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FAMILISMO, ENCULTURATION, AND ACCULTURATION AS PREDICTORS OF
PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING IN LATINA/OS

Abstract

by Sarah Jacqueline Rangel, Ph.D.
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Chair: Brian W. McNeill

This study was designed to determine how enculturation, acculturation, and familismo influence Latina/os’ psychological well-being. A limited amount of studies have integrated enculturation, acculturation and familismo in their research designs to explore moderator and meditational hypotheses. Participants were 401 Latina/os who reside in the Southwest and Pacific Northwest of the United States and who are of Mexican heritage. Participants were recruited from the community, universities, and community colleges. Participants completed a demographic questionnaire, the Attitudinal Familism Scale (AFS; Steidel & Contreras, 2003), the Pan-Hispanic Familism Scale (PHFS; Villareal, Blozis, and Widaman, 2005), the Acculturation Rating Scale for Mexican Americans-II (ARSMA-II; Cuellar et al., 1995), the Latina/o Values Scale (LVS; Kim et al., 2009), and the Psychological Well-Being–Short Scale (PWBSS; Van Dierendonck, 2005 and Diaz et al., 2006). Participants had the option to complete instruments in English or Spanish. Results for Hypothesis 1 was not supported and indicated that enculturation did not moderate the relationship between familismo and psychological well-being. However, both familismo and enculturation were positively related to psychological well-being. In Hypothesis 2, familismo and acculturation were positively related to psychological well-being;
acculturation did moderate the relationship between *familismo* and psychological well-being as predicted. Thus, the relationship between *familismo* and psychological well-being was positive for both high and low acculturation groups; however the relationship was a bit stronger for low acculturated individuals. Hypothesis 3 was partially supported and indicated that enculturation moderately predicted psychological well-being but there was no significant mediation by *familismo*. Hypothesis 4 was not supported because there was no significant relationship between acculturation and psychological well-being. Hypothesis 5 was not supported because after controlling for levels of socioeconomic status, educational attainment, and age, Latina/os who were second generation tended to report higher scores on enculturation than those belonging in the first and 1.5 generation. Additionally, there were no differences in *familismo* and psychological well-being across all generations. For Hypothesis 6 as predicted, Latina/os who were first generation averaged lower on acculturation compared to those in the 1.5 and second generation. Interpretation and critique of the findings, clinical and theoretical implications, and future directions are discussed.
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CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

The second half of the 20th century saw a new wave of ethnically diverse people migrating from Latin America to the United States. As Latina/os migrate to the United States, they bring unique cultures and histories from their respective countries of origin. Some of the reasons for Latina/os migrating to the United States include political and economic turmoil in their countries that force them to move, or they may have aspirations for their children to have a better future (Guarnaccia, Pincay, Alegria, et al., 2007). Historical events, migration patterns, and adaptation processes have influenced Latina/o subgroups’ experiences while residing in the United States. As a result, each Latina/o subgroup’s unique experience varies in terms of privilege, access or lack of power, and other consequences of their settlement in the United States (Guarnaccia et al., 2007; Santiago-Rivera, Arredondo, & Gallardo-Cooper, 2002). More studies are documenting Latina/os’ experience with such stressors as immigration (Mena, Padilla, Maldonado, 1987), lack of access to quality health care (Vega & Lopez, 2001), and discrimination in education and unemployment (Araujo & Borrell, 2006; Gil, Vega, & Dimas, 1994; Hwang, & Goto, 2008; Padilla, Cervantes, Maldonado, & Garcia, 1998; Verdugo, 2003). These stressors may place Latina/os and their families at potential risk for psychological distress and as a result, for developing physical and psychological problems (Alegria, Shrout, Woo et al., 2007; Barger & Gallo, 2008; Falicov, 1998; Golding & Burnam; Santiago-Rivera, 2003).

As the number of foreign- or U.S.-born Latina/os residing in the United States continues to increase, there is a growing need for psychological research in understanding the unique experiences of Latina/os with regard to the role of the family and ethnic identity. Empirical studies support that familismo (Latina/o familism) is considered the most important Latina/o core
cultural value that is based on allocentric and collectivistic worldview, which values interdependence, obligation, affiliation, cooperation, loyalty, reciprocity, and solidarity among members of the family (Triandis, Martin, Bentacourt, Lisansky, & Chang, 1982). Despite empirical evidence supporting *familismo* as a Latina/o core cultural value, there are several issues pertaining to the existing psychological research on the Latina/o family. First, within the last 30 years, a limited number of empirical psychological research studies have been conducted on the Latina/o family. Second, researchers have yet to reach a consensus in terms of using consistent operational definitions that range from global to specific aspects of *familismo*, and develop valid and reliable measures that capture the complexity of the construct of *familismo*. Third, few empirical studies have examined how *familismo* relates to ethnic identity or enculturation by using multidimensional measures of such constructs related to psychological well-being.

Research studies have primarily focused on the maintenance of *familismo* and other Latina/o cultural values by assessing behavioral changes that take place in Latina/o’s way of life. Researchers have strongly opposed using behavioral changes to assess Latina/o cultural values such as *familismo* for several reasons. First, researchers argue that cultural values represent an individual’s worldview and remain stable over time (Marin, 1992). Second, behavioral indicators of cultural retention or involvement are unable to show direct links between culture and outcomes (Phinney, 1996). A limited number of empirical studies have shown the positive relationship between the influence of enculturation on Latina/o values about the family and how individuals perceive their psychological well-being (Hurtado, Rodriguez, Gurin & Beals, 1993; Rodriguez, Mira, Paez, & Myers, 2007). For this reason, there is a need to further evaluate challenges faced by Latina/o subgroups with regard to maintaining Latina/o cultural values.
(enculturation), such as *familismo* while simultaneously integrating and adapting to U.S. cultural values (acculturation) and how these processes may lead to better psychological well-being.

In this study, I investigated the relationships between adherence to Latina/o cultural values or enculturation, and more specifically *familismo*, adherence to U.S. or mainstream cultural values or acculturation, and psychological well-being. Specifically, I treated the level of enculturation or acculturation as independent dimensions and examined whether these dimensions impacted the strength of the relationship between *familismo* and psychological well-being. I also examined the contribution of familismo in better understanding the relationships between psychological well-being and enculturation and acculturation, respectively.

The bidirectional or multidimensional framework has been utilized in empirical research and clinical practice as a guide to understanding the enculturative and acculturative processes of immigrants. This framework is helpful in the conceptualization of Latina/os integrating and adapting to the mainstream culture while maintaining their heritage culture (Cabassa, 2003; Rivera, 2010). However, measures based on the bidirectional model rely primarily on language based items which limits the ability to measure other important domains such as attitudes and values or the maintenance of traditions and customs associated with cultural identity (Cabassa, 2003; Kim, Soliz, Orellana, & Alamilla, 2009). Therefore, researchers need to utilize instruments that assess enculturation and acculturation independently, and examine contextual factors that affect the enculturative and acculturative processes. In this study acculturative processes were conceptualized similar to the bidimensional framework, with the exception of the “process of socializing (or resocializing) into and maintaining the norms of the indigenous culture” (Kim et al., p. 72). More specifically, Kim et al. stated that the concept of cultural maintenance under the bidirectional model may apply primarily to immigrant Latina/os who
have socialized into their respective Latina/o cultural norms before arriving to the U.S. Yet, Latina/os who are born in the U.S. and who are several generations removed from immigration have different enculturative processes. Therefore, it is important to differentiate Latina/o’s enculturative processes from acculturative processes to have a better understanding of an individual’s experience and psychological well-being.

Ryff and Keyes’s (1995) multidimensional model of psychological well-being has been utilized as a guide to empirical research in understanding the challenges Latina/os may face as they strive to function positively in life, specifically in pursuing meaningful goals, growth and development of the person, and establishing quality ties to others (Gloria, Castellanos, & Orozco, 2005). The existing empirical research studying the psychological well-being of Latina/os has mostly focused on the relationship between psychological well-being and family support, specifically in university samples. In general, empirical studies have found a positive relationship between family support and psychological well-being or adjustment (e.g., Castillo, Clooney, & Brossart, 2004; Degarmo & Martinez, 2006). However, there are a few studies that have shown contradictory results (e.g., Gloria et al., 2005; Rodriguez, Bingham, Mira, Morris, & Cardoza, 2003). For example, Rodriguez et al. (2003) found that family support did not seem to be as effective as support from friends in protecting against psychological distress. Rodriguez et al. (2003) raised the *emic* or culture specific question in regard to whether the measures employed in their study accurately captured the experience of psychological well-being and distress as experienced by Latina/os.

Hurtado, Rodriguez, Gurin, and Beals (1993) and Rodriguez, Mira, Paez, and Myers (2007) are the only two empirical studies that have documented aspects of familism and enculturation among adult Latina/os, specifically cultural identity or social identities. Hurtado et
al. (1993) investigated the relationship between adult Latina/os’ social identities and the possible impact on ethnic socialization of children in a survey of a sample of adult Mexicana/os who were born in Mexico and dominant in Spanish as well as Chicana/os who were born in the United States, residing in Southwestern U.S. or in the Chicago metropolitan area and dominant in English. Hurtado et al. found that class and cultural content such as familism were linked to ethnicity and political, family, and class expressions of identity. More specifically, the majority of both Mexicana/os and Chicana/os, especially the most affluent Chicana/os who think of themselves as Spanish-speaking family members, prefer to live near their relatives and desire their children to retain their Mexican culture. Class and cultural content were also linked to ethnicity for those who have strong ties to Mexico as Chicana/os’ ethnic identity socialization was associated with political, family, and class expressions of ethnicity.

Rodriguez et al. (2007) examined the relationships between familism, acculturation, and enculturation and how these contributed to individual’s psychological well-being and distress. Rodriguez et al.’s most important finding was that after controlling for socioeconomic status variables, individuals who identified with a stronger Mexican cultural identity reported a more positive sense of well-being. In addition, Rodriguez et al. found that irrespective of cultural identification (Mexican oriented, Anglo oriented, Bicultural), there was a greater value being placed on the family. However, Rodriguez et al. strongly caution against making generalizations about the positive relationship between acculturation (i.e., enculturation or Mexican orientation) and psychological well-being because of the mixed findings in the literature on acculturation and mental health (Rogler, Cortes, & Malgady, 1991). Researchers need to obtain a more thorough understanding of the relationship between acculturative and enculturative processes and their impact on psychological well-being among Latina/os residing in the United States.
In summary, researchers need to use instruments measuring *familismo* in both a global sense and in studying specific subcomponents, as well as include important contextual variables that could shed more light in further understanding the complexities of this construct. Researchers also need to utilize consistent instruments with strong psychometric properties in order to establish reliability and validity in the study of *familismo* in order to clarify the relationship between *familismo*, enculturation, and acculturation. Thus, there is a gap that exists in the research literature that examines the relationship between the maintenance of *familismo* and how it relates to enculturative and acculturative processes with regard to Latina/os and their psychological well-being.

The present study sought out to close this gap by investigating the relationship between *familismo*, enculturation, and psychological well-being among Latina/os residing in the United States. This study also sought out to contribute to the limited existing body of literature that attempts to identify Latina/os’ strengths and, in turn, inform cultural, research, and educational communities, family systems, and individuals who may obtain knowledge that can be used to ameliorate possible stressors or risk factors previously mentioned. The study of Latina/os’ experiences with regard to the role of the family and ethnic identity has critical implications for the field of psychology in terms of informing counselors of clients’ worldviews and possible impacts on her/his psychological well-being in order to further develop and refine existing treatment approaches (Falicov, 1998, 2005), and to guide training programs (Vega & Lopez, 2001). Consequently, the field of psychology will also benefit by increasing the number of culturally competent bilingual and bicultural professionals, who in turn, will be able to meet the needs of the growing number of Latina/os based on their unique cultural and sociopolitical life experiences (Prieto, McNeill, Walls, & Gomez, 2001; Santiago-Rivera, 2003).
CHAPTER TWO

Introduction

Latina/os are considered a heterogeneous group with unique cultural and sociopolitical histories from their respective countries of origin. Indeed, Latina/os migrated from a variety of Spanish-speaking countries such as Mexico, Puerto Rico, Cuba, El Salvador, Colombia, Argentina, Peru, and the Dominican Republic, among others (Falicov, 1998). Migration patterns and adaptation processes coupled with historical events have shaped each Latina/o subgroup’s experience differently in terms of privilege, access or lack of power, and other consequences of their settlement in the United States (Santiago-Rivera, Arredondo, & Gallardo-Cooper, 2002). Immigration, poverty, discrimination in education and employment, and access to quality healthcare, among other stressors, may place individuals and their families at potential risk for psychological distress, and in turn, for developing physical and psychological problems (Falicov, 1998; Golding & Burnam, 1990; Santiago-Rivera, 2003).

Historically, Latina/o individuals and their families have underutilized psychological services. This is mainly due to a lack of culturally sensitive or responsive mental health services that can meet their unique needs (Prieto, McNeill, Walls, & Gomez, 2001), as well as an insufficient number of professionally trained bilingual and bicultural mental health providers (Vega & Lopez, 2001). Understanding the role of family and ethnic identity is critical for informing counselors regarding a client's worldview, and the possible impact on Latina/o psychological well-being. Therefore, it is necessary to increase our understanding of the Latina/o individual and family experience to further develop and refine existing treatment approaches (Falicov, 1998, 2005) and to guide training programs (Vega & Lopez, 2001). As a result, such approaches and programs will serve to increase the number of competent bilingual
and bicultural professionals in the delivery of services based on the unique cultural and sociopolitical life experiences of Latina/o individuals and family systems (Prieto, McNeill, Walls, & Gomez, 2001; Santiago-Rivera, 2003).

Although Latina/os have unique life experiences, they share histories of colonization and continued societal oppression. As a result, core cultural values are shared among Latina/o subgroups (Campesino, Belyea, & Schwartz, 2009). The following review provides a brief overview of Latina/o cultural values related to gender roles and interpersonal relations, including *familismo* (familism). *Familismo* translated from the Spanish language to the English language is familism. The terms *familismo* and familism are used here only in reference to the construct of *familismo* specific to the Latina/o population. This review will also address the conceptualization and measurement of the construct of *familismo*, processes of acculturation and enculturation, and the influence of family factors on ethnic identity development. Next, I provide an overview of research on psychological well-being with Latina/os residing in the United States. Finally, the review ends with a summary that addresses implications for future research, clinical work, and training programs with the U.S. Latina/o population.

**Overview of Latina/o Cultural Values**

**Gender Roles**

As frequently noted in the literature, Ramirez and Arce (1981) argued that the concept of *machismo* (maleness) erroneously implies that it is primarily a Mexican or Latin American phenomenon. Stressing patriarchy, exaggerated masculinity, and sexual virility, specifically in the extramarital domain, Falicov (2006) stated that *machismo* refers to messages communicated to boys, who are taught to “*ser hombres*” (to be men) by fulfilling the expectations to take care of the family, be in control, and be the dominator in the family. Mirande (1997) later argued that
positive aspects of male behavior are frequently neglected in the literature. As a result, an inadequate picture of Mexican American male behavior has been generated. Mirande (1997) utilized qualitative methods such as focus groups, and reviewed historical sources (i.e., stories, myths, and organized interviews) in Mexico to develop Mirande’s Sex Role Inventory. The instrument captures the positive and negative meanings attributed to machismo. Most recently, Arciniega, Anderson, Tovar-Blank, and Tracey (2008) examined the construct of machismo and its relationship to psychological functioning and found two separate aspects of machismo. The first aspect was associated with aggression and antisocial behavior, greater levels of alexithymia (i.e., the awareness one has of one’s own and other’s emotions), and wishful thinking as a coping mechanism. In contrast, the second aspect, referred to as caballerismo (gentlemeness), was positively associated with nurturance, being family-centered, ethnic pride, chivalry, awareness of emotions, and proactiveness in self-seeking behaviors.

The female counterpart to marianismo (martyrism) is defined by Falicov (2006) as the expectation to live in purity, submissiveness, and sacrifice, like the Virgin Mary. These values are explicitly and implicitly communicated to young Latinas. As a result, Gil and Vasquez (1996) suggested that these expectations may generate internal and external conflicts with the self, and among family members and significant others. Hurtado (1995), in a critical review, found that feminist researchers have studied gender relations within the context of the Latina/o family and thus have portrayed Latina/o family life more accurately than did prior gender relation studies. For example, Baca Zinn (1980) found that women who were employed had a critical impact on marital power and on marital interaction, as employed wives openly challenged the cultural ideal of male dominance among their husbands. In the last two decades a number of researchers have focused on studying Latina/o family phenomena by specifically
examining marital decision-making, gender subordination within the family, conceptions of masculinity and femininity, and the role of fathers in the socialization of children (see reviews by Vega, 1990, and McLoyd, Cauce, Takeuchi, & Wilson, 2000). From a Latina/o theologian perspective, Campesino and Schwartz (2006) argued that the spiritual experiences of women are critical because in Latina/o culture, the mother, grandmother, and other females have a fundamental and unrecognized role in inculcating values and keeping religious rituals alive within the family and local community.

The literature on spirituality among Latina/os reviewed by Campesino and Schwartz (2006) indicates that there is a lack of culturally relevant conceptualizations, particularly in healthcare research. Most recently, Campesino, Belyea, and Schwartz (2009) investigated Latina/o and non-Latina/o university students in the southwestern United States. Results showed that Latina/o students who strongly identified with Latina/o cultural values indicated that spirituality played an important role in their lives. Furthermore, results also revealed that spirituality positively influences one's physical health and psychological well-being.

**Interpersonal Relations**

*Simpatía*, a good natured and pleasant demeanor, is an important allocentric or collectivistic value orientation for Latina/os. *Simpatía* is a defined social script that emphasizes harmony in interpersonal relationships by promoting agreement, cooperation, conformity, and avoidance of conflict in a variety of social settings (Griffith, Joe, Chatham, & Simpson, 1998). Triandis, Marin, Lisansky, and Bentacourt (1984) examined dimensions of *simpatía* in a sample of Latino and non-Latino male Navy recruits and found that Latino males tended to more highly rate the importance of respect, loyalty, dignity, and cooperation than did their non-Latino counterparts. *Personalismo* (personalism) is also related to *simpatía* in that it also upholds the value of *respeto*
(respect) for warm, friendly relationships as well as an unspoken expectation of reciprocity. *Respeto* is also referred to as the expectation of hierarchy and clear lines of authority within the family (Diaz-Guerrero, 1975). In general, unquestioned parental authority is a strong organizing value in the family that persists throughout life. However, age is the most important determinant of authority with older men and women exerting the greatest influence and leadership in the family (Falicov, 2006). In addition, as part of the socialization process, family members send strong messages about parenting and gender role expectations that are strongly influenced by machismo and marianismo (Falicov, 2006; Garcia, 1996; Santiago-Rivera, 2003). *Familismo* is considered to be one of the most important cultural values among Latina/os (Triandis et al., 1982), and is based on an allocentric or collectivist worldview that values interdependence, obligation, affiliation, cooperation, loyalty, reciprocity, and solidarity among members of the family (Falicov, 2006; Marin & Marin, 1991; Marin & Triandis, 1985).

In summary, some of the most important Latina/o cultural values such as *machismo* (Arciniega et. al., 2008), *marianismo* (Baca Zinn, 1980, 1982b), spirituality (Campesino & Schwartz, 2006), *simpatía* (Griffith et al., 1998; Triandis et al., 1984), *respeto* (Garcia, 1996), and *familismo* (Triandis et al., 1982), have some empirical support in the form of gender role relations and expectations, social interactions, and behavioral adherence to the values that are important for Latina/os. In contrast, the concept of *personalismo* has not been subject to similar empirical scrutiny, and is limited to theoretical descriptions. Thus, research utilizing more rigorous methodologies is required to address the inconsistencies in conceptualization and measurement, especially in regards to the construct of *familismo*, a core cultural value to the Latina/o population (Triandis et al., 1982). Consequently, a thorough review of the literature in relation to the conceptualization and measurement of the construct of *familismo* based on both
theoretical descriptions and empirical research follows. *Familismo* translated from the Spanish language to the English language is familism. The terms *familismo* and familism were used here only in reference to the construct of *familismo* specific to the Latina/o population.

**Familismo**

*Conceptualization*

Studies of *familismo* have been primarily conducted in the academic areas of Sociology and History. Arce’s (1978) framework of familism served as the basis for much of the research that grew from the study of the Latina/o family. Prior to the 1980s, little empirical psychological research had been conducted on aspects of the Latina/o family. Therefore, early work on the Latina/o family was reviewed only briefly to provide a background for the theories and conceptualizations that provide the backdrop for more contemporary models and research.

Prior to 1960, much of the research on the Latina/o family was based on the “pathological model,” which depicted the Latina/o family in a negative and pejorative manner (Staples & Mirande, 1980). Most commonly, the Latina/o family was categorized under a patriarchal family system using *machismo* as a key variable for explaining the dynamics of the family. For example, some researchers suggested that the authoritarian and patriarchal family structure resulted in high levels of family violence (Carroll, 1980). However, most of this research was based on observational field research and local surveys in traditional enclaves of the Mexican population (Ramirez & Arce, 1981). Traditional enclaves are defined by individuals living in neighborhoods, districts, or suburbs which retain some cultural distinction from a larger surrounding area. Historically, ethnic enclaves are often involuntary as a result of the dominant groups’ discriminatory practices, one of which is referred to as redlining or preventing members of ethnic minorities from living in other parts of town. Research in traditional enclaves of the
Mexican population is not representative of the diversity that exists among Mexican families with regard to immigration processes, educational attainment, socioeconomic status, and ethnic identity development. As a result, during the 1960s, Chicana/o scholars within the social sciences strongly opposed the depictions of this biased patriarchal family model, which is based on Parsons and Bale’s (1955) functionalist approach (e.g., Mindel, 1980; Mirande & Enriquez, 1979). Thus, in the 1970s and 1980s, “revisionist” scholarship “discarded negative stereotypes in favor of positive and romanticized characterizations that result[ed] in polar caricatures of the Chicano family” (Mirande, 1977, p. 751). Mirande (1977) argued for a reassessment of an ideal depiction of Chicano family life. Instead, a more fruitful area of study is on familism, which is a significant characteristic of the Chicano family found across generations.

Arce proposed a multidimensional framework of familism in 1978 at the National Coalition of Hispanic Health and Human Services Organizations Conference on the Hispanic family. His paper was entitled, “Dimensions of familism and familial identification.” As summarized by Ramirez and Arce (1981) and Baca Zinn (1982a), Arce’s (1978) multidimensional framework consists of four components or types of familism, including demographic, structural, normative, and behavioral. Demographic familism refers to characteristics such as fertility and family size. Structural familism encompasses such characteristics as family cohesion of extended kin networks, residential proximity patterns among kin, availability of extended kin in terms of geography or social settings, and inclusion of households with nuclear or extended families. Normative familism refers to values or attitudes which reflect the importance placed on the family, specifically family life. Behavioral familism refers to the value that is placed on proximity or contact among kin and mutual aid, specifically emotional or financial support and exchanges among members of the family. Each of the four
components or types of familism requires separate measurement and analytic treatment. Arce’s (1978) framework of familism as a multidimensional construct served as the impetus for much of the research that grew from the revisionist movement in the study of the Latina/o family. Moreover, Arce’s (1978) framework on familism continues to be the foundation of contemporary research.

Chicana feminists such as Baca Zinn (1979, 1980, 1982a, 1982b), Hurtado (1995), and Ybarra (1982a, 1982b) have critiqued the functionalist approach and in response contributed to research on the Chicana/o family with regard to gender roles. In particular, Baca Zinn (1979) stated that the literature on the Chicana/o family has many contradictions between conceptual frameworks and empirical findings, and that these contradictions result from a failure to distinguish between cultural ideals and actual family behavior. Baca Zinn (1979) further argued that methodological flaws existed in the literature as researchers have primarily relied on questionnaires and interviews, which focused on the perceptions of respondents rather than on their actual behavior.

