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ABSTRACT

Being Asians, good “moms,” and great workers: Investigating the psychological contours of Asian Indian Immigrant Women’s “Model Minority” experience

by

Sundari Balan

Chair: Ramaswami Mahalingam

In this dissertation study, I examined the psychological antecedents and consequences of endorsing the Asian American model minority belief system (e.g., Asian Americans are the most successful group in the US) as well as Asian American mothers’ idealized beliefs about motherhood (e.g., Asian American mothers have the capacity to make more sacrifices for their family than Asian American fathers) and career (e.g., Asian American women work more hard at their jobs than American women) in a sample of first generation Asian Indian immigrant women who are mothers and are employed in the United States.

I conducted a community survey (N = 289) of first generation Asian Indian women (ages 18 to 55) who are mothers of at least one child less than 16, are employed
for over 25 hours per week and who are first generation immigrants to the United States. I found that higher levels of social marginality predicted greater endorsement of Asian American model minority beliefs ($b = .17, p < .02$) and idealized motherhood beliefs ($b = .32, p < .001$). Perceived discrimination predicted idealized career beliefs ($b = .21, p < .005$). Additionally, subjective socio economic status predicted greater endorsement of model minority beliefs ($b = -.16, p < .02$) and idealized motherhood beliefs ($b = -.15, p < .03$). Idealized motherhood beliefs predicted motherhood self agency ($b = .15, p < .04$) and increased perception of career as a burden ($b = -.14, p < .03$).

I also conducted seven semi structured interviews with first generation Asian Indian immigrant women to examine how they constructed their motherhood with reference to their career. I found that the women held idealized beliefs that valorized motherhood which shaped their motherhood practices. Even as they idealized their own roles in motherhood, the women participated in co-constructing essentialized beliefs about motherhood (e.g., mothers are more competent than fathers). Such discursive constructions seemed to contribute to motherhood self agency and revealed the dynamism, fluidity and heterogeneity in the construction of Asian Indian women’s motherhood within the intersections of race and gender. Overall, the findings contribute to the growing body of research on foreign born women workers who are employed and pursuing careers, in the United States.
Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

Asian Americans have been recognized as one of the most successful group of immigrants in the United States (Abraham, 2006; Mahalingam, 2006; Pedraza, 2006; Seth, 1995; Zhou, 2002). As a consequence of the immigration reform act in 1965, foreign born Asian migrants have occupied several newly created professional and managerial jobs that also constitute the highest paying jobs in the hierarchy (Kanjanapan, 1995; Seth, 1995). Among Asian Indians, the third largest immigrant group, over 77% of the foreign born population is likely to be employed in white collar jobs as against 58% of the White population (Seth, 1995). The relatively poor economic conditions and opportunities for career mobility in their countries of origin have provided further impetus for skilled Asian migration.

The success of Asian Americans in their new homeland has been exemplified in the “model minority” stereotype (Barringer & Kassebaum, 1990; Cheng, 1997; Haritatos, 2005; Hirschman & Wong, 1986; Mahalingam, 2006; Nee & Wong, 1985; Oyserman & Sakamoto, 1997; Tang, 1997; Wong, 1986; Wong & Hirschman 1983; Woo, 1985). Originally proposed to explain the success of the Japanese Americans (Petersen, 1966, as cited in Cheng, 1997), the model minority label has been applied to Asians in general today (Cheng, 1997; Hirschman & Wong, 1986; Tang, 1997). Further, scholars have noted that the stereotype has been internalized by Whites and Asians alike (Oyserman & Sakamoto, 1997). For Asians, the internalization of this stereotype as an ideological
identity has been considered to be beneficial in producing a host of positive mental health outcomes (Mahalingam, 2006; Haritatos, 2005).

Less attention has been directed towards the psychological experience of women within the context of the stereotype (e.g., Browne & Misra, 2003; Purkayasta, 2005). I argue that the significance of studying Asian women’s experiences within the context of dominant stereotypes such as the “model minority” is two fold: a) Gender scholars have noted that women’s bodies and traditionally gendered spaces (e.g., motherhood), become the sites for maintaining the values that honor the group (Ortner, 1974; Yuval Davis & Anthias, 1989); (b) Women often negotiate with these hegemonic expectations by consenting and resisting these idealized identities through specific enactments (Chen, 1999; Glenn, 1991, 1994; Hochschild, 1989; Ong, 1999). For example, Espiritu (2001) noted that Asian immigrant women assert their moral superiority against the dominant White group within the context of the model minority with the contention, “We don’t sleep around like White girls do.” Women’s negotiation with hegemonic expectations is seen in the gender specific strategies that Hochschild observed in her study of women in dual earning families. These enactments are often fluid in nature consistent with the reality of their circumstances (Das Gupta, 1997)

By placing gendered processes such as motherhood at the center, this study seeks to advance our understanding of the psychological antecedents and consequences of Asian Indian immigrant women’s endorsement of model minority as an Asian group-specific stereotype as well as a gendered one (e.g., Asian motherhood). Further, it seeks to use emerging paradigms like intersectionality (Crenshaw, 1995) and recently revived constructs such as social marginality (Mahalingam, 2006) to examine complex
consequences of endorsing the model minority group stereotype (e.g., “Asians are model
minorities”) in various domains of immigrant women’s lives (e.g., “Asian women are
more career oriented than White women”) and their motherhood practices.

I advance the following model: Social marginality contributes to idealization of
ethnic identities (Mahalingam, 2006). Gender is a major site for constructing such
idealized identities (Espin, 2006; Haritatos, 2005; Pesar, 1999). Such idealizations can be
domain-specific (family and career). Asian Indian immigrant women who are working
need to negotiate the conflicting demands of these ideals. Internalizing these ideals has
positive and negative consequences. Social support and perception of flexibility impacts
how women successfully cope with the pressures of the idealized identities.

The rest of the dissertation is organized as follows: I begin by reviewing the
historical perspectives on Asian immigration to the United States, highlighting the Asian
Indian women’s position within the professional labor hierarchy and why they present a
unique perspective for the study of gendered processes within the context of the model
minority. Next, I review key tenets of the intersectionality perspective and social
marginality as relevant constructs to situate the gendered nature of the immigration
experience. Following this section, I review the research on the idealized beliefs about
gender and culture-specific practices in two domains for Asian women and specifically
Asian Indian women: Motherhood and Careers. Then I present an integrated theoretical
model, research questions, method and measures, after reviewing the research on
individual differences in active coping and social support that are relevant in
understanding mental health within the context of immigration for Asian Indian women
in my study.
Historical Perspectives on Asian Immigration

The earliest Asian immigrants to the United States were from the Philippines, and were dropped off the Louisiana coast in the sixteenth century. Large numbers of Asian immigrants to the United States began to arrive in the middle of the nineteenth century. While Europeans were arriving on the East coast, a great number of Asians, especially from China, were arriving on the West Coast as poor laborers and farm workers. Ethnic antagonism towards these groups culminated in the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, which was eventually repealed in 1943. During the years of the Act, the Japanese replaced the Chinese as a major source of cheap labor but when the Japanese Gentleman’s Agreement was signed in 1908, it limited Japanese entry to non laborers (Hirschman & Wong, 1986; Massey, 1995).

Asian Indians began immigrating to the United States at the beginning of the nineteenth century. A large percentage of them hailed from the Northwestern region in India, Punjab, with the majority immigrating as agricultural laborers. Gonzales (1986) noted that the similarities in agricultural and ecological conditions between Punjab and California added to the comfort of the new immigrants, and enabled them to adapt easily to their new environment. It has also been noted that they worked together in close knit communities sharing land as co-operatives even as a climate of racism and ill feelings prevailed outside their ethnic group (Gonzales, 1986). Soon, new legislation was passed that impeded their progress. The Alien land law of 1913 prohibited Aliens’ ownership and leasing of land in California. The Immigration Act of 1917 further barred Asian immigrants and Indians even from leasing land (Gonzales, 1986). The Sikh groups actively sought to resist these infringements in a number of ways. One of the steps they
took was to form the politically active *Gadar* party, which also supported the fight against the British in India (Mahalingam, Philip, & Balan, 2006). The fight by Asian Indians for citizenship in the United States is highlighted by the case of Bhagat Singh Thind who claimed that Asian Indians were similar to Caucasians and must be granted citizenship. The case was quashed by the Supreme Court in 1923. These events marked the decline of Asian Indian immigration to the United States until 1965 (Mahalingam, Philip, & Balan, 2006).

With the passing of immigration legislation in 1965 that permitted the entry of professional immigrants, a new surge of Asian Indian professionals began (Wong, 1986). The impetus for professional labor entry has lead to the operation of selection processes where by the highest educated in India arrived as immigrants (Hirschman & Wong, 1988). This has been cited as one of the reasons for the high academic achievement among Asians (e.g., Hirschman & Wong, 1988). This high achievement has been exemplified in the stereotype of the “model minority.”

Recently scholars have questioned the validity of this stereotype, noting that Asians have poorer occupational outcomes despite having a higher level of educational attainment (Browne & Misra, 2003; Fernandez, 1998; Woo, 1985; Stone, Purkayastha & Berdahl, 2006). Often this has been attributed to either the discounting of educational experiences (as those were obtained in a different country) or to the racism and discrimination in the workplace (Browne & Misra, 2003; Esses, Dietz & Bharadwaj, 2006; Fernandez, 1998). While these disadvantages are particularly prevalent for Asian professionals in general, a few studies have noted that these disadvantages may be more pronounced for professional Asian immigrant women (Browne & Misra, 2003; De,
Additionally, while Asian immigrant women are likely to be highly educated and possess high levels of income, the group has performed poorly on measures of health outcomes. One study found that among first generation Asian Indian women, there was a high incidence of preterm and low birth weight babies and higher rates of fetal mortality than in other groups (Gould, Madan, Qin, & Chavez, 2003). Further, the group has also experienced high rates of domestic violence and marital issues (Abraham, 2006). These contrasting findings suggest that on many different outcomes, Asian immigrants have been facing a paradoxical situation, where circumstances appeared favorable in producing positive psychological and health outcomes, yet the outcomes have been negative.

Except for the few studies that have documented the paradoxical situation created by high income and education for Asian immigrant women in the United States, research on Asian immigrants has generally couched skilled immigrant women’s experiences within the experiences of skilled men and occasionally with unskilled women (Kofman, 2000; Raghuram, 2004; Raghuram & Kofman, 2004). There have been an increasing number of studies of Asian women who immigrate primarily to handle the burden of care work as nannies and domestics (Ehrenreich, 2002; Ehrenreich & Hochschild, 2003; Parrenas, 2000). Overall, these studies have advanced scholarship on how Asian women are taking over the burden of care from their more affluent counterparts in the west (Mohanty, 1988; Parrenas, 2000; Raghuram & Kofman, 2004), an important theme in Asian immigration. Yet little is known either about the psychological experiences of skilled Asian professional immigrant women or about how these women navigate the demands of their career and family identities, their work experiences and their enactment
of their identities (Raghuram & Kofman, 2004). Further, studies have also not addressed how these identities and practices are related to Asian Indian women’s experience of mental health.

Among Asian immigrants, Filipina women and Asian Indian women are likely to have the highest labor force participation rates (as high as 72.3%, Seth, 1995). Further, among all Asian ethnic groups, a greater proportion of Asian Indian women are likely to be engaged in professional or managerial capacities (Zhou, 2002). English language fluency, general valuing of their own professional skills, and ability to contribute to the household income have been cited as major factors that impel Asian Indian women’s labor force participation (De, 2002). Further, women in the community are known to invest heavily in child rearing practices through participation and leadership in religious and community based organizations (Kurien, 1999). Additionally, with high incidence of marital violence but the lowest rates of divorce in the Asian community (Abraham, 2006, Seth, 1995), the group presents an interesting set of circumstances for studying the psychological contours of “becoming model minorities.” Because they are the largest group of professional migrants in the Asian community, a study of Asian Indian skilled women’s experiences with family and workplace would open doors towards a better understanding of skilled Asian immigrant’s experiences in general.

**Gender, Intersectionality, Social Marginality and Asian women’s Experiences**

Gender scholars have emphasized the different ways in which gendered processes are socially constructed. In the realm of family processes, Collins (1994) noted that the dominant motherhood ideology is not applicable to the lived realities of the women of
color who are mothers and engaged in multiple jobs. While the dominant ideology involving continuous engagement with children may be relevant to White women who are from upper socioeconomic classes and whose primary responsibility is caring, it is not relevant to women who are required to perform both caring and providing roles.

Glenn (1991, 1994) noted the unique tensions embodied within the immigrant context for Asian women who are mothers and are employed. A dominant stereotype of Asian women has been that they are more family oriented than White women (e.g., Nee & Wong, 1985), and cultural characteristics of immigrant Asian groups have been overemphasized. Rather than essentializing the cultural characteristics of groups (e.g., Chinese are more family oriented), she emphasized that Chinese family practices were responses to the challenges posed by the immigration context and an expression of women’s agency (Glenn, 1983). Other scholars have documented alternative structural and emotional motherhood arrangements for Asian immigrant women. Moon (2003) has documented public or shared motherhood in many Asian immigrant communities. Latina women and Dominican women who travel to the United States for work engage in “transnational motherhood,” a set of practices according to which mothers leave their children behind in their host countries in order to provide for them by working in low paid occupations abroad (Hondagneu-Sotelo, 1999, Hondagneu-Sotelo & Avila, 1997; Pessar, 1999).

Thus, women experience gender in a plethora of ways and negotiate agency within the pressures of their contexts (Glenn 1991, 1994; Raghuram & Kofman, 2002). For example, low income African American women use social networks to work around the pressures of dealing with their circumstances (Taylor, Chatters, Tucker & Lewis,
Pedi-focal family systems are child centered family systems rather than systems organized around the spouses conjugal relations and are created and maintained by many low income African American women (Crosbie-Burnett & Lewis, 1993).

Expressing agency within a patriarchal structure may have complex consequences for women (Mullings & Wali, 2000). Based on a community study, Mullings & Wali (2000) noted that several women in their study had internalized the “strong Black woman” ideal and worked hard to excel in various domains of their familial and professional lives adding enormous stress to their lives which Mullings and Wali (2000) called Sojourner Syndrome. Bell & Mattis (2000) also found that African American women who have internalized the strong woman ideal did not seek help when they were in an abusive relationship. Further, they noted that popular culture played an important role in perpetuating the strong woman ideal. Belle (1982) found that African American women from lower socio economic classes built extended social networks to cope with the stressors of parenting and work. These networks supported women in times of need. Yet these very networks were sources of stress as the women bore the emotional burden of being a source of support for other people in the network. On the one hand, the women negotiate and develop unique identities and practices, but internalization of identities and enactment of practices can have complex mental health consequences. They can be sources of higher wellbeing as well as increase life stress.

Intersectionality presents a useful paradigm for understanding the unique embodiments and complex life and health outcomes for women in various groups (Cole & Zucker, 2007; Haritatos, 2005; Mahalingam, 2006; Mahalingam, Balan, & Haritatos,
under review; Pessar, 1999; Stewart & McDermott, 2004). Crenshaw (1995) noted that multiple and intersecting social identities emanating from multiple social contexts can impact the lives of those who populate those ascribed categories. In order to understand how complex tensions and practices are negotiated within groups, and to understand how the context is related to individual outcomes, each theoretically meaningful intersection needs to be studied. Stewart and McDermott (2004) outlined three major tenets of the intersectionality perspective, including: (a) the heterogeneity of social groups; (b) people’s locations within social structures that encompass power relations; (c) the unique, non-additive effects of identifying with more than one social group;

Cole & Zucker (2007) have argued that research on intersectionality needs to go beyond comparing various possible combinations of groups. Instead, the empirical research on intersectionality should focus on how various intersections of social identities influence how we make sense of our various life experiences. Such analysis often provides unexpected yet valuable insights about the influence of intersecting identities on how women interpret and enact their gendered experience. Using the experiences of Black women in the United States, Cole & Zucker (2007) have shown that historical marginalization and racialization of African American women has denied them the agency to celebrate their feminine and desirable gendered identities.

Thus historic, social and power characteristics of context appear to have produced unique circumstances for the manifestations of psychological constructs in individuals. Rather than viewing these contexts as independent of each other, each unique intersection produces non-additive meanings and enactments for individuals residing in them.

Power differentials in the hierarchical ordering of groups have produced unique
pressures on members of marginalized communities. The embodiments of the social contexts as seen in one’s social location and the power differentials created appear to be vital in understanding outcomes for individuals residing at the intersections of multiple social contexts. Marginality is experienced as a consequence of one’s social location and could be helpful in understanding the psychological experience of Asian immigrants within the intersectionality paradigm.

One of the earliest references to marginality can be found in Robert Park’s (1928) influential work, *Human Migration and the Marginal Man*. Park, defines marginal as a personality type:

> When however, the walls of the medieval ghetto were torn down and the Jew was permitted to participate in the cultural life of the peoples among whom he lived, there appeared a new type of personality, namely a cultural hybrid, a man living and sharing intimately in the cultural life and tradition of two distinct peoples, never quite willing to break, even if he were permitted to do so, with his past and his traditions, and not quite accepted, because of racial prejudice, in the new society in which he now sought to find a place. (p. 891).

Although Park introduced the term marginal, he never fully developed it as a measurable construct to describe the psychological experience of individuals. Later, Stonequist (1935) developed the idea by specifying the negative psychological consequences of being the marginal man. Stonequist specified the relative power differentials between groups and how these differentials impacted individual choices. Further, he delineated the various stages in the development of the marginal man. However, even at this time no acceptable description of marginality as a relevant
measurable psychological construct has emerged.

An important issue in defining the marginality construct has been the distinction between the macro-level contextual factors that produced marginality and the micro-level individual characteristics that were the outcomes (Dickie-Clark, 1966). While researchers had specified the psychological outcomes of being marginal, little work existed around defining what circumstances produced marginality and further how these circumstances were related to individual experiences. Thus empirical research on marginality did not find the common denominator specified by Park and Stonequist completely valid in their studies and did not find consistent support for the existence of the construct (e.g., Golvensky, 1952).

Kerchoff and McCormick (1955) identified four different characteristics of the marginal situation which helped to refine the construct of marginality: (a) the individual’s marginal status; (b) the individual’s attitude towards one’s own marginal group; (c) the more or less permeable barrier between the marginal and non-marginal groups; (d) the marginal responses of the group members to the marginal situation that is produced; Antonovsky (1956) further refined the construct by noting that clear and irreconcilable differences might exist between the social groups. In particular he emphasized that members of the marginal group are pulled by the greater rewards from membership in the dominant group. This probably was an early allusion to the need for non-dominant group members to acculturate with the dominant group.

Based on these newly elaborated theoretical foundations, research on marginality progressed in a myriad of directions. Some researchers noted that there may be different forms of marginality. One such distinction was made by Gist (1960) who noted that the
English speaking Anglo-Indian community in India could be considered to be culturally marginal as they were torn between the British colonialists and native Indians in the Indian sub-continent, who considered them to be outsiders. This community maintained its unique position within the cultural fabric of India, yet integrated with the mainstream in certain spheres.

Mann (1958) developed a marginality measure to examine the outcomes produced by the marginal situation. The construct of marginality began to be applied in other domains such as the experiences at the workplace. In the workplace, the construct was thought to be useful in understanding the experiences of employees in integrative positions or one which required working across multiple units. New measures were developed and used in these studies (Pruden & Stark, 1971; Ziller, Stark, & Pruden, 1969).

Recently, Del Pillar and Udasco (2004) reviewed the construct of marginality and questioned the validity of the construct citing the inconsistency in the psychological outcomes related to social marginality in previous studies. Despite this criticism that the construct may lack validity, other researchers have established that the construct is useful. (e.g., Kim, Gonzales, Stroh, & Wang, 2006).

Marginality has also been a key construct in acculturation typologies (e.g. Berry, 1995). However, such classifications have met with criticism for placing individuals along dimensions and for rejecting the dominant group (see Rudmin, 2003 for a critical review). Cuellar, Arnold and Maldonado (1995) revised the original Acculturation Rating Scale for Mexican Americans to incorporate many of the criticisms leveled against the original scale which sought to classify people into various categories.
Using this scale among Asian Americans, Kim, Gonzales, Stroh, & Wang (2006) found evidence of negative mental health outcomes for Asian Americans that were related to their perceptions of marginality. They also pointed out that there may be differences in the nature of marginality depending upon who was used as a reference group: Asian marginality, Asian-American marginality and Anglo marginality. In addition, they observed that these marginalities resulted in different psychological outcomes and there were differences by generational status. In particular, Anglo and Asian-American marginality predicted negative mental health outcomes for first generation parents, while Asian and Asian-American marginality predicted negative mental health outcomes for second generation children.

This recent study highlighted the role of Anglo marginality involving rejection of dominant white Americans attitudes for first generation Asian Americans in the United States. The study also highlighted the perception of potential permeability, a point enunciated by Kerchoff & McCormick (1955) and Antonvsky (1956), through acceptance or rejection of dominant group attitudes.

For Asian Indians, the permeability test was seen in Baghat Singh Thind’s claim to be white (Mahalingam, Philip, & Balan, 2006). Permeability is also impacted by perception of rejection by dominant group. This could accentuate perceptions of marginality. Studies examining perceptions of discrimination have alluded to a variety of negative psychological outcomes as a result of this experience (Szalacha, Erkut, Coll, Alarcon, Fields, Ceder, 2003). Harrell (2000) reviewed the multiple ways in which racism can impact the well-being of marginalized groups: interpersonal level, through direct person-to-person interactions; collective level, seen in the disparities through
functioning of large groups of people; cultural-symbolic context, in the images of groups, and in the socio-political context through public debates and discussions. She observed that the plethora of experiences in these multiple spheres can enhance stress for people of color and must be accounted.

Yet, scholars like Espiritu (1997) have pointed out that Asian American experiences are often fitted within the categories of Black and White. Espiritu (1997) highlighted that Asian American experiences are considered neither black nor white. The earlier experiences of Bhagat Singh Thind documents this dilemma. Asian Indians have continued to be racialized and treated as perpetual foreigners.

Harrell (2000) pointed out that racism experiences can be viewed as an antecedent to ethnic identity beliefs. The model minority stereotype itself can be viewed as one such belief about one’s ethnic group that involves attaining the highest levels of success as exemplified in this goal (Haritatos, 2005; Mahalingam, 2006, Mahalingam, Philip, & Balan, 2006.). The positive stereotypes associated with the model minority can involve familial and professional domains for women. Haritatos (2006) documented this stereotype at two levels for Asian Indian and Chinese men and women in her study: family and career. The idealized identities were a source of pride and pressure for the women in her study whereas it was a source of pride alone for the women.

Perceived discrimination or perception of rejection by out group (Barry & Grillo, 2003; Finch, Bohdan & Vega 2000; Zhou & Xiong, 2005) could be an additional source of marginality. Asian Indian immigrant women are vulnerable to experiencing unique health and occupational outcomes at the intersections of gender, class and race. In summary, studying social marginality as a construct within the intersectionality paradigm
is important and useful for understanding the unique embodiments of context, the enactments within the context and outcomes experienced by Asian Indian women. Social marginality may be evident in the rejection of the dominant group attitudes, and in the perception of discrimination or perception of rejection.

