prestige) can be used across time and societal boundaries. Furthermore, "the reports of occupation collected in social surveys are of comparable reliability to reports of income and education, and they appear durable when obtained retrospectively over periods of 5 years" (Hauser & Featherman, 1977, p.59).

Two questions were used in the demographic data: (1) information regarding occupational expectations, and (2) information regarding occupational aspirations.

A question of occupational expectations was similar to McNulty and Borgen's (1988) question, "What occupation do you think you are most likely to take up after you have completed your education?" A question of role model was asked, "Do you know someone personally in this occupation? If YES, --parent? --brother/sister? --other relative? --other?"

A question of occupational aspirations was similar to McNulty and Borgen's (1988) question, "If you were completely free to choose any job, what would you most like as a lifetime job?"

(3) Bem Sex-Role Inventory, a measure of sex-role orientation as developed by Bem (1981) measures personality characteristics which are defined as feminine or masculine. Thirty items are included in this scale "Bem Sex-Role Inventory" (Short Form).

<u>Data Analysis.</u> T-test analysis was used to address the first hypothesis. Multiple Regression Analysis (Pedhazur, 1982) was used to find the relationships between gender, self-efficacy, interest, sex-role orientation, parental

occupations, and the dependent variable career decision-making to address the second hypothesis.

For self-efficacy, two estimates of career related self-efficacy were obtained for performance for PFOs and PMOs. Scores were summed of estimates received by asking subjects to rate on a scale of 0 to 5 how sure they are of their ability to complete the performance for each job (Lauver & Jones, 1990).

Level of interest was measured by asking subjects about each occupation whether or not they intend to go into this field. Strength of interest was measured by asking subjects to indicate, on a scale of 0 to 5, how seriously they consider each occupation (Lauver & Jones, 1990).

Sex-role orientation scores were classified by one of the following: (1) masculinity (low femininity score-high masculinity score), (2) femininity (high femininity score-low masculinity score), (3) androgynous (high femininity score-high masculinity score), and (4) undifferentiated (low femininity score-low femininity score). The classification was based on Student's t-ratio for the difference between the total points assigned to the feminine and masculine attributes (Bem, 1981).

Parental occupations were classified from prestige score distribution into (1) high (score 50 or above), (2) medium (score 39 to 49), and (3) low (score 12 to 38) (Lauver &

Jones, 1990). For Career Decision-Making scores, high certainty scale scores (Total 1-2) indicate certainty of career choice and school major. Certainty Scale scores which are of the 15th percentile or less were classified as indicating that the student is uncertain about the selection of either career choice and/or major. High Indecision Scale scores (Total 3-18) indicate indecision with regard to career choice. Scores which equal or exceed the 85th percentile indicated a serious level of indecision (Osipow, 1987).

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Demographic Data of the American College Students

According to the demographic data from the Career Choice Factor Survey, 133 of the participating American college students (83.6%) were females whereas 26 (16.4%) were males whose class status ranged from freshmen to seniors. Altogether they had 34 different majors, and most of the students were seniors. The majority of the participants were family studies students (39 out of 159 students or 24.5% of the total number). Table 5 (Appendix A) shows the number and percentage of American college students in each class and Table 6 shows the number and percentage of American college students in each major.

The student ages ranged from 19 to 61 years, with a mean age of 25.211. Age ranges are shown in Table 7. The high school grade point average (GPA) ranged from 1.60 to 4.33, with a mean score of 3.192; Table 8 shows the high school GPA's. Their college GPA's ranged from 1.80 to 4.00, with a mean score of 2.962. College GPA's are shown in Table 9.

The mother's prestige scores (MPRES) ranged from 14 to 78, with a mean score of 41.967 while the father's prestige scores (DPRES) ranged from 14 to 82, with a mean score of 50.348. Sixty-one (38.3%) of the mother's prestige scores were classified as low prestige (score 14 to 38), thirtyseven (23.2%) as medium (score 39 to 49), and fifty-four (34.0%) as high prestige (score 50 or above). Twenty-six (16.3%) of the father's prestige score were classified as low prestige, forty-one (25.8%) as medium, and ninety-one (57.2%) as high prestige. Tables 10 and 13 show, respectively, the mother's and father's prestige scores. Table 11 shows the mother's prestige levels of the American college students while Table 12 shows mother's sex-type jobs of the students.

The majority of the mother's sex-type jobs of American college students were female (47.8% of the total number) while the majority of the father's sex-type jobs were male (50.9% of the total number). In Table 14, father's prestige levels are shown while father's sex-type jobs are shown in Table 15.

Occupational expectations (OEXP) scores ranged from 14 to 82, with a mean score of 50.303. The majority of the student sex preference jobs were both female and male jobs (65.4% of the total). Table 16 shows occupational expectation scores and Table 17 shows occupational expectation levels. Sex preference jobs are shown in Table 18.

Occupational aspiration (OASP) scores ranged from 14 to 82, with a mean score of 52.934. Occupational aspiration scores are shown in Table 19 while occupational aspiration levels are shown in Table 20.

The American Students' Interest and Self-Efficacy

The mean scores for the strength of interest for predominantly male occupations (SINTRM), the strength of interest for predominantly female occupations (SINTRF), strength of self-efficacy for predominantly male occupations (SSEFM), strength of self-efficacy for predominantly female occupations (SSEFF), level of interest for predominantly male occupations (LINTRM), level of interest for predominantly female occupations (LINTRF), level of self-efficacy for predominantly male occupations (LSEFM), and level of self-efficacy for predominantly female occupations (LSEFF) appear in Tables 21 through 28 respectively.

Correlations between the level and strength of interest for both predominantly male and predominantly female occupations were highly significant: (1) the correlation between the level of interest for predominantly male occupations (LINTRM) and the strength of interest for predominantly male occupations (SINTRM) was .906; (2) the correlation between the level of interest for predominantly female occupations (LINTRF) and the strength of interest for predominantly female occupations (SINTRF) was .875. Correlations between the level and strength of self-efficacy for both predominantly male and predominantly female occupations were also highly significant: (1) the correlation between the level of self-efficacy for predominantly male occupations (LSEFM) and the strength of self-efficacy for predominantly male occupations (SSEFM) was .896; (2) the correlation between the level of self-efficacy for predominantly female occupations (LSEFF) and the strength of self-efficacy for predominantly female occupations (SSEFF) was .844. The correlation coefficients are shown in Table 29.

Table 30 contains the Chi-Square association between (1) the father's prestige scores and gender, (2) the strength of interest for predominantly male occupations (SINTRM) and gender, major, role model, the influence of a person other than parents, siblings, or relatives (MO), (3) the strength of interest for predominantly female occupations (SINTRF) and the major, role model, the influence of a person other than parents, siblings, or relatives (MO), (4) the strength of self-efficacy for predominantly female occupations (SSEFM) and the major, (5) the strength of self-efficacy for predominantly female occupations (SSEFF) and gender, role model, the influence of a person other than parents, siblings, or relatives (MO), (6) the level of interest for predominantly male occupations (LINTRM) and gender, (7) the level of interest for predominantly female occupations (LINTRF) and gender, and the major, (8) the level of self-efficacy for predominantly female occupations (LSEFF) and gender, and the major, (9) masculinity (BMM) and careercertainty, (10) femininity (BMF) and gender, (11) career indecision (CDINDE) and class, college grade point average, sex-role, the strength of interest for predominantly female occupations (SINTRF), and (12) career indecision percentile (INDEPER) and gender.

Gender Differences in Interest and Self-Efficacy

The Z-test for proportional differences (Freund, 1988) was used to address the differences between American male and female students' interest (Table 1) and self-efficacy (Table 2) in each of twenty occupations. Ten occupations were predominantly male occupations and the other ten occupations were predominantly female occupations. Proportionally, the interest of American male students' was significantly higher than American females in the following three predominantly male occupations: (1) Air Traffic Controller (2) Electrical Engineering, and (3) Computer Programmer. American female students' interest exceeded American male students in three of the predominantly female occupations: (1) Registered Nurse (2) Dietician, and (3) Secretary.

Proportionally, American male students' self-efficacy in the following predominantly male occupations--Computer Programmer-- was significantly higher than that of the American female students. American female self-efficacy was significantly higher than American male students in four of predominantly female occupations: (1) Elementary School Teacher, (2) Registered Nurse, (3) Dietician, and (4) Secretary.

Table 1

THE Z-TEST FOR PROPORTIONAL DIFFERENCES
BETWEEN INTEREST OF THE AMERICAN COLLEGE STUDENTS

Occupations	Female (N)	Male (N)	Z
Predominantly Male Occupations			
1. Accountant	50	8	-.6625
2. Insurance Broker	24	6	-.6011
3. Air Traffic Controller	22	12	-3.3765**
4. Electrical Engineer	15	9	-3.0506**
5. Stockbroker	55	11	-.0904
6. Computer Programmer	43	15	-2.4622*
7. Advertising Account Executive	91	16	.6848
8. Urban Planner	33	9	-1.0384
9. Manager	108	23	-.8884
10. Surveyor	14	5	-1.2549
Predominantly Female Occupations			
11. Elementary School Teacher	107	18	1.2779
12. Personnel Manager	103	24	-1.7283
13. Registered Nurse	61	6	2.1558*
14. Dietician	76	6	3.1837**
15. Home Economist	43	6	.4356
16. Physiotherapist	70	14	-.1136
17. Radiographer	25	6	-.5053
18. Speech Therapist	58	7	1.5861
19. Secretary	68	6	2.6264**
20. Occupational Therapist	88	12	1.9334
Total	133	26	

*p<.05
**p<.01

Table 2

THE Z-TEST FOR PROPORTIONAL DIFFERENCES
BETWEEN SELF-EFFICACY OF THE AMERICAN COLLEGE STUDENTS

Occupations	Female (N)	Male (N)	Z
Predominantly Male Occupations			
1. Accountant	76	11	1.3916
2. Insurance Broker	81	14	.6720
3. Air Traffic Controller	65	16	-1.1826
4. Electrical Engineer	42	13	-1.8095
5. Stockbroker	84	16	.1564
6. Computer Programmer	71	20	-2.2207*
7. Advertising Account Executive	112	19	1.3627
8. Urban Planner	80	17	-.5013
9. Manager	124	24	.1694
10. Surveyor	51	11	-.3794
Predominantly Female Occupations			
11. Elementary School Teacher	121	20	2.0668*
12. Personnel Manager	122	24	-.1059
13. Registered Nurse	80	10	2.0441*
14. Dietician	102	13	2.7861**
15. Home Economist	87	15	.7518
16. Physiotherapist	93	19	-.3226
17. Radiographer	74	13	.5289
18. Speech Therapist	101	16	1.5239
19. Secretary	104	13	2.9836**
20. Occupational Therapist	113	18	1.9255
Total	133	26	

*p<.05
**p<.01

The American Students' Sex-Role Orientation

For the Bem Sex-Role Inventory, the mean and median scores of masculinity (BMM) for American college students are shown in Table 31 while the mean and median scores of femininity (BMF) are shown in Table 32. The results indicated that the sex-role orientation for 43 American students (27.0%) was classified as feminine, for 36 students (22.6%) as masculine, for 46 students (28.9%) as androgynous, and 34 students (21.4%) were undifferentiated. Sex-role orientations of the American students are shown in Table 33.

The American Students' Career Decision

The Career Decision Scale included two parts: (1) career certainty (CDCERT), and (2) career indecision (CDINDE). High certainty scores indicate certainty of career choice and school major. High indecision scores indicate indecision with regard to career choice. Certainty scale scores which are the 15th percentile or less indicate that the student is uncertain about the selection of either career choice and/or major. Scores which equal or exceed the 85th percentile will be indicated as a serious level of indecision. The American students' 15th percentile of certainty score (low certainty) was 5.000 and the 85th percentile of indecision score (high indecision) was 38.00. According to this criterion, 39 of the American college students (24.5%) were classified as low certainty students while 28 of them (17.6%) were classified as high indecision. Thirty female students (18.9%) and nine of male students (5.6%) were low certainty. Twenty three female students (14.6%) and 5 male students (3.6%) were high indecision. Career certainty scores are shown in Table 34 while career indecision scores are shown in Table 43.

Using the standard norm group, the career certainty percentiles of the American college students are shown in Table 35 and career certainty percentile of the students in each class are shown in Tables 36-42. Career indecision percentile of the American students are shown in Table 44 and career indecision percentile in each class are shown in Tables 45-51. According to this criterion, 13 students (8.2% of the total number) were classified as low certainty (<16th percentile) while 54 students (34.0%) were classified as high indecision (>84th percentile). Nine female students (5.6%) and four male students (2.5%) were low certainty. Forty-five female students (28.3%) and nine male students (5.6%) were high indecision.

The Predictors of the American Students' Career Decision

Stepwise multiple regression analyses were conducted to find the relationship between (1) gender, (2) self-efficacy, (3) interest, (4) sex-role orientation, (5) parental occupations, (6) occupational expectations, (7) occupational aspirations, (8) career certainty, and the dependent variable career decision-making to address the second hypothesis. The results indicated that the following five variables of the American group were significant: (1) career certainty, (2) sex-role orientation, (3) mother prestige (4) strength of interest for predominantly female occupations (SINTRF), and (5) level of interest for predominantly female occupations (LINTRF) with the Multiple R of .66318, .68057, .69439, .70653, .71713 respectively.

<u>Demographic Data of the Thai College Students</u>

According to the demographic data from the Career Choice Factor Survey, 202 of the participating Thai college students (68.1%) were females whereas 95 (31.9%) were males whose academic years ranged from the first to the fourth year. Altogether they had a total of 15 different majors and most of the students were freshmen (220 out of 297 students, or 74.1% of the total number). The majority of the participants were associated medical science students (82 students out of 297 students or 27.7% of the total number). Table 52 shows the number and percentage of the Thai college students in each class and Table 53 shows the majors and gender of Thai college students.

The student ages ranged from 16 to 27 years old, with a mean age of 19.260. Students age ranges are shown in Table 54. The high school GPA's ranged from 1.09 to 3.877, with a mean score of 2.613. Table 55 shows the high school GPA's. Their college GPA's ranged from 1.20 to 3.65, with a mean score of 2.612. The college GPA's of Thai students are shown in Table 56.

The mother's prestige scores ranged from 14 to 62, with a mean score of 44.186 whereas father's prestige scores ranged from 14.00 to 82, with a mean score of 47.704. Fifty (16.8%) of the mother's prestige scores were classified as low prestige scores, eighty-nine (29.9%) as medium, and one hundred and nineteen (40.0%) as high prestige. Thirty-three (11.1%) of the father's prestige scores were classified as low prestige scores, ninety-two (42.0%) as medium, and one hundred and forty-four (48.5%) as high. Tables 57 and 60 show, respectively, the mother's and father's prestige scores. Table 58 contains the mother's prestige levels while Table 61 contains the father's prestige levels.

The majority of the mother's sex-type jobs were both female and male jobs (52.5% of the total) while the majority of father's sex-type jobs were both female and male jobs (50.8% of the total). Mother's-sex type jobs are shown in Table 59 whereas father's-sex type jobs are shown in Table 62.

Thai students' occupational expectation scores ranged from 14 to 78, with a mean score of 53.695. The majority of the student sex preference jobs were both female and male jobs (50.2% of the total). Table 63 shows occupational expectation scores while Table 64 shows occupational levels. Table 65 shows sex preference jobs.

Occupational aspiration scores ranged from 14 to 82, with a mean score of 53.078. In Table 66, occupational aspiration scores are shown while Table 67 shows occupational levels.

The Thai Students' Interest and Self-Efficacy

The mean scores of the strength of interest for predominantly male occupations (SINTRM) for Thai students, strength of interest for predominantly female occupations (SINTRF), strength of self-efficacy for predominantly male occupations (SSEFM), strength of self-efficacy for predominantly female occupations (SSEFF), the level of interest for predominantly male occupations (LINTRM), the level of interest scores for predominantly female occupations (LINTRF), level of self-efficacy for predominantly male occupations (LSEFM), and the level of self-efficacy of predominantly female occupations (LSEFF) appear in Tables 68-75.

Correlations between the level and the strength of interest for both predominantly male and predominantly female occupations were highly significant: (1) the correlation between the level of interest for predominantly male occupations (LINTRM) and the strength of interest for predominantly male occupations (SINTRM) was .830, and (2) the correlation between the level of interest for predominantly female occupations (LINTRF) and the strength of interest for predominantly female occupations (SINTRF) was .876. Correlations between the level and strength of self-efficacy for both predominantly male and predominantly female occupations were also highly significant: (1) the correlation between the level of self-efficacy for predominantly male occupations (LSEFM) and the strength of self-efficacy for predominantly male occupations (SSEFM) was .774, and (2) the correlation between the level of self-efficacy for predominantly female occupations (LSEFF) and the strength of self-efficacy for predominantly female occupations (SSEFF) was .824. The correlation coefficients are shown in Table 76.

Table 77 contains the Chi-Square association between variables: (1) gender and the father's prestige scores, the mother's prestige scores, the role model, the influence of their relatives (MREL), occupational aspirations, (2) the strength of interest for predominantly male occupations (SINTRM) and the major, gender, (3) the strength of interest for predominantly female occupations (SINTRF) and gender, (4) the strength of self-efficacy for predominantly female occupations (SSEFF) and gender, (5) the level of interest for predominantly female occupations (LINTRF) and gender,

(6) the masculinity (BMM) and gender, (7) the femininity (BMF) and gender, (8) career indecision and class, role model, the influence of a person other than parents, siblings or relatives (MO), occupational expectations, career certainty (CDCERT), the strength of interest for predominantly female occupations (SINTRF), the level of interest for predominantly female occupations (LINTRF), (9) career certainty percentile (CERTPER) and gender, class, and (10) career indecision percentile (INDEPER) and gender, class.