Baca Zinn (1980) conducted an ethnographic study in urban New Mexico that consisted of intensive interviews and observation of eight Mexican families over a ten-month period in 1975, which shed light on conjugal roles and power in decision making within the family. Findings revealed that there was a difference between the idealism of cultural values and actual behavior exhibited by family members. For example, Baca Zinn (1980) found that there were differences in marital role ideology, marital roles, and marital power between families with wives that were employed and nonemployed. In terms of patriarchal ideology and marital power, all eight families strongly possessed this ideal. Both non-employed and employed wives expressed “statements referring to the father as ‘head’ of the family, as the ‘boss’, and ‘in
charge” (p. 67). Informants confirmed this patriarchal ideal through continuously stating that they believed the authority rested in the husband/father role. In contrast, results of observational findings indicated that all four families with an employed wife shared household tasks and decision making power. Husbands were often observed washing dishes, cooking dinner, and taking care of the children while their wives were working and/or enrolled at the local college. Conversely, husbands expected their non-employed wives to fully meet their responsibilities associated with domestic labor and taking care of the children. Non-employed wives agreed to such patterns of sex segregation and behaved according to their domestic roles. In terms of conjugal roles and decision making power, all eight wives made household decisions such as buying groceries, paying household bills, and buying clothing for children. However, the four employed wives had their own salaries, cars which they had purchased, and three out of four had separate checking accounts. Their husbands accepted that their wives had rights and influence in the family, as wives had resources that affected decisions, which in turn legitimized the power of employed wives. Consequently, Baca Zinn (1982b) concluded that cultural ideals do not define family roles and relationships.

Ybarra (1982a) argued that the Hispanic family is often studied without taking social conditions and gender roles into account. Therefore, Ybarra (1982b) conducted a qualitative study of conjugal role relationships in Fresno, California. Intensive interviews were conducted with 50 Mexican American married couples. Findings supported the view that when the wife is employed there is a change in the division of labor with the husband helping with household work. Consistent with Baca Zinn’s (1980) findings, Ybarra (1982b) found that in terms of attitudes toward duties within the home, 94% of the sample reported that a husband should help his wife if she is employed. However, when the wife was nonemployed, the couple was likely to
rate low on egalitarian values regarding household chores. When the wife was employed, the couple was more likely to actually practice egalitarian house chore values and highly or equally share duties in child care. Results indicated that the wife’s level of education and employment outside of the home was associated with egalitarian conjugal roles and decision making, as opposed to level of acculturation. Results did not support previous findings (Tharp, 1968) that Chicana/o families who were least assimilated had very patriarchal and segregated sex roles. Furthermore, maintenance of patriarchal or egalitarian childrearing practices did not correspond with participants identifying with Mexican traditional or Anglo values. The majority of women who were employed reported that working made them feel happier, and they experienced a sense of independence. Ybarra (1982b) concluded that when educational and employment opportunities are available to Chicanas, different role functions emerge and women adapt to these changes both out of necessity (financial contribution to the family) or desire.

Hurtado (1995) acknowledged that revisionist scholars made important contributions by beginning to understand how cultural deficits associated with Chicana/o or Mexican American families are strengths with regards to possible ways of coping with structural barriers such as racism and labor force discrimination. For example, Chicana/os’ or Mexican Americans’ reliance on emotional support in the extended family may be interpreted as “enmeshment” or an extreme way of relating to others and difficulty in functioning independently. However, this unhealthy way of relating is an inaccurate depiction of the Chicana/o or Mexican American family. Historically, Latina/os have relied on the extended family for emotional support compared to their Anglo American counterparts (Kefee, 1984; Kefee, Padilla, & Carlos, 1978, 1979).
Ramirez and Arce (1981) found that prior to 1970, research on the Chicana/o family was limited and lacking empirical support. In their review, Ramirez and Arce (1981) attempted to clarify conceptual issues around the composition, form and structure of the family, intrafamilial exchange with relations, and familial roles. Ramirez and Arce (1981) and Sena-Rivera (1979) proposed the casa-familia (family home) model which makes the distinction between the home of nuclear family and the kinship network of the extended members. Baca Zinn (1982a) argued that the casa-familia framework acknowledges the importance of kinship and moves away from simple household composition, which is more useful in developing theories for studying the Chicana/o family structure.

Sena-Rivera (1979) studied four families, representing three generations of Mexican-heritage extended families in the Michigan-Indiana-Illinois region. For each of the four families, he interviewed 3 lineal generations of parents. For each respondent, he charted their family genealogical trees by placing them as a third generation person in their family tree. Each respondent was asked that for each family member traced respondents provide factual details such as year and place of birth, occupation, and ethnic identification, among other details. Respondents were also asked to provide how they felt about each family member in terms of his/her interaction with them. Sena-Rivera (1979) found that the structure and function of Chicana/o families was characterized by a strong familistic orientation and a highly integrated, extended kinship system. This family structure was present for Chicana/os who were three or more generations removed from Mexico. This contrasts with Euro-American extended family model. The European American family model has the tri-generational household consisting of children, parents, and grandparents living in geographical proximity, having occupational dependence, belief that the extended family are primary, and a hierarchy based on the authority
of the eldest male. He described his findings on the normative and actual composition of the Chicana/o or Mexican American extended family as the “nuclear-centered household” (p.126). He also noted that geographical proximity was not limited to close physical distance as long as family members perceived having the resources that enabled them to maintain contact and communication with the family such as drive and visit the family or call by telephone.

Furthermore, Sena-Rivera (1979) found that economic interdependence was strongest for the most affluent and least affluent families. Simultaneously, all households of all families were independent financially, with the exception of a great-grandmother and a widowed grandmother. Hierarchies among familia members and households are somewhat authoritative and follow generational and eldest male influence with voluntary request of guidance or advice from children and other adult members of the family. Also, Sena-Rivera (1979) found that all of the families possessed emotive interdependency (e.g., a sense of duty and volunteerism depending on the needs of the family). Furthermore, he found that in terms of spouses’ competing families of origin, the wife determined which family would claim greater loyalty and interaction. In addition, individual family members, from youngest children to oldest adults, internalized their sense of worth and self-fulfillment by internalizing the values and norms which stemmed from the immediate household (casa or home of nuclear family), household of origin (Mexico or homeland), and households of the family (extended family). The values and norms include harmony, love, respect, unity of the family, and obedience of dependent children to their elders. The values and norms prevail first in the casa or home and then in the familia or family.

Promotion of the familia (family) was influenced by generational distance from the homeland, extent of interaction with Mexicans in Mexico or newly arrived immigrants, and being first generation in the United States. Also, fictive kin or the compadrazco (co-parenting) system
seemed to play an insignificant role in the family structure and system. Sena-Rivera’s (1979) study was instrumental in distinguishing differences between the home of the nuclear family and the kinship network of the extended members. He concluded that his *casa-familia* (family home) model was more culturally relevant and representative of the Latina/o family than other Euro-American family models.

Ramirez and Arce’s review (1981) found evidence that Chicana/os prefer to rely on extended family, including *compadres* (coparents) and *padrinos* (godparents), as a primary means of support for coping with emotional stress, as opposed to other alternative sources of support such as friends (Kefee, Padilla, & Carlos, 1978, 1979). Gilbert (1978) conducted a study with 119 second-generation Mexican Americans living in two different areas of Southern California, and divided the family into two categories of kin, primary and secondary. The primary kin included parents, siblings, and adult children of the respondent and spouse. The secondary kin included aunts, uncles, grandparents, first and second cousins, nieces, and nephews of the respondent and/or spouse. Gilbert (1978) found differences in the geographical distribution by kinship category. Participants reported having a greater number of primary kin who were more geographically in close proximity than secondary kin. The types of exchange were collapsed into two general categories, basic and personal service. Basic exchange included financial gifts or loans and provision of shelter. Personal service exchange included labor, babysitting, taking care of someone sick in bed, personal advice with problems, and transportation. The genealogical distance influenced the kind and direction of exchange. Basic exchange was primarily found with primary kin and personal service exchange was carried on by secondary kin.
Ramirez (1980) conducted a study of the type of mental health aid sought by 81 individuals of Mexican descent living in Detroit. Non-mental health aid included Gilbert’s (1978) categories of basic and personal exchange and excluded personal advice and emotional support. Family mental health aid consisted of exchange of emotional support only. Ramirez’s (1980) findings supported Gilbert’s (1978) findings with regard to the impact of geographical distribution on extent of exchange. Specifically, Ramirez (1980) found that the more family members one has available, the more types of non-mental health aid one exchanged. Also, the more family members that one possesses, the more that one will seek emotional support from them. In other words, geographical proximity is significantly associated with the type of exchange.

In summary, the results suggested that factors such as geographical distribution of the family, socio-economic status, and genealogical distance of the family determined the kind, amount, target, and direction of the exchange relationships. With regard to conjugal roles and decision making, the results indicated that the wife’s level of education and employment was associated with egalitarian conjugal roles, and greater independence and power in enforcing decisions, irrespective of level of acculturation or ethnic identity.

Vega (1990) reviewed the literature on Latina/o families in the 1980s and emphasized that there was still a dearth of empirical studies. Vega (1990) reported finding empirical studies on Mexican Americans that supported previous research findings such as: (a) continued preference to join large extended family networks; (b) high rates of visitation and exchange within these networks; (c) reliance on the family for emotional support; and (d) relationships between women’s employment, greater personal autonomy, and family decision-making.

However, Vega (1990) reported that few empirical studies developed new theories or novel contributions to the field. These studies mainly focused on cultural differences between
Latina/o and non-Latina/o Euro Americans related to family structure, family functioning or social support, gender roles, and family processes. For example, second-generation offspring of Mexican American immigrants had broader social networks available, including of multigenerational kin and friend contacts, than did first-generation immigrants. First generation immigrants tended to rely on family for emotional nurturance and problem solving (Golding and Burnam, 1990; Griffith and Villavicencio, 1985; Vega, & Kolody, 1985). Mexican American elderly were more likely to expect their children to take care of them when sick and to provide financial assistance. However, Mexican American elderly were less likely to receive what they expected from their children possibly due to acculturation processes and differing intergenerational expectations (Markides, Bolt, & Ray, 1986; Markides, Hoppe, Martin, & Timbers, 1983).

As reviewed earlier, patriarchal and egalitarian gender roles among Mexican American families were found to depend on the employed wife’s educational level and employment outside of the household (Baca Zinn, 1980, 1982b; Ybarra, 1982a, 1982b). Vega, Kolody, and Valle (1988) conducted a study on marital strain, coping, and depression among Mexican American women. They found that less acculturated women who were low-income housewives were more likely to experience marital strain due to “non-reciprocity in the give-and-take” (p. 393) of their spouse compared to other non-Latina/o women. Vega, Kolody, and Valle (1988) noted that the Mexican American women in their sample were at high risk for depression. However, most of the women were not depressed and their marriages were functioning well.

Canino, Rubio-Stipec, Shrout et al. (1987) examined gender differences associated with depressive disorders and symptomatology in 1552 adult Puerto Ricans. This study was part of a larger study on the epidemiology of mental disorders in Puerto Rico. Specifically, Canino et al.
(1987) examined how employment, marital status, and health variables influenced the prevalence of depression. Results indicated that mainland Puerto Rican women who were working full-time reported higher depressive symptom levels than working men after controlling for socioeconomic status, health, marital, and employment variables. These results are consistent with Canino et al.’s (1987) proposed model that Puerto Rican males and females have different vulnerability to depressive disorder as a result of the socialization that takes place within a patriarchal social context. Pelto, Roman, and Liriano (1982) found that recent migrants from Puerto Rico have a family structure that consists of an overrepresentation of disrupted families or cohabitation by women who are single, head of the household, and who live with her children and partner. They found that recent migrants with this family structure tended to strive and manage economic and social difficulties such as declining economy cutting social programs, and increase of unemployment. However, a significant number of women who are single and heads of households tend to exhibit psychological strains commonly referred to as nervios or nerves. This is also true of unemployed dual parent families. Nervios refer to a wide range of disorders from mild anxieties, phobias, and uncontrollable outbursts of depressive symptoms or depression, and suicidal tendencies. Pelto et al. (1982) reported that general patterns of helpful exchange or “strong, consistent and dependable networks of mutual aid among neighbors and kin” (p.55) were found in a variety of household structures (e.g., unemployed single, dual parent families, and unemployed dual parent families). Furthermore, Pelto, Roman, and Liriano (1982) reported that disrupted families that were headed by females were more likely to come from highly stressful environments where unemployment was more commonly found.

In contrast, Bird and Canino (1982) found that families residing in Puerto Rico were more likely to be intact. Bird and Canino (1982) also found that Puerto Rican familial attitudes
about child rearing practices and decision making indicated that the concept of *machismo* influenced family interactions. However, Puerto Rican families reported egalitarian joint roles with decision making in the family and about half of the sample of husbands reported participating in household chores. Bird and Canino cautioned therapists in making generalizations about cultural values (e.g., characterizing all Puerto Ricans families with *machismo*). Instead, Bird and Canino recommended that treatment was more effective when it focused on changing family structures within sociocultural and ecological contexts rather than on individual behavior. Using the Family Adaptability and Cohesion Scale among families ([FACES-II]; Olson, Rusell, & Douglas, 1980), Vega, Patterson, Sallis, Nader, Atkins, and Abramson (1986) found that overall family functioning and family process characteristics were similar for highly acculturated Mexican Americans and Euro Americans.

Most of the studies Vega (1990) reviewed were exploratory investigations that lacked comprehensive theoretical and conceptual bases. This makes it difficult to develop hypothesis and comparative analyses about cultural similarities or differences in family processes across studies. For example, immigrant adults acculturate at different rates than children and, as a result, intergenerational conflict emerges. These cultural differences in orientation may produce unique parenting problems and familial strains. A model that encompasses the similarities among various Latina/o subgroups during this familial process over time would enable comparative analyses.

Vega’s (1990) review yielded a number of conclusions and recommendations. First, utilization of common instrumentation is needed to establish convergent validity and reliability when conducting and designing studies on Latina/o families. Second, developmental models and multivariate designs are needed to establish causal links between independent variables such as
socioeconomic status, labor market effects, and cultural factors that predict changes in family relations, structure, or processes. Third, ethnographic studies of language use are needed, including the role language plays in preserving family practices, familism, intergenerational cohesion, and ethnic identity. Fourth, sampling of more inclusive subsamples of the Latina/o population (e.g., Central and South Americans) is needed. Fifth, researchers should examine contextual variables such as acculturation and intergenerational characteristics specific to ethnic group membership, as well as immigration settlement patterns in studying intermarriage and cultural dissemination between members of different Latina/o ethnic groups for theory development and research design. Finally, research that investigates family strengths, specifically focusing on the role of culture and how these strengths are sustained should be studied empirically.

Contemporary research on familism reflects the complexity and multidimensional nature of the construct. Operational definitions range from a general or global sense of familism (e.g., Cuellar, Arnold, & Maldonado, 1995; Gil, Wagner, & Vega, 2000; Ramirez, Crano, Quist, Burgoon, Alvaro, & Grandpre, 2004; Rodriguez & Kosloski, 1998) to specific subcomponents such as family networks and support (e.g., Castillo et al., 2004; Griffith & Villavicencio, 1985), family satisfaction (e.g., Schumm, McCollum, Bugaighis et al., 1988), family values (e.g., Rodriguez, Ramirez, & Korman, 1999), family importance (e.g., Gaines, Barajas, Hicks et al., 1997), family functioning (e.g., Rueschenberg & Buriel, 1989; Vega, Patterson, Sallis et al., 1986), and familial honor, interconnectedness, obligations, and perceived support from the family (e.g., Rodriguez et al., 2007; Steidel & Contreras, 2003). Overall, there is a lack of consensus regarding a consistent operational definition of familism, making it difficult to
synthesize the literature (Coohey, 2001; Luna, 1996; Rodriguez et al., 2007; Valenzuela & Dornbusch, 1994).

**Measurement of Familismo**

Functional equivalence of the construct of familismo must be established to enable between-group comparisons (Luna, Torres de Ardon, Lim et al., 1996). Investigators continue research efforts without taking the comparative framework into account when conducting empirical studies. Prior to 1970, familismo studies mainly consisted of descriptive data from the U.S. Census Bureau and Annual Population Surveys. Researchers used demographic characteristics of Chicano families as objective data to examine aspects of family life (e.g., age, composition and size of families, marriage patterns, fertility and childbearing, socio-economic factors), to identify patterns across time, and to compare and contrast aspects of family life to other populations in the United States (e.g., Ramirez & Arce, 1981). Other researchers used in-depth interviews and observation (e.g., Baca Zinn, 1982b; Sena-Rivera, 1977, 1979) or survey interviews to develop more accurate measures and depictions of the Latina/o family (e.g., Baca Zinn, 1979, 1980, 1982b; Grebler, Moore, & Guzman, 1970; Keefe, Padilla, & Carlos, 1978, 1979; Ramirez & Arce, 1981; Vega, 1990, 1995). Baca Zinn (1979) argued that methodological flaws existed in the literature prior to the 1980s. Researchers primarily relied on questionnaires and interviews, which focused on the perceptions of respondents rather than on actual behavior. As reviewed earlier, Baca Zinn (1980) attempted to address these flaws by conducting an ethnographic study in urban New Mexico that consisted of intensive interviews and observation of eight Mexican families. Baca Zinn’s (1980) findings supported her critique that there was a difference between ideal cultural values exhibited by family members (e.g., the patriarchal ideal) and actual behavior (e.g., shared household tasks and decision making power).
Measures of *familismo* referring to the construct specific to Latina/os utilized in more recent studies have included the Pan-Hispanic Familism Scale ([PHFS]; Villareal, Blozis, & Widaman, 2005), and the Attitudinal Familism Scale ([AFS]; Steidel & Contreras, 2003). Measures of familism applied to Latina/os referring to Latina/o familism have been adaptations of existing measures. For example, a 13-item questionnaire that assessed attitudinal familism was constructed by combining questions from Familism scales developed by Bardis (1959) and Triandis et al. (1982), and was based on a definition of familism by Burgess and Lock (1945; Rodriguez, & Kosloski, 1998; Sabogal, Marin, Otero-Sabogal, Marin, & Perez-Stable, 1987). Other measures that assessed perceived family support were developed or adapted from measures such as the Perceived Social Support From Family (PSS-Fa) and Friends ([PSS-Fr]; Procidano & Heller, 1983), the Familism Scale (Gaines et al., 1997), and the Family Obligations Scale (Fulgini et al.,1999; Rodriguez et al., 2007; Sy & Brittian, 2008). The Family Adaptation and Cohesion Evaluation scales have also been utilized with Latina/o populations ([FACES-II]; Olson, Sprenkle, & Russell, 1979).

In recent familism measures researchers attempted to provide clear operationalizations and have used comprehensive methods of instrumentation design. However, there is still a lack of breadth and depth in capturing the complexities of *familismo*. For example, Sabogal et al. (1987) measured attitudinal familism in 452 adult Latina/os and 227 non-Latina/o White adults residing in San Francisco and Miami. Attitudinal familism was defined as beliefs and attitudes about loyalty, solidarity, and reciprocity that Latina/os share regarding nuclear and extended families. The 13 items were derived from the Familism scales developed by Bardis (1959) and Triandis, Martin, Bentacourt, Lisansky, and Chang (1982). The items were also based on a definition of familism by Burgess and Lock (1945). Principal components factor analysis resulted in the
following three factors that accounted for 48% of the variance: Familial Obligations ($\alpha = .76$; Perceived Support from the Family ($\alpha = .70$; and Family as Referents ($\alpha = .70$).

Sabogal et al. (1987) utilized the Short Acculturation Scale for Hispanics (SASH) by Marin, Sabogal, Otero-Sabogal et al. (1987). After controlling for socioeconomic status, place of birth, generation, and place of growing up, and irrespective of acculturation level, Latina/os reported a higher level of perceived family support than did their non-Latina/os counterparts. A limitation of their familism scale was that it did not fully assess the aspects of attitudinal familism proposed by Sabogal et al. Specifically, it did not assess aspects of behavioral familism related to geographical proximity to the motherland and family size.

Rodriguez and Koloski (1998) operationalized attitudinal familism similar to Sabogal et al. (1987) and utilized similar methodologies. Rodriguez and Koloski (1998) utilized a homogeneous sample of 182 Puerto Ricans living in Ohio and found the same three factors with similar reliability coefficients as Sabogal et al. (1987). These investigators also found positive relationships between acculturation and both family obligations and support from relatives. In other words, the more that an individual is exposed to the U.S. culture there is a greater value placed in an individual’s perceived obligation to the family in providing material and emotional support to relatives and members of the extended family. An individual also places greater value in perceiving that family members are reliable sources of help and support in solving problems. In contrast, Sabogal et al. (1987) found a negative relationship between acculturation and family obligations and family as referents. That is, as individual’s exposure to the U.S. culture increases, the value of attitudinal familism decreased in terms of perceiving the family as providers of material and emotional support to relatives and the extended family. Family as referents refers to the value placed on parents as normative behavioral referents, reliance on the
family for advice in important decisions, embarrassment from relatives’ behavior, and the centrality of children in the family. In addition, the value placed on family as referents decreased with increased exposure to the U.S. culture. Results were opposite for individuals that had limited exposure to the U.S. culture as this group placed a greater value in perceiving the family as providers of material and emotional support to relatives, and reliance on parents as normative behavioral referents, and perceiving the family as sources of help and support. In addition, Sabogal et al. (1987) did not find evidence of a relationship between exposure to the U.S. culture and perceiving that family members are reliable sources of help and support in solving problems.

These mixed findings suggest psychometric issues with one of the measures being utilized by either Sabogal et al. (1987) or Rodriguez and Koloski (1998). The sample composition may have influenced findings, and each study may have tapped into differences related to cultural, geographical, and immigration processes within the Latina/o subgroups. Sabogal et al. (1987) utilized primarily Mexican, Cuban, and Central American participants, with fewer Puerto Rican and South American participants in California. In contrast, Rodriguez and Koloski (1998) utilized Puerto Rican Americans in Ohio. Rodriguez and Koloski’s (1998) Puerto Rican sample had an average of 33 years residing in the U.S. and may be more acculturated compared to Sabogal et al.’s (1987) sample, which had 15 years residing in the U.S. In addition, the immigration process of each Latina/o subgroup has many implications in affecting an individual’s experience and exposure to the U.S. For example, Puerto Rico is a colony of the U.S., so Puerto Ricans can easily enter the U.S. without immigration law restrictions and may be able to more easily adjust to the U.S. culture. In contrast, other Latina/o subgroups may experience difficulties in immigrating to the U.S.
Other scales such as the Attitudinal Familism Scale (Steidel & Contreras, 2003) operationalize attitudinal familism as a multidimensional construct and attempt to develop a more psychometrically sound measure. The scale is comprised of four subscales: Familial Support; Familial Interconnectedness; Familial Honor; and Subjugation of Self for Family. Cronbach alphas were reported for the overall scale and for each of the four scales: Overall scale, .83; Familial Support Scale, .72, Familial Interconnectedness, .69; Familial Honor, .68; and Subjugation of Self for Family, .56. Individuals that reported high levels of acculturation to Anglo orientation as measured by the Acculturation Rating Scale for Mexican Americans-II ([ARSMA-II; Cuellar et al., 1995] reported higher adherence to familism. In contrast, lower acculturated individuals reported lower adherence to familism. These findings also support Sabogal et al. (1987), and Rodriguez, and Koloski (1998), who failed to find an association between familial support and acculturation as measured by a unidimensional measure of acculturation (e.g., SASH). Partial correlations between acculturation and familism were significant after controlling for educational level. This study takes into account socioeconomic status and educational level. However the sample used to validate this measure consisted mainly of a homogeneous sample. The sample consisted of Latina/o adults who resided in Ohio and reported low levels of acculturation, primarily spoke Spanish, and primarily self-identified as being of Puerto Rican descent. Thus, this sample was unrepresentative of the heterogeneity that comprises the Latina/o population. The ARSMA-II was developed and validated to assess acculturation levels in Mexican Americans in the United States. It is an inappropriate measure for acculturation in Puerto Ricans as it may overlook unique sociopolitical and historical circumstances and ethnic identity developmental processes (Baca Zinn, 2000; Falicov, 1998).
In contrast, the Pan-Hispanic Familism Scale ([PHFS]; Villareal, Blozis, & Widaman, 2005) is a measure of attitudinal familism. As part of a larger survey, a nationally representative sample of U.S. Hispanics was obtained. Participants were 752 men and women between the ages of 18 and 65, who were recruited via telephone from a list of phone numbers that were randomly generated from low to high Hispanic density neighborhoods across the nine U.S. Census Regions, excluding Alaska and Hawaii. Participants met the following inclusion criteria for this study: a) Self-identified as Hispanic/Latino, b) possessed a Spanish-language country of origin such as Cuban or Mexican, or c) had at least one parent that was of Hispanic/Latino descent.

