Published in final edited form as:

Int J Intercult Relat. 2011 March 1; 35(2): 196–204. doi:10.1016/j.ijintrel.2010.11.012.

Assimilation and Individual Differences in Emotion: The Dynamics of Anger and Approach Motivation

Julia Lechuga and

Center for AIDS Intervention Research, Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Medicine, Medical College of Wisconsin, 2071 N. Summit, Milwaukee, WI 53202, office number (414) 955-7769, fax number (414) 955- 287-4206

Norma P. Fernandez

The University of Texas at El Paso, Psychology Department, 500 W. University, El Paso, TX 79902

Abstract

Individuals who cross cultural boundaries face many challenges when trying to adapt to a receiving culture. Adaptation challenges such as learning to maneuver across societal domains may become increasingly complex if structural level factors such as discrimination are present. Researchers have conceptualized acculturation as a relatively autonomous decision indicating that four acculturation strategies exist: assimilation, separation, integration, and marginalization. Moreover, researchers have also long debated the link between acculturation strategy, adaptation hassles and negative health outcomes. However, models seeking to explain how individual difference and structural level variables may influence each other and subsequently influence acculturation and adaptation are needed. The purpose of this study is to lay the foundation for the conceptualization of such a model. We propose that temperamental predispositions to negative emotionality, anger, and impulsivity may highlight discrimination which in turn may lead to increases in acculturative stress and negative markers of psychosocial well-being. We used SEM to test our hypothesized model. Results supported a modified model. Implications for the measurement of adaptation and interventions are discussed.

Keywords

Acculturation; Assimilation; Emotion

1. Introduction

Individuals who venture to cross language and culture boundaries expose themselves to alternate ways of living and thinking triggering changes in the conceptualization of the self (LaFromboise, Coleman, and Gerton, 1993). This process has been termed acculturation and change entails learning new behaviors, values, and beliefs of the receiving culture. Research has shown that individuals choose among four main acculturation strategies: assimilation, integration, separation, and marginalization (Berry, Kim, Power, Young, & Bujaki, 1989).

Correspondence concerning this article should be sent to Julia Lechuga (jlechuga@mcw.edu). Center for AIDS Intervention Research (CAIR), Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Medicine, Medical College of Wisconsin 2071 N. Summit, Milwaukee, WI 53202.

Publisher's Disclaimer: This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final citable form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

Assimilation refers to the immigrant's decision to supplant behaviors and beliefs from the heritage culture with ones from the receiving culture. Integration refers to the decision to accommodate both cultures. Separation refers to the rejection of the receiving culture's behaviors and beliefs, while retaining the ones from the heritage culture. Marginalization refers to the rejection of both cultures. Capturing the four acculturation patterns requires that the assessment of affiliation to the receiving and heritage cultures be conducted separately. This choice of measurement implicates that affiliation to host and heritage cultures are orthogonal constructs. Assessment of the four acculturation strategies is fraught with controversies (Chirkov, 2009). First, there is variability in research findings regarding the purported orthogonality. Research sometimes unveils an inverse correlation, albeit small, between affiliations to host and heritage cultures which may indicate a preference for assimilation or separation (see Costigan, & Fu, 2004; Flannery, Reise, & Yu, 2001; Ryder, Alden, & Paulhus, 2000). Second, although the acculturation literature unquestionably indicates that when individuals are asked to convey their acculturation preferences most indicate a preference for integration or separation (Berry & Sam, 2006), preferences for integration may reflect the normative discourse in the host society (i.e., what members of the host society believe and convey) and thus may not accurately reflect the actual acculturation process (Safdar, Struthers, & van Oudenhoven, 2009).

Researchers have attempted to capture the complex notion of the process of culture change by indicating that factors outside of an individual's control exert a strong influence on the selection of an acculturation strategy such as attitudes towards the ethnic minority group held by members of the majority group (Bourhis, Moïse, Perreault, & Senécal, 1997) and availability of psychological resources related to coping (Safdar, Struthers, & van Oudenhoven, 2009). However, notably absent from these models is the notion that an individual's choice of acculturation strategy, and consequently adaptation to change, may also be linked to affective regulatory processes. Albert Bandura's (1986) legendary social cognitive theory (SCT) proposed that at the heart of an individual's self-efficacy lies cognition and self-regulation and that these processes underpin successful adaptation. We contend that acculturation may also be a process that is governed by the interaction of individual differences in emotion and consequent reaction to environmental factors.