Gender Differences in Interest and Self-Efficacy

The Z-test for proportional differences was used to address the differences between Thai male and female student interest (Table 3) and self-efficacy (Table 4) in each of the same twenty occupations as listed for the American students. Proportionally, the interest of Thai male students was significantly higher than Thai female students in the following two predominantly male occupations: (1) Electrical Engineer, and (2) Manager. Thai female students' interest exceeded that of Thai male students in two of predominantly female occupations: (1) Registered Nurse, and (2) Secretary.

Proportionally, Thai male students' self-efficacy in the following predominantly male occupation--Electrical Engineer--was significantly higher than Thai female students. Thai female self-efficacy was significantly higher than Thai male students in the following two predominantly female occupations: (1) Registered Nurse, and (2) Secretary.

Table 3

THE Z-TEST FOR PROPORTIONAL DIFFERENCES
BETWEEN INTEREST OF THE THAI COLLEGE STUDENTS

Occupations	Female (N)	Male (N)	Z
Predominantly Male Occupations			
1. Accountant	111	50	-.3752
2. Insurance Broker	74	39	.7340
3. Air Traffic Controller	69	43	-1.8477
4. Electrical Engineer	88	55	-2.3113*
5. Stockbroker	98	49	-.4942
6. Computer Programmer	147	64	.9598
7. Advertising Account Executive	155	70	.5730
8. Urban Planner	91	54	-1.9020
9. Manager	153	83	-2.3205*
10. Surveyor	129	60	.1178
Predominantly Female Occupations			
11. Elementary School Teacher	132	60	.3690
12. Personnel Manger	147	68	.2150
13. Registered Nurse	129	39	3.7087**
14. Dietician	131	53	1.5053
15. Home Economist	110	53	-.2162
16. Physiotherapist	124	51	1.2626
17. Radiographer	98	45	.1849
18. Speech Therapist	103	43	.9237
19. Secretary	149	45	4.4785**
20. Occupational Therapist	133	58	.8062
Total	202	95	

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

Table 4

THE Z-TEST FOR PROPORTIONAL DIFFERENCES
BETWEEN SELF-EFFICACY OF THE THAI COLLEGE STUDENTS

Occupations	Female (N)	Male (N)	Z
Predominantly Male Occupations			
1. Accountant	168	79	.0022
2. Insurance Broker	147	68	.2150
3. Air Traffic Controller	121	57	-.0162
4. Electrical Engineer	117	67	-2.0939*
5. Stockbroker	148	72	-.4602
6. Computer Programmer	166	78	-.0153
7. Advertising Account Executive	179	83	.3113
8. Urban Planner	134	70	-1.2778
9. Manager	174	89	-1.9102
10. Surveyor	160	78	-.5853
Predominantly Female Occupations			
11. Elementary School Teacher	168	75	.8830
12. Personnel Manager	177	85	-.4624
13. Registered Nurse	149	57	2.4060*
14. Dietician	166	71	1.4912
15. Home Economist	149	72	-.3743
16. Physiotherapist	154	64	1.6181
17. Radiographer	130	64	-.5105
18. Speech Therapist	143	65	.4174
19. Secretary	177	68	3.3993**
20. Occupational Therapist	160	76	.1580
Total	202	95	

*p<.05
**p<.01

The Thai Students' Sex-Role Orientation

For the Bem Sex-Role Inventory, the mean and median scores of masculinity (BMM) for Thai college students are shown in Table 78 while the mean and median scores of femininity (BMF) are shown in Table 79. The results indicated that the sex-role orientation for 63 Thai students (21.2%) was classified as feminine, for 55 students (18.5%) as masculine, for 94 students (31.6%) as androgynous, and for 85 students (28.6%) as undifferentiated. Sex-role orientations of the Thai college students are shown in Table 80.

The Thai Students' Career Decision

The Career Decision Scales included two parts: (1) career certainty, and (2) career indecision. The Thai students' 15th percentile of certainty score (low certainty) was 4.000 whereas the students' 85th percentile of indecision (high indecision) was 47.000. According to this criterion, 90 Thai students (30.3%) were classified as low certainty students whereas 45 (15.2%) of them were classified as high indecision. Seventy one female students (23.9%) and nineteen male students (6.4%) were low certainty. Thirty-five female students (11.0%) and twelve male students (4.2%) were high indecision. Career certainty scores of the Thai college students are shown in Table 81 and the career indecision scores of the students are shown in Table 88.

In a comparison with the standard norm group, the career certainty percentiles of the Thai students are shown in Table 82 and the career certainty of the students in each class are shown in Tables 83-87. Career indecision percentile of the Thai students are shown in Table 89 and career indecision percentile in each class are shown in Tables 90-94. According to this criterion, 25 students (8.4% of the total number) were classified as low certainty while 107 students (36.1% of the total number) were classified as high indecision. Twelve female students (4.0%) and thirteen male students (4.4%) were low certainty while eighty-one female students (27.3%) and twenty-six male students (8.8%) were high indecision.

<u>The Predictors of the Thai Students' Career Decision</u>

Stepwise multiple analyses were conducted to find the relationship between (1) gender, (2) self-efficacy, (3) interest, (4) sex-role orientation, (5) parental occupations, (6) occupational expectations, (7) occupational aspirations, (8) career certainty, and the dependent variable career decision-making to address the second hypothesis. The results indicated that two variables were significant in the Thai group: (1) level of interest for predominantly female occupations (LINTRF) and (2) career certainty with the Multiple R of .28251 and .37282 respectively.

<u>The Differences Between Thai and American Students</u>

Comparing the American and Thai college students' demographic data results indicated that: (1) the American students' father prestige score was significantly higher than the Thai students, (2) occupational expectations of Thai students were significantly higher than American students, (3) the sex preference of American students was significantly higher than that of Thai students, and (4) the mother sex type jobs of Thai students were significantly higher than American students.

The strength of interest for the predominantly male occupations (SINTRM) of Thai college students was significantly higher than that of American students.

The strength of self-efficacy for predominantly male occupations (SSEFM) of Thai students was significantly higher than that of American students.

The level of interest of Thai students exceeded American students for both of the following two variables: (1) level of interest for predominantly male occupations (LINTRM), and (2) level of interest for predominantly female occupations (LINTRF).

The level of self-efficacy for predominantly male occupations (LSEFM) of Thai students was significantly higher than that of American students.

The Bem masculinity (BMM) and femininity (BMF) of the

American college students were significantly higher than that of the Thai college students.

The career certainty of the American group was significantly higher than that of the Thai group. The Career indecision of the Thai college students was significantly higher than that of the American college students. The differences between American college students and Thai college students are shown in Table 95.

In answering the first hypothesis , the findings of this study rejected the null hypothesis which stated there will be no significant differences in career decision-making status between Thai and American college students.

In answering the second hypothesis , the results of this research rejected the null hypothesis which stated there will be no significant relationship in career decision-making status within the American college students. For Thai students, however, the results of this research did not reject the null hypothesis.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The demographic data shows that the majority of the Thai and the American students were females and also that the majority of the Thai students were freshmen while American students were seniors. Thai students had a maximum of 15 majors whereas American students' had 35 majors altogether. Most Thai students are required to take as freshman "Introduction to Psychology" whereas "Basic Skills in Counseling" is an elective class for American students. The American students had a wider age range than the Thai students because the American educational system is more open. The Thai educational system requires students' maximum age to be 25 years old.

Significant differences existed between the Thai and the American college students scores for the strength of interest for predominantly male occupations (SINTRM). Thai students reported a higher interest in these professions than did the American students. This may be because the Thai society is male dominated. The typical Thai family focused on Thai males as the head of their families (Suvannathat, 1979). In general, Thai parents tend to pay more attention to their sons than to their daughters in the belief that males are the leaders in both the family and society. Therefore, most Thai students interest emphasized predominantly male occupations.

Scores for the strength of self-efficacy for predominantly male occupations (SSEFM) were also higher for the Thai students than for the American students. This may be because interest is closely related to self-efficacy, as the results show.

Because the number of Thai students in each major exceeded that of the American subjects, Thai subjects may have more universal interest both in predominantly male and predominantly female occupations. Therefore, Thai college students scores for the level of interest for both predominantly male occupations (LINTRM) and predominantly female occupations (LINTRF) were higher than those of American students.

Most of the Thai college students were freshmen who passed their entrance examination, which is very competitive in Thailand. They may feel greater success in completing predominantly male occupations (LSEFM) than the American college students who were seniors. Therefore, Thai students reported a higher level of self-efficacy for predominantly male occupations (LSEFM) than those of the American college students. However, the differences between Thai and American levels of self-efficacy for predominantly female occupations (LSEFF) were not detected.

Both the strength and level of self-efficacy for predominantly male occupations and predominantly female occupations were highly correlated, supporting Matsui, Ikeda and Ohnishi's (1989) study. The strength and level of interest for predominantly male occupations were also highly correlated.

The results of this research indicated that interest was highly correlated with self-efficacy in both the Thai and American groups. These two variables might have some common characteristics which can contribute to the students' career choice. The results also supported Rotberg, Ware and Brown's (1987) study with a sample of 152 community college students which indicated that range of career choices was predicted by interest and self-efficacy.

Thai male students' interest exceeded that of Thai female students in two out of ten predominantly male occupations: (1) Electrical Engineer, and (2) Manager; meanwhile the American male students' interest exceeded that of American female students in three predominantly male occupations: (1) Air Traffic Controller, (2) Electrical Engineer, and (3) Computer Programmer. The results indicated that both the American and Thai male students' interest focused on predominantly male occupations such as Electrical Engineer. However, their interest is different in other professions such as Air Traffic Controller, Computer Programmer, and Manager, possibly because of cultural differences.

For predominantly female occupations, Thai female students' interest exceeded Thai male students in two of predominantly female occupations: (1) Registered Nurse, and (2) Secretary, whereas the American female students' interest exceeded American male students in three occupations: (1) Registered Nurse, (2) Dietician, and (3) Secretary. Both American and Thai female students' interest focused on the same predominantly female occupations with one exception: Dietician. Thai students may not be familiar with this profession.

Thai male students' self-efficacy in predominantly male occupations exceeded Thai female students in one occupation, Electrical Engineer, while American male students showed higher self-efficacy in Computer Programming.

For the predominantly occupations, Thai female students' reported higher self-efficacy than did Thai male students in two of predominantly female occupations: (1) Registered Nurse, and (2) Secretary; meanwhile, the American female students exceeded male students in four professions: (1) Elementary School Teacher, (2) Registered Nurse, (3) Dietician, and (4) Secretary. Both Thai and American female students showed high self-efficacy in the same two professions: (1) Registered Nurse, and (2) Secretary. The other two professions in which Thai female students did not show higher self-efficacy than Thai male students were Elementary School Teacher and Dietician. One of the reasons is that a group of Thai subjects' majors were Elementary Education. Those Thai groups consisted of both female and male students who might perceive their ability to complete Elementary School Teacher profession at the same level. For Dietician, Thai female students did not report higher self-efficacy than Thai male students, however, this profession may be new for Thai students. Thai female students did report a higher level of interest and self-efficacy than did Thai male students.

The results of this research supported Betz and Hackett's (1981) study which reported that male students had the same level of self-efficacy in both predominantly male and predominantly female occupations while female students reported higher self-efficacy in predominantly female occupations but lower self-efficacy in predominantly male occupations (Matsui, Ikeda & Ohnishi, 1989). Male students showed higher self-efficacy in predominantly male occupations than did female students, whereas female students showed higher self-efficacy in predominantly female occupations. The results also indicated that Betz and Hackett's (1981) study can be applied to other cultures such as the Thai culture. This study provided evidence that both Thai and American female college students have lower self-efficacy than do male students regarding predominantly male occupations supporting Clement's (1987) study. However, the female students in this study did not show a higher self-efficacy in predominantly female occupations than did the male students in many professions, as indicated by Clement's (1987) study. Because Clement's (1987) subjects are British, cultural differences may account for this. Those subjects might have different life experiences and perceptions of their own ability in completing the given twenty occupations from the subjects of this study. However, this study was also supported by Post-Kammer and Smith' (1986) study with an ethnically mixed group of 131 precollege students, proposing that gender differences do exist in math/science occupations (predominantly male occupations only). The findings showed gender differences in self-efficacy in three math/science careers: (1) Computer Programmer, (2) Drafter, and (3) Engineer. Both self-efficacy and interest were the predictors of both math-related and non-math-related career consideration for female students. Interest contributed to the prediction only for male students. No sex differences in self-efficacy regarding the non-math occupations was reported (Post-Kammer & Smith, 1986).

The mean score of the college GPA's of Thai students were lower than those of American students, but Thai students showed higher self-efficacy than did American students. The results of this research did not support Lent, Brown, and Larkin's (1984) study which indicated that the undergraduate students reporting high self-efficacy achieved higher grades and persisted longer in the selected major than did subjects with lower self-efficacy.

For the Bem Sex-Role Inventory, the mean scores of both the masculinity (BMM) and femininity (BMF) of the American college students were higher than those of Thai college students. In the standard norm group, the median score of masculinity (BMM) was 4.800 and the median score of femininity (BMF) was 5.500. The median scores of both masculinity (BMM) and femininity (BMF) of the American group were .300 higher than the median of the norm group. Both median scores of masculinity (BMM) and femininity (BMF) of the Thai group were, respectively, .700 and .400 lower than the norm group. The results of the t-test indicated that the mean scores of both masculinity (BMM) and femininity (BMF) of the American students were higher than the mean scores of those from the Thai students. This may be because both male and female American students are more assertive than Thai college students, and prefer to rate their own personality characteristics according to their sex-role orientations. In fact, appropriate sex-role behavior of

Thai people focused on modesty (Suvannathat, 1979). Thai children were taught to pay respect to their parents and the elders from the beginning of their lives. Buddhism plays a major role in Thai society. Quietness, politeness, and inhibition are required and accepted in both children and adults (Sangsingkeo, 1969). The feelings of self-effacement and humbleness, to be considerate for the other persons, including the intention to avoid intruding upon or embarrassing others, or causing others to extend or trouble themselves is a typical trait of Thai people called "krengchai" (National Identity Board, 1984; Phillips,1965; Suvannathat, 1979). Obedience is another concept which was emphasized for rearing of the Thai children. The need to please the others was focused on Thai children (Suvannathat, 1979). Thai social values do not enhance strong expression of emotion but emphasize both inhibition of one's own emotion and self-control (National Identity Board, 1984). The results of this research supported Weisz, Suwanlert, Chaiyasit and Walter' (1987) study that Thai culture focused on Eastern traditions of deference, quietness, and inhibition. Their subsequent study supported that Thais tended to accept inhibited behavior in children more than Americans (Weisz, Suwanlert, Chaiyasit, Weiss, Walter & Anderson, 1988).

Khon Kaen University which is located in the North-

Eastern area of Thailand, is influenced by Buddhism. The majority of the students in this university came from the nearby provinces. Thai Buddhist values of Quietness, politeness, and inhibition influence most Thais in this region. The typical characteristics of the Thai students tend to be the same as traditional Thais. However, the results of this research did not support Komin's (1978) study of the Thai values which indicated that the value of individualism was the most important for Thais. This may be because of the differences in the instruments and the duration of the studies.

Even though the percentage of the American subjects who were classified as "Androgynous" (28.9%) is less than their Thai counterparts, the American group had higher standard median scores than did the Thai group. Both groups had the same standard norm classification consisting of--Feminine, Masculine, Androgynous, and Undifferentiated,-- and the percentage of the American subjects which can be classified as "Androgynous" (47.8%) exceeded that of the Thai subjects (8.8%) and their relative norm group (28.9%). The percentage of the "Undifferentiated" group for Thai subjects (58.6%) exceeded that of the American subjects (11.3%) and also that of their relative norm group (28.6%). This appear to be due to the fact that Thai group had a different standard for classifying the subjects compared to the

American group. Using the same standard norm group (Bem,1981), the majority of the American students were "Androgynous" while the majority of the Thai students were "Undifferentiated."

The career certainty scores of the American college students were higher than those of the Thai college students, whereas the career indecision scores of Thai students were higher than those of the American students.

The results indicated that Thai students had higher indecision than American students. This may be because child-rearing in Thailand is very different from the United States. In general, most Thai parents always help their children to make decisions and to problem solve. Thai children were not taught or encouraged to make their own decisions from an early age. Therefore, when making their career choice Thai students may tend to be more dependent on their parents and thus display higher indecision than do the American students.

Using the standard norm group, the percentage of the American college students who were low certainty (8.2%) were less than their relative norm group (24.5%). The percentage of the American students who were high indecision (34.0%) were more than their relative norm group (17.6%). In comparison with the American students, however, the majority of the Thai college students were freshmen and in the first semester of their college life. Unlike American college students (who were older and had more work and career life experiences) Thai college students may have been less mature and more uncertain in choosing their career choice. Therefore, it is not surprising that Thai college students showed higher career indecision.

The findings of this research did support Mogar's (1964) study which found that freshmen minority groups were classified as indecisive and tended to be struggling with their current "valuelessness." He also found that freshmen considered career as the primary source for satisfactions which was consistent with Katz (1967) who reported that "career or occupation" was very important for freshmen, but of lower importance for seniors.

Considering the predictors in career indecision, five of the independent variables were significant in the American group but only two independent variables were significant in the Thai group. The implication is that those variables cannot predict career indecision for the Thai group. Future research may identify the variables which can be applied to other cultures. This will be useful for cross-cultural study research.

In summary, Thai college students showed higher interest in both predominantly male and predominantly female occupations than the American college students. They also reported higher self-efficacy in the predominantly male occupations than the American college students. For sex-role orientations, the American students rated themselves higher than the Thai students both in masculinity and femininity. The majority of Thai students were classified as "Undifferentiated" while the majority of the American students were classified as "Androgynous." For career decision-making, the Thai students showed higher indecision than the American college students. Finally, the predictor variables of this research were not able to predict the Thai students' career decision-making.