Attitudinal familism was operationalized as participants having “attitudes about the importance of the family” (Villareal, Blozis, & Widaman, 2005, p 412). The scale is composed of five items that were extracted from two other scales (i.e., Familism Scale and FACES-II used by Gaines et al., 1997 and Gil et al., 2000). The five items reflect ideological beliefs about the family and excluded behavioral components. The Pan-Hispanic Familism Scale is measured by a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Confirmatory factor analysis showed that the same factor structure holds across the three countries of origin (e.g., United States, Mexico, and Latin America). The internal consistency of the total score was .82 for this sample. There were no mean differences between Hispanic subgroups defined by country of origin. This supports Sabogal et al.’s (1987) findings that attitudinal familism is a value possessed by Mexican Americans, Cuban Americans, Central Americans, Puerto Ricans, and South Americans. In addition, evidence supported the factorial invariance of the familism scale between Hispanic subgroups across the two languages (e.g., English and Spanish) in which participants were interviewed. This suggests that attitudinal familism is a core cultural value of U.S. Hispanics and is stable irrespective of one’s country of origin or language preference. In
addition, this scale is missing other components of familismo such as behavioral dimensions (e.g., frequency of visitation, actual visitation or contact, type of visitation, type of exchange or aid as in monetary assistance or advice, and assistance with child rearing). Also, the scale only provides one dimension of the unique experience of Latina/os and the family. Testing for convergent validity with other measures such as acculturation and ethnic identity is needed in order to have a deeper understanding how these variables may interact with familism and relate to Latina/o populations residing in the U.S.

Developed most recently, the Latina/o Values Scale ([LVS]; Kim et al., 2009) is a 35-item scale that measures an individual’s adherence to Latina/o cultural values. The LVS consists of an overall score and four subscales: a) LVS-Cultural Pride, b) LVS-Simpatía, c) LVS-Familismo, and d) LVS-Espiritismo. All the items are rated on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly agree) and 4 (strongly disagree). Internal consistency estimates for the LVS and LVS-sub scales yielded: LVS overall $\alpha = .88 \text{ and } .85$; LVS-Cultural Pride $\alpha = .89 \text{ and } .85$; LVS-Familismo $\alpha = .75 \text{ and } .68$; LVS-Simpatía $\alpha = .46$; LVS-Espiritismo $\alpha = .50$. Test-retest reliability estimates over a two week period for LVS overall, LVS-Cultural Pride, and LVS-Familismo were $\alpha = .78$, $\alpha = .75$, and $\alpha = .75$, respectively. Kim et al. (2009) did not report test-retest reliability estimates for LVS-Simpatía and LVS-Espiritismo. Concurrent validity was demonstrated by significant positive correlations between the items that measure dimensions of enculturation. Kim et al. used all of the following as measures of enculturation: a) a single item measuring adherence to traditional Latina/o cultural values that was used only for testing concurrent validity (“Using the scale below [10-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (not at all) to 10 (always)], please circle the number that represents the degree to which you follow the traditional cultural values of your ethnic background”); b) Latino Orientation Scale score of the
ARSMA-II; and c) the five LVS scores. Discriminant validity was assessed using the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale score and Social Desirability Scale score since there was no empirical basis to expect that adherence to Latina/o cultural values would be associated with self-esteem and/or social desirability with any reported significant correlations. Confirmatory factor analysis provided additional support for the construct validity of the LVS scores. Concurrent validity was further demonstrated through positive correlations between the LVS scores and the Self Construal Scale-Interdependent, Cultural Identification Scale-Latino/a, and the single item scores mentioned above, which all measure enculturation. There was also a significant negative correlation between LVS-Cultural Pride and Cultural Identification Scale-Anglo.

In summary, functional equivalence of measurement has not been reached in the literature on familism. Specifically, studies on familism tend to utilize inconsistent operational definitions and lack comprehensive measures capturing the complexity of the familism construct. Research studies lack the utilization of multiple measures to test for convergent validity. Originally-derived and adapted instruments have not been validated for use with Latina/o populations. Specifically, the construct validity and reliability evidence for the adapted instruments suggests that these instruments may not be applicable to the general Latina/o population or even for specific Latina/o subgroups. Furthermore, adaptations of existing instruments originally derived from a Western perspective may overlook key Latina/o cultural factors associated with mental health and psychological well-being (Kim et al., 2009). In general, studies lack representative samples and utilization of multiple psychometrically derived measures of familism to test for convergent validity. Also, there is a lack of instrument validation testing their applicability with diverse Latina/o subsamples. Finally, utilization of
multidimensional measures of acculturation and ethnic identity need to be included in studies related to familism in Latina/os residing in the U.S.

Processes of Acculturation and Enculturation

Some researchers consider the 1990s as the *decade of ethnicity* (Gaines et al., 1997; Hurtado, 1995). During that time, much of the literature focused on Chicana/os’ experiences in negotiating between two cultures [the cultures of Mexico and of the U.S.] (Buriel, 1993; Cuellar, Siles, & Bracamontes, 2004). Negotiating the demands of these two cultures can have both positive and negative physical and psychological outcomes (Cuellar et al., 2004; Edwards & Lopez, 2006). This negotiation is conceptualized by both unidimensional and bidimensional or multidimensional models that have guided the research on acculturation processes (Cabassa, 2003; Rivera, 2010). The unidimensional model proposes that the acculturation process is conceptualized in terms of movement along a single continuum ranging from immersion in one's culture to immersion in the dominant culture. In other words, Latina/os that are highly acculturated will have a higher degree of U.S. cultural values, beliefs, attitudes, and practices incorporated into their self-concepts (Kohatsu, Concepcion, & Perez, 2010). In addition, the unidimensional model assumes that the acculturating group or individual has no influence in modifying the dominant culture and that as individuals move toward the dominant culture they lose aspects of their own culture (Cortes, 1994; Cuellar et al., 1995; Marin & Gamba, 1996; Rogler et al., 1991). Measures based on the unidimensional model, such as the Acculturation Rating Scale for Mexican Americans (ARSMA), and the Short Acculturation Scale for Hispanics (SASH) have typically used several behavioral, cognitive, and attitudinal dimensions associated with acculturation to determine where individuals fall on a single continuum (Cuellar et al., 1980, 1995; Marin & Gamba, 1996; Marin et al., 1987; Negy & Woods, 1992). However, a
major shortcoming of the unidimensional model is that it fails to capture a process of how individuals that are bicultural negotiate adapting to the dominant culture, while also maintaining their own culture (Buriel, 1993; Cuellar et al., 1995; Cuellar et al., 2004). Cabassa (2003) argued that the unidimensional model provides an incomplete or fragmented measure of the acculturation process because it negates the existence of an acculturating individual’s experience in negotiating between two cultures simultaneously.

The bidirectional model attempts to rectify the major problem of the unidirectional model by conceptualizing acculturation across two or more main dimensions (Kohatsu, Concepcion, & Perez, 2010). Consistent with Redfield and colleagues’ (1936) definition, Cuellar, Arnold, and Gonzalez (1995) summarized acculturation, “as an interactive, developmental, multifactorial, multidirectional, and multidimensional process” (p. 279). Acculturation can be viewed as a group or individual phenomenon that affects individuals at different levels of functioning (e.g., behavioral, affective, and cognitive). According to Berry’s (1997) model of acculturation, an individual is faced with two issues when in a new environment. One issue is the degree to which an individual holds on to her/his heritage culture. The other issue is the degree to which the individual becomes involved in the new culture or society. More specifically, Berry (1997) proposed four distinct acculturation strategies, which he labeled assimilation, separation, integration, and marginalization. In the assimilation strategy individuals embrace the new culture and adapt its values and behaviors, while simultaneously rejecting the values and behaviors of the culture of origin. In the separation strategy, individuals maintain their heritage culture by avoiding contact and rejecting the new culture. In the marginalization strategy, individuals have no desire to maintain their heritage culture or adopt the new culture’s values and behaviors. The integration strategy is an attempt to simultaneously maintain heritage culture
while interacting and adapting to certain aspects of the new culture. Thus, integration involves an individual becoming bicultural, or being effective in negotiating two cultures, and is associated with psychological well-being (LaFramboise, Coleman, & Gerton, 1993).

Acculturation is considered a “fluid [process that] occurs on multiple levels that intersect simultaneously at any given point in time, over the duration of a client’s life span and across generations” (Kohatsu, Concepcion, & Perez, 2010, p. 344). Ethnic identity refers to the process of learning specific ethnic knowledge, ethnic group behaviors (e.g., rituals, celebration of holidays), and ethnic preferences ([music, food, friends]; Knight et al., 1993) from an individual’s self-identified ethnic group membership. The seminal work by Knight, Bernal, Garza, Cota, and Ocampo (1993) with Mexican American children provides a good example of the study of acculturation with other intersecting constructs such as ethnic identity in understanding the world view of clients through a developmental perspective. Knight et al. (1993) proposed that acculturation and enculturation are two distinct processes that both influence ethnic identity and can result in the development of various strategies of acculturation as proposed by Berry’s model (e.g., becoming bicultural). For example, an individual may adopt and prefer speaking English language at school, while speaking Spanish at home, indicating biculturalism in terms of language. However, the same individual in a different context may prefer practicing rituals or behaviors such as having a “Sweet Sixteen” party instead of the traditional Latina/o Quinceañera, which may suggest a higher level of acculturation to the dominant cultural rituals.

Vera and Quintana (2004) argue that physical appearance is part of one’s self-concept and affects one’s racial and ethnic identity. Racial differences between Latina/os who are lighter skinned or do not possess Spanish accent may have different experiences than Latina/os of
darker skin, language use, and accent. Latina/o experiences with regard to their acculturation to the dominant culture or to their culture of origin is impacted by these racial differences. Particularly, discrimination experiences may vary within the Latino community as well as in the dominant culture. Vera and Quintana (2004) argued that due to Latina/o ancestry of a mix of Spanish, North African, and Indigenous peoples, among other groups, Latina/os are typically classified under ethnic groups and not racial groups. Yet when researchers only focus on examining variables such as ethnicity, ethnic identity, and acculturation, these constructs do not fully capture the unique experiences of studying Latina/o populations. Thus, researchers that exclude racial identity development models do not fully represent an individual’s worldview. In order to fully understand the Latina/os’ acculturative processes, developmental models and longitudinal studies are needed with adolescents and children to provide insight about how acculturation processes may develop over time. In addition, researchers need to generate theories and hypothesis that can be useful in fully understanding adult acculturation processes.

Quintana (2007) reviewed the developmental literature on ethnic and racial identity with Latina/os. He found longitudinal research documenting that Latina/o youth who were exposed to racism in their transition to high school had better academic achievement. Specifically, adolescents that demonstrated awareness that many minority groups experience discrimination were buffered against the negative effects of discrimination and showed better psychological adjustment a year later. Fostering cultural pride in identification with youth’s racial-ethnic groups was associated with positive adjustment. However, in contexts where discrimination was infrequent and parents fostered ethnic pride, adolescents experienced cognitive distress. Quintana (2007) also suggested that in measuring these complex constructs, multiple strategies
and instruments are ideal to fully investigate the developmental aspects of racial-ethnic identity, and achieve a more comprehensive approach in understanding Latina/os experiences.

Measures using the bidimensional model (e.g., ARSMA-II, Bidimensional Acculturation Scale for Hispanics [BAS]) incorporate independent scales for assessing how acculturating individuals maintain their culture and adapt to the dominant culture (Cuellar, et al, 1995; Marin & Gamba, 1996). One of the major limitations of acculturation measures based on the bidimensional model, particularly for Latina/os, is their overreliance on language based items. This limits their ability to measure other domains such as attitudes and values or the maintenance of traditions and customs associated with cultural identity (Cabassa, 2003). For this reason, it is important to examine contextual factors that affect the phenomenon of acculturation and enculturation such as patterns of immigration, age, generational status, length of stay in the U.S., language preference, and ethnic and racial identity. In particular, researchers need to clarify the role of contextual factors and the impact of maintaining the heritage culture on individual adaptation to a new culture. Also, it is important to understand the impact of maintaining familistic values from Latina/o heritage culture on an individual’s psychological well-being in the U.S.

**Familism and Acculturation**

The research on the relationship between familism and acculturation has produced conflicting views and findings. Grebler, Moore, and Guzman (1970) suggested that urbanization and acculturation undermined the Chicana/o extended family. In other words, as Latina/os acculturate and adopt more of the dominant Euro-American culture, the importance of familism decreases. Sabogal et al. (1987) found evidence for Grebler et al.'s (1970) hypothesis in their study of the effects of acculturation on attitudinal familism in Latina/o and White non-Latina/o
adults. As mentioned previously, they found that familism values appeared strong in spite of migration processes and acculturation, particularly when contact with the family was limited. However, familism values decreased in importance as acculturation and exposure to the U.S. culture increased. In addition, familial obligations and family as referents decreased as acculturation increased. Steidel and Contreras (2003) developed the Attitudinal Familial Scale (AFS) and attempted to validate this instrument with 124 unacculturated Latina/o adults. Steidel and Contreras (2003) found that family support and subjugation of self for family did not differ by level of acculturation, as measured by the ARSMA-II. In contrast, overall familism, family honor, and family interconnectedness decreased with adoption of a greater Anglo orientation. Rodriguez and Koloski (1998) examined the relationship between acculturation (as measured by the [SASH]; Marin et al., 1987) and an attitudinal familism measure (Sabogal et al., 1987) with Puerto Rican Americans and found that after controlling for social demographic variables, family support and obligations increased with acculturation while family as referents did not differ by level of acculturation.

Gil, Wagner, and Vega (2000) conducted a longitudinal study with both immigrant and U.S.-born Latina/o middle school students and their families in South Florida and examined the relationships among acculturation, acculturative stress, familismo, place of birth, and alcohol consumption. Familism was defined as having close proximity to the family and the use of family networks as sources of instrumental and social support as measured by the Familism Scale developed by Olson et al. (1983). Acculturation was measured in three ways, pulling from previous research assessing acculturation by: 1) conflicts associated with the use of English, 2) perceived discrimination, and 3) acculturation conflicts associated within the family and outside of the family. Results indicated that as acculturation and acculturative stress increased, the value
placed on parental respect and familism decreased among immigrant male adolescents. They also found that as recent immigrant adolescents acculturated to the dominant culture, there was an increase in stressors such as perceived discrimination and conflicts associated with the family. In addition, as the value of familism decreased, the tendency for deviant behaviors such as stealing or quitting school increased.

Ramirez et al. (2004) examined the relationships between familism, acculturation, parental monitoring of marijuana use, knowledge, gender, grade, and region in 772 Chicana/o and 372 Anglo fourth through 12th-grade students from Southwest Arizona. Familism was measured using a seven-item scale that assessed the importance of parents, other relatives, and elders. Responses were rated on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) with higher scores indicating higher familistic attitudes. Acculturation was measured by using a short version of the ARSMA consisting of 4 items on a 5-point Likert-type scale. Adolescents were categorized into four different groups by level of acculturation (e.g., Anglo American; versus low, moderately, and highly acculturated Hispanic American). After controlling for gender, region (e.g., urban, rural), grade level, knowledge of drug use, and acculturation, results demonstrated that familism was associated with lower drug use only for adolescents that were knowledgeable about marijuana and inhalant use. Findings also supported a relationship between acculturation and familism. Latino male adolescents scored higher on familism compared to their Euro-American counterparts. More specifically, highly, moderately, and low acculturated Hispanic Americans all scored higher on familism than Anglo Americans. Ramirez et al. (2004) reported that among the highly, moderately, and low acculturated Hispanic Americans there were no differences related to familism.
Cortes (1995) studied familism among two-family linked generations of Puerto Ricans. The sample included 400 individuals, consisting of 200 husband-wife pairs linked by lineage to represent 100 intergenerational families. Four-persons made up an intergenerational family. Age at arrival in the United States was found to be positively associated with familism for the parent generation. That is, the older the individual was when they arrived in the United States, the stronger their belief in familism. Cortes (1995) did not find other acculturation variables that predicted familism for either the parent or child generations.

In a brief review of Chicana/o and Latina/o acculturation, Cuellar et al. (2004) found a general trend for researchers to employ acculturation instruments based on a single dimension ([e.g., preferred language spoken]; (e.g., Khan, Sobal, & Martorell, 1997; Sundquist & Winkleby, 2001). They recommended that more research is needed to develop new methods of measuring acculturation that take into account various levels of acculturation. Cuellar et al. studied the acculturative typologies using the ARSMA-II (e.g., traditional, marginal, integrated, and assimilated) and psychological adjustment in two independent samples of Hispanic adolescents and college freshmen from southern Texas. Measures were also used to assess ethnic identity, self-esteem, loneliness, stress, and depression. Cuellar et al. found that in both studies, individuals with integrated typologies appeared to have higher levels of psychological adjustment. Conversely, individuals with marginal typologies appeared to have lower levels of psychological adjustment and risk for depression. The most interesting finding was that highly bicultural individuals from the adolescent group reported higher stress and depression while also having higher self-esteem and social support. Cuellar et al. suggested that acculturation and mental health are not necessarily related in a linear fashion and the use of orthogonal measures of acculturation is needed to provide a complete understanding of this relationship.
Bourhis, Moise, Perreault, and Senecal (1997) and Navas et al. (2005) have expanded Berry’s (1997) model and proposed theoretical frameworks of acculturation that are more comprehensive. Bourhis et al. (1997) proposed the Interactive Acculturation Model (IAM), which consists of five acculturation strategies: integration; assimilation; separation; anomie; and individualism. The marginalization strategy from Berry’s model is replaced by anomie and individualism. Individuals who adopt the anomie strategy are alienated from their heritage culture and the new society’s culture and, as a result may develop psychosocial or psychological difficulties. In contrast, individuals who adopt the individualism strategy view themselves as individualists who choose not to rely on their heritage culture or the new society’s culture to achieve their goals and, as a result may not develop adjustment difficulties. This model notes the interaction between individual and the host society, and highlights the interactive and dynamic nature of acculturation. It includes assessment of the dominant group’s acculturation attitudes and the expectations of ethnic minorities.

Navas et al. (2005) built on Bourhis et al.’s (1997) model and proposed the Relative Acculturation Extended Model (RAEM). The RAEM takes into account that acculturation takes place in various domains. Indeed, seven domains within the public and private realms are included. For example, the public and private realms include religious beliefs, principles and values, family relations, economics, among others. Navas et al. stated that the individual undergoing the acculturation process may engage in selective strategies depending on the domain. Also, they assessed the dominant society’s attitudes and expectations in order to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the experiences of ethnic minorities within the context of the society in which they reside.
In summary, unidimensional models are limited in assessing the processes of acculturation. They make it difficult to obtain a deeper understanding of the experiences faced by Latina/os residing in the U.S., as well as their psychological well-being. Existing multidimensional models of acculturation are adequate, but limited in depth and breadth in fully capturing the complexity of constructs. There have been several recent models. While Bourhis et al. (1997) and Navas et al. (2005) attempted to develop theoretical frameworks that are more comprehensive, future research is needed to further refine existing models and to develop other frameworks. In particular, we need comprehensive models that include mental health outcomes and strength based approaches, among Latina/os residing in the U.S (Cortes, 1994; Rogler et al., 1991).

Rogler et al. (1991) reviewed 30 studies that examined the association between acculturation and mental health status as measured by psychological distress. They found that 12 studies reported a positive association, 13 studies reported a negative association, 2 studies reported both a positive and negative association, and 3 studies documented a curvilinear relationship between acculturation and mental health. Rogler et al. reported that the majority of the studies lacked methodological uniformity in the measurement of acculturation and mental health status, and often failed to report statistical indices. It is noteworthy to mention that in closely examining the 30 studies in Rogler et al.'s review, only two studies used bilinear models of measurement (e.g., Burnam, Telles, Kanno, Hough, & Escobar, 1987). The remaining 28 studies assessed acculturation using unidimensional models or proxy measures such as generational status or language preference (e.g., Inclan, 1983). As discussed earlier, unidimensional models measure acculturation and enculturation on the same bipolar continuum. Rogler et al. stated that acculturation instruments based on unidimensional models are
incorrectly based on the assumption that there is a direct linear relationship between involvement in the American dominant culture and disengagement from the immigrant’s traditional culture, thus, suggesting a competition between the two cultures. Instead, Kim and Abreu (2001) argued the importance of separating the effects of enculturation to the indigenous culture and acculturation to the dominant culture. In addition, it is important to distinguish behavioral components from cultural values and knowledge (e.g., cultural identity or ethnic identity) by utilizing multidimensional models of acculturation.

Familism and Ethnic Identity/Enculturation

Herskovits (1948) first referred to enculturation as the process of socialization to the norms of one’s indigenous or heritage culture, which include the values, ideas, and concepts that are important to the indigenous or heritage culture. Historically, researchers have included enculturation as part of the construct of acculturation as evidenced by the unidimensional or unilinear models of acculturation which were discussed earlier. Szapocznik, Scopetta, Kurtines, and Aranalde (1978) were credited as being the first to develop a bilinear model of acculturation. Most importantly, Szapocznik et al. (1978) conceptualized the involvement in both the indigenous or heritage culture and the dominant or host culture by measuring these constructs on two separate continua, thus, proposing the idea of biculturalism. Mendoza and Martinez (1981) proposed four typological patterns of acculturation: a) cultural incorporation (e.g., biculturalism or adaptation of both indigenous and dominant cultures), b) cultural transmutation (e.g., creating a unique blend of indigenous and dominant culture), c) cultural resistance (e.g., strong enculturation or maintenance of indigenous culture while resisting dominant culture), and d) cultural shift (e.g., assimilation or substituting the indigenous culture with the dominant culture). Szapocznik et al. (1978) and Mendoza and Martinez (1981) were early theoreticians
who proposed that individuals are experiencing a unique way of adapting to the dominant culture while attempting to retain or maintain their indigenous or heritage culture.

Berry, Trimble, and Olmedo’s (1986) model is similar to Mendoza and Martinez’s (1981) measurement model of acculturation. Berry (1997) further refined this framework for acculturation research. As reviewed earlier, Berry (1997) proposed four distinct acculturation strategies (i.e., assimilation, separation, integration, and marginalization). Berry’s (1997) model has been widely cited by researchers, and most importantly, characterizes acculturation in terms of cultural maintenance of their indigenous cultural norms. However, Kim et al. (2009) argued that this characterization of cultural maintenance may apply primarily to immigrant Latina/os who have been socialized into their respective Latina/o cultural norms before arriving to the U.S. Kim et al. (2009) argued that the concept of cultural maintenance may not accurately describe the experiences of Latina/os who were born in the U.S. and who are several generations removed from immigration. These individuals may never be fully enculturated into their families’ or ethnic group’s indigenous cultural norms. In addition, their parents and family may also be U.S. born. Moreover, Kim (2007) stated that using the term enculturation is important in differentiating it from acculturation. Acculturation refers “solely to the process of adapting to the norms of the dominant group (e.g., European American culture)” (p. 474). In contrast, enculturation refers to the “process of socializing (or resocializing) into and maintaining the norms of the indigenous culture” (Kim et al., 2009, p. 72). Kim et al. (2009) argued that the measures developed to assess adherence to Latina/o cultural norms had noteworthy limitations. The first limitation was that researchers measured enculturation on the same continuum as acculturation. Thus, researchers subsumed enculturation as an aspect of acculturation. The second limitation was the lack of attention to assessing solely the dimensions of cultural values
by distinguishing items that represent other dimensions such as behavior, identity, and knowledge. The third limitation was the lack of assessing Latina/o cultural values in a comprehensive manner that includes various value dimensions such as *familismo*, simpatía, and *espiritismo* (spirituality). Cockley (2007) argued that when researchers conduct studies on individual’s view of themselves relative to their cultural beliefs, values, and behaviors, ethnic identity is a more appropriate construct to use as opposed to race.