An additional important issue using intersectionality perspective for the study of marginality pertains to methodological considerations. Methodologically, quantitative approaches alone may not completely capture the nuanced embodiments of multiple and intersecting social locations for individuals. Cole & Zucker (2007) have argued that research on intersectionality perspective needs to go beyond comparing various possible combinations of groups where social categories are treated as mutually exclusive blocking variables. Instead, the empirical research on intersectionality should focus on how various intersections of social identities influence how we make sense of our various life experiences. Such analysis often provides unexpected yet valuable insights into the influence of intersecting identities on how women interpret and enact their gendered experience. Inman, Howard, & Beaumont (2007) showed that Asian Indian women selectively appropriated ethnic identities. Londhe (2006) demonstrated that Asian Indian mothers endorsed hybrid practices in child rearing. These nuances in meanings and enactment embodied by the women’s intersecting race, class and gender context would be obliterated within quantitative studies. In addition, quantitative approaches may not be adequate in capturing the social construction of mothering and careers for Asian Indian immigrant women. A mixed methods approach is particularly relevant in understanding the nature and enactments of intersecting social identities such as gender, social and economic circumstances within immigration and race. These enactments could be a
source of agency (Glenn, 1991). A variable centered approach may be inadequate in capturing these nuances. Further, the negotiation of agency may be complex and dynamic reflecting the heterogeneity of individual women’s circumstances.

**Immigration, Gender, Families and Idealized Beliefs about Family and Motherhood**

Reviewing many studies that examined the intersecting social contexts of class, gender and race for immigrant women, Pessar (1999) noted that these intersecting contexts produced unique sets of enactments and embodiments for women residing within them. She critiqued traditional immigration scholarship for assuming that women in households were passive entities who adapted to the immigration context created by men’s migration, and argued for the need to move beyond examining private and public spaces to study the complex tensions embodied in a multiplicity of domains. She noted the case of a Dominican woman who secretly longed for her migrant worker husband to be caught and deported at the border, so that he could go back to take care of her children.

Further, Pessar’s review highlighted the unique and gendered processes that were obliterated by previous scholarship that focused exclusively on men. In a study of wives of Japanese academic migrants, Sakamoto (2006) noted that although many of her participants did not resent being labeled “housewives” within the Japanese cultural context, they also felt that such identities became a source of stigma within an academic community in the United States. One participant in Sakamoto’s study pointed out that this unacceptable status was compelling motivation to acquire graduate education and pursue a career.
Several researchers have observed the pervasive role of gender in creating and organizing family relationships (Dion & Dion, 2001; Sakamoto, 2006). Such cultural adaptation of families often involves task sharing and allocation, which is consistent with traditional gendered expectations. While couples’ family adaptation began as a unit when they first arrived in the United States, this changed over time. Men seemed to turn increasingly to the work domain while women’s experiences were less localized to any one domain (Sakamoto, 2006). Secondly, Dion (2006) noted that parents have unique gendered expectation and standards for their children. Parents expect to be closely involved with children’s decisions in various spheres and girls have greater restrictions than boys (Zhou, 2006).

First generation Asian mothers face unique challenges in an immigration context that are gendered; women are believed to hold moral responsibility for transmission of cultural values. Londhe (2006) noted that Asian Indian immigrant mothers are torn between various child rearing practices. Sometimes, this involves maintaining dual sets of allegiances to different cultural practices. Tummala-Narra (2004) noted that women believed sleeping with the child was a necessary precursor to life long obedience, an important cultural value. They did not share this traditional sleeping arrangements with their child’s pediatrician. Apparently, these women felt the responsibility to “recreate” their culture in their new “home” which became a source of stress for the women. Immigrant women worked within the family unit to identify a set of core practices that they sought to maintain. Inman, Howard & Beaumont (2006) observed:

Having an Indian core was also represented through ascribing to cultural values (e.g., intracultural marriages, being family oriented, and maintaining
vegetarianism) and adhering to cultural activities. For instance, a mother stated,
“Having close family ties, you know, having my in-laws over, my brothers-in-law, living with them, making sacrifices here and there for them, that’s very Indian.” (p. 95).

Speaking of mothering in a transnational context, Tummala-Narra (2004) observed:

Mothering in a foreign land involves the transformation of one’s cultural and maternal identifications. Pre-immigration fantasies, the actual migration to a new country, and post-migration experiences shape the formation of the immigrant mother’s sense of identity and competence in raising children to adapt to two or more cultures. Inherent in this process of adjustment are women’s separation from their own maternal figures and their motherlands. The renegotiation of gender roles is a necessary component of the immigrant mother’s identity formation. (p. 168).

The process of motherhood for immigrant mothers is inherently stressful as it involves reconciling multiple and competing ideologies as well as creating a reflexive version of culture that can be imparted. Even when this version is created, there is the fear that this will be challenged as evidenced in the following words of an Iranian mother cited by Tummala-Narra (2004).

When I was in Iran, I assumed that my kids would know what it means to be Iranian. I didn’t know how much I have to teach them for them to understand it. I can teach them but I don’t know how much they listen. (p. 169).
Kim, Gonzales, Stroh and Wang (2006) noted that first generation Asian immigrants reported experiencing *Anglo* marginality and *Asian American* marginality. The perception of difference between one’s own group and that of others became a salient issue for the women. In response they rejected attitudes and values of the dominant group and experienced social marginality. Together, with the studies reviewed above, this suggests that Asian immigrants preferred to adopt newer practices and acculturate, yet they were not completely integrated within the social hierarchy. It appeared that they experienced marginality vis-à-vis White Americans on the one hand as well as Asian Americans on the other as well.

Sometimes the intrapersonal conflict produced is difficult to resolve for Asian Indian women. Despite being aware of the contradictions, Asian immigrant women often have difficulty accepting them. Tummala-Narra (2004) observes of 12 Asian Indian women in his study.

When asked what they would envision for their children growing up in the United States, most of these women stated that they hoped for increased financial independence for their daughters and an egalitarian relationship in their children’s marital relationships. They also disclosed that they felt anxious about their children potentially choosing marital partners outside their ethnic group…. Why can’t we just accept that our kids will marry whoever they want? I think we don’t know how to bridge these two different worlds in our minds. We still want to preserve ourselves and our cultures somehow?” (p. 175)

Within the American context, additional pressures also exist. The idealized motherhood envisioned in the *intensive mothering ideology* is one such belief system
This is exemplified in the *Mommy Myth* of an individualistic superhuman mother. This vision of motherhood contrasts with the interdependent vision of parenting constituted by the traditional Asian model (Sakamoto, 2006). These conflicting *selfways* (Markus, Mullally, & Kitayama, 1997) present unique challenges given the demands of the individualistic mothering context created by immigration for Asian Indian women.

This vision of motherhood as agentic and constantly engaging, that appears consistent with the *intensive mothering ideology* (e.g., Hays, 1996) seems necessary to handle safety and well-being concerns that immigrant mothers in racialized groups have for their children (Glenn, 1994). A series of family based strategies are used including giving names to children, such that they can be easily pronounced, being aware of ethnic and non-ethnic peers of the children as well as being constantly available to the children (e.g., Glenn, 1991; Inman, Howard, & Beaumont, 2006; Kim, Conway-Turner, Sherif, & Woolfolk, 2006; Tummala-Narra, 2004;)

These experiences of othering and discrimination accentuate the social marginality experiences of Asian women. Women’s experiences of being perpetual foreigners create the climate for idealizing motherhood glorifying greater involvement and engagement with the children vis-à-vis their own spouses and other women. Espiritu (2001) noted that Filipina women create idealized versions of Asian motherhood as against White motherhood which couched Asian motherhood in morally superior terms attributing greater involvement with children than White American mothers. Espiritu (2001) quoted one of her study participants:
“Asian parents take care of their children. Americans have a different attitude. They leave their children to their own resources. They get baby sitters to take care of their children or leave them in day care. That’s why when they get old, their children don’t even care about them.” (p. 420)

The creation of unique cultural idealizations in contrast to the dominant group are a source of pride through collective self esteem (Luhthanen & Crocker, 1992) and are created to buffer against negative consequences of marginality experiences and acculturation pressures (Mahalingam, 2006; Farver, Narang, & Bhadha, 2002). In Espiritu’s (2001) study of Filipina women and their daughters, she found that the women created unique positive idealization of Filipina women as chaste and pure in contrast to White American women. Further they created an air of moral superiority, even as they consented to traditional patriarchal structures. Espirtu (2001) observed:

The construction of white Americans as the “other” and American culture as deviant serves a dual purpose: It allows immigrant communities both to reinforce patriarchy through sanctioning of women’s (mis)behavior and to present an unblemished, if not morally superior, public face to the dominant society….Through the oppression of Filipina women and the denunciation of white women’s morality, the immigrant community attempts to exert its moral superiority over the dominant Western culture and to reaffirm to itself its self-worth in the face of economic, social, political and legal subordination. (p. 436)

Creating this model minority vision of Asian motherhood is necessary for mothers as a means of dealing with their minority status and their oppression on racial lines (Espiritu, 2001; Mahalingam & Haritatos, 2006). Yet the maintenance of the model
minority ideal increases the burden of traditional gender role expectations within the patriarchal context for women (Abrahman, 2006; Inman, Howard, & Beaumont, 2006). Women, who have been traditionally considered responsible for child care (see Arendell, 1991, for a review of motherhood construct) and for the transmission of culture (Ortner, 1974), have increased pressures towards socializing children in the model minority ideology. This need to inculcate cultural values can be a leading stressor for Asian Indian immigrant women. (Tummala-Narra, 2004).

Inman, Howard, & Beaumont (2006.) studied 16 Asian Indian mothers and fathers. They noted that mothers and fathers valued culture specific enactments especially as immigrants. Kurien (1999) noted that Asian Indian mothers engaged in unique community and religious practices such as developing and taking important positions in Sunday school and cultural activities. Mothers’ engagement in religious festivals at Sunday school, tutoring children and generally volunteering were an important basis for creating and developing a sense of community for Asian Indian women. This gendered space created with an obligation to the community’s children became a trope to idealize motherhood as culture bearer. The domain of motherhood presents a unique gendered process with the context of the immigrant family, where these ideals become a trope to create a moral superiority of the group in contrast to dominant White Americans (e.g., Asian mothers are more caring than white mothers).

Research examining motherhood in Asian populations has focused on acculturation as the basis for parenting strategies, primarily using qualitative approaches (e.g., Deepak, 2005; Inman, Howard, & Beaumont, 2006; Londhe, 2006). While implicitly these studies have assumed that stress in the context of acculturation led to
idealized motherhood practices, most of the studies have not sufficiently examined the links between experience of social marginality and development of a model minority ideology within an empirical paradigm. Further, limited work exists on the extent to which various motherhood practices are prevalent and how the practices are affected by Asian Americans’ endorsement of the model minority stereotype. This study seeks to bridge this gap by examining the antecedents and consequences of the model minority motherhood ideology that ethnographic studies have documented to be prevalent in the Asian Indian population (e.g., Inman, Howard, & Beaumont, 2006; Jambunathan 2002)

**Asian Indian Immigrant Women and Work: The Pressure of Idealized Work Identities**

Motherhood ideologies and expectations can affect the meanings and satisfaction women derive from work (Tizard, 1991). Traditionally, the demands of motherhood have been conceived as conflicting with expectations at work (Tizard, 1991). On the other hand, psychological constructions of parenting have emphasized that parents, and especially mothers of young children, should be constantly engaged with their children. Feminists have criticized these models for limiting public roles of earning to men and caring and nurturing roles to women (Glenn, 1994). Recently, researchers have begun to examine characteristics of multiple roles including how working women negotiate multiple roles. Specifically, research has addressed whether the time demands of one role impede successful performance of the other - the role conflict view (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985; Hughes & Gallinsky, 1994; Voydanoff, 1988; Williams & Alliger, 1994), and the strains from participation in multiple roles including outcomes such as subjective sense of balance- the role overload view (Milkie & Petola, 1999). A few studies have also
examined the impact of multiple roles on each other in terms of whether they lead to overall enrichment of the person (e.g., Rothbard, 2001) and stress (e.g., Coverman, 1989).

Idealized model minority beliefs can place increased stress on women to pursue and be successful in their careers through the successful career woman ideal (Haritatos, 2005). Research by Oyseman and Sakamoto (1997) suggested that the Asian stereotype was to be a high achiever. Even though the group-specific stereotype includes high achievement, researchers have documented poorer occupational outcomes for minority groups and especially for women (Browne & Misra, 2003; Segura, 1989). Specifically, race impacts perception of women as employees as well as the types of jobs that are available to them (Parrenas, 2003). Career progression is also likely to be poor for women of color, who are likely to face poorer outcomes than men of color (Fernandez, 1998). Overall several researchers have noted that Asian women’s experiences in the labor force may not be similar to the experiences of White women. Asian women are likely to have higher educational attainments yet poorer occupational outcomes that are not commensurate with their education (Barringer & Kassebaum, 1989; Cheng, 1997; Glenn, 1994; Hirschman & Wong, 1986).

Even though Asians are expected to be career oriented and successful (despite evidence to the contrary), Asian women are also expected to be more family oriented, nurturing and caring (Jackson, Lewandowski, Ingram, & Hodge, 1997). Asian women are expected to contribute to the family income, yet the income generated from employment for women is viewed to be secondary to the man’s within the household situation (Dion & Dion, 2001). Thus the model minority stereotype (Mahalingam & Haritatos, 2006) can
place employed Asian women who are mothers in double jeopardy. While women are
expected to be good mothers, they are also expected to use their education constructively
and perform better than white women in science and math. Shih, Pittinsky, & Ambady
(1999) studied the relative salience of gender and cultural stereotypes on performance.
Their study suggested that the priming of Asian Identity resulted in better performance in
Math for women, as compared to priming their gender identity.

Asian women are likely to be in professionally engaged in science and
information technology related occupations that happen to be male dominated
traditionally gendered occupations. Entering masculine occupations poses unique
challenges for women. In the first place male dominated occupations value agentic ideals
(Cejka & Eagly, 1999). Higher compensation in professional occupations also places
women vulnerable to stereotypes that augment their agentic characteristics. (Johannesen-
Smith & Eagly, 2002).

Thus it appears that Asian Indian women who are mothers and are employed are
likely to experience pressure on multiple fronts. Apart from having to selectively
acculturate, rejecting some dominant value systems, they are experience rejections
through othering and discrimination experiences. Their own fears that their children may
be discriminated adds an additional layer of pressure. So also does their experiences in
pursuing success in male dominated occupations. This provides an impetus for multiple
and conflicting idealizations in the lives of Asian immigrant women who are employed
and are mothers. While immigrant Asian Indian women are expected to be caring,
nurturing and family oriented on the one hand, they are also expected to be successful in
their career pursuits (Espiritu, 2000; Hays, 1995).
Additionally, scholars have argued that Asian women’s vocational behavior may be directed by needs that emanate from their immigrant status and concerns over meeting multiple idealized identities. Among these are the needs for protecting children from discrimination (Glenn, 1991) and investment in community organizations to enhance their cultural experiences (Kurien, 1999). Given this, little is known about how these multiple identities are idealized in the face of social marginality. Scholars (Glenn, 1997; Grahame, 2003; Duleep & Sanders, 1993; Fernandez, 1998) noted that Asian and other minority women deal with multiple levels of marginality: at the work level; within the patriarchal structure; and racism. Some studies suggest that in the face of social marginality, Asian women may choose to idealize motherhood rather than their careers (Glenn, 1991; Pessar, 1999; Pessar, 2006; Kurien, 1999). Yet many different personal factors (e.g., socio-economic status) would determine how women make these choices (Pessar, 1999).

Subjective experience of one’s social status may be particular relevant as a form of structural marginality. Adler et al. (2000) noted that perceived position on a hierarchy rather than the real one could be a possible explanation for the role of subjective socioeconomic status on psychological beliefs. Apart from working through cognitions, subjective socioeconomic status more than objective socioeconomic status represents an individual’s nuanced perception of one’s own position in the social hierarchy and thus as a psychological belief system is related to other psychological outcomes such as the model minority.

Additionally, subjective socioeconomic status appears to be a more comprehensive predictor of psychological outcomes than objective socioeconomic status
Whereas, these studies have looked at white women, the present study advances these findings to first generation Asian Indian women.

**Motherhood, Work and Mental Health**

Researchers have pointed out the similarities in the mothering and stress discourses on the one hand as well as the deleterious effects of social marginality through the experience of discrimination (Harrell, Hall, & Taliaferro, 2003; Harell, 2000; Horwitz & Long, 2005). The additional burden of dealing with racism and adjustment concerns of children may be related to unique coping strategies and psychological health for mothers of young and school aged children in racialized groups (Glenn, 1991; Espiritu, 2004).

Horwitz and Long (2005) integrated motherhood and stress discourses. They observed that individuals are expected to handle their own stressors but mothers are expected also to be responsible for their own children. Linking the two discourses, they observed that mothers are expected to handle their own stress as well as protect their children from stress. Idealized identities serve as buffers reducing the effects of discrimination and social marginality (Harrell, 2000; Mahalingam, 2006). Where mothers are unable to protect their children, they are likely to feel guilty. For immigrant women, given the increased emphasis on protecting their children from race related stress, the experience of social marginality through this additional burden would have important health ramifications.

Some positively constructed group-specific identities buffer the negative effects of stress. Idealized identities (e.g., Sojourner Syndrome: Mullings & Walli, 2000) and active coping (John Henryism: James, Hartnett, & Kalsbeek, 1983) are used by groups to
produce positive mental health consequences for themselves as well as to buffer general life stress (Mahalingam & Haritatos, 2006). Part of the Idealized Identities model, culture specific narratives of the group (e.g., we are caring mothers; we are high achievers) are woven into a structure of idealized identities that serve to enhance ethnic pride and collective self esteem and impel active coping strategies to buffer against stress (Mahalingam, 2006). Previously, I noted that these identities may be group-specific (e.g., Asians are model minority) as well as domain-specific (e.g., Asian women are more family oriented than White women; Asian women are more career oriented than White women).

Several researchers have documented the importance of active coping in reducing the perception of stress (e.g., Beasley, Thompson, & Davidson, 2002). Active coping mechanisms may emerge from within the group and aid in building resilience to stressors. Luthar, Cicchetti, & Becker (2000) have distinguished between resilience as a trait and resilience as a socio-cultural factor. It has been suggested that resilience as a trait may be internal to the person, yet resilience as a group-specific factor is produced from within the characteristics of the context. Particularly for marginalized groups, as those in immigration contexts, positively constructed identities become a source of resilience in times of high levels of stress and strain (Mahalingam & Haritatos, 2006). Resilience may be domain specific active coping strategy (e.g., motherhood self agency or perception of confidence in motherhood, Dumka, Stoerzinger, Jackson, & Roosa, 1996; career resilience, Carson & Bedeian, 1994; or general (e.g., John Heryism).

John Henryism is a personal ideal, which involves active high effort coping in the face of multiple stressors. (James, 1994; James, Hartnett, & Kalsbeek, 1983). The
personal ideal founded on success through hard work and determination to succeed and active engagement (James, 1994), is based on the legend of John Henry who competed against a machine and managed to win but died of exhaustion (James, Hartnett, & Kalsbeek, 1983). The measure uses the social contextual experiences of African Americans (James et al., 1984; Bennett, Merritt, Sollers, Edwards, Whitfield et al., 2004) and has demonstrated validity in predicting cardiovascular outcomes especially among low SES African Americans (Bennett, Merritt, Sollers, Edwards, Whitfield et al. 2004). Haritatos, Mahalingam & James (2007) studied John Henryism as an active coping strategy in buffering stress for foreign born Asian Americans. They found that John Henryism had many benefits, including better physical health functioning, and these benefits were attained by reducing perceived stress.

Social Support has been suggested to be an important factor in perceiving stress from motherhood (e.g., Oakley, 1992; Lee, Koeske, & Sales, 2004) and work (Ingledew, Hardy, & Cooper, 1997). Researchers have noted that social networks can mitigate stress for women who are mothers (Oakley, 1992). Particularly for immigrant women, social networks and translational ties have been found to improve mental health outcome. Lee, Koeske & Sales (2004) observed that the presence of social support buffered against the experience of acculturative stress for immigrants. Within a motherhood discourse, social support has been shown to mitigate the effects of maternal distress on child behavior (Short & Johnston, 1997). Mulvaney & Kendrick (2005) found that lack of social support predicted higher depression for mothers. DeLongis & Holtzman (2005) observed that coping strategies to mitigate stress and social support were entwined and research needs to examine the bidirectional relationship between them.
Moon (2003) found that Korean immigrant mothers’ stress levels were predicted by the presence of their own mothers as a source of support. Another feature of social support is the presence of role models that would validate the mother’s experiences (e.g., Inman, Howard, & Beaumont, 2006). Community networks and religious groups are further important social support determinants of Asian Indian women experience of stress (Kurien, 1999).

The overwhelming evidence is that the presence of social support is an important individual difference factor that needs to be including in understanding stress and resilience processes for immigrants. Further, social networks can impact whether and how stress is perceived. It also affects how other mental health outcomes such as depression are perceived.

On the work front, personal perception of flexibility or its absence appears to affect women’s coping. Many studies found that flexibility in work scheduling impacted work-family attitudes for employed mothers (Rothausen, 1994; Kossek, Lautsch & Eaton, 2005).

Social marginality and discrimination experiences lead to the valorization of unique stereotypical cultural identities such as the model minority. Further, these identities are gendered. While social marginality and idealized identities may be important towards understanding how Asian Indian women valorize their motherhood and career related ideological identities, personal (e.g., active coping) and contextual factors (e.g., social support) affects how women experience psychological outcomes (e.g., stress) associated with endorsing those identities.

**Summary and Present Study**
Asian Indian women’s immigrant status in the United States places them in a unique situation. On the one hand, their racial position makes them vulnerable to overt and covert forms of discrimination (Abraham, 2006; Esses, Dietz, & Bharadwaj, 2006; Fernandez, 1998; Glenn, 1991; Inman, Howard, & Beaumont, 2006; Mahalingam, 2006; Raghuram & Koffman, 2004; Tang, 2004); on the other hand, the cultural beliefs about the low status of women within the patriarchal order and community social networks makes them vulnerable to gender based discrimination and in extreme instances abuse and violence (Abraham, 2006; Kurien, 1999). Women within the immigration context also share the burden of reproduction and transmission of cultural values (Pessar, 1999; Dion & Dion, 1999). Culture-specific ideological identities such as “model minority” create a further need for Asian Indian women to engage continuously and selflessly in the nurturing and caring of young children and for their family (Mahalingam, 2006; Haritatos, 2005). Asian Indian women are expected to perform well in their careers, which are often in masculine fields (e.g., science, information technology) and contribute to the family income and success in the new “world” (De, 2002; Mahalingam, 2006), an image consistent with the model minority stereotype.