1.1. Individual and Structural Factors Related to Acculturation

The idea that individual difference factors influence the selection of an acculturation strategy is not new. Researcher indicates that both individual difference variables and structural factors facilitate or impinge acculturation strategies (Berry, 1980). Prior research has shown that individual difference variables such as personality (Ryder, Alden, & Paulhus, 2000), self-efficacy (Ward & Kennedy, 1992), and need for cognitive closure (Kosic, 2002) influence the selection of an acculturation strategy. For example, extraversion, a sense of self-efficacy, and low tolerance for ambiguity predict a preference for assimilation while low socioeconomic status predicts a preference for other acculturation strategies (Berry, 1980).

Our study was inspired by Padilla and Perez (2003) who suggest a socio-cognitive approach to the study of acculturation. The study of acculturation, in their view, has suffered from a static view of intergroup relations and an insufficient account of contextual determinants such as discrimination. According to Padilla and Perez (2003), intergroup relations are dynamic and in constant change meaning that the level of stigmatization for a particular minority group is in constant flux. The extent to which members of the host culture stigmatize ethnic minorities and the extent to which individuals are aware of the stigmatization will influence acculturation. This idea suggests that acculturation is a dynamic process responsive to situational factors. We would like to add to this model the thesis that temperamental predispositions may also influence the salience of and reaction to

stressors such as discrimination and consequently selection of an acculturation strategy. This is an important thesis given the link between acculturation and adaptation.

1.2. Acculturation and Adaptation

Researchers have been concerned with the psychosocial adaptation of individuals undergoing the process of culture change (Moyerman & Forman, 1992). The study of the relationship between acculturation and adaptation is understandably important since maladjustment can result in considerable societal costs. For example, empirical findings suggest a relationship between maladjustment and negative mental health outcomes (Constantine, Okazaki, & Utsey, 2004; Zheng & Berry, 1991).

Acculturation and adaptation are linked by the experience of “acculturative stress” (Smart & Smart, 1995). Acculturative stress results from the complex challenges that individuals face when entering a new culture. These challenges range from learning a new language to being able to successfully maneuver in the social, institutional and economic layers that constitute the fabric of society (Organista, Organista, & Kurasaki, 2002). Acculturative stress is thus a form of psychological stress created from “culture shock” and results in decreased markers of mental health and well-being such as, reduced physical health, erratic decision-making, and occupational malfunctioning (Smart & Smart, 1995). Prior models have shown that individual difference variables related to the ability to cope with the process of culture change such as psychosocial well-being, perceptions of cultural competence, and social support are related to acculturation preferences (Safdar, Lay, & Struthers, 2003). However, a model linking individual differences in temperament to the process of adaptation and selection of an acculturation strategy has not been specified.

The purpose of this study is to begin the process of delineating such a model by investigating the role that processes related to the regulation of behavior and affect have on the experience of culture related stressors and markers of well-being. Research aimed at delineating such a model is important given that researchers question the importance of studying the influence of acculturation on the health status and well-being of ethnic minorities undergoing the process of culture change (Hunt, Schneider, & Commer, 2004). Thus, it is imperative to uncover the role that other important individual difference variables such as affect may bear on an individual's selection of acculturation strategy and experience of acculturative stress.

1.3. Temperament and Adaptation

Research on affect regulation has focused primarily on individuals' direct affective responses to stressors or aversive events. However, it is possible that greater predisposition to certain emotions also increases exposure to aversive events and to certain coping strategies (Bolger, 1991). Individuals actively select and shape their environments (Buss, 1987). That is, an individual's temperament is linked to the situations that he/she selects and also to the way he/she copes with those situations. Neuroticism, defined as the propensity for negative emotionality and an inefficient way of coping, is a prime example. In a longitudinal study, comparing the effects of neuroticism, exposure to long term stressors, and change in life circumstances, neuroticism emerged as the strongest predictor of well-being (Ormel & Wohlfarth, 1991). Notably, this study clarified a causal link. Predisposition to neuroticism early in life had a direct effect on psychological distress and a stronger effect than deterioration of life circumstances or exposure to long term stressors (i.e., chronic illness of a family member and unemployment).