Recently, Phinney and Ong (2007) have questioned the existing conceptualizations of ethnic identity. They argued that ethnic identity is a multidimensional construct and that because of its complexity, no single measure can comprehensively assess this construct. Phinney and Ong (2007) conceptualized ethnic identity as a process that includes self-categorization, exploration (e.g., seeking information and experiences relevant to one’s ethnicity), commitment or sense of belonging, and attachment or affective commitment to one’s self-identified ethnic identity or group. These processes are all essential for ethnic formation as a part of ethnic identity development. Important subcomponents of ethnic identity continue to be ethnic behaviors, evaluation and ingroup activities, importance and salience. Previous frameworks, such as those proposed by Berry (1997) and Bernal et al. (1993), conceptualize ethnic identity as acculturation and enculturation working together. In contrast, Phinney and Ong (2007) view ethnic identity as a process in which changes take place with time and context, as ethnic identity development is considered an independent construct compared to acculturation or national identity (e.g., American identity). Further research is needed in this area to continue revising existing models of ethnic identity that also include longitudinal designs since this approach goes hand in hand with developmental approaches to better understand the construct.
Recently, Syed, Azmitia, and Phinney (2007) conducted a longitudinal study with 128 Latina/o college students and examined the strength of ethnic identity and change in ethnic identity status during their first year of college in two contexts. The contexts differed in both density of ethnic minorities and density of target group studied at a California State University system (CSU) and University of California system (UC). More specifically, students attended one of two public universities in Los Angeles, California and in a small coastal city in northern California. In one university, European Americans were predominant. In the other university Latina/os were the majority. Latina/os were chosen as the single ethnic group because Latina/os are the largest ethnic group in California and in both universities. Syed et al. (2007) did not find a significant change in mean levels of ethnic identity exploration or commitment over time. However, cluster analysis results provided evidence for substantial individual shifts in ethnic identity statuses from fall to spring quarters. In the fall quarter, Latina/o students were relatively equally distributed among the three statuses with slightly more emerging adults falling into the moratorium status than the unexamined or achievement statuses. By the spring quarter, most Latina/o students were either in the moratorium or achieved statuses with few in the unexamined status. Most Latina/o students were moving towards the achieved status regardless of the context in which the students were developing. Syed et al. suggested the notion of *ethnic identity pathways*, which indicated that students arrived at the same result in ethnic identity over time. However, the processes and meanings ascribed to their ethnic identities varied by student. Latina/o students shifted from achieved to moratorium status and from unexamined to achieved status, and less frequently from, moratorium to unexamined status. This suggests the notion of negotiation and renegotiation of ethnic identity, which does not fluctuate in a linear fashion. In addition, the results suggest that gender and immigrant generational status were not associated
with changes in ethnic identity (i.e., mean levels or status membership). However, at the end of
the school year in both contexts, results indicated that Latina/os students in the unexamined
status group were of higher socioeconomic status than the moratorium and achieved groups. The
high SES students who remained in the unexamined status entered college with low
identification with their ethnic identity, and persisted at the same level across their first year,
whereas the students of lower SES strengthened their ethnic identification during their first year
of college. Syed et al. suggested that ethnicity may not be salient for high SES students, who
may be more assimilated to the mainstream, middle class culture and values that characterize
universities. Syed et al. also suggested that more research with individuals of mixed heritage is
needed. Latina/os of mixed heritage may define themselves into the Chicana/o or Latina/o
groups. However, the degree to which they exhibit the physical, demographic, behavioral, and
other characteristics associated with this ethnic group may be influenced by how easily they
integrate into the group and their experiences of prejudice and discrimination. A physical
characteristic such as skin color is likely to play a role in how others perceive Latina/o mixed-
heritage students’ ethnic group membership.

Bernal, Knight, Ocampo, Garza and Cota (1993), Umaña-Taylor and Fine (2004), and
Umaña-Taylor, Bhanot, and Shin (2006) developed and examined ethnic identity development
among Latino children and adolescents and described the central role that families play in
children’s and adolescent ethnic identity development. Hurtado et al. (1993) and Rodríguez et
al. (2007) are the only two studies that have documented aspects of familism with cultural
identity or social identities among adult Latina/os.

Hurtado et al. (1993) investigated the relationship between adult Latina/os’ social
identities and the possible impact on ethnic socialization of children in a survey conducted in
They surveyed 345 adult Mexicana/os who were born in Mexico and dominant in Spanish as well as 429 adult Chicana/os who were born in the United States, currently residing the Southwestern U.S. or in the Chicago metropolitan area and dominant in English. Ethnic socialization was measured by the following five indices: Proximal familism (importance that relatives live nearby), cultural preference (activities such as watching television, reading magazines and newspapers in Spanish), preference for children retaining Mexican culture, approval of bilingualism, and stress on family responsibility and independence.

Results indicated that the majority of both Mexicana/os and Chicana/os, especially the most affluent Chicana/os who think of themselves as Spanish-speaking family members, prefer to live near their relatives and desire their children to retain their Mexican culture. Mexicana/os with a working-class identity were more likely to prefer to live near relatives, socialize children to keep Mexican culture, approve of bilingualism, and prefer Spanish media. Middle class identity was associated with approval of bilingualism and comprised 54% of those that identified with this group were from the Mexicana/o sample.

Class and cultural content were also linked to ethnicity for those who have strong ties to Mexico as Chicana/os’ ethnic identity socialization was associated with political, family, and class expressions of ethnicity. A political sense of self is unique to Chicana/os and is expressed in a Raza Identity which is associated with political movements of the 1970s that politicized the Raza group labels. For example, political labels vary within the Chicana/o group. Slightly less than half self-identified as Raza and Chicano; over half used the label of Brown; one quarter used Indian; and less than a fifth self-identified as Mestizo and Pocho.
Also, part of the political sense of self is being a Spanish speaker. Hurtado et al. reported that although the sample was primarily dominant in English, three quarters of the Chicanos viewed themselves as Spanish speakers. Chicana/os who identified with the Raza group label as compared to other Chicana/os, reported stronger preferences for media in Spanish and Mexican entertainment; greater commitment to bilingualism; and greater importance on children retaining Mexican culture.

In addition, for the Chicana/o group, farm worker, working class, and U.S./middle class identities were tied to class status. The few Chicana/os who identified with the farm workers (e.g., poor, foreigners, or immigrants) expressed a sense of being outsiders and reported having greater loyalty to Mexican culture in terms of preference for media in Spanish and Mexican entertainment. Chicana/os who identified with the U.S. middle class reported feeling a sense of being insiders by exhibiting less emphasis on Mexican culture and the desire for children to retain Mexican culture. Chicana/os who identified with the working class were primarily men and individuals with high school educations, who emphasized family responsibility rather than cultural preference.

In terms of gender differences, women in both groups were more likely than men to want to live near relatives and enjoy media in Spanish. In particular, women in the Mexicana/o group emphasized their desire that children learn about Mexican culture. Approval of bilingualism and stress on family responsibility and independence were not associated with gender in either Mexicana/o or Chicana/o group. Hurtado et al. reported that in terms of age, the only difference was that fewer younger than older Chicana/os felt it was important to live in close proximity to relatives. Although Hurtado et al.’s (1993) study provides a unique contribution to a new
perspective on ethnic identity and social class, more recent research is needed in the area of
familism and ethnic identity.

Most recently, Rodriguez et al. (2007) interviewed 248 adults of Mexican origin in Los
Angeles to examine the relationships between familism, acculturation and enculturation.
Rodriguez et al. also examined how these factors contributed to psychological well-being and
distress among adults of Mexican origin. The following three dimensions of familism were
examined in this study: a) importance of family; b) family support; and c) family conflict.
Acculturation was measured by the Multidimensional Acculturation Scale II ([MAS II];
Rodriguez, Myers, Bingham Mira et al., 2002) and additional items were incorporated to assess
the role of Mexican and American cultural identity. This study also utilized several measures
(e.g., [Familism Scale]; Gaines et al., 1997; [Perceived Social Support from Family]; Procidano
& Heller, 1983) in which items were translated into Spanish, items were added or modified, and
response formats were changed (e.g., “yes”, “no”, or “I don’t know” was changed to 5-point
Likert-type scale). For example, the 10-item Familism Scale by Gaines et al. (1997) was utilized
to assess the importance of family and was modified by rewording items.

Results indicated that higher degree of importance of family was found among
individuals with higher family incomes, individuals who were second generation or greater, U.S.
born women, and those that strongly identified with both Mexican and American culture.
Consistent with Rodriguez and Koloski’s (1998) findings, Rodriguez et al. (2007) found that
after controlling for SES, those individuals who identified with Mexican culture and practices
were more likely to report greater family support. Mexican cultural identity was found to be
high irrespective of nativity or length of residence in the U.S. Bicultural identity or Mexican and
American cultural identification was associated with a greater value being placed on the family.
Also, family conflict was not associated with acculturation. In other words, the process of adapting to the dominant culture did not increase the level of family conflict. When solely examining psychological distress (after controlling for acculturation and SES), individuals who reported greater levels of family conflict reported experiencing greater psychological distress and lower family support. After controlling for SES variables, individuals who identified with a stronger Mexican cultural identity reported a more positive sense of well-being. However, Rodriguez et al. (2007) strongly caution against making generalizations about the positive relationship between acculturation and well-being due to mixed findings in the literature (Rogler et al., 1991). In summary, there is a gap in the research literature on the relationship between familism and enculturation or ethnic identity processes among Latina/os residing in the United States.

Familism and Psychological Well-Being

A debate in the literature on well-being exists regarding the presence of human universals versus cultural differences in the variables that are associated with well-being across cultures. A universalistic approach conceptualizes psychological well-being as satisfaction of universal needs for existential challenges of life, specifically pursuing meaningful goals, growth and development of the person, and establishing quality ties to others (Keyes, Shmotkin, & Ryff, 2002; Ryff, 1989). Ryff and Keyes (1995) proposed a multidimensional model of psychological well-being, which consists of six distinct components of wellness, including Self Acceptance, Environmental Mastery, Purpose in Life, Positive Relations with Others, Personal Growth, and Autonomy. Each of these components is associated with different challenges individuals may encounter as they strive to function positively. In contrast, an alternative approach to psychological well-being is conceptualized Deci and Ryan’s (2000) Self-Determination Theory,
which describes three basic psychological needs (e.g., autonomy, competence, and relatedness). This approach proposes that fulfillment of these “intrinsic” needs is essential for well-being (Diener, Oishi, & Lucas, 2003).

Counseling psychologists have emphasized the importance of well-being in identifying and developing client strengths in theory, research, and practice (Lopez, Magyar-Moe, Petersen et al., 2006). More recently, the field of psychology is beginning to acknowledge the importance of identifying individual and group strengths, particularly identifying and nurturing cultural values (e.g., family, spirituality, ethnic identity, and racial identity) and strengths in diverse populations (Lopez et al., 2006; Marin & Gamba, 1996; Sue & Constantine, 2003). There is acknowledgment that conceptions of healthy functioning and well-being are not universal and differ by cultural background. Therefore, existing research studies need to be more inclusive in reflecting more diverse and representative samples (DeNeve & Cooper, 1998; Diener & Diener, 1995; Diener, Oishi, & Lucas, 2003; Ryff & Keyes, 1995). For example, in a study examining the importance of happiness among college students in 42 different countries, Suh, Diener, Oishi, and Triandis (1998) found that respondents from Latin American countries such as Argentina, Brazil, and Chile, gave higher importance ratings to subjective well-being (global sense of well-being, happiness and life satisfaction) compared to countries such as the United States and Germany.

Ryan and Deci’s (2001) review focused on two general perspectives of well-being, identified as hedonic and eudemonic. Hedonic well-being refers to a focus on happiness, pleasure attainment and pain avoidance. Eudemonic well-being refers to a focus on meaning and degree of psychological functioning. Wealth is a variable that has been found to be an antecedent condition that is likely to facilitate well-being. Diener and Diener (2001) found that
people in rich nations are happier than people in poor nations. Diener and Diener (2001) found that financial status had a higher correlation with life satisfaction in poorer nations than in wealthier nations. Results support the idea of a “need hierarchy,” whereby finances are less important to people who have met their basic physical needs (Diener & Diener, 1995, p.661). Diener and Diener (2001) suggested that once people obtain the adequate level of a resource (e.g., money) to meet the goals which are seen as important to happiness in that culture (e.g., wealthier nations such as the U.S.) the resource may correlate less with subjective well-being. In poor societies (e.g., India), many people have not obtained an adequate level of this resource (i.e., money for goods and services) which may be therefore seen as important to happiness.

In support of these findings, a recent study by Gonzalez, Bonilla, Juaregui, Yamanis, and Salgado de Snyder (2007) examined perceptions of quality of life, family support, and economic resources in relation to migration to the U.S. among 372 elderly males from rural Mexico, and elderly males from the same hometown that had not migrated to the U.S. These authors found that, among migrants, the greater level of contact with the U.S. was associated with a higher level of perceived well-being, family support, and economic security. Elderly Mexican men perceived stronger well-being associated with old age, if they experienced migration to the U.S. and if their offspring continued the migratory tradition of the father. In contrast, the majority of the older Mexican men, who did not emigrate, or received economic income in the form of retirement or pension, reported lower levels of well-being. In addition, those that continued to work lived as a dependent of their family or of other members of their communities and also reported a lower sense of well-being with old age (Gonzalez et al., 2007). Therefore, it is important to consider contextual factors such as migration patterns, family support, and age,
which may influence the experiences of individuals who come from diverse societies with limited economic resources, and in turn may significantly impact their psychological well-being.

Researchers who examine the relationship between familism and psychological well-being or adjustment have mostly focused on family support. In general, these studies have found a positive relationship between family support and psychological well-being or adjustment (Castillo et al., 2004; DeGarmo & Martinez, 2006; Schneider & Ward, 2003; Solberg, & Villareal, 1997). In contrast, there are a few studies that have shown contradictory or inconsistent results (Gloria et al., 2005; Rodriguez et al. (2003). For example, Solberg and Villareal (1997) investigated the role of self-efficacy, social support, and stress on the psychological adjustment of 164 Latina/o undergraduate students using a diathesis-stress model. Results indicated that perceived social support buffered the effect of stress on psychological adjustment. That is, students perceived that they were able to better deal with stress if they viewed a source of family support available as needed.

Rodriguez et al. (2003) related perceptions of family and friend support to psychological well-being and distress among 338 Latina/o college students who attended a public university in the southwestern part of the U.S. with a predominantly Latina/o student body. Contrary to previous findings, family support did not seem to be as effective as support from friends in protecting against psychological distress. More specifically, being female, and carrying the burden of acculturative and general college stress tended to place an individual at risk for psychological distress. In other words, females struggled with acculturative stress related to cultural identity, language difficulty, and familial conflict, as well as general college stress including academic demands, relationship problems, and financial concerns. In contrast, Central American males with a high family income and a mother with limited education showed
decreased levels of distress and an increase in psychological well-being. Rodriguez et al. (2003) suggested that Latina/o college students may seek support from their peers for challenges they face as college students, whereas family support may be useful in coping with non-college stressors. Rodriguez et al. raised the emic or culture-specific question of whether the measures employed in this study accurately capture the experience of psychological well-being and distress as experienced by Latina/os.

A more recent study by DeGarmo and Martinez (2006) examined the detrimental effects of discrimination and the protective effects of social support (parent, school, peer, and friends) on the academic well-being of 278 Latina/o youth. The results supported Solberg and Villareal’s (1997) findings in that parental support buffered the negative effects of discrimination on academic well-being. However, a combination of all types of social support had the greatest positive impact on well-being.

Gloria et al. (2005) were the first to empirically examine Latina college students’ psychological well-being within the context of higher education. Gloria et al. surveyed 98 Latina undergraduate students, and examined their perceived educational barriers, cultural fit, and coping responses and how these factors may influence Latina’s psychological well-being. The results suggested that the strongest predictors of psychological well-being were cultural congruity (university environment/climate) and the coping response of taking planned positive actions such as talking with friends and relatives about the problem, seeking professional advice, drawing on past experiences, and seeking help from members of their cultural group.

As reviewed earlier, Rodriguez et al. (2007) examined the impact of familism and acculturation on the psychological well-being and distress of adults of Mexican origin in Los Angeles. Rodriguez et al. found that after controlling for SES, those individuals who identified
with Mexican culture and practices were more likely to report greater family support, and lower levels of family conflict and psychological distress. Rodríguez et al.’s results support previous findings (e.g., Rodríguez & Koloski, 1998; Vega, Kolody, Valle, & Weir, 1991) and underscore that family support is positively associated with well-being. In particular, the stronger an individual identified with Mexican culture and perceived a supportive family, the more likely they were to feel positive about their life in general. Rodríguez et al. suggested caution in interpreting these results as previous studies have found contradictory findings regarding the relationship between acculturation and mental health status (Rogler et al., 1991). For this reason, future research is needed to further examine the relationship between familism, enculturation or ethnic identity, acculturation, and the influence of these factors on the psychological well-being of Latina/os residing in the United States.

Summary of Research and Future Directions

Familismo (familism) is one of the most important cultural values of Latina/os (Triandis, et al., 1982). As a core cultural value, familismo is based on an allocentric or collectivistic worldview that values interdependence, obligation, affiliation, cooperation, loyalty, reciprocity, and solidarity among members of the family (Falicov, 2006; Marin & Marin, 1991; Marin & Triandis, 1985). For this reason, it is essential to increase our understanding of the maintenance of familismo as a cultural value (enculturation) while Latina/os adapt to the U.S. culture (acculturation; Berry, 1997; Kim et al., 2009). Research has often focused on Latina/o adherence to familismo and other cultural values by assessing behavioral changes that take place in Latina/o’s way of life. However, Marin (1992) argued that it is more important to focus on cultural values than behavioral changes because values such as familismo represent an individual’s worldview and remain more stable over time. Furthermore, Phinney (1996) argued
that measures that utilize only behavioral indicators of cultural retention or involvement are unable to show the direct links between culture and outcomes. In addition, when researchers utilize proxy variables such as generational status as a cultural value, they ignore familistic values that are central to understanding the Latina/o experience in the U.S. (Cabassa, 2003). Researchers also need to examine how the core value of *familismo* relates to other variables such as ethnic identity or enculturation, acculturation, and psychological well-being.

In summary, the studies in this review provide a historical background of descriptive and empirical studies that support the need for more complex multidimensional models of *familismo* or familism. To fully understand the unique needs of Latina/os and to better serve them, researchers need to further examine the construct of *familismo*. Researchers need to use instruments measuring familism in both a global sense, and in studying specific subcomponents. Also, researchers need to include other important moderating and mediating variables that could provide a wider scope of understanding the complexities of this construct. Potential moderating and mediating variables include ethnic and racial identity; psychological well-being; background and contextual variables (e.g., language, race, age, sexual orientation, immigration patterns to the U.S., adherence to family customs and rituals). In addition, utilization of consistent instruments with strong psychometric properties is needed in order to establish validity and reliability in the study of *familismo*. In particular, developing valid and reliable “emic” or culture specific constructs and instruments is needed to assess the unique experiences of Latina/os living in the U.S. (Diaz-Guerrero, 2003; Vega, 1990). In addition, multivariate designs are needed to establish causal links between independent variables such as socioeconomic status, labor market effects, and cultural factors, and dependent variables such as family relations, structure, and processes (Vega, 1990). There is also a need for researchers to utilize diverse representative
subsamples of the Latina/o population that are more inclusive (e.g., Central and South Americans, Cubans). Also, researchers should focus on studying family strengths in the context of psychological well-being and the role of culture in sustaining these strengths.

As mentioned previously, more thorough understanding is needed regarding the relationship between acculturative and enculturative processes, and their impact on psychological well-being. Based on previous research, irrespective of acculturation level, Chicana/os continue to possess greater values of familism, especially family support, across three generations removed from Mexico. There is little research on enculturation and familismo as predictors of psychological well-being. Specifically, research examining attitudes and beliefs of the family, ethnic pride, and greater self-identification to one or more ethnic group memberships. Also, researchers should use orthogonal measurement of acculturation, and positive aspects of psychological functioning.

Overview of the Present Study

This study evaluated the relationships between enculturation, acculturation, familismo, and psychological well-being. Moreover, this study tested whether levels of enculturation or acculturation, treated as independent dimensions, alter the strength of the relationship between familismo and psychological well-being. Previous research has shown that enculturation positively influences Latina/o’s values about the family and how they perceive their psychological well-being. This study also tested whether or not familismo mediates the relationships between enculturation and psychological well-being and between acculturation and psychological well-being in Latina/os residing in the United States. Research studies document that familismo is one of the most important cultural values for Latina/os and that it accounts to a certain extent for the variance in psychological well-being.

The hypotheses that were tested for this study are as following:
**Hypothesis 1:** The relationship between *familismo* and psychological well-being will be stronger for Latina/os with higher levels of enculturation.

**Hypothesis 2:** The relationship between *familismo* and psychological well-being will be stronger for Latina/os with lower levels of acculturation.

**Hypothesis 3:** Higher levels of enculturation will lead to stronger values of *familismo* and in turn, to better psychological well-being.

**Hypothesis 4:** Higher levels of acculturation will lead to weaker values of *familismo*, and in turn, weaker psychological well-being.

**Hypothesis 5:** First-generation Latina/os, as compared to the 1.5 generation, second generation, and third or later generations, will average higher in enculturation, *familismo*, and psychological well-being, while controlling for levels of socioeconomic status, educational attainment, and age.

**Hypothesis 6:** First-generation Latina/os will exhibit lower levels of acculturation as compared to the 1.5 generation, second generation, and third or later generations.
CHAPTER THREE

Method

Participants

The study participants were 401 Latina/os (239 women, 162 men) who reside in the Southwest and Pacific Northwest of the United States and who are of Mexican heritage. Participants ranged in age from 18 to 85 (M = 34.29, SD = 15.67). In this study, individuals who were eligible to participate met one of the following criteria: a) 18 years of age or older, b) “Latina/o” ethnic self-identification with Mexican heritage, c) self-identification as Mexican, Mexicano, Mexican American, or Chicana/o, d) place of birth is Mexico, e) country of origin or nationality is from Mexico, f) place of birth is the United States of America and at least one parent or grandparent is of Mexican descent, or g) familial lineage through the mother’s or father’s side of the family is of Mexican descent. Participants were recruited from cultural and recreational community centers, shopping centers, universities, community colleges, churches, trolley stations, and outside grocery stores, and fast food restaurants.

Forty-six percent of participants were second generation (U.S. born and parents U.S. born with familial lineage of Mexican heritage), 34.3% were first generation (born in Mexico and living in U.S.), 16.3% were 1.5 generation, and 2.8% were third generation and later. Participants reported their self-identified ethnicity as the following: Mexican (50%, n = 202), Mexican-American (30.4%, n = 122), Hispanic (7.5%, n = 30), Chicana/o (5.5%, n = 22), Latina/o (1.2%, n = 5), ethnic mixture (both parents are of different ethnicities; .5%, n = 2). Other ethnicities reported by participants were the following: Mestiza, Japanese Mexican, Mexican American/Latino, Mexican American/Chicano, Hispanic/Central American (.7%, n =...
Fifty-seven percent of participants chose to complete the packet of measurements in English, while 43% completed measures in Spanish. Participants’ native language was primarily Spanish (82.3%, n = 330). The native language of participants’ mothers and fathers was generally Spanish (94.8% for mothers and 94.3% for fathers).