Using the lens of intersectionality can be valuable in understanding the unique experiences and coping strategies of marginalized groups. Mahalingam (2006) argued in the formulation of the Idealized Identities model that groups use stereotypical group-specific resources to create idealized visions of themselves. These idealized identities are constructed with reference to the dominant group. Scholars have argued that the salience of these idealized cultural identities (e.g., model minority, model minority Asian woman) emanates from experiencing social marginality (Mahalingam, 2006, Haritatos, 2005). Yet
very few studies have empirically examined whether social marginality is indeed an antecedent to group and domain specific idealized identities. Many different forms of marginality appear to be important. One reference within the literature involves marginality attitudes or the rejection of the attitudes and values of the dominant group which is part of the acculturation experience, (e.g. Cuellar, Arnold, & Maldonado, 1995). There is also some evidence within literature that perceiving discrimination (Espiritu, 2001; Mahalingam, 2006) could accentuate the perceptions of marginality and idealizing of one’s own group in the face of insubordination. These two constructs were measured to test for their effects on idealized beliefs with respect to motherhood and careers in the present study.

A second and related pursuit which has been implicitly assumed to be the impetus for immigration and acculturation for Asian women is the pursuit of higher socioeconomic status in the new “world” (e.g., Haritatos, 2005). This appears to be a form of structural marginality. Few studies empirically investigate the relationship between subjective socioeconomic status and model minority stereotype endorsement.

In this study, I empirically examined how the experience of marginality relates to the model minority belief system for Asian Indian women (see Fig 1). My first major research question was (Q1): How does the experience of different forms of marginality relates to the greater endorsement of the model minority stereotype?

Hypothesis 1 (a): Greater experience of social marginality relates to the greater endorsement of the model minority stereotype.

Hypothesis 1 (b): Greater perception of discrimination relates to the greater endorsement of the model minority stereotype.
Hypothesis 1 (c): Greater subjective socioeconomic status relates to the greater endorsement of the model minority stereotype.

Group specific (e.g., Asians) and domain specific idealized identities (e.g., Motherhood, Work) seem to be essential constituents of Asian Indian professional women’s model minority belief system (e.g., Haritatos, 2005). Little is known about how marginality impacts these domain specific ideals. The second research question will seek to address this issue: (Q2): Does the experience of social marginality lead to greater endorsement of the idealized motherhood and idealized career beliefs?

A major objective of this dissertation study was to understand how domain specific idealizations impacts coping in each. In keeping with this objective, a third set of questions concerned how endorsement of the idealized model minority beliefs in the domain of motherhood and career impacted personal coping: John Henryism (a form of active high effort coping), motherhood self agency (confidence in one’s ability to successfully carry out the demands of being a mother), career planning and perception of career as a burden. According to the idealized cultural identities model (Mahalingam, 2006), the endorsement of the model minority stereotype has many positive and negative outcomes. Yet an intriguing question remained that of how idealization in one domain would impact the other. Consistent with previous research on idealized beliefs and John Henryism (e.g., Haritatos, 2006), the following hypothesis were formulated for the relationship between idealized motherhood beliefs and John Henryism on the one hand and motherhood self agency on the other.

Hypothesis 3(A) (i): The greater endorsement of the model minority motherhood belief system will positively relate to John Henryism.
Hypothesis 3 (A) (ii): The greater endorsement of the model minority motherhood belief system will lead stronger endorsement of motherhood self agency

In order to understand how idealized motherhood beliefs affected work-family transitions (Stephens, 1994), wherein home can impact subjective and objective transitions at work, I also examined the relationship between idealized motherhood beliefs and two career related measures: pursuit of a planned career strategy and perception of career as a burden.

Similar hypothesis were formulated with respect to idealized career beliefs and various outcomes.

Hypothesis 3(B) (i): The greater endorsement of the model minority career belief system will positively relate to John Henryism.

Hypothesis 3 (B) (ii): The greater endorsement of the model minority career belief system will positively relate to motherhood self agency

The fourth set of hypothesis concerned mental health outcomes. In immigration research, group specific and culturally derived hardiness factors such as John Henryism have been suggested to reduce stress and improve coping with the stresses of immigration (Haritatos, 2006; Haritatos, Mahalingam & James, 2006; Portes & Rumbaut, 2006). I will examine this pathway in fourth major question in this study (Q4): Does active coping negatively relate to perceived stress? The specific hypotheses I formulated were:

Hypothesis 4(A) (i): John Henryism will be negatively related to perceptions of stress.

Hypothesis 4(A) (ii): John Henryism will be negatively related to depression.

Hypothesis 4(A) (iii): John Henryism will be positively related to subjective wellbeing.
I also examined a work outcome, namely job satisfaction in addition to mental health outcomes in the general life domain.

I expected a similar relationship to hold for motherhood self agency, a form of confidence in motherhood. Similar hypotheses were formulated for motherhood self agency (4B).

In addition, to the above questions, the study will examine how idealized motherhood beliefs affect ethnic socialization practices. This will provide an understanding of how women are coping with their cultural burden. My study addressed the following questions (Q5): Is the greater endorsement of idealized motherhood beliefs related to greater frequency of practices that impart cultural and religious training to children? Does the greater endorsement of this stereotype relate to practices that are geared towards enhancing children’s academic advancement? We noted that little is known about what belief systems (e.g., importance of celebrating cultural festivals, success orientation) are affected by the endorsement of the motherhood ideal. Hence this part of the study will be exploratory.

A sixth set of questions pertained to idealized motherhood beliefs and work sharing in the home domain (Q6): Does the greater endorsement of the model minority motherhood belief system lead to greater work in the household domain being performed by the mother?

Investigating these processes is vital to understand culture-specific antecedents to mental health and sources of resilience for Asian Indian working mothers. Researchers have noted (e.g., Pessar, 1999) the need to use mixed methods in investigating gendered processes in immigration for a number of reasons. Although quantitative methods are
helpful in establishing prevalence of gendered processes, qualitative methods are extremely useful in identifying gendered processes previously obliterated in quantitative research. In addition, quantitative approaches may not adequately capture the unique everyday dilemmas and contradictions in immigrant women’s lives. My research combined qualitative and quantitative methods. The study has two parts: 1) Community survey to examine the prevalence of certain practices and importance given to various enactments. 2) Semi-structured interviews with employed Asian Indian women who are mothers.
Chapter II

METHODS

In the previous chapter I noted that a major objective of the present study was to empirically examine how different forms of social marginality were related to idealized motherhood and career identities for Asian Indian women pursuing their careers and were mothers of school going children. In addition, I sought to replicate previous findings (e.g., Haritatos, 2006) with respect to idealized identities in the domain of motherhood for Asian Indian women. Finally, I also examined how idealized identities translated into everyday practices. Given that previous studies have documented the fluidity in the enactment of gendered processes such as motherhood (e.g., Dasgupta, 1998), I decided to use a mixed methods approach. I did a community survey to examine the relationship between social marginality and endorsement of idealized identities on the one hand as well as idealized identities and active coping/health outcomes on the other. I followed up this analysis with an analysis of semi-structured interviews with seven Asian Indian women with children pursuing careers. I first present the methods that pertain to the community survey followed by a description of the sampling strategy and methods that pertain to the interviews.

Community Survey

Participants

Two hundred and eighty nine Asian Indian participants were recruited for this study. The following selection criteria were used to recruit participants for this study: a)
Participants must be between 18-55 years old; b) They must have at least one child who is currently less than 16 years old; c) They must be foreign born and first generation Asian Indian immigrant women in the United States; d) They must be employed or self employed over 25 hours/week at the time of the study; Participants were offered $15 for participating in the survey. The average age of the group was 38 (SD = 6.71, N = 287) and the women had lived in the United States for an average of 11.6 years (SD = 6.67, N = 286). 32.6% had family income that was less than $60,000 per annum, 46% had family incomes between $60,000 and $200,000 and 20.7% had incomes over $200,000. The women had a mean number of children of 1.57.

Procedure

Participants were recruited for the web based survey through the following methods: through personal network and through community bulletin boards (e.g., miindia.com, myilaaka.com). Additionally flyers were emailed to various South Asian women’s organization including South Asian Women’s Network, an online community of South Asian Women and Asian Indian women’s organization of Michigan. Flyers were also distributed at various St. Louis events (e.g., Tamil Sangam festival).

The survey could be completed in approximately 45 minutes. At the end of the survey, participants were directed to a separate payment page, where they provided their name and address for payment purposes.

Measures

Social marginality. Six items from the Acculturation Rating Scale for Mexican Americans (ARSMA-II, Cuellar, Arnold, & Maldonado, 1995), which measures marginalization as an outcome of acculturation, was used to measure social marginality.
in this study (e.g., “I have difficulty accepted some values of White Americans, I have difficulty accepting some values held by White Americans.”). Participants rated the frequency with which they experienced each statement on a five point rating scale where 1 is “Not at all,” and 5 is “Almost Always.” The measure was developed for use with the Hispanic population and Cuellar, Arnold, & Maldonado (1995) noted that the Cronbach Alpha for the Anglo orientation of the scale was .83. Kim, Gonzales, Stroh and Wang (2006) used the measure on Asian American adult and adolescent samples consisting of Chinese Americans, Korean Americans and Japanese Americans. The Cronbach Alpha for the scale ranged from .83 to .91 (Kim, Gonzales, Stroh, & Wang, 2006). The alpha in the present study was .89.

**Perceived discrimination.** The Perpetual Foreigner subscale, consisting of seven items, from the Asian American Racism Related Stress Inventory (Liang, Li, & Kim, 2004) was used to assess the extent to which Asian Indians perceived discrimination in general life spheres (e.g., “You are treated with less courtesy than other people.”). Two additional items (“Someone said Asians are now seen everywhere; Someone said Asians are taking away jobs from America”) were included to reflect more overt experiences especially in the workplace. Participants indicated the extent to which they had encountered and were affected by the experiences on a five point scale ranging from 1 = This Never happened to me; to 5 = This happened and I was extremely upset. In the present study, the alpha was .82.

**Subjective socioeconomic status.** The subjective socioeconomic status measure developed by Adler, Epel, Casellazo, & Ickovics (2000) was used in the present study. Participants were presented with a ladder, calibrated upwards along a 7 point scale with
the following instructions: “Imagine this ladder represents all the people in the United State. People lower down on the ladder are have lower income and living standards and people at the top have higher income and living standard. Where would you place yourself?”

*Model minority stereotype.* The model minority measure developed by Mahalingam & Haritatos (2005) was used in this study (e.g., “Asian Americans are more intelligent than other groups in the US.”). Four items from the measure were used in this study. The measure asks respondents to think about “your thoughts about Asian Americans as a group living in the US today” and to rate their agreement with each statement on a response scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). In a previous study of first generation Asian Americans including Asian Indians and Chinese participants, the scale had an alpha of .77 (Haritatos, 2005). In the present study, the alpha was .86.

*Idealized motherhood beliefs.* A modified version of the Asian American woman ideal (AAWI) scale (Mahlingam & Haritatos, 2005) was used in this study. The scale assesses the degree to which participants endorsed various beliefs about Asian American women in the domains of family/relationships (e.g., Asian American women have the capacity to make more sacrifices for their family than Asian American men). The original scale items are worded such that they make comparisons between Asian American and Caucasian women, and between Asian American women and men in terms of attitude and behavioral norms. Haritatos (2005) noted that this allows for measurement of the dual (and often co-existing) domains of racial/ethnic and gender expectations that Asian American women may have to cope with. This structure was retained for the present
study. Since I was interested in idealized motherhood beliefs for women, the references to women were changed to “mothers.” and the references to men were changed to “fathers.” Additionally, references to “Caucasian” were changed to “American.” Respondents were asked to think about “your thoughts about Asian American mothers in general living in the US today” and to rate their agreement with each statement on a response scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The alpha was .82.

Idealized career beliefs. A modified version of the Asian American woman ideal (AAWI) scale (Mahalingam & Haritatos, 2005) was used in this study. The scale assesses the degree to which participants endorse various beliefs about Asian American women in vocational domains. (Asian American women are better at science and math than white women). Respondents were asked to think about “your thoughts about Asian American women and men in general living in the US today” and to rate their agreement with each statement on a response scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

The original scale items are worded such that they make comparisons between Asian American and Caucasian women in terms of attitude and behavioral norms. Two new items comparing Asian American women and American men were included in the study. Thus the scale consisted of four items in this study. The alpha was .80.

Active coping measures

John Henryism. John Henryism measure (James, Hartnett, & Kalsbeek, 1987), as a measure of active high effort coping, was included in this study. The scale consists of twelve items (e.g., “I’ve always felt that I could make of my life pretty much what I wanted to make of it.”). The scale was originally developed for use in the African American population. Haritatos, Mahalingam & James (2007) found that the scale
properties for Asian Americans were comparable to those of the African American populations. The scale had reliabilities over .70 (Haritatos, Mahalingam, & James, 2007). The alpha was .78.

Motherhood self agency. Motherhood self agency was measured using the parenting self agency measure (Dumka, Stoerzinger, Jackson, & Roosa, 1996). Parenting self agency has been defined by Dumka, Stoerzinger, Jackson, & Roosa (1996) as parents’ overall confidence to be successful in the parenting role. Three items from this scale were used in this study (e.g., “I feel sure of myself as a mother; I know I am doing a good job as a mother, I know things about being a mother that would be helpful to other parents.”). Dumka, Stoerzinger, Jackson, & Roosa (1996) reported that the scale had cultural equivalence in Mexican and Anglo populations and had reliabilities over .70. In the present study, the alpha was .86.

Mental health measures.

Subjective Well-being. The Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS, Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985) was used to measure Subjective Wellbeing. The SWLS consists of five items that measure the individual’s evaluation of satisfaction with life in general (e.g., “In most ways my life is close to my ideal.”). Respondents selected one of seven options (ranging from “1 = strongly disagree” to “7 = strongly agree”) for each question. Responses were averaged to provide a life satisfaction score. The scale had good psychometric properties in previous studies of the Asian American population (Haritatos, 2005). The alpha in the present study was .92.

Depression. Depression was self reported by participants using the Center for Epidemiological Studies – Depressed Mood Scale (CES-D, Radloff, 1977). This scale
measures current levels of depressive symptomology with an emphasis on the affective component of depressed mood (e.g., “I was bothered by things that usually don’t bother me.”). Participants were asked to think about how often they experienced each symptom during the past week on a 4-point scale from 1 (rarely or none of the time [less than one day]) to 4 (most or all of the time [5-7 days]). Haritatos (2005) noted that measure had been widely used in Asian and Asian American populations. The CES-D has been found to have high internal consistency and validity. In a previous study of foreign born Asian Americans, the alpha reliability for the CES-D was .89 (Haritatos, 2005). In the present study, the alpha was .91.

**Perceived Stress.** The Perceived Stress Scale (PSS, Cohen, Kamarck, & Mermelstein, 1983) was used to assess participants’ subjective perception of stress during the past month. The original PSS is composed of fourteen items asking the degree to which life situations in the past month are appraised as stressful (e.g., “In the last month, how often have you been upset because of something that happened unexpectedly?”). An abbreviated ten item version used previously in the foreign born Asian American group had a reliability of .78 and was used in this study. For each item, respondents were asked to indicate how often they felt or thought a certain way on a response scale from 1 (never) to 5 (very often). In the present study the alpha was .79.

**Individual Difference Measures**

**Social Support.** The twelve item Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support (MSPSS, Zimet, Dahlem, Zimet, & Farley, 1988) will be used in this study (e.g., “There is a special person who is around when I am in need.”). The scale measures the extent to which participants have instrumental and emotional social support at the present
time. Participants will be asked to indicate the extent to which they agreed with each of the statements on a 7 point scales. Higher scores will indicate the presence of social support. In previous studies the scale had good psychometric properties (Haritatos, 2005) and in the present study the alpha was .95.

**Career related measures**

*Pursuit of planned career strategy.* Planned career strategy was measured with five items from the career commitment scales developed by Carson and Bedian (1994). Participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they agree or disagree with each of five statements on a five point scale (e.g., “I have created a plan for development in my career,” “I do not have a strategy for achieving my career goals,” “I am constantly trying to improve the skills I need for my career”). Negatively worded items were reverse coded. Higher scores indicated that the women pursued a planned career strategy. The alpha in the present study was .63.

*Perception of career as a burden.* Perception of career as a burden was measured by two items (e.g., “The costs associated with my career sometimes seem too great,” “Given the costs associated with my career, I sometime wonder if the personal burden is worth it.”) from Carson and Bedian’s (1994) career commitment scale. Higher score indicated greater perception of career as a burden. The alpha in the present study was .85.

**Job related measures**

*Job Satisfaction.* Job Satisfaction was measured with the Stanton, Bachiochi, Robbie, Perez, & Smith (2002) short version of the Job Descriptive Index. The overall satisfaction with the job subscale was used in this study. The measure lists seven characteristics of the job and participants are asked to indicate whether or not that
characteristic defines their work with a Yes, ?, or a “No. The items were scored according to the manual.

*Scheduling Flexibility.* Perception of flexibility was measured using items similar to that developed by Rothausen (1994) for measuring satisfaction with the flexibility facet of jobs (e.g., “I have flexibility in scheduling my work,” “I easily get time off for family as needed”). Participants indicated the extent to which they recognized each of the statements applied to their jobs (1 = Mostly True; 2 = Somewhat True; 3 = Never True; 4 = I do not know). The alpha was .81 in the present study.

*Motherhood Practices.*

*Practices in the household domain.* Motherhood practices in the household domain were measured using a measure developed by Luthar (2007) and concerned how various tasks were performed in the household. Participants indicated “who makes these decisions in your house” to nineteen items with whether it was “Mostly Me,” “Mostly my spouse/partner,” “Both equally,” “NA-I am a single parent.” The items were categorized as follows: 1) Responsibility for general household functioning (e.g., Organizing schedules for the family); 2) Responsibility for children (e.g., Being vigilant of the children’s emotions); 3) Decisions with respect to cultural transmission (e.g., Whether your child should learn your native language) For each task in a category, a score of 1 was assigned if it was performed by the respondent alone, versus it being performed jointly or by the spouse alone For each category, these scores were summed to obtain a frequency score of tasks performed by the self in that category. A higher the score indicated that tasks in that category were performed by the respondent rather than the spouse or jointly.
Ethnic socialization practices. The model minority practices measure addressed priorities for the mothers in the study. The domains of the measure were similar to that used by Suizzo & Soon (2006) to measure academic socialization. Participants were asked to indicate “how important each of these are currently to you” on a three point scale where 1 = Not at all important; 2 = Moderately important; and 3 “Very Important; The practices were categorized into the following: 1) Engaging in rigorous out of school academic activities (e.g., Enroll children in extra math lessons (e.g., Kumon); 2) Success orientation(e.g., Encourage child to participate in competitions); 3) Emphasis on high moral standards (e.g., Remind child that it is bad to indulge too much in his/her pleasures); 4) Cultural transmission (e.g., Enroll children in Sunday School/culture building activities (e.g., Bal Vihar).

Demographics. The following demographic measures were incorporated into the study: Year of Birth, Years in the United States and the number of children the participants had. Additionally, the family income was obtained along the following categories (Less than $20,000; $21,000-$40,000; $40,000-$60,000; $61,000-$100,000; $100,000-$200,000; Over $200,000). These categories were recoded into 3 categories (-1 = Less than $60,000; 0 = $61,000-$200,000; 1 = Over $200,000).

Semi-structured Interviews

Previously I emphasized the need for a mixed methods approach in the present study. The quantitative study used a variable centered approach to understand the antecedents and consequences of idealized identities. While the quantitative section of the study was assigned to examine the significance of the empirical relationships among
critical variables (see Laub & Sampson, 1998), the qualitative part was conceived to examine: a) the fluidity in practices which was person-centered rather than variable centered (see Laub & Sampson, 1998); b) the complexity in the endorsement of idealized identities; c) to provide a dynamic nature of the construction of motherhood in the identities by examining women’s post-immigration narratives. The selection of participants and sampling strategy were made to reflect these goals.

Participants

Similar to the community survey, the participants (see table 14) for this portion of the study were all Asian Indian women, who had moved from India. All women either came to join a spouse or to pursue a higher degree/ training opportunity of their own in a science/technology research related field. This aspect of the participant group differed from that used for the community survey. Since this analysis was designed to complement the survey, and I was interested in understanding motherhood as an idealized identity within the model minority discourse, I deliberately chose to examine the transcripts of women in fields (i.e., science/technology) for Asian women. At the time of the study, all women had at least one child who was younger than 16 years. In other words, at least one child was presently residing with the women. All women were located in the St. Louis area and were Hindu. Two women came to the United States for a doctoral degree and later married and had children. Four of the women started their research career with one or more children. One woman had children after she joined her line of work. All women had at least a Master’s degree in science/technology area prior to their travel to the United States. All women claimed to have aspired to acquire a higher degree in the United States and eventually be productive in their particular field.
Procedure

I used a snowball sampling approach to reach these women. Initially, I was able to contact a person who was employed in a research lab at a local private University. At the end of the interview, I asked her if she knew other women meeting the study criteria, who would be willing to participate in the study. The women were then contacted on the phone. Six other women were contacted in order to participate in the study. Four of the women could not be interviewed because of scheduling difficulties. Two women declined to participate. All women were paid $25 as a token of appreciation. Two of the women donated their money to a local organization that works towards generating funds for children’s education in India.

I developed an interview protocol (see table 15) and conducted semi-structured interviews with these women. Each interview lasted about ninety minutes and took place at a location convenient to the women. Four of the interviews took place at the women’s residence, two at the women’s workplace and one at the interviewer’s home.

Analysis

All interviews were tape recorded with the informant’s consent. The interviews were later transcribed and the transcripts were analyzed using the overall thematic analysis plan suggested by Boyatzis (1998) as a guide. A combination of theory driven and data driven themes were coded.

Boyatzis (1998) defines unit of analysis as the entity on which the interpretation of the study will focus. Each individual interviewee’s personal narrative of their life as an Asian Indian woman immigrant was used as the unit of analysis. I first examined each transcript in its entirety to examine how the 7 women’s narratives with respect to
motherhood and career were constructed. Next I examined individually indexed segments of the transcripts (e.g., What do you enjoy the most about being a mother? What is your proudest moment as a mother?) which I coded. Boyatzis (1998) defines the unit of coding as the most basic segment, or element, of the raw data or information that can be assessed in a meaningful way regarding the phenomenon. All references to being a mother including any prior beliefs, any emotion expressed, anything that the interviewee described as doing with her children, her interaction with her spouse on children’s issues, and the impact of work on being a mother were identified. These units were then indexed to address the following two questions as a guide: Consistent with the idealized identities model, I examined whether beliefs about motherhood (imagined and real beliefs about self or children, thoughts, emotions, acts) and acts was a source of pride or pressure for the women. The following is an illustration from Latha’s transcript: Here she talked about her daughter who was diagnosed with a learning disability and another who was a super achiever:

When I see her you know, for me that is a different kind of pride. Because I want to know that when I die, she is ok and she can take care of herself. Because that really surprises me. Because she has been diagnosed with a lot of little problems, medical problems also. And medical problems have let to psychological. Then we went to psychotherapy. We went to psychologist and we went to psychiatrist. And we had medication. But she was a very strong kid. So far, she is concerned, it is not achievement. Because Nandini if she reads a book, she gets an A. She’s on the, they call it the Dean’s list. Every semester, she’s on the Dean’s list and so when I ask her for her grade she says, why do you ask me for the grade. Didn’t
that letter come home to you? And I still ask her, because I love to know.. With Malati I don’t care whether she gets a B or a C. Of course I scream at her. But the fact that she can take care of herself is something. Because I am not a tyrant..