Empirical findings indicate that two systems, susceptibility to either anxiety or impulsivity, are primary motivators of behavior. A high predisposition to anxiety inhibits behavior and

conversely, a predisposition to act impulsively facilitates behavior. These two regulators of behavior are named the Behavioral Activation System (BAS) and the Behavioral Inhibition System (BIS) (Gray, 1972). Anticipation of a reward or positive consequence activates the BAS, also known as the approach system, which in turn guides behavior towards the attainment of goals. Conversely, anticipation of punishment activates the BIS, a system that responds to anxiety by inhibiting behavior (Carver & White, 1994). The experience of positive affect is attributed to the BAS system and conversely, the experience of negative affect is regulated by the BIS system (Gray, 1972; Carver & Scheier, 1990). Research on animals and humans supports the notion that impulsivity and anxiety guide behavior, indicating that different brain pathways are, in fact, involved in the regulation of a susceptibility to the expectation of reward or punishment (Fowles, 1993).

Experts have posited that individual differences in the sensitivity of these systems underlie problematic behaviors and issues of adaptation (Fowles, 1987). An overactive BAS system may result in various forms of psychopathology and predisposition towards risk (Fowles, 1993). However, an underactive BIS system may result in attention related disorders such as ADHD (Quay, 1988). Researchers have linked individual differences in personality to these systems and are now beginning to uncover their influence on other powerful motivators of behavior such as affect. We would like to center our focus on one such powerful affective driver of behavior, anger. Although anger has been conceptualized as a negative affect, researchers are now beginning to understand the determinants of anger and as a result link it to the BAS system.

1.4. Anger: An Affect Derived from the Approach System

Recent evidence suggests that the experience of anger is linked to the approach system (Harmon-Jones, 2003; Carver & Harmon-Jones, 2009). Anger is defined as an affect that initiates some form of retaliatory action, becoming a powerful driver of behavior rather than an inhibitor (Berkowitz & Harmon-Jones, 2004). Although there is considerable debate in the literature about the specifics of situations that stir anger, most researchers align with the view that actions, preventing individual from attaining goals, are important determinants of anger (Berkowitz & Harmon-Jones, 2004).

The purpose of our study was to investigate the interrelationships between temperamental predispositions to neuroticism, anger, and the BAS system on perceived discrimination, the experience of acculturative stress, and assimilation. The main goal of this study was to investigate the influence of affect on one acculturation strategy, assimilation. We did not assess the four acculturation preferences because we align with the view that acculturation is not a process that occurs in a vacuum. In our view, the individual will actively pursue goals in accordance with his/her innate tendencies such as a tendency to regulate behavior through the active pursuit of goals (an approach system) and theoretically speaking, an approach system should only be related to assimilation. Although, undeniably, research suggests that acculturation is also influenced by the level of integration present in society at large, the goal of our study was to understand the extent to which temperamental predispositions influence assimilation.

2. Method

The present investigation took place at the University of Texas at El Paso (UTEP), located in the city of El Paso, Texas. El Paso is located on the U.S.-Mexico border. The city in Mexico is Ciudad Juarez. The population from both cities combined is estimated to be 2,200,000, making it the largest international border community in the world (U.S. Census Bureau, 2007). Many individuals commute daily from and to Ciudad Juarez. UTEP is predominantly a Hispanic serving institution. The ethnic composition of UTEP is: 72%

Hispanic, 11% non-Hispanic Caucasian, 8% Mexican-National, 1% Asian-American, and .2% Native American. The ethnic mix of the professoriate is: 57% non-Hispanic Caucasian, 27% Hispanic, 2% Black, and 11% other.

2.1. Participants

Participants were 298 UTEP students of Mexican descent (63% females) with a mean age of 19.75 ($SD = 3.32$) years. Participants reported to have lived in the U.S. a mean of 12.55 ($SD = 7.38$) years, to cross the border once per week (median), and a mean language proficiency (speaking, reading, and writing) of 7.06 ($SD = 2.60$) in English and 7.99 ($SD = 1.40$) in Spanish.

2.2. Measures

Participants were asked to complete a survey that included a demographics questionnaire asking about age, gender, years lived in the U.S., weekly border crossings, generation status, country where they attended elementary school, the perceived ethnic identity of the city of El Paso, whether they had relatives in Latin America, and country of birth. Participants were also asked to report their level of language proficiency in reading, writing, and speaking in English and Spanish. Response options for the language proficiency items were 1 = “not at all proficient” to 10 = “very proficient.”