Participants reported their place of birth being primarily Mexico (52%) and almost half were born in the U.S. (48%). Participants’ mothers and fathers were born primarily in Mexico, 92.3% and 91.3%, respectively. However, the number of years the family has lived in the U.S. was about 28 years (M = 28, SD = 16.38). Some of the reasons that participants reported for why they first immigrated to the U.S. were as follows: work (40.3%, n = 64), progress/better future/opportunities (22%, n = 35), “la familia” (the family; 28%, n = 45), education (6.3%, n = 10), and other (3%, n = 5). Forty percent of the sample is currently in university or has a college degree. Thirty four per cent (n = 136) of participants completed their high school education in Mexico compared to 66% who completed their high school education in the U.S. (n = 264). The highest level of education attained by participants’ mothers and fathers was primary school (grades 1 through 6). Those who completed their education in Mexico were 49.5% for mothers and 77.6% for fathers. Almost half of participants reported earning less than $19,000 as their annual income (52%, n = 206). However, family income levels were reported as the following: $50,000 to $74,999 (25%, n = 93), $31,000 to $49,999 (23%, n = 87), $20,000 to $30,999 (21%, n = 71, and less than $19,000 (19%, n = 71). The majority of participants were either single (46.9%, n = 187) or married (42.1%, n = 168), whereas a small number was divorced (4.5%), cohabitating (4.3%), widowed (2%), or separated (.3%).
**Instruments**

*Demographic Questionnaire.* All participants completed a Demographic Questionnaire requesting the following information: self-identified ethnicity; age; gender; educational attainment and where education was completed (or years in school); marital status; employment status; place of birth of participant, parents, and grandparents; number of years living in the U.S.; family income; number of dependents; number of people living in household; native language(s); and language preference. The information in the Demographic Questionnaire provided contextual and background information that would facilitate a better understanding of participants’ experiences living in the U.S (see Appendix A).

*Attitudinal Familism Scale.* The Attitudinal Familism Scale (AFS) is an 18-item measure that is used to assess individuals’ beliefs toward the family (Steidel & Contreras, 2003). The responses are made on a 10-point Likert-type scale, ranging from *strongly disagree* (1) to *strongly agree* (10). The Attitudinal Scale is comprised of the following four subscales: a) familial support, b) family interconnectedness, c) familial honor, and d) subjugation of self for the family. Steidel and Contreras (2003) reported coefficient alphas for the overall AFS scale and for each of the four subscales: Overall scale, .83; Familial Support Scale, .72, Familial Interconnectedness, .69; Familial Honor, .68; and Subjugation of Self for Family, .56. Steidel and Contreras (2003) demonstrated construct validity through positive correlations that were observed between overall familism, AFS-Familial Honor, AFS-Familial Interconnectedness scores, and ARSMA-II LOS. Discriminant validity was demonstrated through lack of correlations observed between the AOS ARSMA-II subscale and overall familism, AFS-Familial Honor, and AFS-Familial Interconnectedness scores. In the present study, I tested whether the structure of the AFS instrument replicated across Spanish-only and English-only groups (see
Chapter 4). In addition, other measures of *familismo* were utilized to test for convergent validity and construct validity of instruments. In the present study, alpha reliability for the overall AFS scale was .84, which is comparable to the value obtained by Steidel and Contreras. Table 8 presents alpha reliabilities for the participants who completed their measures in English only and provides alpha reliabilities for each of the four subscales: Familial Support Scale, .71, Familial Interconnectedness, .65; Familial Honor, .51; and Subjugation of Self for Family, .48. Table 8 also presents alpha reliabilities for participants who completed their measures in Spanish only and provides alpha reliabilities for each of the four subscales: Familial Support Scale, .74, Familial Interconnectedness, .67; Familial Honor, .65; and Subjugation of Self for Family, .69.

*Pan-Hispanic Familism Scale.* The Pan-Hispanic Familism Scale (PHFS) is a 5-item measure that is used to assess the ideological beliefs about the family, while excluding behavioral components. The PHFS was designed by Villareal, Blozis, and Widaman, (2005) as a measure of attitudinal familism. The instrument was developed in a nationally representative sample of U.S. Hispanics across nine U.S. census regions, excluding Alaska and Hawaii. The PHFS scale is composed of five items that were extracted from two other scales (i.e., Familism Scale and FACES-II used by Gaines et al. [1997] and Gil et al. [2000]). The PHFS uses a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). Villareal et al. (2005) reported an alpha reliability coefficient of .82 with a sample of 762 Hispanic/Latino adults who mirrored the distribution of Hispanics residing in the continental U.S. Villareal et al. (2005) used confirmatory factor analysis to establish the validity and measurement invariance of the scale across individuals from different countries of origin (i.e., United States, Mexico, and Latin America) and language preference in which the survey study was conducted. In the present study, alpha reliability for the overall PHFS scale was .90, which is slightly higher than
the value reported by Villareal et al. The total alpha reliability for English only was .87 and for Spanish only was .92 (see Appendix B, Table 8).

*Acculturation Rating Scale for Mexican Americans-II.* The Acculturation Rating Scale for Mexican Americans-II (ARSMA-II) is a 30-item multidimensional behavioral scale that measures levels of acculturation and enculturation (e.g., identification with Mexican and Anglo cultures) using an orthogonal or multidimensional approach (Cuellar et al., 1995). The ARSMA-II is composed of two scales. Scale 1 consists of two independent subscales: an Anglo Orientation Subscale (AOS) and a Mexican Orientation Subscale (MOS). The ARSMA-II includes items that assess four factors: a) language use and preference, b) ethnic identity and classification, c) cultural heritage and ethnic behaviors, and d) ethnic interaction. The inventory uses a bilingual format with English and Spanish items appearing side by side on the same page. All the items are rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*not at all*) to 5 (*extremely often or almost always*).

The MOS and AOS are composed of 17 and 13 items, respectively. To obtain an MOS score, items are summed up and divided by 17. Higher scores represent an orientation toward the Mexican culture. To obtain an AOS score, items are summed up and divided by 13. Higher scores represent an orientation toward the Anglo culture. The MOS score can be subtracted from the AOS score to obtain a score that represents an individual’s score along a continuum from very Mexican-oriented to very Anglo-oriented. Cuellar et al. (1995) reported internal consistency reliability estimates for the AOS and MOS scales of .83 and .88, respectively, and test-retest reliability estimates over a one-week period of .94 and .96, respectively. Scale 2 of the ARSMA-II was designed to measure two other acculturation dimensions, separation and marginalization. Since the ARSMA-II was designed to measure four different dimensions of
acculturation, each scale can be independently administered, scored, and interpreted. Scale 2 is considered experimental and was not used in this study (see Cuellar et al., 1995; Zamarripa, 2009). Cuellar et al. (1995) administered the original ARSMA and ARSMA-II inventories to a sample of 171 individuals and the acculturation scores for the two inventories were highly correlated, thus demonstrating concurrent validity. Cuellar et al. (1995) reported evidence of construct validity through positive correlations between acculturation scores and generational status. Table 8 presents alpha reliabilities for the participants in the present study who completed the instrument in English or Spanish. For the MOS and AOS scales, alpha reliabilities were .86 and .71, respectively, for the English group and .72 and .88 for the Spanish group. The total alpha reliability for English only was .81 and Spanish only was .79.

_Latina/o Values Scale._ The Latina/o Values Scale ([LVS]; Kim et al., 2009) is a 35-item scale that measures an individual’s adherence to Latina/o cultural values. The LVS consists of an overall score and four subscales: a) LVS-Cultural Pride, b) LVS- _Simpatía_, c) LVS- _Familismo_, and d) LVS- _Espiritismo_. All the items are rated on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (_strongly agree_) to 4 (_strongly disagree_). Kim et al. (2009) reported the following internal consistency reliability estimates for the LVS and LVS-subscales in a sample of 231 Latina/o students from two West Coast universities who were predominantly Mexican or Chicana/o (69.7%): LVS overall $\alpha = .88$ and .85; LVS-Cultural Pride $\alpha = .89$ and .85; LVS- _Familismo_ $\alpha = .75$ and .68; LVS- _Simpatía_ $\alpha = .46$; LVS- _Espiritismo_ $\alpha = .50$. Test-retest reliability estimates over a two week period for LVS overall, LVS-Cultural Pride, and LVS- _Familismo_ were .78, .75, and .75, respectively. Kim et al. did not report test-retest reliability estimates for the LVS- _Simpatía_ and LVS _Espiritismo_ subscales.
Concurrent validity was demonstrated by significant positive correlations between the scales that measure dimensions of enculturation (see Kim et al., 2009). There were significant negative correlations between the LVS, LVS-Cultural Pride, LVS-\textit{Familismo}, and the Anglo Orientation Scale score of the ARSMA-II. Kim et al. (2009) demonstrated convergent validity through observed positive correlations between LVS and LVS-Cultural Pride scores and the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale scores. Kim et al. (2009) demonstrated discriminant validity through lack of correlations between all of the LVS scores and Social Desirability Scale scores. Confirmatory factor analysis provided additional support for the construct validity of the LVS scores. Concurrent validity was further demonstrated through positive correlations between the LVS scores and the Self Construal Scale-Interdependent, Cultural Identification Scale-Latina/o, and single item scores, which all measured enculturation (for more specifics see Kim et al., 2009). In the present study, Table 8 presents alpha reliabilities for the instrument. For the participants who completed their measures in English, reliability of the overall scale was .73 and the subscale reliabilities ranged from .12 to .59. For the participants who completed their measures in Spanish, reliability of the overall scale was .73 and the subscale reliabilities ranges from .20 to .45. The overall alpha reliability for the present study was .75.

\textit{Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure-Revised (MEIM-R).} The MEIM-R is a 6-item measure of the original version of this instrument, the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM). The instrument assesses the process of ethnic identity development in adolescents and young adults of diverse ethnicities (Phinney, 1992). The MEIM-R consists of two subscales, ethnic identity exploration (a process-oriented developmental and cognitive component) and commitment (an affective and attitudinal component). All the items are rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (\textit{strongly disagree}) to 5 (\textit{strongly agree}). The MEIM-R also includes open-
ended questions that elicit the participant’s spontaneous ethnic self-label. Participants are also provided with a list of ethnic groups and are asked to indicate their own and their parent’s ethnic background. Phinney and Ong (2007) reported the following internal consistency reliability estimates for the MEIM-R total score and MEIM-R subscales: MEIM-R total score α = .81; MEIM-R Exploration α = .76; and MEIMR-Commitment α = .78. These reliabilities were reported for an ethnically diverse sample of 241 university students from a predominantly minority urban public university in southern California who were predominantly Latina/o (51%). Phinney and Ong (2007) used confirmatory factor analysis to establish construct validity of the MEIM-R subscale scores. In the present study, Table 8 presents alpha reliabilities for the instrument. For the participants who completed their measures in English, reliability of the overall scale was .88 and the subscale reliabilities ranged from .83 to .86. For the participants who completed their measures in Spanish, reliability of the overall scale was .89 and the subscale reliabilities ranges from .82 to .86.

*Psychological Well-Being–Short Scale.* The Psychological Well-Being–Short Scale (PWBSS), which was constructed by Van Dierendonck (2005), is a shortened version of the original Psychological Well-Being Scale (PWB; Ryff & Keyes, 1995). The instrument measures psychological well-being or positive healthy functioning. Van Dierendonck’s (2005) PWBS subscales consist of 6, 7, or 8 items depending on the scale. The Self Acceptance, Positive Relations with Others, Environmental Mastery, and Purpose in Life subscales consisted of 6 items; the Personal Growth subscale consisted of 7 items; and the Autonomy subscale consisted of 8 items. All the items are rated on a 6-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*completely disagree*) to 6 (*completely agree*). Higher scores on each item represent an increased level of positive functioning. Van Dierendonck (2005) reported the following internal consistency reliability
estimates for the PWBS subscales: Self-Acceptance, $\alpha = .81$; Positive Relations with Others, $\alpha = .80$; Autonomy, $\alpha = .81$; Environmental Mastery, $\alpha = .78$; Purpose in life, $\alpha = .81$; and Personal Growth, $\alpha = .72$. Van Dierendonck (2005) used confirmatory factor analysis and established construct validity of a six-dimensional model of psychological well-being. Each of the six dimensions is associated with different challenges individuals encounter as they strive to function positively (Ryff & Keyes, 1995). Ryff and Keyes (1995) demonstrated concurrent validity for the original PWB through correlations between the six dimensions and indicators of happiness and life satisfaction. Ryff and Keyes (1995) also demonstrated discriminant validity by reporting lack of correlations between depression and all dimensions of psychological well-being. Gloria et al. (2005) utilized the 3-item per scale PWB Short Scale version developed by Ryff and Keyes (1995) in a study with 98 Latina undergraduate students and revealed an adequate total score alpha reliability coefficient of .71. Most recently, Gloria, Castellanos, Scull, and Villegas (2009) utilized the 3-item per scale PWB Short Scale version developed by Ryff and Keyes (1995) and reported a total score alpha reliability of .84 in a study with 100 male Latino undergraduates.

Diaz et al. (2006) adapted the Van Dierendonck (2005) PWB short version for the Spanish language in a sample of 467 adults who resided in Spain and were between 18 and 72 years of age. Diaz et al. (2006) reported the following internal consistency reliability estimates for the adapted Spanish version: Self-Acceptance, $\alpha = .83$; Positive Relations with Others, $\alpha = .81$; Autonomy, $\alpha = .73$; Environmental Mastery, $\alpha = .71$; Purpose in Life, $\alpha = .83$; and Personal Growth, $\alpha = .68$. However, Diaz et al. proposed a shorter Spanish version with the 6, 7, or 8 items reduced to 3, 4, 5, or 6 items depending on the specific scale, which yielded overall improved psychometric qualities. The shortened Personal Growth scale consists of 3 items; the
Self Acceptance subscale consists of 4 items; the Positive Relations with others, Environmental Mastery, and Purpose in Life subscales consist of 5 items; and the Autonomy subscale consists of 6 items. Internal reliability estimates for Diaz et al.’s shortened PWBS Spanish subscales were as follows: Self-Acceptance, $\alpha = .84$; Positive Relations with Others, $\alpha = .78$; Autonomy, $\alpha = .70$; Environmental Mastery, $\alpha = .82$; Purpose in life, $\alpha = .70$; and Personal Growth, $\alpha = .71$. In the present study, internal consistency reliability estimates for the Diaz et al. (2006) PWBS subscales for those participants who filled out the measures in Spanish were as follows: Self-Acceptance, $\alpha = .74$; Positive Relations with others, $\alpha = .24$; Autonomy, $\alpha = .31$; Environmental Mastery, $\alpha = .30$; Purpose in life, $\alpha = .82$; and Personal Growth, $\alpha = .49$ (see Table 8). Internal consistency reliability estimates for those participants who filled out the measures in English were as follows: Self-Acceptance, $\alpha = .70$; Positive Relations with others, $\alpha = .14$; Autonomy, $\alpha = .30$; Environmental Mastery, $\alpha = -.25$; Purpose in life, $\alpha = .76$; and Personal Growth, $\alpha = .01$. Because the reliabilities of some subscales were unacceptable, I only used the total scale score in subsequent analyses. The $\alpha$ reliability estimates for the total score were .66 in the English language subgroup and .81 in the Spanish language subgroup.

Procedure

Participants who met the criteria previously mentioned completed a packet, which included a demographic questionnaire and each of the measures described in the instrument section. Participants had the option to complete instruments in English or Spanish. Participants were asked to fill out the instruments under the supervision of this researcher or at the earliest convenience of participants. The MEIM-R, LVS, and Demographic Questionnaire were translated into Spanish and back-translated into the English by two different English-Spanish bilinguals with a Mexican background. A professional translator approved the final translated
version. Completed packets were turned in to this researcher in person or dropped off in a designated box at participating locations such as a community center. The order of administration of the instruments was counterbalanced. The first order of instruments was as follows: Demographic Questionnaire, Attitudinal Familism Scale, Pan-Hispanic Familism Scale, ARSMA-II, LVS, MEIM-R, and PWBSS. The second order of instruments was as follows: Demographic Questionnaire, Pan-Hispanic Familism Scale, Attitudinal Familism Scale, PWBSS, MEIM-R, LVS, and ARSMA-II. After completion of the measures, the participants were debriefed by this researcher, who clarified any unanswered questions.
CHAPTER FOUR

Results

Tests of Measurement Models to Establish Language Equivalence

Prior to conducting hypotheses testing, I used confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) to test the measurement models for the various constructs and establish the invariance of all the instruments across language preference (i.e., Spanish versus English; see Appendix B, Table 8 for Cronbach alphas). This was important because some participants filled out the instruments in English and others in Spanish. Before I could combine these two language subsamples, I needed to test whether the scores from the two language versions were reasonably equivalent. Language equivalence was tested for all the instruments, with the exception of the PHFS and the ARSMA-II. Villareal et al. (2005) previously established the invariance of the PHFS across individuals from different countries of origin and language preference (i.e., Spanish and English). Cuellar et al. (1995) previously established invariance of the ARSMA-II with individuals representing 1 to 5 generations of Mexican descent as well as with different language preferences (i.e., Spanish and English). I used CFA to test the equality of factor loadings or “metric invariance” and the equality of intercepts or “scalar invariance” across two language groups (Brown, 2006, p.268-269; Byrne, 2001).

Each measurement model consisted of a latent or unobserved variable and at least three observed indicators. For example, the MEIM-R scale has 6 items, which were divided into three observed indicators or parcels of 2 items each. Because of the modest reliabilities for the Psychological Well-Being subscales (PWB), a PWB total score (rather than each of the PWB subscale scores) was used to simplify my analyses. In the confirmatory factor analysis, I used
one latent construct and items from all scales were allocated into three item parcels as observed variables. This is the procedure recommended by Little, Cunningham, Shahar, and Widaman (2002) for allocating items to parcels. For each instrument, the first measurement model tested included freely estimated factors loadings. That is, the factor loadings for the item parcels or indicators of each latent construct were allowed to vary across the two language groups. In the second model, all factor loadings were constrained to be equal across the two language groups. In the third model, the item intercepts were also constrained to be equal across language groups. Finally, when the fit of the third model was unacceptable, one or more intercepts were freely estimated (rather than constrained to equality across groups) to improve model fit and to determine whether partial equivalence could be established. It is possible that only partial invariance can be established, in which case some but not all of the factor loadings or intercepts can be considered equal across language groups. It is not uncommon for researchers to utilize instruments with partial language equivalence (Brown, 2006).

Each of the three measurement models was tested for the MEIM-R, LVS, AFS, and total latent PWB construct. LVS-Familismo was excluded from the overall LVS in these measurement equivalence analyses because this subscale was not included in subsequent analyses (see next section). Overall chi-square tests that are not statistically significant indicate that the model has a good fit of the data. However, overall $\chi^2$ tests are very sensitive to sample size and usually reject models even when the fit to the data is reasonably good. Therefore, I also examined several goodness-of-fit indices, including the following: $\chi^2$/df, good fit = 2:1-3:1; GFI, good fit = .90 or greater; CFI, good fit = .90 or greater; and RMSEA, good fit ≤ .05, fair fit ≤ .08. In addition to examining overall model fit indices, $\chi^2$ difference tests were used to compare selected models pair-wise. Table 1 shows the fit indices for all of the measurement models tested.
Table 1

*Fit Indices for Measurement Models Testing for Language Equivalence (N=401)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct and models</th>
<th>Overall $\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>$\chi^2/df$</th>
<th>GFI</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEIM-R</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freely estimated loadings (Model 1)</td>
<td>44.30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained loadings (Model 2)</td>
<td>45.44</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained intercepts (Model 3)</td>
<td>52.09</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LVS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freely estimated loadings (Model 1)</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained loadings (Model 2)</td>
<td>10.77</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained intercepts (Model 3)</td>
<td>51.20</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>10.24</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One intercept unconstrained (Model 4)</td>
<td>28.91</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>7.23</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AFS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freely estimated loadings (Model 1)</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained loadings (Model 2)</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained intercepts (Model 3)</td>
<td>159.13</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>14.47</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One intercept unconstrained (Model 4)</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PWB</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freely estimated loadings (Model 1)</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained loadings (Model 2)</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained intercepts (Model 3)</td>
<td>36.76</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One intercept unconstrained (Model 4)</td>
<td>21.58</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two intercepts unconstrained (Model 5)</td>
<td>13.45</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* MEIM-R = Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure-Revised Scales; AFS = Attitudinal Familism Scales; LVS = Latina/o Values Scales; PWB = Psychological Well-Being Scales. P-values and RMSEA indices are not provided by AMOS for saturated models. GFI indices are not provided when intercepts are estimated.

For all of the instruments, the models with all constrained loadings (i.e., Model 2) were not significantly worse in fit than the models with freely estimated loadings (Model 1) ($\chi^2$ [2 to 4] difference value ranges from .48 to 10.77). The model fit indices were also good for the models with constrained factor loadings. Therefore, metric (loading) equivalence was demonstrated for all the instruments. The comparison of Models 2 and 3 for the MEIM-R yielded a $\chi^2$ difference value of 1.2 (df = 4), which was nonsignificant ($p < .01$). Thus, full metric and scalar equivalence across languages was demonstrated for the MEIM-R. When I compared measurement Models 2 and 3 for the LVS, the $\chi^2$ difference value was significant ($p < .01$),
suggesting that not all intercepts could be constrained to equality across cultures. That is, there was only partial scalar equivalence across the two language groups. Similarly, when I compared AFS Model 2 and Model 3, the $\chi^2$ difference value of 155.73 (df = 4; p < .01) was statistically significant, indicating that full scalar equivalence was lacking. For the LVS-Familismo scale, the $\chi^2$ difference test comparing Models 2 and 3 yielded a value of 51.0 (df = 3), which was significant (p < .01). When I compared measurement Models 2 and 3 for the PWB, the $\chi^2$ difference value of 33.82 (df = 3) was significant (p < .01), again indicating that full scalar (intercept) equivalence was lacking. As seen in Table 2, most of the models with constrained intercepts (i.e., Model 3 for each instrument) had unacceptable fit indices. Therefore, I tested additional models in which I unconstrained (i.e., freely estimated in each language group) 1 or 2 intercepts to obtain acceptable model fits. With the exception of the LVS measure, the final models (i.e., Models 4 and/or 5) yielded fair to good model fit indices. Thus, the results established full metric (loading) equivalence and at least partial scalar (intercept) equivalence for all of the measures except for the LVS subscale. These results provide some bases for combining the English and Spanish language groups in the remainder of the analyses.

**Forming Composites of Related Variables**

Some of the instruments measured similar constructs and I wished to reduce the number of variables for some analyses. To do so, I conducted a factor analysis of the following scales: AFS Family Support, AFS Subjugation of Self for Family, AFS Familial Honor, AFS Familial Interconnectedness, PHFS MEIM-R Commitment, MEIM-R Ethnic Identity Exploration, ARSMA-II MOS, ARSMA-AOS, LVS-Espiritismo, LVS-Simpatía, LVS-Familismo, and LVS-Cultural Pride. I used principal axis extractions with varimax rotations to identify the common factors or dimensions underlying the various scales. The pattern of eigenvalues suggested that up
to four factors might be meaningful, although the fourth factor was largely defined by a single scale, the ARSMA-AOS (the first 10 eigenvalues were 3.56, 1.80, 1.38, 1.09, .93, .77, .72, .64, .57, and .50). Therefore, I examined the three-factor solution with and without the ARSMA-II AOS subscale. Table 2 shows the pattern of factor loadings for the three-factor solution. The three-factor model accounted for 67% of the common variance. The first factor was a general *familismo* dimension. The second factor represented an enculturation dimension. The third factor represented a Latino values construct. The LVS-Familismo scale had dual loadings on the first and third factor so I excluded the scale to obtain more distinct composite scores representing the three factors.