Latha uses academic achievement as a source of pride for one daughter and a different yard stick for her other child. She differentiated between the expectations for her two children. This was as source of pride as a mother.
Table 1 lists the overall Analysis Plan. In figure 1, this is presented graphically. Figures 2, 3, 4, and 5 present the relationships that were examined in separate multiple regression analysis graphically.

**Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations between study variables**

Table 2 lists the means and standard deviations for the variables in the study. With the exception of the planned career strategy measure, all alphas were over .70. Table 3 lists the intercorrelations of these variables. Among the demographic factors I included, family income, year of birth and years in the United States. Family income was significantly correlated with year of birth ($r = -.28, p < .001$) and significantly correlated with years in the United States ($r = .35, p < .001$). Thus, older participants and those who had lived longer in the United States had higher family incomes. Family income was negatively correlated with subjective socio economic status (lower score = higher perceived SES). Those with higher family incomes also saw themselves to be in the higher echelons of the socio economic status ladder. Higher family income was also associated with greater workplace flexibility ($r = -.14, p < .02$) and lower perception of career as a burden ($r = .16, p < .01$). Older participants had lower perception of career as a burden ($r = -.17, p < .01$).
Longer period of stay in the United States was associated with higher subjective socioeconomic status ($r = -.17, p < .01$). Longer period of stay in the United States was also associated with higher John Henryism ($r = .16, p < .01$), greater workplace flexibility ($r = -.15, p < .02$) and lower perception of career as a burden ($r = .29, p < .001$). This pointed to life span development issues with respect to how the women were coping with their immigration and work experiences.

Among the various types of social marginality, subjective socioeconomic status was negatively correlated with the Asian American model minority belief system ($r = -.13, p < .04$). Perhaps, those who saw themselves to be on the upper echelons of the ladder also endorsed the model minority system more. The measure also correlated with higher John Henryism ($r = -.27, p < .001$) and motherhood self agency ($r = -.30, p < .001$). Those who were higher on the socioeconomic status ladder had greater flexibility in work scheduling ($r = .20, p < .002$), higher job satisfaction ($r = .20, p < .002$) and many positive mental health outcomes including lower stress ($r = .17, p < .02$) and increased life satisfaction ($r = -.20, p < .004$). Social marginality attitude was associated with higher perception of discrimination ($r = .40, p < .001$) and greater levels of idealization in motherhood ($r = .33, p < .001$) and career ($r = .14, p < .04$). Further social marginality attitude was also associated with lower levels of John Henryism ($r = -.16, p < .02$).

Social marginality attitude was associated with lower workplace flexibility ($r = .21, p < .001$), lower pursuit of a planned career strategy ($r = -.23, p < .001$) and increased perception of career as a burden ($r = -.20, p < .002$). Marginality attitude was also associated with poorer mental health outcomes including higher stress ($r = .22, p < .002$), greater depression ($r = .35, p < .001$) and lower life satisfaction ($r = -.14, p < .05$).
Perceived Discrimination was associated with greater endorsement of motherhood (r = .15, \(p < .03\)) and career ideals (r = -.25, \(p < .001\)) and many poorer workplace outcomes including lower job satisfaction (r = -.16, \(p < .02\)) and increased perception of career as a burden (r = -.25, \(p < .001\)). Perceived discrimination was also associated with lower flexibility in workplace scheduling (r = .14, \(p < .03\)).

Among the active coping measures, (John Henryism and motherhood self agency), John Henryism was associated with increased perception of social support (r = .16, \(p < .02\)), and decreased stress (r = -.28, \(p < .001\)). The measure was also associated with increased perceptions of workplace flexibility (r = -.23, \(p < .001\)), higher job satisfaction (r = .32, \(p < .001\)) and higher planned career strategy (r = .25, \(p < .001\)).

Motherhood self agency was associated with lower perception of discrimination (r = -.15, \(p < .03\)), greater flexibility in workplace scheduling (r = -.17, \(p < .01\)) and higher job satisfaction (r = .27, \(p < .001\)). Many positive mental health outcomes accrued, including higher perceptions of social support (r = .17, \(p < .02\)), lower stress (r = -.28, \(p < .001\)), lower depression (r = -.32, \(p < .001\)) and higher life satisfaction (r = .37, \(p < .001\)). John Henryism was related to motherhood self agency (r = .38, \(p < .001\)).

In order to address my research questions consistent with the idealized identities model, I examined the antecedents and consequences of endorsing idealized beliefs in the motherhood and career domains. The results section is organized as follows: First, I present the antecedents of the Asian American model minority stereotype and domain-specific idealizations. Next I present various consequences for the endorsement of domain specific idealized beliefs. Finally I present the psychological well-being and job satisfaction outcomes.
Antecedents of the Model Minority Belief system

First, I examined the relationship between these components of social marginality and the model minority stereotype. Since, a primary focus of this study was motherhood, I also performed an analysis that examined the relationship between the measures of social marginality and idealized beliefs about motherhood. Subsequently I present the model where I regressed idealized career beliefs on these components of social marginality. Since previous literature (Portes & Rumbhaut, 2006; Cuellar, Arnold, & Maldonado, 1995; Cabassa, 2003, Berry, 1995) suggested that contextual factors such as period of stay, age and socio economic status could be related to the impact of acculturation attitudes, I included these three measures as controls in all the models.

Social Marginality and Asian American Model Minority belief system

I performed multiple regression analysis (see Table 4) on the Asian American model minority stereotype including year of birth, years in the United States and Family income in the first step to control for their effect. In the second step, I included the variables of interest, the attitude component of ARSMA scale (to measure marginality attitudes), perceived discrimination and subjective socioeconomic status.

I found that year of birth was a significant predictor of the Asian American model minority stereotype. Being older (lower birth year) was associated with greater endorsement of the model minority stereotype ($b = -.26, p < .008$). Family income and years of stay in the United States were not significantly associated with the stereotype. This step accounted for 3% of the variance in the model. In the second step, I included social marginality attitude scale, perceived discrimination and subjective socioeconomic status. Higher social marginality was associated with higher scores on the model minority
scale \( (b = .17, p < .02) \). Perceived discrimination was not a significant predictor of the model minority stereotype. Subjective socio economic status was a significant predictor of beliefs in model minority. The closer one is to the top of the ladder (lower score), the greater was the endorsement of the model minority stereotype \( (b = -.16, p < .02) \). The inclusion of the variables in the second step accounted for 8% of the variance in the model with a \( \Delta R^2 \) of 5% \( (ps < .05) \).

**Social Marginality and Idealized Motherhood beliefs**

I performed multiple regression analysis (see Table 5) on idealized beliefs about motherhood including year of birth, years in the United States and Family income in the first step to control for their effect. In the second step, I included the variables of interest, the attitude component of ARSMA scale (to measure marginality attitudes), perceived discrimination and subjective socio economic status as potential predictors.

None of the control variables predicted the endorsement of idealized beliefs about motherhood. In the second step, I included the social marginality attitude scale, perceived discrimination and subjective socio economic status as potential predictors. Higher social marginality was associated with higher endorsement of idealized beliefs about motherhood \( (b = .32, p < .001) \). Perceived discrimination was not a significant predictor of the endorsement of idealized beliefs about motherhood. Subjective socioeconomic status was a significant predictor of idealized beliefs about motherhood \( (b = -.15, p < .03) \). The inclusion of the variables contributed to 14% of the variance in the model with a \( \Delta R^2 \) of 13% \( (ps < .05) \).

**Social Marginality and Idealized beliefs about career**
I performed multiple regression analysis (see Table 6) on idealized beliefs about career including year of birth, years in the United States and Family income in the first step to control for their effect. In the second step, I included the variables of interest, the attitude component of ARSMA scale (to measure marginality), perceived discrimination and subjective socioeconomic status.

None of the control variables were significantly associated with idealized beliefs about career. In the second step, I included marginality, perceived discrimination and subjective socioeconomic status. Higher perceived discrimination was associated with greater endorsement of idealized beliefs about careers (b = .21, \( p < .01 \)). Social marginality and subjective socioeconomic status were not significant predictors of the idealized career beliefs. The inclusion of the variables accounted for 8% of the variance in the model with a \( \Delta R^2 \) of .07 (\( p < .008 \)).

**Summary.**

I examined social marginality as an antecedent to the endorsement of the model minority stereotype as well as idealized beliefs about motherhood and career. I found that marginality attitudes, involving rejection of the values of White Americans, were associated with the endorsement of Asian American model minority stereotype and greater endorsement of idealized beliefs about motherhood. Higher subjective socioeconomic status was related to greater endorsement of the model minority stereotype and idealized beliefs about motherhood. Perceived discrimination was positively related to idealized beliefs about career. Being older positively predicted model minority stereotype and idealized career beliefs.
Consequences of endorsing model minority beliefs: Testing the consequences of endorsing idealized beliefs about motherhood.

I performed separate regression analysis to test the relationship between idealized motherhood beliefs on various outcomes. Year of birth, family income and years in the United States were included to control for their effects in all the models. Additionally, I also included flexibility in work scheduling as an additional predictor to control for its effect in all models.

John Henryism. I performed multiple regression analysis (Table 7) on John Henryism including income, year of birth, years in the United States and flexibility in work scheduling in the first step to control for their effect on John Henryism. In the next step I included the variable of interest, namely idealized motherhood beliefs. Higher scheduling flexibility (low score) was associated with higher John Henryism (b = -.13, \( p < .06 \)). Endorsement of Idealized beliefs about motherhood was not a significant predictor of John Henryism (b = .10, ns).

Motherhood self agency. I performed multiple regression analysis (Table 7) on motherhood self agency including income, year of birth, years in the United States and flexibility in work scheduling in the first step to control for their effect on motherhood self agency. In the next step we included the variable of interest, namely idealized beliefs about motherhood. Higher scheduling flexibility (low score) was associated with higher motherhood self agency (b = -.14, \( p < .07 \)). None of the control variables were significantly associated with Motherhood self agency. This step accounted for 2% of the variance in the model. In the second step, the variable of interest, idealized motherhood beliefs was included. Greater endorsement of the beliefs was associated with greater
motherhood self agency (b = .15, p < .04). The inclusion of this step accounted for 4% of the variance in the model with a $\Delta R^2$ of 2% ($ps < .04$).

**Pursuit of a planned career strategy.** I included two career related outcomes (see Table 7) to examine the impact of idealizing relational motherhood on them. I performed multiple regression analysis on pursuit of a career strategy including income, year of birth, years in the United States and scheduling flexibility in the first step to control for their effect on the outcome. Greater scheduling flexibility (low score) was associated with the pursuit of a planned career strategy (b = -.14, $p < .04$). This step accounted for 3% of the variance in the model. Idealized motherhood belief system was not a significant predictor of career strategy (b = .06, ns).

**Perception of career as a burden.** Next, I examined perception of career burden (see Table 7) including income, year of birth, years in the United States and scheduling flexibility in the first step of the regression model to control for their effect on the outcome. Greater scheduling flexibility (low score) was associated with the lower perception (high score) of career as a burden (b = -.19, $p < .01$). This step accounted for 10% of the variance in the model. Idealized beliefs about motherhood measure was included in the second step. Greater endorsement of idealized beliefs about motherhood was associated with greater perception of career as a burden (b = -.14, $p < .03$). The inclusion of step 2 accounted for 12% of the variance with $\Delta R^2$ of 2% ($ps < .03$).

**Consequences of endorsing model minority beliefs: Testing the consequences of endorsing idealized beliefs about careers.**

I performed separate regression analysis to test for the impact of idealized motherhood beliefs on various outcomes. Year of birth, family income and years in the
United States were included to control for their effects. Additionally, I included flexibility in work scheduling as an additional predictor to control for its effect.

*John Henryism.* I performed multiple regression analysis (see Table 8) including year of birth, family income, years in the United States and flexibility in work scheduling in the first step to control for their effect on John Henryism. None of the control variables were significant predictors of John Henryism. In the second step, I included endorsement of idealized career beliefs. Endorsement of idealized career beliefs was associated with greater John Henryism (\(b = .15, p < .03\)). The second step accounted for 6% of the variance in the model. \(\Delta R^2\) from the inclusion of the second step was 2% (\(ps < .03\)).

*Motherhood self agency.* I tested the model with Motherhood self agency (see table 8) as an outcome variable. None of the control variables had a significant relationship with motherhood self agency. When idealized career beliefs were included in the second step, higher endorsement of these beliefs was associated with higher motherhood self agency (\(b = .15, p < .04\)). This step accounted for 4% of the variance in the model with a \(\Delta R^2\) of 2% (\(ps < .04\)).

*Pursuit of a Planned Career Strategy.* Next I tested the impact of idealized career beliefs on two career related outcome measures, namely the pursuit of a planned career strategy and perception of career as a burden. I performed separate regressions (see Table 8) on these two outcome measures including income, year of birth, years in the United States and flexibility in work scheduling in the first step in each case to control for their effect on the outcome variable. Greater flexibility in work scheduling (low score) was associated with greater pursuit of a planned career strategy (\(b = -.13, p < .06\)). None of the other control variables were significant predictors of career strategy. This step
accounted for 3% of the variance in the model. In the second step, I included endorsement of idealized career beliefs. Higher idealized career beliefs were significantly associated with the higher pursuit of a planned career strategy ($b = .21, p < .01$). The second step accounted for 7% of the variance in the model. The $\Delta R^2$ 4% ($p < .01$).

**Perception of career as a burden.** When I tested the model with career as a burden (see Table 8), I found that the longer one had stayed in the United States, the lower was their perception of career as a burden ($b = .22, p < .02$). Greater scheduling flexibility (low score) was associated lower perception (high score) of career as a burden ($b = -.19, p < .01$). This step accounted for 10% of the variance in the model. I found that the idealized career beliefs was not a significant predictor of perception of career burden. The $\Delta R^2$ was 1% (ns).

**Summary**

I examined the consequences of endorsing idealized motherhood and career beliefs. Endorsement of Idealized motherhood beliefs positively predicted motherhood self agency and was associated with greater perception of career as a burden. Endorsement of idealized career beliefs positively predicted John Henryism, motherhood self agency and pursuit of a planned career strategy. Scheduling flexibility was associated with higher John Henryism, greater motherhood self agency and pursuit of a planned career strategy.

**John Henryism and outcomes**

I performed multiple regression analysis (see Table 9) including income, years in the United States and year of birth to control for their effect on the outcome variables. In the next step, I included perceived social support and flexibility in work scheduling to
control for their effect on the outcome. In the final step, I included the variable of interest, John Henryism. All predictors were centered to their means. The following are the results of modeling each of the outcomes, beginning with the two mental health outcomes, stress and depression followed by motherhood self agency and job satisfaction.

*Life Satisfaction.* Income, year of birth and years in the United States were not significantly associated with life satisfaction. The inclusion of social support and scheduling flexibility accounted for 41% of the variance in the model with a $\Delta R^2$ of 40% ($p < .001$). Higher perceived social support was associated with greater life satisfaction ($b = .61$, $p < .001$). Greater John Henryism was associated with higher life satisfaction ($b = .21$, $p < .001$) The inclusion of John Henryism in the third step accounted for 45% of the variance in the model with an $\Delta R^2$ of 4% ($ps < .001$).

*Perceived Stress.* Income, year of birth and years in the United States were not significantly associated with perceived stress. The inclusion of social support and flexibility in work scheduling accounted for 22% of the variance in the model with a $\Delta R^2$ of 21% ($ps < .001$). Higher perceived social support was associated with lower perceived stress ($b = -.42$, $p < .001$). Greater scheduling flexibility (low score) was associated with lower perceived stress ($b = .14$, $p < .05$). The inclusion of John Henryism in the third step accounted for 26% of the variance in the model with a $\Delta R^2$ of 5% ($ps < .001$). Greater John Henryism was associated with lower perceived stress ($b = -.22$, $p < .001$).

*Depression.* Income, year of birth and years in the United States were not significantly associated with depression. The inclusion of social support and scheduling flexibility accounted for 23% of the variance in the model with a $\Delta R^2$ of 22% ($ps < .001$). Higher perceived social support was associated with lower depression ($b = -.41$, $p$
Greater scheduling flexibility (low score) was associated with lower depression 
\( (b = .18, p < .01) \). Although higher John Henryism was associated with lower depression, 
the beta value was non significant at the .05 level \( (b = -.09, ns) \).

*Job Satisfaction.* Income, year of birth and years in the United States were not 
significantly associated with job satisfaction. The inclusion of social support and 
flexibility in work scheduling contributed to 12% of the variance in the model with a \( \Delta R^2 \) of 12% \( (ps < .001) \). Greater scheduling flexibility (low score) was associated with 
greater higher job satisfaction \( (b = -.31, p < .001) \). In the third step, greater John 
Henryism was associated with higher job satisfaction \( (b = .25, p < .001) \). The inclusion 
of John Henryism in the third step contributed to 18% of the variance in the model with a 
\( \Delta R^2 \) of 6% \( (ps < .001) \).

*Summary*

I examined John Henryism as a predictor of psychological health outcomes and 
job satisfaction. John Henryism was negatively related to perceived stress and positively 
related to life satisfaction and job satisfaction. John Henryism was positively related to 
job satisfaction. Flexibility in work scheduling and perceived social support were 
positively associated with John Henryism. Scheduling flexibility was positively related 
to job satisfaction.

*Motherhood self agency and outcomes*

Previously, I pointed out how greater endorsement of both career and motherhood 
ideal were associated with greater motherhood self agency, which is increased self 
perception of motherhood related competence and effectiveness. I examined this affects 
work attitudes and mental health. I examined four different outcomes in this study:
perceived stress, depression, life satisfaction in the general life domain and overall satisfaction with job.

In each case, I performed multiple regression analysis (see Table 10) including income, years in the United States and year of birth to control for their effect on the outcome variables. In the next step, I included perceived social support and flexibility in work scheduling to control for their effect on the outcome. In the final step, I included the variable of interest, motherhood self agency. All predictors were centered to their means. The following are the results of modeling each of the outcomes, beginning with the three mental health outcomes stress, depression and life satisfaction followed by job satisfaction in the domain of work.

*Life Satisfaction.* Income, year of birth and years in the United States were not significantly associated with depression. The inclusion of social support and flexibility in work scheduling accounted for 40% of the variance in the model with a $\Delta R^2$ of 40% ($ps < .001$). Higher perceived social support was associated with greater life satisfaction ($b = .61, p < .001$). Greater motherhood self agency was associated with higher life satisfaction ($b = .26, p < .001$). The inclusion of motherhood self agency in the third step accounted for 47% of the variance in the model with an $\Delta R^2$ of 7% ($ps < .001$).

*Perceived Stress.* Income, year of birth and years in the United States were not significantly associated with perceived stress. The inclusion of social support and flexibility in work scheduling accounted for 25% of the variance in the model with a $\Delta R^2$ of 22% ($ps < .001$). Higher perceived social support was associated with lower perceived stress ($b = -.42, p < .001$). Greater flexibility in scheduling work (low score) was associated with lower perceived stress ($b = .14, p < .04$). The inclusion of motherhood
self agency in the third step accounted for 27% of the variance in the model with a $\Delta R^2$ of 3% ($p < .01$). Greater motherhood self agency was associated with lower perceived stress ($b = -.22, p < .01$).

*Depression.* Income, year of birth and years in the United States were not significantly associated with depression. The inclusion of social support and flexibility in work scheduling accounted for 24% of the variance in the model with a $\Delta R^2$ of 23% ($p < .001$). Higher perceived social support was associated with lower depression ($b = -.39, p < .001$). Greater flexibility in workplace scheduling (low score) was associated with lower depression ($b = .20, p < .01$). Greater motherhood self agency was associated with lower depression ($b = -.23, p < .001$). The inclusion of motherhood self agency in the third step accounted for 30% of the variance in the model with an $\Delta R^2$ of 5% ($p < .001$).

*Job Satisfaction.* Income, year of birth and years in the United States were not significantly associated with job satisfaction. The inclusion of social support and flexibility in work scheduling accounted for 12% of the variance in the model with a $\Delta R^2$ of 11% ($p < .001$). Greater flexibility in work scheduling (low score) was associated with greater higher job satisfaction ($b = .29, p < .001$). In the third step, greater motherhood self agency was associated with higher job satisfaction ($b = .18, p < .05$). The inclusion of motherhood self agency in the third step accounted for 15% of the variance in the model with an $\Delta R^2$ of 3% ($p < .02$).

**Summary**

I examined motherhood self agency as a predictor of psychological health outcomes and job satisfaction. Motherhood self agency was positively related to life
satisfaction and negatively related to perceived stress and depression. Motherhood self-agency was positively related to job satisfaction. Perceived scheduling flexibility was associated with lower depression and perceived stress. Perceived scheduling flexibility also predicted higher job satisfaction. Perceived social support was negatively related to perceived stress and depression and positively related to life satisfaction.

**Practices associated with the Asian American Model Minority belief system**

Having established the antecedents and consequences of endorsing the model minority belief system, it was important to understand the practices that correlated with the belief system. I examined two sets of practices (See Table 11 for Descriptive Statistics). In the first place, I examined how model minority as an Asian American group specific belief system was associated with the importance given to various activities on a day to day basis. The importance assigned to each category of practices was regressed (see Table 12) on idealized motherhood beliefs after including year of birth, years in the US and income to control for their effect in the first step. Below are the results of this analysis.

*Engaging in rigorous out of school academic activities.* Income, year of birth and years in the United States were entered in the first step. Income was a significant predictor of the importance placed on new experiences. At lower levels of family income, greater importance appeared to be placed on obtaining new experiences ($b = -.18, p < .02$). None of the other variables were significantly associated with the outcome. This step accounted for 5% of the variance in the model. In the next step, I included the variable of interest, the idealized motherhood belief system. Higher endorsement of idealized motherhood beliefs was associated with higher importance ratings on these
activities ($b = .24, p < .001$). Inclusion of this step accounted for 10% of the variance in the model with an $\Delta R^2$ of 6% ($ps < .001$).

**Success Orientation.** Income, year of birth and years in the United States were included in the first step. Greater the number of years one lived in the United States lower was the success orientation ratings ($b = -.25, p < .01$) This step accounted for 5% of the variance in the model. When idealized motherhood belief system was included in the second step, the step accounted for 13% of the variance in the model with an $\Delta R^2$ of 8% ($ps < .001$). Greater endorsement of the model minority belief system was associated with higher importance given to success ($b = .29, p < .001$).

**Emphasis on High Moral Standards.** Income, year of birth and years in the United States were included in the first step. Higher family income was associated with lower importance given to practices involving reiterating high moral standards ($b = -.15, p < .04$). This step contributed to 3% of the variance in the model. When idealized motherhood belief system was included in the second step, the step accounted for 8% of the variance in the model with an $\Delta R^2$ of 5% ($ps < .01$). Greater endorsement of idealized beliefs was associated with emphasis on high moral standards ($b = .23, p < .01$).

**Cultural Transmission.** Income, year of birth and years in the United States were included in the first step. Higher family income was associated with lower importance to practices involving cultural transmission ($b = .21, p < .01$). Year in the United States was negatively associated with cultural transmission. This step accounted for 7% of the variance in the model. When idealized motherhood belief system was included in the second step, the step accounted for 11% of the variance in the model with an $\Delta R^2$ of 3%
The endorsement of idealized motherhood beliefs was positively related to cultural transmission ($b = .18, p < .01$).