APPENDIX A: TABLES 5-95

TABLE 5

THE NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF THE AMERICAN COLLEGE STUDENTS IN EACH CLASS

Class	Gender Female	Percent	Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
1	1	.6			1	.6	.6
2	1	.6	3	1.9	4	2.5	3.1
3	16	10.0	9	5.7	25	15.7	18.8
4	108	67.9	13	8.2	121	76.1	94.9
5	2	1.3	1	.6	3	1.9	96.8
Graduate	5	3.1			5	3.1	100.0
Total	133	83.6	26	16.4	159	100.0	

Valid cases 159 Missing cases 0

TABLE 6

MAJORS OF THE AMERICAN COLLEGE STUDENTS

Majors	Female	Percent	Gender Male	Percent	Total	Percent
1. Family Studies	36	22.6	3	1.9	39	24.5
2. Psychology	21	13.3	5	3.2	26	16.5
3. Child Development	17	10.8			17	10.8
4. Health/Human Service	4	2.5			4	2.5
5. Merchandising	6	3.8			6	3.8
6. Personnel Manager	8	5.1			8	5.1
7. Business	4	2.5			4	2.5
8. Educational Psychology	2	1.3			2	1.3
9. Special Education	2	1.3			2	1.3
10. Anthropology	2	1.3			2	1.3
11. Religious Studies	1	.6			1	.6
12. Nutrition	1	.6			1	.6
13. Italian	1	.6			1	.6
14. Communication	3	1.9	1	.6	4	2.5
15. Veterinary Science	1	.6			1	.6
16. Sociology	5	3.2	4	2.5	9	5.7
17. General Studies	4	2.5			4	2.5
18. Cosmetology			1	.6	1	.6
19. Marketing	1	.6	1	.6	2	1.3
20. Accounting	1	.6			1	.6
21. Elementary Education	1	.6			1	.6
22. Criminal Justice	2	1.3	1	.6	3	1.9
23. General Home Economics	2	1.3			2	1.3
24. Family Resource	1	.6			1	.6
25. Exercise & Sport Science	1	.6	3	1.9	4	2.5
26. Education	1	.6			1	.6
27. Rehabilitation Counseling	1	.6	1	.6	2	1.3
28. Political Science	1	.6	2	1.3	3	1.9
29. Journalism	1	.6			1	.6
30. Undecided			1	.6	1	.6
31. Media	1	.6			1	.6
32. Consumer Studies	1	.6			1	.6
33. Community Health	1	.6			1	.6
34. Management Info System			1	.6	1	.6
			1	.6	Missing	
Total	133	83.6	26	16.4	159	100.0

Valid cases 159 Missing cases 0

TABLE 7

AGE RANGES OF THE AMERICAN COLLEGE STUDENTS

Age range (years)	Female	Gender Percent	Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
19-19.99	2	1.3			2	1.3	1.3
20-29.99	113	71.1	18	11.3	131	82.4	83.7
30-39.99	8	5.0	7	4.4	15	9.4	92.1
40-49.99	7	4.4			7	4.4	97.5
50-59.99	3	1.8			3	1.9	99.4
60-62			1	.6	1	.6	100.0
	---	---	---	---	---	---	
Total	133	83.6	26	16.4	159	100.0	

Mean 25.211 Median 22.151 Standard Deviation 7.744

Valid cases 159 Missing cases 0

TABLE 8

HIGH SCHOOL GRADE POINT AVERAGE OF THE AMERICAN COLLEGE STUDENTS

GPA	Female	Gender Percent	Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
1.00-1.99	1	.6	1	.6	2	1.3	1.3
2.00-2.99	24	15.1	10	6.3	34	21.4	22.7
3.00 3.99	89	56.0	13	8.2	102	64.2	86.9
4.00-4.33	4	2.5			4	2.5	100.0
	15	9.4	2	1.3	17	10.7	Missing
Total	133	83.6	26	16.4	159	100.0	

Mean 3.192 Median 3.150 Standard Deviation .510

Valid cases 142 Missing cases 17

TABLE 9

COLLEGE GRADE POINT AVERAGE OF THE AMERICAN COLLEGE STUDENTS

GPA	Female	Gender Percent	Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
1.00-1.99	2	1.3	1	.6	3	1.9	1.9
2.00-2.99	61	38.4	12	7.5	73	45.9	47.8
3.00-3.99	67	42.1	11	6.9	78	49.1	96.9
4.00	2	1.3			2	1.3	98.2
	1	.6	2	1.3	3	1.9	Missing
Total	133	83.6	26	16.3	159	100.0	

Mean 2.962 Median 3.000 Standard Deviation .535

Valid cases 156 Missing cases 3

TABLE 10

MOTHER'S PRESTIGE SCORES OF THE AMERICAN COLLEGE STUDENTS

Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
14.00	4	2.5	2.6	2.6
20.00	1	.6	.7	3.3
25.00	2	1.3	1.3	4.6
26.00	36	22.6	22.7	28.3
29.00	4	2.5	2.6	30.9
32.00	2	1.3	1.3	32.2
33.00	3	1.9	2.0	34.2
35.00	4	2.5	2.6	36.8
36.00	3	1.9	2.0	38.8
37.00	2	1.3	1.3	40.1
39.00	2	1.3	1.3	41.4
40.00	3	1.9	2.0	43.4
43.00	10	6.3	6.6	50.0
44.00	3	1.9	2.0	52.0
45.00	1	.6	.7	52.6
46.00	9	5.7	5.9	58.6
47.00	2	1.3	1.3	59.9
48.00	3	1.9	2.0	61.8
49.00	4	2.5	2.6	64.5
50.00	18	11.3	11.8	76.3
51.00	5	3.1	3.3	79.6
52.00	3	1.9	2.0	81.6
55.00	1	.6	.7	82.2
57.00	1	.6	.7	82.9
58.00	1	.6	.7	83.6
60.00	6	3.8	3.9	87.5
61.00	1	.6	.7	88.2
62.00	14	8.8	9.2	97.4
71.00	1	.6	.7	98.0
72.00	2	1.3	1.3	99.3
78.00	1	.6	.7	100.0
	7	4.4	Missing	
Total	159	100.0	100.0	

Mean 41.967 Median 43.500 Standard Deviation 14.047

Valid cases 152 Missing cases 7

TABLE 11

MOTHER'S PRESTIGE LEVELS OF THE AMERICAN COLLEGE STUDENTS

Prestige Level	Female	Gender Percent	Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Low	49	30.8	12	7.5	61	38.3	38.3
Medium	30	18.8	7	4.4	37	23.2	61.5
High	48	30.2	6	3.8	54	34.0	95.5
	6	3.9	1	.6	7	4.5	Missing
	----	----	----	----	----	----	
Total	133	83.6	26	16.4	159	100.0	

Valid cases 152 Missing cases 7

TABLE 12

MOTHER'S SEX-TYPE JOBS OF THE AMERICAN COLLEGE STUDENTS

Sex-Type Jobs	Female	Gender Percent	Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Female jobs	68	42.8	10	6.3	78	49.1	49.1
Male jobs	8	5.0	4	2.5	12	7.5	56.5
Both female and male jobs	51	32.0	11	6.9	62	39.0	95.5
	6	3.7	1	.6	7	4.4	Missing
	----	----	----	----	----	----	
Total	133	83.6	26	16.4	159	100.0	

Valid Cases 152 Missing Cases 7

TABLE 13

FATHER'S PRESTIGE SCORES OF THE AMERICAN COLLEGE STUDENTS

Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
14.00	6	3.8	3.8	3.8
17.00	1	.6	.6	4.4
18.00	1	.6	.6	5.1
22.00	1	.6	.6	5.7
25.00	1	.6	.6	6.3
26.00	1	.6	.6	7.0
28.00	4	2.5	2.5	9.5
29.00	5	3.1	3.2	12.7
31.00	1	.6	.6	13.3
32.00	2	1.3	1.3	14.6
34.00	1	.6	.6	15.2
36.00	1	.6	.6	15.8
38.00	1	.6	.6	16.5
40.00	2	1.3	1.3	17.1
41.00	4	2.5	2.5	20.9
42.00	1	.6	.6	21.5
43.00	4	2.5	2.5	24.1
44.00	9	5.7	5.7	29.7
45.00	2	1.3	1.3	31.0
46.00	1	.6	.6	31.6
47.00	3	1.9	1.9	33.5
48.00	6	3.8	3.8	37.3
49.00	8	5.0	5.1	42.4
50.00	37	23.3	23.4	65.8
51.00	6	3.8	3.8	69.6
56.00	3	1.9	1.9	71.5
57.00	4	2.5	2.5	74.1
58.00	2	1.3	1.3	75.3
61.00	3	1.9	1.9	77.2
62.00	1	.6	.6	77.8
67.00	6	3.8	3.8	81.6
68.00	3	1.9	1.9	83.5
69.00	7	4.4	4.4	88.0
70.00	1	.6	.6	88.6
71.00	1	.6	.6	89.2
72.00	5	3.1	3.2	92.4
76.00	4	2.5	2.5	94.9
78.00	2	1.3	1.3	96.2
80.00	1	.6	.6	96.8
82.00	5	3.1	3.2	100.0
	1	.6	Missing	

Table 13--Continue

Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	-------	-------	-------	
Total	159	100.0	100.0	

Mean 50.348 Median 50.000 Standard Deviation 15.697
Valid cases 158 Missing cases 1

TABLE 14

FATHER'S PRESTIGE LEVELS OF THE AMERICAN COLLEGE STUDENTS

Prestige Level	Female	Gender Percent	Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Low	18	11.3	8	5.0	26	16.3	16.3
Medium	32	20.1	9	5.6	41	25.8	42.1
High	83	52.2	8	5.0	91	57.2	99.3
			1	.6	1	.6	Missing
	----	----	----	----	----	----	
Total	133	83.6	26	16.4	159	100.0	

Valid cases 158 Missing cases 1

TABLE 15

FATHER'S SEX-TYPE JOBS OF THE AMERICAN COLLEGE STUDENTS

Sex-type Cumulative Jobs	Female	Percent	Male	Gender Percent	Total	Percent	Percent
Female jobs	7	4.4	2	1.3	9	5.6	5.6
Male jobs	64	40.2	17	10.7	81	50.9	56.5
Both female and male jobs	62	39.0	6	3.7	68	42.8	99.3
			1	.6	1	.6	Missing
	----	----	----	----	----	----	
Total	133	83.6	26	16.4	159	100.0	

Valid cases 158 Missing cases 1

TABLE 16

OCCUPATIONAL EXPECTATION SCORES OF THE AMERICAN COLLEGE STUDENTS

Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
14.00	3	1.9	1.9	1.9
25.00	3	1.9	1.9	3.9
26.00	4	2.5	2.6	6.5
34.00	1	.6	.6	7.1
36.00	1	.6	.6	7.7
37.00	9	5.7	5.8	13.5
39.00	3	1.9	1.9	15.5
42.00	2	1.3	1.3	16.8
43.00	12	7.5	7.7	24.5
44.00	1	.6	.6	25.2
46.00	1	.6	.6	25.8
47.00	3	1.9	1.9	27.7
48.00	3	1.9	1.9	29.7
49.00	4	2.5	2.6	32.3
50.00	12	7.5	7.7	40.0
51.00	49	30.8	31.6	71.6
52.00	17	10.7	11.0	82.6
56.00	3	1.9	1.9	84.5
57.00	1	.6	.6	85.2
60.00	1	.6	.6	85.8
69.00	1	.6	.6	86.5
71.00	10	6.3	6.5	92.9
72.00	2	1.3	1.3	94.2
76.00	6	3.8	3.9	98.1
78.00	2	1.3	1.3	99.4
82.00	1	.6	.6	100.0
	4	2.5	Missing	
Total	159	100.0	100.0	

Mean 50.303 Median 51.000 Standard Deviation 12.474

Valid cases 155 Missing cases 4

TABLE 17

OCCUPATIONAL EXPECTATION LEVELS OF THE AMERICAN COLLEGE STUDENTS

Occupational Expectation Levels	Female	Percent	Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Low	20	12.6	1	.6	21	13.2	13.2
Medium	22	13.8	7	4.4	29	18.2	31.4
High	88	55.3	17	10.7	105	66.0	97.4
	3	1.9	1	.6	4	2.5	Missing
	----	----	----	----	----	----	
Total	133	83.6	26	16.4	159	100.0	

Valid cases 155 Missing cases 4

TABLE 18

SEX PREFERENCE JOBS OF THE AMERICAN COLLEGE STUDENTS

Sex Preference Jobs	Female	Percent	Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Female jobs	18	11.3			18	11.3	11.3
Male jobs	26	16.3	11	6.9	37	23.2	34.6
Both female and male jobs	86	54.1	14	8.8	100	62.9	97.5
	3	1.9	1	.6	4	2.5	Missing
	----	----	----	----	----	----	
Total	133	83.6	26	16.4	159	100.0	

Valid cases 155 Missing cases 4

TABLE 19

OCCUPATIONAL ASPIRATION SCORES OF THE AMERICAN COLLEGE STUDENTS

Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
14.00	6	3.8	3.9	3.9
25.00	1	.6	.7	4.6
26.00	4	2.5	2.6	7.2
33.00	1	.6	.7	7.9
36.00	2	1.3	1.3	9.2
37.00	1	.6	.7	10.5
38.00	1	.6	.7	11.8
39.00	2	1.3	1.3	12.5
40.00	1	.6	.7	13.2
41.00	1	.6	.7	13.8
42.00	1	.6	.7	16.4
43.00	4	2.5	2.6	16.4
44.00	1	.6	.7	17.1
46.00	3	1.9	2.0	19.1
47.00	1	.6	.7	19.7
48.00	3	1.9	2.0	21.7
49.00	1	.6	.7	22.4
50.00	18	11.3	11.8	34.2
51.00	39	24.5	25.7	59.9
52.00	15	9.4	9.9	69.7
55.00	2	1.3	1.3	71.1
56.00	2	1.3	1.3	72.4
57.00	1	.6	.7	73.0
58.00	1	.6	.7	73.7
60.00	4	2.5	2.6	76.3
61.00	5	3.1	3.3	79.6
68.00	2	1.3	1.3	80.9
69.00	3	1.9	2.0	82.9
71.00	10	6.3	6.6	89.5
76.00	9	5.7	5.9	95.4
78.00	1	.6	.7	96.1
82.00	6	3.8	3.9	100.0
	7	4.4	Missing	
Total	159	100.0	100.0	

Mean 52.934 Median 51.000 Standard Deviation 14.483

Valid cases 152 Missing cases 7

TABLE 20

OCCUPATIONAL ASPIRATION LEVELS OF THE AMERICAN COLLEGE STUDENTS

Occupational Aspiartion Levels	Gender						Cumulative
	Female	Percent	Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Percent
Low	14	8.8	2	1.3	16	10.1	10.1
Medium	15	9.4	3	1.9	18	11.3	21.4
High	98	61.6	20	12.6	118	74.2	95.6
	6	3.8	1	.6	7	4.4	Missing
	----	----	----	----	----	----	
Total	133	83.6	26	16.4	159	100.0	

Valid cases 152 Missing cases 7

TABLE 21

THE STRENGTH OF INTEREST FOR PREDOMINANTLY MALE OCCUPATION SCORES OF THE AMERICAN COLLEGE STUDENTS

	Gender						Cumulative
Value	Female	Percent	Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Percent
.00	9	3.1			9	5.7	5.7
1.00	3	1.9	1	.6	4	2.5	8.2
2.00	3	1.9	1	.6	4	2.5	10.7
3.00	18	11.3	2	1.3	20	12.6	23.3
4.00	11	6.9	1	.6	12	7.5	30.8
5.00	14	8.8			14	8.8	39.6
6.00	8	5.0			8	5.0	44.7
7.00	7	4.4	2	1.3	9	5.7	50.3
8.00	7	4.4	1	.6	8	5.0	55.3
9.00	5	3.1	1	.6	6	3.8	59.1
10.00	6	3.7	2	1.3	8	5.0	64.2
11.00	3	1.9	2	1.3	5	3.1	67.3
12.00	5	3.1	3	1.9	8	5.0	72.3
13.00	7	4.4			7	4.4	76.7
14.00	4	2.5	1	.6	5	3.1	79.9
15.00	4	2.5	3	1.9	7	4.4	84.3
16.00	4	2.5			4	2.5	86.8
17.00	1	.6			1	.6	87.4
18.00	2	1.3	1	.6	3	1.9	89.3
19.00	3	1.9	1	.6	4	2.5	91.8
20.00	2	1.3			2	1.3	93.1
21.00	1	.6	2	1.3	3	1.9	95.0
23.00	1	.6			1	.6	95.6
24.00	1	.6			1	.6	96.2
25.00			1	.6	1	.6	96.9
26.00	2	1.3	1	.6	3	1.9	98.7
28.00	1	.6			1	.6	99.4
32.00	1	.6			1	.6	100.0
Total	133	83.6	26	16.4	159	100.0	