Discrimination—Participants' experience with discrimination was assessed with three questions asking the extent to which they had personally experienced discriminatory acts, the extent to which they believed there is something about their appearance or behavior that conveys to other persons that they are from an ethnic minority group, and the extent to which they perceived discrimination as a pervasive event that affects or will affect their relatives and children. Responses were captured on a 7 point Likert-type scale with response options ranging from 1 = “strongly disagree” to 7 = “strongly agree.” The Cronbach alpha was .76.

Approach Motivation System—The approach motivation systems were assessed with the Behavioral Activation System (BAS) (Carver and White, 1994). This instrument assesses the extent to which an individual's behavior is driven by impulsivity. The BAS scale is composed of 13 items and is subdivided into three subscales that assess: 1) the drive associated with the active pursuit of goals (Drive subscale), 2) the extent to which rewarding consequences are enticing (Reward subscale), and 3) the extent to which an individual seeks new rewards (Fun seeking subscale). Responses were captured on a 7 point Likert-type scale with response options ranging from 1 = “strongly disagree” to 7 = “strongly agree.” The Cronbach alpha was .77.

Anger—Anger was assessed with The State-Trait Anger Inventory (STAI) (Spielberger, Krasner, & Solomon, 1988). The instrument is composed of 57 items that assess anger and hostility as situationally determined (a state) or as a temperamental predisposition (a trait). Responses were captured on a 4 point Likert-type scale with response options ranging from 1 = “not at all/almost never” to 4 = “very much so/almost always.” The Cronbach alphas for the subscales were .81 (anger as a state) and .82 (anger as a trait).

Neuroticism—Neuroticism was assessed with the NEO-FFI-R neuroticism subscale (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Responses were captured on a 7 point Likert-type scale with response options ranging from 1 = “strongly disagree” to 7 = “strongly agree.” The Cronbach alpha was .77.

Center for Epidemiological Studies on Depression (CESD)—Depression was assessed with the CESD (Randloff, 1977). This instrument consists of 20 items that assess the various symptoms associated with depression. Responses were captured on a 7 point Likert-type scale with response options ranging from 1 = “strongly disagree” to 7 = “strongly agree.” The Cronbach alpha was .88.

Adjustment—Overall adjustment was assessed with 12 items asking about the extent to which individuals were adjusted to school work, academic requirements, professor's teaching styles, instructional methods, and interpersonal relationships. Responses were captured on a 7 point Likert-type scale with response options ranging from 1 = “not at all adjusted” to 7 = “very well adjusted.” The Cronbach alpha was .87. In addition, we assessed other markers of adjustment by asking participants to self-report the number of times they were sick with a cold the present year and their cumulative grade point average (GPA).

Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS)—Satisfaction with life was assessed with the SWLS (Diener, 1985). This instrument is composed of 5 items that assess an individual's degree of life satisfaction. Responses were captured on a 7 point Likert-type scale with response options ranging from 1 = “strongly disagree” to 7 = “strongly agree.” The Cronbach alpha was .83.

Acculturative Stress—Acculturative stress was assessed with the Social, Attitudinal, Familial, and Environmental Acculturation Stress Scale (S.A.F.E) (Mena, Padilla, & Maldonado, 1987). This scale is composed of 24 items that measure stress as a result of the acculturation process. It also asks participants to respond to open-ended questions regarding the specific hassles that they may have encountered in the U.S. as members of an ethnic minority group. Responses were captured on a 7 point Likert-type scale with response options ranging from 1 = “strongly disagree” to 7 = “strongly agree.” The Cronbach alpha was .84.

Acculturation—Assimilation was assessed with the ARSMA-I (Cuellar, Harris, & Jasso, 1980). The ARSMA-I was developed following a unidirectional model of acculturation and consists of 22 items that assess language preference in general and when speaking, thinking, reading, writing, watching TV programs, movies, and listening to music. Items also assess ethnic identity of mother and father, the ethnic composition of childhood and adolescence friends, and of community acquaintances, place of birth, place where the individual was raised, and present contact with heritage culture. Lastly, the ARSMA-I asks participants to self-report their perceived degree of acculturation. Options range from 1 = “Very Mexican” to 5 = “Very Anglicized.” The Cronbach alpha for this scale was .94.

