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Abstract

Because young adult, Latina/o immigrants encompass a rapidly growing minority group in the U.S., there is need for empirical literature focusing on their mental health and the ways in which it relates with identity and culture. The primary aim of the present study was to examine the relations among dimensions of marianismo beliefs and indices of acculturative stress as moderated by ethnic identity commitment among recent Latina young adult immigrants.

The sample consisted of 530 Latina women in Miami, Florida (time in US: \( M = 11.5 \) months; \( SD = 9.94 \); Ages: 18-23 years \( M = 20.82, SD = 1.88 \)). Measures included the Marianismo Beliefs Scale (MBS; Castillo et al., 2010), the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM; Phinney, 1992), the Revised Acculturative Stress Scale Total Scale (SAFE-R; Mena et al., 1987), the Revised Hispanic Stress Inventory Frequency and Appraisal Scales (HSI-R; Cervantes et al., 2012), and the Caetano Acculturation Stress Total Scale (Caetano et al., 2007).

Four hierarchical multiple regression analyses were performed- one for each indicator of acculturative stress. The overall set of predictors was significantly related to acculturative stress when controlling for covariates and accounted for 41.6%, 7.5%, 24.5%, and 43.3% of the variability in SAFE-R, Caetano Acculturation Stress Scale, and HSI-R Frequency and Appraisal Subscale scores, respectively.

For this sample, endorsing more family pillar marianismo beliefs was correlated with higher levels of acculturative stress on most indices. Endorsing more subordinate/silencing self marianismo beliefs was linked to lower levels of acculturative stress on all indices. Endorsing more spiritual pillar marianismo beliefs was correlated with lower levels of acculturative stress on one indicator. Endorsement of higher levels of ethnic identity commitment corresponded to higher levels of acculturative stress on most indices.
Participants who endorsed less subordinate/silencing self marianismo beliefs reported more acculturative stress on most indices, especially when they reported stronger commitment to their ethnic identity. Higher levels of ethnic identity commitment served as a protective factor against acculturative stress for participants who endorsed less family pillar marianismo beliefs and acted as a risk factor for those who endorsed more family pillar marianismo beliefs.

Clinical and research implications are discussed.
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Chapter I

Introduction

Latina/os currently make up approximately 17% of the U.S. population, a figure that is projected to increase to 29% by 2060 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2014). The term Latina/o is used to refer to individuals of Mexican, Cuban, Puerto Rican, and/or South and Central American heritage (Gloria & Rodriguez, 2000). With a current presence of approximately 55.4 million, Latina/os represent the largest and fastest growing minority group in the country (U.S. Census Bureau, 2014). From 2013 to 2014 alone, the Latina/o population increased by 1.15 million, constituting almost half of the U.S. population’s total growth that year (U.S. Census Bureau, 2014). Due to this rapid growth rate (approximately four times that of the average population), there is an increased demand for research investigating Latina/o health and its relationship with culture (Ennis, Rios-Vargas & Albert, 2011). Studying Latina/o immigrants is of particular importance as over one-third (35.2%) of the U.S. Latina/o population was foreign-born as of 2013 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2014). Specifically, the majority (64.3%) of non-citizens residing in the U.S. under the age of 35 was born in Latin America or the Caribbean (U.S. Census Bureau, 2014).

Although young adult, Latina/o immigrants encompass a prominent minority group in the U.S., there is a dearth of empirical literature focusing on this population and the ways in which they choose to identify and interact with their culture. Latina/o immigrants are routinely confronted by challenges that place them at increased risk (compared to U.S. born Latina/os and non-Latina/o Whites) for both mental and physical health issues (Alegria et al., 2007; Alegria et al., 2008). Many studies suggest that aspects of living in the U.S. place Latina/os at risk for experiencing high stress levels and psychological problems as well (Torres, 2010). Moreover,
studies suggest that Latina immigrants in particular suffer more intensely from acculturative stress and the consequences with which it is associated (Kiang, Gryzwacz, Marin, Arcury, & Quandt, 2010; Mills & Caetano, 2012; Sarmiento & Cardemil, 2009; Tran et al., 2014).

Thus, the general purpose of the present study was to examine the values, identity, and experiences of young adult recent Latina immigrants; that is, focus on a specific, understudied population within Latina/o adult immigrants. An increased understanding of Latina/o cultural variables and their links with identity and stress would facilitate the provision of culturally sensitive psychological services as well as the corresponding design and adaptation of strengths-based interventions for this population. This increased understanding of cultural nuance in the context of immigration can also inform prevention programming, particularly that which can address acculturative stress before reaching clinical levels of depression and/or anxiety. Furthermore, findings may provide a greater understanding of potential protective and risk factors related to acculturative stress. Hence, the present study investigated relations among traditional gender role beliefs, ethnic identity commitment, and acculturative stress at immigration. The following section will review the literature relevant to acculturative stress among Latina/os.

**Acculturative Stress**

Currently, research on Latina/o immigrants is dominated by studies based on theories of acculturation (Torres & Wallace, 2013). Acculturation has been defined simply as the acquisition of a second culture (Rudmin, 2009). Nevertheless, it is a complex process by which individuals negotiate the way and extent to which they merge with a new culture (Berry, 2005; Rudmin, 2009). The negotiation of cultural values involved in acculturation requires the use of psychological, social, and even physiological resources (Torres, 2010; Berry, 2006). For Latinas,
much of these personal resources must be allocated toward navigating the clash between a more
egalitarian U.S. culture and a more patriarchal Latina/o culture in which their gender largely
dictates their place in society. The influence of acculturation can be positive or negative,
depending on the individual’s unique identity and circumstances; acculturative stress can be a
significant and negative byproduct of the acculturation process (Rudmin, 2009).

The construct of acculturative stress has its roots in the stress and coping literature
(Berry, 2005; Church 1982). Initially, Oberg (1960) referred to ‘acculturative stress’ as ‘culture
shock’. Consequently, Berry (2006) posited that “culture shock” implied an exclusively negative
encounter resulting from exposure to a single, new culture. Instead, acculturative stress is a more
inclusive, complex concept that exists in the context of multiple cultural encounters while also
having a place within the larger stress and coping theoretical framework (Berry, 2005; Lazarus &
Folkman, 1984; Rudmin, 2009).

Acculturative stress has been posited to occur when immigrants encounter conflict during
their efforts to resolve or minimize cultural differences between the culture of origin and host
culture (Born, 1970). Berry (1995) later expanded on this notion, describing acculturative stress
as “one kind of stress, in which the stressors are identified as having their source in the process
of acculturation; [with] a particular set of stress behaviors that occur during acculturation” (p.
479). Smart and Smart (1995) similarly referred to acculturative stress as the psychological
impact of adapting to a new culture. Acculturative stress also has been conceptualized as the
stressors related to transitioning and adapting to a new environment and includes linguistic
difficulties, pressures to assimilate, separation from one’s family, experiences with
discrimination, perceived feelings of inferiority, and intergenerational family conflicts (Berry,
1997; Williams & Berry, 1991). For the purposes of the present study, acculturative stress was
defined as stress directly related to transitioning and adapting to a new environment (i.e., the acculturation process) and took into account social, attitudinal, familial, and environmental factors including those directly related to Latina/os and their immigration-related stress (Berry, 1990; Cervantes, Goldbach & Padilla, 2012; Mena, Padilla, & Maldonado, 1987; Williams & Berry, 1991). Thus, multiple indicators of acculturative stress were used in order to capture the breadth of the construct and better clarify its relations with the predictor variables and moderator. The following section will provide a more detailed description of the experience of acculturative stress among Latina/os in the U.S.

**Acculturative stress among Latina/os.** The rationale for examining acculturative stress lies in its varied and pervasive impact on those who experience it. The extent to which individuals experience acculturative stress can range from minor to significantly debilitating (Berry, Kim, Minde, & Mok, 1987). Latina/o immigrants experience more acculturative stress than their European immigrant counterparts (Yeh & Inose, 2003). Studies have continually shown that acculturative stress is tied to mental and physical health issues among U.S. Latina/os (Driscoll & Torres, 2013; Rudmin, 2009; Torres, 2010). Latina/o immigrants may face stressful experiences throughout the migration process that place them at increased risk for poor mental health in particular (Tran et al., 2014). In fact, Latina/o immigrants experience greater acculturative stress than other groups due to the unique challenges they face (Arbona et al., 2010; Mena et al., 1987). Recent Latina/o immigrants are likely the most affected by acculturative stress (Caplan, 2007), thus indicating the importance of investigating the factors linked to this construct. The following subsections will review the extant literature concerning acculturative stress among Latina/os as a whole as well as Latinas specifically, and protective and risk factors for acculturative stress.
The effects of acculturative stress on the mental health of Latinos in U.S. are unique from traditional etic sources of psychopathology. Notably, acculturative stress has been positively linked to general psychological distress (Thoman & Suris, 2004), depression (Hovey & King, 1996), anxiety (Revollo, Qureshi, Collazos, Valero, & Casas, 2011), and adverse psychological adjustment (Driscoll & Torres, 2013) for Latina/os. It has been shown to predict increased depression even when controlling for culturally universal stressors and negative attribution styles (Stein, Gonzalez & Huq, 2012). In a sample of young adult Latina/os, acculturative stress also was found to be associated with suicide attempts (Gomez, Miranda, & Polanco, 2011).

Acculturative stress also has been associated with auditory hallucinations in Latina/os and increased risk for related psychotic-like experiences was associated with immigration and younger age (DeVylder et al., 2013). Along with the aforementioned psychological problems, acculturative stress in Latina/os has been found to be related to alcohol abuse (Sanchez, Dillon, Concha, & La Rosa, 2015), declines in family cohesion (Dillon, La Rosa, & Ibañez, 2013), lower academic persistence (Chun, Marin, Schwartz, Pham, and Castro-Olivo, 2016), and relatively poorer physical health (Finch & Vega, 2003; Sanchez, Dillon, Ruffin, & De La Rosa, 2012).

Therefore, increased knowledge of Latina/os’ experience of acculturative stress is necessary to guide mental health professionals, enhance service delivery, and generate alternatives for mental health-related interventions (Santiago-Rivera, et al., 2011).

**Acculturative stress among Latina women.** Latina immigrants suffer more intensely from the consequences with which acculturative stress is associated (Kiang et al., 2010; Mills & Caetano, 2012; Sarmiento & Cardemil, 2009; Tran et al., 2014). The distress resulting from conflicts of cultural differences can be pronounced for Latinas given the patriarchal structure typical of traditional Latina/o families. The nature of traditional Latina/o familial and societal
structure- governed by gender differences/roles- can exacerbate the cultural clash experienced by Latina immigrants adjusting to the considerably more egalitarian U.S. majority culture. Latina immigrants face significant family/maternal responsibilities (National Alliance on Mental Health (NAMI), 2009), conflicts between cultural gender role expectations (Shattell, Quinlan-Colwell, Villaba, Iverns, & Mails, 2010), and heightened levels of intimate partner violence (Edelson, Hokoda, & Ramos-Lira, 2007). These factors place them at higher risk of suffering from negative social, psychological, and physical consequences. Such risk factors, combined with Latina immigrants’ decreased likelihood of having access to and receiving fitting mental healthcare treatment (Hochhausen, Le, & Perry, 2011; Pérez, Fortuna, & Alegría, 2008), contribute to mental health disparities (e.g., depression, suicide) that may begin to be addressed through research concentrating on this population.

Acculturative stress can result from different sources specific to Latinas and has subsequently been shown to affect Latinas in unique ways. For instance, in a sample of recent Latina/o immigrant adults, the connection between stress and depression was strongest for Latina adults in comparison to males (Kiang et al., 2010). Aside from contributing to previously noted mental health problems such as depression and anxiety for Latina immigrants (Driscoll & Torres, 2013; Ornelas & Perreira, 2011; Torres, 2010), acculturative stress has also been shown to contribute to a slew of other variables for this population. Acculturative stress has been found to exacerbate the relationship between family functioning and depression among Latina adults in particular (Sarmiento & Cardemil, 2009). Acculturative stress also has been associated with a higher body mass index (BMI) for Latina immigrants (Ro & Bostean, 2015). For young adult Latinas in particular, acculturative stress has been associated with increased eating pathology,
decreased self-esteem (Claudat, White, & Warren, 2016), body image disturbances, and an internalization of the cultural thin ideal (Menon & Harter, 2012).

**Risk and protective factors of acculturative stress.** Numerous risk and protective factors for acculturative stress have been identified in the literature. Williams and Berry (1991) and Berry and Kim (1988) created an initial framework of psychological and social variables that can be predictive of acculturative stress. They postulated that the following individual and contextual variables were all relevant to acculturative stress: family support found in the new community (immediate and extended family networks); non-family social support within the new community; socioeconomic status (including education and income); pre-migration variables such as adaptive functioning (self-esteem and coping ability); knowledge of new language and culture; cognitive attributes such as positive expectations for the future; and the degree of tolerance and acceptance of cultural diversity within the mainstream society. The following paragraphs describe support for this framework and additional relations between cultural variables and acculturative stress.

Consistent with the aforementioned frameworks, various factors have been found to be associated with acculturative stress in different contexts for Latina/o immigrants. Psychological and attitudinal factors appear to play a prominent role in predicting acculturative stress. Such individual-level factors can affect the extent to which mental health issues are experienced (Salas-Wright, Robles, Vaughn, Cordova, & Pérez-Figueroa, 2015). For instance, acculturating Latina/os experience high levels of acculturative stress (Hovey & King, 1996), especially when their expectations of the immigration process are not congruent with their reality (Negy, Schwartz, & Reig-Ferrer, 2009). The way in which Latina/o immigrants think about their future (e.g., hope versus negative expectations) also has been shown to influence their experience of
acculturative stress (Hovey & King, 1996; Negy et al., 2009). Mena et al. (1987) also found that those who migrated after age 12 experienced more acculturative stress, which they postulated was due to the significance of culture during the transition from childhood to adolescence. Crockett et al. (2007) reported that psychological distress (i.e., depression and anxiety) was a consequence of perceived acculturative stress when Latina/o college students used avoidant coping strategies. Another study found that inadequate coping strategies, low self-esteem, and neuroticism were risk factors for acculturative stress whereas use of adaptive coping strategies was seen as protective (Capielo, Delgado-Romero, Edward, & Stewart, 2015; Crockett et al., 2007; Mangold, Veraza, Kinkier & Kinney, 2007; Padilla, Alvarez, & Lindholm, 1986). Finally, anxious predisposition (or padece de nervios) has been associated with increased acculturative stress for Latinas in particular (Alcántara, Abelson, & Gone, 2012).

The way in which Latina/os perceive the intersection between the majority/host culture and their own, minority, culture has also been shown to influence their levels of acculturative stress (Bekteshi & Hook, 2015; Negy et al., 2009). For example, lack of cultural acceptance by the majority group was associated with more acculturative stress for Latina/o immigrants (Sanchez & Fernandez, 1993). Low acculturation and perceived intragroup marginalization were also linked with higher acculturative stress for a sample of young adult Latina/os (Castillo, Cano, Chen, Blucker, & Olds, 2008). Similarly, limited English proficiency (Concha, Sanchez, De La Rosa, & Villar, 2013), along with English and Spanish competency pressures for adolescents and adults (Rodriguez, Flores, Flores, Myers, & Vriesema, 2015), have also been associated with increased acculturative stress in Latina/o immigrants. For a group of Latina/o adolescents, cultural conflict and bicultural self-consciousness, such as that which may occur while balancing bicultural practices, contributed to increased acculturative stress (Rodriguez et al., 2015). As one
would expect, undocumented immigrant status also has demonstrated significance in predicting increased acculturative stress levels (Arbona et al., 2010; Sanchez et al., 2012). On the other hand, happiness with the move as well as increased time in the U.S. have been shown to inversely relate with acculturative stress among Latina/o immigrants (Bekteshi & Hook, 2015).

Although myriad factors have been associated with acculturative stress among Latina/o immigrants, relatively little is known about the way in which Latina/o ethnic identity may affect experience of acculturative stress for young adult recent Latina immigrants. The following section will summarize the relevant literature on ethnic identity, its conceptualization, and potential roles in terms of experience of acculturative stress.

**Ethnic Identity**

Germane to the development of an individuals’ self-concept is their ethnicity; this seems to be particularly true for members of racial and ethnic minority groups in the U.S. (Phinney, 1990; Phinney, 1992). Adult women are often endowed with the responsibility of carrying their culture, especially when they are expected to remain at home and maintain cultural traditions (Phinney, Horenczyk, Liebkind, & Vedder, 2001). Thus, the intersections among gender roles, ethnic identity, and acculturative stress seem of particular relevance for young adult recent Latina immigrants. For the purposes of this study, level of ethnic identity commitment was defined as the extent to which one endorses a sense of belonging and attachment to one’s group as well as a sense of one’s cultural identity and its personal meaning (Phinney, 1992). In the following subsection, the relationship between ethnic identity and acculturative stress among Latina/os will be reviewed.

**Ethnic identity and acculturative stress.** Ethnic identity has been recognized as a buffer against acculturative stress as well as its negative psychological correlates among Latina/os
(Iturbide, Rafaelli, & Carlo, 2009; Polanco-Roman & Miranda, 2013). Ethnic identity has even been identified as a main predictor of thriving for young Latina/os in the U.S. (Alvarado & Ricard, 2013) and has been positively related to self-esteem (Phinney, 1990; Wang, Schwartz, & Zamboanga, 2010). This supports the idea that ethnic identity can be seen as a personal cultural resource and strength, helping Latina/os cope with the negative effects of stress (both cultural and otherwise) (Umaña-Taylor, Updegraff, & Gonzales-Backen, 2011; Unger, 2015). Polanco-Roman and Miranda (2013) found that ethnic identity buffered against the ill effects of acculturative stress such as hopelessness and related suicidal ideation among a sample of Latina/o emerging adults. Similarly, among a sample of Latina college students, ethnic identity moderated the relation between low levels of acculturative stress and depression such that higher levels of ethnic identity weakened the relation (Iturbide, Raffaelli, & Carlo, 2009). Together with low levels of acculturative stress, strong ethnic identity had significant, positive effects on emotional well-being for Latina/o college students (Chun et al., 2016).

However, despite the theoretical and empirical endorsement of the protective nature of ethnic identity, one study generated conflicting results in a sample of Mexican immigrant adults. Ethnic identity exacerbated the negative effect of acculturative stress on psychological well-being (Kim, Hogge, & Salvisberg, 2014). Kim et al. (2014) posit that these results may be due to increased personal sensitivity to group threat brought along by identification with that group. The authors also theorized that higher levels of ethnic identity may reduce Latina/os’ perceived need to integrate aspects of U.S. culture into their lifestyle, thus potentially making adjustment more difficult (Kim et al., 2014). More research has been called for to better understand the moderating role of ethnic identity in the lives of Latina/o immigrants (Hernandez, 2009; Leong, Park, & Kalibatseva, 2013).
Marianismo

Of particular relevance to Latina/o culture are traditional gender role beliefs, which dictate distinct expectations for Latina/o men and women. Marianismo refers to these gender role beliefs for Latinas. This term references the Virgin Mary and the prevalent idea in Latin culture that women are ideally pure, humble, willing and able to withstand extreme sacrifice, and thus, spiritually superior, albeit, subordinate to men (Castillo, Pérez, Castillo, & Ghosheh, 2010; Stevens, 1973). Marianismo continues to be a multidimensional construct that refers to the beliefs and norms that define gender role expectations for Latinas, reflecting the influence of cultural tradition on private and social behaviors (e.g., Castillo & Cano, 2007; Castillo et al., 2010; Gil, 1996; Reyes Luna, Garduno, & Velásquez, 2004). The tenets of marianismo make it so that the positive aspects of Latina femininity are those which make her powerful in a domestic setting and limited in a public one (Zinn, 1982; Cofresí, 2002; Rocha-Sanchez & Diaz-Loving, 2005). According to theorists, the extent to which a Latina woman endorses the various dimensions of marianismo has a strong bearing on her self-perception as well as the ways in which she is perceived by others (Reyes Luna et al., 2004). More specifically, Reyes Luna et al. (2004) found that norms and social inequalities for men and women are modeled within families and internalized by children at a young age; they emphasized how gender roles become an integral part of Latina/o’s development. It can be argued that not only do traditional gender roles become a formative component of Latina identity, but also that the way in which she chooses to embody these roles will have a significant bearing on her standing within the family and culture in which she was taught.