Mean 9.057 Median 7.000 Standard Deviation 6.723

Valid cases 159 Missing cases 0

TABLE 22

THE STRENGTH OF INTEREST FOR PREDOMINANTLY FEMALE OCCUPATION SCORES OF THE AMERICAN COLLEGE STUDENTS

	Gender					Cumulative	
Value	Female	Percent	Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Percent
.00	4	2.5	1	.6	5	3.1	3.1
2.00	1	.6			1	.6	3.8
3.00	6	3.8	3	1.9	9	5.7	9.4
4.00	3	1.9			3	1.9	11.3
5.00	5	3.1	1	.6	6	3.8	15.1
6.00	7	4.4	1	.6	8	5.0	20.1
7.00	3	1.9	3	1.9	6	3.8	23.9
8.00	6	3.8	2	1.3	8	5.0	28.9
9.00	5	3.1	2	1.3	7	4.4	33.3
10.00	5	3.1	1	.6	6	3.8	37.1
11.00	5	3.1			5	3.1	40.2
12.00	4	2.5			4	2.5	42.8
13.00	9	5.7	3	1.9	12	7.5	50.3
14.00	4	2.5	1	.6	5	3.1	53.5
15.00	7	4.4			7	4.4	57.9
16.00	4	2.5	1	.6	5	3.1	61.0
17.00	4	2.5	1	.6	5	3.1	64.2
18.00	3	1.9			3	1.9	66.0
19.00	5	3.1	1	.6	6	3.8	69.8
20.00	2	1.3	1	.6	3	1.9	71.7
21.00	3	1.9	2	1.3	5	3.1	74.8
22.00	5	3.1			5	3.1	78.0
23.00	4	2.5			4	2.5	80.5
24.00	2	1.3			2	1.3	81.8
25.00	6	3.8			6	3.8	85.5
26.00	3	1.9			3	1.9	87.4
27.00	5	3.1			5	3.1	90.6
28.00	3	1.9	1	.6	4	2.5	93.1
29.00	2	1.3			2	1.3	94.3
30.00	1	.6			1	.6	95.0
31.00	1	.6			1	.6	95.6
32.00	1	.6			1	.6	96.2
33.00	1	.6			1	.6	96.9
34.00	1	.6			1	.6	97.5
36.00	1	.6			1	.6	98.1
37.00	1	.6			1	.6	98.7
40.00			1	.6	1	.6	99.4
42.00	1	.6			1	.6	100.0
Total	133	83.6	26	16.4	159	100.0	

Table 22--Continue

Mean 14.956 Median 13.000 Missing cases 9.105

Valid cases 159 Missing cases 0

TABLE 23
THE STRENGTH OF SELF-EFFICACY FOR PREDOMINANTLY MALE OCCUPATION SCORES OF THE AMERICAN COLLEGE STUDENTS

Value	Gender Female	Percent	Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
.00	1	.6			1	.6	.6
1.00	1	.6			1	.6	1.3
2.00	1	.6	1	.6	2	1.3	2.5
3.00	3	1.9	1	.6	4	2.5	5.0
4.00	5	3.1	1	.6	6	3.8	8.8
5.00	6	3.8			6	3.8	12.6
6.00	4	2.5			4	2.5	15.1
7.00	8	5.0	1	.6	9	5.7	20.8
8.00	8	5.0	1	.6	9	5.7	26.4
9.00	4	2.5			4	2.5	28.9
10.00	2	1.3			2	1.3	30.2
11.00	6	3.8	1	.6	7	4.4	34.6
12.00	4	2.5	1	.6	5	3.1	37.7
13.00	4	2.5			4	2.5	40.3
14.00	3	1.9	1	.6	4	2.5	42.8
15.00	2	1.3	1	.6	3	1.9	44.7
16.00	4	2.5			4	2.5	47.2
17.00	3	1.9	1	.6	4	2.5	49.7
18.00	3	1.9			3	1.9	51.6
19.00	7	4.4	1	.6	8	5.0	56.6
20.00	3	1.9	1	.6	4	2.5	59.1
21.00	5	3.1	1	.6	6	3.8	62.9
22.00	4	2.5			4	2.5	65.4
23.00	2	1.3			2	1.3	66.7
24.00	4	2.5	1	.6	5	3.1	69.8
25.00	6	3.8	1	.6	7	4.4	74.2
26.00	1	.6			1	.6	74.8
27.00	3	1.9	2	1.3	5	3.1	78.0
28.00	2	1.3	1	.6	3	1.9	79.9
29.00	5	3.1	3	1.9	8	5.0	84.9
30.00	1	.6			1	.6	85.5
31.00	4	2.5			4	2.5	88.1
32.00	2	1.3	1	.6	3	1.9	89.9
33.00	2	1.3			2	1.3	91.2
35.00	2	1.3	1	.6	3	1.9	93.1
36.00			1	.6	1	.6	93.7
37.00	2	1.3	1	.6	3	1.9	95.6
39.00	2	1.3			2	1.3	96.9
40.00	1	.6			1	.6	97.5
41.00	1	.6			1	.6	98.1
42.00	1	.6	1	.6	2	1.3	99.4
44.00	1	.6			1	.6	100.0

Table 23--Continue

Value	Female	Percent	Gender Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	
Total	133	83.6	26	16.4	159	100.0	

Mean 18.119 Median 18.000 Standard Deviation 10

Valid cases 159 Missing cases 0

TABLE 24
THE STRENGTH OF SELF-EFFICACY FOR PREDOMINANTLY FEMALE OCCUPATION SCORES OF THE AMERICAN COLLEGE STUDENTS

	Gender						Cumulative
Value	Female	Percent	Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Percent
.00	1	.6	1	.6	2	1.3	1.3
2.00	1	.6			1	.6	1.9
3.00			1	.6	1	.6	2.5
4.00	2	1.3	2	1.3	4	2.5	5.0
5.00	2	1.3			2	1.3	6.3
7.00			1	.6	1	.6	6.9
9.00	1	.6	1	.6	2	1.3	8.2
10.00	3	1.9			3	1.9	10.1
11.00	2	1.3	1	.6	3	1.9	11.9
12.00	4	2.5			4	2.5	14.5
13.00	2	1.3	1	.6	3	1.9	16.4
14.00	2	1.3	1	.6	3	1.9	18.2
15.00	1	.6			1	.6	18.9
16.00	3	1.9	1	.6	4	2.5	21.4
17.00	4	2.5			4	2.5	23.9
18.00	2	1.3	2	.6	4	2.5	26.4
19.00	1	.6	1	.6	2	1.3	27.7
20.00	3	1.9			3	1.9	29.6
21.00	4	2.5			4	2.5	32.1
22.00	4	2.5	2	1.3	6	3.8	35.8
23.00	3	1.9			3	1.9	37.7
24.00	6	3.8			6	3.8	41.5
25.00	8	5.0			8	5.0	46.5
26.00	3	1.9			3	1.9	48.4
27.00	5	3.1			5	3.1	51.6
28.00	7	4.4			7	4.4	56.0
29.00	2	1.3	2	1.3	4	2.5	58.5
30.00	8	5.0			8	5.0	63.5
31.00	5	3.1	1	.6	6	3.8	67.3
32.00	6	3.8			6	3.8	71.1
33.00	3	1.9			3	1.9	73.0
34.00	8	5.0	1	.6	9	5.7	78.6
35.00	3	1.9			3	1.9	80.5
36.00	2	1.3	1	.6	3	1.9	82.4
37.00	1	.6			1	.6	83.0
38.00	1	.6			1	.6	83.6
39.00	4	2.5			4	2.5	86.2
40.00	1	.6	2	1.3	3	1.9	88.1
41.00	3	1.9			3	1.9	89.9
42.00	2	1.3	1	.6	3	1.9	91.8
43.00	1	.6	2	1.3	3	1.9	93.7

Table 24--Continue

Value	Female	Percent	Gender Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
44.00	1	.6	1	.6	2	1.3	95.0
45.00	4	2.5			4	2.5	97.5
46.00	1	.6			1	.6	98.1
47.00	3	1.9			3	1.9	100.0
Total	133	83.65	26	16.35	159	100.0	

Mean 26.031 Median 27.000 Standard deviation 11.370

Valid cases 159 Missing cases 0

TABLE 25

THE LEVEL OF INTEREST FOR PREDOMINANTLY MALE OCCUPATION SCORES OF THE AMERICAN COLLEGE STUDENTS

Value	Female	Gender Percent	Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
.00	9	5.7			9	5.7	5.7
1.00	12	7.5	3	1.9	15	9.4	15.1
2.00	29	18.2	4	2.5	33	20.8	35.8
3.00	29	18.2	2	1.3	31	19.5	55.3
4.00	19	11.9	5	3.1	24	15.1	70.4
5.00	16	10.1	4	2.5	20	12.6	83.0
6.00	5	3.1	2	1.3	7	4.4	87.4
7.00	7	4.4	3	1.9	10	6.3	93.7
8.00	2	1.3	3	1.9	5	3.1	96.9
9.00	3	1.9			3	1.9	98.7
10.00	2	1.3			2	1.3	100.0
Total	133	83.6	26	16.4	159	100.0	

Mean 3.579 Median 3.000 Standard Deviation 2.220

Valid cases 159 Missing cases 0

TABLE 26

THE LEVEL OF INTEREST FOR PREDOMINANTLY FEMALE OCCUPATION SCORES OF THE AMERICAN COLLEGE STUDENTS

Value	Gender Female	Percent	Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
.00	4	2.5	1	.6	5	3.1	3.1
1.00	10	6.3	4	2.5	14	8.8	11.9
2.00	12	7.5	3	1.9	15	9.4	21.4
3.00	5	3.1	4	2.5	9	5.7	27.0
4.00	17	10.7	5	3.1	22	13.8	40.9
5.00	22	13.8			22	13.8	54.7
6.00	14	8.8	4	2.5	18	11.3	66.0
7.00	19	11.9	2	1.3	21	13.2	79.2
8.00	17	10.7	2	1.3	19	11.9	91.2
9.00	11	6.9	1	.6	12	7.5	98.7
10.00	2	1.3			2	1.3	100.0
Total	133	83.65	26	16.35	159	100.0	

Mean 5.057 Median 5.000 Standard Deviation 2.586

Valid cases 159 Missing cases 0

TABLE 27

THE LEVEL OF SELF-EFFICACY FOR PREDOMINANTLY MALE OCCUPATION SCORES OF THE AMERICAN COLLEGE STUDENTS

Value	Female	Gender Percent	Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
.00	1	.6			1	.6	.6
1.00	7	4.4	2	1.3	9	5.7	6.3
2.00	12	7.5	3	1.9	15	9.4	21.4
3.00	17	10.7	1	.6	18	11.3	27.0
4.00	13	8.1	3	1.9	16	10.1	37.1
5.00	15	9.4	1	.6	16	10.1	47.2
6.00	10	6.3	2	1.3	12	7.5	54.7
7.00	8	5.0	4	2.5	12	7.5	62.3
8.00	13	8.1	3	1.9	16	10.1	72.3
9.00	13	8.1	1	.6	14	8.8	81.1
10.00	24	15.1	6	3.7	30	18.9	100.0
Total	133	83.6	26	16.4	159	100.0	

Mean 5.956 Median 6.000 Standard Deviation 3.003

Valid cases 159 Missing cases 0

TABLE 28

THE LEVEL OF SELF-EFFICACY FOR PREDOMINANTLY FEMALE OCCUPATION SCORES OF THE AMERICAN COLLEGE STUDENTS

	Gender						Cumulative
Value	Female	Percent	Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Percent
.00	1	.6	1	.6	2	1.3	1.3
1.00	4	2.5	3	1.9	7	4.4	5.7
2.00	2	1.3	1	.6	3	1.9	7.5
3.00	3	1.9	1	.6	4	2.5	10.1
4.00	9	5.7	3	1.9	12	7.5	17.6
5.00	9	5.7			9	5.7	23.3
6.00	13	8.1	2	1.3	15	9.4	32.7
7.00	12	7.5	6	3.7	18	11.3	44.0
8.00	21	13.2	1	.6	22	13.8	57.9
9.00	21	13.2	1	.6	22	13.8	71.7
10.00	38	23.9	7	4.4	45	28.3	100.0
Total	133	83.6	26	16.4	159	100.0	

Mean 7.283 Median 8.000 Standard Deviation 2.698

Valid cases 159 Missing cases 0

TABLE 29

CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS BETWEEN STRENGTH AND LEVEL OF INTEREST AND SELF-EFFICACY

	LINTRM	LINTRF	LSEFM	LSEFF	SINTRM	SINTRF	SSEFM	SSEFF
LINTRM	1.000	.315	.453	.062	.906	.340	.486	.121
LINTRF	.315	1.000	.051	.423	.246	.875	.001	.401
LSEFM	.453	.051	1.000	.568	.436	-.002	.896	.521
LSEFF	.062	.423	.568	1.000	.013	.312	.464	.844
SINTRM	.906	.246	.436	.013	1.000	.322	.511	.059
SINTRF	.340	.875	-.002	.312	.322	1.000	.011	.367
SSEFM	.486	.001	.896	.464	.511	.011	1.000	.566
SSEFF	.121	.401	.521	.844	.059	.367	.566	1.000

TABLE 30

CHI-SQUARE ASSOCIATION BETWEEN VARIABLES

Variables	Chi-Square	Level of Significance
1. Father's Prestige Scores and Gender	9.22403**	p < .01
2. SINTRM and		
2.1 Gender	5.80391**	p < .01
2.2 Major	983.56147**	p < .01
2.3 Role Model (MO)	47.55096**	p < .01
3. SINTRF and		
3.1 Major	6.77400**	p < .01
3.2 Role Model (MO)	53.43631*	p < .05
4. SSEFM and Major	4.18905*	p < .05
5. SSEFF and		
5.1 Gender	63.37560*	p < .05
5.2 Role Model (MO)	61.90133*	p < .05
6. LINTRM and Gender	4.09673*	p < .05
7. LINTRF and Major	3.88154*	p < .05
8. LSEFF and		
8.1 Major	4.31551*	p < .05
8.2 Gender	5.07923*	p < .05
9. BMM and CDCERT	258.43056**	p < .01
10. BMF and Gender	4.50562*	p < .05
11. CDINDE and		
11.1 Class	68.66192**	p < .01
11.2 College GPA	495.7319**	p < .01
11.3 Sex-Role	125.54458**	p < .01
11.4 SINTRF	3.80755*	P < .05
12. INDEPER and Gender	11.85944**	p < .01

* p < .05
** p < .01

TABLE 31

MASCULINITY SCORES OF THE AMERICAN COLLEGE STUDENTS

Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
1.60	1	.6	.6	.6
2.50	1	.6	.6	1.3
2.89	1	.6	.6	1.9
2.90	1	.6	.6	2.5
3.20	3	1.9	1.9	4.4
3.50	1	.6	.6	5.0
3.60	2	1.3	1.3	6.3
3.80	4	2.5	2.5	8.8
3.90	4	2.5	2.5	11.3
4.00	5	3.1	3.1	14.5
4.10	3	1.9	1.9	16.4
4.20	3	1.9	1.9	18.2
4.30	3	1.9	1.9	20.1
4.40	4	2.5	2.5	22.6
4.50	7	4.4	4.4	27.0
4.60	6	3.8	3.8	30.8
4.70	3	1.9	1.9	32.7
4.80	12	7.5	7.5	40.3
4.90	7	4.4	4.4	44.7
5.00	6	3.8	3.8	48.4
5.10	7	4.4	4.4	52.8
5.20	7	4.4	4.4	57.2
5.30	5	3.1	3.1	60.4
5.40	8	5.0	5.0	65.4
5.50	9	5.7	5.7	71.1
5.60	8	5.0	5.0	76.1
5.70	9	5.7	5.7	81.8
5.80	5	3.1	3.1	84.9
5.90	8	5.0	5.0	89.9
6.00	2	1.3	1.3	91.2
6.10	5	3.1	3.1	94.3
6.30	2	1.3	1.3	95.6
6.40	2	1.3	1.3	96.9
6.60	2	1.3	1.3	98.1
6.80	2	1.3	1.3	99.4
6.90	1	.6	.6	100.0
Total	159	100.0	100.0	

Mean 5.011 Median 5.100 Standard Deviation .874
Valid cases 159 Missing cases 0

TABLE 32

FEMININITY SCORES OF THE AMERICAN COLLEGE STUDENTS

Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
1.60	1	.6	.6	.6
3.30	1	.6	.6	1.3
4.00	1	.6	.6	1.9
4.20	2	1.3	1.3	2.5
4.30	3	1.9	1.9	4.4
4.40	1	.6	.6	5.0
4.50	2	1.3	1.3	6.3
4.60	1	.6	.6	6.9
4.70	2	1.3	1.3	8.2
4.80	3	1.9	1.9	10.1
4.90	1	.6	.6	10.7
5.00	2	1.3	1.3	11.9
5.10	6	3.8	3.8	15.7
5.20	6	3.8	3.8	19.5
5.30	7	4.4	4.4	23.9
5.33	1	.6	.6	24.5
5.40	10	6.3	6.3	30.8
5.50	7	4.4	4.4	35.2
5.60	5	3.1	3.1	38.4
5.67	1	.6	.6	39.0
5.70	8	5.0	5.0	44.0
5.80	12	7.5	7.5	51.6
5.90	8	5.0	5.0	56.6
6.00	9	5.7	5.7	62.3
6.10	8	5.0	5.0	67.3
6.20	14	8.8	8.8	76.1
6.30	4	2.5	2.5	78.6
6.40	5	3.1	3.1	81.8
6.50	5	3.1	3.1	84.9
6.60	1	.6	.6	85.5
6.70	5	3.1	3.1	88.7
6.80	4	2.5	2.5	91.2
6.90	5	3.1	3.1	94.3
7.00	9	5.7	5.7	100.0
Total	159	100.0	100.0	

Mean 5.781 Median 5.800 Standard Deviation .782

Valid cases 159 Missing cases 0

TABLE 33

SEX-ROLE ORIENTATIONS OF THE AMERICAN COLLEGE STUDENTS

Sex-role	Female	Percent	Gender Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Feminine	39	24.5	4	2.5	43	27.0	27.0
Masculine	25	15.7	11	6.9	34	22.6	49.7
Androgynous	40	25.1	6	3.8	46	28.9	78.6
Undifferen-tiated	29	18.2	5	3.1	34	21.4	100.0
Total	133	83.6	26	16.4	159	100.0	

Valid cases 159 Missing cases 0

TABLE 34

CAREER CERTAINTY SCORES OF THE AMERICAN COLLEGE STUDENTS

Value	Female	Percent	Gender Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
2.00			1	.6	1	.6	.6
3.00	2	1.3			2	1.3	1.9
4.00	7	4.4	3	1.9	10	6.3	8.2
5.00	21	13.2	5	3.1	26	16.4	24.5
6.00	35	22.0	8	5.0	43	27.0	51.6
7.00	32	20.1	3	1.9	35	22.0	73.6
8.00	36	22.6	6	3.8	42	26.4	100.0
Total	133	83.65	26	16.35	159	100.00	