3. Data Analysis

We computed bivariate correlations between demographic factors and assimilation. To compute bivariate correlations we coded the response options, of the variable place of birth, born in Mexico as “0” and born in the U.S. as “1.” To test our hypothesized model, presented in Figure 1, we computed indices of fit using structural equation modeling. As Figure 1 shows, we hypothesized that neuroticism and anger would influence the BAS system, an approach motivator. The BAS will in turn motivate the individual to assimilate and assimilation should reduce motivation to maintain contact with the heritage culture. Because the BAS system motivates individuals to approach a variety of situations in the pursuit of goals, regulation of behavior through the BAS system should also increase the saliency of discrimination. Perceived discrimination should increase acculturative stress which in turn should lead to increases in depression. Perceived discrimination should essentially act as a feedback loop accentuating the innate tendency towards anger. Depression and a

predisposition towards negative affect (i.e., neuroticism and anger) should influence well-being. Empirical findings have substantiated that increases in anger are linked to increases in stress and to reduced physical and emotional well-being (Deffenbacher et al., 1996; Diong, & Bishop, 1999). Our model is exploratory. Thus, we allowed ourselves to inspect modification indices and follow suggested modifications to optimize model fit indices. Values of $< .05$ for the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) and $> .95$ for the Goodness of Fit Index (GFI) and the Comparative Fit Index (CFI) are considered indices of good model fit (Byrne, 2001).

4. Results

Table 1 presents the distributions in terms of demographic characteristics. As Table 1 indicates, 80% self-reported to be either first or second generation. It was interesting that 65% perceived El Paso to be a city with a mixed American and Hispanic identity. Table 2 presents bivariate correlations. As Table 2 indicates, strong positive associations emerged between assimilation and demographic characteristics.

Indices of fit for the hypothesized model (Fig. 1) were $\chi^2(55) = 156.17$, $\chi^2/df = 2.83$, $p = .000$, Goodness of Fit Index (GFI) = .92, Comparative Fit Index (CFI) = .87, Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) = .07. These indices suggested that the model could be improved. Thus, we inspected modification indices and based on $\chi^2\Delta$, we added the following four paths to the model: 1) a path from anger as a state to acculturative stress ($\beta = .48$, $p < .001$), 2) a path from anger as a state to number of colds ($\beta = .54$, $p < .001$), 3) a path from BAS to depression ($\beta = -.30$, $p < .001$), and 4) a path from number of colds to GPA ($\beta = -.12$, $p < .01$). Indices of fit after these additions indicated that the model fit improved $\chi^2(51) = 86.34$, $\chi^2/df = 1.69$, $p = .001$, Goodness of Fit Index (GFI) = .95, Comparative Fit Index (CFI) = .95, Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) = .04. Figure 2 presents the paths of the modified model. These indices indicate that the model fits the data well (Byrne, 2001).

Estimates of direct effects indicated that neuroticism influenced a predisposition towards anger. Anger influenced the BAS which in turn had an effect on assimilation and discrimination. Discrimination influenced acculturative stress and stress influenced depression and adjustment. Increases in assimilation predicted decreased contact with heritage culture and increases in depression. Estimates of indirect effects indicated that neuroticism had a mediating effect on depression, adjustment, and satisfaction with life. Anger as a state had a mediating effect on depression, adjustment, and satisfaction with life.

5. Discussion

The purpose of this study was to develop and test an exploratory model that would specify the role that motivation to regulate behavior through an approach system would have on the decision to assimilate. Furthermore, our interest lied on elucidating the influence of affective antecedents of the approach system on well-being in the context of the experience of discrimination and acculturative stress, both deterrents of assimilation. Because we consider this study a first attempt at specifying the role of seldom considered individual difference variables in acculturation research (i.e., affect), we inspected modification indices and made suggested changes to our original model to maximize model fit. Modification indices indicated that four paths should be added to our original model to improve model fit. After the addition of these paths, results yielded estimates suggestive of good fit. Results indicated that neuroticism influenced anger which in turn influenced a tendency to regulate behavior through the approach system. The approach system contributed to increases in assimilation yet heightened the experience of discrimination. This is an important finding because it

elucidates that an individual's temperament can also contribute to accentuate the negative experience of acculturation hassles.