**Practices associated with the idealized motherhood beliefs**

Previously, I examined the antecedents and consequences of endorsing idealized motherhood beliefs. One aspect of the ideal involves endorsing a valorized vision of one’s own group. In the case of the idealized motherhood beliefs, it involved creating an enhanced view of Asian American mothers as superior over Asian American fathers as well as American mothers. In order to understand, how this valorized vision was associated with household responsibility sharing, I examined 3 categories of practices in the home domain. These were: (a) Responsibility for general household functioning; (b) Responsibility for children; (c) Decisions with respect to cultural transmission; The score in each of the three categories was regressed upon idealized motherhood beliefs (see Table 13). In the first step, I included income, years in the United States and year of birth to control for its effect on the outcome. In the second step, I included, the variable of interest, namely idealized motherhood beliefs. The results of the multiple regression analysis are presented below.

*Responsibility for household functioning.* Income, years in the United States and year of birth were not significant predictors of the outcome. This part of the model contributed to 2% of the variance. The inclusion of idealized motherhood beliefs accounted for 6% of the variance in the model with an $\Delta R^2$ of 4% ($ps < .01$). Greater endorsement of idealized motherhood beliefs was associated with increased responsibility for general household functioning with the mother ($b = .20, p < .01$).
**Responsibility for children.** Income, years in the United States and year of birth were not significant predictors of the outcome. This part of the model contributed to 1% of the variance. The inclusion of idealized motherhood beliefs accounted for 3% of the variance in the model with an $\Delta R^2$ of 2% ($ps < .05$). Greater endorsement of the idealized motherhood beliefs was associated with increased responsibility for children with the mother ($b = .15, p < .001$).

**Decisions with respect to cultural transmission.** Income, years in the United States and year of birth were not significant predictors of the outcome. This part of the model accounted for 1% of the variance. Endorsement of idealized motherhood beliefs was positively related to cultural transmission decisions ($b = .15, p < .05$). This step resulted in a $\Delta R^2$ of 3%.

**Discussion**

A major purpose of this study was to empirically test the different kinds of marginality as antecedents of model minority stereotypes among first generation Asian Indian women who are employed and are mothers of school going or younger children living in the United States. Asian Indian women are more likely to be pursuing careers and possibly being mothers as well, among all Asian immigrant women, next only to Filipina immigrant women (Mahalingam & Leu, 2005; Seth, 1995). Their ability to speak English and ease in transferring their previous skills places them in circumstances where they are more likely to pursuing careers and motherhood. Further, even when they are employed full time they are more likely to be responsible for cultural reproduction within the family as mothers (Dasgupta, 1998) including the transmission of “Indian” cultural values and the model minority belief system (Das Gupta, 1997; Mahalingam, 2006).
However, there is limited empirical understanding of the antecedents and consequences of motherhood and career related model minority beliefs held by these women. A major theoretical perspective, the idealized identities model (Mahalingam, 2006) identified social marginality as an antecedent to the endorsement of model minority beliefs. Asian women immigrants experience racialization and marginalization within their racial and patriarchal contexts (Abraham, 2006; Dasgupta, 1998). This dual marginalization creates the impetus for endorsing group specific idealized identities that valorize the group as well as reify existing essentialized views about their ethnic group (Espiritu, 2001; Mahalingam, 2006; Mahalingam & Leu, 2005; Pessar, 1999). Few studies have empirically examined how marginality affects the endorsement of idealized identities about gender and particularly motherhood. My study bridges this gap by empirically examining how different forms of marginality could affect the endorsement of model minority beliefs about Asians in general and Asian motherhood and career ideals in particular.

**Social Marginality and Model Minority Beliefs**

I examined social marginality attitudes and perceived discrimination as two different kinds of social marginality. Additionally, I also examined subjective socioeconomic status as an additional predictor.

I found that while objective socioeconomic status was not significantly associated with the endorsement of the Asian American model minority stereotype, higher subjective socio economic status was associated with greater endorsement of the model minority belief system. Thus, women who perceived themselves to be higher pedestal on the economic status ladder also endorsed the belief that Asian Americans were more
hardworking and successful than other minority groups. In other words, those on the
echelons of the ladder and potentially experienced structural marginality, did not endorse
the model minority stereotype. This hypothesis was not supported.

Several researchers have highlighted the role of social cognition in the
acculturation process of immigrants (e.g., Zhou & Xiong, 2005). Particularly for first
generation immigrants, the process appears significant, given that social mobility
aspirations lie at the basis for the immigration decision itself (Portes & Rumbaut, 2006).
For the Asian Indian mothers in the present study who were also pursuing careers, the
perception of economic inequality was related to the general model minority beliefs as
well as idealized motherhood beliefs but in an unexpected direction.

These findings are consistent with research that subjective socioeconomic status is
a predictor of many different psychological outcomes (Adler, Epel, Casellazo, &
Ickovics, 2000). It is also interesting that the women used their own status as Asians on
the economic status ladder to reify stereotypical beliefs about the group. Their own status
beliefs were used to generalize conclusions about the group. It is possible that their own
inequality or lack of it, served as a mirror towards understanding the group’s status.
Charles Cooley referred to this phenomenon as the looking glass self (Cooley, 1902).
This is consistent with social influence theory related findings where, for Asian (e.g.,
Koreans) in Bagozzi and Lee (2002), self-construal is defined by co-members of the
group and the self is part of a group. Levin and Leong (1978) studied social comparative
processes among Chinese Americans high school students and found that members used
the group with which they perceived themselves to be similar. For more assimilated
members, the reference group was likely to be White American values. Many studies
(e.g., Inman, Howard & Beaumont, 2006) have documented that Asian Indians as a group have shown segmented assimilation, perceiving themselves to be closer in values to the White group on some fronts but not in others. It is possible that the women used their own group as a reference group with respect to model minority values. Thus when they perceived their own subjective socioeconomic status to be high, they also perceived their own group to be hard working and potentially more successful reifying the model minority stereotype.

Similar relationships were also seen for motherhood beliefs, but not for career beliefs, in the study. Subjective socioeconomic status was not a significant predictor of idealized career beliefs. Apparently, the women viewed idealized motherhood beliefs as being more central to defining one’s subjective socioeconomic position than idealized career beliefs.

Social Marginality attitudes seen in the rejection of White American attitudes predicted beliefs about Asian American Model minority as well as idealized motherhood beliefs. This finding lent support to the prediction about the relationship between these belief systems. Thus, Asian Indian women who said they had more difficulty accepting dominant White American group values also endorsed idealized beliefs about Asian Americans in general and idealized motherhood beliefs as well. This is consistent with tenets of the idealized identities model (Mahalingam, 2006) that perception of social marginality creates the impetus for reifying stereotypes such as the model minority. In addition, for Asian Indian women as a group, who experience marginality at two levels, the racial and patriarchal levels (Dasgupta, 1998; Mahalingam, 2006), acculturation or rejection of white dominant group attitudes probably creates a more congenial climate for
creating idealized visions of the group and specifically of their women. Thus, motherhood became the means for creating and maintaining a differentiated cultural identity for the group.

Although perceived discrimination correlated with beliefs about motherhood, it was not a significant predictor of this belief system in the model. It appeared that the social marginality component involving rejection of White group values was a more significant predictor of the idealized belief system. Thus, for both the endorsement of model minority beliefs as well as Idealized motherhood beliefs, subjective socioeconomic status and rejection of out group values appeared more salient than perceptions of discrimination.

It seems motherhood and being Asian were central to these women’s identity construction as immigrants. Hence acculturation attitudes involving rejection of dominant group values were more salient to valorization of one’s group in those domains. This is consistent with existing literature documenting the salience of traditionally gendered identities such as motherhood for women within immigration (e.g., Pessar, 1999). Similar to the evidence presented by Espiritu (2001), Asian Indian immigrant women appeared to assert their superiority over the dominant White group in the arena of motherhood. Concerns with cultural reproduction were more likely to be addressed by mothers who Kurien (1999) observed played a key role in community organizations. This finding reinforces what gender scholars have noted that traditionally gendered spaces (e.g., motherhood) become the sites for maintaining the values that honor the group (Ortner, 1974; Yuval Davis & Anthias, 1989).
In the professional domain, perceived discrimination was a significant predictor of beliefs about the career ideal. With respect to the career ideal, the perception of discrimination appeared to be more important than social marginality attitudes involving rejection of the group and subjective socioeconomic status. Hence for the career ideal the hypothesis with respect to the perception of discrimination as an antecedent was supported. It is possible that individuals who were perceiving discrimination more were in fields with more Asians. This is consistent with some evidence (e.g., Stone, Purkayasta & Berdahl, 2006) that for highly skilled Asian Indian women, employment in fields with a higher concentration of Asian Indians was associated with poorer occupational outcomes (e.g., lower earnings). This created the impetus for the greater endorsement of idealized career beliefs, which valorized Asian American women as more hardworking and career oriented than American women and men.

I also found that age was associated with greater endorsement of the model minority stereotype. Older women in my study, who perhaps had older children, endorsed model minority beliefs more strongly than younger women. This finding is similar to findings about traditional gender beliefs as observed by Dasgupta (1998) among Asian Indian women. While the mothers’ beliefs about gender were dynamic in her study, they tended to become conservative with age. One explanation she suggested was that for mothers with older children there was greater need to uphold traditional beliefs about dating for instance. A similar explanation may be relevant here as well given that the expectation to be successful and hardworking may be closer to the expectations for children’s lives of the older women and older children in this study. However, this explanation could not be verified.
Consequences of idealized beliefs

As expected, greater endorsement of idealized motherhood beliefs predicted higher levels of motherhood self agency (confidence in one’s own motherhood abilities). Idealized motherhood beliefs probably served to enhance motherhood confidence by increasing perceptions of effectiveness and competence for the women in the study. Many researchers have documented how “motherhood” became the domain for reifying essential views of gender for Asian Indian immigrant women (e.g., Dasgupta, 1998; Kurien, 1999). Dasgupta (1998) found that these views of gender were associated with greater feelings of anxiety for the women in her study. In the domain of motherhood, motherhood self agency appears to be an active coping measure predicting many positive mental health outcomes. This is consistent with findings by Haritatos (2006) that idealized beliefs such as the model minority impacted mental health through the development of active coping mechanisms such as John Henryism.

The endorsement of the motherhood ideal apart from enhancing motherhood self agency also had a cost, that of increasing the perception of career as a burden. Women who idealized motherhood perceived that their own careers were not worth pursuing. Idealization in the motherhood domain probably required greater investment in that domain to eliminate dissonance (Festinger, 1953) through consistent behaviors. Perhaps for this reason, women may have found their work to be a burden. It is also possible that women who were previously engaged in careers that were stressful or ones they disliked were invested more in the motherhood domain and hence experienced their career as a burden. However, given that some studies (Johnson, 2005) that have found that over time, reasons for career pursuit tend to become externally motivated for some women,
rather than finding any intrinsic value, these women perceived investing in motherhood to be more central to their identities.

The association of motherhood self agency with positive outcomes appears to highlight the important role of attaining confidence in their motherhood for Asian Indian immigrant women. Other studies have documented the conflicts Asian Indian mothers face as first generation immigrant women (e.g., Londhe, 2006). Apart from difficulties in dealing with cultural transmission (e.g., Inman et. al., 2006), the women also experienced difficulties in dealing with daily stressors involving the family domains and children (e.g., Jambunathan & Counselman, 2002; Londhe, 2006; Srinivasan, 2001). My findings using the psychological construct of self agency are consistent with these previous findings. Attaining confidence in motherhood, a traditionally gendered expectation for women, is crucial to attaining better mental health for the women in my study.

In addition to mental health outcomes, motherhood self agency also predicted higher job satisfaction for the women. Thus, not just general life domains but job related attitudes too were affected by mothers’ perceptions of competence and effectiveness in the familial domain. Attaining confidence in motherhood could have provided women with the necessary psychological resources (e.g., lower role overload: Milkie & Petola, 1999. lower conflict: Greenhaus & Buetell, 1985; Hughes & Gallinsky, 1994; Voydanoff, 1988; Williams & Alliger, 1994. lower stress: Coverman, 1989) to achieve work goals and satisfaction with the job. Given the cross-sectional design of the current study, the causal direction cannot be established. It is possible that satisfaction with their jobs affected motherhood self agency.
Endorsement of idealized career beliefs was also associated with greater endorsement of motherhood self agency. This seemed to suggest that many different forms of idealizations could impact confidence in motherhood. Endorsing career ideals could possibly help women experience less conflict between their familial and work domains and enhance confidence in motherhood. This potential explanation needs to be further studied in the future. Perhaps idealization in the career domain resulted in increased investment in that domain, helping them build adequate financial resources and social support to attain confidence in motherhood. Hence there was a likelihood of a positive spillover from work to motherhood.

Overall, I found social support predicted many positive outcomes for the women. Many different studies have highlighted the role of social support in supporting motherhood (see review by Oakley, 1992). I found that for Asian Indian mothers,’ perception of social support was associated with lower stress and depression. However, even when social support was controlled, motherhood self agency and confidence in one’s own motherhood capabilities predicted many positive mental health outcomes for the women. This points to the significance of motherhood self agency in improving the psychological well-being of Indian immigrant women.

Additional consequences of Idealized beliefs

Little research exists with respect to determinants of job attitudes for foreign born workers. John Henryism has been suggested to form a psychosocial basis for resilience for high status Asian immigrants (Haritatos, Mahalingam and James, 2007). Greater endorsement of the career ideal was associated with higher John Henryism. This could be on account of similarities in the definition of the constructs. A second explanation could
involve the nature of the ideal itself that promoted women’s involvement in male dominated occupations like science and technology, which also had a higher employment of Asian men and women than other occupations (Stone, Purkayastha, & Berdahl, 2006).

Given the nature of John Henryism, which involved active coping through difficult situations, women who endorsed the stereotype of Asian American women’s success in such occupations were probably engaged in these occupations and involved in this agentic high effort coping themselves. This is consistent with literature that documents the importance of agentic traits for achieving success in certain occupations for women (Cejka & Eagly, 1999). Increased endorsement of the career ideal was also associated with the pursuit of a planned career strategy, probably as a means of achieving success in their careers.

The motherhood ideal was not a significant predictor of John Henryism, a form of high energy and high effort coping, or the pursuit of a planned career strategy. This was probably because motherhood ideal was defined in terms of relational skills and consistent with the traditional gender stereotype for women. Both motherhood self agency as well as John Henryism affected job satisfaction for the women. Thus, apart from affecting positive mental health outcomes as a psychosocial basis for resilience (see Luthar, Cicchetti, & Becker, 2000), these active coping mechanisms also predicted positive job attitudes. This finding highlights the importance of examining socio-cultural basis for job measures.

Additionally, I found that psychological perception of work scheduling flexibility predicted many outcomes in my study. Psychological perception of flexibility has been identified to be an important determinant of the experience of work-family conflict, work,
family satisfaction and depression (Kossek, Lautsch & Eaton, 2005). More than the presence or absence of policies and individual utilization of them through practices, the individual’s perception of flexibility appears to be an important correlate for various psychological outcomes (Kossek, Lautsch & Eaton, 2005).

In this study, psychological perception of flexibility in scheduling was introduced into the regression model to control for its effects on motherhood related outcomes including self agency and career outcomes. I found that flexibility was related to many different psychological outcomes in my analysis. Higher flexibility predicted greater endorsement of John Henryism and motherhood self agency. Being a cross sectional study, however, the causal direction of the relationship is unknown. It is possible that women who were high in John Henryism, an active coping measure, and motherhood self agency, sought jobs where they perceived higher flexibility because they may have better problem solving skills or were very efficient at multitasking. Among career variables, flexibility was associated with the pursuit of a planned career strategy, and lower perception of career as a burden. Further flexibility in work scheduling was associated with lower stress, lower depression and increased job satisfaction.

Overall, this study highlights how Asian Indian women cope with their marginalized experiences by constructing idealized representations of group’s motherhood and career identities. Marginalization can occur in multiple ways, through rejection of out-group values, perceiving rejection by members as well as subjective perceptions of one’s economic status. For immigrant Asian Indian mothers, pursuing employment and careers, the salience of different forms of marginality seems to differ by the domain. While perceived rejection by members was salient for idealized career
identities, rejection of dominant group values was salient for idealized motherhood identities.

Idealized motherhood and idealized career beliefs affected psychological well-being by enhancing motherhood self agency in the case of the former and both motherhood self agency and John Henryism in the case of the latter. Idealized motherhood beliefs also reified existing traditional identities for women which essentialized gender. Thus in dealing with the larger power issues and social marginality, essentialized identities pertaining to motherhood, traditional gender role for women was reiterated (Mahalingam & Leu, 2005). When I examined motherhood practices, I found that endorsement of idealized identities was also associated with greater responsibility for children, performance of household tasks and decision making with respect to cultural reproduction. There is evidence that the women took on primary responsibility for their children and their home. Thus, their idealized belief about motherhood were related to practices, especially in how they deal with the division of labor at home. This also suggests that the women were negotiating with their circumstances integrating their own belief systems with their own realities. Essentialized representations of Asian American women as more family oriented were reinforced. Thus even as it reflected the women's agency (see Glenn, 1999) and coping with marginality within the psychosocial context of immigration and marginality, idealized beliefs about motherhood also reiterated traditional patriarchal structures. Women themselves were probably participating in the co-construction of the motherhood ideal at the intersections of race and gender. They were reinventing alternative scripts of motherhood (as better than American women) at these intersections. Some of these scripts (Asian American mothers are better) were
reinforced by practices such on taking on a greater responsibility for the children than their spouses. The women also ascribed importance to various ethnic socialization practices such as cultural transmission, reiterating high moral standards, engaging in rigorous out of school academic activities and success orientation. Idealized motherhood beliefs were positively related to the importance the women assigned to these practices. Extending the argument that model minority beliefs have many positive psychological benefits for members (see Mahalingam, 2006) for women who are mothers in particular it increased their parenting burden. As the women engaged in greater responsibility for the children, they were also probably responsible for the fulfillment of these ethnic socialization practices. Thus women at the intersections of race and gender paid a price through increased burden for upholding these ideals. It is interesting that women at higher levels of family income ascribed less importance to some of these practices. This points to class intersections within the group.
"I'm a mother first, then a CEO, then a wife"

Nooyi, Indra (2007). CEO, PepsiCo

In this analysis, I examined the dynamic nature of the construction of motherhood and the heterogeneity in the ways immigrant women practice motherhood using open-ended interviews. I examined how the women related to their roles as immigrant Asian Indian mothers pursuing careers in science and technology alongside their spouses. I draw upon three sets of perspectives: 1) the idealized identity model (Mahalingam, 2006) to understand how social marginality contributes to the idealization of motherhood and further how this idealization was a source of pride and pressure for the women; 2) the subjective career transitions perspective (Stephens, 1994; Ashforth, Kriener, & Fugate, 2000) to understand how women managed the boundaries between work and motherhood; 3) the motherhood ideological perspective, wherein motherhood is a socially constructed sets of beliefs and practices pertaining to how women engage with their children (Glenn, 1999).

According to the idealized identities model (Mahalingam, 2006), marginalized groups construct idealized beliefs about their group’s own superior status and this contributes to their well-being. I extend this perspective to examine how idealized beliefs about motherhood created within a larger a discourse of the model minority affect Asian
Indian women’s negotiation of the multiple roles including work and parenting in their lives. Idealized beliefs about gender constructed in a cultural context are often fluid and dynamic and involve both resistance and endorsement of traditional cultural identities (Das Gupta, 1997). They can involve subjective career transitions (e.g., externalizing career) in the face of conflicting work and parenting roles (Stephens, 1994). They also involve reinventing motherhood identities, which in turn are negotiated against culturally hegemonic expectations about motherhood, which reify mothers exclusive role in parenting and continuous engagement with their children (Hays, 1985). These are seen in the many discursive strategies that women use in their everyday lives (Elvin-Nowak & Thomsson, 2001; Johnston & Swanson, 2006), when they are faced with a conflict in their lives. For immigrant Asian Indian women who are pursuing careers and motherhood within a discourse of the model minority stereotype, there is likely to be a greater heterogeneity and fluidity in the construction of motherhood. In many ways, this motherhood is likely to be dynamic and moderated by the pressures of their social contexts (e.g., discrimination and othering) as well as influenced by hegemonic beliefs about motherhood (e.g., mothers must be constantly available to their children).

Many studies have documented the concentration of Asian Indian women in the fields of science and technology. This concentration of women, apart from reinforcing stereotypic model minority images (e.g., Asians women are more likely to pursue careers in science and technology), also renders them vulnerable to poorer occupational outcomes in those fields (Stone, Purkayastha & Berdahl, 2006). Based upon the intersectionality perspective the idealized identities model (Mahalingam, 2006) has highlighted the complex ways in which marginalized groups construct idealized
identities, which can enhance their psychological well-being. My qualitative study focused on the following research question with respect to their construction of motherhood as an idealized identity within the larger context of marginalization (racial and patriarchal) and the discourse of Asian model minority stereotype: How do first generation Asian Indian women pursuing careers construct motherhood in their post-immigration narratives? Consistent with the intersectionality perspective, I examined the pluralism in the ways these women enact gender in their lives and negotiate with hegemonic motherhood identities (e.g., intensive mothering) and the model minority discourse. Specifically I examined the following: In what ways is there heterogeneity in the ways in which these women construct and enact motherhood? In what ways do Indian mothers resist and co-participate in the construction of motherhood? How do women construct motherhood as a source of self agency even as they are pursuing careers in science and technology?

I found that the women’s narratives were reflected their adjustment and coping with the immigration context as well as their negotiation with hegemonic motherhood expectations such as intensive mothering as they dealt with their careers. The themes in the narratives also reflected how they participated in and challenged idealized identities such as the model minority in their own lives. The themes also represented a progression in the development of their competence as mothers pursuing careers. In these ways, the themes represented fluidity, complexity and dynamism in constructing motherhood. I present four categories of themes, to reflect two different ways in which motherhood was represented as a source of pressure and two different ways in which motherhood was a source of pride in the women’s post-immigration narratives. These are: 1) Early
challenges; 2) Fear of discrimination; 3) Perceptions of spousal support; 4) Pride in children’s achievements.

**Early challenges**

The women’s narratives typically began with a description of a difficult phase in time post-immigration as new mothers pursuing a career in the United States. Janani, Roma, Meena and Latha recalled the difficulties in managing even routine tasks in their early days. They idealized their days before immigration living with their own mothers or with external help to manage routine tasks in the household. Janani mentioned that she was hardly expected to cook at home before she arrived in the United States. Roma talked about having the support of a joint family when she got married and had her child. Also she missed having additional financial resources, which had previously placed her in a privileged status and was something that caused her deep distress after her move to the United States. In Roma’s words:

I was in a family, it was not a nuclear family – it was a joint family, so I lived with my in laws. I stayed in the boarding all the time. I wasn’t that bad at doing little things but I never had to do because I was studying and there were so many people in the house and so many cooks and you know you have somebody to take care of everything and then practically you do a little bit of work. And I used to cry a lot when I came here because I couldn’t handle my son, I couldn’t handle the cooking ; I couldn’t handle my work, everything was really bothering me a lot and we had a tough time then..And you could do everything in a very organized way and not worry very much and you know financially we never had
to worry because we had a resource. We knew that money is not a crisis. We didn’t have a crisis for money back home.