Mean 6.396 Median 6.000 Standard Deviation 1.327

15th percentile 5.000 85th percentile 8.00

Valid cases 159 Missing cases 0

TABLE 35

CAREER CERTAINTY PERCENTILE OF THE AMERICAN COLLEGE STUDENTS

Career Certainty	Gender Female	Percent	Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
1. Low (<16th Percentile)	9	5.6	4	2.5	13	8.2	8.2
2. Middle (16-84th Percentile)	88	55.3	16	10.1	104	65.4	73.6
3. High (>84th Percentile)	36	22.6	6	3.8	42	26.4	100.0
	---	---	---	---	---	---	
Total	133	83.6	26	16.4	159	100.0	

Valid cases 159 Missing cases 0

TABLE 36

CAREER CERTAINTY PERCENTILE OF THE AMERICAN COLLEGE STUDENTS IN EACH CLASS

Class	Career Certainty Low (<16th Percentile)	Percent	Medium (16-84th Percentile)	Percent	High (>84th Percentile)	Percent	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
1			1	.6			1	.6	.6
2	1	.6	1	.6	2	1.3	4	2.5	3.1
3	4	2.5	16	10.1	5	3.1	25	15.7	18.8
4	7	4.4	80	50.3	34	21.4	121	76.1	94.9
5			3	1.9			3	1.9	96.8
Graduate	1	.6	3	1.9	1	.6	5	3.1	100.0
Total	13	8.2	104	65.4	42	26.4	159	100.0	

Valid cases 159 Missing cases 0

TABLE 37

CAREER CERTAINTY PERCENTILE OF THE FIRST YEAR AMERICAN COLLEGE STUDENTS

Career Certainty	Female	Gender Percent	Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
1. Low (<16th Percent-ile)							
2. Medium (16-84th Percent-ile) 100.0	1	100.0			1	100.0	
3. High (>84th Percent-ile)							
	----	----			----	----	
Total	1	100.0			1	100.0	

Valid cases 1 Missing cases 0

TABLE 38

CAREER CERTAINTY PERCENTILE OF THE SECOND YEAR AMERICAN COLLEGE STUDENTS

Career Certainty	Gender Female	Percent	Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
1. Low (<16th Percentile)			1	25.0	1	25.0	50.0
2. Medium (16-84th Percentile)			1	25.0	1	25.0	75.0
3. High (>85th Percentile)	1	25.0			1	25.0	100.0
	----	----	----	----	----	----	
Total	1	25.0	3	75.0	4	100.0	

Valid cases 25 Missing cases 0

TABLE 39

CAREER CERTAINTY PERCENTILE OF THE THIRD YEAR AMERICAN COLLEGE STUDENTS

	Gender						Cumulative
Percentile	Female	Percent	Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Percent
1. Low (<16th Percent-ile)	2	8.0	2	8.0	4	16.0	16.0
2. Medium (16-84th Percent-ile)	11	44.0	5	20.0	11	64.0	80.0
3. High (>84th Percent-ile)	5	20.0			5	20.0	100.0
Total	18	72.0	7	28.0	20	100.0	

Valid cases 20 Missing cases 0

TABLE 40

CAREER CERTAINTY PERCENTILE OF THE FOURTH YEAR
AMERICAN COLLEGE STUDENTS

Career Certainty	Gender Female	Percent	Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
1. Low (<16th Percentile)	6	4.9	1	.8	7	5.8	5.8
2. Medium (16-84th Percentile)	71	58.7	9	7.4	80	66.1	71.9
3. High (>84th Percentile)	29	24.0	5	4.1	34	28.1	100.0
Total	106	87.6	15	12.4	121	100.0	

Valid cases 121 Missing cases 0

TABLE 41

CAREER CERTAINTY PERCENTILE OF THE FIFTH YEAR AMERICAN COLLEGE STUDENTS

Career Certainty	Female	Gender Percent	Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
1. Low (<16th Percentile)							
2. Medium (16-84th Percentile)	2	66.7	1	33.3	3	100.0	100.0
3. High (>84th Percentile)							
	----	----	----	----	----	----	
Total	2	66.7	1	33.3	3	100.0	

Valid cases 3 Missing cases 0

TABLE 42

CAREER CERTAINTY PERCENTILE OF THE AMERICAN GRADUATE STUDENTS

Career Certainty	Gender Female	Percent	Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
1. Low (<16th Percentile)	1	20.0			1	20.0	20.0
2. Medium (16-84th Percentile)	3	60.0			3	60.0	80.0
3. High (>84th Percentile)	1	20.0			1	20.0	100.0
	----	----			----	----	
Total	5	100.0			5	100.0	

Valid cases 5 Missing cases 0

TABLE 43

CAREER INDECISION SCORES OF THE AMERICAN COLLEGE STUDENTS

Value	Female	Gender Percent	Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
16.00	2	1.3	2	1.3	4	2.5	2.5
17.00	9	5.7	1	.6	10	6.3	8.8
18.00	11	6.9			11	6.9	15.7
19.00	8	5.0			8	5.0	20.8
20.00	2	1.3	2	1.3	4	2.5	23.3
21.00	4	2.5	1	.6	5	3.1	26.4
22.00	9	5.7	1	.6	10	6.3	32.7
23.00	3	1.9			3	1.9	34.6
24.00	7	4.4	1	.6	8	5.0	39.6
25.00	7	4.4			7	4.4	44.0
26.00	7	4.4	2	1.3	9	5.7	49.7
27.00	6	3.8	1	.6	7	4.4	54.1
28.00	4	2.5	1	.6	5	3.1	57.2
30.00	5	3.1			5	3.1	60.4
31.00	3	1.9	2	1.3	5	3.1	63.5
32.00	2	1.3	1	.6	3	1.9	65.4
33.00	5	3.1	1	.6	6	3.8	69.2
34.00	5	3.1	1	.6	6	3.8	73.0
35.00	7	4.4	2	1.3	9	5.7	78.6
36.00	3	1.9	2	1.3	5	3.1	81.8
37.00	1	.6			1	.6	82.4
38.00	9	5.7			9	5.7	88.1
39.00	1	.6			1	.6	88.7
41.00	2	1.3			2	1.3	89.9
42.00	2	1.3	1	.6	3	1.9	91.8
43.00	2	1.3	1	.6	3	1.9	93.7
44.00	1	.6			1	.6	94.3
45.00	2	1.3			2	1.3	95.6
47.00	2	1.3	1	.6	3	1.9	97.5
51.00	1	.6	1	.6	2	1.3	98.7
53.00	1	.6	1	.6	2	1.3	100.0
Total	133	83.6	26	16.4	159	100.0	

Mean 28.453 Median 27.000 Standard Deviation 9.015

15 percentile 18.000 85 percentile 38.000

Valid cases 159 Missing cases 0

TABLE 44

CAREER INDECISION PERCENTILE
OF THE AMERICAN COLLEGE STUDENTS

Career Indecision	Gender Female	Percent	Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
1. Low (<16th Percentile)	2	1.3	4	2.5	6	3.8	3.8
2. Medium (16-84th Percentile)	86	54.1	13	8.2	99	62.3	66.0
3. High (>84th Percentile)	45	28.3	9	5.6	54	34.0	100.0
	---	---	---	---	---	----	
Total	133	83.6	26	16.4	159	100.0	

Valid cases 159 Missing cases 0

TABLE 45

CAREER INDECISION PERCENTILE OF THE AMERICAN COLLEGE STUDENTS IN EACH CLASS

Class	Career Indecision								Cumulative
	Low (<16th Percent-tile)	Per-cent	Medium (16-84th Percent-tile)	Per-cent	High (>84th Percent tile)	Per-cent	Total	Per-cent	Percent
1					1	.6	1	.6	.6
2	1	.6	3	1.8			4	2.5	3.1
3			18	11.3	7	4.4	25	15.7	18.8
4	5	3.1	71	44.6	45	18.3	121	76.1	94.9
5			3	1.8			3	1.9	96.8
Graduate			4	2.5	1	.6	5	3.2	100.0
Total	6	3.8	99	62.3	54	34.0	159	100.0	

Valid cases 159 Missing cases 0

TABLE 46

CAREER INDECISION PERCENTILE OF THE FIRST YEAR AMERICAN COLLEGE STUDENTS

Career Indecision	Female	Percent	Gender Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
1. Low (<16th Percentile)							
2. Medium (16-84th Percentile)							
3. High (>84th Percentile)	1	100.0			1	100.0	100.0
	----	----			----	----	
Total	1	100.0			1	100.0	

Valid cases 1 Missing cases 0

TABLE 47

CAREER INDECISION PERCENTILE
OF THE SECOND YEAR AMERICAN COLLEGE STUDENTS

Career Indecision	Gender Female	Percent	Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
1. Low (<16th Percentile)			1	25.0	1	25.0	25.0
2. Medium (16-84th Percentile)	1	25.0	2	50.0	3	75.0	100.0
3. High (>84th Percentile)							
Total	1	25.0	3	75.0	4	100.0	

Valid cases 75 Missing cases 0

TABLE 48

CAREER INDECISION PERCENTILE
OF THE THIRD YEAR AMERICAN COLLEGE STUDENTS

Career Indecision	Gender Female	Percent	Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
1. Low (<16th Percentile)							
2. Medium (16-84th Percentile)	14	25.0	4	16.0	18	72.0	72.0
3. High (>84th Percentile)	4	16.0	3	12.0	7	28.0	100.0
	----	----	----	----	----	----	
Total	18	41.0	7	28.0	25	100.0	

Valid cases 25 Missing cases 0

TABLE 49

CAREER INDECISION OF THE FOURTH YEAR AMERICAN COLLEGE STUDENTS

Career Indecision	Female	Gender Percent	Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
1. Low (<16th Percentile)	2	1.6	3	2.5	5	4.1	4.1
2. Medium (16-84th Percentile)	65	53.7	6	5.0	71	58.7	62.8
3. High (>84th Percentile)	39	32.2	6	5.0	45	37.2	100.0
Total	106	87.6	15	12.4	121	100.0	

Valid cases 121 Missing cases 0

TABLE 50

CAREER INDECISION PERCENTILE OF THE FIFTH YEAR AMERICAN COLLEGE STUDENTS

Career Indecision	Female	Percent	Gender Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
1. Low (<16th Percent-ile)							
2. Medium (16-84th Percent-ile) 100.0	2	66.7	1	33.3	3	100.0	
3. High (>84th Percent-ile)							
	----	----	----	----	----	----	
Total	2	66.7	1	33.3	3	100.0	

Valid cases 3 Missing cases 0

TABLE 51

CAREER INDECISION PERCENTILE OF THE AMERICAN GRADUATE STUDENTS

Career Indecision	Female	Gender Percent	Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
1. Low (<16th Percentile)							
2. Medium (16-84th Percentile)	4	80.0			4	80.0	80.0
3. High (>84th Percentile)	1	20.0			1	10.0	100.0
	----	----			----	----	
Total	5	100.0			5	100.0	

Valid cases 5 Missing cases 0

TABLE 52

THE NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF THE THAI COLLEGE STUDENTS IN EACH CLASS

Class	Female	Gender Percent	Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
1	151	50.8	69	23.2	220	74.1	74.1
2	44	14.8	18	6.1	62	20.9	95.0
3	6	2.0	8	2.7	14	4.7	99.7
4	1	.3			1	.3	100.0
Total	202	68.1	95	31.9	297	100.00	

Valid cases 297 Missing cases 0

TABLE 53

MAJORS OF THE THAI COLLEGE STUDENTS

Majors	Gender Female	Percent	Male	Percent	Total	Percent
21. Elementary Education	34	11.4	12	4.0	46	15.5
35. Associated Medical Science	54	18.2	28	9.4	82	27.7
36. Art Teacher	5	1.7	7	2.3	12	4.1
37. Language	1	.3	1	.3	2	.7
38. Thai	6	2.0	3	1.0	9	3.0
39. French	12	4.0	4	1.3	16	5.4
40. Law	1	.3			1	.3
41. Business Administration	5	1.7	5	1.7	10	3.4
42. Finance	22	7.5	15	5.0	37	12.5
43. Nursing	4	1.3			4	1.4
44. Library Science and Information Science	24	8.1	4	1.3	28	9.5
45. Community Development	14	4.7	9	3.0	23	7.8
46. Pharmaceutical Science	16	5.4	5	1.7	21	7.1
47. Agriculture Economics	2	.7			2	.7
48. Agronomy	2	.7	1	.3	3	1.0
			1	.3	Missing	
	---	---	---	---		
Total	202	68.1	95	31.9	100.0	

Valid cases 297 Missing cases 0

TABLE 54

AGE RANGES OF THE THAI COLLEGE STUDENTS

Ages range (Years)	Gender Female	Percent	Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
16-19.99	171	57.6	65	21.9	236	79.5	79.5
20-29.99	24	8.0	25	8.4	49	16.5	96.0
	7	1.7	5	1.7	12	4.0	Missing
	---	---	---	---	---	---	
Total	202	68.1	95	31.9	297	100.0	

Mean 19.260 Median 18.822 Standard Deviation 1.934

Valid cases 285 Missing cases 12

TABLE 55

HIGH SCHOOL GRADE POINT AVERAGE OF THE THAI COLLEGE STUDENTS

GPA	Female	Gender Percent	Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
1.00-1.99	14	5.1	6	2.2	20	7.3	7.3
2.00-2.99	127	46.2	65	23.6	192	69.8	77.1
3.00-3.99	50	18.2	13	4.7	63	22.9	100.0
	11	4.0	11	4.0	22	8.0	Missing
	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	
Total	202	68.1	95	31.9	297	100.0	

Mean 2.613 Median 2.630 Standard Deviation .474

Valid cases 275 Missing cases 22

TABLE 56

COLLEGE GRADE POINT AVERAGE OF THE THAI COLLEGE STUDENTS

GPA	Gender						Cumulative
	Female	Percent	Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Percent
1.00-1.99	9	3.0	1	.3	10	3.4	3.4
2.00-2.99	29	9.8	14	4.7	43	14.5	17.9
3.00 3.99	12	4.0	8	2.7	20	6.7	24.6
	152	51.2	72	24.2	224	75.4	Missing
Total	202	68.1	95	31.9	297	100.0	

Mean 2.612 Median 2.600 Standard Deviation .528

Valid cases 73 Missing cases 224

TABLE 57

MOTHER'S PRESTIGE SCORES OF THE THAI COLLEGE STUDENTS

Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
14.00	1	.3	.4	.4
25.00	1	.3	.4	.8
26.00	38	12.8	14.7	15.5
32.00	1	.3	.4	15.9
36.00	9	3.0	3.5	19.4
41.00	66	22.2	25.6	45.0
43.00	18	6.1	7.0	51.9
49.00	5	1.7	1.9	53.9
50.00	85	28.6	32.9	86.8
60.00	33	11.1	12.8	99.6
62.00	1	.3	.4	100.0
	39	13.1	Missing	
Total	297	100.0	100.0	

Mean 44.186 Median 43.000 Standard Deviation 10.222

Valid cases 258 Missing cases 39

TABLE 58

MOTHER'S PRESTIGE LEVELS OF THE THAI COLLEGE STUDENTS

Prestige Level	Female	Gender Percent	Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Low	41	13.8	9	3.0	50	16.8	16.8
Medium	47	15.8	42	14.1	89	29.9	46.7
High	91	30.6	28	9.4	119	40.0	86.7
	23	7.7	16	5.4	39	13.1	Missing
	----	----	----	----	----	----	
Total	202	68.1	95	31.9	297	100.0	

Valid cases 258 Missing cases 39

TABLE 59

MOTHER'S SEX-TYPE JOBS OF THE THAI COLLEGE STUDENTS

Sex-Type Jobs	Female	Gender Percent	Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Female jobs	34	11.4	9	3.0	43	14.5	14.5
Male jobs	58	19.5	41	13.8	99	33.3	47.8
Both female and male jobs	87	29.3	29	9.7	116	39.1	86.9
	23	7.7	16	5.4	39	13.1	Missing
	----	----	----	----	----	----	
Total	202	68.1	95	31.9	297	100.0	

Valid cases 258 Missing cases 39

TABLE 60

FATHER'S PRESTIGE SCORES OF THE THAI COLLEGE STUDENTS

Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
14.00	7	2.4	2.6	2.6
16.00	1	.3	.4	3.0
17.00	1	.3	.4	3.4
25.00	2	.7	.7	4.1
26.00	1	.3	.4	4.5
32.00	3	1.0	1.1	5.6
36.00	18	6.1	6.7	12.3
40.00	1	.3	.4	12.6
41.00	60	20.2	22.3	34.9
43.00	17	5.7	6.3	41.3
48.00	8	2.7	3.0	44.2
49.00	6	2.0	2.2	46.5
50.00	74	24.9	27.5	74.0
60.00	64	21.5	23.6	97.8
67.00	2	.7	.7	98.5
72.00	1	.3	.4	98.9
76.00	1	.3	.4	99.3
78.00	1	.3	.4	99.6
82.00	1	.3	.4	100.0
	28	9.4	Missing	
Total	297	100.0	100.0	

Mean 47.740 Median 50.000 Standard Deviation 10.935

Valid cases 269 Missing cases 28

TABLE 61

FATHER'S PRESTIGE LEVELS OF THE THAI COLLEGE STUDENTS

Prestige Level	Female	Gender Percent	Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Low	28	9.4	5	1.7	33	11.1	11.1
Medium	47	15.8	45	15.1	92	30.9	42.0
High	109	36.7	35	11.8	144	48.5	90.5
	18	6.0	10	3.4	28	9.4	Missing
	----	----	----	----	----	----	
Total	202	68.1	95	31.9	297	100.0	