The literature does not reflect a consensus among theorists or researchers as to a specific definition and potential roles of marianismo. Marianismo has been reasoned to be comprised of
several positive as well as negative dimensions (Castillo & Cano, 2007; Castillo et al., 2010; Kulis, Marsiglia, & Hurdle, 2003), and some researchers have theorized that it may act as both a protective and risk factor for women (Centers for Disease Control [CDC], 2013; Kulis et al., 2003; Rodriguez, Castillo & Gandara, 2013). Indeed, because marianismo beliefs are considered simultaneously idealized and oppressive for women, it may be too simplistic to view these beliefs as one or the other (Rodriguez et al., 2013). Hence, marianismo has been conceptualized as a multidimensional construct, reflecting both positive and negative aspects of Latina femininity (Castillo et al., 2010). Whether positive or negative, endorsement of marianismo beliefs reflect acceptance of their importance.

For the purposes of the present study, the understanding of marianismo was the one proposed by Castillo et al. (2010) due to its specificity and prominence in the extant empirical literature regarding marianismo. Castillo et al., (2010) conceptualized marianismo as being comprised of five dimensions: family pillar, virtuous and chaste, subordinate to other, silencing self to maintain harmony, and spiritual pillar. First, the family pillar dimension represents the belief that Latinas should be their family's primary source of strength and are responsible for the family's unity and happiness. Second, the virtuous and chase dimension represents the belief that Latinas should be pure in their morals (namely those guiding their sexuality). Third, the subordinate to other dimension represents the belief that Latinas should abide by and respect the power hierarchy outlined by their culture. Fourth, the silencing self to maintain harmony dimension represents the belief that Latinas should not make their personal thoughts or needs known to the extent to which it guards against discord in their relationships. Fifth, the spiritual pillar dimension represents the belief that Latinas should lead their family and foster their growth in terms of religiosity.
The complexity of the marianismo construct necessitates more empirical investigations of its influences (Rodriguez et al., 2013). Although marianismo has been discussed theoretically in the literature, empirical research on the construct, especially its multiple dimensions, is rare. Mixed results require continued investigation. Outcomes related to drug use and academic performance (Kulis et al., 2003), academic motivation (Rodriguez et al., 2013) and sexual attitudes and behaviors (Sanchez, Whittaker, Hamilton, & Zayas, 2015) have all been found to differ according to the dimensions of marianismo endorsed by study participants, although not necessarily in the ways hypothesized by the researchers. Nevertheless, these findings not only support a multidimensional conceptualization of marianismo, but point toward the need to clarify the nature and role of these dimensions.

Theorists have noted that although individual and sociocultural factors contribute to more diverse and liberal gender expectations for contemporary young Latinas, traditional gender roles continue to be promoted within Latina/o culture (Castillo et al., 2010; Gil, 1996). The continued promotion of marianismo indicates the beliefs and behaviors Latinas are socialized to enact in order to be perceived favorably within their culture (Castillo et al., 2010). For example, in two studies analyzing Mexican media, women who portrayed adherence to marianismo beliefs were perceived positively as dependent, helpful, and rewarded by their family. Contrastingly, women who were portrayed as independent were more sexualized or perceived as violent (Tatar, 2010; Villegas, Lemanski, & Valdez, 2010).

Although Latinas benefit from endorsement of some marianismo beliefs, they also tend to experience psychological and social hardship due to the clash between traditional gender norms and the lifestyles common to women in the U.S. (Gil, 1996). For this reason, it seemed particularly important to study this potential clash of gender norms and values for recent Latina
young adult immigrants, who are more likely to experience the conflict than second and third generation Latina immigrants or women living in Latin countries. Based on the aforementioned literature, it was reasoned that endorsing and ascribing to traditional gender roles like marianismo beliefs may contribute to cultural conflict and acculturative stress during initial year after immigration. Ethnic identity may buffer this conflict given the protective effects that has been suggested by aforementioned literature (see section *Ethnic identity and acculturative stress* above). Hence, it is of scientific importance to further investigate marianismo beliefs as they relate to broader ethnic identity and acculturative stress for Latinas. The influence of marianismo beliefs on acculturative stress, to date, has not been examined among Latina young adult recent immigrants. Although studies have suggested that traditional marianismo beliefs play a role in Latina immigrants' health and well-being (CDC, 2013; Kulis et al., 2003), more research is required to clarify the way in which this occurs. The following section will detail the aims of the proposed empirical study.

**Present Study**

The general purpose of the present study was to investigate the relations between the five dimensions of marianismo (Castillo et al., 2010) and multiple indicators of acculturative stress, and whether such relations are moderated by ethnic identity among recent Latina young adult immigrants, aged 18-23 years. The present study used archival data, which were collected as a baseline for a longitudinal study of recent Latina immigrants (Research Subproject Principal Investigator Dillon *Social Determinants Predicting Trajectories of HIV with Recent Latina Immigrants*-Subproject ID: P20MD002288 - 6064), hereafter called the *parent* study.

Based on the reviewed literature, the following sets of hypotheses were tested:
Hypothesis one: Latina women reporting more endorsement of marianismo beliefs will indicate experiencing more acculturative stress after accounting for covariates. Covariates for the present study include age, level of education, time in U.S., immigration status (documented or undocumented), employment status, personal income, and socioeconomic status (SES) during childhood and adolescence. Rationales for each covariate are described below.

While the young adult participants are already very close in age due to study eligibility age criterion (18-23 years), this variable was chosen as a covariate. There is evidence suggesting that age at time of immigration is a correlate of ethnic identity development (Phinney et al., 2001) and acculturative stress (Padilla et al., 1986) such that ethnic identity often develops with age and immigration at a later age is associated with increased acculturative stress. Level of education was also chosen as a covariate due to its negative relations with adherence to gender roles (Bowleg, Belgrave, & Reisen, 2000), ethnic identity commitment (Shehadeh et al., 2012), and acculturative stress (Villagrasa and Garcia-Izquierdo, 2007).

Although the present study’s sample naturally controlled for time in the U.S., given that eligibility criterion included residing in the U.S. for less than 36 months, time in U.S. was further controlled for as a covariate. As reflected by the “Hispanic Paradox” (Markides & Coreil, 1986), increased time in the U.S. has been significantly linked to worse health outcomes (Gallo et al., 2009) and less endorsement of traditional Latina/o gender roles (Kulis et al., 2003).

Immigration documentation status was also controlled for as it has been significantly related to acculturative stress, such that undocumented immigrants have been found to report higher levels of acculturative stress (Arbona et al., 2010; Sanchez et al., 2012).

Employment status at time of data collection can also be argued to relate to acculturative stress due to the influence employment can have on social and environmental acculturation.
factors through increased exposure to the host culture (Mena et al., 1987), thus, was controlled for. Finally, personal income at time of data collection as well as participants’ socioeconomic status while growing up was controlled for as these factors have the potential to influence the nature of immigration such that more financial resources can facilitate a less stressful process.

*Hypothesis two:* Latina women reporting higher levels of ethnic identity commitment will indicate experiencing less acculturative stress while accounting for aforementioned covariates.

*Hypothesis three:* Ethnic identity commitment will moderate the hypothesized positive relationship between all types of marianismo beliefs and acculturative stress while accounting for the aforementioned covariates. That is, the positive relationship between marianismo beliefs and acculturative stress will be weaker among Latinas who report higher levels of commitment to their ethnic identity than those who report lower levels of ethnic identity commitment. *(see Figure 1 for representation of hypothesized model.)*

**Chapter II**

**Method**

**Participants**

Inclusion criteria for the baseline assessment of the parent study included (a) being between the ages of 18-23, (b) being an immigrant of a Spanish-speaking Latin American country, (c) being in the U.S. for 36 months or fewer, (d) living in Miami-Dade County, FL and intending to stay in the U.S. for at least four years, and (e) being willing to provide two corroborative sources in the U.S. and country of origin for potential contact during participation in the study. Exclusion criteria included having a neurological, medical, or psychiatric condition which would impede the participant's ability to provide reliable information.
Participant data. The present study used archival baseline data from a longitudinal study (Sheehan et al., 2016) that investigated sociocultural determinants of health among 530 Latinas who immigrated to the U.S., specifically, to Miami-Dade County, FL, between 2014 and 2017. At the time of baseline data collection, participants enrolled in the parent study had resided in the U.S. for 36 months or less ($M = 12, SD = 9.94$). Their ages ranged from 18-23 years ($M = 20.81, SD = 1.8$). Participants varied in ethnic identification and country of origin, with the most represented groups being Cubans (34%), followed by Colombians (11.1%), Nicaraguans (7.5%), Hondurans (6.4%), Peruvians (5.6%), Mexicans (5.1%), Venezuelans (4.9%), Ecuadorians (3.8%), Panamanians (3.6%), and Dominicans (3.0%), with less representation from other Latin groups. Approximately 77% of participants were documented immigrants, whereas 23% were either undocumented or had an expired/tourist visa.

Participants' primary reasons for immigrating to the U.S. were economic (57.9%), familial (28.6%), political (5.3%), and other (7.9%). More than half of the participants had a high school diploma (57%) and an additional 30% had completed either a bachelor's or a trade school degree. Approximately 66% of participants were unemployed at the time of initial data collection. Among those who were employed (34%), hours worked per week varied ($M = 32.63, SD = 10.50$).

Power analysis. A power analysis was conducted to estimate the statistical power of the present study given the sample size of the parent study ($N=530$). Because hypothesized relations in the present study have not yet been examined previously, an estimated effect size of .03 was used in the power calculation. This choice was supported by a review of the literature on moderating effects in psychology typically report effect sizes of interactions ranging from .01 to .03 (Champoux & Peters, 1987; Chaplin, 1991; Whisman & McClelland, 2005). In the field of
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counseling psychology specifically, a median effect size of $\eta^2 = .033$ was reported for interaction testing (Haase, Martens, Ferrier & Corbett, 2005). Thus, based on an estimated effect size of .03, a sample size of 530, and an alpha level of .05, the present study would have 88% power, exceeding the traditionally accepted statistical power of 80% (Cohen, 1988; Haase, n.d.).

**Design**

The study used an ex-post facto design given that there was no manipulation of variables and no comparison groups. The design consisted of five continuous independent variables (assessing dimensions of one construct – marianismo beliefs), one continuous moderator variable (ethnic identity), and four continuous dependent variables (assessing indicators of acculturative stress). The independent variables, marianismo beliefs, were measured by the subscales of the Marianismo Beliefs Scale (MBS; Castillo et al., 2010). The moderator, ethnic identity commitment, was measured by the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure’s Commitment subscale (MEIM; Phinney, 1992). Acculturative stress was measured by four indicators to enhance construct validity: the Revised Acculturative Stress Scale Total Scale (SAFE-R; Mena et al., 1987), the Revised Hispanic Stress Inventory Frequency and Appraisal Scales (HSI-R; Cervantes et al., 2012), and the Caetano Acculturation Stress Total Scale (Caetano, Ramissetty-Mikler, Vaeth, & Harris, 2007). Seven covariates for the present study included age, level of education, time in U.S., immigration status (documented or undocumented), employment status, personal income, and socioeconomic status (SES) while growing up.

**Instruments**

**Translation of instruments.** As participants were offered (and 100% selected) the option to complete each self-report measure in Spanish, a translated version of each measure was provided. If these measures were not already available and validated in Spanish from previous
research (see following subsections), they were translated into Spanish for the present study. As recommended by Behling and Law (2000), English versions of such measures went through a process of translation and back translation, modified direct translation, and checks for semantic and conceptual equivalence to verify accurate translation from English to Spanish. For modified direct translations, a panel consisting of individuals from Latino subgroups representative of the Miami-Dade County population reviewed the translation for potential within-group variability.

**Marianismo Beliefs Scale.** The Marianismo Beliefs Scale (MBS; Castillo et al., 2010; see Appendix A) is a 24-item self-report measure that assesses the endorsement of traditional Latina gender role beliefs. Items consist of statements regarding what a woman "should" be or do within each dimension of marianismo. Participants' agreement with each item is assessed on a 4-point Likert-type scale, where 1 = *strongly disagree* and 4 = *strongly agree.* The MBS is comprised of five subscales representing the five dimensions of marianismo: Family Pillar (5 items); (e.g., "a source of strength for her family"); Virtuous and Chaste (5 items); (e.g., "be pure"); Subordinate to Others (5 items); (e.g., "not speak out against men"); Silencing Self to Maintain Harmony (6 items); (e.g., "feel guilty about telling people what she needs"); Spiritual Pillar (3 items) (e.g., "responsible for the spiritual growth of the family". Because the MBS was developed based on the conceptualization of marianismo as multidimensional (Castillo et al., 2010), there is no total score. Rather, item-level scores on each scale are averaged to create subscale scores, with higher scores indicating stronger endorsement of the beliefs pertaining to each dimension.

Initial item development for the MBS was based on the review of interdisciplinary literature pertaining to Latina/o cultural values (e.g., marianismo/gender role socialization, familism and respect) along with anecdotal evidence and personal experiences of a small,
“ethnically-mixed” research team (Castillo et al., 2010, p. 166). This process resulted in a pool of 85 items, which was then reviewed and edited to 75 items by mental health practitioners and faculty members considered experts in Latina issues. Statistical analyses (described in the following paragraphs) were then conducted with two samples of Latinas. Both samples \((N = 370)\) consisted primarily of participants identifying as Mexican-American \((N= 326)\), with fewer participants identifying other Latin-American origins (e.g., Central American \([N= 15]\), Puerto Rican \([N= 11]\), and South American \([N= 10]\)); over half of this sample was currently enrolled in university.

The scale was further developed by conducting an exploratory factor analysis with a sample of 181 Latina adults (Castillo et al., 2010). Selected items met the following criteria: (a) a component loading of at least 0.30 without loading onto another factor at or above 0.30; (b) items within each factor were logically related to the other items in that factor; (c) each factor had to consist of at least three items. The EFA met the assumptions for the principal-axis factor analysis with a Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy of 0.78 and the Bartlett’s test of sphericity being significant for each factor at the 0.0001 level (Castillo et al., 2010, p. 168). Based upon Scree Plot analysis and meeting the standard of eigenvalues greater than 1.00, Castillo et al. (2010) determined that the MBS consisted of five factors. Each factor corresponds to the aforementioned marianismo dimensions and subscales and accounts for a different amount of variance: (a) Family Pillar (25.13% of variance); (b) Virtuous and Chaste (13.02% of variance); (c) Subordinate to Other (7.27% of variance); (d) Silencing Self to Maintain Harmony (6.19% of variance); (e) Spiritual Pillar (5.65% of variance).

Next, with a sample of 189 Latina adults, a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was conducted on the retained items as well as to assess the scale's construct validity. Castillo et al.
reported that the results of the five-factor model indicated an adequate fit and a second-order factor structure for the scale was not supported. These results support their multidimensional conceptualization of marianismo. In terms of construct validity, results indicated significant positive correlations between all subscale scores and measures chosen to represent similar values, representing either medium ($r^2 = .30$) or large ($r^2 = .50$) effect sizes, supporting the convergent validity of the MBS.

Data from both samples were used to assess evidence of the internal reliability as well as discriminant and convergent validity of the measure. The Family Pillar, Virtuous and Chaste, Subordinate to Other, Silencing Self to Maintain Harmony, and Spiritual Pillar scales had internal consistency reliabilities of $\alpha = .77$, .79, .76, .78 and .80, respectively. Evidence of discriminant validity was supported in that none of the scales was significantly correlated with scores on a scale of behavioral acculturation (Castillo et al., 2010). The MBS was included in the parent study because it is the only psychometrically supported instrument that exclusively assesses endorsement of marianismo beliefs. In the present study, scores on the Family Pillar, Virtuous and Chaste, Subordinate to Other, Silencing Self to Maintain Harmony, and Spiritual Pillar scales yielded internal consistency reliability coefficients of $\alpha = .92$, .88, .92, .95 and .90, respectively.

**Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure.** The Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM; Phinney, 1992; see Appendix B) is a self-report measure used to assess levels of ethnic identity development. The original measure has been modified slightly (Roberts et al., 1999) and a newer version consists of 12 items, each rated on a 5-point Likert-type scale where 5 = *strongly agree* and 1 = *strongly disagree*. Thus, higher scores are indicative of a greater extent of ethnic identity development. Roberts et al. (1999) posit that the MEIM can best be considered to consist of the
following two factors/subscales: (a) ethnic identity search and (b) affirmation, belonging, and commitment, respectively. Due to the present study’s aim to assess young adult participants’ self-reported commitment to their ethnic identity at the time of data collection, MEIM subscale items corresponding to the affirmation, belonging, and ethnic identity commitment subscale were used. The measure first asks individuals to identify the ethnic group from which they consider themselves to be. The subsequent 12 items consist of statements such as “I have a clear sense of my ethnic background and what it means for me”, “I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group”, and “I have a lot of pride in my ethnic group”. Seven of these 12 items (i.e., items 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 11, and 12) comprise the commitment subscale scores used in the present study.

The Roberts et al. (1999) version of the MEIM was initially validated with a sample of 5,496 adolescent students, 49% of which were female, from over 20 distinctive ethnic groups (e.g., African American \[N= 1,237\], European American \[N= 755\], Mexican American \[N= 755\], and Central American \[N= 253\]). MEIM scores have consistently demonstrated evidence of good reliability in multiple studies, with a median coefficient alpha of .85 (Ponterotto et al., 2003). High internal consistency of MEIM scores has been demonstrated when used with Latina/o samples in particular (Roberts et al., 1999). Scores on this measure have also evidenced convergent validity with relevant concepts such as acculturation (Cuéllar, Nyberg, Maldonado, & Roberts, 1997), ethnic self-concept (Phinney, Chavira & Tate, 1996), and racial identity development (Goodstein, 1994). Ponterotto, Gretchen, Utsey, Stracuzzi, and Saya (2003) determined that the readability of the MEIM (in English) was at a sixth-to seventh-grade level.

Spanish translation of the measure was available at time of data collection. Using a sample of 631 Mexican students aged 17-40, Esteban Guidart (2010) tested the psychometric properties of the Spanish version of the MEIM. Internal consistency alpha coefficients for the
total scale and commitment subscale were .87 and .83, respectively (Esteban Guidart, 2010). This measure was used by the parent study because of its strong psychometric properties and predominance in the empirical literature.

In the present study, commitment subscale scores yielded a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of .98.

**SAFE Acculturative Stress Scale.** The SAFE-R, (Mena, et al., 1987; see Appendix C) is a modified, short version of the original Social, Attitudinal, Familial, Environmental (SAFE) acculturative stress scale. The SAFE-R is a 24-item self-report measure that assesses acculturative stress in social, attitudinal, familial, and environmental contexts in addition to perceived discrimination toward migrant populations. Because the SAFE-R assesses acculturative stress within varied contexts, including those with perceived discrimination, it is considered to be a comprehensive measure of the construct. Each item is rated on a 6-point Likert-type scale where 0 = *did not happen* and 5 = *extremely stressful*. The total score, which was used in the current study, can range from 0-120, with higher scores indicating higher levels of acculturative stress. Items include statements such as “people think I am unsociable when in fact I have trouble communicating in English”, “it bothers me that family members I am close to do not understand my new values”, and “because of my ethnic background, I feel that others exclude me from participating in their activities”.

The revised SAFE scale utilized in the present study was initially validated using a sample of 214 undergraduate students, 118 of which were female. Participants primarily identified as either first, second, or third generation immigrants from a variety of ethnic origins (e.g., Asian [N=61], Hispanic [N=9], and European [N=7]). Evidence of reliability of scores for this multicultural group of students was demonstrated by an alpha coefficient of .89. The nature
of item selection for this abbreviated scale was not detailed by Mena et al. (1987) other than to report that research supported items’ ability to distinguish among intergenerational status. Evidence of adequate internal consistency reliability (.89) and construct validity has consistently been demonstrated for versions of this scale (Fuertes & Westbrook, 1996).

With Latina/o samples in particular, reliability coefficients between .90 and .95 have been calculated for scale scores among samples of varied Latina/o origin and immigrant status (Hovey, 2000) as well as those consisting only of Mexican immigrants (Fuertes & Westbrook, 1996). As suggested by Fuertes and Westbrook (1996), the present study used total SAFE-R scores rather than subscale scores due to the lack of sufficient support for the scale’s multidimensional factor structure. This scale was chosen for use in the present study because it was designed to be sensitive to the particular stressors encountered by acculturating individuals as well as its strong psychometric properties.

In the present study, total scores on the SAFE-R yielded a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of .97.