The financial strain from the move made it imperative for the women to pursue their research careers at least initially as well as handle parenting responsibilities almost all by themselves. The nature of scientific research was such that they had to be engaged continuously with it and work meticulously through an incubation phase, which placed tremendous pressure on them as mothers. Consistent with research that which highlighted how immigrants adaptation took place as families, with women taking on the greater burden of children (e.g., Sakamoto, 2006), the women in my study claimed to being single parents themselves with spouses aggressively engaging with their own careers. The women experienced enormous pressures as mothers and budding researchers themselves. Roma highlighted her predicament:

The lab which I joined initially was very good. It’s a very good lab, but good labs are always demanding, so initially we struggled a lot because my husband he spent a lot of time in the lab and my son was 2 years, you can imagine if you are a mother..

These early experiences highlighted the nature of struggles especially one involving dealing with work and family conflicts in the absence of traditional support structures for the women with children. The women contrasted their lives back home with life post immigration and idealized their life back home. Almost all women commented upon their life growing up with their own mothers, who emphasized the importance of achieving a career goal for their daughters, over day to day responsibilities. They seemed to idealize their own mothers’ competence in caring for them and nurturing their career
goals. After moving to the United States, they reiterated the importance of furthering this goal. They recalled post-immigration images of their own incompetence as mothers and in handling what appeared to them as routine tasks. They struggled to find the best possible position that would further their research career. They seemed to feel obligated at pursuing their career goals aggressively. Yet the social expectations involving motherhood – especially the need to realize discursive representation of motherhood that is better than American motherhood - placed tremendous strain upon them.

The sense of incompetence for the women also arose from viewing motherhood as a static rather than a dynamic process. The women used their own mothers or imagined groups of mothers with whom they did not have any contact as a yardstick to create visions of “I know” or “I do not know” how to be a good mother. Laxmi, mentioned that she hardly had any contact with other non-Indian mothers as she said her friends were exclusively Indian. Yet as a mother of two elementary school children, she remarked that she could not be as organized as mothers in the United States. She expressed regret that unlike many other women she found it difficult to support her spouse by being an additional earning member as well as be a mother. It was not until she had the opportunity to interact with some other non-Asian women over a school project that she said she realized that they faced struggles similar to hers. The women were faced with hegemonic motherhood expectations, such as being super organized moms. Laxmi, also recalled how her Indian friends who were mothers also contributed financially for the family. She struggled with meeting this dual goal to be a great mother pursuing a career. Laxmi expressed regret at not being able to volunteer at her child’s school. Some women like Laxmi discounted their own abilities as mothers as they contrasted their own skills as
mothers with mothers from other groups in managing the household. Being in research, she also expressed her inability to earn as much as other Indian women who were employed in information technology. At the time of the interview Laxmi felt traumatized by these multiple expectations and was considering leaving her job or a potential career transition into information technology.

While all the women in our study claimed they had found a position that fit in with their background and interests, even if it did not earn enough and prided their own competence, they highlighted their own deficit of soft skills (e.g., planning and organizing, negotiation skills). This intensified the pressures on motherhood. Roma talked about her situation, expressing an inability to negotiate a good position because she was an Asian in a research job. Had she been able to do that, she would not have to struggle balancing her work and being a mother. She claimed that being an Asian who worked hard placed enormous pressure on her as a mother. In order to overcome this situation, she secured an alternative research project in a lab, which required her to change her field of study. However, this new research project offered her the ability to do some of her work from home even as she got time to spend with her child. Roma’s mention of the lack of negotiation skills, as a source of stress was complemented by Laxmi, who referred to her fear of making presentations to her research colleagues.

Along with the pressure of meeting deadlines with respect to her project, Laxmi reiterated that this was a major stressor in her job and intensified the conflict it created with her motherhood. Laxmi eventually decided to leave her job, relinquishing her desire for securing a higher degree and was potentially examining a career transition, because she felt that the demands interfered tremendously with being a mother. In particular, she
mentioned that the pressures of maintaining her own research agenda, which was required for her to be a “good” researcher, interfered with her ability to find time to volunteer at her child’s school on a regular basis, something she imagined other white mothers did all the time.

Some women, like Janani responded in unconventional ways. Janani, quit her career in research and acquired a medical degree. With her father’s support, she completed three years of medical residency and became a part time doctor. She worked in an emergency ward at two different hospitals on nights and weekends. This enabled her to spend considerable time with her children. While this new field helped her garner financial resources for her family, it also helped her pursue a career in a “prestigious” subject area.

You either work full time or not at all. I mean if you can’t get your grants, and the whole idea of doing all that was not appealing. So I wanted a job where I could work part-time and still make reasonable money that I can have a reasonable life so thats why I ended up deciding to go to medical school – it was a very practical approach that I wanted to do something that I could do part-time.

In all cases, the spouses continued in similar careers, while the women themselves made career changes. They cited their own deficit of skills in comparison with other groups of women who included their own mothers or other White women. In some cases they created an idealized vision of what social support they would have had in order to deal with parenting responsibilities had they been in India.

Missing family social support was cited by the women as a major obstacle in pursuing a career and being a mother. Latha recalled the time her children were sick and
she was left to fend for herself. She idealized parental support when she mentioned that having a mother or sister around would have helped her immensely. Laxmi had sent her daughter to live with her mother for three years, believing her mother could take care of her daughter in India better than she could. Such transnational arrangements for motherhood are not uncommon among Indian immigrant women (Mahalingam, Balan & Molina, in press). She was grateful to her father-in-law who she claimed almost forcibly imposed this decision on her. Later, when she brought her daughter back at the behest of her friends, she claimed her child ended up being “tortured” by her, the child’s own mother.

In stark contrast to the use of parental support, the women expressed reluctance to use paid support networks and friends. Some of the women also expressed reluctance to use resources outside the immediate family such as a babysitter or nanny either for financial or for personal reasons. Jyoti and Shefali mentioned that they had friends who they might be able to rely upon, yet expressed reluctance to do so. Jyoti felt doing so would place an additional burden on them. Laxmi observed that she trusted her mother more than her friends. She observed that her friends “poisoned her mind” when they urged her to bring her daughter, who used to live with her parents. She claimed that with this decision she “tortured” her daughter rather than doing her any good. Had she listened to her own mother and left her daughter for a longer period of time, she might have done far greater good.

While they were unlikely to use friends’ support for help with day to day parenting responsibilities, the women recalled using friends for gathering information. Laxmi talked about discussing what lessons her children must be enrolled in with her
friends. She observed that her friends got together almost every week and while the men engaged in casual conversations the women’s discussions revolved around the kids. This observation was corroborated by Radhika who recalled that she and her close friends mostly discussed their kids’ developmental goals and how challenges could be addressed.

Thus, while immediate family was more trusted as a provider of instrumental social support, the friendship network was used to provide informational support. On some occasions, this triggered social comparison. While engaging in social comparisons, the women also claimed to know some things better than her friends. While Laxmi prided herself on the discipline with which she had raised her children, Jyoti mentioned that she even advised one of her friends:

Don’t try to teach her… maybe like whenever you talk about things…eh look at the red ball.. Don’t tell like come here, this is a red ball, this is blue. You should not do that. Just your normal, general, whenever you talk to your kids use colors that way, then they automatically pick up and so.

Thus, Jyoti had gained confidence as a mother and was now able to advise her friends. In doing so, she idealized her own mothering as superior and better than her counterparts. She claimed she knew aspects of parenting that were not known to others. Janani, another informant remarked:

I think every mom should spend time. They do spend time but with their schoolwork. They do not work with them.. Those parents think, I am cooking and cleaning but it is not as effective as spending time with them.

Thus, the confidence for these women arose from claiming superiority over their friends. Being able to advise other mothers was a source of pride for them and instilled
confidence in them as mothers. In this way, they idealized their own motherhood as superior to that of other mothers.

**Fear of Discrimination**

In some instances, the women’s personal narratives suggested that along with cultural adaptation to immigration and pursuing work success, unique challenges for which they did not have any previous referents were posed to them. Dealing with these became a source of achieving competence and effectiveness as mothers. Janani mentioned that many of her daughter’s friends sent religious emails to her daughter even though they knew that she endorsed a different religious belief system. She found dealing with this issue was a big challenge for her daughter. In contrast to her spouse who had a “blasé way” of dealing with the problem, she had to engage in problem solving, working closely with her daughter.

Sometimes the women experienced confusion with respect to what triggered certain strange experiences at work. Jyoti and Janani narrated specific experiences at work, where they had to work extra hard as a non-White woman to be taken seriously by their colleagues. The women referred to situations where they were supervisors and were expected to be in control but as Asian women had to work extra hard. Jyoti talked about convening a meeting of her project group at which no one showed up. Janani referred to medical professional colleagues with whom she was expected to provide more of explanations for her decisions. She claimed that “White men” were the best possible doctors, after which came “White women.” It was hard to be Asian in that position. These situations often made these women question the welfare of their own children in similar circumstances. Janani was gratified that her daughter’s lighter skin probably made her
pass for a Mexican or some other group and she was less likely to be discriminated against.

Roma created a similar “us versus them” situation in her narration of an incident, when her son had an injury at school which was neglected. Later, once he got home he had to be rushed to the hospital. Roma suspected that the indifferent treatment at school may have been meted out because of his brown skin. Laxmi feared that her children may face embarrassment if they carried certain ethnic foods in their lunch box. She talked about packing her children’s lunch boxes in a particular way. She abstained from packing rice, which she thought might embarrass her children. This implied that she extensively and immaculately planned the meals the children took to school. Shefali pointed out the negative reaction of packing Indian foods for her child. She remarked that she was now learning to make different kinds of foods even though she was not fond of cooking. She had assigned herself the task of cooking different kinds of foods probably as a way of creating pride in being Indian. Like Laxmi, she too attempted to provide Indian foods in the evenings, so the children did not lose touch with these foods.

Latha created a web that would support not only her but her daughter as well, to the point where her daughter does not miss her own friends any more. She is unsure if she would have had to do this had they lived in India.

Now she says, amma (mother) I don’t care if I don’t have friends. All my friends have become her friends. She emails them. She’ll call them. She’ll chat with them. My friends. These are all people whose babies are much younger than her. They listen to her. So, all of them are her friends. I don’t know if it is this society.
I don’t know if I would have had this problem if I had been in India. Maybe, maybe not.

Unsure whether to attribute her marginalized experiences to being an immigrant, she idealizes the importance of her own role in supporting her daughter. Referring to her own initiatives for her daughter she claimed: “If she didn’t have a mother who took so much initiative to her, she would have gone crazy.” Latha idealized her own role as a mother in her daughter’s life which would render her irreplaceable.

Radhika recalled how her son’s daycare providers talked slowly and loudly when she was dressed in ethnic clothes. She mentioned that being an Indian she always had her radar on especially in matters pertaining to her son. The women also mentioned that discussions about identity and skin color were an essential part of their conversations with their children. Shefali recalled a conversation she had with her son about skin color, where he wondered “why am I brown?” “Can I be white?” She reiterated that kids were very race conscious. She mentioned that she frequently dealt with these issues in her life, so much so that she moved from a race conscious southern state to a mid western region. “And the worst is you are neither black nor white. So you can’t get accepted either- its not like you can be in the black group and feel part of that. And be fine.” She thought it was particularly problematic for her because her son moved here as a young child rather than being born here.

The women took on the concerns of protecting their children on themselves. While Laxmi immaculately planned her children’s meals, Shefali learned to cook different foods to increase the children’s pride and Janani worked with her daughter to find a good solution to the religious emails that she received. In some cases, as in
Janani’s the mother took on the burden to a greater extent than their spouses. Radhika indicated that she kept her radar on. Thus, mothers became exclusively involved in dealing with issues of discrimination, in retaining cultural heritage and sharing the children’s emotional burden. The women ruminated about these experiences and how they dealt with them became a source of competence for them. The women found solutions that were traditionally gendered including engaging in cooking foods and interacting exclusively with school/day care authorities.

**The Perceptions of Spousal Support**

Apart from discrimination experiences, work that required continuous physical presence became a tremendous source of stress for the women. In Jyoti’s case, not being physically around was problematic as it led to her inability to perform certain tasks that she exclusively engaged in with her daughter. Jyoti mentioned that she detested moments when she was on call, which was one week of fifteen. Additionally, when she was delayed at work, it was problematic as she had to depend on her spouse to take care of her child. She claimed that she was responsible for everything with her daughter.

Physical presence at work, undermined a critical motherhood virtue: that of being exclusively responsible for the child or children. Yet, this situation made Jyoti and some other women feel uniquely vulnerable, as it exposed their children to their spouse’s parenting. Jyoti claimed her spouse lacked the patience to feed her daughter adequately. A similar sentiment was expressed by Laxmi, who claimed her spouse usually let his hand do the talking, rather than words. Like Jyoti, she claimed he completely lacked the patience to deal tactfully with the child. She thus had to organize herself such that she
was the one who disciplined her child using words rather than through physical
punishment. Jyoti referred to a daily ritual, that of bathing her daughter:

We start like..I give her a bath in the evening. Then she will play for sometime.
Then we try to give her a bath. I give her a bath. Then we read books.. One hour.
She will say 2 books and then it will go to 20. Then we have to read all the books.
By the time she falls asleep it is 9:30 but she is relaxing and in bed. She won’t
want my husband to read because he will be just…he will read without any
expressions.. So she will say “No daddy, I want mommy to read,” laughs.

Jyoti also talked about who put her daughter to bed in her house. She mentioned that she
worked away from home and hence arrived much later than her spouse. She began by
describing how they together began giving her the bath “We start like..” but quickly
shifted to “I.” She further described how she would be the one reading to her child,
simply because that is what the child demanded. She attributed it to her partner’s inability
to respond to the child’s needs.

Jyoti took pride in being a better parent by being somehow more effective and
competent than her husband in performing the daily rituals. The basis for her
effectiveness was defined by her reading of her own daughter’s perceptions in the former
case as well as what was not accomplished when she was absent. Referring to parenting
difficulties they faced, Jyoti remarked:

Not me, but my husband. In terms of when she has a tantrum or something.. but
see when she has a tantrum or something outside it is kind of hard. But he loses
patience very easily. The more you lose, with her, the longer it lasts but he does
Jyoti believed that her spouse was incompetent as he lacked the patience. In doing so, she reiterated the traditional gendered nature of motherhood. “Things for her, mostly I will do it. Only if I am busy, he will do.”

The women constructed **patience as an essential virtue of motherhood.** The virtue of patience was highlighted by another woman who claimed she would often complain to her own mother about her children. The only advice the mother always gave was to be patient with the children. In this situation and in others, the women used their own parents as allies, creating a contrast with their own spouses’ lack of experience. Laxmi sent her daughter to India at the behest of her father-in-law, who she claimed had greater knowledge of what was best for her own good. Like Laxmi’s father-in-law, Janani’s father came to take care of her children when she had to be away at work for extended periods of time.

Janani opted for a career change when she had her children. After a doctoral degree she decided to acquire a medical degree and pursue part-time employment. She made herself available to her children by working in the emergency ward at two different hospitals in the nights and weekends. Jyoti switched from research to full time employment in information technology.

**Pride in children’s achievements**

The women in the study endorsed that being mothers brought them immense joy. Radhika noted that as soon as she got into the car every evening she told herself how
proud she was to be a mother. For other women in the study, pride and motherhood confidence emanated from many different sources. Beliefs with respect to academic achievement in particular played a role as a significant source of pride. Janani noted that her pride in her children came from their superior academic achievements and participating in competitions. She observed that unlike many other parents she dedicated considerable time to their academic activities and when they did well, she was very happy.

when they accomplish things, you know, when they are doing a dance or when she participates in various activities, when they are performing, and then those are moments which you are really proud of

She contrasted herself with other parents in her daughter’s school:

I mean they do spend time but they don’t spend time with their school work; they don’t sit with them with their school work and I see so many kids in her school not doing well because they don’t get that kind of one on one attention so I guess that will be my biggest advice to spend time doing school work. (Laughs)

Laxmi talked about preparing her child for an exam in school. She mentioned that she had worked hard on the subject matter with her daughter to the extent that in “whatever the teacher asks in a twisted way, she will be able to answer.” She proclaimed “I did my job- I didn’t leave her without practicing or studying, I didn’t leave it.”

Laxmi recalled how being obedient and organized provided her pride. She mentioned that her friends often said:

“your kids are so good, you have trained them a lot, they listen to you , how do you make them? I say, all the time, I don’t use my hand, only my voice but my
husband is different. He doesn’t use his voice, he uses his hand so I don’t allow him to interfere with the kids. I tell him to come, play with the kids, that’s it. Because he doesn’t have patience and I feel I have a lot of patience. I try to suppress my anger. If I get really irritated, I just yell them, but it is really rare when I hit them.

Latha, one of whose daughters was diagnosed with a learning disability, contrasted the source of pride each of her daughters provided. She contested the view that the dominant Asian yardstick of academic achievement could be the only source of pride as a mother.

When I see her you know, for me that is a different kind of pride. Because I want to know that when I die, she is ok and she can take care of herself. Because that really surprises me. Because she has been diagnosed with a lot of little problems, medical problems also. And medical problems have let to psychological. Then we went to psychotherapy. We went to psychologist and we went to psychiatrist. And we had medication. But she was a very strong kid. So far, she is concerned, it is not achievement. Because Nandini if she reads a book, she gets an A. She’s on the, they call it the Dean’s list. Every semester, she’s on the Dean’s list and so when I ask her for her grade she says, why do you ask me for the grade. Didn’t that letter come home to you? And I still ask her, because I love to know.. With Malati I don’t care whether she gets a B or a C. Off course I scream at her. But the fact that she can take care of herself is something. Because I am not a tyrant..

While reveling in the academic achievements of her older child, she denied that academic achievement could be the only source of satisfaction for a mother. In doing so,
she idealized her own child’s strengths (a strong kid) but also idealized her own role as a non tyrant. Thus, Latha endorsed that children’s achievement is important as a belief, but her enactments reflected the reality of her circumstances. While Latha differentiated between her two children, Jyoti, another mother of a young child, differentiated herself from others, stating that she was not like other moms, who only valued academic achievement. Yet, she admitted that she had considered investing in private schooling for her daughter. While Latha subscribed to model minority views of academic achievement even as her enactments reflected the reality of her children’s circumstances, Jyoti rejected the belief system but her enactments were inconsistent with her beliefs. Both mothers used the model minority stereotype to create idealized visions of themselves, Latha as a non tyrant and Jyoti as “easy going.” While Laxmi and Janani idealized their own physical involvement with their children, Latha, whose teenage daughter struggled socially, tried to help her by creating a friends network for her.

**Discussion**

The women’s narratives of their motherhood highlighted several themes. The women typically recalled early images of incompetence and ineffectiveness which they were eventually able to overcome using a number of different strategies. The representations of motherhood in the women’s post-immigration narratives reveal that the construction of motherhood is dynamic and fluid: the women actively participated in the construction of motherhood ideals, also use it to resist and challenge overt as well as subtle forms of discrimination. This is consistent with evidence from other studies (e.g., Das Gupta, 1997; Dasgupta, 1998; Jambunathan & Counselman, 2002), showing that
mother’s beliefs and attitudes were fluid along a number of dimensions and changed with time.

The women also constructed their motherhoods reflexively and used a network of spouse, family, friends, and social networks extensively in their construction. Their motherhoods were closely attuned to the social location within which they operated after immigration. The new experiences (e.g., school experiences) were constantly integrated into their motherhoods. The use of networks suggested the importance of viewing alternative models of motherhood that often involve negotiating the traditional independent model (Blum & Deussen, 1996).

The mothers I interviewed used a number of different strategies to attain motherhood self agency. It was interesting that the women’s images of incompetence were attributed to external sources, such as lack of financial resources, absence of spousal support with respect to parenting, absence of support structures such as parents and fears of discrimination. Their sources of competence arose from being somehow better than their own spouses and friends. They highlighted their competence as mothers by juxtaposing it to their friends’ and spouses’ incompetence. They advised their friends on being “good” mothers. They claimed their spouses lacked some essential virtues (e.g., patience), which were necessary to be a good parent.

They created an idealized vision of their own mothers who encouraged them to pursue a career and abstain from performing routine household tasks. With the spouses, the center was shifted and the women took on the nurturing role within their families. Almost all the women claimed that they would do almost everything they could to further their spouses’ careers. They justified it on the basis of their spouses’ “love” for their...
careers, their spouses’ competence in it or simply because they themselves were not cut out for it. With respect to parenting, they created visions of their own competence and thus took on a greater share of the parenting. Thus, spousal role and division of labor with respect to parenting appears to be central to the mother’s construction and enactment of motherhood.

In many ways, the women’s construction of motherhood was defined in relational terms and particularly in the household domain this reinforced traditional gender identities. While reiterating difference with other mothers, they also participated in co-constructing essentialized beliefs about gender. These include assertion of beliefs such as “mothers are more competent than fathers,” “only mothers have the patience,” “only mothers can understand their children’s needs,” etc. It is interesting that the women’s themes also reflected progression from potential incompetence or ineffectiveness as mothers to one of competence and effectiveness. However, the competence was created upon essentialized beliefs about motherhood.

Career identity and resources were used as a source of motherhood resilience by the women. The women took pride in their own abilities to make transitions in their careers. Sometimes these were significant shifts from one career to another (e.g., research to practice, acquiring new degree etc.). At other times the transitions were subjective, moving from one line of research which demanded excessive physical presence at the workplace to another project that suited their ability to negotiate familial responsibilities.

How do women negotiate hegemonic motherhood expectations?

Hegemonic motherhood identities (e.g., intensive mothering) define hegemonic social expectations about mothering. Intensive mothering (Hays, 1995), for example,
one such form of ideology which urges women to exclusively and constantly be engage with their children. The Asian Indian women participated in creating scripts of motherhood that were tied to their dynamic experience and expectations of being Asian mothers. As Asians, they continued to hold their careers, but reconfigured them to engage more with their motherhood roles. In this way, they consented to hegemonic expectations of being more involved with the children but also continued to pursue a “prestigious” career as Asians. Consistent with the reality of their own circumstances, they created alternative scripts of motherhood for dealing with perceptions of “othering” and discrimination, which they or their children experienced as Asians.

Sometimes they co-constructed motherhood ideologies that were consistent with traditional gender expectations and the patriarchal belief system. The women endorsed the view that mothers more than fathers were more competent parents. The women idealized parental support network and especially valued the support or advice of their own mothers. They contrasted their own skills as mothers with those of their own. In this way they engaged in cognitive border crossing in the transnational space (Kim, 2006; Park, 2007) to highlight images of their own incompetence in contrast to their moms.