Valid Cases 269 Missing Cases 28

TABLE 62

FATHER'S SEX-TYPE JOBS OF THE THAI COLLEGE STUDENTS

Sex-Type Jobs	Female	Gender Percent	Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Female jobs	5	1.7			5	1.7	1.7
Male jobs	94	31.6	49	16.5	143	48.1	49.8
Both female and male jobs	85	28.6	36	12.1	121	40.7	90.5
	18	6.0	10	3.4	28	9.4	Missing
	----	----	----	----	----	----	
Total	202	68.1	95	31.9	297	100.0	

Valid cases 269 Missing cases 28

TABLE 63

OCCUPATIONAL EXPECTATION SCORES OF
THE THAI COLLEGE STUDENTS

Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
14.00	1	.3	.4	.4
25.00	3	1.0	1.1	1.5
35.00	7	2.4	2.6	4.0
36.00	3	1.0	1.1	5.1
40.00	3	1.0	1.1	6.3
41.00	5	1.7	1.8	8.1
43.00	42	14.1	15.4	23.5
46.00	2	.7	.7	24.3
48.00	1	.3	.4	24.6
49.00	17	5.7	6.3	30.9
50.00	33	11.1	12.1	43.0
51.00	11	3.7	4.0	47.1
52.00	1	.3	.4	47.4
55.00	9	3.0	3.3	50.7
57.00	9	3.0	3.3	54.0
60.00	33	11.1	12.1	66.2
61.00	72	24.2	26.5	92.6
62.00	4	1.3	1.5	94.1
72.00	13	4.4	4.8	98.9
76.00	1	.3	.4	99.3
78.00	2	.7	.7	100.0
	25	8.4	Missing	
Total	297	100.0	100.0	

Mean 53.695 Median 55.000 Standard Deviation 9.840

Valid cases 272 Missing cases 25

TABLE 64

OCCUPATIONAL EXPECTATION LEVELS OF THE THAI COLLEGE STUDENTS

Occupational Expectation Levels	Gender Female	Percent	Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Low	10	3.4	4	1.3	14	4.7	4.7
Medium	44	14.8	26	8.7	70	23.6	28.3
High	132	44.4	56	18.8	188	63.3	91.6
	16	5.4	9	3.0	25	8.4	Missing
	----	----	----	----	----	----	
Total	202	68.1	95	31.9	297	100.0	

Valid cases 272 Missing cases 25

TABLE 65

SEX PREFERENCE JOBS OF THE THAI COLLEGE STUDENTS

Sex Preference Jobs	Gender Female	Percent	Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Female jobs	50	16.8	19	6.4	69	23.2	23.2
Male jobs	54	18.2	25	8.4	79	26.6	49.8
Both female and male jobs	82	27.6	42	14.1	124	41.7	91.5
	16	5.4	9	3.0	25	8.4	Missing
	----	----	----	----	----	----	
Total	202	68.1	95	31.9	297	100.0	

Valid cases 272 Missing cases 25

TABLE 66

OCCUPATIONAL ASPIRATION SCORES OF
THE THAI COLLEGE STUDENTS

Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
14.00	1	.3	.4	.4
25.00	4	2.5	1.3	1.6
35.00	14	4.7	5.4	7.4
36.00	1	.3	.4	7.8
40.00	5	1.7	1.9	9.7
41.00	9	3.0	3.5	13.2
43.00	32	10.8	12.5	25.7
44.00	1	.3	.4	26.1
46.00	5	1.7	1.9	28.0
48.00	6	2.0	2.3	30.4
49.00	7	2.4	2.7	33.1
50.00	68	22.9	26.5	59.5
51.00	8	2.7	3.1	62.6
52.00	4	1.3	1.6	64.2
55.00	3	1.0	1.2	65.4
56.00	4	1.3	1.6	66.9
57.00	6	2.0	2.3	69.3
58.00	2	.7	.8	70.0
60.00	21	7.1	8.2	78.2
61.00	12	4.0	4.7	82.9
62.00	2	.7	.8	83.7
67.00	6	2.0	2.3	86.0
68.00	3	1.0	1.2	87.2
71.00	4	1.3	1.6	88.7
72.00	6	2.0	2.3	91.1
74.00	5	1.0	1.2	92.2
78.00	3	1.0	1.2	93.4
82.00	17	5.7	6.6	100.0
	40	13.5	Missing	
Total	297	100.0	100.0	

Mean 53.073 Median 50.000 Standard Deviation 12.658

Valid cases 257 Missing cases 40

TABLE 67

OCCUPATIONAL ASPIRATION LEVELS OF THE THAI COLLEGE STUDENTS

Occupational Aspiration Levels	Gender: Female	Percent	Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Low	16	5.4	4	1.3	20	6.7	6.7
Medium	40	13.5	25	8.4	65	21.9	28.6
High	125	42.1	47	15.8	172	57.9	86.5
	21	7.0	19	6.4	40	13.4	Missing
Total	202	68.1	95	31.9	297	100.0	

Valid Cases 257 Missing Cases 40

TABLE 68

THE STRENGTH OF INTEREST FOR PREDOMINANTLY MALE OCCUPATION SCORES OF THE THAI COLLEGE STUDENTS

Value	Gender Female	Percent	Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
.00	11	3.8	2	.7	13	4.5	4.5
1.00	6	2.0			6	2.0	6.6
2.00	6	2.1	2	.7	8	2.8	9.4
3.00	3	1.0	1	.3	4	1.4	10.8
4.00	5	1.7	1	.3	6	2.1	12.8
5.00	6	2.1	2	.7	8	2.8	15.6
6.00	3	1.0	4	1.3	7	2.4	18.1
7.00	4	1.3	5	1.7	9	3.1	21.2
8.00	16	5.6	4	1.4	20	6.9	28.1
9.00	12	4.2	3	1.0	15	5.2	33.3
10.00	18	6.3	4	1.4	22	7.6	41.1
11.00	8	2.8	5	1.7	13	4.5	45.5
12.00	4	1.3	4	1.3	8	2.8	48.3
13.00	6	2.1	5	1.7	9	3.8	52.1
14.00	5	1.7	1	.3	6	2.1	54.2
15.00	9	3.1	5	1.7	14	4.9	59.0
16.00	7	2.4	8	2.8	15	5.2	64.2
17.00	10	3.5	3	1.0	13	4.5	68.8
18.00	6	2.1	3	1.0	9	3.1	71.9
19.00	8	2.8	2	.7	10	3.5	75.3
20.00	1	.3	3	1.0	4	1.4	76.7
21.00	4	1.3	2	.7	6	2.1	78.8
22.00	9	3.1	3	1.0	12	4.2	83.0
23.00	6	2.1	2	.7	8	2.8	85.8
24.00	2	.7	3	1.0	5	1.7	87.5
25.00	2	.7	2	.7	4	1.4	88.9
26.00	6	2.1	1	.3	7	2.4	91.3
27.00	2	.7			2	.7	92.0
28.00	3	1.0			3	1.0	93.1
29.00	1	.3	2	.7	3	1.0	94.1
30.00	2	.7	1	.3	3	1.0	95.1
31.00	1	.3	1	.3	2	.7	95.8
32.00	1	.3	2	.7	3	1.0	96.9
33.00	2	.7			2	.7	97.6
34.00			2	.7	2	.7	98.3
35.00	1	.3			1	.3	98.6
37.00			1	.3	1	.3	99.0
38.00			1	.3	1	.3	99.3
42.00	1	.3			1	.3	99.7
50.00			1	.3	1	.3	100.0
	5	1.7	4	1.3	9	3.0	Missing

Table 68--Continue

Value	Gender Female	Percent	Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
	----	----	----	----	----	----	
Total	202	68.1	95	31.9	297	100.0	

Mean 14.139 Median 13.000 Standard Deviation 8.841
Valid cases 288 Missing cases 9

TABLE 69
THE STRENGTH OF INTEREST FOR PREDOMINANTLY FEMALE OCCUPATION SCORES OF THE THAI COLLEGE STUDENTS

Value	Gender Female	Percent	Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
.00	4	1.3	5	1.7	9	3.1	3.1
1.00	5	1.7	2	.7	7	2.4	5.6
2.00	5	1.7	1	.3	6	2.0	7.6
3.00	4	1.3	3	1.0	7	2.4	10.1
4.00	7	2.4	4	1.3	11	3.8	13.9
5.00			8	2.7	8	2.8	16.7
6.00	9	3.1	3	1.0	12	4.2	20.8
7.00	9	3.1	2	.7	11	3.8	24.7
8.00	12	4.2	3	1.0	15	5.2	29.9
9.00	5	1.7	5	1.7	10	3.5	33.3
10.00	7	2.4	5	1.7	12	4.2	37.5
11.00	5	1.7	2	.7	7	2.4	39.9
12.00	10	3.5	3	1.0	13	4.5	44.4
13.00	3	1.0	3	1.0	6	2.1	46.5
14.00	8	2.7	2	.7	10	3.5	50.0
15.00	4	1.3	2	.7	6	2.1	52.1
16.00	7	2.4	2	.7	9	3.1	55.2
17.00	7	2.4	4	1.3	11	3.8	59.0
18.00	5	1.7	2	.7	7	2.4	61.5
19.00	9	3.1	3	1.0	12	4.2	65.6
20.00	6	2.0	4	1.3	10	3.5	69.1
21.00	5	1.7	1	.3	6	2.0	71.2
22.00	5	1.7	2	.7	7	2.4	73.6
23.00	4	1.3	1	.3	5	1.7	75.3
24.00	6	2.0	1	.3	7	2.4	77.8
25.00	3	1.0	1	.3	4	1.4	79.2
26.00	7	2.4	4	1.3	11	3.8	83.0
27.00	3	1.0	2	.7	5	1.7	84.7
28.00	5	1.7	3	1.0	8	2.7	87.5
29.00	3	1.0	1	.3	4	1.3	88.9
30.00	7	2.4	2	.7	9	3.1	92.0
31.00			1	.3	1	.3	92.4
32.00	2	.7	1	.3	3	1.0	93.4
33.00	3	1.0	1	.7	4	1.4	94.8
34.00	2	.7			2	.7	95.5
35.00	1	.3			1	.3	95.8
36.00	2	.7			2	.7	96.5
37.00	2	.7			2	.7	97.2
38.00	3	1.0			3	1.0	98.3
40.00	1	.3			1	.3	98.6
42.00	1	.3			1	.3	99.0
44.00	2	.7			2	.7	99.7

Table 69--Continue

Value	Female	Percent	Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
50.00			1	.3	1	.3	100.0
	5	1.7	4	1.3	9	3.0	Missing
Total	202	68.1	95	31.9	297	100.0	

Mean 15.851 Median 14.500 Standard deviation 10.314

Valid cases 288 Missing cases 9

TABLE 70

THE STRENGTH OF SELF-EFFICACY FOR PREDOMINANTLY MALE OCCUPATION SCORES OF THE THAI COLLEGE STUDENTS

Value	Gender Female	Percent	Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
.00	5	1.7	1	.3	6	2.1	2.1
1.00	2	.7			2	.7	2.8
2.00			1	.3	1	.3	3.1
3.00	2	.7	1	.3	3	1.0	4.2
4.00	2	.7			2	.7	4.9
5.00	1	.3			1	.3	5.2
6.00	1	.3			1	.3	5.6
7.00	3	1.0			1	1.0	6.6
8.00	2	.7	3	1.0	5	1.7	8.4
9.00	4	1.3			4	1.3	9.8
10.00	5	1.7			5	1.7	11.5
11.00	6	2.1			6	2.1	13.6
12.00	5	1.7	2	.7	7	2.4	16.0
13.00	9	3.1	5	1.7	14	4.9	20.9
14.00	5	1.7	2	.7	7	2.4	23.3
15.00	3	1.0	3	1.0	6	2.1	25.4
16.00	7	2.3	3	1.0	10	3.5	28.9
17.00	4	1.3	3	1.0	7	2.4	31.4
18.00	9	3.1	3	1.0	12	4.2	35.5
19.00	8	2.8	3	1.0	11	3.8	39.4
20.00	8	2.8	4	1.3	12	4.2	43.6
21.00	6	2.1	5	1.7	11	3.8	47.4
22.00	6	2.1	4	1.4	10	3.5	50.9
23.00	4	1.3	6	2.1	10	3.5	54.4
24.00	10	3.5	2	.7	12	4.2	58.5
25.00	7	2.4	1	.3	8	2.8	61.3
26.00	6	2.1	4	1.4	10	3.5	64.8
27.00	5	1.7	6	2.1	11	3.8	68.6
28.00	6	2.1	1	.3	7	2.4	71.1
29.00	7	2.4	3	1.0	10	3.5	74.6
30.00	10	3.5	2	.7	12	4.2	78.7
31.00	2	.7	2	.7	4	1.4	80.1
32.00	5	1.7	1	.3	6	2.1	82.2
33.00	4	1.3	9	3.1	13	4.5	86.8
34.00	7	2.4	2	.7	9	3.1	89.9
35.00	2	.7	1	.3	3	1.0	90.9
36.00	4	1.3			4	1.4	92.3
37.00			1	.3	1	.3	91.7
38.00	2	.7			2	.7	93.4
39.00	4	1.3	1	.3	5	1.7	95.1
40.00	2	.7	3	1.0	5	1.7	96.9

Table 70--Continue

Value	Female	Percent	Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
42.00	3	1.0	1	.3	4	1.4	98.3
43.00			1	.3	1	.3	98.6
46.00	1	.3			1	.3	99.0
50.00	2	.7	1	.3	3	1.0	100.0
	6	2.1	4	1.3	10	3.4	MIssing
Total	202	68.1	95	31.9	297	100.0	

Mean 22.404 Median 22.000 Standard Deviation 10.170

Valid cases 287 Missing cases 10

TABLE 71

THE STRENGTH OF SELF-EFFICACY FOR PREDOMINANTLY FEMALE OCCUPATION SCORES OF THE THAI COLLEGE STUDENTS

	Gender						Cumulative
Value	Female	Percent	Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Percent
.00	2	.7	1	.3	3	1.0	1.0
2.00	1	.3	1	.3	2	.7	1.7
3.00			1	.3	1	.3	2.1
4.00	2	.7	2	.7	4	1.4	3.5
5.00	3	1.0	1	.3	4	1.4	4.9
6.00	3	1.0			3	1.0	5.9
7.00	4	1.4	1	.3	5	1.7	7.7
8.00	4	1.4	4	1.4	8	2.8	10.5
9.00	3	1.0			3	1.0	11.5
10.00	2	.7	3	1.0	5	1.7	13.2
11.00	1	.3	4	1.4	5	1.7	15.0
12.00	4	1.4	1	.3	5	1.7	16.7
13.00	2	.7	3	1.0	5	1.7	18.5
14.00	3	1.0	2	.7	5	1.7	20.2
15.00	2	.7	2	.7	4	1.4	21.6
16.00	5	1.7	3	1.0	8	2.8	24.4
17.00	4	1.4	2	.7	6	2.1	26.5
18.00	6	2.1	1	.3	7	2.4	28.9
19.00	9	3.1	7	2.4	16	5.6	34.5
20.00	9	3.1	3	1.0	12	4.2	38.7
21.00	3	1.0	3	1.0	6	2.1	40.8
22.00	4	1.4			4	1.4	42.2
23.00	4	1.4	1	.3	5	1.7	43.9
24.00	3	1.0	4	1.4	7	2.4	46.3
25.00	5	1.7	2	.7	7	2.4	48.8
26.00	7	2.4	4	1.4	11	3.8	52.6
27.00	2	.7	3	1.0	5	1.7	54.4
28.00	11	3.8	1	.3	12	4.2	58.5
29.00	5	1.7	2	.7	7	2.4	61.0
30.00	5	1.7	4	1.4	9	3.1	64.1
31.00	4	1.4	2	.7	6	2.1	66.2
32.00	9	3.1	5	1.7	14	4.9	71.1
33.00	4	1.4	3	1.0	7	2.4	73.5
34.00	10	3.5	3	1.0	13	4.5	78.0
35.00	6	2.1	1	.3	7	2.4	80.5
36.00	9	3.1	2	.7	11	3.8	84.3
37.00	1	.3	1	.3	2	.7	85.0
38.00	10	3.5	1	.3	11	3.8	88.9
40.00	4	1.4	3	1.0	7	2.4	91.3
41.00	1	.3			1	.3	91.6

Table 71--Continue

Value	Female	Percent	Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Gender						
42.00	13	4.5			13	4.5	96.2
43.00	1	.3			1	.3	96.5
44.00	1	.3	1	.3	2	.7	97.2
46.00	2	.7	1	.3	3	1.0	98.3
48.00	2	.7			2	.7	99.0
50.00	2	.7	1	.3	3	1.0	100.0
	5	1.7	5	1.7	10	3.4	Missing
Total	202	68.1	95	31.9	297	100.0	

Mean 24.986 Median 26.000 Standard Deviation 11.465

Valid cases 287 Missing cases 10

TABLE 72

THE LEVEL OF INTEREST FOR PREDOMINANTLY MALE OCCUPATION SCORES OF THE THAI COLLEGE STUDENTS

Value	Female	Gender Percent	Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
.00	11	3.7	3	1.0	14	4.7	4.7
1.00	11	3.7	2	.7	13	4.4	9.1
2.00	11	3.7	4	1.3	15	5.0	14.1
3.00	9	3.0	10	3.4	19	6.4	20.5
4.00	21	7.1	11	3.7	32	10.8	31.3
5.00	33	11.1	13	4.4	46	15.5	46.8
6.00	28	9.4	12	4.0	40	13.5	60.3
7.00	25	8.4	8	2.7	33	11.1	71.4
8.00	23	7.7	11	3.7	34	11.4	82.8
9.00	21	7.1	8	2.7	29	9.8	92.6
10.00	9	3.0	13	4.4	24	7.4	100.0
Total	202	68.1	95	31.9	297	100.0	