**Revised Hispanic Stress Inventory.** The Hispanic Stress Inventory (HSI; Cervantes, Padilla, & Salgado de Snyder, 1990; see Appendix D) was revised using qualitative methods due to the significant social and geopolitical changes that occurred over two decades after its initial development (Cervantes et al., 2012). As demonstrated by the findings of the study by Cervantes et al. (2012), these contextual changes had a strong influence on the types and intensity of stressors experienced by Latina/os. Many of these changes were reflected in the relative abundance of new items pertaining to immigration stress. In brief, the items in this inventory were generated with the use of literature reviews, expert interviews and community-based focus groups in order to expand upon the core, theoretical psychosocial stress constructs from the
original HSI (Cervantes et al., 2012). Specifically, focus groups consisted of adult Latina/os residing in either California or Massachusetts, of either Caribbean, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Dominica, Central American, or Mexican backgrounds. They varied in their foreign or U.S.-born status as well as in their ability to speak English (for which a Spanish group was also provided).

Open coding, then axial coding was used to label the emergent concepts from the interviews and focus groups and conceptually refine them. Ph.D.-level researchers acted as coders and separately analyzed the data in this way before reaching consensus (Cervantes et al., 2012). The core themes derived from these processes were later abstracted into stress item stems before evolving into statements directly related to the original content provided (Cervantes et al., 2012). The HSI is unique in that it specifically assesses for the experience and intensity of stressors specific to immigration for Latina/os, particularly those extreme enough to considerably threaten their physical and psychological well-being.

The parent study utilized the Immigration Stress Items derived from Cervantes et al.’s (2012) revision of the HSI. This assessment of immigration-specific stress for Latina/os consisted of 25 two-part self-report items. The first part of each item requires individuals to indicate whether they were exposed to or faced with a particular stressor (0 = not experienced, 1 = experienced). If individuals indicate that they experienced the stressor, the next, related item requires that they rate how grave the stressor was. The second part of each item is rated on a 5-point Likert-type scale where 1 = not at all concerning/stressful and 5 = extremely concerning/stressful; for this scale, 0 is assigned to those who did not experience the stressor. Thus, two types of acculturative stress scores were calculated and used in the current study. The first reflects frequency of acculturative stressors. The second reflects appraisal of that stress. Higher scores indicate higher levels of immigration-related stress for each index. Items include
statements such as “I was without food or water when coming to the U.S.”, “I was forced to pay a "Coyote" to help me”, “I lost contact with family members”, and “I was insulted and treated poorly”.

Evidence of content validity was assessed for all of the items generated by Cervantes et al.’s (2012) qualitative study. Items were reviewed by two (additional) experts in Latina/o mental health and evidence of interrater reliability was assessed; the associated Kappa index coefficient, .55, and Pearson correlation coefficient, .654, were both statistically significant at \( p < .001 \) and \( p < .01 \) respectively. These coefficients supported the authors’ retention of all items generated within the study (Cervantes et al., 2012). This measure was used in the parent study because of its careful development for Latina/o adults, using empirical evidence, expertise, and community-based input regarding their contemporary, culturally-specific, immigration-related stressors.

In the present study, scores on the HSI-Frequency and Appraisal subscales yielded Cronbach’s alpha coefficients of .89 and .88, respectively.

**Caetano Acculturation Stress Scale.** The Caetano Acculturation Stress Scale (Caetano et al., 2007; see Appendix E) is an 11-item self-report measure that assesses the extent to which individuals are experiencing various sources of acculturative stress. Item content for the scale was derived from the work of Mena et al. (1987), Vega and Gill (1999), and Straus (1995) and addresses sources of acculturative stress ranging from problems with communication in English, ethnic and culturally-related adjustment issues, and relational conflicts stemming from changes in values. Each item is rated on a 5-point Likert-type scale where 1= *extremely stressful* and 5= *not at all stressful*. A single total score is recommended and was used in the current study. Thus, lower total scores are indicative of higher levels of acculturative stress. Items include statements such as “it bothers me that my close relatives do not understand my values”, “people think I am
not social, but what happens is that it is hard for me to communicate in English”, and “people underestimate me if I practice my cultural traditions”.

The psychometric properties of the scale were tested using a sample of 1,392 couples, of which 527 couples were Latina/o (Caetano et al., 2007). Scores from the scale demonstrated evidence of high reliability, represented by a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of .86. Additionally, a principal components factor analysis of the scale items revealed a main factor with an Eigen value of 4.7, accounting for 43% of the variance in the data. Loadings on the main factor varied from .412 to .813 (Caetano et al., 2007). The Caetano Acculturation Stress Scale was included in the parent study for its evidence of high reliability and the theoretical basis from which it was developed.

In the present study, total scores on the Caetano Acculturation Stress Scale yielded a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of .97.

**Demographic Questionnaire.** The following demographic variables (collected at baseline in the parent study; see Appendix F) were used as covariates and/or to describe study sample: (a) age (in years); (b) level of education; (c) months in the U.S.; (d) legal/immigration status (i.e., documented or undocumented); (e) country of origin (i.e., Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Republica Dominicana, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay, or Venezuela); (f) primary reason(s) for immigrating (i.e., economic, political, to reunite with family, or other); (g) employment status (i.e., unemployed or employed); (h) personal income; (i) socioeconomic status (SES) while growing up.

**Procedure**

Data for the present study were collected as part of the parent study, which aimed to
identify social and cultural determinants of health risk behaviors in recent Latina immigrants to the U.S. The present study used archived baseline data (i.e. the first wave of data collection) from the longitudinal, parent study. The parent and present study were approved by the Institutional Review Boards of two large universities in the southeastern and northeastern U.S.

**Recruitment.** Respondent driven sampling (RDS; Salganik & Heckthorn, 2003) was used to recruit participants. RDS has demonstrated utility in obtaining samples from populations that are not easily accessible, such as immigrants and individuals whose legal status is undocumented (Salganik & Heckthorn, 2003). The RDS method involves asking each eligible participant (called a seed) to recruit three others in her social network who meet the inclusionary criteria. That is, individuals who consent to participate in a study are asked to refer three other individuals whom they believe may want to take part. This procedure is repeated up to five times, at which point a new seed is sought so as to avoid skewing the sample with participants who are too closely socially interconnected. For the parent study, seed participants were recruited through advertisements at various community-based agencies, Latina/o health fairs, and community activities and online postings in Miami, FL. Interested participants were screened for eligibility.

**Interviews.** Eligible participants were scheduled for an interview. All informed consent procedures and interviews were conducted in Spanish by one of four bilingual Latina research assistants. Interviews were conducted (in volunteer's choice of Spanish or English) rather than a written administration of measures for the benefit and comfort of participants. Individuals were asked to sign an informed consent if they chose to proceed with their involvement in the parent study (see Appendix G). All interviews were conducted in a safe place chosen either by the participant or in a university office. Duration of participation was approximately 60-90 minutes as all data was collected verbally through these interviews.
Prospective participants were informed that the purpose of the study was to learn how different aspects of their lives could influence how much they engage in health risk behaviors during their first years in the U.S. Volunteers were made aware of the large participant pool, the four-year duration of the longitudinal study, and the procedures which included interviews and saliva and urine testing for the presence of drugs and/or STDs. Participants were alerted to the potential risks and/or discomforts associated with the sensitive information elicited as part of the study and were provided with referrals to counseling and medical services. Participants were also alerted to the potential benefits associated with the study including increased self-awareness and screening for health risks. Individuals were also told that their participation was completely voluntary, that they reserved the right to withdraw at any time, and that their responses and test results were confidential. Participants were compensated $45 for the baseline interview, plus an additional $30 for engaging HIV/STDs testing. They were informed they would receive $50, $55, and $60 for the second, third, and fourth waves of data collection, respectively, with the same $30 compensation for testing.

**Analytic Plan**

**Planned preliminary analyses.** First, statistical software was used to assess for accuracy of data entry (e.g. outliers) and missing values (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Participants missing a substantial proportion of data per study variable (i.e., greater than 20% of item-level data per variable measure) were planned to be excluded from analyses (Schlomer, Bauman, & Card, 2010; Peng, Harwell, Liou, & Ehman, 2006). However, descriptive statistics of the variables demonstrated that less than 2% of participants exceed the missing data limit of greater than 20% of item-level data for any study variable (i.e., MBS Subscales: Family Pillar = 0%, Virtuous and Chaste = 0.38%, Subordinate to Other = 0%, Silencing Self to Maintain Harmony = 0%,
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Spiritual Pillar = 0%; MEIM = 0%; SAFE-R =0%; HSI-R Frequency Scale= 0%, HSI-R Appraisal Scale=0%; Caetano Acculturation Stress Scale = 0%; Covariates: Age = 0%, Time in U.S. = 0%, Immigration Status = 1.13%, Education = .19%, Personal Income = 0%, Employment Status = 0%, and SES growing up = .19% ). Thus, nine cases were dropped due to missing scale-level data and 521 cases were used in the analysis.

The following assumptions of a multiple regression analysis were tested: (a) normality, by examination of skewness, kurtosis; (b) linearity; (c) homoscedasticity; (d) outliers; (e) multicollinearity among predictor variables, by examination of correlation matrix that was calculated with all study variables; and (f) independence of data, ensured by study design (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Evidence of discriminant validity among the indicators of acculturative stress (the dependent variable) was also tested for the present study’s sample by examining strength of correlations between indicators of acculturative stress; results are illustrated in Table 1 using Pearson correlation values.

Planned preliminary analyses also included multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVA) to test for between-group differences among regional subgroups by study variables. As participants identified as originating from a variety of Latin-American countries, they were grouped by the following ethnic/regional subgroups: Mexican, South American, Central American, and Caribbean. Any between-group differences were considered in the regression model as a covariate.

**Planned major analyses.** To test the three study hypotheses, four multiple regression analyses were performed for each of the indicators of acculturative stress (i.e., SAFE-R, HSI Frequency and Appraisal Scales, and Caetano Acculturation Stress Scale scores). Based on the results of the assessment of discriminant validity among these distinct indicators of acculturative
stress (see Table 1), the decision to conduct separate analyses for each scale score was maintained.

Given moderation tests of hypothesis three, the scores associated with the independent variables (Marianismo Beliefs Scale (MBS) subscales), and moderator variable (ethnic identity commitment measured by the corresponding MEIM subscale), were standardized to avoid multicollinearity. Once they were standardized, product terms were created to represent the interaction between the independent variables and the moderator (Frazier, Tix, & Barron, 2004). This was done by multiplying the standardized scores on the five MBS subscales with standardized MEIM commitment subscale scores.

All variables were then entered into the multiple regression equation using statistical software (i.e., SPSS) to test for hypothesized direct and moderator effects (Frazier et al., 2004). Covariates (i.e., age; level of education [1 = less than high school, 2 = high school diploma, 3 = some college, 4 = bachelor’s degree, 5 = graduate/professional degree]; time in the U.S.; immigration status [1 = documented, 0 = undocumented]; employment status [1 = employed, 0 = unemployed]; personal income; SES growing up [1 = poorer than others, 2 = same as others, 3 = richer than others]; and region of origin [1 = Central American, 2 = not Central American]) were entered in the first step. Standardized MBS subscale scores were entered in the second step. Standardized MEIM commitment subscale scores were entered in the third step. The product terms between MBS and MEIM commitment subscale scores were entered in the fourth step. To address hypotheses 1 and 2, the direct effects of the independent variables and moderator variable were interpreted before finally testing the significance of the moderator effect and plotting said effect.
If the moderator effects were interpreted as significant, the statistical significance of the slopes of the simple regression lines were also tested (Frazier et al., 2004) to interpret the moderation effects. These regression lines represented the relations between a particular MBS subscale and a particular indicator of acculturative stress at specific levels (i.e., quantified values) of ethnic identity commitment.

Chapter III

Results

Preliminary Analyses

As previously mentioned in Chapter 2, study variables were analyzed to determine whether they violated the assumption of normality. Kline (2015) suggests interpreting the absolute values of skewness (SI) and kurtosis (KI) to check for normality, proposing that variables with absolute values of SI < 3 and KI< 8 meet the assumption of normality. Based on Kline’s (2015) guidelines, all study variables appeared to be reasonably normally distributed. A bivariate correlation matrix, including sample sizes, means and standard deviations for all study variables, is presented in Table 2. Based on Tabachnick and Fidell’s (2013) guideline that correlation coefficients between predictors should be less than .70, the assumption of multicollinearity appeared to be violated between two predictor variables. Scores on the MBS Subscales of Subordinate to Other and Silencing Self to Maintain Harmony had a Pearson correlation coefficient of .88. To address this assumption violation, both predictor variables were merged for inclusion in the hierarchical regression model. The new name of the composite variable is Subordinate/Silencing Self, and the Cronbach alpha reliability estimate for it is .97.

Multivariate analysis of variance. A one-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used to test for between-group differences among regional subgroups by study
variables for consideration in the regression model. The fixed, categorical independent variable was region of origin with four levels. Based on the variety of Latin American countries from which study participants originated, they were grouped by the following regional subgroups: Mexico, South America, Central America, and the Caribbean. The continuous dependent variables were all of the study variables: scores on the five MBS Subscales, scores on the four acculturative stress scales, and scores on the MEIM Commitment Subscale.

The multivariate analysis was significant based on the geographical region from which participants’ originated, $F(30, 1512.30) = 2.59, p < .0005$; Wilk's $\Lambda = .86$, partial $\eta^2 = .05$. Given the significance of the overall test, univariate main effects were examined. The results of the MANOVA are presented in Table 3.

As indicated on Table 3, regions of origin did not have a significant difference in acculturative stress scale scores. Regional differences did have a statistically significant effect on the following MBS subscale scores: Virtuous and Chaste ($F(3, 524) = 8.64; p < .0005$; partial $\eta^2 = .05$), Subordinate to Other ($F(3, 524) = 6.37; p < .0005$; partial $\eta^2 = .04$), Silencing Self to Maintain Harmony ($F(3, 524) = 6.97; p < .0005$; partial $\eta^2 = .04$), and Spiritual Pillar ($F(3, 524) = 3.88; p < .01$; partial $\eta^2 = .02$). Significant ANOVAs were followed up with post-hoc tests with a Bonferroni correction.

Post-hoc tests revealed that mean scores on the Virtuous and Chaste MBS subscale were statistically significantly different between participants who identified as originating from Central American ($M = 3.25, SD = .57$) versus South American ($M = 2.93, SD = .76$) regions ($p=.001$), and participants who identified as originating from Central American versus Caribbean regions ($M = 2.85, SD = .68$) ($p<.0005$).
Mean scores on the Subordinate to Other MBS subscale were statistically significantly
different between participants who identified as originating from Central American \( (M = 2.68, \ SD = .86) \) versus South American regions \( (M = 2.33, \ SD = .83) \) \( (p < .005) \), and participants who
identified as originating from Central American versus Caribbean regions \( (M = 2.29, \ SD = .80) \)
\( (p < .0005) \).

Mean scores on the Silencing Self to Maintain Harmony MBS subscale were statistically
significantly different between participants who identified as originating from Central American
\( (M = 2.52, \ SD = .93) \) versus South American regions \( (M = 2.15, \ SD = .90) \) \( (p < .005) \), and
participants who identified as originating from Central American versus Caribbean regions \( (M = 
2.06, \ SD = .86) \) \( (p < .0005) \).

Lastly, mean scores on the Spiritual Pillar MBS subscale were statistically significantly
different between participants who identified as originating from Central American \( (M = 3.06, \ SD = .71) \) versus South American regions \( (M = 2.76, \ SD = .79) \) \( (p < .01) \).

In summary, the results of the MANOVA indicated that there were significant between-
group differences corresponding to mean scores on four of five MBS subscales for those
participants from Central America when compared to mean scores of participants from other
regions of origin. Therefore, participants’ region of origin was controlled for (along with
covariates) in the first step of the hierarchical regression model after converting it into a
dichotomous variable (i.e. dummy-coded as Central American = 1 and Not Central American = 0).

**Hierarchical Regression Analyses**

As described in Chapter 2, four hierarchical regression analyses were conducted in order
to examine the hypothesized direct and moderating effects on each of the four indices of
acculturative stress. First, before conducting regression analyses, the scores associated with the
independent variables (Marianismo Beliefs Scale (MBS) subscales), and moderator variable (ethnic identity commitment measured by the corresponding MEIM subscale), were standardized to reduce potential multicollinearity in testing moderation (Frazier et al., 2004). Product terms were then created (by multiplying the standardized scores on the five MBS subscales with standardized MEIM commitment subscale scores) to represent the interaction between the independent variables and the moderator (Frazier et al., 2004).

For each of the four regression analyses, predictors were entered sequentially into each equation in four blocks. Covariates (i.e., age, level of education, time in the U.S., immigration status, employment status, personal income, SES growing up, and region of origin) were entered in block 1. Standardized MBS subscale scores were entered in block 2. Standardized MEIM commitment subscale scores were entered in block 3. The product terms between MBS and MEIM commitment subscale scores were entered in block 4. Results of the regression analyses corresponding to each of the four indices of acculturative stress (i.e., scores on the SAFE-R, Caetano Acculturation Stress Scale, HSI-R Frequency Scale, and HSI-R Appraisal Scale) are presented in Tables 4-7 respectively. Any significant moderator effects resulting from the four hierarchical regression analyses are plotted and presented in Figures 2-6.

**Regression model for SAFE-R.** Examination of Table 4 indicated that the overall set of predictors was highly related to acculturative stress as indicated by SAFE-R scores, accounting for 41.6% of variability in SAFE-R scores, $F (17, 504) = 21.09, p<.0005$.

**Direct effects for SAFE-R.** Several of the hypothesized predictors were significant in the penultimate step of the model, indicating that these predictors had significant direct effects even after controlling for the others. These effects included the following: (a) time in the U.S. ($\beta = .14, p<.0005$); (b) employment status ($\beta = .22, p<.0005$); (c) personal income ($\beta = -.26,$
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(d) immigration status ($\beta = .09, p = .02$); (e) MBS Subordinate/ Silencing Self subscale scores ($\beta = -.38, p < .0005$); (f) MBS Family Pillar subscale scores ($\beta = .25, p < .0005$); (g) MEIM Commitment subscale scores ($\beta = .15, p < .0005$). Participants who were employed, documented, spent more time in the U.S., had lower personal income, endorsed fewer subordinate/silencing self marianismo beliefs, endorsed more family pillar marianismo beliefs, or reported having higher levels of ethnic identity commitment were more likely to report experiencing more acculturative stress on the SAFE-R.

**Moderation effects for SAFE-R.** Table 4 also shows that the addition of the interaction terms between MBS subscale scores and MEIM Commitment subscale scores explained 1.3% of incremental variance in SAFE-R scores ($F$ for $\Delta R^2 = 2.87, p < .05$). MEIM Commitment Subscale scores had a significant moderating effect on the significant relation between Subordinate/ Silencing Self MBS subscale scores and SAFE-R scores ($\beta = -.20, p < .005$). As indicated in Figure 2, higher ethnic identity commitment (as measured by MEIM Commitment subscale scores) strengthened the negative link between subordinate/silencing self marianismo beliefs and acculturative stress (as measured by Subordinate/Silencing Self MBS subscale scores and those on the SAFE-R, respectively). Additionally, MEIM Commitment Subscale scores had a significant moderating effect on the significant relation between Family Pillar MBS subscale scores and SAFE-R scores. As indicated in Figure 3, higher levels of ethnic identity commitment (as measured by MEIM Commitment subscale scores) attenuated the positive link between family pillar marianismo beliefs and acculturative stress (as measured by Family Pillar MBS subscale scores and those on the SAFE-R, respectively) when controlling for covariates.

**Regression model for Caetano Acculturation Stress Scale.** Examination of Table 5 indicated that the overall set of predictors was related to acculturative stress as indicated by
scores on the Caetano Acculturation Stress Scale, accounting for 7.5% of variability, $F (17, 504) = 1.91, p=.001$.

**Direct effects for Caetano Acculturation Stress Scale.** Several of the hypothesized predictors were significant in the penultimate step of the model, indicating that these predictors had significant direct effects even after controlling for the others. These effects included age ($\beta = .09, p=.05$), MBS Spiritual Pillar subscale scores ($\beta = .13, p=.05$), and MBS Subordinate/Silencing Self subscale scores ($\beta = .13, p<.05$). Of note, the direction of these relations was interpreted inversely due to the nature of scoring for this scale (in which lower scores are indicative of higher levels of acculturative stress). Thus, participants who were younger, endorsed fewer spiritual pillar marianismo beliefs, and endorsed fewer subordinate/silencing self marianismo beliefs were more likely to report experiencing more acculturative stress on the Caetano Acculturation Stress Scale.