The women accepted and contested hegemonic belief systems (e.g., intensive mothering) that mothers were responsible exclusively for their children. They idealized or used transnational motherhood arrangements and thus their enactments contested independent views of mothers (Blum & Deussen, 1996). In some cases, the hegemonic identities were part of their imagination (e.g., the super organized mother) and placed pressure on them as mothers who were pursuing careers and had to be away from their children (Elvin-Nowak & Thomsson, 2001; Johnston & Swanson, 2006).
More than their own careers, they used their children’s success as a source of pride. Their own pride as mothers emanated from the children’s academic achievements, consistent with the larger discourse of the model minority. Yet, when circumstances so demanded (as in the case of the woman whose child was diagnosed with a learning disability), their enactments were modified to be consistent. In this way they were also able to challenge as well as accept the larger discourse of model minority, which glorified academic and social success. When required they were able to innovate newer arrangements such as when Latha, used her own friends network to support her daughter.

The mothers engaged in constant negotiations to create visions of their own motherhood self agency. They negotiated agency at several levels. Within the family level, they took on traditionally gendered domains, justifying it on the basis of their own competence and their spouse’s incompetence or disinterest. In many cases, this was complemented by career transitions, which provided them greater responsibility for the children. They creatively crafted their careers to continue meeting model minority expectations of having a successful career. They used this to gain greater control through their struggles early in the immigration process, which highlighted images of incompetence for them. They were thus able to use motherhood to negotiate control within the household in traditionally gendered ways. From a mental health perspective, the activities they performed with the children became a source of pride for them and they were then able to claim success within their children’s successes. Where circumstances were inconsistent with their own beliefs (e.g., for the mother of a child with learning disability), the women were able to differentiate themselves with alternative enactments.
The women also took on the responsibility for ensuring their children’s wellbeing during othering experiences. Their own workplace experiences affected their perception of burden and increased their share of worries about their children. Among others they worried for their children, worked with the children to develop a solution, and occasionally evolved unique solutions (e.g., creating a friends support network). They also took on the role of day to day guardianship for their children, interacting with the school authorities and generally keeping their “radars open.”

With respect to their careers they made several transitions, enabling their spouses to be successful and continue their own pursuit of “prestigious careers” and themselves to “good” mothers as well. This ranged from changing line of research (e.g., Roma switched from a demanding lab to a different one) to switching to another career (e.g., Janani acquired a medical degree). In one case the woman quit her job. The women’s career transitions further enabled them to negotiate control within the household domain as the women used their own sacrifice to bargain for greater control in the household and confidence as mothers. They even encouraged their spouses to continue in whichever field they belonged.

Summary

The major purpose of this analysis was to examine how Asian Indian women pursuing careers constructed their motherhood experiences. I examined themes in post migration narratives of seven women based in the St. Louis area. The women’s constructions revealed a great degree of heterogeneity, fluidity and dynamism in enactments. The women used unique strategies to attain motherhood self agency or confidence as mothers. Through these strategies they were able to negotiate control
within the household domain. These strategies, while contesting hegemonic motherhood identities, in some cases also reinforced essentialized beliefs about gender and motherhood (Mahalingam & Leu, 2005). While being marginalized by these identities, our participants also resisted certain dominant identities even as they participated in co-constructing alternative belief systems.
Chapter V

GENERAL DISCUSSION

Several researchers have emphasized the socially constructed nature of motherhood ideologies. As hegemonic identities, these processes dictate how women should perform motherhood. In the western context, several different forms of socially constructed motherhood ideologies have been documented by several researchers (e.g., intensive mothering). Many of these ideologies, such as intensive mothering (e.g., Hays, 1996) dictate mother’s continuous engagement with the children. Thus mothers, according to this ideology are exclusively suggested to be in the best possible position to care for the children and mothers are indispensable to the children.

Collins (1994) emphasized how these motherhood ideologies do not encompass the lived experience of women of color. Non-white women’s circumstances dictate the construction of alternative ways of doing motherhood (e.g., transnational motherhood). For example, for immigrant Latina mothers leaving home in order to provide for their children questions traditional motherhood ideologies where mother-child relationship is considered central to children’s lives (Hondagneu Sotelo & Avila, 1997). Besides being providers for their families, Latina mothers’ experiences raise questions about traditional gender ideological beliefs inherent in which is the separation of motherhood and employment spheres (Raijman, Schammah-Gesser & Kemp, 2003). These practices have questioned essentialized ways of doing gender, wherein mothers more than fathers must
be exclusively engaged with the children and this forms the basis for children’s wellbeing (Hays, 1996). Yet the economic circumstances of the Latina women led them to live away from the children in order to be “good” mothers. Low income African American mothers created alternative scripts of motherhood contradicting the traditional notions involving non independent community networks (Blum & Deussen, 1997). Thus social location of groups dictates how alternative ideologies are constructed and involves negotiation with the group’s fluid circumstances.

In my study, I examined how motherhood is constructed by Asian Indian women within unique circumstances of marginalization at several different levels. The move away from traditional support structures (e.g., joint family) and newer economic circumstances placed unique impetus for experiencing many different forms of marginalization. I found that in addition to their racialized ethnic status as Asians, these women have to confront marginalization by two different kinds of patriarchal values system - in the name of culture at home and at work place as women of color, the hard working Asians in a predominantly White male dominated professions. These different forms of marginality provided the impetus for endorsing idealized visions of the group on multiple fronts including “successful” Asian Americans, “good” Asian American moms and “great” workers. Consistent with the idealized identities model (Mahalingam, 2006), for Asian Indian women, I was able to empirically establish that social marginality positively relates to the endorsement of these idealized identities at the intersections of gender and women’s racial position as Asian Americans. Consistent with previous research I was able to establish how this social location shaped psychological wellbeing of Asian Indian women. Idealizing was linked to the initiation of active coping
mechanisms such as John Henryism (e.g., Haritatos, 2006). In the domain of motherhood, it formed the basis for attaining motherhood self agency, or confidence in being a mother, that positively contributed to many positive psychological outcomes.

I also examined how idealization was related to everyday practices involving division of labor in the household. I noticed that the idealization process while contributing to women’s positive sense of well-being reified many traditional beliefs about gender for women who are parent-workers. On the one hand, the women who idealized motherhood, also claimed they took on greater share of division of labor within the household and took on greater responsibility for the children. While the nature of cross sectional research precludes the establishment of a causal relationship, it was interesting that a relationship between the two was noticed. It seems women who engaged in household labor more than their partners and took on greater responsibility for the children idealized Asian American mothers or Asian American mothers who idealized performed greater share of household labor. Thus, household practices were very much linked to idealized beliefs about gender and in the overall analysis reified essentialized constructions of Asian American women who are mothers. This is consistent with views that self representations of gender can also impact household division of labor with the advent of parenting responsibilities (Spitze, 1988). This is also preliminary evidence that there was reshaping of Asian Indian mother’s roles within the household but probably not father’s roles (Sanchez & Thomson, 1997) with the advent parenting and work responsibilities.

For women, the construction of motherhood confidence arose from these idealized identities. I investigated this construct in the personal narratives of Asian Indian
women pursuing careers in science and technology. Choosing women in this field was significant given the larger discourse of Asian Americans as “good” workers especially in the science and technology fields. All women I interviewed proclaimed that they once or continued to aspire to be successful in that field. This implied that the women engaged with the discourse of model minority at multiple levels- as Asians, mothers and workers. Consistent with discursive strategies noticed by Elvin-Nowak & Thomsson (2001) among Swedish employed mothers, I found that the women considered their own careers as more malleable that their spouses. They were more willing to negotiate their own work spheres to accommodate mothering of their children. Unique to this study, they further legitimized it on the basis of being somehow more competent parents than their spouses. The Asian Indian women contended with the notions involving intellectual pursuits over routine household work, which was dominant in their discourses growing up. Their own mothers, they recalled nurtured their intellectual potential. The women acquired confidence after immigration by making career transitions (Stephens, 1994) and reconfiguring their careers around motherhood. Yet, they continued to remain in “prestigious” careers. The women thus found work that provided flexibility in scheduling advantageous as this strategy could be met more easily. Consistent with this idea, I found that perception of flexibility in work scheduling was a positive predictor of psychological wellbeing in my community survey. Where women were able to resolve the conflicting expectation even as they were able to work consistently with traditional beliefs about motherhood, they were rewarded with positive wellbeing outcomes.

Perception of social support helped the women in achieving this goal (Oakley, 1992). Social support predicted many positive wellbeing outcomes in my
community survey. However, I found that for Asian Indian women in my analysis of transcripts used support networks in interesting ways. They used social support networks, particularly friends to acquire more information or as a basis for social comparison. The information appeared to be mostly in the domain of children’s achievement of academic or developmental goals. The mothers used this information for actively pursuing ethnic socialization practices particularly to reinforce the model minority stereotype of Asians.

The traditional motherhood ideology provides for mothers being responsible for child’s future wellbeing (e.g., Hays, 1994). The women engaged with hegemonic motherhood ideal of immunizing the child for the future in ways that were consistent with the model minority stereotype. The women sought information about academic or developmental goals and made time to intellectually engage with the children as an immunization for their child’s future success in education or work pursuit. Either by working on their school goals or more basic goals at the preschool level (e.g., knowing colors), the mothers took pride in being able to work with the children in those domains. Motherhood confidence was constructed around this theme. Thus mothers became active agents in the child’s development (Elvin-Nowak & Thomsson, 2001) but specifically in achieving intellectual goals. This was consistent with the dominant discourse of the model minority stereotype.

According to this construction, the child is not understood as an individual who develops and grows, irrespective of the environment, but rather as an individual who is modulated and developed because of the environment and especially because of the mother. (Elvin-Nowak & Thomsson, 2001, p. 415).
However, very similar to the notion of “emotional preparation for the child’s future,” seen by Elvin-Nowak and Thomsson (2001) among Swedish mothers, I noticed intellectual preparation as the goal among Asian Indian mothers. Thus, the women appropriated this discursive strategy in ways that were consistent with the larger discourse of model minority.

This finding in the qualitative study is consistent with the ethnic socialization practices that the mothers in my survey deemed to be important. Idealized motherhood beliefs were positively related to the importance given to engagement in rigorous academic out of school activities and success orientation. While the women engaged in these practices as a means of reinforcing the model minority stereotype; viewed another way, the practices also placed additional burden on motherhood for these women. They were not only responsible for transmitting traditional Indian cultural values (e.g., Kurien, 1999) but also reinforce idealized model minority beliefs that were evoked in relation to their social location at the intersections of race and gender. Thus, the women negotiated their own subordinated position within the patriarchal order by intensively engaging in motherhood as an immunization of their children for future academic/ career success. This also seemed to place additional demands on being mothers.

The dominant goal of successfully maintaining the façade of being a model minority also created additional forms of tension for the women in the study. They were expected to be successful and competitive as workers as well as mothers. Financial strain and subjective socioeconomic state coupled with the need for ascendancy up the economic ladder, placed women in provider roles. Traditional motherhood ideology was, however, inconsistent with this expectation. Like Mexican immigrant women who
engaged in transnational motherhood (Hondagneu-Sotelo & Avila, 1997), which entailed living away from the children in order to provide for their children, the women in my study also faced contradictory ideologies. They were expected to provide economically for the family yet also work continuously with the children to insure future academic/career success. According to theories of cognitive dissonance (e.g., Festinger, 1957), when there is inconsistency between attitude and behavior, attitudes are changed to be consistent with behavior. I found that women changed attitudes with respect to their work. Satisfaction from work became external and the women endorsed that pay was a major source of satisfaction from work. Work that demanded being away from the children became a source of stress. The women created a discourse of “patience as a virtue,” which they as mothers possessed but their spouses as fathers lacked. More time with the children presented greater opportunity to be patient and persevering with them. This is consistent with intensive motherhood ideology notions (e.g., Hays, 1994). Yet the discursive strategy was complicated by the dual marginality experienced by Asian Indian women at the intersections of race and gender. There was evidence that the women idealized their own competence over their spouses and created a discourse of “we have more patience than our spouses.” Further, they indicated that they, unlike other mothers (non Asian Indian), did everything with their children. They did not use baby sitters for their children. In this way they created rhetoric of indispensability for their children.

The idealization of their stay back home and the comforts they enjoyed provided the impetus for the construction of an emergent motherhood belief system that valorized their own group. The women justified the importance of pursuing this motherhood belief system, which involved placing extraordinary emphasis on being mothers. This emergent
motherhood belief system was based upon deficit of some things and surfeit of others. Among others were financial strain and discrimination experiences respectively, which could have potentially threatened their children’s well-being. Like the women in Blum & Deussen’s study (1996), the women created alternative scripts of motherhood, which were heterogeneous and fluid.

Thus, in the face of discrimination experiences and marginalization along patriarchal and racial lines, the mothers in my study participated in the co-construction of an emergent motherhood ideology that invested them with self-agency, which became a precursor for their psychological wellbeing. The quantitative community survey highlighted the different ways social marginality was an antecedent for the endorsement of idealized beliefs about Asian American mothers. Further, this belief system was consistent with self-reported household division of labor. The qualitative interviews revealed how the women co-participated in the construction of an emergent motherhood belief system that valorized their own roles as mothers.

The emergent belief system was in many ways consistent with the intensive mothering ideology, with interesting differences produced by the women’s marginalization experiences. The evidence is consistent with the cultural practices view. According to Wertsch and Tulviste (1992), Vygotsky has argued that mental functioning is not limited to that which is occurring within the skin. Mental functioning can best be understood by examining the socio-cultural processes within which it develops. As an analytic process, in order to understand the psychological functioning of the individual, one needs to start from outside the person in the cultural practices. Vygotskian view suggests that culture plays a semiotic mediational role in the development of the person.
Within this framework, cultural tools become the key agents with the help of which individual psychological functioning develops. (Wertsch and Tulviste, 1992). This framework seems to be the basis for the cultural practices view.

The internalization of intensive mothering ideology is likely to take place through participation in cultural practices. Cultural practices are meaningful actions situated in a context and open to interpretation, have a recurrent quality, are social or cultural i.e., are engaged by most members of a group, are not value neutral, have the potential to become part of the group identity and may be sustained, changed or challenged (Miller and Goodnow, 1995). Given these features of cultural practices, they seem to have an important role in the identity construction of the person. Over a period of time, individuals participate in practices and thereby shape and transform them while simultaneously configuring their identity as a result of their participation. As part of their identity it seems practices constitute the basis for experiencing various mental health outcomes such as life satisfaction and depression. Immigrant Asian Indian women participated and negotiated with the ideologies in interesting ways. The women negotiated with traditional motherhood beliefs and idealized model minority beliefs about Asians to engage in academic and intellectual engagement with the children. They participated in conversations with other mothers, during which they sought information about setting and meeting model minority goals. They created newer visions of motherhood (e.g., developing obedient and organized children) in the process.

It is interesting that the motherhood identities were emergent and based upon social comparative processes with the dominant group. Rejection of the dominant group attitudes and values positively related to idealization of motherhood in my community
survey. While the women rejected the overall value system, they also endorsed traditional belief systems with respect to motherhood. In interesting and complicated ways they endorsed traditional mothering ideologies, which required women’s continuous engagement with the child and has been documented among White women. Thus, while immigration processes triggered social comparative processes (Festinger, 1953) with dominant groups, the women appropriated the values of their reference group in interesting and complex ways (Levin & Leong, 1960). Thus, while Asian Indian women’s practices questioned essentialized ways of doing motherhood, it also created newer essentialized beliefs at the intersections of race and gender.

A word about the methodologies employed in this study. I attempted to use quantitative and qualitative approaches in this dissertation study. Using a community survey, I sought to confirm an existing research model (the idealized identities model) by extending it into the domain of motherhood. I examined how idealized motherhood beliefs were related to specific motherhood practices including household division of labor and ethnic socialization practices. Further, in order to understand the construction of motherhood within a larger discourse of model minority, I conducted semi structured interviews. I sought to uncover how women dynamically engaged with these larger belief systems.

I used intersectionality as an analytical lens to examine how women participated in the construction of idealized beliefs about motherhood. Being marginalized along multiple identities, placed tremendous impetus for the need to construct idealized beliefs (motherhood and career). Further, as mothers, the women also took on the additional burden of bearing children’s stressors. They had to keep their “radar open,” being aware
of the different ways this “othering” could impact their children. This probably was an additional source of stress for the women consistent with the observations of Horowitz & Long (2005), who linked the two discourses. They engaged in conversations about skin color and race with their children, even as they did not have any precedent for engaging in these conversations. They also learned to cook particular kinds of foods and pack lunch boxes in particular ways so that the children did not experience “othering.”

Positively constructed identities such as the motherhood ideal became an important means to attain well-being outcomes for the women in my study. The women use these identities as a socio-cultural basis for developing resilience (see Luthar, Cicchetti, & Becker, 2000).

Use of qualitative and quantitative methods

In this dissertation study, I used a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods. The qualitative analysis was conceived to follow the community survey analysis by examining the complexity, fluidity and dynamic nature of the construction of the motherhood ideology in the women’s narratives. Using thematic analysis facilitated this objective as it complemented the variable centered approach in the community survey. I examined the transcripts for themes consistent with the model minority ideology (e.g., academic achievement) and the idealized identities model (e.g., social marginality experiences). Additionally, data driven themes (e.g., early challenges) were also identified.

The community survey, due to its cross-sectional design could not be used to understand the themes within the women’s own stories. Thus in some ways the qualitative part of the study was able to provide this understanding. The sampling
strategy for the qualitative section of the study was consistent with the community survey. Similar criteria were used to select participants. Further, participants with a great degree of similarity were included. There was convergence in the sampling strategy. In addition to meeting the sampling criteria, the qualitative part of the study was restricted in the occupations from which participants were included. Pursuing a career in science/technology, the women were in fields consistent with the model minority stereotype about careers for Asian women. This accentuated the idealizing by the women.

In both the quantitative and qualitative studies, women endorsed idealized beliefs about motherhood (e.g., mothers were better than fathers). However, in the qualitative study, the women’s reference groups were not restricted to any one group, such as American mothers but to all mothers they knew. They also did not seem to valorize their own group alone.

In addition to being the reference group, social networks also triggered social comparison processes for the women. This was evident in the qualitative study, where the women appeared to use their social networks to gather information, such as about competitive classes for children, but not as baby sitters. The differences between the different objectives that their networks met (e.g., informational versus instrumental) was only evident from the qualitative interviews.

The qualitative study was instrumental in unearthing the motivations for glorifying women as superior mothers: it appeared that the women went through their own “early challenges,” and they used their learning as a trope to glorify their own roles as the better parent. The women also appeared to bear the burden of the children’s emotional challenges (e.g., dealing with discrimination). Being in domains traditionally
associated with women’s roles (e.g., packing lunches), coping with them probably required greater investment in their motherhood identities for the women.

Limitations and Future Directions

When I conducted the interviews and later during my analysis, I was very aware of my own identity as a first generation Asian Indian woman and as a mother of two young children. I gave birth to my second child while conducting and writing this dissertation. This seemed like an advantage as well as a disadvantage along the various stages of the research. During the recruitment phase of my qualitative study, the women seemed much more comfortable inviting me to their houses. Yet they were also suspicious of my intentions when I first called them. They were usually very cautious and guarded especially about the time commitment it might involve. Scheduling was particularly problematic as the women said “you know how it is,” being employed and being a mother. This way they easily created bridges of similarity going into the interview. The women were less willing to negotiate their time, sometimes requesting that they be interviewed in short durations, multiple times over the phone. Sometimes interviews took place on weekends, with spouses and family members present at home. This may have elicited a guarded response from the informants. In some cases the informants asked me to turn off the recording and shared negative information about their work or resentment about their spouses. In one case, for instance, the woman asked if I wanted to know about her idealistic best or her cynical best going into the interview. When I used this to begin the conversation she remarked that she was not even 75% of her idealistic best as a mother in real life.
As Riessman observed (1987) of her interviewer, I noticed while looking at the transcripts that while my perceived similarity with the interviewee may have helped me participate in the women’s story telling, there may have been tensions with scientific objectivity in the interview process for me. In many ways, I assisted and co-participated in the women’s storytelling. Although, I used a thematic analysis as against a narrative analysis, consistent with Pasupathi’s (2001) review, I may have inadvertently elicited certain consistencies in the women’s stories where none existed. Besides, the use of snowball sampling was another major limitation of the study.

The quantitative study has many limitations, not the least of which is the convenience sampling methodology that was used. The women who participated were a self selected group of Asian Indian women, who were initially contacted through chains of networks. A large number of women did not complete the survey. Many participants wrote emails suggesting time limitations as they were busy working moms. Hence the analysis may have been biased towards mothers who in the first place had achieved a sense of competence dealing with the multiple demands on their life. There also appears to be unique regional variations in group experiences especially in the degree of contact with the White group that is available. These regionally variations could not be controlled in the analysis. My participant group was also mostly professionally skilled with high levels of family income. Future studies need to examine motherhood in lower income groups, where motherhood and provider roles further exert pressures in maintaining these hegemonic identities.

Future studies need to examine other beliefs about gender such as masculinity and chastity and their association with beliefs about motherhood. In addition, examining how
motherhood confidence is constructed by non employed Asian Indian moms, would present interesting contrasts.

Years in the United States and age appeared to be related to many outcomes in this study. Thus, future studies need to employ a life span perspective for examining motherhood at the intersections of age and period of migration. Further, longitudinal studies would be particularly helpful in understanding how women negotiate with self agency over a period of time.

I also noticed that the family context became a critical context for constructing idealized identities. Women negotiated with their spouses and asserted superiority over them, legitimizing this on the basis of their own competence over their spouses in handling parenting responsibilities. Future studies need to examine this negotiation process though family level data involving spouse-partner dyads. Partner representations of gender may be critical to what strategy the women adopted with respect to motherhood. Marital satisfaction may also be a critical factor in shaping partner representations. Future studies need to include measurs of marital satisfaction. Additionally studies also need to examine various individual level factors such as perfectionism and negative affectivity which may moderate the effects of perceived social marginality on the idealization of motherhood.

Although I examined career identities, few job related variables were used in the analysis. Future studies need to examine what organizational factors were related to marginality. Scheduling flexibility was related to many outcomes in my study. Perhaps there are other facets of the job that could affect how idealized identities are constructed and need to be examined in the future studies.
Implications of the Study

This is a first major empirical study on Indian immigrant employed women with children. As noted previously Indian immigrant women are among the second largest group of Asian women who are employed, second only to Filipinas. They are more likely to be employed in professional and white collar fields and in male dominated fields such as science and information technology. Often Asian Indian women migrate as spouses but go on to use their professional skills and English language proficiency to find employment and pursue careers. Many Asian Indian women have achieved the pinnacle of their careers. One such example is Indra Nooyi, who currently is the Chief Executive Officer of Pepsico. Even Nooyi, at the helm of her career, appears to idealize motherhood as evident in the quotation at the beginning of Chapter IV. The South Asian Women’s Forum lists many other women who hold leadership positions in many organizations. Yet, considering that they are among the largest group of professionally engaged Asian women, the number of women who seem to hold leadership positions is still limited. A few empirical studies have documented the dilemmas they face as mothers acculturating to a new context but none that I know examines their career identities along with motherhood. Perhaps engaging in motherhood practices placed tremendous stress on them, such that they perceived work to be a burden, as I find in my study. Perhaps the additional pressure to engage in ethnic socialization and assert moral superiority with other mothers was a source of stress as well. Moreover, experiencing social marginality and perceiving discrimination was positively correlated with perceived stress. Hence cognitive resources needed to be directed towards pursuing those goals. An unexpected but not surprising finding was the importance of perceived scheduling flexibility in
producing positive well-being outcomes for the women. So also was the number of years in the United States which predicted many different outcomes. It seems as if the women somehow over time had developed an ability to successfully negotiate the multiple expectations.