We conducted our study in a border region where individuals have the opportunity to commute daily to Mexico. Moreover, our sample consisted of a mixture of individuals who were foreign and U.S. born and who varied in the length of time they had been residing in the U.S. For example, 75% of our sample reported to have lived in the U.S. between 5 and 35 years. These characteristics suggest that participants may have been at different stages of the acculturation process which may have influenced motivation to assimilate. Moreover, length of residence in the U.S. is associated with an increase in mental disorders. Future studies should attempt to replicate our model in a more homogeneous sample.

A limitation of our study was that we assessed assimilation only. However, we would like to point out that the main objective of our study was to investigate the role of affect in the decision to assimilate. It was particularly interesting that our results supported our model in a border community where approximately 75% of the population is Hispanic. Affect influenced the experience of discrimination in a group of individuals who may be far removed from such experiences. Responses to the open-ended item of the acculturative stress instrument -asking participants to identify stressful situations they may have experienced as a result of being members of an ethnic minority- suggest that participants were fundamentally aware of the negative stereotypes endorsed by some members of the U.S. culture yet acknowledged that in El Paso there is less discrimination. An alternative explanation for these findings may be that individuals of Mexican descent who have lived in the U.S. for a shorter period of time may be perceiving discrimination from individuals of Mexican descent who have lived in the U.S. for a longer period of time. Unfortunately, we did not measure whether a contentious relationship exists between individuals of Mexican descent who vary in demographic characteristics related to culture change. Sadfar, Struthers, and van Oudenhoven, (2009) indicate that acculturation is a process subject to the influence of in-group/out-group distinctions. Jasinskaja-Lahti, Liebkind, Horenczyk, and Schmitz (2003) have shown that members of the same ethnic group can surely be perceived as the out-group.

With our choice of sample, we incurred in other limitations including restricted generalizability to older adults. In addition, our design was cross-sectional. Ultimately, the best strategy to investigate the process of culture change and adaptation is via longitudinal studies. Presently, our research group is investigating the acculturation practices of the border community at large.

Padilla and Perez (2003) advocated the use of a socio-cognitive approach to the study of acculturation. We attempted to advance their model by linking the experience of discrimination to individual differences in emotion regulation. We would like to advocate the use of an experimental approach for the study of emotion regulation, anger, distress, and acculturation in future studies. Research suggests that acculturation may be malleable and shift in response to contextual cues (Lechuga, 2008). Use of an experimental approach can contribute significantly to our understanding of the malleability of acculturation in response to contextual cues indicative of stereotype threat and potential discrimination. Moreover, a shift in acculturation strategy should be mediated by the regulation of affect.

Schmitz (1992, 1994) has conducted extensive work on the relationship between the big five personality dimensions, coping, and acculturation strategies and outcomes. Schmitz's work suggests, indeed, that certain personality factors such as neuroticism and impulsivity are inversely related to a preference for integration and that certain coping strategies such as problem-oriented coping are positively related to preference for assimilation. However,

Kosic's (2006) review of the literature on the relationship between acculturation and personality indicates that this is a complex relationship and research attempting to elucidate it has been fraught by inconsistent findings. Moreover, a small proportion of the acculturation variance is predicted by personality alone. Consequently, Kosic (2006) recommends following the "person $\times$ situation" view which posits that immigrants' individual characteristics will interact with situational factors such as host culture members' attitudes towards the acculturation strategies of immigrants. For example, research suggests that extraversion predicts assimilation (Kosic, 2006). However, maladjustment may result when extraverted immigrants enter a culture where members of the host society prefer separation.

Following Kosic's recommendation, our objective was to contribute to previous work on acculturation and personality by elucidating interactional relationships between the individual and his/her environment that may lead to an aversive acculturation experience. We hope that our research expands acculturation theory by promoting the inclusion of individual level variables that may accentuate the experience of negative contextual factors. Interventions designed to advance the adjustment of individuals undergoing the process of culture change may be more successful if they target a combination of individual level and contextual factors.

Acknowledgments

Preparation of this manuscript was supported, in part, by center grant P30-MH52776 from the National Institute of Mental Health and by NRSA postdoctoral training grant T32-MH19985.