**Moderation effects for Caetano Acculturation Stress Scale.** Table 5 also shows that the addition of the interaction terms between MBS subscale scores and MEIM Commitment subscale scores explained 3% of incremental variance in Caetano Acculturation Stress Scale scores ($F$ for $\Delta R^2 = 3.81, p =.005$). MEIM Commitment Subscale scores had a significant moderating effect on the relation between Family Pillar MBS subscale scores and scores on the Caetano Acculturation Stress Scale ($\beta = -.40, p <.05$). Figure 4 shows an interaction in which the direction of the negative relation between family pillar marianismo beliefs and acculturative stress (as measured by Family Pillar MBS subscale scores and those on the Caetano Acculturation Stress Scale, respectively) was reversed for participants with high ethnic identity commitment (as measured by MEIM Commitment subscale scores) when controlling for covariates.
**Regression model for HSI-R Frequency Subscale.** Examination of Table 6 indicated that the overall set of predictors was highly related to acculturative stress as indicated by HSI-R Frequency Subscale scores, accounting for 24.5% of variability, \( F(17, 504) = 9.60, p<.0005. \)

**Direct effects for HSI-R Frequency Subscale.** Several of the hypothesized predictors were significant in the penultimate step of the model, indicating that these predictors had significant direct effects even after controlling for the others. These effects included the following: (a) employment status (\( \beta = .14, p<.01 \)); (b) SES growing up (\( \beta = -.11, p<.01 \)); (c) MBS Subordinate/Silencing Self subscale scores (\( \beta = -.31, p<.0005 \)); (d) MBS Family Pillar subscale scores (\( \beta = .24, p<.0005 \)); (e) MEIM Commitment subscale scores (\( \beta = .13, p=.005 \)). Participants who were employed, reported a lower SES while growing up, endorsed fewer subordinate/silencing self marianismo beliefs, endorsed more family pillar marianismo beliefs, and reported having higher levels of ethnic identity commitment were more likely to report experiencing more acculturative stress on the HSI-R Frequency Subscale.

**Moderation effects for HSI-R Frequency Subscale.** Table 6 also shows that the addition of the interaction terms between MBS subscale scores and MEIM Commitment subscale scores explained 2% of incremental variance in HSI-R Frequency Subscale scores (\( F \) for \( \Delta R^2 = 2.59, p < .05 \)). MEIM Commitment Subscale scores had a significant moderating effect on the significant relation between Subordinate/ Silencing Self MBS subscale scores and HSI-R Frequency Subscale scores (\( \beta = -.19, p<.05 \)). As indicated in Figure 5, higher ethnic identity commitment (as measured by MEIM Commitment subscale scores) strengthened the negative link between subordinate/silencing self marianismo beliefs and acculturative stress (as measured by Subordinate/Silencing Self MBS subscale scores and those on the HSI-R Frequency Subscale, respectively) when controlling for covariates.
Regression model for HSI-R Appraisal Subscale. Examination of Table 7 indicated that the overall set of predictors was highly related to acculturative stress as indicated by HSI-R Appraisal Subscale scores, accounting for 43.3% of variability, $F(17, 504) = 22.60, p<.0005$.

Direct effects for HSI-R Appraisal Subscale. Several of the hypothesized predictors were significant in the penultimate step of the model, indicating that these predictors had significant direct effects even after controlling for the others. These effects included the following: (a) time in the U.S. ($\beta = .16, p<.0005$); (b) employment status ($\beta = .25, p<.0005$); (c) personal income ($\beta = -.18, p<.0005$); (d) MBS Subordinate/Silencing Self subscale scores ($\beta = -.41, p<.0005$); (f) MBS Family Pillar subscale scores ($\beta = .32, p<.0005$); (g) MEIM Commitment subscale scores ($\beta = .11, p<.01$). Participants who were employed, spent relatively more time in the U.S., had lower personal income, endorsed fewer subordinate/silencing self marianismo beliefs, endorsed more family pillar marianismo beliefs, and reported having higher levels of ethnic identity commitment were more likely to report experiencing more acculturative stress on the HSI-R Appraisal Subscale.

Moderation Effects for HSI-R Appraisal Subscale. Table 7 also shows that the addition of the interaction terms between MBS subscale scores and MEIM Commitment subscale scores explained 4% of incremental variance in HSI-R Appraisal Subscale scores ($F$ for $\Delta R^2 = 4.18, p < 0.05$). MEIM Commitment Subscale scores had a significant moderating effect on the significant relation between Subordinate/Silencing Self MBS subscale scores and HSI-R Appraisal Subscale scores ($\beta = -.19, p<.005$). As indicated in Figure 6, higher ethnic identity commitment (as measured by MEIM Commitment subscale scores) strengthened the negative link between subordinate/silencing self marianismo beliefs and acculturative stress (as measured by
Subordinate/Silencing Self MBS subscale scores and those on the HSI-R Appraisal Subscale, respectively) when controlling for covariates.

**Results Summary**

**Hypothesis 1.** It was predicted in Hypothesis 1 that MBS subscale scores would be positively related to acculturative stress levels indicated by the SAFE-R, Caetano Acculturation Stress Scale, HSI-R Frequency subscale and HSI-R Appraisal subscale when controlling for covariates (e.g. age, time spent in the U.S., employment status, immigration status, education level, personal income, and SES growing up). This hypothesis was partially supported within three of the regression models; scores on the Family Pillar MBS subscale were positively related to scores on the SAFE-R, HSI-R Frequency, and HSI-R Appraisal subscales, respectively, when controlling for covariates. Unexpectedly, scores on Subordinate to Other and Silencing Self to Maintain Harmony MBS subscale were negatively related with higher levels of acculturative stress (as indicated by scores on the SAFE-R, Caetano Acculturation Stress Scale, HSI-R Frequency, and HSI-R Appraisal subscales), when controlling for covariates. Scores on the Spiritual Pillar MBS subscale were also negatively related to higher levels of acculturative stress (as indicated by scores on the Caetano Acculturation Stress Scale) when controlling for covariates.

**Hypothesis 2.** It was predicted in Hypothesis 2 that MEIM Commitment subscale scores would be negatively related to acculturative stress levels as indicated by scores on the SAFE-R, Caetano Acculturation Stress Scale, HSI-R Frequency subscale and HSI-R Appraisal subscale when controlling for covariates. The significant results within three of the regression models contradicted the direction of the hypothesized relation. Scores on the MEIM Commitment
subscale were positively related to scores on the SAFE-R, HSI-R Frequency, and HSI-R Appraisal subscales, respectively, when controlling for covariates.

**Hypothesis 3.** It was predicted in Hypothesis 3 that the positive relation between MBS subscale scores and scores on the SAFE-R, Caetano Acculturation Stress Scale, HSI-R Frequency subscale and HSI-R Appraisal subscale would be moderated (i.e. weakened) by endorsement of greater ethnic identity commitment (the MEIM Commitment subscale). The regression model corresponding to the SAFE-R scale indicated that ethnic identity commitment had a significant moderating effect on the relation between Family Pillar MBS subscale scores and those on its measure of acculturative stress, such that participants who endorsed less family pillar marianismo beliefs experienced less acculturative stress when less committed to their ethnic identity. Additionally, the regression model corresponding to the Caetano Acculturation Stress Scale indicated that ethnic identity commitment had a significant moderating effect on the relation between Family Pillar MBS subscale scores and those on its measure of acculturative stress, such that endorsing higher levels of ethnic identity commitment protected against acculturative stress for participants who endorsed less family pillar marianismo beliefs. The regression models corresponding to the SAFE-R, HSI-R Frequency, and HSI-R Appraisal subscales indicated that ethnic identity commitment also had a significant moderating effect on the relation between Subordinate/Silencing Self MBS subscale scores and those on the corresponding measure of acculturative stress, such that participants endorsing less subordinate/silencing self marianismo beliefs experienced more acculturative stress when more strongly committed to their ethnic identity.
Chapter IV

Discussion

The present study examined the relations among five dimensions of marianismo beliefs and four indices of acculturative stress, as they are moderated by ethnic identity commitment and provided insight into the experience of young adult recent Latina immigrants. Findings revealed nuanced relations among dimensions of marianismo and indices of acculturative stress. The findings supported the multidimensional conceptualization of marianismo (Castillo et al., 2010) due to the varying ways in which each dimension of marianismo was related to each index of acculturative stress. Similarly, the discrepant nature of the direct relations between dimensions of marianismo and indices of acculturative stress supported the use of multiple measures of acculturative stress and marianismo to capture the breadth of the constructs. Along with providing evidence to support a link between different dimensions of marianismo beliefs and acculturative stress, the present study’s findings also provided evidence to support a positive relation between ethnic identity commitment and acculturative stress. Moreover, ethnic identity commitment appeared to augment relations between dimensions of marianismo beliefs and acculturative stress. The following section details the results of the present study in the context of each study hypothesis.

Interpretations and Implications

Covariates. For those covariates found to be significantly related to acculturative stress (i.e. age, time spent in the U.S., employment status, immigration status, personal income, and SES growing up), the relation was not consistent across all indices as indicators assessed for varying sources/aspects of acculturative stress. Nevertheless, findings revealed that participants who were employed tended to endorse experiencing more acculturative stress on some indices. It
can be reasoned that the work environment applies additional pressure to acculturate as it may require more social interaction and expectations of professionalism and performance in the context of the host culture. This pressure to acculturate may be interpreted as more distressing due to the potential financial consequences of not meeting expectations in the workplace. Participants who reported lower personal income and lower SES growing up were also more likely to report experiencing higher levels of acculturative stress. As adjusting to a new culture requires social resources (Torres, 2010; Berry, 2006), it can be argued that fewer financial resources, and/or the pressure associated with maintaining financial resources through employment in a new country, could contribute to acculturative stress. These significant correlations were detected by those indices that measured stress related to occupational and economic stress in particular, such as the SAFE-R and HSI-R subscales.

Another covariate found to be related to acculturative stress was immigration status. It was found that participants who identified themselves as legally documented endorsed experiencing more acculturative stress on one index. This finding is inconsistent with previous findings, such as those by Arbona et al. (2010) and Sanchez et al. (2012), which suggested that undocumented immigration status contributed to higher levels of acculturative stress. It can be theorized that, for this sample, documentation status imposed additional expectations and requirements, particularly through its contingency upon factors measured by the SAFE-R such as employment, academic studies, and/or dependence upon a spouse/family member that made adjusting to the U.S. more difficult.

Results also indicated that younger participants reported experiencing more acculturative stress according to one index. While immigration at a later age has been associated with increased acculturative stress among Latina/os (Padilla et al., 1986), these findings suggested
that the relation between age and experience of acculturative stress may be more nuanced. As the youngest participants in this sample were 18 years old, it can be argued that their developmental stage (having just reached legal adulthood) and its significant role in identity formation (Phinney et al., 2001) complicated the acculturation process. This complication may have been due, at least in part, to relational conflict (with family) stemming from changes in values, for which the Caetano Acculturation Stress Scale specifically assesses. Younger participants’ experience of acculturative stress may have also been influenced by having to take on more responsibilities upon immigration to the U.S. than that which would have been expected in their country of origin at their age.

Finally, study results demonstrated that participants having spent relatively more time in the U.S. tended to report experiencing more acculturative stress on some indices. This finding is consistent with those supporting the “Hispanic Paradox” (Markides & Coreil, 1986), which suggested that that more time in the U.S. is related to worse health outcomes due to the protective role of Latina/o values; it has been suggested that health risk behaviors are a result of acculturative stress from the deterioration of Latino family values (Gil, Wagner, & Vega, 2000). It is also possible that adhering to Latina/o values for longer periods of time in the U.S. could contribute to a greater sense of dissonance and experiences of perceived discrimination, which can also contribute to acculturative stress (Berry, 1997; Mena, Padilla, & Maldonado, 1987). Additionally, this sample of Latinas spent a maximum of 3 years in the U.S. at the time of data collection and it has been suggested that immigrants are most likely to experience acculturative stress within the first two years of immigration (Gil & Vega, 1996). Findings such as those by Bekteshi and Hook (2015) also suggest the importance of context in that positive feelings around having immigrated can play a role in Latina/os experiencing less acculturative stress over time in
the U.S. Thus, future research would benefit from assessing for participants’ cultural values and attitudes as well as how they may shift over time when investigating risk and protective factors of acculturative stress.

**Are dimensions of marianismo related to different indices of acculturative stress?**

Results of the present study only partially supported this hypothesis as not all marianismo beliefs were significantly, positively related to acculturative stress. For this sample of young adult recent Latina immigrants, endorsing more family pillar marianismo beliefs (i.e. those consistent with being the source of strength for her family) was linked with higher levels of acculturative stress on most indices. This was consistent with Raffaelli and Ontai’s (2004) suggestion that the Latino cultural value of *familismo* is an integral part of the Latina gender role as well as Castillo et al.’s (2010) claim that Latinas are expected to provide physical and emotional support to their family. Latinas’ dedication and attachment to family along with the cultural expectation to care for them can require a great deal of personal resources (Castillo & Cano, 2007; Triandis & Trafimow, 2001). It can be reasoned that during a complex transition, such as immigration, the depletion of additional physical and emotional resources due to being a strength to the collective and not only to oneself could potentially result in more acculturative stress. Future research would benefit from further understanding the dialectical nature of Latinas’ relationship to and with their families. While Latinas tend to value and, thus, prioritize their family, the act of doing so can be taxing. Clinical practice can validate this cultural value while also encouraging exploration of the ways in which it influences Latina clients’ well-being. Clinicians can therefore be more informed in supporting Latina clients in managing the acculturative stress that may be associated with their responsibility to their family.
Contrastingly, participants who endorsed more subordinate to other and silencing self to maintain harmony marianismo beliefs (i.e. those related to self-sacrifice and not expressing personal needs or feeling guilty if needs are expressed) reported experiencing less acculturative stress. The direction of this relation is contrary to that predicted. It was hypothesized that endorsing more marianismo beliefs would relate to more acculturative stress as psychological and social hardship can be an outcome of conflict between traditional Latina gender roles and those of women in the U.S. (Gil, 1996; Nuñez, et al., 2016). It is possible that participants’ tendency to self-silence extended to their participation within the study. In other words, those who endorsed more subordinate/silencing self marianismo beliefs were more likely to minimize and/or underreport their experience of acculturative stress across all measures. Conversely, it is also possible that the cultural shift to the U.S., in which there is a feminist movement gaining traction and encouraging women to speak out, had a particularly protective impact on these Latina women’s experience of acculturative stress. Participants who endorsed beliefs regarding self-sacrifice may have especially benefited from entering a more egalitarian host culture that fosters independence for women (Castillo et al., 2010). Researchers and clinicians would benefit from being attuned to the way in which marianismo beliefs may influence Latinas’ response style. Future research could benefit from accounting for this cultural tendency and host country’s sociopolitical climate in the development of instruments assessing Latinas’ experience and/or the interpretation of related results. Within clinical practice, providers working with Latina clients may be more effective when attuned to the cultural value placed on subordination and self-silencing for the benefit of others. Knowledge of these cultural tendencies/values may increase clinicians’ awareness of the influence of power dynamics on treatment progress. Therefore,
clinicians may choose to implement interventions that empower Latina clients to disclose distress more openly within treatment and explore the impact of self-sacrifice on their mental health.

Finally, participants who endorsed more spiritual pillar marianismo beliefs (i.e. those related to being the spiritual leader of the family) reported experiencing less acculturative stress on one index. While the spiritual pillar dimension of marianismo has been associated with higher levels of negative cognitions and emotions among Latinas (Nuñez, et al., 2016), it has also been suggested that religious support protects against acculturative stress among Latina/os (Finch & Vega, 2003). Stronger marianismo beliefs around spirituality may suggest more religiosity, thus, more likelihood of using religion as a coping mechanism to ameliorate acculturative stress. Conversely, due to the prominence of religion within Latina/o culture, it can be reasoned that participants who diverge from cultural religious standards and/or choose not to be responsible for the family’s spiritual growth experience more acculturative stress due to the conflict it creates within their family. Future directions of research may focus on clarifying the role of spirituality/religiosity in Latina immigrant’s experience of acculturative stress as a significant relation was not detected on most indices of acculturative stress. Gaining a better understanding of whether spiritual pillar beliefs impact acculturative stress through their role within the family or through their ability to contribute to coping strategies can inform therapeutic interventions implemented with Latina clients.

Overall, the measurement of marianismo beliefs requires future empirical study to ensure construct validity. As the samples with which the Marianismo Beliefs Scale (Castillo et al., 2010) was validated almost exclusively identified as Mexican/Mexican-American, it is possible that its factor structure does not apply for all Latina sub-groups, such as those represented in the
present study’s sample. Thus, future research should assess measurement invariance across Latina subgroups.

**Is ethnic identity commitment related to different indices of acculturative stress?**

For this sample of young adult recent Latina immigrants, endorsing stronger ethnic identity commitment corresponded to experiencing higher levels of acculturative stress as measured by most indices. While commitment to one’s ethnic identity has been classified as a personal resource and source of strength, helping Latina/os to cope with the negative effects of stress (both cultural and otherwise) (Umaña-Taylor, Updegraff, & Gonzales-Backen, 2011; Unger, 2015), it has been reasoned that stronger ethnic identity commitment can also reduce Latina/o’s perceived need to integrate elements of U.S. culture into their own (Kim et al., 2014). Likewise, strong identification with their ethnic group could make Latina/os more sensitive to group threat (Kim et al., 2014). Thus, it is possible that stronger ethnic identity commitment was significantly related to higher levels of acculturative stress because of the cultural clash commonly experienced as part of immigration. In the future, researchers can more comprehensively assess the role of ethnic identity commitment, particularly in the context of immigration, in order to gain a more nuanced understanding of its potential to hinder Latinas’ acculturation process and contribute to related distress. Clinicians treating Latina clients, particularly those clients suffering from acculturative stress, would benefit from attending to clients’ self-reported commitment to their ethnic identity. Clinicians can promote insight and increase clients’ awareness around the ways in which their ethnic identity commitment influences their adjustment to the U.S.; they may use this insight to implement a strengths-based approach that supports Latina clients in integrating aspects of U.S. culture without foregoing valued aspects of their identity.
Are the relations among dimensions of marianismo and different indices of acculturative stress moderated by ethnic identity commitment? It was predicted that stronger ethnic identity commitment would buffer against acculturative stress for participants who endorsed more marianismo beliefs. While study results revealed significant moderation effects, the role of ethnic identity commitment was not as predicted.

Specifically, participants who endorsed less subordinate/silencing self marianismo beliefs reported more acculturative stress on most indices, especially when more committed to their Latina identity. These findings are consistent with the aforementioned notion that ethnic identity commitment can serve as a barrier to effective adjustment to the U.S. and contribute to acculturative stress through increasing sensitivity to group threat and decreasing perceived need to integrate U.S. and Latino/a cultures (Kim et al., 2014). Continued research on the role of ethnic identity commitment in the development and experience of acculturative stress could further clarify the mechanisms through which commitment to Latina identity can interfere with adaptive acculturation. A better understanding of these mechanisms can shape interventions delivered in treatment of Latina clients presenting with acculturative stress. Thus, treatment could focus on the mechanism (e.g., sensitivity to discrimination, perceived need to acculturate) to reduce acculturative stress rather than reduction of ethnic identity commitment. These findings also point toward the importance of properly accounting for context when engaging in research or clinical practice around ethnic identity commitment.

Ethnic identity commitment also significantly moderated the relationship between family pillar marianismo beliefs and acculturative stress, however, the nature of the moderation effect varied across indices of acculturative stress. The influence of family pillar marianismo beliefs on acculturative stress (as measured by the Caetano Acculturation stress scale) was different at
different levels of ethnic identity commitment. Stronger commitment to Latina identity protected against acculturative stress for participants who endorsed less family pillar marianismo beliefs and less ethnic identity commitment was protective for those who endorsed more family pillar marianismo beliefs. Moreover, less commitment to Latina identity was a risk factor for acculturative stress for participants who endorsed less family pillar marianismo beliefs and stronger ethnic identity commitment was a risk factor for those who endorsed more family pillar marianismo beliefs. In other words, participants’ acculturation experience benefited from more strongly endorsing either family pillar marianismo beliefs or ethnic identity commitment; endorsing neither or both of these variables contributed to acculturative stress.