Mean 5.663 Median 6.000 Standard deviation 2.703

Valid cases 297 Missing cases 0

TABLE 73

THE LEVEL OF INTEREST FOR PREDOMINANTLY FEMALE OCCUPATION SCORES OF THE THAI COLLEGE STUDENTS

Value	Female	Gender Percent	Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
.00	4	1.3	6	2.0	10	3.4	3.4
1.00	6	2.0	8	2.7	14	4.7	8.1
2.00	20	6.7	10	3.4	30	10.1	18.2
3.00	9	3.0	8	2.7	17	5.7	23.9
4.00	25	8.4	8	2.7	33	11.1	35.0
5.00	15	5.0	8	2.7	23	7.7	42.8
6.00	25	8.4	6	2.0	31	10.4	53.2
7.00	19	6.4	8	2.7	27	9.1	62.3
8.00	23	7.7	10	3.4	33	11.1	73.4
9.00	19	6.4	11	3.7	30	10.1	83.5
10.00	37	12.5	12	4.0	49	16.5	100.0
	----	----	----	----	----	----	-----
Total	202	68.1	95	31.9	297	100.0	

Mean 5.963 Median 6.000 Standard Deviation 3.026

Valid cases 297 Missing cases 0

TABLE 74

THE LEVEL OF SELF-EFFICACY FOR PREDOMINANTLY MALE OCCUPATION SCORES OF THE THAI COLLEGE STUDENTS

Value	Female	Percent	Gender Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
.00	5	1.7	1	.3	6	2.0	2.0
1.00	3	1.0	1	.3	4	1.3	3.4
2.00	2	.7	1	.3	3	1.0	4.4
3.00	3	1.0	1	.3	4	1.3	5.7
4.00	11	3.7	3	1.0	14	4.7	10.4
5.00	19	6.4	9	3.0	28	9.4	19.9
6.00	20	6.7	11	3.7	31	10.4	30.3
7.00	20	6.7	8	2.7	28	9.4	39.7
8.00	27	9.1	10	3.4	37	12.5	52.2
9.00	37	12.5	24	8.0	61	20.5	72.7
10.00	55	18.5	26	8.8	81	27.2	100.0
Total	202	69.1	95	31.9	297	100.0	

Mean 7.593 Median 8.000 Standard Deviation 2.433

Valid cases 297 Missing cases 0

TABLE 75

THE LEVEL OF SELF-EFFICACY FOR PREDOMINANTLY FEMALE OCCUPATION SCORES OF THE THAI COLLEGE STUDENTS

	Gender						Cumulative
Value	Female	Percent	Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Percent
.00	2	.7	1	.3	3	1.0	1.0
1.00	1	.3	2	.7	3	1.0	2.0
2.00	12	4.0	6	2.0	18	6.1	8.1
3.00	4	1.3	4	1.3	8	2.7	10.8
4.00	9	3.0	4	1.3	13	4.3	15.2
5.00	9	3.0	8	2.7	17	5.7	20.9
6.00	16	5.4	5	1.7	21	7.1	27.9
7.00	16	5.4	9	3.0	25	8.4	36.4
8.00	27	9.0	11	3.7	38	12.8	49.2
9.00	29	9.7	16	5.4	45	15.2	64.3
10.00	77	25.9	29	9.7	106	35.7	100.0
Total	202	68.1	95	31.9	297	100.0	

Mean 7.643 Median 9.000 Standard Deviation 2.656

Valid cases 297 Missing cases 0

TABLE 76

CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS BETWEEN THE STRENGTH AND LEVEL OF INTEREST AND SELF-EFFICACY

	LINTRM	LINTRF	LSEFM	LSEFF	SINTRM	SINTRF	SSEFM	SSEFF
LINTRM	1.000	.619	.579	.359	.830	.577	.548	.340
LINTRF	.619	1.000	.353	.606	.453	.876	.282	.605
LSEFM	.579	.353	1.000	.645	.467	.293	.774	.534
LSEFF	.359	.606	.645	1.000	.193	.484	.436	.824
SINTRM	.830	.453	.467	.193	1.000	.518	.615	.228
SINTRF	.577	.876	.293	.484	.518	1.000	.300	.592
SSEFM	.548	.282	.774	.436	.615	.300	1.000	.525
SSEFF	.340	.605	.534	.824	.228	.592	.525	1.000

TABLE 77

CHI-SQUARE ASSOCIATION BETWEEN VARIABLES

Variables	Chi-Square	Level of Significance
1. Gender and		
1.1 Father's Prestige Scores	46.32661**	p < .01
1.2 Mother's Prestige Scores	29.99865**	p < .01
1.3 Role Model (MREL)	5.19128*	p < .05
1.4 Occupational Aspirations	48.58413**	p < .01
2. SINTRM and		
2.1 Major	603.15623*	p < .05
2.2 Gender	5.15405*	p < .05
3. SINTRF and Gender	4.11428*	p < .05
4. SSEFF and Gender	6.38702**	p < .01
5. LINTRF and Gender	4.47931*	p < .05
6. BMM and Gender	3.79388*	p < .05
7. BMF and Gender	53.67498*	p < .05
8. CDINDE and		
8.1 Class	8.14581**	p < .01
8.2 Role Model (MO)	58.60812*	p < .05
8.3 Occupational Expectations	6.71228**	p < .01
8.4 Career Certainty (CDCERT)	10.22206**	p < .01
8.5 SINTRF	17.02222**	p < .01
8.6 LINTRF	26.72246**	p < .01
9. CERTPER and		
9.1 Gender	7.19892*	p < .05
9.2 Class	23.98634**	p < .01
10. INDEPER and		
10.1 Gender	8.80176**	p < .01
10.2 Class	19.20373**	p < .01

* p < .05

** p < .01

TABLE 78
MASCULINITY SCORES OF THE THAI COLLEGE STUDENTS

Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
1.80	2	.7	.7	.7
2.20	2	.7	.7	1.3
2.30	1	.3	.3	1.7
2.50	4	1.3	1.3	3.0
2.60	5	1.7	1.7	4.7
2.70	3	1.0	1.0	5.7
2.78	1	.3	.3	6.1
2.80	4	1.3	1.3	7.4
2.90	7	2.4	2.4	9.8
3.00	9	3.0	3.0	12.8
3.10	7	2.4	2.4	15.2
3.11	1	.3	.3	15.5
3.20	5	1.7	1.7	17.2
3.30	3	1.0	1.0	18.2
3.38	1	.3	.3	18.5
3.40	8	2.7	2.7	21.2
3.50	9	3.0	3.0	24.2
3.56	1	.3	.3	24.6
3.60	11	3.7	3.7	28.3
3.70	15	5.1	5.1	33.3
3.78	1	.3	.3	33.7
3.80	15	5.1	5.1	38,7
3.89	1	.3	.3	39.1
3.90	17	5.7	5.7	44.8
4.00	15	5.1	5.1	49.8
4.10	16	5.4	5.4	55.2
4.11	1	.3	.3	55.6
4.20	8	2.7	2.7	58.2
4.30	19	6.4	6.4	64.6
4.38	1	.3	.3	65.0
4.40	11	3.7	3.7	68.7
4.44	1	.3	.3	69.0
4.50	12	4.0	4.0	73.1
4.60	10	3.4	3.4	76.4
4.70	17	5.7	5.7	82.2
4.80	13	4.4	4.4	86.5
4.90	7	2.4	2.4	88.9
5.00	2	.7	.7	89.6
5.10	7	2.4	2.4	91.9
5.20	6	2.0	2.0	93.9
5.30	5	1.7	1.7	95.6
5.40	4	1.3	1.3	97.0
5.50	3	1.0	1.0	98.0

Table 78--Continue

Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
5.60	1	.3	.3	98.3
5.70	1	.3	.3	98.7
5.80	2	.7	.7	99.3
6.10	1	.3	.3	99.7
6.30	1	.3	.3	100.0
	----	----	----	
Total	297	100.0	100.0	

Mean 4.043 Median 4.100 Standard Deviation .790

Valid cases 297 Missing cases 0

TABLE 79
FEMININITY SCORES OF THE THAI COLLEGE STUDENTS

Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2.90	1	.3	.3	.3
3.10	3	1.0	1.0	1.3
3.30	1	.3	.3	1.7
3.40	1	.3	.3	2.0
3.50	5	1.7	1.7	3.7
3.60	4	1.3	1.3	5.1
3.70	1	.3	.3	5.4
3.80	3	1.0	1.0	6.4
3.90	3	1.0	1.0	7.4
4.00	5	1.7	1.7	9.1
4.10	6	2.0	2.0	11.1
4.20	8	2.7	2.7	13.8
4.30	7	2.4	2.4	16.2
4.40	5	1.7	1.7	17.8
4.50	14	4.7	4.7	22.6
4.60	9	3.0	3.0	25.6
4.63	1	.3	.3	25.9
4.70	5	1.7	1.7	26.3
4.80	19	6.4	6.4	34.3
4.90	19	6.4	6.4	40.7
5.00	19	6.4	6.4	47.1
5.10	19	6.4	6.4	53.5
5.20	10	3.4	3.4	56.9
5.30	20	6.7	6.7	63.6
5.40	12	4.0	4.0	67.7
5.50	13	4.4	4.4	72.1
5.60	17	5.7	5.7	77.8
5.70	7	2.4	2.4	80.1
5.80	11	3.7	3.7	83.8
5.90	11	3.7	3.7	87.5
6.00	7	2.4	2.4	89.9
6.10	4	1.3	1.3	91.2
6.20	6	2.0	2.0	93.3
6.22	1	.3	.3	93.6
6.30	6	2.0	2.0	95.6
6.40	4	1.3	1.3	97.0
6.50	3	1.0	1.0	98.0
6.60	4	1.3	1.3	99.3
6.70	2	.7	.7	100.0
Total	297	100.0	100.0	

Mean 5.091 Median 5.100 Standard Deviation .757
Valid cases 297 Missing cases 0

TABLE 80

SEX-ROLE ORIENTATIONS OF THE THAI COLLEGE STUDENTS

Sex-role	Gender Female	Percent	Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Feminine	49	16.5	14	4.7	63	21.2	21.2
Masculine	36	12.1	19	6.4	55	18.5	39.7
Androgynous	57	19.2	37	12.4	94	31.6	71.4
Undifferen-tiated	60	20.2	25	8.4	85	28.6	100.0
	---	---	---	---	---	---	
Total	202	68.1	26	31.9	297	100.0	

Valid cases 297 Missing cases 0

TABLE 81

CAREER CERTAINTY SCORES OF THE THAI COLLEGE STUDENTS

	Gender						Cumulative
Value	Female	Percent	Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Percent
2.00	11	3.7	5	1.7	16	5.4	5.4
3.00	13	4.4	6	2.0	19	6.4	11.8
4.00	47	15.8	8	2.7	55	18.5	30.3
5.00	29	9.8	17	5.7	46	15.5	45.8
6.00	53	17.8	30	10.1	83	27.9	73.7
7.00	23	7.7	16	5.4	39	13.1	86.8
8.00	26	8.8	13	4.4	39	13.1	100.0
Total	202	68.1	95	31.9	297	100.0	

Mean 5.461 Median 6.000 Standard Deviation 1.646

15th percentile 4.000 85th percentile 7.000

Valid cases 297 Missing cases 0

TABLE 82

CAREER CERTAINTY PERCENTILE OF THE THAI COLLEGE STUDENTS

Percentile	Female	Gender Percent	Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
1. Low (<16th Percentile)	12	4.0	13	4.4	25	8.4	8.4
2. Middle (16-84th Percentile)	142	47.8	54	18.2	196	66.0	74.4
3. High (>84th Percentile)	48	16.1	28	9.4	76	25.6	100.0
	---	---	---	---	---	---	
Total	202	68.1	95	31.9	297	100.0	

Valid cases 159 Missing cases 0

TABLE 83

CAREER CERTAINTY PERCENTILE OF THE THAI COLLEGE STUDENTS IN EACH CLASS

Class	Career Certainty								Cumulative
	Low (<16th Percentile)	Percent	Medium (16-84th Percentile)	Percent	High (>84th Percentile)	Percent	Total	Percent	Percent
1	11	3.7	146	49.2	63	21.2	220	74.1	74.1
2	11	3.7	40	13.5	11	3.7	62	20.9	95.0
3	2	.6	10	3.3	2	.6	14	4.7	99.7
4	1	.3					1	.3	100.0
Total	25	8.4	196	66.0	76	25.6	297	100.0	

Valid cases 297 Missing cases 0

TABLE 84

CAREER CERTAINTY PERCENTILE OF THE FIRST YEAR
THAI COLLEGE STUDENTS

Career Certainty	Female	Percent	Gender Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
1. Low (<16th Percent-ile)			11	5.0	11	5.0	5.0
2. Medium (16-84th Percent-ile)	107	48.6	39	17.7	146	66.4	71.4
3. High (>84th Percent-ile)	44	20.0	19	8.6	63	28.6	100.0
Total	151	68.6	69	31.4	220	100.0	

Valid cases 219 Missing cases 1

TABLE 85

CAREER CERTAINTY PERCENTILE OF THE SECOND YEAR THAI COLLEGE STUDENTS

Career Certainty	Female	Percent	Gender Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
1. Low (<16th Percentile)	10	16.1	1	1.6	11	17.7	17.7
2. Medium (16-84th Percentile)	32	51.6	8	12.9	40	64.5	82.2
3. High (>84th Percentile)	2	3.2	9	14.5	11	17.7	100.0
Total	44	71.0	18	29.0	62	100.0	

Valid cases 62 Missing cases 0

TABLE 86

CAREER CERTAINTY PERCENTILE OF THE THIRD YEAR THAI COLLEGE STUDENTS

Career Certainty	Female	Gender Percent	Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
1. Low (<16th Percent-ile)	1	7.1	1	7.1	2	14.3	14.3
2. Medium (16-84th Percent-ile)	3	21.4	7	50.0	10	71.4	85.7
3. High (>84th Percent-ile)	2	14.2			2	14.2	100.0
	----	----	----	----	----	----	
Total	6	42.9	8	57.1	14	100.0	

Valid cases 14 Missing cases 0

TABLE 87

CAREER CERTAINTY PERCENTILE OF THE FOURTH YEAR THAI COLLEGE STUDENTS

Career Certainty	Female	Gender Percent	Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
1. Low (<16th Percentile)	1	100.0			1	100.0	100.0
2. Medium (16-84th Percentile)							
3. High (>84th Percentile)							
	----	----			----	----	
Total	1	100.0			1	100.0	

Valid cases 1 Missing cases 0

TABLE 88

CAREER INDECISION SCORES OF THE THAI COLLEGE STUDENTS

Value	Female	Percent	Gender Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
16.00	2	.7	1	.3	3	1.0	1.0
17.00	1	.3			1	.3	1.4
18.00	1	.4			1	.3	1.7
19.00	1	.3			1	.3	2.0
20.00	4	1.3	2	.7	6	2.0	4.1
21.00	3	1.0	4	1.3	7	2.4	6.4
22.00	3	1.0	1	.3	4	1.4	7.8
23.00	2	.7	1	.3	3	1.0	8.8
24.00	1	.3	1	.3	2	.7	9.5
25.00	11	3.7			11	3.7	13.2
26.00	2	.7	2	.7	4	1.4	14.5
27.00	10	3.4	2	.7	12	4.1	18.6
28.00	5	1.7	2	.7	7	2.4	20.9
29.00	5	1.7	7	2.4	12	4.0	25.0
30.00	4	1.3	1	.3	5	1.7	26.7
31.00	4	1.3	6	2.0	10	3.4	30.1
32.00	5	1.7	4	1.3	9	3.0	33.1
33.00	6	2.0	6	2.0	12	4.1	37.2
34.00	10	3.4	1	.3	11	3.7	40.9
35.00	7	2.4	7	2.4	14	4.7	45.6
36.00	6	2.0	2	.7	8	2.7	48.3
37.00	10	3.4	3	1.0	13	4.4	52.7
38.00	9	3.0	3	1.0	12	4.1	56.8
39.00	5	1.7	7	2.4	12	4.0	60.8
40.00	13	4.4	2	.7	15	5.1	65.9
41.00	5	1.7	3	1.0	8	2.7	68.6
42.00	7	2.4	2	.7	9	3.0	71.6
43.00	8	2.7	1	.3	9	3.0	74.7
44.00	4	1.3	2	.7	6	2.0	76.7
45.00	4	1.3	6	2.0	10	3.4	80.1
46.00	11	3.7	3	1.0	14	4.7	84.8
47.00	2	.7			2	.7	85.5
48.00	9	3.0	3	1.0	12	4.1	89.5
49.00	6	2.0	1	.3	7	2.4	91.9
50.00	5	1.7	3	1.0	8	2.7	94.6
51.00	2	.7	2	.7	4	1.4	95.9
52.00	3	1.0	1	.3	4	1.4	97.3
53.00	2	.7			2	.7	98.0
54.00			1	.3	1	.3	98.3
55.00	1	.3	1	.3	2	.7	99.0
56.00	1	.3			1	.3	99.3
57.00	1	.3			1	.3	99.7

Table 88--Continue

Value	Female	Gender Percent	Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
61.00	1	.3			1	.3	100.0
			1	.3	Missing		
			---	---	----		
Total	202	68.01	95	31.99	297	100.0	

Mean 36.628 Median 37.000 Standard Deviation 9.193

15th percentile 27.000 85th percentile 47.000

Valid cases 296 Missing cases 1

TABLE 89

CAREER INDECISION PERCENTILE OF THE THAI COLLEGE STUDENTS

Percentile	Female	Gender Percent	Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
1. Low (<16th Percentile)	26	8.8	23	7.8	49	16.6	16.6
2. Medium (16-84th Percentile)	95	32.1	45	15.2	140	47.3	63.9
3. High (>84th Percentile)	81	27.3	26	8.8	107	36.1	100.0
			1	.3		Missing	
	---	---	---	---	---	---	
Total	202	68.1	95	31.9	297	100.0	