A composite score representing each of these three factors was computed using the following steps. First, I transformed each scale score into z-scores to standardize the data and give each subscale equal weight in the composites. Second, the standardized scores for the scales that were combined into a single composite were then averaged. In this way, composite scores were derived for *familismo*, enculturation, and Latino values. The familismo composite score was the average of the standardized PHFS and AFS subscale scores. The enculturation composite score was the average of the ARSMA-II MOS and MEIM-R Total Score. The Latino values composite was the average of the standardized LVS-Cultural Pride, LVS-*Espíritismo*, and LVS-*Símpatia* scales. Again, LVS-Familismo was excluded from the *familismo* composite score because in the factor analysis it loaded on both the Familismo and Latino Values factors. The ARMA-II AOS scale, which split off to form its own dimension in the four-factor solution, was treated as a separate variable in subsequent analyses.

Table 2

*Factor Loading Matrix for Principal Axis Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instruments</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Relationship between Familismo and Psychological Well-Being: Testing Enculturation as a Moderator Variable (Hypothesis 1)

In Hypothesis 1, I predicted that the relationship between familismo and psychological well-being would be stronger for Latina/os with higher levels of enculturation. The familismo and enculturation composites (see above) were centered around their sample means and used as predictors in a moderated multiple regression with the psychological well-being (PWB) total score as the criterion. Two continuous demographic variables correlated significantly, albeit modestly, with psychological well-being: age (r = .11, p < .05) and number of years the family has lived in the United States of America (r = .11, p < .05). Therefore, these two variables were entered in Step 1 as control variables. In Step 2, the familismo composite score was entered. In Step 3, I entered the enculturation composite score. In Step 4, I entered the interaction term (enculturation composite score x familismo composite score). Table 3 shows the results for each step in the moderated regression analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFS Family Support</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFS Subjugation of Self for family</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFS Familial Honor</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFS Familial Interconnectedness</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHFS</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEIM-R Commitment</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEIM-R Ethnic Identity Exploration</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARSMA-II MOS</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVS-Espiritismo</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVS-Simpatia</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVS-Familismo</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVS-Cultural Pride</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARSMA-II AOS</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. AFS = Attitudinal Familism Scale; PHFS = Pan-Hispanic Familism Scale; MEIM-R = Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure-Revised; ARSMA-II MOS = Acculturation Rating Scale for Mexican Americans-II Mexican Orientation Subscale; LVS = Latina/o Values Scale; ARSMA-II AOS = Acculturation Rating Scale for Mexican Americans-II Anglo Orientation Subscale.
As seen in the table, older participants reported modestly greater psychological well-being in Step 2, but no longer provided unique prediction after additional predictors were added in Step 3. The number of years the family lived in the U.S. also modestly predicted psychological well-being in Steps 3 and 4. In addition, participants who reported higher levels of familismo reported greater psychological well-being. Participants who endorsed greater ethnic pride and self-identification with their ethnic group also reported experiencing greater positive psychological well-being. However, the relationship between familismo and PWB was not moderated by enculturation (see Step 4). Therefore, Hypothesis 1 was not supported.

Table 3

Testing Enculturation as a Moderator of the Relationship between Familismo and Psychological Well-Being (N = 359)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Years the family lived in U.S.</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.11*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Years the family lived in U.S.</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familismo Composite Score</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.31***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Years the family lived in U.S.</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familismo Composite Score</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.26***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enculturation Composite Score</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.17***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Years the family lived in U.S.</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.11*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familismo Composite Score</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.26***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enculturation Composite Score</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.19***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enculturation Composite x Familismo Composite Score</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Step 1 $\Delta R^2 = .02, p = .02$; Step 2 $\Delta R^2 = .10, p < .001$; Step 3 $\Delta R^2 = .02, p = .002$; Step 4 $\Delta R^2 = .002, p = .37$. *p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001
**Relationship between Familismo and Psychological Well-Being: Testing Acculturation as a Moderator Variable (Hypothesis 2)**

In Hypothesis 2, I predicted that the relationship between *familismo* and psychological well-being would be stronger for Latina/os with lower levels of acculturation. As in the analysis for Hypothesis 1, moderated multiple regression was used to test Hypothesis 2. However, in Steps 3 and 4, acculturation, as measured by the ARSMA-II AOS, was entered in the analysis rather than the enculturation composite. Table 4 shows the results after each step of the moderated regression analysis. The results indicated that greater endorsement of an Anglo orientation was modestly associated with greater psychological well-being. However, this finding is qualified by a statistically significant moderation effect. The interaction term in step 4 was statistically significant (p < .05), indicating that acculturation did moderate the relationship between *familismo* and PWB. Figure 1 shows a plot of the moderation effect. As indicated in the plot, the relationship between *familismo* and psychological well-being was positive for both high and low acculturation groups, but the relationship (i.e., regression slope) was a bit stronger for low acculturated individuals. That is, *familismo* had a slightly stronger impact on psychological well-being for low acculturated participants.

Table 4

*Testing Acculturation as a Moderator of the Relationship between Familismo and Psychological Well-Being (N = 359)*

Predictor Variables
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Years the family lived in U.S.</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.11*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Years the family lived in U.S.</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familismo Composite Score</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.31***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.21**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Years the family lived in U.S.</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familismo Composite Score</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.32***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARSMA-II AOS</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.14*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.21**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Years the family lived in U.S.</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familismo Composite Score</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.28***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARSMA-II AOS</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.15*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation x Familismo Composite Score</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.11*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Step 1 \( \Delta R^2 = .02, \ p = .03 \); Step 2 \( \Delta R^2 = .12, \ p < .001 \); Step 3 \( \Delta R^2 = .13, \ p < .001 \); Step 4 \( \Delta R^2 = .14, \ p < .001 \). *p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001.

Figure 1. Interaction plot of acculturation as moderator variable.
Familismo as a Mediator of the Relationships of Enculturation and Acculturation with Psychological Well-being (Hypotheses 3 and 4)

To test Hypothesis 3 and 4, the *a priori* model presented in Figure 2 was evaluated using structural equation modeling (SEM) techniques with the AMOS 19.0 computer program (Byrne, 2001).

Figure 2. Mediation model showing that *familismo* did not mediate the relationship between enculturation and psychological well-being. The enculturation variable significantly predicted psychological well-being when *familismo* was excluded from the model ($\beta = .48, p < .01$). However, familismo did not significantly predict psychological well-being ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$. 

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Enculturation} & \rightarrow \text{Familismo} \\
\text{Familismo} & \rightarrow \text{Psychological Well-Being} \\
\end{align*}
\]
I first used confirmatory factor analysis to test the measurement models for all instruments used in the structural equations model. Table 5 presents fit indices for the relevant measurement models. The latent variable *familismo* was measured with three observed variables, comprised of the PHFS total score and two item parcels formed from AFS scale items. The standardized regression weights (factor loadings) of the three item parcels for the *familismo* construct were estimated as follows: PHFS ($\beta = .26$), AFSpar1 ($\beta = .88$), and AFSpar2 ($\beta = .76$).

The enculturation latent variable (also referred to as Latino Values in the factor analysis) was measured with three observed variables: MEIM-R, ARSMA-II MOS, and LVS scores, with the LVS variable measured by the items in the LVS-Cultural Pride, LVS-*Espirítas*, and LVS-*Simpatía* subscales. The standardized regression weights (factor loadings) of the three indicators of the enculturation construct were as follows: LVS ($\beta = .20$), MEIM-R ($\beta = .33$), and MOS ($\beta = .81$). The acculturation latent variable was measured by three item parcels, each comprised of items from the ARSMA-II AOS scale. The standardized regression weights (factor loadings) for the three item parcels were $\beta = .97$, $\beta = .86$, and $\beta = .84$. The measurement models for enculturation and acculturation are both saturated models and therefore fit the data perfectly.

Based on the overall $\chi^2$ test, the *familismo* model was rejected ($p < .01$). However, the fit indices revealed that the model fit the data very well. Given the acceptable fit of the measurement models, I proceeded to test the structural models.

Table 5

*Model Fit Indices for Measurement Models and Structural Models*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Overall $\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$P$</th>
<th>$\chi^2$/df</th>
<th>GFI</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measurement Models</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Familismo</em> (Model 1)</td>
<td>31.16</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enculturation (Model 2)</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARSMA-II AOS (Model 3)</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structural Models</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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In Hypothesis 3, I predicted that higher levels of enculturation would lead to higher values of *familismo* and, in turn, to better psychological well-being. Given the large sample size and the stringent nature of SEM the baseline structural model in which enculturation alone (Model 4 in Table 5) predicted psychological well-being was rejected by the overall $\chi^2$ test. However, the fit indices for the baseline models showed a good fit of the data. In the baseline model for enculturation (Model 4), enculturation moderately predicted psychological well-being ($\beta = .48$, $p < .01$). That is, individuals who reported stronger adherence to norms of their indigenous culture or ethnic group reported experiencing higher levels of psychological well-being. Thus, I could test whether *familismo* mediated the relationship between enculturation and psychological well-being (see Model 5 in Table 5). However, the estimated path coefficients for Model 5 indicated that there was no significant mediation by *familismo* of the relationship between enculturation and psychological well-being. Although enculturation significantly predicted familismo ($\beta = .68$, $p < .001$), *familismo* did not predict psychological well-being ($\beta = -.05$, $p = .77$).

For Hypothesis 4, I predicted that higher levels of acculturation will lead to weaker values of *familismo* and, in turn, weaker psychological well-being. Although the overall $\chi^2$ test rejected the model, the fit indices indicated that the model had good fit. The baseline structural model (Model 6) did not support a significant relationship ($\beta = -.01$ $p = .93$) between acculturation and psychological well-being. Therefore, I did not conduct a mediation analysis for *familismo* as a mediator variable.

**Group Comparisons**
In Hypothesis 5, I predicted that first-generation Latina/os, as compared to the 1.5 generation, second generation, and third or later generations, would average higher in enculturation, *familismo*, and psychological well-being, while controlling for levels of socioeconomic status, educational attainment, and age.

Participants belonging to the third and later generations were excluded due to their small numbers in my sample (N = 11). To test Hypothesis 5, I first conducted a Multivariate Analysis of Covariance (MANCOVA), with generation as the independent variable, the enculturation scores (MEIM-R, LVS, and ARSMA-MOS) as dependent variables, and age and number of years the family has lived in the U.S. as covariates. The MANCOVA revealed a significant multivariate main effect for generational level (Wilk’s $\lambda$ = .96, F (6,694) = 2.57, p < .05). Given the significance of the overall test, the univariate main effects were examined. A significant univariate main effect was obtained for MEIM-R scores, F (2, 348) = 4.23, p=.02. However, the effects of generation level on LVS scores, F (2, 348) = .32, p = .73, and MOS scores, F (2, 348) = 1.19, p = .31 were not statistically significant. As seen in Table 6, participants who were in the second generation group tended to report higher scores on the MEIM-R than participants who belonged in the first and 1.5 generation group. Hypothesis 5 was not supported.

To compare familismo scores of the generational groups, I conducted a similar MANCOVA with AFS and PHFS scores as the dependent variables. The MANCOVA revealed a nonsignificant main effect for *familismo* (e.g., AFS, and PHFS as dependent variables) between generational groups, Wilk’s $\lambda$ = .99, F (4,696) = .62 p = .71, after controlling for age and number of years the family has lived in the U.S. Given the nonsignificance of the overall test, the univariate main effects were not examined.
Finally, an overall ANCOVA revealed a nonsignificant main effect of generation level for the total psychological well-being (PWB) score, Wilk’s $\lambda = .96$, $F(12,688) = 1.12$, $p = .34$, after controlling for age and number of years the family has lived in the U.S. Therefore, no univariate follow up tests were conducted.

In Hypothesis 6, I predicted that first generation Latina/os, as compared to 1.5 generation, and second generation, would average lower on acculturation (i.e., ARSMA-II AOS scores). An Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) revealed that there was a significant difference between groups on acculturation, $F(2, 386) = 175.04$, $p < .001$. Tukey post hoc comparison tests indicated that participants in the first generation group averaged lower on acculturation compared to the participants in the 1.5 and second generation (see Table 6), which supports Hypothesis 6. In addition, the 1.5 generation group averaged lower than the second generation group.

Table 6

Means and Standard Deviations for the Dependent Variables by Generational Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>First Generation</th>
<th>1.5 Generation</th>
<th>Second Generation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOS Mean Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>74.71$^a$</td>
<td>71.02$^a$</td>
<td>69.22$^a$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>8.93</td>
<td>9.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEIM-R Total Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.75$^a$</td>
<td>3.78$^a$</td>
<td>3.93$^b$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>2.78$^a$</td>
<td>2.70$^a$</td>
<td>2.64$^a$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familismo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>.11$^a$</td>
<td>.14$^a$</td>
<td>.04$^a$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological well-being</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Total Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>124.12&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>122.54&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>123.52&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ARSMA-II AOS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32.98&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>10.14</td>
<td>46.87&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>50.29&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Means that share the same subscript were not significantly different in follow-up Tukey tests.
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Discussion

In Hypothesis 1, I predicted that the relationship between *familismo* and psychological well-being would be stronger for Latina/os with higher levels of enculturation. Hypothesis 1 was not supported as enculturation did not moderate the relationship between *familismo* and psychological well-being. However, the results of the present study found that both *familismo* and enculturation were positively related to psychological well-being. That is, participants who endorsed higher levels of *familismo* reported greater psychological well-being. Also, participants who identified with Mexican culture were likely to feel positive about their life in general. These findings are consistent with past research on *familismo* and psychological well-being, as studies have found a positive relationship between family support and psychological well-being or adjustment (Castillo et al., 2004; DeGarmo & Martinez, 2006; Rodriguez et al., 2007; Rodriguez & Koloski, 1998; Schneider & Ward, 2003; Solberg & Villareal, 1997; Vega et al. 1991). The present study’s findings were consistent with those of Hurtado, Rodriguez, Gurin, and Beals (1993), who found that class and cultural content such as familism were linked to ethnicity and political, family, and class expressions of identity. More specifically, the majority of both Mexicana/os and Chicana/os, especially the most affluent Chicana/os who think of themselves as Spanish-speaking family members, prefer to live near their relatives and desire their children to retain their Mexican culture. Class and cultural content were also linked to ethnicity for those who have strong ties to Mexico as Chicana/os’ ethnic identity socialization was associated with political, family, and class expressions of ethnicity. The present study’s results were consistent with those of Rodriguez et al. (2007), who found a positive relationship
between individuals who identified with Mexican heritage, family support, and psychological well-being. The results of this present study point to the need for theoretical frameworks and empirical research to utilize a bidimensional model instead of a unidimensional model of enculturation.

Yoon, Langrehr, and Ong’s (2011) review of the literature supported the need for current research to utilize bidimensional models of both enculturation and acculturation. These authors conducted a 22-year review of acculturation research in American Psychological Association and American Counseling Association journals and found that 44% of studies used unilinear measures of acculturation and enculturation versus 29% of studies used bilinear measures. Other outcome variables, such as racism, oppression, and discrimination should be included in future research to advance the field, and examine how these variables relate to enculturation and acculturation processes with Latinos of Mexican descent who reside in the U.S.

In Hypothesis 2, I predicted that the relationship between familismo and psychological well-being would be stronger for Latina/os with lower levels of acculturation. Hypothesis 2 was supported. Familismo and acculturation were positively related to psychological well-being, and acculturation did moderate the relationship between familismo and psychological well-being. Thus, the relationship between familismo and psychological well-being was positive for both high and low acculturation groups; however, the relationship was a bit stronger for low acculturated individuals. These results suggest that participants who endorsed an Anglo orientation reported having a positive sense of psychological well-being. Results were consistent with Ramirez et al. (2004) who found familismo across low, moderate, and high levels of acculturation, which were associated with psychological adjustment.
In general, these results were also consistent with those of Rodriguez et al. (2007) in that bicultural identity or Mexican and American cultural identification was associated with greater value being placed on the family. The participants in this study who identified with a stronger Mexican cultural identity also reported a more positive sense of well-being. These findings were also consistent with those of Villareal et al. (2005), who found that familism is a value possessed by Mexican Americans, Cuban Americans, Central Americans, Puerto Ricans, and South Americans. Similarly, Rodriguez et al.’s (2004) findings supported the present study’s findings; using the ARSMA, they found that Chicana/os with low, medium, and high levels of acculturation had higher levels of familism, respectfully.

Bettendorf and Fischer (2009) studied the relationship between familism, ethnic identity, enculturation and acculturation, and eating- and body-related concerns in 209 Mexican American female college students and professors. These authors found that stronger acculturation to mainstream U.S. society was linked to higher levels of eating- and body-related concerns among women with lower values of familism. Furthermore, these authors found strong moderator effect sizes, which indicated that the family plays a role in buffering the negative effects of living in a society that endorses the thin ideal, which may be a possible source of acculturative stress. Also, ethnic identity moderated the relationship between acculturation to mainstream U.S. society and restricted eating.

Rodriguez and Koloski (1998) also found that individuals who were more exposed to the U.S. culture reported greater family support utilizing a unidimensional model of acculturation and a sample which consisted of Puerto Rican Americans living in Ohio. The present study results differed from those of Grebler et al. (1970), who suggested that as Latina/os acculturate and adopt more of the dominant Euro-American culture, the importance of familism decreases.
Sabogal et al. (1987) supported Grebler et al.’s theory that familism values decrease in importance as acculturation and exposure to the U.S. culture increases. However, Sabogal et al. utilized a unidimensional model of acculturation with a Latina/o sample that consisted of Mexican Americans, Cuban Americans, Central Americans, Puerto Ricans, and South Americans. Also, the measures utilized to assess familism were derived from several familism scales that were combined and were not validated with these subgroups of the Latina/o population.

The present study utilized several measures that validate the use of these measures with individuals of Mexican heritage. Steidel and Contreras’ (2003) study utilized the ARSMA-II with individuals of Puerto Rican descent who resided in Ohio and found that high acculturation was associated with higher adherence of familism, which is consistent with the results of the present study. However Steidel and Contreras also found that lower acculturated individuals reported lower adherence to familism, which is inconsistent with the present study’s findings. Steidel and Contreras’s (2003) study is problematic in that the ARSMA-II was designed and validated with Mexican Americans in the United States, and not with Puerto Ricans or Puerto Rican Americans. Therefore, it is an inappropriate measure of acculturation in Puerto Ricans as it may overlook unique sociopolitical and historical circumstances and ethnic developmental processes (Baca Zinn, 2000; Falicov, 1998).

Arce’s (1978) multidimensional framework of familism continues to be the foundation of contemporary research. Future research is needed to develop more modern and updated frameworks of familism to keep abreast of the modern Latina/o family. There is a lack of consensus regarding a consistent operational definition of familism in the literature, making it difficult to synthesize the literature and develop more comprehensive frameworks. Future
research needs to utilize well-defined operational definitions and psychometric instruments to capture the multidimensional constructs of *familismo*, acculturation, enculturation, and psychological well-being.

In Hypothesis 3, I predicted that higher levels of enculturation would lead to higher values of *familismo* and, in turn, to better psychological well-being. Hypothesis 3 was not supported because there was no mediation effect. The present study’s findings indicated that enculturation moderately predicted psychological well-being. That is, individuals who reported stronger adherence to norms of their indigenous culture or ethnic group reported experiencing higher levels of psychological well-being. However, the results also found that there was no significant mediation by *familismo* of the relationship between enculturation and psychological well-being. In other words, although enculturation significantly predicted *familismo*, *familismo* did not predict psychological well-being. Thus, the findings suggested that it is important for low acculturated individuals to have some sense of *familismo* as it serves as a buffer or protective factor against distress and promotes better psychological well-being.

The results of the present study utilized a more sophisticated statistical analyses, that is, structural equation modeling to relate constructs such as *familismo*, enculturation, and acculturation, and how these relate to psychological well-being among Latina/os living in the U.S. Research utilizing more sophisticated and complex statistical analyses are necessary to provide a deeper understanding of constructs, as well as being able to identify culturally appropriate measures for a specific population, such as those of Mexican heritage. Researchers need to use instruments measuring familism in both a global sense, and in examining specific components. In addition, utilization of consistent instruments with strong psychometric properties is needed in order to establish validity and reliability in the study of *familismo*.
enculturation, and acculturation as researchers should focus on studying family strengths in the context of psychological well-being, and the role of culture in sustaining these strengths. For example, exploring a family’s level of hardiness, communication, unity, resilience, optimism, and spirituality may be strengths to examine further, as well as how these variables may relate to enculturation and acculturation, and their impact on a family member’s psychological well-being.

In Hypothesis 4, I predicted that higher levels of acculturation will lead to weaker values of *familismo* and, in turn, weaker psychological well-being. Hypothesis 4 was not supported. The results of the present study found that there was no significant relationship between acculturation and psychological well-being. Therefore, I did not conduct a mediation analysis for *familismo* as a mediator variable. Further research is needed to explore acculturation with other variables such as racism, discrimination, or spirituality and how these may impact an individual’s psychological well-being. For example, Moradi and Risco (2006) examined a model that tested direct, indirect, and mediated relations among perceived discrimination, psychological distress, self-esteem, psychological well-being (e.g., sense of control), and acculturation to Latina/o and U.S. cultures in a sample of 128 Latina/os, of which 39% were from Cuban descent, living in Florida. Moradi and Risco (2006) found that perceived discrimination was related to greater psychological distress, with personal control partially mediating this relationship. These authors found that perceived discrimination was also related indirectly through personal control to lower self-esteem. Self-esteem partially mediated the relationship between personal control and distress. These authors’ noteworthy findings were that Latina/o and U.S. acculturation when examined together were related indirectly through personal
control, to greater self-esteem, and lower distress. Also, these authors found that U.S.
acculturation was related directly to greater distress.

In Hypothesis 5, I predicted that first-generation Latina/os, as compared to the 1.5
generation, second generation, and third or later generations, would average higher in
culturation, familismo, and psychological well-being, while controlling for levels of
socioeconomic status, educational attainment, and age. Hypothesis 5 was not supported.
Latina/os who were second generation tended to report higher scores on enculturation than those
belonging in the first and 1.5 generation. First-generation Latina/os are predominantly born in
Mexico and immigrated to the U.S. after the age of 15 years of age. Therefore, Latina/os in this
generational group have been socialized and immersed in the Mexican culture. However, 1.5
generation Latina/os have immigrated to the U.S. prior to the age of 15 years, and depending on
their experience may have been socialized and immersed in the Mexican culture to a slightly
lesser extent than first-generation Latina/os. In the present study, second generation Latina/os
averaged higher in enculturation than prior generations. This suggests the possibility that being
U.S. born from Mexican parents, or having Mexican heritage, impacted their experience
differently in terms of the process of socialization and ethnic identification with their Mexican
culture. Results revealed that there were no differences in familismo and psychological well-
being across all generations, and these results were unexpected. The present study’s findings that
psychological well-being was present across generations suggests that more research is needed to
further evaluate the construct of psychological well-being with the Latino population of Mexican
heritage as there are a lack of studies in this area. The present study’s findings suggest that
familismo is a value that is present across generations. These findings were consistent with
Rodriguez et al.’s (2007) findings that *familismo* was present across U.S. born and Mexican born Latina/os of Mexican heritage, specifically on perceived family support and family conflict.