Contrastingly, participants who endorsed less family pillar marianismo beliefs reported less acculturative stress (when measured by the SAFE-R), especially when they reported less commitment to Latina identity, suggesting that less commitment to Latina identity could be protective for acculturating Latinas who endorsed less belief in a sense of responsibility for their family. These mixed findings emphasize the need for further research to clarify the contexts (e.g. social, psychological, familial) in which ethnic identity commitment can facilitate or hinder the acculturation process. While the SAFE-R and the Caetano Acculturation Stress Scale both assess for acculturative stress, the SAFE-R assesses acculturative stress in social, attitudinal, familial, and environmental contexts in addition to perceived discrimination toward migrant populations while the more concise Caetano scale assesses sources of acculturative stress ranging from problems with communication in English, ethnic and culturally-related adjustment issues, and relational conflicts stemming from changes in values. Variations in results based on assessment of acculturative stress are consistent with Berry’s (2005) assertion that it is an inclusive, complex concept that exists in the context of multiple cultural encounters.
Nevertheless, findings suggested that in the context of stronger commitment to Latina identity, family pillar marianismo beliefs were associated with higher levels of acculturative stress for participants. These findings suggested that more endorsement of family pillar marianismo beliefs was related to more acculturative stress not only because family responsibilities deplete personal resources, but also because commitment to a culture that holds these beliefs in high esteem can place additional pressure on Latina immigrants. While the family pillar dimension of marianismo has been linked to higher levels of negative cognitions and emotions (Nuñez, et al., 2016), studies have reiterated the cultural value of familism for Latinas (Badger, et al., 2017; Castillo et al., 2010; Raffaelli & Ontai, 2004). Further attention to the role of identification with broader cultural values/expectations in experiencing acculturative stress for this sample of Latina immigrants is warranted due to the complexity of these relations.

The consequences of endorsing family pillar marianismo beliefs, particularly in the process of adjusting from a traditionally collectivistic culture to a traditionally individualistic culture, should be taken into account by researchers and clinicians. Future research can hone in on the conflict experienced by Latina immigrants in upholding beliefs that are culturally valued at a personal cost. Clinicians working with Latina clients would benefit from being cognizant of the potential obstacles Latinas face due to personal pressures and cultural expectations around their familial responsibilities. At the same time, it should be noted that strong ethnic identity commitment and/or strong endorsement of marianismo beliefs are not to be pathologized or intervened with in the absence of environmental/contextual considerations. Clinicians can address Latina client’s relationship with their beliefs and the impact of said beliefs rather than seeking to change clients’ values. For example, it is possible to empower Latina clients to integrate values from their culture of origin and their host culture as they see fit; they can be
supported in making the choice to endorse and adhere to ethnic values of personal importance while foregoing those they feel are detrimental. It is important for clinicians to avoid oversimplifying the impact of ethnic identity and traditional gender role beliefs. Clinicians and researchers should be mindful that while marianismo beliefs are a component of the Latina identity, commitment to marianismo beliefs should not be assumed based on commitment to ethnic identity and vice versa.

The relations among traditional Latina gender roles and the experience of acculturative stress as they are moderated by ethnic identity commitment are complex and warrant further examination. Future research can replicate and extend the present study in various ways. For example, the sample can be compared to Latinas who immigrated to a different region of the U.S., Latinas of other age groups, other generations of Latina immigrants, or their White female counterparts. The body of literature would benefit from a similar study conducted with a sample of Latinos, investigating the role of machismo in this context. Subsequent studies can also examine changes in the study variables and their relations over time.

**Contributions, Limitations, and Recommendations**

**Contributions.** The present study addressed a gap in the literature regarding the role and impact of marianismo as a multidimensional construct in the lives of recent Latina young adult immigrants. The extant literature examining marianismo beliefs is limited in several ways (Miville, Mendez, & Louie, 2017). Namely, the empirical studies on marianismo have failed to specifically take into account the ways in which marianismo beliefs are related to acculturative stress or within the context of the broader ethnic identity of Latinas.

Addressing this gap in the literature has helped to fulfill the need for building toward multifactorial acculturative stress and coping models (Berry, 2005; Church, 1982) that will
increase understanding of the acculturative process (Kimber, Courturier, Georgiades, Wahoush, & Jack, 2014). The large sample of recent Latina immigrant young adults of varied origin countries was unique to the present study. The age range (18-23 years) and recent immigration status of the sample also helped to reduce confounding variables related to age and acculturation. Moreover, although the study collected a wealth of quantitative data, personal/culturally respectful one-on-one interviews were used to collect this data in the participants’ language of preference.

Additionally, many studies of marianismo involve small samples (commonly fewer than 100 Latina participants), usually with Latinas from a single national heritage, and/or most of whom were not immigrants (see Aranda, Castaneda, Lee & Sobel, 2001; Caplan & Whittemore, 2013; Cespedes & Huey, 2008; Cianelli, Ferrer & McElmurry, 2008; Hernandez & Wallace, 2014; Moreno, 2007; Rodriguez et al. 2013). With the exception of Castillo et al.’s (2010) instrument (MBS), marianismo beliefs have been measured inconsistently throughout the extant literature, using quantitative measures that have not been psychometrically validated, qualitative methodology, or merely theoretically by means of other gender-related variables (see Aranda et al., 2011; Caplan & Whittemore, 2013; D’Alonzo, 2012; Kulis et al., 2003; Miville, et al., 2017; Rivera-Marano, 2000; Moreno, 2007). This lack of consistency in the conceptualization and measurement of marianismo has also made it difficult to draw valid conclusions based on the extant literature, with some studies assessing these beliefs unidimensionally and others measuring them multidimensionally. Furthermore, it is often unclear whether past studies implemented culturally sensitive data collection (e.g. whether participants were assessed according to language of preference, using validated measures in Spanish language, provided a safe space in which to be assessed).
The results of the present study provided additional evidence supporting the varying roles of marianismo beliefs, thus confirming the importance of utilizing a multidimensional conceptualization of marianismo. The study findings also challenged theories suggesting that ethnic identity commitment can serve as a buffer against the experience of acculturative stress (Umaña-Taylor, Updegraff, & Gonzales-Backen, 2011; Unger, 2015) and pointed toward a more nuanced relation between cultural beliefs/commitment and acculturative stress for Latina immigrants. Moreover, the present study utilized four different indices in an attempt to capture the breadth of acculturative stress experiences. The differential relations between dimensions of marianismo beliefs and indices of acculturative stress suggested that they may be attributed to the multifaceted nature of both constructs. Results helped clarify the nature of these relations among young adult recent Latina immigrants. In terms of practice, this information can sensitize counselors to the multidimensional nature of marianismo beliefs and encourage them to explore these beliefs (as well as identity commitment related to a culture that promotes these beliefs) with Latina clients. Beyond individual work with Latina clients, mental health professionals may apply this information to the development of prevention programming as acculturative stress is considered to be a predecessor to clinical levels of depression and anxiety among other issues.

**Limitations.** Despite the present study’s contributions to a more nuanced understanding of young adult recent Latina immigrants’ beliefs, identity, and acculturation experience, it also had its limitations. Due to the ex post facto design, causality could not be determined. Additionally, the cross-sectional design did not allow for developmental inferences. The exclusive use of self-report data also introduced a mono-method bias (Shadish, Cook, & Campbell, 2012). The body of research dedicated to the understanding the role of traditional gender role beliefs, ethnic identity commitment, and acculturative stress for young adult recent
Latina immigrant would be enriched by incorporating a variety of methodologies—specifically, longitudinal study designs and those that utilize a variety of data sources so that additional inferences may be made.

Self-report data can be influenced by contextual factors. Since the measures required participants to provide information about their cultural beliefs, ethnic identity, and stress levels related to personal context, social desirability effects may have influenced the obtained data. Depending on the order in which participants completed the assessments, the Marianismo Beliefs Scale could have had a priming effect if being reminded of culturally determined gender roles influenced participants’ disclosure of information about behaviors inconsistent with those beliefs. Researchers assessing these variables may account for this potential priming effect by randomizing the order in which self-report measures are administered as well as attending to the ways in which participants’ endorsed beliefs may influence their response style.

Additionally, the MBS is limited in that it can only provide information regarding the extent to which participants endorsed marianismo beliefs at a specific point in time; the scale does not inquire about past beliefs nor future intentions. Whether participants adhere to these beliefs or feel culturally pressured to endorse these beliefs was not assessed. Further understanding the relation between marianismo beliefs and cultural identity is warranted. Additionally, the MBS Subordinate to Other and Silencing Self to Maintain Harmony subscales were consolidated within the present study due to their strong correlation between one another; this implies the need for future research to further refine the conceptualization of marianismo beliefs. This conclusion is particularly salient in the context of Miville et al.’s (2017) call for more rigorous, culturally-based gender role measures to be developed.

Moreover, representative sampling was not necessarily ensured even though the use of
respondent driven sampling has been successful for recruiting hidden populations such as undocumented immigrants (Passel & Cohn, 2011). A self-selection bias could also be a limitation of the present study. Volunteers for the study may have been women who were more comfortable in the U.S. than other immigrants and/or more open to sharing personal information including their cultural beliefs and stressors.

Although efforts were made to recruit a heterogeneous Latina/o sample, representative of major Latina/o subgroups, some groups were represented more than others due to the unique population landscape in the geographical area in which they were recruited. The group of participants in the present study were representative of Latina/os living in South Florida but not the larger United States (U.S. Census Bureau, 2015). This may have influenced results in ways not accounted for by analyses. For example, Miami-Dade County constitutes as an ethnic enclave (with 67.7% of the population identifying as Latina/o) (U.S. Census Bureau, 2016), which may facilitate stronger ethnic identity commitment and slow the acculturation process. Additionally, the most represented group of participants identified as Cuban (34%); their U.S. immigration terms and process tend to differ from those of other ethnicities. Moreover, Cuban culture is influenced by its status as a socialist country and one of the only Latin American countries who allows abortion without restriction and provides free contraceptives. While Cuba was formally a bastion of Catholicism and the majority of Cubans continue to identify as Roman Catholic, the government’s regulations are not influenced by this religion and, thus, may influence the ways in which Cuban Latinas endorse marianismo beliefs influenced by said religion. Future research should consider participants’ country of origin as well as the U.S. state to which they immigrate (as culture can vary among regions) when designing and identifying target populations for studies. Moreover, additional demographic data regarding relevant cultural
identities (e.g. religious affiliation) should be collected within future research given its overlap with marianismo.

While the results of the present study provided inconsistent support for study hypotheses, they provided valuable insight into the relations that were examined. There is a dearth of literature focusing on gender role-specific predictors of acculturative stress for recent Latina immigrants. The present study’s findings began to clarify the nature of the relations between dimensions of marianismo beliefs and indices of acculturative stress along with the direct and moderating role of ethnic identity commitment. The nature of these findings confirmed the need for more research on this topic.
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Tables and Figures

Figure 1. Hypothesized model.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Scores</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. SAFE-R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Caetano Acculturation Stress Scale</td>
<td>-.174</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. HSI-R: Frequency Scale</td>
<td>.504</td>
<td>-.243</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. HSI-R: Appraisal Scale</td>
<td>.617</td>
<td>-.165</td>
<td>.736</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. *Correlations among Indicators of Acculturative Stress Scale Scores*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Age</td>
<td>20.81</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>530</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Time in U.S.</td>
<td>11.51</td>
<td>9.94</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>0.15</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>3. Employment status</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>0.077**</td>
<td>0.014</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>4. Education level</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>0.211**</td>
<td>-0.144**</td>
<td>0.031**</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>5. Immigration status</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>-0.105*</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.024</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>6. SES growing up</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>-0.080</td>
<td>-0.052</td>
<td>-0.022</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>-0.126**</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>7. Personal Income in the U.S.</td>
<td>3529.51</td>
<td>7615.73</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>-0.155**</td>
<td>0.055**</td>
<td>0.189**</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.006</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>8. Region of origin</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
<td>-0.047</td>
<td>-0.061</td>
<td>-0.047</td>
<td>-0.187**</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>-0.014</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>9. SES in Spirituality Beliefs</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>-0.155**</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>-0.112*</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.142**</td>
<td>0.150**</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>10. SES in Spirituality Beliefs</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>-0.150**</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>-0.172**</td>
<td>0.078**</td>
<td>0.192**</td>
<td>0.187**</td>
<td>0.572**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. SES in Social Capital</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>-0.044*</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>-0.137**</td>
<td>-0.014</td>
<td>0.116**</td>
<td>0.169**</td>
<td>0.526**</td>
<td>0.876**</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. SES in Social Capital</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>-0.033*</td>
<td>-0.034</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>-0.098</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>0.088**</td>
<td>0.399**</td>
<td>0.719**</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.027**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. SES in Family Role</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>-0.018</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>0.028**</td>
<td>0.150**</td>
<td>0.505**</td>
<td>0.659**</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. SES in Family Role</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>0.104**</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>-0.079**</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>-0.117**</td>
<td>-0.076**</td>
<td>-0.125**</td>
<td>-0.446**</td>
<td>0.393**</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.242**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. SES in Frequency of Social Activities</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.249**</td>
<td>0.099*</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>-0.071*</td>
<td>-0.034</td>
<td>-0.062</td>
<td>-0.256**</td>
<td>-0.198**</td>
<td>-0.034</td>
<td>0.218**</td>
<td>0.732**</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. SES in Frequency of Social Activities</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>-0.084</td>
<td>-0.053</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.138**</td>
<td>0.149**</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.165**</td>
<td>0.223**</td>
<td>0.517**</td>
<td>0.101**</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. SES in Frequency of Social Activities</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.572**</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>-0.059</td>
<td>0.204**</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>-0.126**</td>
<td>-0.157**</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
<td>0.227**</td>
<td>0.617**</td>
<td>0.254**</td>
<td>-0.174**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. SES in Frequency of Social Activities</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.160**</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.125**</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.088**</td>
<td>0.134**</td>
<td>0.054**</td>
<td>0.205**</td>
<td>0.516**</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<0.05 ** p<0.01

Table 2. Correlations Among Demographic, Predictor, and Criterion Variables
Table 3. Means, Standard Deviations, and MANOVA for Effects of Region of Origin on Acculturative Stress, Ethnic Identity Commitment, and Marianismo Beliefs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Mexican M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>South American M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Central American M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Caribbean M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F(3, 524)</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>ηp²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAFE-R Scale</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caetano Acculturative Stress Scale</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSI-R Frequency Scale</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSI-R Appraisal Scale</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEIM Commitment Scale</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(MBS) Family Pillar</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(MBS) Virtuous and Chaste</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>8.64</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(MBS) Subordinate to Other</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>6.37</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(MBS) Silencing Self...</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>6.97</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(MBS) Spiritual Pillar</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) Wilkes’ lambda = .86, p<.001. Mexican group n =26; South American group n =184; Central American group n =122; Caribbean group n =196.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$df$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>$SE$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>19.712</td>
<td>8,513</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time in U.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal income in the U.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES growing up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region of origin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>26.662</td>
<td>12,509</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time in U.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal income in the U.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES growing up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region of origin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(MBS) Spiritual Pillar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.53</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(MBS) Subordinate/Silencing Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(MBS) Virtuous and Chaste</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>26.310</td>
<td>13,508</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time in U.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal income in the U.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES growing up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region of origin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(MBS) Spiritual Pillar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.51</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(MBS) Subordinate/Silencing Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(MBS) Virtuous and Chaste</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(MBS) Family Pillar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Identity/Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 4</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>21.089</td>
<td>17,504</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time in U.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal income in the U.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES growing up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region of origin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(MBS) Spiritual Pillar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.47</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(MBS) Subordinate/Silencing Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(MBS) Virtuous and Chaste</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(MBS) Family Pillar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Identity/Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(MBS) Family Pillar X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Identity/Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(MBS) Subordinate/Silencing Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.061</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Predictors of Acculturative Stress as Measured by the SAFE-R: Results of a Hierarchical Regression Model
Table 5. Predictors of Acculturative Stress as Measured by the Caetano Acculturation Stress Scale: Results of a Hierarchical Regression Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$\beta_p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1.216</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.515</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time in U.S.</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment status</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal income in the U.S.</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education level</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SES growing up</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Immigration status</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Region of origin</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>2.003</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time in U.S.</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment status</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal income in the U.S.</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education level</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SES growing up</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Immigration status</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Region of origin</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(NBS) Spiritual Pillar</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(NBS) Subordinate/Silencing Self...</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(NBS) Virtuous and Chaste</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(NBS) Family Pillar</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethnic Identity Commitment</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.911</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time in U.S.</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment status</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal income in the U.S.</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education level</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SES growing up</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Immigration status</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Region of origin</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(NBS) Spiritual Pillar</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(NBS) Subordinate/Silencing Self...</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(NBS) Virtuous and Chaste</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(NBS) Family Pillar</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethnic Identity Commitment</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(NBS) Family Pillar X</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethnic Identity Commitment</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(NBS) Subordinate/Silencing Self... X</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethnic Identity Commitment</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6. Predictors of Acculturative Stress as Measured by the HSI-R Frequency Scale: Results of a Hierarchical Regression Model
Table 7. Predictors of Acculturative Stress as Measured by the HSI-R Appraisal Scale: Results of a Hierarchical Regression Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>$\hat{b}$</th>
<th>SE $\hat{b}$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>18.706</td>
<td>8.513</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time in U.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal income in the U.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES growing up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region of origin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>28.900</td>
<td>12.509</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time in U.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal income in the U.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES growing up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region of origin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(MBS) Spiritual Pillar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(MBS) Subordinate/Silencing Self...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(MBS) Virtuous and Chaste</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(MBS) Family Pillar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3</strong></td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>27.571</td>
<td>13.508</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time in U.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal income in the U.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES growing up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region of origin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(MBS) Spiritual Pillar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(MBS) Subordinate/Silencing Self...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(MBS) Virtuous and Chaste</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(MBS) Family Pillar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Identity Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 4</strong></td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>22.595</td>
<td>17.504</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time in U.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal income in the U.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES growing up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region of origin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(MBS) Spiritual Pillar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(MBS) Subordinate/Silencing Self...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(MBS) Virtuous and Chaste</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(MBS) Family PillarX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Identity Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(MBS) Spiritual Pillar X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Identity Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(MBS) Subordinate/Silencing Self...</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Identity Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtuous and Chaste X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Predictors of Acculturative Stress as Measured by the HSI-R Appraisal Scale: Results of a Hierarchical Regression Model
Figure 2. Moderating role of ethnic identity commitment on relation between subordinate/silencing self marianismo beliefs and acculturative stress measured by the SAFE-R.
Figure 3. Moderating role of ethnic identity commitment on relation between family pillar marianismo beliefs and acculturative stress measured by the SAFE-R.
Figure 4. Moderating role of ethnic identity commitment on relation between family pillar marianismo beliefs and acculturative stress measured by the Caetano Acculturation Stress Scale.
Figure 5. Moderating role of ethnic identity commitment on relation between subordinate/silencing self marianismo beliefs and acculturative stress measured by the HSI-R Frequency subscale.
Figure 6. Moderating role of ethnic identity commitment on relation between subordinate/silencing self marianismo beliefs and acculturative stress as measured by the HSI-R Appraisal subscale.
Appendix A

Marianismo Belief Scale (MBS; Castillo et al., 2010)

**E1.** Debería de ser una fuente de fortaleza para la familia.

*ESTRFAM*  E1. Should be a source of strength for the family  
1 = Fuertemente No De Acuerdo  
2 = No De Acuerdo  
3 = De Acuerdo  
4 = Fuertemente De acuerdo  
7 = No se  
8 = Reuso a contestar  
9 = No aplica

**E2.** Es considerada la fuente principal de fuerza para su familia.

*ESOURST*  E2. Is considered the main source of strength for her family  
1 = Fuertemente No De Acuerdo  
2 = No De Acuerdo  
3 = De Acuerdo  
4 = Fuertemente De acuerdo  
7 = No se  
8 = Reuso a contestar  
9 = No aplica

**E3.** Madre debería de mantener a su familia unida.

*EMOTOG*  E3. Mother should maintain her family together  
1 = Fuertemente No De Acuerdo  
2 = No De Acuerdo  
3 = De Acuerdo  
4 = Fuertemente De acuerdo  
7 = No se  
8 = Reuso a contestar  
9 = No aplica
E4. Debería enseñarles a su niños ser leales a su familia.

ECHLOY E4. Should teach their children to be loyal to their families 1

1 = Fuertemente No De Acuerdo
2 = No De Acuerdo
3 = De Acuerdo
4 = Fuertemente De acuerdo
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica

E5. Debería de hacer cosas que hagan feliz a su familia.