Valid cases 296 Missing cases 1

TABLE 90

CAREER INDECISION PERCENTILE
OF THE THAI COLLEGE STUDENTS
IN EACH CLASS

Class	Career Indecision								Cumulative
	Low (<16th Percentile)	Percent	Medium (16-84th Percentile)	Percent	High (>84th Percentile)	Percent	Total	Percent	Percent
1	44	14.9	93	31.4	81	27.3	219	74.0	74.0
2	6	2.0	40	13.5	16	5.4	62	20.9	94.9
3			5	1.7	9	3.0	14	4.7	99.6
4			1	.3			1	.3	100.0
							1	.3	Missing
	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	
Total	50	16.8	140	47.1	107	36.0	297	100.0	

Valid cases 296 Missing cases 1

TABLE 91

CAREER INDECISION PERCENTILE OF THE FIRST YEAR THAI COLLEGE STUDENTS

Career Indecision	Gender Female	Percent	Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
1. Low (<16th Percent-ile)	23	10.5	20	9.1	43	19.6	19.6
2. Medium (16-84th Percent-ile)	62	28.3	32	14.6	94	42.9	62.5
3. High (>84th Percent-ile)	66	30.1	16	7.3	82	37.4	100.0
			1	.4	Missing		
	---	---	---	---	---		
Total	151	68.6	69	31.4	220	100.0	

Valid cases 219 Missing cases 1

TABLE 92

CAREER INDECISION PERCENTILE OF THE SECOND YEAR THAI COLLEGE STUDENTS

Career Indecision	Gender Female	Percent	Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
1. Low (<16th Percentile)	3	4.8	3	4.8	6	9.7	9.7
2. Medium (16-84th Percentile)	30	48.3	10	16.1	40	64.5	94.2
3. High (>84th Percentile)	11	17.7	5	8.1	19	25.8	100.0
Total	44	71.0	18	29.0	62	100.0	

Valid cases 62 Missing cases 0

TABLE 93

CAREER INDECISION PERCENTILE OF THE THIRD YEAR THAI COLLEGE STUDENTS

Career Indecision	Female	Gender Percent	Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
1. Low (<16th Percentile)							
2. Medium (16-84th Percentile)	2	14.3	3	21.4	5	35.7	35.7
3. High (84th Percentile)	4	28.6	5	35.7	9	64.3	100.0
	----	----	----	----	----	----	
Total	6	42.9	8	57.1	14	100.0	

Valid cases 14 Missing cases 0

TABLE 94

CAREER INDECISION PERCENTILE OF THE FOURTH YEAR THAI COLLEGE STUDENTS

Career Indecision	Female	Gender Percent	Male	Percent	Total	Percent	Cumulative Percent
1. Low (<16th Percent-ile)							
2. Medium (16-84th Percent-ile)	2	100.0			2	100.0	100.0
3. High (84th Percent-ile)							
	----	----			----	----	
Total	2	100.0			2	100.0	

Valid cases 2 Missing cases 0

TABLE 95

THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN AMERICAN COLLEGE STUDENTS AND THAI COLLEGE STUDENTS

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error	t Value	Degrees of Freedom	2-tail Prob.
LINTRM							
Group 1	159	3.5786	2.220	.176	-8.34***	454	<.0001
Group 2	297	5.6633	2.703	.157			
LINTRF							
Group 1	159	5.0566	2.586	.205	-3.20**	454	<.001
Group 2	297	5.9630	3.026	.176			
LSEFM							
Group 1	159	5.9560	3.003	.238	-6.30***	454	<.0001
Group 2	297	7.5926	2.433	.141			
SINTRM							
Group 1	159	9.0566	6.723	.533	-6.31***	445	<.0001
Group 2	288	14.1389	8.841	.521			
SSEFM							
Group 1	159	18.1195	10.753	.853	-4.17***	444	<.0001
Group 2	287	22.4042	10.170	.600			
BMM							
Group 1	159	5.0106	.874	.069	12.00***	454	<.0001
Group 2	297	4.0428	.790	.046			
BMF							
Group 1	159	5.7836	.782	.062	9.21***	454	<.0001
Group 2	297	5.0906	.757	.044			
CECERT							
Group 1	159	6.3962	1.327	.105	6.17***	454	<.0001
Group 2	297	5.4613	1.646	.096			

Table 95--Continue

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error	t Value	Degree of Freedom	2-tail Prob.
CDINDE							
Group 1	159	28.4528	9.015	.715	-9.11***	453	<.0001
Group 2	296	36.6284	9.193	.534			

**p < .001
***p < .0001

APPENDIX B: HUMAN SUBJECT APPROVAL

HUMAN SUBJECTS RESEARCH STATEMENT

One copy of this form must be submitted with each Application for Candidacy or Master's Degree Study Progra . Please sign one of the statements below:

1) The thesis/dissertation referenced on the attached form is based on research involving the use of human subjects. The project has been approved by the Human Subjects Committee. (Please attach a copy of the letter of approval received from the Committee.)

Student ________________ Date ________

Department Head ________________ Date ________

* * *

2) The thesis/dissertation referenced on the attached form is based on research involving human subjects exempted from review by departmental or University Human Subjects committees by the National Research Act revision effective July 27, 1981.

x Nit Bunyamanotkon 11/21/90

Student Date

x Shital P. Mishra 11/21/90

Department Head Date

* * *

3) The thesis/dissertation referenced on the attached form is based on research which does not involve the use of human subjects.

Student ________________ Date ________

Department Head ________________ Date ________

July 28, 1981

REFERENCES

Abel, W,H, (1966). Attrition and the student who is certain. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 44, 1042-1045.

Ashby, J.D., Wall, H.W. & Osipow, S.H. (1966). Vocational certainty and indecision in college freshmen. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 44, 1037-1041.

Astin, H.S. (1984). The meaning of work in women's lives: A sociopsychological model of career choice and work behavior. The Counseling Psychologist, 12, 117-126.

Bachman, J., O'Malley, P. & Johnson, J. (1978). Youth in transition: Change and stability in the lives of young men. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Baird, L.L. (1969). The undecided students: How different is he? Personnel and Guidance Journal, 47, 429-434.

Bandura, A. (1977a). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. Psychological Review, 84, 191-215.

Bandura, A. (1977b). Social learning theory. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bandura, A. (1982a). Self-efficacy mechanisms in human agency. American Psychologist, 37, 122-147.

Bandura, A. (1982b). The self and mechanisms of agency. In J. Suls (Ed.), Psychological perspectives on the self: Vol.1 (pp.33-39). London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bandura, A., Adams, N.E. and Beyer, J. (1977). Cognitive process of mediating behavioral change. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 35, 125-139.

Barak, A. & Friedkes, R. (1982). The mediating effects of career indecision and subtypes on career-counseling effectiveness. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 20, 120-128.

Barrett, T.C. & Tinsley, H.E.A. (1977). Vocational self-concept crystallization and vocational indecision. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 24, 301-307.

Bem, S.L. (1981). Bem sex-role inventory professional manual. CA: Counseling Psychologists Press, Inc.

Betz, N. & Hackett, G. (1981). The relationship of career-related self-efficacy expectations to perceived career options in college women and men. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 28, 399-410.

Betz, N. & Hackett, G. (1986). Applications of self-efficacy theory to understanding career choice behavior. Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 4, 279-289.

Brown, D. (1970). Students' vocational choices: A review and critique. Guidance monograph series (Series IV). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Clement, S. (1987). The self-efficacy expectations and expectations and occupational preferences of females and males. Journal of Occupational Psychology, 3, 257-265.

Collin, J.L. (1982). Self-efficacy and ability in achievement behavior. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association.,NY.

Crites, J.O. (1969). Vocational Psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Crites, J.O. (1981). Career maturity inventory: Theory and research handbook. 2nd.ed. Montery, CA: CTB/McGraw-Hill.

Doty, M.S. & Betz, N.E. (1979). Comparison of the concurrent validity of Holland's theory for men and women in an enterprising occupation. Journal of Vocational behavior, 15, 207-216.

Elton, C.F. & Rose, H.A. (1970). Male occupational constancy and change: Its prediction according to Holland's theory. Journal of Counseling Psychology Monograph17, part2, 1-19.

Erikson, E. (1957). Childhood and Society. (rev.ed). New York: Norton.

Farmer, H.S. (1976). What inhibits achievement and career motivation in women. The Counseling Psychologist, 6, 12-14.

Fitzgerald, L.F. & Crites, J.O. (1980). Toward a career psychology of women: What do we know? What do we need to know? Journal of Counseling Psychology, 27, 44-62.

Foss, C.J. & Slaney, R.B. (1986). Increasing nontraditional career choices in women: Relation of attitudes toward women and responses to a career intervention. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 28, 191-202.

Freund, J.E. (1988). Modern elementary statistics. 7th.ed. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Englewood Cliff.

Galinsky, D.F. & Fast, S. (1966). Vocational choice as a focus of the identity search. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 13, 89-93.

Ginzberg, E., Ginsberg, S.W., Axelrad, S. & Herma, J.L. (1951). Occupational choice: An approach to a general theory. New York: Columbia University Press.

Greenhaus, J.H. & Simon, W.E. (1977). Career saliency, work values, and vocational indecision. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 10, 104-110.

Haber, S. (1980). Cognitive support for the career choices of college women. Sex Roles, 6, 129-138.

Hackett, G. & Betz, N. (1981). A self-efficacy approach to the career development of women. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 18, 326-339.

Harmon, R.L. (1973). Students who lack vocational identity. Vocational Guidance Quarterly, 21, 169-173.

Hauser, R.M. & Featherman, D.L. (1977). The process of stratification: Trends and analyses. New York: Academic Press.

Horner, J.T., Buterbaugh, J.E. & Carefoot, J.J. (1967). Factors relating to occupational and educational decision-making of rural youth. Research summary final report. Lincoln, NE; University of Nebraska, College of Agriculture.

Hodge, R.W., Siegel, P.M. & Rossi, P.H. (1964). Occupational prestige in the United States: 1925-1963. American Journal of Sociology, 70, 286-302.

Holland, J.L. (1973). Making vocational choices. Englewood Cliff, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Holland, J.L. & Nichols, R.C. (1964). The development and validation of an indecision scale: The natural history of a problem in basic research. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 11, 27-34.

Houser, B.B. & Garvey, C. (1985). Factors that affect nontraditional vocational enrollment among women. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 4, 105-117.

Huston, A,C. (1983). Sextyping. In M.E. Hetherington (Ed.), Handbook of child psychology. (pp.387-468). New York: Wiley.

Katz, J. (1967). A portrait of two classes: The undergraduate students at Berkeley and Stanford from entrance to exit. In J. Katz (Ed.), Growth and constraint in college students: A study of the varieties of psychological development. (pp.7-80). U.S.Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Project No. 5-0799. Stanford, California: Institute for the Study of Human Problems, Stanford University.

Kimes, H.G. & Troth, W.A. (1974). Relationship of trait anxiety to career decisiveness. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 21, 277-280.

Komin, S. (1978). Some empirical evidence of Thai values and personality. Thai Journal of Development Administration, 18, 271-292.

Krumboltz, J.D., Mitchell, A.M. & Jones, G.B. (1976). A social learning theory of career selection. The Counseling Psychologist, 6, 71-81.

Lauver, P. & Jones, R.M. (1990). Career choice factors survey. Personal copy of the author. (The University of Arizona).

Lent, R.W., Brown, S.D. & Larkin, K.C. (1984). Relation of self-efficacy expectations to academic achievement and persistence. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 34, 293-298.

Lent, R.W., Brown, S.D. & Larkin, K.C. (1987). Comparison of three theroetically derived variables in predicting career and consequence thinking. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 34, 293-298.

Lunneborg, P.W. (1975). Interest differentiation in high school and vocational indecision in college. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 7, 297-303.

Lunneborg, P.W. (1976). Vocational indecision in college graduates. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 23, 402-404

Maccoby, E.E. & Jacklin, C.N. (1974). The psychology of sex differences. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Maier, D. & Harman, A. (1974). The relationship of vocational decidedness and satisfaction with dogmatism and self-esteem. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 5, 95-102.

Marr, E. (1965). Some behaviors and attitudes relating to vocational choice. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 12, 404-408.

Marrini, M. (1978). Sex differences in the determination of adolescent aspirations: A review. Sex Roles, 4, 723-753.

Matsui,T., Ikeda, H. & Ohnishi, R. (1989). Relations of sex-typed socializations to career self-efficacy expectations of college students. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 35, 1-16.

Matthews, D.F. & Walsh, W.B. (1978). Concurrent validity of Holland's theory for non-college degreed working women. Journal of Vocational behavior, 12, 371-379.

McNulty, W.B. & Borgen, W.A. (1988). Career expectations and aspirations of adolescents. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 33, 217-224.

Mitchell, M.H. (1977). Attitudes of adolescent girls toward vocational education. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Mogar, R.E. (1964). Value orientation of college students: preliminary data and review of the literature. Psychological Report, 15, 739-770.

Mortimer, J. & Kumka, D. (1982). A further examination of the occupational linkage hypothesis. Sociological Quarterly, 23, 3-16.

National Identity Board, Office of the Prime Minister, Kingdom of Thailand. (1984). Thailand in the 80s. Bangkok: Muang Boran Publishing House.

Nielsen. L. (1987). Adolescent psychology: A contemporary view. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Osipow, S.H. (1973). Theories of career development. 2nd.ed. Englewood Cliff, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Osipow, S.H., Carney, C.G., Winer, J., Yanico, B. & Koschier, M. (1987). Career decision scale. 3rd.ed. Florida: Psychological Association Resource, Inc.

Osipow, S.H., (1987). Manual for career decision scale. Florida: Psychological Association Resources, Inc.

Pedhazur, E.J. (1982). Multiple regression in behavioral research: Explanation and prediction. 2nd.ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Penn, J.R. & Gabriel, M.E. (1976). Role constraints influencing the lives of women. School Counselor, 23, 252-254.

Philips, H.P. (1965). Thai peasant personality: The patterning of interpersonal behavior in the village of Bang Chan. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Post-Kammer, P. & Smith, P.L. (1985). Sex differences in career self-efficacy, consideration, and interests of eighth and ninth graders. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 32, 551-559.

Post-kammer, P. & Smith, P.L. (1986). Sex differences in math and science career self-efficacy among disadvantaged students. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 29, 89-101.

Rehberg, R.A. & Sinclair, J. (1970). Adolescent achievement behavior, family authority structure, and parental socialization processes. American Journal Sociology, 75, 1012-1034.

Resnick, H., Fauble, M.L. & Osipow, S.H. (1970). Vocational crystallization and self-esteem in college students. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 17, 465-467.

Rotberg, H.L., Brown, D., & Ware, W.B. (1987). Career self-efficacy expectations and perceived range of career options in community college students. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 34, 164-170.

Sangsingkeo, F. (1969). Buddhism and some effects on the rearing of children in Thailand. In W. Caudill and T.Y. Lin (Eds.), Mental health research in Asia and the Pacific. (pp.286-295). Honolulu, HI: East-West Center Press.

Schulenberg, J., Vondracek, F. & Crouter, A. (1984). The influence of family on vocational development. Journal of Marriage and The Family, 46, 366-374.

Sewell, W.H. & Shah, V.P. (1968a). Parents' education and children's educational aspirations and achievements. American Sociological Review, 33, 141-209.

Sewell, W.H. & Shah, V.P. (1968b). Social class, parental encouragement, and educational aspirations. American Journal of Sociology, 73, 559-572.

Sherman, J.A. (1971). On the psychology of women: A survey of empirical studies. Springfield, ILL.: Charles C. Thomas.

Sherman, J.A. (1976). Social values, femininity, and the development of female competence. Journal of Social Issues, 32, 181-195.

Slaney, R.B. (1988). The assessment of career decision making. In W.B. Walsh and S.H. Osipow (Eds.), Career decisionmaking. (pp.33-76). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Super, D.E. (1957). The psychology of career. New York: Harper.

Suvannathat, C. (1979). The inculcation of values in Thai children. International Social Science Journal, 31, 477-485.

Taylor, K.M. (1982). An investigation of vocational indecision in college students: Correlates and moderators. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 21, 318-329.

Taylor, K.M. & Betz, N.E. (1983). Applications of self-efficacy theory to the understanding and treatment of career indecision. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 22, 63-81.

Thailand. Division of planning, University Bureau Office (1987). Educational Report on Federal Institute of Higher Education: 1987. Bangkok: Thai Government Printing Office.

Tiedeman, D.V. & Miller-Tiedeman, A. (1979). Choice and decision processes and career revisited. In A.M. Mitchell, G.B. Jones & J.D. Krumboltz (Eds.), Social learning and career decision-making. (pp.160-183). Cranston, RI: The Carroll Press.

Tiedeman, D.V. & O'Hara, R.P. (1963). Career development: Choice and adjustment. New York: College Entrance Examination Board.

U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of The Census (1980). Statistical abstract of The U.S.: 1980. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics (1988). Occupational outlook handbook. 1988-89 edition. Bulletin 2300.

U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration (1977). Dictionary of occupational titles. 4th.ed. IN: JIST Works, Inc.

U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration (1986). Dictionary of occupational titles. 4th ed. supplement, 1986.

Walsh, W.E. & Lewis, R.O. (1972). Consistent, inconsistent, and undecided career preferences and personality. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 2, 309-316.

Watley, D. (1965). Performance and characteristics of the confident student. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 43, 591-596.

Weisz, J.R., Suwanlert, S., Chaiyasit, W. & Walter,B.R. (1987). Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 55, 719-726.

Weisz, J.R., Suwanlert, S., Chaiyasit, W., Weiss, B., Walter, B.R. & Anderson, W.W. (1988). Thai and American perspectives on over- and undercontrolled child behavior problems: Exploring the threshold model among parents, teachers, and psychologists. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 56, 601-609.

Williamson, E.G. (1937). Scholastic motivation and the choice of a vocation. School and Society, 46, 353-357.

Williamson, E.G. (1939). How to choose counsel students. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Wijting, J., Arnold, C. & Conrad, K. (1978). General differences in work values between parents and children and between boys and girls across grade levels 6, 9, 10 and 12. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 12, 245-260.