In Hypothesis 6, I predicted that first generation Latina/os, as compared to 1.5 generation, and second generation, would average lower on acculturation (i.e., ARSMA-II AOS scores). Hypothesis 6 was supported. Latina/os who were first generation averaged lower on acculturation compared to Latina/os who were 1.5 and second generation. Again, it may be that the process of acculturation to the dominant culture may vary by place of birth. Latina/os who average lower on acculturation may be able to navigate in the dominant culture. However, their experience may be very different than those in the 1.5 and second generations. For the second generation group, results suggest that they may be bicultural and have the ability to navigate between, Mexican and mainstream American cultures without having to lose or choose one culture over the other. These results support LaFromboise, Coleman, and Gerton’s (1993) review of the alternation model of second-culture acquisition, which assumes that it is possible to know and understand two different cultures. LaFromboise and Rowe (1983) defined the type of biculturalism for American Indians as involving dual modes of social behavior that are used appropriately in different situations. The present study’s results suggest that the second generation group is able to know and understand two different cultures and simultaneously be able to maintain their cultural roots in a healthy way.

Romero, Carvajal, Valle, and Orduña (2007) studied bicultural stress due to discrimination/prejudice, immigration, and acculturation in relation to mental well-being in a sample of 304 urban Latino (78% of Latino subgroup was Mexican American), 215 European American, and 131 Asian American 8th grade students. These authors found that bicultural stress was reported by all ethnic groups and was significantly associated with more depressive
symptoms and less optimism. Lower socioeconomic status, male gender, and not English speaking were associated with more stress. These findings suggest that bicultural efficacy—defined by LaFambroise, Coleman, and Gerton (1993) as the belief or confidence that one can live effectively and in a satisfying manner within two groups without compromising one’s sense of cultural identity to develop or maintain competence is key in impacting psychological well-being in a positive way. The present study’s findings suggest that the second generation group may have higher bicultural efficacy and thus reported more positive psychological well-being. These findings are important as they point to research that considers not only bicultural competence (e.g., shifts in cognitive and perceptual processes, acquisition of a new language; LaFambroise, Coleman, and Gerton, 1993) but also bicultural efficacy in developing a positive psychological well-being.

Clinical Implications

The results of the present study document the important role of family and ethnic identity for all generations of Latina/os, including those individuals who have low levels of acculturation to the dominant culture. In addition, the present study documented the need for low acculturated individuals to possess the Latina/o core cultural value of familismo as it may serve as a buffer or protective factor against distress and protects individuals from negatively impacting their psychological well-being. The results provide information for counselors regarding a client’s worldview in that familismo, enculturation or ethnic pride and belonging to one’s ethnic group is very important as it impacts Latina/os’ psychological functioning.

These results also support the theory that culturally sensitive interventions are essential in clinical work and intervention with Latinos. For example, Constantino, Malgady, and Primavera (2009) investigated the construct of cultural congruence, which is associated with cultural
competence in the delivery of mental health services to ethnic minority clients. Cultural congruence was defined as the distance between the cultural competence characteristics of the health care organization and the older Latino clients’ perception of these characteristics meeting clients’ cultural needs. These authors found that cultural congruence had a stronger effect on reduction of symptoms of depression (e.g., physical and social functioning) at 3- and 6-month follow-up for older Latino adults.

Cardemil, Kim, Pinedo, and Miller (2005) also developed a culturally appropriate depression prevention program with low-income Latina mothers. Cardemil et al. discussed the recruitment and retention of Latina mothers in the Family Coping Skills Program and found that those Latina mothers who reported mild to moderate levels of depression at baseline reported significant improvement of their symptoms postintervention. These findings support the design and implementation of effective culturally sensitive research and prevention programs.

Additionally, Kopelowicz, Zarate, Smith, Mintz, and Liberman (2003) implemented a culturally sensitive skills training program to teach Latinos with schizophrenia and their families to manage their symptoms at a community mental health center. Results indicated that a culturally relevant skills training program had a direct effect on skill acquisition and generalization of skills. In addition, utilization of symptom management skills led to decreased rates of rehospitalization. The importance of incorporating cultural values, such as familismo is key in the implementation of such intervention programs. Doing so will increase skill acquisition and maintenance of skills by including family members/caregivers. More research and programs are needed to incorporate important cultural values in the work with Latinos to effectively impact their psychological well-being, and thus impact their overall quality of life.
**Strengths of the Present Study.** The present study is an attempt to begin refining the complexities of a multidimensional framework, and the conceptualization of such constructs as *familismo*, enculturation, and acculturation. The present study also validated measures of *familismo* with a cross-section of a Latina/o subgroup of Mexican heritage, as only a handful of studies have validated measures with this subgroup. In addition, this study included members of the community from diverse backgrounds including a variety of ages, gender, generations, socioeconomic status, level of education, and levels of ethnic identity. This study documented the processes of enculturation for adult Latina/os of Mexican heritage. In particular, the present study included community members as well as college students, therefore opening up the range in terms of age, SES, and background. Also, individuals of Mexican heritage, both born in Mexico as well as in the U.S., were included.

The present findings provided evidence for linguistic equivalence of measures in Spanish and English as I attempted to utilize reliable “emic” or culture-specific instruments and captured a glimpse into the unique experiences of Latina/os living in the U.S. The present study documented the validity and reliability of these instruments with Latina/os of Mexican heritage who were living in the U.S. as multidimensional models of acculturation and enculturation were utilized. In contrast, previous studies have utilized unidimensional models or proxy variables. This study also utilized multiple measures of *familismo*, whereas most studies have utilized proxy variables or measures that have not been validated with individuals of Mexican heritage. In addition, the present study was one of the few studies that documented positive aspects of psychological functioning and was guided by a strength-based approach.

**Limitations of the Present Study.** Although the present study sampled a cross-section of Latina/os of Mexican heritage, the results are not generalizable to other subgroups (e.g., Cuban,
Puerto Rican, Central American) of the Latino population. The sample was primarily recruited in Southern and Northern California, as well as various parts of Washington State and they are not representative of Latina/os living in other geographical areas of the United States.

Conclusions

The present study has important implications for theory, research, and clinical work in the field of psychology as well as sociology, history, human development, and family systems as the results indicated that *familismo*, Mexican cultural identity and lower acculturated individuals seem to play an important role in the psychological well-being of Latina/os of Mexican heritage. Again, the results suggested that *familismo* and enculturation are separate constructs of Latina/o cultural values and that each differentially predicted psychological well-being. In addition, acculturation positively impacted the relationship between *familismo* and psychological well-being as *familismo* had a slightly stronger impact on psychological well-being for low acculturated individuals. *Familismo* was also found to be high regardless of place of birth, length of residence in the U.S., or socioeconomic status. Consequently, future research needs to consider utilizing clear and well-defined conceptualizations and psychometric instruments that capture the multidimensional constructs. In addition, more sophisticated statistical frameworks should be utilized in studying such constructs as *familismo*, enculturation, acculturation, and psychological well-being. Finally, this study documented the importance of examining the modern 20th century Latina/o family of Mexican heritage, as Latina/os are growing in number in the U.S.
APPENDIX A

Instruments in Spanish
Cuestionario Demográfico

1. Edad: ___________

2. Género: □ Mujer □ Hombre

3. Por favor indique cuál de las siguientes opciones describe mejor la forma en que se identifica étnicamente: ___________
   (1) Mexicana/o
   (2) Mexicoamericano/a
   (3) Chicana/o
   (4) Mestiza/o
   (5) Hispana/o
   (6) Latina/o, por favor indique si usted es de descendencia mexicana □ Sí □ No □ Otro (rellene): ___________
   (7) Centroamericana/o
   (8) Sudamericana/o, incluyendo Brazilena/o entre otros
   (9) Cubana/o
   (10) Boricua/Puertorriqueña
   (11) Dominicana/o
   (12) Etnia mixta; Los padres son de dos grupos étnicos diferentes
   (13) Otros (rellenar): ____________________________________________

4. Por favor, indique el lugar de nacimiento para:
   a) Usted: □ México □ Estados Unidos □ Otro: ____________________________
   b) Madre: □ México □ Estados Unidos □ Otro: ____________________________
   c) Padre: □ México □ Estados Unidos □ Otro: ____________________________
   d) Abuela materna: □ México □ Estados Unidos □ Otro: __________________
   e) Abuelo materno: □ México □ Estados Unidos □ Otro: __________________
   f) Abuela paterna: □ México □ Estados Unidos □ Otro: __________________
   g) Abuelo paterno: □ México □ Estados Unidos □ Otro: __________________

5. Si sus dos abuelos nacieron en EE.UU., ¿es su familia de descendencia mexicana? □ Sí □ No
   a) En caso afirmativo, ¿cuántas generaciones atrás sitúa su origen mexicano?: ____________________________

6. Si no nació en los EE.UU., ¿a qué edad fue la primera vez que usted emigró a los EE.UU.? : __________
   a) Por favor, indique el motivo (s) por que emigro por primera vez a los EE.UU. : ______________________

7. Años que usted lleva viviendo en los EE.UU.: __________
8. Años que su familia lleva viviendo en los EE.UU.: __________
10. Idioma nativo de su madre es: □ Inglés □ Español □ Otro: _______________________
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11. Idioma nativo de su padre es: □ Inglés □ Español □ Otro: _________________________

12. Ciudad y estado donde usted vive actualmente:

13. ¿Está usted empleado?: □ Sí □ No En caso afirmativo, su ocupación es: _______________________

14. ¿Cuántas personas en total viven en la casa de su familia? (excluyéndose a sí mismo):

15. ¿Vive en casa de su familia?: □ Sí □ No

16. Si usted es estudiante, indique la escuela a la que asiste:
   a) Número total de personas que viven en el hogar y asisten a la escuela (incluyéndose a sí mismo): ___

17. Por favor, indique su ingreso anual actualmente (en dolares):
   (1) Menos de $20,999
   (2) $21,000-$30,999
   (3) $31,000-$49,999
   (4) $50,000-$74,999
   (5) $75,000-$99,999
   (6) $100,000-$149,999
   (7) Más de $150,000

18. Por favor, indique el ingreso familiar anual de su hogar actualmente (en dolares):
   (1) Less than $20,999
   (2) $21,000-$30,999
   (3) $31,000-$49,999
   (4) $50,000-$74,999
   (5) $75,000-$99,999
   (6) $100,000-$149,999
   (7) Greater than $150,000

19. Por favor, indique cuál es su estado civil actualmente:
   (1) Casada/o
   (2) Divorciada/o
   (3) Viviendo juntos/Viviendo con una pareja
   (4) Solter/o/a
   (5) Viuda/o

20. Por favor, indique el último grado que usted completó en la escuela y en qué país:
   □ 1-6 (Educación Primaria), País: □ México □ EE.UU. □ Ambos (EE.UU./México) □ Otro: __________
   □ 7-8 (Secundaria), País: □ México □ EE.UU. □ Ambos (EE.UU./México) □ Otro: __________
   □ 9-12 (Preparatoria), País: □ México □ EE.UU. □ Ambos (EE.UU./México) □ Otro: __________
   □ 1-2 años de Universidad, País: □ México □ EE.UU. □ Ambos (EE.UU./México) □ Otro: __________
   □ 2-5 years de Universidad, País: □ México □ EE.UU. □ Ambos (EE.UU./México) □ Otro: __________
   □ Post-grado (Maestría o Doctorado), País: □ México □ EE.UU. □ Ambos (EE.UU./México) □ Otro: _______
21. Por favor, indique el último grado que completó su madre en la escuela y en qué país:
   □ 1-6 (Educación Primaria), País: □ México □ EE.UU. □ Ambos (EE.UU./México) □ Otro: ______
   □ 7-8 (Secundaria), País: □ México □ EE.UU. □ Ambos (EE.UU./México) □ Otro: ______
   □ 9-12 (Preparatoria), País: □ México □ EE.UU. □ Ambos (EE.UU./México) □ Otro: ______
   □ 1-2 años de Universidad, País: □ México □ EE.UU. □ Ambos (EE.UU./México) □ Otro: ______
   □ 2-5 años de Universidad, País: □ México □ EE.UU. □ Ambos (EE.UU./México) □ Otro: ______
   □ Post-grado (Maestria o Doctorado), País: □ México □ EE.UU. □ Ambos (EE.UU./México) □ Otro: ______

22. Por favor, indique el último grado que completó su padre en la escuela y en qué país:
   □ 1-6 (Educación Primaria), País: □ México □ EE.UU. □ Ambos (EE.UU./México) □ Otro: ______
   □ 7-8 (Secundaria), País: □ México □ EE.UU. □ Ambos (EE.UU./México) □ Otro: ______
   □ 9-12 (Preparatoria), País: □ México □ EE.UU. □ Ambos (EE.UU./México) □ Otro: ______
   □ 1-2 años de Universidad, País: □ México □ EE.UU. □ Ambos (EE.UU./México) □ Otro: ______
   □ 2-5 años de Universidad, País: □ México □ EE.UU. □ Ambos (EE.UU./México) □ Otro: ______
   □ Post-grado (Maestria o Doctorado), País: □ México □ EE.UU. □ Ambos (EE.UU./México) □ Otro: ______
Attitudinal Familism Scale (AFS)- Spanish version

Por favor circule la respuesta que mejor describa su opinión personal acerca de cada punto. Por favor responda lo más honestamente posible. Usted puede utilizar cualquiera de los puntos del 1 al 10.

1. Los hijos siempre deben ayudar a sus padres con el sostén de sus hermanos menores, por ejemplo, ayudar con las tareas escolares, ayudar a cuidarlos, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>completamente en desacuerdo</td>
<td>en desacuerdo</td>
<td>más bien en desacuerdo</td>
<td>más bien de acuerdo</td>
<td>de acuerdo</td>
<td>completamente de acuerdo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. La familia debe controlar el comportamiento de los miembros de la familia menores de 18 años.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>completamente en desacuerdo</td>
<td>en desacuerdo</td>
<td>más bien en desacuerdo</td>
<td>más bien de acuerdo</td>
<td>de acuerdo</td>
<td>completamente de acuerdo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Una persona debe apreciar el tiempo que pasa con sus familiares.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>completamente en desacuerdo</td>
<td>en desacuerdo</td>
<td>más bien en desacuerdo</td>
<td>más bien de acuerdo</td>
<td>de acuerdo</td>
<td>completamente de acuerdo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Una persona debe vivir cerca de donde sus padres vivan y debe pasar tiempo con ellos regularmente.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>completamente en desacuerdo</td>
<td>en desacuerdo</td>
<td>más bien en desacuerdo</td>
<td>más bien de acuerdo</td>
<td>de acuerdo</td>
<td>completamente de acuerdo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. En caso de necesidad una persona siempre debe apoyar a otros miembros de su familia, (por ejemplo, tíos, tíos y familiares políticos) aunque sea un gran sacrificio.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>completamente en desacuerdo</td>
<td>en desacuerdo</td>
<td>más bien en desacuerdo</td>
<td>más bien de acuerdo</td>
<td>de acuerdo</td>
<td>completamente de acuerdo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Una persona debe contar con su familia en casos de necesidad.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>completamente en desacuerdo</td>
<td>en desacuerdo</td>
<td>más bien en desacuerdo</td>
<td>más bien de acuerdo</td>
<td>de acuerdo</td>
<td>completamente de acuerdo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Una persona debe sentirse avergonzada si deshonra a su familia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>completamente en desacuerdo</td>
<td>en desacuerdo</td>
<td>más bien en desacuerdo</td>
<td>más bien de acuerdo</td>
<td>de acuerdo</td>
<td>completamente de acuerdo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Los hijos deben ayudar en las labores de la casa sin esperar pago.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>completamente en desacuerdo</td>
<td>en desacuerdo</td>
<td>más bien en desacuerdo</td>
<td>más bien de acuerdo</td>
<td>de acuerdo</td>
<td>completamente de acuerdo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Los padres y los abuelos deben ser tratados con gran respeto a pesar de sus diferencias de opiniones.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>completamente en desacuerdo</td>
<td>en desacuerdo</td>
<td>más bien en desacuerdo</td>
<td>más bien de acuerdo</td>
<td>de acuerdo</td>
<td>completamente de acuerdo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Una persona debe hacer actividades frecuentemente con su familia, por ejemplo comer, jugar y salir juntos.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>completamente en desacuerdo</td>
<td>en desacuerdo</td>
<td>más bien en desacuerdo</td>
<td>más bien de acuerdo</td>
<td>de acuerdo</td>
<td>completamente de acuerdo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Los padres de edad avanzada deben vivir con sus parientes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>completamente en desacuerdo</td>
<td>en desacuerdo</td>
<td>más bien en desacuerdo</td>
<td>más bien de acuerdo</td>
<td>de acuerdo</td>
<td>completamente de acuerdo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Una persona siempre debe defender el honor de la familia sin importar el costo.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>completamente en desacuerdo</td>
<td>en desacuerdo</td>
<td>más bien en desacuerdo</td>
<td>más bien de acuerdo</td>
<td>de acuerdo</td>
<td>completamente de acuerdo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Los hijos menores de 18 años deben dar gran parte de sus ingresos económicos a sus padres.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>completamente en desacuerdo</td>
<td>en desacuerdo</td>
<td>más bien en desacuerdo</td>
<td>más bien de acuerdo</td>
<td>de acuerdo</td>
<td>completamente de acuerdo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. Los hijos deben vivir con sus padres hasta que se casen.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>completamente en desacuerdo</td>
<td>en desacuerdo</td>
<td>más bien en desacuerdo</td>
<td>más bien de acuerdo</td>
<td>de acuerdo</td>
<td>completamente de acuerdo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Los hijos deben obedecer a sus padres aún cuando piensen que sus padres están equivocados.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>completamente en desacuerdo</td>
<td>en desacuerdo</td>
<td>más bien en desacuerdo</td>
<td>más bien de acuerdo</td>
<td>de acuerdo</td>
<td>completamente de acuerdo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Una persona deben ayudar a sus padres de edad avanzada cuando están en necesidad, por ejemplo, ayudarlos economicamente o compartir una casa.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>completamente en desacuerdo</td>
<td>en desacuerdo</td>
<td>más bien en desacuerdo</td>
<td>más bien de acuerdo</td>
<td>de acuerdo</td>
<td>completamente de acuerdo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. Una persona debe ser buena por consideración a su familia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>completamente en desacuerdo</td>
<td>en desacuerdo</td>
<td>más bien en desacuerdo</td>
<td>más bien de acuerdo</td>
<td>de acuerdo</td>
<td>completamente de acuerdo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. Una persona debe respetar a sus hermanos mayores sin importar las diferencias de opiniones.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>completamente en desacuerdo</td>
<td>en desacuerdo</td>
<td>más bien en desacuerdo</td>
<td>más bien de acuerdo</td>
<td>de acuerdo</td>
<td>completamente de acuerdo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INSTRUCCIONES: Use la escala siguiente para indicar en qué medida está de acuerdo con el valor expresado en cada declaración.

1 = totalmente en desacuerdo 2 = en desacuerdo 3 = de acuerdo 4 = totalmente de acuerdo

____ 1. Uno no está obligado a seguir sus costumbres culturales.
____ 2. Uno no tiene por qué ser leal a su origen cultural.
____ 3. El lazo con su grupo cultural debe ser muy fuerte.
____ 4. Hay que preservar su patrimonio cultural.
____ 5. Uno nunca debe perder la lengua de origen.
____ 6. Uno debe trabajar para preservar la lengua propia de su grupo étnico.
____ 7. Un hombre debe mantener a su familia económicamente.
____ 8. Uno debe poder de cuestionar a sus mayores.
____ 9. Uno nunca debería avergonzarse a la familia.
____10. Uno no tiene que practicar sus celebraciones culturales.
____11. La fuerza de un hombre proviene de ser un buen padre y esposo.
____12. Uno no necesita ser emocionalmente cariñoso/a con personas conocidas.
____13. La mujer debe sacrificar todo por su familia.
____14. El éxito se debe atribuir a la propia familia.
____15. Una madre debe mantener la familia unida.
____16. Uno no tiene que presentarse simpático ante los demás en todo momento.
____17. Una mujer se considera la columna vertebral de la familia.
____18. La familia es la fuente principal de la propia identidad.
____19. No hay que ofender a otros.
____20. Uno no tiene por qué ser siempre cordial con los demás.
____21. Hay que acudir a la gente mayor para pedir consejos.
____22. Uno no necesita tener fe en las premoniciones.
____23. Hay que mantener un sentido de interdependencia con su propio grupo.
____24. Uno no necesita confiar en un ser superior.
____25. Uno no tiene necesidad de mantener sus tradiciones culturales.
____26. Uno no tiene necesidad de apoyar siempre su propio grupo.
____27. Hay que ayudar a su propio grupo para alcanzar sus objetivos.
____28. No siempre se necesita evitar conflictos con los demás.
____29. Una mujer debe ser una fuente de fortaleza para su familia.
____30. Uno debe ser respetuoso con las personas que tienen un status superior.
____31. Uno nunca debe ofender a la gente mayor.
____32. Una mujer no tiene por qué soportar con éxito toda adversidad.
____33. Una mujer debe ser líder espiritual en la familia.
____34. Uno no tiene necesidad de preservar las costumbres de su origen cultural.
____35. Hay que estar orgullosos de su grupo cultural.
Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure-Revised (MEIM-R)- Spanish version

En este país, la gente viene de muchas culturas y países diferentes, y hay muchas palabras distintas para describir los diferentes lazos culturales o grupos étnicos a los que la gente pertenece. Algunos ejemplos de grupos étnicos son Latina/o, Hispano, Mexicana/o, Mexicoamericana/o, y Boricua, entre otros. Estas preguntas son acerca de su origen étnico o su grupo étnico y cómo se siente o reacciona ante ellos.

Por favor rellene: En términos de grupo étnico, me considero ____________________________

Use los números abajo para indicar a qué nivel usted está de acuerdo o desacuerdo con cada afirmación.