EFAMHAP E5. Should do things that make their family happy 1

1 = Fuertemente No De Acuerdo
2 = No De Acuerdo
3 = De Acuerdo
4 = Fuertemente De acuerdo
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica

E6. Debería (hubiera) permanecer/permanecido virgen hasta el matrimonio

EMANVIR E6. Should (should have) mantan her virginity until marriage 1

1 = Fuertemente No De Acuerdo
2 = No De Acuerdo
3 = De Acuerdo
4 = Fuertemente De acuerdo
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica

E7. Debe de esperar hasta después del matrimonio para tener hijos.

ECHMARR E7. Should wait until after marriage to have children 1

1 = Fuertemente No De Acuerdo
2 = No De Acuerdo
3 = De Acuerdo
4 = Fuertemente De acuerdo
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica
E8. Debería de ser pura.

EPURE  F8. Should be pure

1 = Fuertemente No De Acuerdo
2 = No De Acuerdo
3 = De Acuerdo
4 = Fuertemente De acuerdo
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica

E9. Debería de adoptar los valores inculcados por su religión.

ERELIG  F9. Should adopt the values instilled by her religion

1 = Fuertemente No De Acuerdo
2 = No De Acuerdo
3 = De Acuerdo
4 = Fuertemente De acuerdo
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica

E10. Debería serle fiel a su pareja.

ELOYAL  E10. Should be loyal to her partner

1 = Fuertemente No De Acuerdo
2 = No De Acuerdo
3 = De Acuerdo
4 = Fuertemente De acuerdo
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica

E11. Debería satisfacer las necesidades sexuales de mi pareja sin quejarme.

ESEXNEED  E11. Should satisfy the sexual needs of my partner without complaining

1 = Fuertemente No De Acuerdo
2 = No De Acuerdo
3 = De Acuerdo
4 = Fuertemente De acuerdo
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica
E12. No debería alzar su voz contra los hombres.

EVOICE E12. Should not raise her voice to men

1 = Fuertemente No De Acuerdo
2 = No De Acuerdo
3 = De Acuerdo
4 = Fuertemente De acuerdo
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica

E13. Debería respetar las opiniones de los hombres aunque no esté de acuerdo.

EOPIMEN E13. Should respect the opinion of men even if she is not in agreement

1 = Fuertemente No De Acuerdo
2 = No De Acuerdo
3 = De Acuerdo
4 = Fuertemente De acuerdo
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica

E14. Debe de evitar decirles no a la gente.

ESAYNO E14. Should avoid saying "no" to people

1 = Fuertemente No De Acuerdo
2 = No De Acuerdo
3 = De Acuerdo
4 = Fuertemente De acuerdo
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica

E15. Debería hacer cualquier cosa que le pida un hombre de la familia.

EMENASK E15. Should do anything that a men asks her for the family

1 = Fuertemente No De Acuerdo
2 = No De Acuerdo
3 = De Acuerdo
4 = Fuertemente De acuerdo
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica
**E16.** No debe de hablar de métodos anticonceptivos.

_ECONTMET_ E16. Should not speak about contraception methods

1 = Fuertemente No De Acuerdo
2 = No De Acuerdo
3 = De Acuerdo
4 = Fuertemente De acuerdo
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica

**E17.** No debe expresar sus necesidades a su pareja.

_ENEEDEX_ E17. Should not express her needs to her partner

1 = Fuertemente No De Acuerdo
2 = No De Acuerdo
3 = De Acuerdo
4 = Fuertemente De acuerdo
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica

**E18.** Debe de sentirse culpable por decirle a la gente sus necesidades.

_ETELNEED_ E18. Should feel guilty for telling people her needs

1 = Fuertemente No De Acuerdo
2 = No De Acuerdo
3 = De Acuerdo
4 = Fuertemente De acuerdo
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica

**E19.** No debe de hablar del sexo.

_ETALKSEX_ E19. Should not talk about sex

1 = Fuertemente No De Acuerdo
2 = No De Acuerdo
3 = De Acuerdo
4 = Fuertemente De acuerdo
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica
Debe perdonar en todos aspectos.

应原谅在各个方面。

Should forgive in all aspects

1 = Fuertemente No De Acuerdo
2 = No De Acuerdo
3 = De Acuerdo
4 = Fuertemente De acuerdo
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica

Siempre debería estar de acuerdo con las decisiones de los hombres.

应永远遵循男性的决策。

Should always agree with the decisions of men

1 = Fuertemente No De Acuerdo
2 = No De Acuerdo
3 = De Acuerdo
4 = Fuertemente De acuerdo
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica

Debería de ser el líder espiritual de la familia.

应成为家庭的精神领袖。

Should be the spiritual leader of the family

1 = Fuertemente No De Acuerdo
2 = No De Acuerdo
3 = De Acuerdo
4 = Fuertemente De acuerdo
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica

Es responsable de llevar a su familia a servicios religiosos.

应负责带家人参加宗教服务。

Is responsible for talking her family to religious services

1 = Fuertemente No De Acuerdo
2 = No De Acuerdo
3 = De Acuerdo
4 = Fuertemente De acuerdo
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica
E24. Es responsable del crecimiento espiritual de su familia.

ESPIRGR E24. Is responsible for the spiritual growth of her family

1 = Fuertemente No De Acuerdo
2 = No De Acuerdo
3 = De Acuerdo
4 = Fuertemente De acuerdo
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica
Appendix B

Revised Acculturative Stress Scale (SAFE-R; Mena, Padilla, & Maldonado, 1987)

**G1.1.** Me siento incómoda cuando otros bromean o insultan a gente de mi grupo étnico.

*G1INSETH* G1.1. I feel uncomfortable when others joke or insult people from my ethnic group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>NO ME HA PASADO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>PARA NADA ESTRESANTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>UN POCO ESTRESANTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>MODERADAMENTE ESTRESANTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>MUY ESTRESANTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>EXTREMADAMENTE ESTRESANTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>No se</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Reuso a contestar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>No aplica</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**G1.2.** Tengo más barreras que sobrepasar en comparación con la mayoría de la gente.

*G1OBSOVE* G1.2. I have more obstacles to overcome than the majority of people

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>NO ME HA PASADO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>PARA NADA ESTRESANTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>UN POCO ESTRESANTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>MODERADAMENTE ESTRESANTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>MUY ESTRESANTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>EXTREMADAMENTE ESTRESANTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>No se</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Reuso a contestar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>No aplica</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**G1.3.** Me molesta que miembros de mi familia cercanos a mi no entienden mis valores nuevos.

*G1VALUES* G1.3. It bothers me that my close relatives do not understand my values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>NO ME HA PASADO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>PARA NADA ESTRESANTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>UN POCO ESTRESANTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>MODERADAMENTE ESTRESANTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>MUY ESTRESANTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>EXTREMADAMENTE ESTRESANTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>No se</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Reuso a contestar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>No aplica</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
G1.4. Miembros de mi familia cercanos a mi tienen otras expectativas o ideas sobre mi futuro que yo.

G1.4. My close relatives have other expectations or ideas of my future

0 = NO ME HA PASADO
1 = PARA NADA ESTRESANTE
2 = UN POCO ESTRESANTE
3 = MODERADAMENTE ESTRESANTE
4 = MUY ESTRESANTE
5 = EXTREMADAMENTE ESTRESANTE
6 = No se
7 = Reuso a contestar
8 = No aplica

G1.5. Es difícil expresar a mis amigos como me siento en realidad.

G1.5. It is difficult to express to my friends how I truly feel

0 = NO ME HA PASADO
1 = PARA NADA ESTRESANTE
2 = UN POCO ESTRESANTE
3 = MODERADAMENTE ESTRESANTE
4 = MUY ESTRESANTE
5 = EXTREMADAMENTE ESTRESANTE
6 = No se
7 = Reuso a contestar
8 = No aplica

G1.6. Mi familia no quiere que yo me mude (fuera de casa) pero yo sí quiero hacerlo.

G1.6. My family doesn't want me to move (out of the house) but I want to do it

0 = NO ME HA PASADO
1 = PARA NADA ESTRESANTE
2 = UN POCO ESTRESANTE
3 = MODERADAMENTE ESTRESANTE
4 = MUY ESTRESANTE
5 = EXTREMADAMENTE ESTRESANTE
6 = No se
7 = Reuso a contestar
8 = No aplica
G1.7. Me molesta el pensar que tanta gente usa drogas.

G1DRUG  G1.7. It bothers me to think that so many people use drugs  
0 = NO ME HA PASADO  
1 = PARA NADA ESTRESANTE  
2 = UN POCO ESTRESANTE  
3 = MODERADAMENTE ESTRESANTE  
4 = MUY ESTRESANTE  
5 = EXTREMADAMENTE ESTRESANTE  
7 = No se  
8 = Reuso a contestar  
9 = No aplica

G1.8. Me molesta el no poder estar con mi familia.

G1BEFAM  G1.8. It bothers me not to be able to be with my family  
0 = NO ME HA PASADO  
1 = PARA NADA ESTRESANTE  
2 = UN POCO ESTRESANTE  
3 = MODERADAMENTE ESTRESANTE  
4 = MUY ESTRESANTE  
5 = EXTREMADAMENTE ESTRESANTE  
7 = No se  
8 = Reuso a contestar  
9 = No aplica

G1.9. En buscar un buen trabajo, algunas veces siento que mi etnicidad es una limitación.

G1JOBLM  G1.9. In looking for a job, sometimes I think that my ethnicity is a limitation  
0 = NO ME HA PASADO  
1 = PARA NADA ESTRESANTE  
2 = UN POCO ESTRESANTE  
3 = MODERADAMENTE ESTRESANTE  
4 = MUY ESTRESANTE  
5 = EXTREMADAMENTE ESTRESANTE  
7 = No se  
8 = Reuso a contestar  
9 = No aplica
**G1.10.** No tengo amistades íntimas o cercanas a mí.

*G1FRIEN G1.10. I do not have intimate or close friends*

0 = NO ME HA PASADO
1 = PARA NADA ESTRESANTE
2 = UN POCO ESTRESANTE
3 = MODERADAMENTE ESTRESANTE
4 = MUY ESTRESANTE
5 = EXTREMADAMENTE ESTRESANTE
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica

**G1.11.** Mucha gente tiene estereotipos o ideas acerca de mi cultura o de mi grupo étnico, y me tratan como si los estereotipos o las ideas fueran verdad.

*G1STEREO G1.11. Many people have stereotypes or ideas about my cultural or ethnic group, and they treat me as if these were true*

0 = NO ME HA PASADO
1 = PARA NADA ESTRESANTE
2 = UN POCO ESTRESANTE
3 = MODERADAMENTE ESTRESANTE
4 = MUY ESTRESANTE
5 = EXTREMADAMENTE ESTRESANTE
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica

**G1.12.** No me siento como que estoy en mi casa.

*G1HOME G1.12. I do not feel at home*

0 = NO ME HA PASADO
1 = PARA NADA ESTRESANTE
2 = UN POCO ESTRESANTE
3 = MODERADAMENTE ESTRESANTE
4 = MUY ESTRESANTE
5 = EXTREMADAMENTE ESTRESANTE
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica
G1.13. La gente cree que no soy sociable o amistosa cuando en realidad tengo dificultad comunicándome en inglés.

GISOCENG G1.13. People think I am not social or friendly when in reality I have difficulty communicating in English.

0 = NO ME HA PASADO
1 = PARA NADA ESTRESANTE
2 = UN POCO ESTRESANTE
3 = MODERADAMENTE ESTRESANTE
4 = MUY ESTRESANTE
5 = EXTREMADAMENTE ESTRESANTE
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica

G1.14. A menudo siento que la gente a propósito trata de parar mi avance.

GISTOPGR G1.14. I often think that people are trying to purposely stop my growth/advancement.

0 = NO ME HA PASADO
1 = PARA NADA ESTRESANTE
2 = UN POCO ESTRESANTE
3 = MODERADAMENTE ESTRESANTE
4 = MUY ESTRESANTE
5 = EXTREMADAMENTE ESTRESANTE
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica

G1.15. Me molesta cuando la gente me presiona para que me haga parte de la cultura Americana.

GIAMCULT G1.15. It bothers me when people pressure me to become part of the American culture.

0 = NO ME HA PASADO
1 = PARA NADA ESTRESANTE
2 = UN POCO ESTRESANTE
3 = MODERADAMENTE ESTRESANTE
4 = MUY ESTRESANTE
5 = EXTREMADAMENTE ESTRESANTE
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica
G1.16. A menudo me siento ignorado/a por personas que deben ayudarme.

G1.16. I often feel ignored by people who should help me

0 = NO ME HA PASADO
1 = PARA NADA ESTRESANTE
2 = UN POCO ESTRESANTE
3 = MODERADAMENTE ESTRESANTE
4 = MUY ESTRESANTE
5 = EXTREMADAMENTE ESTRESANTE
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica

G1.17. Porque soy diferente no me dan suficiente mérito por el trabajo que hago.

G1.17. Because I am different they do no give me enough credit for the work that I do

0 = NO ME HA PASADO
1 = PARA NADA ESTRESANTE
2 = UN POCO ESTRESANTE
3 = MODERADAMENTE ESTRESANTE
4 = MUY ESTRESANTE
5 = EXTREMADAMENTE ESTRESANTE
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica

G1.18. Me molesta que tengo acento.

G1.18. It bothers me that I have an accent

0 = NO ME HA PASADO
1 = PARA NADA ESTRESANTE
2 = UN POCO ESTRESANTE
3 = MODERADAMENTE ESTRESANTE
4 = MUY ESTRESANTE
5 = EXTREMADAMENTE ESTRESANTE
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica
G1.19. El tener menos contacto con mi país me es difícil.

G1CONTAC G1.19. Having less contact with my country is difficult for me

0 = NO ME HA PASADO
1 = PARA NADA ESTRESANTE
2 = UN POCO ESTRESANTE
3 = MODERADAMENTE ESTRESANTE
4 = MUY ESTRESANTE
5 = EXTREMADAMENTE ESTRESANTE
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica

G1.20. A menudo pienso en mi herencia cultural.

G1HERIT G1.20. I often think about my cultural heritage

0 = NO ME HA PASADO
1 = PARA NADA ESTRESANTE
2 = UN POCO ESTRESANTE
3 = MODERADAMENTE ESTRESANTE
4 = MUY ESTRESANTE
5 = EXTREMADAMENTE ESTRESANTE
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica

G1.21. Por causa de mi etnicidad, siento que la gente a menudo no me incluye en sus actividades.

G1ACTIVI G1.21. Due to my ethnicity, I feel that people often do not include me in their activities

0 = NO ME HA PASADO
1 = PARA NADA ESTRESANTE
2 = UN POCO ESTRESANTE
3 = MODERADAMENTE ESTRESANTE
4 = MUY ESTRESANTE
5 = EXTREMADAMENTE ESTRESANTE
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica
G1.22. Me es difícil presentar a otros mi familia.

*G1INTROD* 
G1.22. It is difficult for me to introduce other to my family 1

0 = NO ME HA PASADO
1 = PARA NADA ESTRESANTE
2 = UN POCO ESTRESANTE
3 = MODERADAMENTE ESTRESANTE
4 = MUY ESTRESANTE
5 = EXTREMADAMENTE ESTRESANTE
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica

G1.23. La gente me hace de menos si practico las costumbres de mi cultura.

*G1CULTTR* 
G1.23. People think less of me if I practice my cultural traditions 1

0 = NO ME HA PASADO
1 = PARA NADA ESTRESANTE
2 = UN POCO ESTRESANTE
3 = MODERADAMENTE ESTRESANTE
4 = MUY ESTRESANTE
5 = EXTREMADAMENTE ESTRESANTE
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica

G1.24. Me es difícil entender a otros cuando hablan.

*G1UNDSPE* 
G1.24. It is difficult for me to understand others when they speak 1

0 = NO ME HA PASADO
1 = PARA NADA ESTRESANTE
2 = UN POCO ESTRESANTE
3 = MODERADAMENTE ESTRESANTE
4 = MUY ESTRESANTE
5 = EXTREMADAMENTE ESTRESANTE
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica
Appendix C

Revised Hispanic Stress Inventory (HSI-R; Cervantes, Goldbach & Padilla, 2012)

G2.1. Mi familia estuvo expuesta a pobreza.

G2POVE G2.1. My family was exposed to poverty

0 = No
1 = Si
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica

G2.1a. Por favor marque la gravedad del problema.

G21GRAV G2.1. How grave was the problem

1 = Nada Preocupado/Tenso
2 = Un Poco Preocupado/Tenso
3 = Moderadamente Preocupado/Tenso
4 = Muy Preocupado/Tenso
5 = Extremadamente Preocupado/Tenso
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica

G2.2. No teníamos suficiente dinero para las necesidades básicas.

G2NEED G2.2. We did not have enough money for the basic needs

0 = No
1 = Si
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica

G2.2a. Por favor marque la gravedad del problema.

G22GRAV G2.2. How grave was the problem

1 = Nada Preocupado/Tenso
2 = Un Poco Preocupado/Tenso
3 = Moderadamente Preocupado/Tenso
4 = Muy Preocupado/Tenso
5 = Extremadamente Preocupado/Tenso
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica
G2.3. I left my native country because of poverty

0 = No
1 = Si
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica

G2.3a. How grave was the problem?

1 = Nada Preocupado/Tenso
2 = Un Poco Preocupado/Tenso
3 = Moderadamente Preocupado/Tenso
4 = Muy Preocupado/Tenso
5 = Extremadamente Preocupado/Tenso
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica

G2.4. I did not have freedom in my native country

0 = No
1 = Si
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica

G2.4a. How grave was the problem?

1 = Nada Preocupado/Tenso
2 = Un Poco Preocupado/Tenso
3 = Moderadamente Preocupado/Tenso
4 = Muy Preocupado/Tenso
5 = Extremadamente Preocupado/Tenso
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica
G2.5. Me hacía falta oportunidades educativas.
*G2EDU*  G2.5. I was missing educational opportunities 1

0 = No  
1 = Sí  
7 = No se  
8 = Reuso a contestar  
9 = No aplica

G2.5a. Por favor marque la gravedad del problema.

*G25GRAV*  G2.5. How grave was the problem 1

1 = Nada Preocupado/Tenso  
2 = Un Poco Preocupado/Tenso  
3 = Moderadamente Preocupado/Tenso  
4 = Muy Preocupado/Tenso  
5 = Extremadamente Preocupado/Tenso  
7 = No se  
8 = Reuso a contestar  
9 = No aplica

G2.6. No conseguí buenos cuidados médicos.

*G2HEALTH*  G2.6. I could not find good healthcare 1

0 = No  
1 = Sí  
7 = No se  
8 = Reuso a contestar  
9 = No aplica

G2.6a. Por favor marque la gravedad del problema.