Viewed at another level, the current dissertation highlights the multiple facets of being Asians and pursuing success as model minorities. The women in the study reported perceiving discrimination, which seemed to be the basis for the idealization of motherhood. Thus, despite the stereotype of success, the women experienced as being model minorities, it seems there is a price for being a successful ethnic minority woman. A longitudinal study is more likely to help us to understand the directionality and stability of these relationships.

The present study contributes to the growing body of research on social marginality, immigration, gender and resilience. Very few studies have examined beliefs about gender in a large community sample of Asian Indian women. Foreign born Asian Indian women constitute one of the largest groups of professionally skilled Asian migrants, employed in science and technology fields. Not many studies looked at the experience of this group of foreign born workers and especially how their immigration and acculturation experiences can impact their job as well as career related attitudes. This study appears to be among the few that attempted to document the experiences of this group of women at the intersections of race and gender.

In the present study I examined idealization in the domain of motherhood and careers. The study’s findings may also be relevant to the experiences of other groups of women among whom other forms of idealization (e.g., Marianismo, Gil & Vasquez,
1996) are common. These kinds of idealization in the domain of motherhood may affect well-being for women in similar ways for these groups. They may also help us understand how and why women make various career choices and subjective career transitions.

These studies advance the research on work-family conflict perspective (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985; Milkie & Petola, 1999; Voydanoff, 1988) as a basis for understanding various job attitudes for women. I found job satisfaction to be determined by various active coping strategies such as John henryism. In this way, the study presents a framework to study the link between social position and work attitudes, an area so far neglected in organization literature. While social marginality as a construct seems to have emerged in organizational studies, few recent studies have employed it to understand job related and career related attitudes.

The study extends the propositions of the transnational intersectionality perspective (Mahalingam, Balan & Molina, 2009) to examine how Asian Indian women construct motherhood in the transnational space. Motherhood self agency served as a form of motherhood resilience that impacted how motherhood ideals impacted well-being. When Asian Indian mothers attained self agency by developing competence and effectiveness as mothers, they had developed mother resilience, which positively related to well-being. Beyond examining geographical dislocations in motherhood, the study extends transnational intersectionality perspective to examine motherhood in the cognitive space. The women in the present study used several cognitive strategies (e.g., idealize motherhood back home, idealize their own mothers) to construct idealized beliefs
about motherhood. These idealized beliefs were positively related to psychological well-being.
Chapter VI

CONCLUSION

In this dissertation study I examined the antecedents and consequences of pursuing idealized beliefs about motherhood and careers for Asian Indian immigrant women who are mothers. Asian Indian immigrant women constitute one of the largest groups of professionally skilled Asian women immigrants (De, 2001). Several studies have documented that they experience marginalization along multiple dimensions (Abraham, 2006; Dasgupta, 1997; Dasgupta, 1998; Mahalingam, 2006), despite high incomes and high levels of professional skills, which earned them the title “model minority.” Integrating the tenets of intersectionality and social marginality perspectives, I used the propositions of the idealized identities model (Mahalingam, 2006), to empirically examine: 1) social marginality as an antecedent for the endorsement of idealized beliefs about motherhood and career; 2) the well-being and job/career related consequences of the endorsement of these beliefs. I found that social marginality attitudes positively related to idealized beliefs about motherhood and perceived discrimination positively related to idealization in the career domain. Rejection of dominant group values and attitudes were linked to the creation and maintenance of idealized beliefs about motherhood for immigrant Asian Indian women in my study. Thus, motherhood, a traditionally gendered space was used as a site for maintaining the group’s distinct identity (Ortner, 1974; Yuval Davis & Anthias, 1989).
It seemed as if idealized beliefs about gender were internalized and were reflected in various practices within the household. Women took on primary responsibility for their children more than their spouses. Only when they took on these roles and internalized the idealized beliefs that they experienced confidence in motherhood which had many positive well-being outcomes associated with it. Given the social context of immigration and marginalization along patriarchal and racial lines, I observed that women negotiated self-agency by participating in the construction of the idealized belief system within which they were more “family-oriented.” This is consistent with the findings of Glenn (1999), who found that Chinese women were “family-oriented” in the face of social marginality and discrimination.

At another level, the idealized belief system increased the burden upon the women in my study. The women took on responsibility for the children more and also took on the burden of ethnic socialization practices that probably reinforced model minority values such as success and academic achievement.

It is ironic that Asian Indian women should take on the additional burden, even as they were subsumed with household tasks and responsibilities during their “early challenges.” The fall in subjective socioeconomic status, especially because of financial strain, wherein they felt they were privileged prior to immigration led to new challenges (e.g., not being able to afford baby sitters). Yet the women’s alternative script of motherhood, developed over a period of time, involved an even higher effort in coping, including the responsibility for the ethnic socialization of children. Age and years in the United States appeared to be important in determining coping patterns for the women.
Thus, outcomes were impacted by intersections of age (Miller, 2006) and immigration processes.

Idealization of motherhood appears to be an important domain impacting everyday practices that are linked to acculturation processes for Asian Indian women. Power and social marginality appear to be important in determining what forms of ideals become salient to well-being in a particular context (Mahalingam, 2006). While social marginality attitudes seemed more salient to idealized motherhood beliefs, perceived discrimination appeared critical to idealized career beliefs. Thus, this study points to how different forms of marginalities may impact idealization in various domains.

Consistent with the idealized identities model (Mahalingam, 2006), I found ideals had many benefits for women. However, I also found that the consequences may on occasion be in domains of life other than where the idealization originally took place and there are costs of pursuing ideals. Similar to Mahalingam & Balan (2006), I found that mental health consequences may accrue for women investing in traditionally gendered domains, even as the costs may be in alternative domains (e.g., academic, professional).

At the same time, I found that women did not endorse the ideals in consistent ways. They negotiated with them and sometimes resisted them (Chen, 1999; Glenn, 1991, 1997; Hochschild, 1989; Ong, 1999). For example, the mother who was confronted with the child’s learning disability, differentiated the source of pride that each of her two daughters provided. While endorsing the belief that academic achievement should be a source of pride consistent with the larger discourse of model minority, her own enactments reflected the reality of her circumstances. Thus women’s construction of motherhood is fluid and dynamic and reflects the heterogeneity of their individual
circumstances including the intersections of developmental stage and immigration processes.
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Figure 1. Summary of the Analysis
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Figure 2. Idealized Motherhood Beliefs Regression Analysis Summary

- **Social Marginality Attitudes**: $b = .32 (p < .001)$
- **Perceived Discrimination**: $b = .04 (ns)$
- **Subjective Socioeconomic status**: $b = -.15 (p < .05)$
- **Idealized Motherhood Beliefs**: $b = .10 (ns)$
- **John Henryism**: $b = .15 (p < .05)$
- **Motherhood Self Agency**: $b = .06 (ns)$
- **Pursuit of a planned career strategy**: $b = -.15 (p < .05)$
- **Perception of Career as a Burden**: $b = -.14 (p < .05)$
Figure 3. Idealized Career Beliefs Regression Analysis Summary

- Social Marginality Attitudes: $b = .04 (ns)$
- Perceived Discrimination: $b = .21 (p < .001)$
- Subjective Socioeconomic status: $b = -.08 (ns)$
- Idealized Career Beliefs: $b = .15 (p < .05)$
- John Henryism
- Motherhood Self Agency: $b = .15 (p < .05)$
- Pursuit of a planned career strategy: $b = .21 (p < .05)$
- Perception of Career as a Burden: $b = -.10 (ns)$
Figure 4. John Henryism and Outcomes Regression Analysis summary

John Henryism

- Life Satisfaction: $b = .21 (p < .001)$
- Perceived Stress: $b = -.22 (p < .001)$
- Depression: $b = -.09 (ns)$
- Job Satisfaction: $b = .25 (p < .001)$
Figure 5. Motherhood self agency and Outcomes Regression Analysis Summary

Motherhood self agency

- $b = .26 (p < .001)$
- $b = -.23 (p < .001)$
- $b = .18 (p < .05)$

Life Satisfaction

Perceived Stress

Depression

Job Satisfaction
TABLES
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Analysis &amp; Controls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Marginality Perceptions – Asian American Model Minority stereotype</td>
<td>Regression Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Controls:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Family Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Years in the United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Marginality Perceptions- Idealized beliefs about Motherhood/ Idealized beliefs about Career</td>
<td>Multiple Regression Analysis (Fig. 2 &amp; 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.A</td>
<td>Controls:</td>
<td>Separate Regressions (Fig 2 &amp; 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Controls:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Income</td>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Years in the United States</td>
<td>Family Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Idealized beliefs about</td>
<td>Years in the US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motherhood – John Henryism/</td>
<td>Workplace Flexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motherhood Self Agency/ Career</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.B</td>
<td>Idealized beliefs about Career</td>
<td>Separate Regressions (Fig 2 &amp; 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– John Henryism/ Motherhood Self</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. A</td>
<td>Agency/ Career Outcomes</td>
<td>Separate Regressions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Controls:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family Income</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Years in the US</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workplace Flexibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. B</td>
<td>John Henryism-Mental Health Outcomes/Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>Separate Regressions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Controls:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family Income</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Years in the US</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workplace Flexibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. B</td>
<td>Motherhood Self Agency-Mental</td>
<td>Separate Regressions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Outcomes/Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>Controls:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family Income</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Years in the US</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workplace Flexibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>Model Minority – Ethnic Socialization Practices</th>
<th>6 Separate Regressions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6</th>
<th>Idealized motherhood beliefs-Household Division of Labor</th>
<th>6 Separate Regressions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>No. of items</td>
<td>Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of Birth</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in the United States</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model Minority Stereotype</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized beliefs about Motherhood</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized beliefs about Career</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Marginality (Acculturation)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Discrimination</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Stress</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Satisfaction</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Henryism</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Support</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motherhood Self Agency</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling Flexibility*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pursuit of Planned Career Strategy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of career as a burden*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job in General</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective Socioeconomic status*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*High score = Low on the measure
Table 3

*Intercorrelations among Study variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Family Income</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Year of birth</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-.699**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Years in US</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Economic Marginality</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>-.30**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Social Marginality attitudes</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Perceived Discrimination</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Idealized Motherhood Beliefs</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Idealized Career Beliefs</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Model Minority Stereotype</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < .001; *p < .05.
Table 3 Cont.

*Inter-correlations among Study variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>John Henryim</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>193</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Motherhood Self Agency</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>-.32**</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>195</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Scheduling Flexibility</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>-.34**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>266</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>204</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Pursuit of Planned Career Strategy</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>267</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Perception of Career Burden</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>-.37**</td>
<td>-.38**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>260</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>203</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-.33**</td>
<td>-.34**</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>182</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>196</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.73**</td>
<td>-.44**</td>
<td>-.44**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>161</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>182</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Perceived Stress</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-.47**</td>
<td>-.51**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>181</td>
<td>181</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Social Support</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Life Satisfaction</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .001; *p < .05.**
Table 4

*Summary of Regression Analysis with variables predicting model minority beliefs (N = 221)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE (B)</th>
<th>b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Income</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of Birth</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.26**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yrs in US</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Income</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of Birth</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.30***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yrs in US</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.22*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Marginality</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Discrimination</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective Socioeconomic Status</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.16*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $R^2 = .03$ for Step 1; $\Delta R^2 = .05$ for Step 2 ($ps < .05$).

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$. 
### Table 5

**Summary of Regression Analysis with variables predicting idealized motherhood beliefs (N = 219)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE (B)</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family Income</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of Birth</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yrs in US</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE (B)</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family Income</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of Birth</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yrs in US</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Marginality</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>.32***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Discrimination</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective SES</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $R^2 = .004$ for Step 1; $\Delta R^2 = .13$ for Step 2 ($p < .05$).

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$. 
Table 6

*Summary of Regression Analysis with variables predicting idealized career beliefs (N = 213)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE (B)</th>
<th>b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family Income</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of Birth</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yrs in US</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE (B)</th>
<th>b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family Income</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of Birth</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yrs in US</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Marginality</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Discrimination</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>.21***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective SES</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $R^2 = .01$ for Step 1; $\Delta R^2 = .07$ for Step 2 ($p < .05$).

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$. 
Table 7

*Summary of Regression Analysis with idealized motherhood beliefs as a predictor of John Henryism, Motherhood self agency, pursuit of a planned career strategy and perception of career as a burden*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>John Henryism (N = 218)</th>
<th>Motherhood self agency (N = 192)</th>
<th>Pursuit of planned career strategy (N = 220)</th>
<th>Perception of career as a burden (N = 223)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE(B)</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Income</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in the US</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of Birth</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling Flexibility</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-.13**</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Income</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year in the US</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of Birth</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling Flexibility</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-.13**</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Motherhood Beliefs</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note. John Henryism $R^2 = .04$ for Step 1; $\Delta R^2 = .01 \text{ (ns)}$. Motherhood Self Agency: $R^2 = .02$ for Step 1; $\Delta R^2 = .02 \text{ for Step 2 (} p < .04 \text{)}$. Pursuit of a planned career strategy: $R^2 = .10$ for Step 1; $\Delta R^2 = .02 \text{ for Step 2 (} p < .03 \text{)}$. Perception of career as a burden: $R^2 = .10$ for Step 1; $\Delta R^2 = .02 \text{ for Step 2 (} p < .03 \text{)}$.  

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$. 
Table 8

*Summary of Regression Analysis with idealized career beliefs as a predictor of John Henryism, Motherhood self agency, pursuit of a planned career strategy and perception of career as a burden*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>John Henryism (N = 212)</th>
<th>Motherhood self agency (N = 185)</th>
<th>Pursuit of a planned career strategy (N = 216)</th>
<th>Perception of career as a burden (N = 223)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE(B)</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Income</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in US</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of Birth</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling Flexibility</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Income</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in US</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of Birth</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling Flexibility</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Career Beliefs</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. John Henryism: $R^2 = .04$ for Step 1; $\Delta R^2 = .02$ for Step 2 ($p < .03$). Motherhood Self Agency: $R^2 = .02$ for Step 1; $\Delta R^2 = .02$ for Step 2 ($p < .04$). Pursuit of planned career strategy: $R^2 = .03$ for Step 1; $\Delta R^2 = .07$ for Step 2 ($p < .04$). Perception of Career as a burden: $R^2 = .10$ for Step 1; $\Delta R^2 = .01$ for Step 2 ($ns$).
*p < .05. p < .01. p < .001.
### Table 9

*Summary of Regression Analysis with John Henryism as a predictor of well-being and job satisfaction*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Life Satisfaction (N = 188)</th>
<th>Perceived Stress (N = 169)</th>
<th>Depression (N = 170)</th>
<th>Job satisfaction (N = 184)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE(B)</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of Birth</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in US</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Income</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of Birth</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in US</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Income</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Support</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>.62***</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling Flexibility</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of Birth</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in US</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: B = coefficient, SE(B) = standard error of the coefficient, b = standardized coefficient.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0.08</th>
<th>0.10</th>
<th>0.05</th>
<th>-0.03</th>
<th>0.06</th>
<th>-0.05</th>
<th>-0.09</th>
<th>0.05</th>
<th>-0.13</th>
<th>0.05</th>
<th>0.51</th>
<th>0.01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Support</strong></td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.59***</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.39***</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.39***</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scheduling Flexibility</strong></td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.16**</td>
<td>-2.20</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>-0.28***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>John Henryism</strong></td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.22***</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.25***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Life Satisfaction: \( R^2 = .01 \) for Step 1; \( \Delta R^2 = .40 \) for Step 2 \((p < .001)\); \( \Delta R^2 = .04 \) for Step 3 \((p < .001)\). Perceived Stress: \( R^2 = .01 \) for Step 1; \( \Delta R^2 = .21 \) for Step 2 \((p < .001)\); \( \Delta R^2 = .05 \) for Step 3 \((p < .001)\). Depression: \( R^2 = .01 \) for Step 1; \( \Delta R^2 = .22 \) for Step 2 \((p < .001)\); \( \Delta R^2 = .01 \) for Step 3 \((ns)\). Job Satisfaction: \( R^2 = .001 \) for Step 1; \( \Delta R^2 = .12 \) for Step 2 \((p < .001)\); \( \Delta R^2 = .06 \) for Step 3 \((p < .001)\).

\* \( p < .05 \).  \( p < .01 \).  \( p < .001 \).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Life Satisfaction (N = 183)</th>
<th>Perceived Stress (N = 164)</th>
<th>Depression (N = 165)</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction (N = 180)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of Birth</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in US</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Income</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of Birth</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in US</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Income</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Support</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of Birth</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in US</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Income</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Support</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>.58***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>.26***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motherhood Self Agency</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>.26***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Life Satisfaction: $R^2 = .01$ for Step 1; $\Delta R^2 = .39$ for Step 2 ($p < .001$); $\Delta R^2 = .07$ for Step 3 ($p < .001$). Perceived Stress: $R^2 = .01$ for Step 1; $\Delta R^2 = .23$ for Step 2 ($p < .001$); $\Delta R^2 = .03$ for Step 3 ($p < .001$). Depression: $R^2 = .03$ for Step 1; $\Delta R^2 = .21$ for Step 2 ($p < .001$); $\Delta R^2 = .05$ for Step 3 ($p < .001$). Job Satisfaction: $R^2 = .01$ for Step 1; $\Delta R^2 = .11$ for Step 2 ($p < .001$); $\Delta R^2 = .03$ for Step 3 ($p < .02$).

*p < .05,  p < .01,  p < .001.
Table 11

*Descriptive Statistics for motherhood practices measures*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>No. of items</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility for general household functioning</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility for children</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions with respect to cultural transmission</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success Orientation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on High moral standards</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Transmission</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging in rigorous out of school academic activities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12

*Summary of Regression Analysis with Idealized motherhood beliefs as a predictor of ethnic socialization practices (N = 191)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Engaging in rigorous out of school activities</th>
<th>Success orientation</th>
<th>Emphasis on high moral standards</th>
<th>Cultural transmission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE(B)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE(B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Income</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of Birth</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in US</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.19*</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Income</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of Birth</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in US</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized motherhood beliefs</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.21**</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Engaging in rigorous out of school activities: $R^2 = .06$ for Step 1; $\Delta R^2 = .04$ for Step 2 ($p < .01$). Success orientation: $R^2 = .05$ for Step 1; $\Delta R^2 = .08$ for Step 2 ($p < .001$). Emphasis on high moral standards: $R^2 = .03$ for Step 1; $\Delta R^2 = .05$ for Step 2 ($p < .01$). Cultural transmission: $R^2 = .08$ for Step 1; $\Delta R^2 = .03$ for Step 2 ($p < .01$).  

*p < .05  p < .01  p < .001;*
Table 13

**Summary of Regression Analysis with Idealized motherhood beliefs as a predictor of practices in the household domain (N = 196)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility for household functioning</th>
<th>Responsibility for children</th>
<th>Decisions with respect to cultural transmission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE(B)</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Step 1**

- **Year of Birth**: 0.17 0.03 0.58 -0.01 0.02 -0.05 -0.01 0.02 -0.05
- **Years in US**: 0.36 0.03 0.13 0.01 0.02 0.08 0.01 0.02 0.08
- **Family Income**: 0.24 0.20 0.09 -0.03 0.13 -0.02 -0.03 0.13 -0.02

**Step 2**

- **Year of Birth**: 0.02 0.03 0.07 -0.01 0.02 -0.05 -0.01 0.02 -0.05
- **Years in US**: 0.04 0.30 0.15 0.02 0.02 0.09 0.02 0.02 0.09
- **Family Income**: 0.28 0.20 0.10 -0.01 0.13 -0.01 -0.01 0.13 -0.01
- **Idealized motherhood beliefs**: 0.42 0.15 0.20** 0.20* 0.09 0.15† 0.19 0.09 0.15†

*Note. Responsibility for household functioning: $R^2 = .02$ for Step 1; $\Delta R^2 = .04$ for Step 2 ($p < .01$). Responsibility for children: $R^2 = .01$ for Step 1; $\Delta R^2 = .02$ for Step 2 ($p < .05$). Decisions with respect to cultural transmission: $R^2 = .01$ for Step 1; $\Delta R^2 = .02$ for Step 2 ($p < .05$).*

* $p < .05$. † $p < .01$. ‡ $p < .001$. 
Table 14

*Qualitative interviews participant description*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Current Occupation</th>
<th>Year of Birth</th>
<th>Years in US</th>
<th>No. of children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Janani</td>
<td>Pediatrician</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laxmi</td>
<td>Research Technician</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radhika</td>
<td>Programmer Analyst</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latha</td>
<td>Research Scientist</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shefali</td>
<td>Post Doctoral Fellow</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jyoti</td>
<td>IT Architect</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roma</td>
<td>Staff Scientist</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interview guide for qualitative interviews

Interview Protocol

1. Life History.
   a. How did you come here?
   b. Who lives in your home back in your country?
   c. Describe your experiences growing up?
   d. Who did you admire the most?
   e. Sometime, we all like to be “like somebody in one way or another?” In what ways did you try to be “like someone?”

2. Present Occupation, Income and Conditions

3. Perception of Job
   A. Describe a typical day in your life?
   B. How would you describe your employer?
   C. Describe the work you do?
   D. In what ways is what you do similar to what other(s) in similar jobs do?
   E. What was one of the proudest moment in your job?
   F. What is the part of the day that you really look forward to?
   G. What part of your work day do you really wish did not exist?
   H. In what ways is your typical day you experience in this country different from your experiences back home?
   I. How do your work experiences differ from your friends back home?
   J. In what ways do you think your typical day is similar to your friends in the United States?
   K. If there was something about you work that you could change, what would that be?
   L. What expectations about work did you have when you have when you decided to travel to this country?
   M. In what ways did your expectations remain consistent with your experiences?
   N. If you had the chance to make this decision again, what do you think you will do?
   O. What advice would you give someone who is in a similar position as you?

4. Social Networks/ Family/ Friends
   A. Can you tell me more about your family?
B. What in your view is an ideal family?
C. How would your family describe you?
D. How would your friends describe you?
E. What are some of the things you do in your spare time?
F. What are some of the things you do when you feel sad or low?
G. What are some of the things you do when you feel nice and happy?
H. What are some of the things that you miss from back home?

5. Motherhood ideology
   A. Describe your mother?
   B. If you were to give advice to a new mother what would that be?
   C. How would your family describe an ideal mother?

6. Mothering Experiences
   A. What do you enjoy the most about being a mother?
   B. How would your children describe you?
   C. What are your expectations for your children?
   D. What are some of the things that you do differently from what your mother/ close relatives did for you?
   E. What are the special things you enjoy with your children?

7. Experience of Mental Health
   A. How would you describe your life so far?
   B. If there are one or two things that you could change in your life, what would those be?
   C. What aspects of the day do you enjoy the most?
   D. What parts of the day do you wish you could do without?

8. Goals and life expectations
   A. Looking ahead, what are your goals for the next 5 years?
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