(5) Totalmente de acuerdo (4) De acuerdo (3) Neutral (2) En desacuerdo (1) Totalmente en desacuerdo

1- He pasado tiempo tratando de averiguar más acerca de mi grupo étnico, como su historia, tradiciones, y costumbres. ____________________________

2- Tengo un fuerte sentido de pertenencia a mi propio grupo étnico. ____________________________

3- Entiendo bastante bien lo que mi pertenencia a grupos étnicos significa para mí. ____________________________

4- Muchas veces he hecho cosas que me ayudarán a entender mejor mi origen étnico. ____________________________

5- Muchas veces he hablado con otras personas para aprender más acerca de mi grupo étnico. ____________________________

6- Siento un fuerte apego hacia mi propio grupo étnico. ____________________________

7- Mi grupo étnico es
   (1) Negro o afroamericano
   (2) Asiático o asiático-americano, entre ellos chino, japonés, u otros
   (3) Asiático de las Islas del Pacífico
   (4) Blanco, caucásico, anglo o americano europeo (no hispano)
   (5) Indio americano/ Nativóamericano, indique afiliación de tribu (registrada o no) ____________________________
   (6) Chicana/o
   (7) Hispana/o
   (8) Latina/o
   (9) Mexicana/o
   (10) Mexicoamericana/o
   (11) Mestiza/o
   (12) Centroamericana/o
   (13) Sudamericana/o, incluye brasileño entre otros
   (14) Cubana/o
   (15) Boricua/ Puertorriqueño
   (16) Dominicana/o
   (17) Étnica mixta; Los padres son de dos grupos étnicos diferentes
   (18) Otro grupo (reliene): ____________________________

Para las preguntas 8 a 13, por favor utilice los números mencionados arriba:

8- El origen étnico de mi padre es: ____________________________

9- El origen étnico de mi madre es: ____________________________

10- El origen étnico de mi abuela materna es: ____________________________

11- El origen étnico de mi abuelo paterno es: ____________________________

12- El origen étnico de mi abuela paterna es: ____________________________

13- El origen étnico de mi abuelo paterno es: ____________________________
Pan-Hispanic Familism Scale (PHFS)- Spanish Version

Marque con un círculo el número entre 1 y 5 a la respuesta que mejor indique qué tan de acuerdo o en desacuerdo está usted con cada declaración.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mi familia siempre está ahí cuando los necesito.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estoy orgulloso de mi familia.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valoro el tiempo que pasó con mi familia.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sé que mi familia tiene en mente los mejores intereses para mí.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los miembros de mi familia y yo compartimos valores y creencias similares.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Psychological Well-Being Short Scale (PWBSS)- Spanish Version**

Por favor marque el número entre 1 y 6 a la respuesta que mejor indique qué tan de acuerdo o en desacuerdo está usted con cada declaración.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>muy en desacuerdo</td>
<td>moderadamente en desacuerdo</td>
<td>un poco en desacuerdo</td>
<td>un poco de acuerdo</td>
<td>moderadamente de acuerdo</td>
<td>muy de acuerdo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Cuando repaso la historia de mi vida estoy contento con cómo han resultado las cosas.
2. A menudo me siento solo porque tengo pocos amigos íntimos con quienes compartir mis preocupaciones.
3. No tengo miedo de expresar mis opiniones, incluso cuando son opuestas a las opiniones de la mayoría de la gente.
4. Me preocupa cómo otra gente evalúa las elecciones que he hecho en mi vida.
5. Me resulta difícil dirigir mi vida hacia un camino que me satisfaga.
6. Disfruto haciendo planes para el futuro y trabajar para hacerlos realidad.
7. En general, me siento seguro y positivo contigo mismo.
8. No tengo muchas personas que quieran escucharme cuando necesito hablar.
9. Tiendo a preocuparme sobre lo que otra gente piensa de mí.
10. He sido capaz de construir un hogar y un modo de vida a mi gusto.
11. Soy una persona activa al realizar los proyectos que propuse para mí mismo.
12. Siento que mis amistades me aportan muchas cosas.
13. Tiendo a estar influenciado por la gente con fuertes convicciones.
14. En general, siento que soy responsable de la situación en la que vivo.
15. Me siento bien cuando pienso en lo que he hecho en el pasado y lo que espero hacer en el futuro.
16. Mis objetivos en la vida han sido más una fuente de satisfacción que de frustración para mí.
17. Me gusta la mayor parte de los aspectos de mi personalidad.
18. Tengo confianza en mis opiniones incluso si son contrarias al consenso general.
19. Las demandas de la vida diaria a menudo me deprimen.
20. Tengo clara la dirección y el objetivo de mi vida.
21. En general, con el tiempo siento que sigo aprendiendo más sobre mí mismo.
22. No he experimentado muchas relaciones cercanas y de confianza.
23. Es difícil para mí expresar mis propias opiniones en asuntos polémicos.
24. En su mayor parte, me siento orgulloso de quién soy y la vida que llevo.
25. Sé que puedo confiar en mis amigos, y ellos saben que pueden confiar en mí.
26. Cuando pienso en ello, realmente con los años no he mejorado mucho como persona.
27. Tengo la sensación de que con el tiempo me he desarrollado mucho como persona.
28. Para mí, la vida ha sido un proceso continuo de estudio, cambio y crecimiento.
29. Si me sintiera infeliz con mi situación de vida daría los pasos más eficaces para cambiarla.
Acculturation Rating Scale for Mexican Americans-II (ARSMA-II)

1. I speak Spanish
2. I speak English
3. I enjoy speaking Spanish
4. I associate with Anglos
5. I associate with Mexicans and/or Mexican Americans
6. I enjoy listening to Spanish language music
7. I enjoy listening to English language music
8. I enjoy Spanish language TV
9. I enjoy English language TV
10. I enjoy English language movies
11. I enjoy Spanish language movies
12. I enjoy reading (e.g., books in Spanish)
13. I enjoy reading (e.g., books in English)
14. I write (e.g., letters in Spanish)
15. I write (e.g., letters in English)

109
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Not at all</th>
<th>2 Very little or not very often</th>
<th>3 Moderately</th>
<th>4 Much or very often</th>
<th>5 Extremely often or almost always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. My thinking is done in the English language</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. My thinking is done in the Spanish language</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. My contact with Mexico has been</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. My contact with the U.S. has been</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. My father identifies or identified as 'Mexicano'</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. My mother identifies or identified as 'Mexicana'</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. My friends, while growing up, were of Mexican origin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. My friends, while growing up, were of Anglo origin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. My family cooks Mexican foods</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. My friends now are of Anglo origin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. My friends now are of Mexican origin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I like to identify myself as an Anglo American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. I like to identify myself as a Mexican American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I like to identify myself as a Mexican</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. I like to identify myself as an American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Estadounidenses de origen Mexicano*
Instruments in English
Demographic Questionnaire

1. Age: ____________

2. Gender: □ Female □ Male

3. Please choose one of the following that best describes how you identify ethnically (write in): ____________
   (1) Mexican/Mexicano
   (2) Mexican American
   (3) Chicano/a
   (4) Mestizo
   (5) Hispanic
   (6) Latina/o, please indicate if you are of Mexican descent □ Yes □ No □ Other (write in): ____________
   (7) Central American
   (8) South American, including Brazilian and others
   (9) Cuban
   (10) Boricua/Puerto Rican
   (11) Dominican
   (12) Mixed; Parents are from two different ethnic groups
   (13) Other (write in): ____________

4. Please indicate place of birth for:
   a) Self: □ Mexico □ United States of America □ Other (write in): ____________
   b) Mother: □ Mexico □ United States of America □ Other: ____________
   c) Father: □ Mexico □ United States of America □ Other: ____________
   d) Maternal Grandmother: □ Mexico □ United States of America □ Other: ____________
   e) Maternal Grandfather: □ Mexico □ United States of America □ Other: ____________
   f) Paternal Grandmother: □ Mexico □ United States of America □ Other: ____________
   g) Paternal Grandfather: □ Mexico □ United States of America □ Other: ____________

5. If both of your grandparents were U.S. born, is your family of Mexican Heritage □ Yes □ No
   a) If Yes, how many generations back is your Mexican origin (write in): ____________
   b) If not born in the U.S., what was your age when you first immigrated to the U.S.: ____________
   a) Please indicate the reason(s) for first immigrating to the U.S.: ____________

6. Your total number of years living in the U.S.: ____________

7. Family's total number of years living in the U.S.: ____________

8. Your native language is: □ English □ Spanish □ Other (write in): ____________

9. Mother's native language is: □ English □ Spanish □ Other (write in): ____________

10. Father's native language is: □ English □ Spanish □ Other (write in): ____________

11. City/Town and State you are currently residing in: ____________

12. Are you employed: □ Yes □ No If Yes, your occupation is: ____________

13. Total number of people living in your family's home (excluding yourself): ____________

14. Do you live in your family's home: □ Yes □ No

15. If you are a student, indicate the school you are attending
   a) Total number of people living in household at school (including yourself): ____________

16. Please indicate which one of the following is your current annual income: ____________
   (1) Less than $20,999
   (2) $21,000-$30,999
   (3) $31,000-$49,999
   (4) $50,000-$74,999
   (5) $75,000-$99,999
   (6) $100,000-$149,999
   (7) Greater than $150,000
Demographic Questionnaire

17. Please indicate which of the following is your family's current annual household income: __________
   (1) Less than $20,999
   (2) $21,000-$30,999
   (3) $31,000-$49,999
   (4) $50,000-$74,999
   (5) $75,000-$99,999
   (6) $100,000-$149,999
   (7) Greater than $150,000

18. Please indicate which of the following is your current Marital Status: __________
   (1) Married
   (2) Divorced
   (3) Cohabiting/Living with a partner
   (4) Single
   (5) Widowed

19. Please indicate last grade you completed at school and how much of this education was completed in what country:
   □ Elementary-6 (Primary School), Country: □ Mexico □ U.S. □ Both(U.S/Mexico) □ Other: __________
   □ 7-8 (Secondary School), Country: □ Mexico □ U.S. □ Both(U.S/Mexico) □ Other: __________
   □ 9-12 (Preparatory School), Country: □ Mexico □ U.S. □ Both(U.S/Mexico) □ Other: __________
   □ 1-2 years of college, Country: □ Mexico □ U.S. □ Both(U.S/Mexico) □ Other: __________
   □ 2-5 years of college, Country: □ Mexico □ U.S. □ Both(U.S/Mexico) □ Other: __________
   □ Graduate School (Master's or Doctorate), Country: □ Mexico □ U.S. □ Both(U.S/Mexico) □ Other: __________

20. Please indicate last grade your mother completed at school and how much of this education was completed in what country:
   □ Elementary-6 (Primary School), Country: □ Mexico □ U.S. □ Both(U.S/Mexico) □ Other: __________
   □ 7-8 (Secondary School), Country: □ Mexico □ U.S. □ Both(U.S/Mexico) □ Other: __________
   □ 9-12 (Preparatory School), Country: □ Mexico □ U.S. □ Both(U.S/Mexico) □ Other: __________
   □ 1-2 years of college, Country: □ Mexico □ U.S. □ Both(U.S/Mexico) □ Other: __________
   □ 2-5 years of college, Country: □ Mexico □ U.S. □ Both(U.S/Mexico) □ Other: __________
   □ Graduate School (Master's or Doctorate), Country: □ Mexico □ U.S. □ Both(U.S/Mexico) □ Other: __________

21. Please indicate last grade your father completed at school and how much of this education was completed in what country:
   □ Elementary-6 (Primary School), Country: □ Mexico □ U.S. □ Both(U.S/Mexico) □ Other: __________
   □ 7-8 (Secondary School), Country: □ Mexico □ U.S. □ Both(U.S/Mexico) □ Other: __________
   □ 9-12 (Preparatory School), Country: □ Mexico □ U.S. □ Both(U.S/Mexico) □ Other: __________
   □ 1-2 years of college, Country: □ Mexico □ U.S. □ Both(U.S/Mexico) □ Other: __________
   □ 2-5 years of college, Country: □ Mexico □ U.S. □ Both(U.S/Mexico) □ Other: __________
   □ Graduate School (Master's or Doctorate), Country: □ Mexico □ U.S. □ Both(U.S/Mexico) □ Other: __________
**Attitudinal Familism Scale (AFS)**

Please circle the response that best describes your personal views about each particular statement. Please answer as honestly as possible. Please respond by using any of the numbers between 1 and 10.

1. Children should always help their parents with the support of younger brothers and sisters, for example, help them with homework, help the parents take care of the children, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The family should control the behavior of children under the age of 18.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. A person should cherish the time they spend with his or her relatives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. A person should live near his or her parents and spend time with them on a regular basis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. A person should always support members of the extended family, for example, aunts, uncles, and in-laws, if they are in need, even if it is a big sacrifice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. A person should rely on his or her family if the need arises.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. A person should feel ashamed if something he or she does dishonors the family name.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Children should help out around the house without expecting an allowance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Parents and grandparents should be treated with great respect regardless of their differences in views.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>somewhat disagree</td>
<td>somewhat disagree</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>somewhat agree</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. A person should often do activities with his or her immediate and extended families, for example, eat meals, play games, or go somewhere together.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>somewhat disagree</td>
<td>somewhat disagree</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>somewhat agree</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Aging parents should live with their relatives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>somewhat disagree</td>
<td>somewhat disagree</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>somewhat agree</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. A person should always be expected to defend his/her family’s honor no matter what the cost.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>somewhat disagree</td>
<td>somewhat disagree</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>somewhat agree</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Children below 18 should give almost all their earnings to their parents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>somewhat disagree</td>
<td>somewhat disagree</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>somewhat agree</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Children should live with their parents until they get married.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>somewhat disagree</td>
<td>somewhat disagree</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>somewhat agree</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Children should obey their parents without question even if they believe that they are wrong.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>somewhat disagree</td>
<td>somewhat disagree</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>somewhat agree</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. A person should help his or her elderly parents in times of need, for example, help financially or share a house.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>somewhat disagree</td>
<td>somewhat disagree</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>somewhat agree</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. A person should be a good person for the sake of his/her family.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>somewhat disagree</td>
<td>somewhat disagree</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>somewhat agree</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. A person should respect his or her older brothers and sisters regardless of their differences in views.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>somewhat disagree</td>
<td>somewhat disagree</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>somewhat agree</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Latina/o Values Scale (LVS)

**INSTRUCTIONS:** Use the scale below to indicate the extent to which you agree with the value expressed in each statement.

1 = strongly disagree  2 = disagree  3 = agree  4 = strongly agree

1. One does not need to follow one’s cultural customs.
2. One does not need to be loyal to one’s cultural origin.
3. One’s bond with one’s cultural group must be very strong.
4. One must preserve one’s cultural heritage.
5. One should never lose one’s language of origin.
6. One should work to preserve the language of one’s ethnic group.
7. A man must provide for his family financially.
8. One should be able to question one’s elders.
9. One should never bring shame upon one’s family.
10. One does not need to practice one’s cultural celebrations.
11. A man’s strength comes from being a good father and husband.
12. One does not need to be emotionally affectionate to familiar individuals.
13. A woman should sacrifice everything for her family.
14. One’s successes should be attributed to one’s family.
15. A mother must keep the family unified.
16. One does not need to always present oneself as likeable to others.
17. A woman is considered the backbone of the family.
18. One’s family is the main source of one’s identity.
19. One must not offend others.
20. One does not need to always be cordial to others.
21. One must defer to one’s elders for advice.
22. One does not need to have faith in premonitions.
23. One must maintain a sense of interdependence with one’s group.
24. One does not need to trust a higher being.
25. One does not need to maintain one’s cultural traditions.
26. One does not need to always support one’s group.
27. One must help one’s group to achieve its goals.
28. One does not need to always avoid conflict with others.
29. A woman must be a source of strength for her family.
30. One should be respectful to people who have a higher status.
31. One should never offend one’s elders.
32. A woman does not need to successfully endure all adversity.
33. A woman should be the spiritual leader in the family.
34. One does not need to preserve the customs of one’s cultural background.
35. One must be proud of one’s cultural group.
Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure-Revised (MEIM-R)

In this country, people come from many different countries and cultures, and there are many different words to describe the different backgrounds or ethnic groups that people come from. Some examples of ethnic groups are Latino, Hispanic, Mexican, Mexican American, Mexicana/o, and Chicana/o, among many others. These questions are about your ethnicity or your ethnic group and how you feel about it or react to it.

Please fill in: In terms of ethnic group, I consider myself to be ________________

Use the numbers below to indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

(5) Strongly agree (4) Agree (3) Neutral (2) Disagree (1) Strongly disagree

1- I have spent time trying to find out more about my ethnic group, such as its history, traditions, and customs. ____________

2- I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group. ____________

3- I understand pretty well what my ethnic group membership means to me. ____________

4- I have often done things that will help me understand my ethnic background better. ____________

5- I have often talked to other people in order to learn more about my ethnic group. ____________

6- I feel a strong attachment towards my own ethnic group. ____________

7- My ethnicity is
   (1) Black or African American
   (2) Asian or Asian American, including Chinese, Japanese, and others
   (3) Asian Pacific Islander
   (4) White, Caucasian, Anglo or European American (non-Hispanic)
   (5) American Indian/Native American, indicate tribal affiliation (registered or not) ______________
   (6) Chicana/o
   (7) Hispanic
   (8) Latina/o
   (9) Mexican or Mexicana/o
   (10) Mexican American
   (11) Mestizo
   (12) Central American
   (13) South American, including Brazilian and others
   (14) Cuban
   (15) Boricua/Puerto Rican
   (16) Dominican
   (17) Mixed; Parents are from two different groups
   (18) Other (write in): ____________________________________________________________________________

For questions 8 through 13, please use the numbers above

8- My father’s ethnicity is ____________

9- My mother’s ethnicity is ____________

10- My Maternal grandmother’s ethnicity is ____________

11- My Maternal grandfather’s ethnicity is ____________

12- My Paternal grandmother’s ethnicity is ____________

13- My Paternal grandfather’s ethnicity is ____________
Pan-Hispanic Familism Scale (PHFS)

Please circle a number from 1-5 that best indicates how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My family is always there for me in times of need.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am proud of my family.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I cherish the time I spend with my family.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know my family has my best interests in mind.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My family members and I share similar values and beliefs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Psychological Well-Being Short Scale (PWBSS)**

Please choose a number from 1-6 that best indicates how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>moderately disagree</td>
<td>slightly disagree</td>
<td>slightly agree</td>
<td>moderately agree</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I am not afraid to voice my opinions, even when they are in opposition to the opinions of most people.
2. In general, I feel I am in charge of the situation in which I live.
3. In general, I feel that I continue to learn more about myself as time goes by.
4. I often feel lonely because I have few close friends with whom to share my concerns.
5. I feel good when I think of what I've done in the past and what I hope to do in the future.
6. When I look at the story of my life, I am pleased with how things have turned out.
7. I tend to worry about what other people think of me.
8. The demands of everyday life often get me down.
9. I don't want to try new ways of doing things--my life is fine the way it is.
10. I don't have many people who want to listen when I need to talk.
11. I have a sense of direction and purpose in life.
12. In general, I feel confident and positive about myself.
13. I tend to be influenced by people with strong opinions.
14. I am quite good at managing the many responsibilities of my daily life.
15. I think it is important to have new experiences that challenge how you think about yourself and the world.
16. I feel like I get a lot out of my friendships.
17. I don't have a good sense of what it is I'm trying to accomplish in life.
18. Given the opportunity, there are many things about myself that I would change.
19. I have confidence in my opinions, even if they are contrary to the general consensus.
20. If I were unhappy with my living situation, I would take effective steps to change it.
21. When I think about it, I haven't really improved much as a person over the years.
22. It seems to me that most other people have more friends than I do.
23. I enjoy making plans for the future and working to make them a reality.
24. I like most aspects of my personality.
25. It's difficult for me to voice my own opinions on controversial matters.
26. I have difficulty arranging my life in a way that is satisfying to me.
27. I have the sense that I have developed a lot as a person over time.
28. I have not experienced many warm and trusting relationships with others.
29. I am an active person in carrying out the plans I set for myself.
30. In many ways, I feel disappointed about my achievements in life.
31. I often change my mind about decisions if my friends or family disagree.
32. I have been able to build a home and a lifestyle for myself that is much to my liking.
33. For me, life has been a continuous process of learning, changing, and growth.
34. I know that I can trust my friends, and they know they can trust me.
35. My aims in life have been more a source of satisfaction than frustration to me.
36. For the most part, I am proud of who I am and the life I lead.
37. I am concerned about how other people evaluate the choices I have made in my life.
38. I gave up trying to make big improvements or changes in my life a long time ago.
39. I judge myself by what I think is important, not by the values of what others think is important.
# Acculturation Rating Scale for Mexican Americans-II (ARSMA-II)

[Circle a number between 1-5 next to each item that best applies.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1. Not at all</th>
<th>2. Very little or not very often</th>
<th>3. Moderately</th>
<th>4. Much or very often</th>
<th>5. Extremely often or almost always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I speak Spanish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I speak English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I enjoy speaking Spanish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I associate with Anglos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I associate with Mexicans and/or Mexican Americans</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I enjoy listening to Spanish language music</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I enjoy listening to English language music</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I enjoy Spanish language TV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I enjoy English language TV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I enjoy English language movies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I enjoy Spanish language movies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I enjoy reading (e.g., books in Spanish)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I enjoy reading (e.g., books in English)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I write (e.g., letters in Spanish)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I write (e.g., letters in English)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Marque con un círculo el numero entre 1 y 5 a la respuesta que sea más adecuada para usted.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Not at all</td>
<td>2 Very little or not often</td>
<td>3 Moderately</td>
<td>4 Much or very often</td>
<td>5 Extremely often or almost always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. My thinking is done in the English language</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>16. Mis pensamientos ocurren en el idioma Inglés</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. My thinking is done in the Spanish language</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>17. Mis pensamientos ocurren en el idioma Español</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. My contact with Mexico has been</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>18. Mi contacto con Mexico ha sido</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. My contact with the U.S. has been</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>19. Mi contacto con los Estados Unidos Americanos ha sido</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. My father identifies or identified as 'Mexicano'</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>20. Mi padre se identifica (o se identificaba) como Mexicano</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. My mother identifies or identified as 'Mexicana'</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>21. Mi madre se identificaba (o se identificaba) como Mexicana</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. My friends, while growing up, were of Mexican origin</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>22. Mis amigos(as) de mi niñez eran de origen Mexicano</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. My friends, while growing up, were of Anglo origin</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>23. Mis amigos(as) de mi niñez eran de origen Anglo Americano</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. My family cooks Mexican foods</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>24. Mi familia cocina comidas mexicanas</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. My friends now are of Anglo origin</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>25. Mis amigos recientes son Anglo Americanos</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. My friends now are of Mexican origin</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>26. Mis amigos recientes son Mexicanos</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I like to identify myself as an Anglo American</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>27. Me gusta identificarme como Anglo Americano</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. I like to identify myself as a Mexican American</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>28. Me gusta identificarme como Norte Americano* (Mexico-American)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I like to identify myself as a Mexican</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>29. Me gusta identificarme como Mexicano</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. I like to identify myself as an American</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>30. Me gusta identificarme como un(a) Americano(a)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Estadounidenses de origen Mexicano
APPENDIX B
### Table 7

**Pearson Correlations between Scales**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-II MOS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.17**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-II AOS</td>
<td>- .24**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVS-CP</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>- .17**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVS-S</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>- .21**</td>
<td>- .27**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVS-E</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-R C</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-R EIE</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFS-FS</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFS-FI</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>AFS-FH</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>AFS-SSF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


N = 401 for each correlation

*p < .05, **p < .01.
**Continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AFS-SSF</td>
<td>PHFS</td>
<td>PWB-SA</td>
<td>PWB-PRO</td>
<td>PWB-A</td>
<td>PWB-EM</td>
<td>PWB-PL</td>
<td>PWB-PG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. A-II MOS</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>.18**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. A-II AOS</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. LVS-CP</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. LVS-S</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. LVS-E</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. LVS-F</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.13*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. M-R C</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.16**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. M-R E</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. AFS-FS</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. AFS-FI</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.13**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. AFS-FH</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.15**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. AFS-SSF</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.53**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. PHFS</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. PWB-SA</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.76**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. PWB-PRO</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. PWB-A</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. PWB-EM</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. PWB-PL</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Chronbach’s alpha English only</th>
<th>Chronbach’s alpha Spanish only</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitudinal Familism Scale</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familial Support</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Interconnectedness</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familial Honor</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjugation of Self for the family</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pan-Hispanic Familism Scale</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latina/o Values Scale</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familismo</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Espiritismo</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simpatía</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Pride</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multigroup Ethnic Identity-Revised</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploration</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation Rating Scale for MexicanAmericans-II</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican Orientation</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo Orientation</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Well-Being</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose in Life</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Mastery</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Growth</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Acceptance</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Relations with Others</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9  
**Sociodemographic Characteristics of All Participants (N=401)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native Language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>94.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>94.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Grade Completed(^b)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-6 (Primary)</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8 (Secondary)</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12 (Preparatory)</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 years of University</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 years of University</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post graduate(Master’s or Doctorate)</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country completed Education(^a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>66.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both-Mexico and U.S.</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Grade Completed by Mother(^b)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-6 (Primary)</td>
<td>49.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8 (Secondary)</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12 (Preparatory)</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 years of University</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 years of University</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post graduate(Master’s or Doctorate)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country completed Education by Mother(^c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>77.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both-Mexico and U.S.</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Grade Completed by Father(^d)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-6 (Primary)</td>
<td>49.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8 (Secondary)</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12 (Preparatory)</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1-2 years of University  2.8
2-5 years of University  4.3
Post graduate(Master’s or Doctorate)  2.8
None  4.8
Don’t know .5

Country completed Education by Father\textsuperscript{d}
  
  U.S.  80.6
  Mexico  9.8
  Both-Mexico and U.S.  3.5
  Other .8
  Don’t know .3
  N/A  5.1

\textsuperscript{a}Please note that data were only available for 400 of the participants.
\textsuperscript{b}Please note that data were only available for 399 of the participants.
\textsuperscript{c}Please note that data were only available for 398 of the participants.
\textsuperscript{d}Please note that data were only available for 396 of the participants.
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