*G26GRAV*  G2.6. How grave was the problem 1

1 = Nada Preocupado/Tenso  
2 = Un Poco Preocupado/Tenso  
3 = Moderadamente Preocupado/Tenso  
4 = Muy Preocupado/Tenso  
5 = Extremadamente Preocupado/Tenso  
7 = No se  
8 = Reuso a contestar  
9 = No aplica
G2.7. Miembros de mi familia no podían conseguir buenos cuidados médicos.  
G2FAMHEA G2.7. Family members could not get good healthcare  
0 = No  
1 = Si  
7 = No se  
8 = Reuso a contestar  
9 = No aplica

G2.7a. Por favor marque la gravedad del problema.  
G27GRAV  G2.7. How grave was the problem  
1 = Nada Preocupado/Tenso  
2 = Un Poco Preocupado/Tenso  
3 = Moderadamente Preocupado/Tenso  
4 = Muy Preocupado/Tenso  
5 = Extremadamente Preocupado/Tenso  
7 = No se  
8 = Reuso a contestar  
9 = No aplica

G2.8. Estuve sin comida o agua al venir a los Estados Unidos.  
G2COMING  G2.8. I was without food or water when coming to the U.S.  
0 = No  
1 = Si  
7 = No se  
8 = Reuso a contestar  
9 = No aplica

G2.8a. Por favor marque la gravedad del problema.  
G28GRAV  G2.8. How grave was the problem  
1 = Nada Preocupado/Tenso  
2 = Un Poco Preocupado/Tenso  
3 = Moderadamente Preocupado/Tenso  
4 = Muy Preocupado/Tenso  
5 = Extremadamente Preocupado/Tenso  
7 = No se  
8 = Reuso a contestar  
9 = No aplica
G2.9. Me robaron al venir a los Estados Unidos.
G2ROBB  G2.9. I was robbed when coming to the U.S. 1
0 = No
1 = Sí
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica

G2.9a. Por favor marque la gravedad del problema.
G29GRAV  G2.9. How grave was the problem 1
1 = Nada Preocupado/Tenso
2 = Un Poco Preocupado/Tenso
3 = Moderadamente Preocupado/Tenso
4 = Muy Preocupado/Tenso
5 = Extremadamente Preocupado/Tenso
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica

G2.10. Me asaltaron sexualmente al venir a los Estados Unidos.
G2RAPE  G2.10. I was raped when coming to the U.S. 1
0 = No
1 = Sí
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica

G2.10a. Por favor marque la gravedad del problema.
G210GRAV  G2.10. How grave was the problem 1
1 = Nada Preocupado/Tenso
2 = Un Poco Preocupado/Tenso
3 = Moderadamente Preocupado/Tenso
4 = Muy Preocupado/Tenso
5 = Extremadamente Preocupado/Tenso
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica
**G2.11.** Estuve forzado a pagarle a un coyote para que me ayude.

```
0 = No
1 = Sí
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica
```

**G2.11a.** Por favor marque la gravedad del problema.

```
1 = Nada Preocupado/Tenso
2 = Un Poco Preocupado/Tenso
3 = Moderadamente Preocupado/Tenso
4 = Muy Preocupado/Tenso
5 = Extremadamente Preocupado/Tenso
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica
```

**G2.12.** Yo vi a personas morir.

```
0 = No
1 = Sí
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica
```

**G2.12a.** Por favor marque la gravedad del problema.

```
1 = Nada Preocupado/Tenso
2 = Un Poco Preocupado/Tenso
3 = Moderadamente Preocupado/Tenso
4 = Muy Preocupado/Tenso
5 = Extremadamente Preocupado/Tenso
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica
```
**G2.13.** Yo no podía encontrar un lugar donde vivir.

| 0 = No | 1 = Si | 7 = No se | 8 = Reuso a contestar | 9 = No aplica |

**G2.13a.** Por favor marque la gravedad del problema.

| 1 = Nada Preocupado/Tenso | 2 = Un Poco Preocupado/Tenso | 3 = Moderadamente Preocupado/Tenso | 4 = Muy Preocupado/Tenso | 5 = Extremadamente Preocupado/Tenso | 7 = No se | 8 = Reuso a contestar | 9 = No aplica |

**G2.14.** Yo vi violencia de pandillas.

| 0 = No | 1 = Si | 7 = No se | 8 = Reuso a contestar | 9 = No aplica |

**G2.14a.** Por favor marque la gravedad del problema.

| 1 = Nada Preocupado/Tenso | 2 = Un Poco Preocupado/Tenso | 3 = Moderadamente Preocupado/Tenso | 4 = Muy Preocupado/Tenso | 5 = Extremadamente Preocupado/Tenso | 7 = No se | 8 = Reuso a contestar | 9 = No aplica |
**G2.15.** Yo no pude proporcionar para traer a mi familia

_G2PROV_ G2.15. I could not provide to bring my family

1

0 = No
1 = Sí
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica

**G2.15a.** Por favor marque la gravedad del problema.

_G215GRAV_ G2.15. How grave was the problem

1

1 = Nada Preocupado/Tenso
2 = Un Poco Preocupado/Tenso
3 = Moderadamente Preocupado/Tenso
4 = Muy Preocupado/Tenso
5 = Extremadamente Preocupado/Tenso
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica

**G2.16.** Yo NO tenía los documentos legales apropiados.

_G2DOCU_ G2.16. I did not have the appropriate legal documents

1

0 = No
1 = Sí
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica

**G2.16a.** Por favor marque la gravedad del problema.

_G216GRAV_ G2.16. How grave was the problem

1

1 = Nada Preocupado/Tenso
2 = Un Poco Preocupado/Tenso
3 = Moderadamente Preocupado/Tenso
4 = Muy Preocupado/Tenso
5 = Extremadamente Preocupado/Tenso
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica
G2.17. Yo me mude de un pueblo pequeño a la ciudad.

G2MOVED G2.17. I moved from a small town to the city

0 = No
1 = Si
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica

G2.17a. Por favor marque la gravedad del problema.

G217GRAV G2.17. How grave was the problem

1 = Nada Preocupado/Tenso
2 = Un Poco Preocupado/Tenso
3 = Moderadamente Preocupado/Tenso
4 = Muy Preocupado/Tenso
5 = Extremadamente Preocupado/Tenso
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica

G2.18. Yo fui separado de mi pareja.

G2SEPAR G2.18. I was separated from my partner

0 = No
1 = Si
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica

G2.18a. Por favor marque la gravedad del problema.

G218GRAV G2.18. How grave was the problem

1 = Nada Preocupado/Tenso
2 = Un Poco Preocupado/Tenso
3 = Moderadamente Preocupado/Tenso
4 = Muy Preocupado/Tenso
5 = Extremadamente Preocupado/Tenso
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica
G2.19. Yo me divorcie debido a la inmigración.

**G2DIVOR**
G2.19. I divorced due to immigration

1 = Si
0 = No
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica

G2.19a. Por favor marque la gravedad del problema.

**G219GRAV**
G2.19. How grave was the problem

1 = Nada Preocupado/Tenso
2 = Un Poco Preocupado/Tenso
3 = Moderadamente Preocupado/Tenso
4 = Muy Preocupado/Tenso
5 = Extremadamente Preocupado/Tenso
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica

G2.20. Yo perdí contacto con miembros de mi familia.

**G2COFAM**
G2.20. I lost contact with family members

0 = No
1 = Sí
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica

G2.20a. Por favor marque la gravedad del problema.

**G220GRAV**
G2.20. How grave was the problem

1 = Nada Preocupado/Tenso
2 = Un Poco Preocupado/Tenso
3 = Moderadamente Preocupado/Tenso
4 = Muy Preocupado/Tenso
5 = Extremadamente Preocupado/Tenso
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica
G2.21. **Yo no podía proveer para necesidades básicas**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Si</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>No se</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Reuso a contestar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>No aplica</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G2.21a. **Por favor marque la gravedad del problema.**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nada Preocupado/Tenso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Un Poco Preocupado/Tenso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Moderadamente Preocupado/Tenso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Muy Preocupado/Tenso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Extremadamente Preocupado/Tenso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>No se</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Reuso a contestar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>No aplica</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G2.22. **Miembros de mi familia no pueden comunicarse en lugares públicos**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Si</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>No se</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Reuso a contestar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>No aplica</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G2.22a. **Por favor marque la gravedad del problema.**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nada Preocupado/Tenso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Un Poco Preocupado/Tenso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Moderadamente Preocupado/Tenso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Muy Preocupado/Tenso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Extremadamente Preocupado/Tenso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>No se</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Reuso a contestar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>No aplica</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
G2.23. Niños en mi familia tenían que traducir.

G2CHTRAN G2.23. Children in my family had to translate

| 0 | No |
| 1 | Si |
| 7 | No se |
| 8 | Reuso a contestar |
| 9 | No aplica |

G2.23a. Por favor marque la gravedad del problema.

G223GRAV G2.23. How grave was the problem

| 1 | Nada Preocupado/Tenso |
| 2 | Un Poco Preocupado/Tenso |
| 3 | Moderadamente Preocupado/Tenso |
| 4 | Muy Preocupado/Tenso |
| 5 | Extremadamente Preocupado/Tenso |
| 7 | No se |
| 8 | Reuso a contestar |
| 9 | No aplica |

G2.24. Yo no pude hacer cambios importantes dentro de mi matrimonio.

G2CHMARR G2.24. I could not make necessary changes in my marriage

| 0 | No |
| 1 | Si |
| 7 | No se |
| 8 | Reuso a contestar |
| 9 | No aplica |

G2.24a. Por favor marque la gravedad del problema.

G224GRAV G2.24. How grave was the problem

| 1 | Nada Preocupado/Tenso |
| 2 | Un Poco Preocupado/Tenso |
| 3 | Moderadamente Preocupado/Tenso |
| 4 | Muy Preocupado/Tenso |
| 5 | Extremadamente Preocupado/Tenso |
| 7 | No se |
| 8 | Reuso a contestar |
| 9 | No aplica |
G2.25. Yo fui insultado y tratado mal.

G2INSUL  G2.25. I was insulted and treated poorly

0 = No
1 = Si
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica

G2.25a. Por favor marque la gravedad del problema.

G225GRAV  G2.25. How grave was the problem

1 = Nada Preocupado/Tenso
2 = Un Poco Preocupado/Tenso
3 = Moderadamente Preocupado/Tenso
4 = Muy Preocupado/Tenso
5 = Extremadamente Preocupado/Tenso
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica
Appendix D

Caetano Acculturation Stress Scale

G1. Me molesta que mis familiares más allegados no comprendan mis nuevos valores. ¿Diría usted que es sumamente estresante, muy estresante, relativamente estresante, no muy estresante, o para nada estresante? Simplemente indíqueme la letra en la tarjeta.

GVALUE G1. It bothers me that my close relatives do not understand my values

1 = Sumamente estresante
2 = Muy estresante
3 = Relativamente estresante
4 = No muy estresante
5 = Para nada estresante
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica

G2. Mis familiares más allegados y yo tenemos expectativas opuestas en cuanto a mi futuro.

GEXPPUT G2. My close family members and I have opposing expectations of my future

1 = Sumamente estresante
2 = Muy estresante
3 = Relativamente estresante
4 = No muy estresante
5 = Para nada estresante
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica

G3. Me resulta difícil decirles a mis amigos cómo me siento realmente.

GFRIFEEEL G3. It is hard for me to tell my friends how I really feel

1 = Sumamente estresante
2 = Muy estresante
3 = Relativamente estresante
4 = No muy estresante
5 = Para nada estresante
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica
**G4.** No me siento a gusto.

_GFEELEAS_ G4. I do not feel at ease

1 = Sumamente estresante
2 = Muy estresante
3 = Relativamente estresante
4 = No muy estresante
5 = Para nada estresante
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica

**G5.** La gente cree que soy poco sociable, pero lo que ocurre es que me resulta difícil comunicarme en inglés.

_GSOCIENG_ G5. People think I not social, but what happens is that it is hard for me to communicate in English

1 = Sumamente estresante
2 = Muy estresante
3 = Relativamente estresante
4 = No muy estresante
5 = Para nada estresante
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica

**G6.** Me molesta que la gente me presione para que me adapte o viva a la manera angloamericana.

_GLIVEAME_ G6. It bothers me when people pressure me to adopt or live the way that Americans do

1 = Sumamente estresante
2 = Muy estresante
3 = Relativamente estresante
4 = No muy estresante
5 = Para nada estresante
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica
G7.  Con frecuencia pienso en mis orígenes culturales.

GCULORI  G7. I often think about my cultural origin 1

1 = Sumamente estresante
2 = Muy estresante
3 = Relativamente estresante
4 = No muy estresante
5 = Para nada estresante
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica

G8.  Tengo más barreras que superar que la mayoría de la gente.

GOBSTA  G8. I have more obstacles to overcome than most people 1

1 = Sumamente estresante
2 = Muy estresante
3 = Relativamente estresante
4 = No muy estresante
5 = Para nada estresante
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica

G9.  Debido a mi origen étnico, siento que los demás me excluyen a menudo y me impiden participar en sus actividades.

GETHACTI  G9. Due to my ethnic origin, I feel that others exclude me often or do not allow me to participate in their activities 1

1 = Sumamente estresante
2 = Muy estresante
3 = Relativamente estresante
4 = No muy estresante
5 = Para nada estresante
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica
G10. La gente me menosprecia si practico costumbres de mi cultura.

GUNDCULT G10. People underestimate me if I practice my cultural traditions 1

1 = Sumamente estresante
2 = Muy estresante
3 = Relativamente estresante
4 = No muy estresante
5 = Para nada estresante
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica

G11. Le desagrado a la gente porque soy Hispana/Latina.

GDISLHIS G11. People dislike me because I am Hispanic/Latina 1

1 = Sumamente estresante
2 = Muy estresante
3 = Relativamente estresante
4 = No muy estresante
5 = Para nada estresante
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica
Appendix E

Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM; Phinney, 1992)

**D0.1.** Yo me considero del grupo étnico

*DIEGHER*  D. I consider myself from this ethnic group

**D1.1.** He dedicado tiempo para averiguar más acerca de mi grupo étnico, como la historia, tradiciones y costumbres.

*DIFIETH*  D1.1. I have dedicated time to find out more about my ethnic group

1 = Fuertemente en desacuerdo
2 = En desacuerdo
3 = En el medio / No estoy seguro
4 = De acuerdo
5 = Fuertemente de acuerdo
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica

**D1.2.** Estoy activa en organizaciones o grupos sociales en los cuales la mayoría de sus miembros son de mi propio grupo étnico.

*DISOETH*  D1.2. I am active in social groups where the majority of the people are from my ethnic group

1 = Fuertemente en desacuerdo
2 = En desacuerdo
3 = En el medio / No estoy seguro
4 = De acuerdo
5 = Fuertemente de acuerdo
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica
**D1.3.** Tengo una idea clara de lo que es mi grupo étnico y lo que significa para mí.  
*DIETHSIG* D1.3. I have a clear idea of what is my ethnic group and what it means to me

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 = Fuertemente en desacuerdo</th>
<th>2 = En desacuerdo</th>
<th>3 = En el medio / No estoy seguro</th>
<th>4 = De acuerdo</th>
<th>5 = Fuertemente de acuerdo</th>
<th>7 = No se</th>
<th>8 = Reuso a contestar</th>
<th>9 = No aplica</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**D1.4.** He pensado bastante en como mi grupo étnico influye en mi vida.  
*DIETINFL* D1.4. I have thought at length about how my ethnic group influences my life

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 = Fuertemente en desacuerdo</th>
<th>2 = En desacuerdo</th>
<th>3 = En el medio / No estoy seguro</th>
<th>4 = De acuerdo</th>
<th>5 = Fuertemente de acuerdo</th>
<th>7 = No se</th>
<th>8 = Reuso a contestar</th>
<th>9 = No aplica</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**D1.5.** Me siento contenta de pertenecer a mi grupo étnico.  
*DIHAPETH* D1.5. I feel happy to be part of my ethnic group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 = Fuertemente en desacuerdo</th>
<th>2 = En desacuerdo</th>
<th>3 = En el medio / No estoy seguro</th>
<th>4 = De acuerdo</th>
<th>5 = Fuertemente de acuerdo</th>
<th>7 = No se</th>
<th>8 = Reuso a contestar</th>
<th>9 = No aplica</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
**D1.6.** Me siento muy identificada con el grupo étnico al que pertenezco.

*D1ETBEL* D1.6. I identify greatly with the ethnic group I belong to 1

1 = Fuertemente en desacuerdo
2 = En desacuerdo
3 = En el medio / No estoy seguro
4 = De acuerdo
5 = Fuertemente de acuerdo
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica

**D1.7.** Entiendo claramente lo que significa pertenecer a mi propio grupo étnico.

*D1PARET* D1.7. I understand clearly what it means to be part of my ethnic group 1

1 = Fuertemente en desacuerdo
2 = En desacuerdo
3 = En el medio / No estoy seguro
4 = De acuerdo
5 = Fuertemente de acuerdo
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica

**D1.8.** Para aprender mas acerca de mis raíces étnicas, he hablado con otros acerca de mi grupo étnico.

*D1ETROOT* D1.8. To learn more about the roots of my ethnic group I have talked to others about my ethnic group 1

1 = Fuertemente en desacuerdo
2 = En desacuerdo
3 = En el medio / No estoy seguro
4 = De acuerdo
5 = Fuertemente de acuerdo
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica
**D1.9. Estoy orgullosa de mi grupo étnico**

*DPROETH*  D1.9. I am proud of my ethnic group

1 = Fuertemente en desacuerdo  
2 = En desacuerdo  
3 = En el medio / No estoy seguro  
4 = De acuerdo  
5 = Fuertemente de acuerdo  
7 = No se  
8 = Reuso a contestar  
9 = No aplica

**D1.10. Participo en actividades culturales de mi propio grupo étnico como, por ejemplo, comidas especiales, música y costumbres.**

*D1EVETH*  D1.10. I participate in cultural events of my ethnic group

1 = Fuertemente en desacuerdo  
2 = En desacuerdo  
3 = En el medio / No estoy seguro  
4 = De acuerdo  
5 = Fuertemente de acuerdo  
7 = No se  
8 = Reuso a contestar  
9 = No aplica

**D1.11. Siento un gran afecto hacia mi grupo étnico.**

*D1AFFETH*  D1.11. I feel large affection for my ethnic group

1 = Fuertemente en desacuerdo  
2 = En desacuerdo  
3 = En el medio / No estoy seguro  
4 = De acuerdo  
5 = Fuertemente de acuerdo  
7 = No se  
8 = Reuso a contestar  
9 = No aplica
D1.12. I feel satisfied with my cultural and ethnic background

1 = Fuertemente en desacuerdo
2 = En desacuerdo
3 = En el medio / No estoy seguro
4 = De acuerdo
5 = Fuertemente de acuerdo
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica
Appendix F

Demographic Questionnaire

A1. ¿Cómo se dio cuenta de este estudio? (Tarjeta #1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LRNSTUDY</th>
<th>A1 How did you learn about this study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Un amigo/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Agencia de la comunidad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Panfleto en mi vecindario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Universidad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Otro, especificé</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>No se</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Reuso a contestar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A1a. Especifiqué

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A1OTHER</th>
<th>A1 specify where did you learn about this study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A2. ¿Cuál es su fecha de nacimiento?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOB</th>
<th>A2. date of birth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unlimited - Unlimited = dd/mm/aaaa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2097 = No se (Año)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2098 = Reuso a contestar (Año)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A2a. ¿Cuántos años tiene?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE1</th>
<th>A2a. age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 100 = range</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>997 = No se</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>998 = Reuso a contestar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A3. ¿dónde nació? (En que país) (Tarjeta#2)

**BIRTHPL** A3. birth place

1 = Argentina  
2 = Bolivia  
3 = Chile  
4 = Colombia  
5 = Costa Rica  
6 = Cuba  
7 = República Dominicana  
8 = Ecuador  
9 = El Salvador  
10 = Guatemala  
11 = Honduras  
12 = México  
13 = Nicaragua  
14 = Panamá  
15 = Paraguay  
16 = Perú  
17 = Uruguay  
18 = Venezuela

A3a. ¿Es este el país de donde inmigró?

**IMMIGRAT** A3a. Is this the country from which you immigrated 1

0 = No  
1 = Sí
**A3b. ¿De qué país inmigró? (Tarjeta#2)**

*IMMFROM* A3b what country did you immigrate from

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bolivia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Chile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cuba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Republica Dominicana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ecuador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>El Salvador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Guatemala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Honduras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Panama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Paraguay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Peru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Uruguay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Venezuela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Reuso a contestar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A4. ¿Cuántos meses ha estado viviendo en los Estados Unidos?**

*MONTHUS* A4. How many months in the U.S.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 96</td>
<td>range</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A4a. ¿En qué fecha llegó a los Estados Unidos?**

*DATEUS* A4a. what date did you arrive to the U.S.

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unlimited - Unlimited = dd/mm/yyyy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A5. ¿Cuál es su estado civil? (Tarjeta#3)**

*MARITAL* A5. What is your marital status

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Casado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Unión Libre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Soltero / Jamás Casado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Separado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Divorciado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Viudo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Reuso a contestar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**A6.** Identificar la frase que mejor describe su orientación sexual: (Tarjeta#4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEXORIEN</th>
<th>A6. Sexual orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Exclusivamente heterosexual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mayormente heterosexual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bisexual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mayormente homosexual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Exclusivamente homosexual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Otro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>No se</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Reuso a contestar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>No aplica</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A7.** ¿Estás actualmente empleado? (Y/N)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMPLOYED</th>
<th>A7. currently employed?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>No se</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Reuso a contestar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>No aplica</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A7a.** ¿Cuántas horas trabaja por semana?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HRSWEEK</th>
<th>A7a. How many hours do you work per week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 999</td>
<td>range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9997</td>
<td>No se</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9998</td>
<td>Reuso a contestar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9999</td>
<td>No aplica</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A7b.** ¿Cuánto te pagan por hora?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HRPAY</th>
<th>A7b How much do they pay you per hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 999</td>
<td>range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9997</td>
<td>No se</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9998</td>
<td>Reuso a contestar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9999</td>
<td>No aplica</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A7c. Este trabajo es:

\[ WRKTYPE \]

1c. This job is:

\[ 1 = \text{Temporario} \]
\[ 2 = \text{Permanente} \]
\[ 3 = \text{Otro} \]
\[ 7 = \text{No se} \]
\[ 8 = \text{Reuso a contestar} \]
\[ 9 = \text{No aplica} \]

A8. ¿Cuál es ingresos combinados de todos los medios incluso empleo, trabajos varios, ayuda del gobierno, etc. para su casa durante los últimos 3 meses?

INCOMCOM

A8. How much was your combined income for the last 3 months?

\[ 0 - 999999 = \text{range} \]
\[ 9999997 = \text{No se} \]
\[ 9999998 = \text{Reuso a contestar} \]
\[ 9999999 = \text{No aplica} \]

A9. ¿Cuánta gente contribuye a los ingresos de su casa?

INCOMPEO

A9. How many people contribute to the income in your house?

\[ 1 - 99 = \text{range} \]
\[ 997 = \text{No se} \]
\[ 998 = \text{Reuso a contestar} \]
\[ 999 = \text{No aplica} \]

A10. ¿Cuánta gente, incluyéndolo a usted depende de estos ingresos?

INCOMDEP

A10. How many people depend on your income?

\[ 1 - 99 = \text{range} \]
\[ 997 = \text{No se} \]
\[ 998 = \text{Reuso a contestar} \]
\[ 999 = \text{No aplica} \]

A11. ¿Cuáles eran sus ingresos anuales (en dólares) desde su llegada a los Estados Unidos?

INCOMANN

A11. What were your annual income since your arrival to the U.S.

\[ 0 - 999999 = \text{range} \]
\[ 9999997 = \text{No se} \]
\[ 9999998 = \text{Reuso a contestar} \]
\[ 9999999 = \text{No aplica} \]
A12. ¿Cual fue el último grado que completaste en la escuela? (Tarjeta#5)

SCHOOL A12. What was the last grade you completed in school 1

1 = Menos de High School/Secundaria
2 = Diploma de High School/Secundaria
3 = Algún entrenamiento/Universidad (carrera o ciclo) después de terminar High School/Secundaria
4 = Bachelor's (4-5 años de Universidad) (AYUDA: ciclo, carrera, diploma)
5 = Post-grado / Estudios profesionales
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica

A13. Cual fue el ultimo grado que completaste en la High School/ Secundaria

SCHOOL1 A12a. What was the last grade you completed in high school 2

0 - 96 = range
97 = No se
98 = Reuso a contestar
99 = No aplica

A14. ¿Qué tan bien habla usted Español? (Tarjeta#6)

LANSPAN A13. how well do you speak Spanish 1

1 = Hablo / Entiendo Un Poco
2 = Entiendo Mas o Menos
3 = Hablo Bien
4 = Hablo Muy Bien
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica

A14a. ¿Qué tan bien habla usted Ingles? (Tarjeta#6)

LANENG A13a. How well do you speak English 1

1 = Hablo / Entiendo Un Poco
2 = Entiendo Mas o Menos
3 = Hablo Bien
4 = Hablo Muy Bien
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica
**A14b.** Habla algún otro idioma?

*LANOTHER* A13b. Do you speak another language

0 = No  
1 = Sí  
7 = No se  
8 = Reuso a contestar  
9 = No aplica

**A14c.** Que otro idioma habla?

*LANSPEC* A13c. specify what other language do you speak

**A14d.** ¿Qué tan bien habla usted [Response to A14c] ?

*LANOTHE2* A13d. How well do you speak other language

1 = Hablo / Entiendo Un Poco  
2 = Entiendo Mas o Menos  
3 = Hablo Bien  
4 = Hablo Muy Bien  
7 = No se  
8 = Reuso a contestar  
9 = No aplica

**A15.** ¿Cual es la razón PRINCIPAL por la cual usted inmigro a Estado Unidos (Tarjeta#7)

*IMMREAS1* A14. MAIN reason why immigrated to the U.S.

1 = Económica  
2 = Política  
3 = Para reunirme con mi familia  
4 = Otra: Especifique:  
7 = No se  
8 = Reuso a contestar  
9 = No aplica

**A15a.** Otra: especifique

*IMMOTH1* A14a. specify reason for immigrating to U.S.
A15b. ¿Cual es la SEGUNDA razón por la cual usted inmigro a Estado Unidos (Tarjeta#7)

IMMREAS2 A14b. what is the SECOND main reason why you immigrated to the U.S.

1 = Económica
2 = Política
3 = Para reunirme con mi familia
4 = Otra: Especifique:
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica

A15c. Otra: especifique

IMMOTH2 A14c. specify reason for immigrating to U.S.

30

A15d. ¿Cual es la TERCERA razón por la cual usted inmigro a Estado Unidos (Tarjeta#7)

IMMREAS3 A14d. what is the THIRD main reason why you immigrated to the U.S.

1 = Económica
2 = Política
3 = Para reunirme con mi familia
4 = Otra: Especifique:
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica

A15e. Otra: especifique

IMMOTH3 A14e. specify reason for immigrating to U.S.

30

A16. ¿Vino usted a los Estados Unidos solo, con su familia y/o con amigos?

CAMEUSA A15. Did you come to the U.S. alone, with your family and/or friends:

Solo

0 = No
1 = Si
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica
CAMEUSB  A15. Did you come to the U.S. alone, with your family and/or friends:  
Familia  
0 = No  
1 = Si  
7 = No se  
8 = Reuso a contestar  
9 = No aplica  

CAMEUSC  A15. Did you come to the U.S. alone, with your family and/or friends:  
Amigos  
0 = No  
1 = Si  
7 = No se  
8 = Reuso a contestar  
9 = No aplica  

A17. ¿Tenía usted a algún miembro de familia en los Estados Unidos antes de inmigrar aquí?  
FAMYN  A16 did you have a family member in the U.S. before immigrating  
0 = No  
1 = Si  
7 = No se  
8 = Reuso a contestar  
9 = No aplica  

A17a. ¿Quién? (Miembro de Familia) (Tarjeta#8)  
FAMWHOB A16a Who (family member): Padre  
0 = No  
1 = Si  
97 = No se  
98 = Reuso a contestar  
99 = No aplica  

FAMWHOC A16a Who (family member): Madre  
0 = No  
1 = Si  
97 = No se  
98 = Reuso a contestar  
99 = No aplica  
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**FAMWHOD** A16a Who (family member): Abuelos 1

0 = No  
1 = Si  
97 = No se  
98 = Reuso a contestar  
99 = No aplica

**FAMWHOE** A16a Who (family member): Esposo/a 1

0 = No  
1 = Si  
97 = No se  
98 = Reuso a contestar  
99 = No aplica

**FAMWHOF** A16a Who (family member): Hermano/a 1

0 = No  
1 = Si  
97 = No se  
98 = Reuso a contestar  
99 = No aplica

**FAMWHOG** A16a Who (family member): Tio/a 1

0 = No  
1 = Si  
97 = No se  
98 = Reuso a contestar  
99 = No aplica

**FAMWHOH** A16a Who (family member): Primo/a 1

0 = No  
1 = Si  
97 = No se  
98 = Reuso a contestar  
99 = No aplica

**FAMWHOI** A16a Who (family member): Sobrino/a 1

0 = No  
1 = Si  
97 = No se  
98 = Reuso a contestar  
99 = No aplica
**FAMWHO** A16a Who (family member): Otro 1

0 = No
1 = Si
97 = No se
98 = Reuso a contestar
99 = No aplica

**A17b.** Especifique

**FAMSPEC** A16b. other family member specify 30

**A18.** ¿Tiene algún miembro de su familia que vino a quedarse con usted después que usted inmigró a los Estados Unidos?

**FAMYN2** A17. do you have a family member that came to stay with you after immigrating to U.S. 1

0 = No
1 = Si
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica

**A18a.** ¿Quién? (Miembro de Familia) (Tarjeta#8)

**FAMWHO2B** A17a Who (family member): Padre 1

0 = No
1 = Si
97 = No se
98 = Reuso a contestar
99 = No aplica

**FAMWHO2C** A17a Who (family member): Madre 1

0 = No
1 = Si
97 = No se
98 = Reuso a contestar
99 = No aplica
**FAMWHO2D** A17a Who (family member): Abuelos  
\[
\begin{align*}
0 &= \text{No} \\
1 &= \text{Si} \\
97 &= \text{No se} \\
98 &= \text{Reuso a contestar} \\
99 &= \text{No aplica}
\end{align*}
\]

**FAMWHO2E** A17a Who (family member): Esposo/a  
\[
\begin{align*}
0 &= \text{No} \\
1 &= \text{Si} \\
97 &= \text{No se} \\
98 &= \text{Reuso a contestar} \\
99 &= \text{No aplica}
\end{align*}
\]

**FAMWHO2F** A17a Who (family member): Hermano/a  
\[
\begin{align*}
0 &= \text{No} \\
1 &= \text{Si} \\
97 &= \text{No se} \\
98 &= \text{Reuso a contestar} \\
99 &= \text{No aplica}
\end{align*}
\]

**FAMWHO2G** A17a Who (family member): Tio/a  
\[
\begin{align*}
0 &= \text{No} \\
1 &= \text{Si} \\
97 &= \text{No se} \\
98 &= \text{Reuso a contestar} \\
99 &= \text{No aplica}
\end{align*}
\]

**FAMWHO2H** A17a Who (family member): Primo/a  
\[
\begin{align*}
0 &= \text{No} \\
1 &= \text{Si} \\
97 &= \text{No se} \\
98 &= \text{Reuso a contestar} \\
99 &= \text{No aplica}
\end{align*}
\]

**FAMWHO2I** A17a Who (family member): Sobrino/a  
\[
\begin{align*}
0 &= \text{No} \\
1 &= \text{Si} \\
97 &= \text{No se} \\
98 &= \text{Reuso a contestar} \\
99 &= \text{No aplica}
\end{align*}
\]
**FAMWHO2J**

A17a Who (family member): Otro

0 = No
1 = Sí
97 = No se
98 = Reuso a contestar
99 = No aplica

A18b. Especifique

**FAMSPEC2**

A17b. other family member specify 30

A19. Cuando usted crecía, comparado a otras familias en su comunidad, usted diría que su familia era:

**POV**

A18. when you were growing up, compared to other families, did you feel that your family was:

1 = Más pobre que los demás
2 = Igual a los demás
3 = Más rico que los demás
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica

A20. ¿En la comunidad en la cual usted creció o vivió antes de su llegada a los Estados Unidos como caracteriza el nivel de crimen?

**COMMCRIM**

A19. in the neighborhood that you grew up or lived in prior to coming to the U.S. how would you characterize the crime level

1 = Alto
2 = Mediano
3 = Bajo
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica
A21. ¿Cuál es el idioma primario que usted usa con sus vecinos en la comunidad en que usted está viviendo actualmente? (Tarjeta#9)

LANCOMM A20. what is the primary language you use with your neighbors in the community where you are currently living

1 = Solamente Ingles
2 = Casi Siempre Ingles
3 = Tanto Ingles Como Español
4 = Casi Siempre Español
5 = Solamente Español
6 = No se
7 = Reuso a contestar
8 = No aplica

A22. ¿Cuál de los siguiente mejor describe su estado legal en los Estados Unidos? (Tarjeta#10)

LEGSTAT A21. which of the following describes your legal status in the U.S.

1 = Residente Permanente
2 = Sin papeles
3 = Visa de estudiante
4 = Dependiente en la visa de otra persona (Por ejemplo: esposo, padres, o guardián.)
5 = Exilio
6 = Residente temporario
7 = Visa de trabajo temporario
8 = Visa de turista
9 = Visa expirada
10 = Inmigrante protegido temporariamente
97 = No se
98 = Reuso a contestar
99 = No aplica

A23. ¿En este momento donde se encuentran su Madre? (Tarjeta#11)

PLMOTHER A22. where is your mother

1 = En la misma ciudad
2 = USA
3 = Fuera de Estados Unidos
4 = Otro lugar
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica
A23a. ¿Qué lugar?

PLMOTHE1 A22a. where is your mother, other: specify

A23b. ¿En este momento donde se encuentran su Padre? (Tarjeta#11)

PLFATHER A22b. where is your father

1 = En la misma ciudad
2 = USA
3 = Fuera de Estados Unidos
4 = Otro lugar
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica

A23c. ¿Qué lugar?

PLFATHE1 A22c. where is your father, other: specify

A23d. ¿En este momento donde se encuentran su Pareja? (Tarjeta#11)

PLPARTN A22d. where is your partner

1 = En la misma ciudad
2 = USA
3 = Fuera de Estados Unidos
4 = Otro lugar
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica

A23e. ¿Qué lugar?

PLPARTN1 A22e. where is your partner, other: specify

A23f. ¿En este momento donde se encuentran su Mejor Amigo/a? (Tarjeta#11)

PLFRIEND A22f. where is your best friend

1 = En la misma ciudad
2 = USA
3 = Fuera de Estados Unidos
4 = Otro lugar
7 = No se
8 = Reuso a contestar
9 = No aplica
A23g. ¿Que lugar?

*PLFRIEND* A22g. where is your friend, other: specify 30
Appendix G

ADULT CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN A RESEARCH STUDY

Social Determinants Predicting Trajectories of HIV/AIDS with Recent Latinas Immigrants

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY
This study aims to describe how recent Latina immigrants’ (age 18-23 years old) social life, culture, mental health, and neighborhoods influence how much they perform health risk behaviors during their first four years in the United States. Examples of health risk behaviors include using alcohol and drugs, doing risky sexual behaviors, not having proper health care. The study also hopes to learn how recent Latina immigrants’ family, friends, and romantic partners may influence how much they perform health risk behaviors. Findings from this study also will help researchers develop a screening tool [titled the Latina Screening Index of Risk and Resilience] to help community care providers to predict recent Latina immigrants’ risk for HIV/AIDS and substance use disorders and make interventions to support the health of Latina immigrants.

NUMBER OF STUDY PARTICIPANTS
If you decide to be in this study, you will be one of approximately 600 people in this research study.

DURATION OF THE STUDY
Your participation will require 4-annual assessment interviews conducted by our community experienced and culturally competent bilingual interviewers; as well as collection of saliva and urine specimens to test for substance use and sexually transmitted diseases (1 time per year for a total of 4 tests).

PROCEDURES
If you agree to be in the study, we will ask you to do the following things:

1. We will first interview you for about 1.5 hours, which will be followed up by 3 more 1.5 hour long interviews (to be conducted every 12 months). There will be 4 interviews in total.

2. We will ask you many questions about your life. Some of the questions are about substance use, sexual behaviors, abuse, mental health, and things you may have done that are against the law.

3. We will record the interview and staff will listen to the digital recordings. A code will be given to the digital recordings and they will be kept in a computer password protected. The recordings will be destroyed once the study concludes. You can stop the recording at any moment. You can refuse to be recorded at all.

4. In the event you become stressed due to your participation in the study and decide to discontinue the interview, we will do so immediately and provide referrals to counseling to deal with such stress.
5. We also will ask you to participate in saliva (drug test and HIV) and urine (for gonorrhea and chlamydia) testing for substance use and sexually transmitted diseases during each of the 4 years that you participate in the study.
   a. Saliva will be collected and tested by a study interviewer to test for substance use. You will be asked to place a swab in your mouth for 3-5 minutes until swab is saturated with saliva. You will be notified of screening result at the time of the test. In the event of positive results, you will receive counseling and self-help referrals by a study interviewer.
   b. Testing for STDs will be done by Care Resource - a community-based health service organization specializing in testing and prevention of Sexually Transmitted Diseases (STDs). Testing will be done staff employed by Care Resource. Testing will take place at Care Resource’s Downtown Miami Office (3510 Biscayne Blvd., Suite 300 Miami, FL 33137) or Care Resource’s mobile units at several Miami-Dade community locations (see attached list of testing sites). The amount of urine collected during each test is expected to be at least 1/3 of a typical urine specimen collection cup. Saliva will be collected by placing a swab in mouth for 3-5 minutes. You will be notified of screening result at the time of the test. In the event of positive results, you will receive counseling and medical referrals by Care Resource.
   c. We will like to have access to your test results with us. If you agree, you will need to sign a release authorizing Care Resource to share your results with us.

RISKS AND/OR DISCOMFORTS
It is anticipated that this study will involve minimal physical risks. We are not aware of any negative side effects associated with completing the interview assessments used in this study. Nevertheless, as with many studies assessing risk behaviors, some people may experience some degree of discomfort and stress. Moreover, no substantial medical risks exist to the participants, other than minor discomfort in response to urine and saliva tests. Participants testing positive for STDs / HIV will receive counseling and medical referrals by Care Resource. Although all measures to protect confidentiality will be put on place, the possibility exists that security of encrypted electronic information could be jeopardized. In the remote case that such event occurs, it will be immediately reported to the Florida International University IRB.

BENEFITS
This study is expected to generate important information about factors that may impact HIV transmission and other health risk behaviors in this population. Study findings may inform scientists of potential modifiable risks, and could enhance researchers’ information for the future development of both HIV and health risk interventions. On an individual level, our prior experience indicates that most participants find the research process interesting and rewarding. Many participants also volunteer comments that research participation increases their knowledge of HIV and other health risks.

ALTERNATIVES
There are no known alternatives available to you other than not taking part in this study. However, any significant new findings developed during the course of the research which may relate to your willingness to continue participation will be provided to you.
CONFIDENTIALITY
The records of this study will be kept private and will be protected to the fullest extent provided by law. In any sort of report we might publish, we will not include any information that will make it possible to identify a subject. Research records will be stored securely and only the researcher team will have access to the records. However, your records may be reviewed for audit purposes by authorized University or other agents who will be bound by the same provisions of confidentiality.

Every effort will be made to protect the confidentiality of study respondents and the data collected. To this end, several measures will be undertaken. First, respondents’ names will not be kept on questionnaires. A unique study identification number will be used in place of their names. The list which includes these numbers and the names will be stored in a locked cabinet at the College of Public Health and Social Work at Florida International University (FIU), along with the consent forms. The data collected (electronic and paper files, and recorded interviews) will also be kept under password protection or in a locked cabinet at FIU, but separate from the cabinet that has the list and the consent forms. Both the locked cabinets will be accessible to the Principal Investigator only. Second, the data collected will be coded and entered into a password protected database in password protected computers at FIU. Only those who enter and analyze the data and the Principal Investigator will be given passwords for these computers and files. Also, this study has been given a Certificate of Confidentiality, which protects researchers from being forced to disclose information that may identify you. But under the law, we must report to the state suspected cases of child abuse (or if you tell us you are planning to cause serious harm to yourself or others).

COMPENSATION & COSTS
The participants will be compensated for their time and effort. The compensation will be distributed accordingly, $45 for baseline interview (first year) plus $30 for HIV/STDs Test; $50 for first follow-up interview (2nd year) plus $30 for HIV/STDs Test; $55 for second follow-up interview (3rd year) plus $30 for HIV/STDs Test; and $60 for last interview plus $30 for HIV/STDs test. You will also have the opportunity to receive $20 for every eligible person (up to three) that you refer and participates in the study. You will not be responsible for any costs to participate in this study.

RIGHT TO DECLINE OR WITHDRAW
Your participation in this study is voluntary. You are free to participate in the study or withdraw your consent at any time during the study. Your withdrawal or lack of participation will not affect any benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. The investigator reserves the right to remove you without your consent at such time that they feel it is in the best interest. You may refuse to share your lab results with us. If you refuse, your participation in the research study will not be affected.

RESEARCHER CONTACT INFORMATION
If you have any questions about the purpose, procedures, or any other issues relating to this research study you may contact Dr. Mario De La Rosa at Florida International University, PCA 354B, 305-348-5794, Delarosa@fiu.edu; or Dr. Frank Dillon at the University at Albany – State University of New York, 518-442-5047, fdillon@albany.edu.
IRB CONTACT INFORMATION
If you would like to talk with someone about your rights of being a subject in this research study or about ethical issues with this research study, you may contact the FIU Office of Research Integrity by phone at 305-348-2494 or by email at ori@fiu.edu.

PARTICIPANT AGREEMENT
I have read the information in this consent form and agree to participate in this study. I have had a chance to ask any questions I have about this study, and they have been answered for me. I understand that I am entitled to a copy of this form after it has been read and signed.

________________________________           __________________
Signature of Participant      Date

________________________________
Printed Name of Participant

________________________________    __________________
Signature of Person Obtaining Consent    Date