References

- Bandura, A. Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory. Englewood Cliff, NJ: Prentice Hall; 1986.
- Berry, JW. Acculturation as varieties of adaptation. In: Padilla, AM., editor. Acculturation: Theory, models and some new findings. Boulder, CO: Westview; 1980. p. 9-25.
- Berry JW, Kim U, Power S, Young M, Bujaki M. Acculturation attitudes in plural societies. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*. 1989; 21:491-511.
- Berwkowitz L, Harmon-Jones E. Toward an understanding of the determinants of anger. *Emotion*. 2004; 4:107-130. [PubMed: 15222847]
- Bolger N, Schilling EA. Personality and the problems of everyday life: The role of neuroticism in exposure and reactivity to daily stressors. *Journal of Personality*. 1991; 59:355-386. [PubMed: 1960637]
- Buss DM. Selection, evocation, and manipulation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 1987; 53:1214-1221. [PubMed: 3320336]
- Byrne, BM. Structural equation modeling with AMOS: Basic concepts, applications, and programming. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum; 2001.
- Carver CS, Harmon-Jones E. Anger is an approach-related affect: Evidence and implications. *Psychological Bulletin*. 2009; 135:183-204. [PubMed: 19254075]
- Carver CS, Scheier MF. Origins and functions of positive and negative affect: A control-view process. *Psychological Review*. 1990; 97:19-35.
- Carver CS, White TL. Behavioral inhibition, behavioral activation, and affective responses to impending reward and punishment: The BIS/BAS Scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 1994; 67:319-333.
- Chirkov V. Summary of the criticisms and of the potential ways to improve acculturation psychology. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*. 2009; 33:177-180.
- Constantine MG, Okazaki S, Utsey SO. Self-concealment, social self-efficacy, acculturative stress, and depression in African, Asian, and Latin American international college students. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*. 2004; 74:320-241.

- Costa, PT.; McCrae, RR. NEO-PI-R Professional manual Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R) and NEO Five Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI). Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources; 1992.
- Costigan CL, Su TF. Orthogonal versus linear models of acculturation among immigrant Chinese Canadians: A comparison of mothers, fathers, and children. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*. 2004; 28:518–527.
- Cuellar I, Arnold B, Maldonado R. Acculturation rating scale for Mexican Americans-II: A revision of the original ARSMA scale. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*. 1995; 17:275–304.
- Deffenbacher JL, et al. State-trait anger theory and the utility of the trait anger scale. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*. 1996; 43:131–148.
- Diener E, Emmons RA, Larsen RJ, Griffin S. The satisfaction with life scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*. 1985; 49:71–75. [PubMed: 16367493]
- Diong, Sm; Bishop, GD. Anger expression, coping styles, and well-being. *Journal of Health Psychology*. 1999; 4:81–96.
- Flannery WP, Reise SP, Yu J. An empirical comparison of acculturation models. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*. 2001; 27:1035–1045.
- Fowles DC. Application of a behavioral theory of motivation to the concepts of anxiety and impulsivity. *Journal of Research in Personality*. 1987; 21:417–435.
- Fowles, DC. Biological variables in psychopathology: A psychobiological perspective. In: Sutker, PB.; Adams, HE., editors. *Comprehensive handbook of psychopathology*. 2nd. New York: Plenum; 1993. p. 57-82.
- Gray, JA. The psychophysiological basis of introversion-extraversion: A modification of Eysenck's theory. In: Nebylitsyn, VS.; Gray, JA., editors. *The biological basis of individual behavior*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press; 1972. p. 182-205.
- Harmon-Jones E. Anger and the behavioral approach system. *Personality and Individual Differences*. 2003; 35:995–1005.
- Hunt LM, Schneider S, Comer B. Should acculturation be a variable in health research? A critical review of research on US Hispanics. *Social Science & Medicine*. 2004; 59:973–986. [PubMed: 15186898]
- Jasinskaja-Lahti I, Liebkind K, Horenczyk G, Schmitz P. The interactive nature of acculturation: perceived discrimination, acculturation attitudes and stress among young ethnic repatriates in Finland, Israel and Germany. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*. 2003; 27:79–97.
- Kosic A. Acculturation attitudes, need for cognitive closure, and adaptation of immigrants. *The Journal of Social Psychology*. 2002; 2:179–201. [PubMed: 11999871]
- Kosic, A. Personality and individuals factors in acculturation. In: Sam, DL.; Berry, JW., editors. *The Cambridge handbook of acculturation psychology*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press; 2006. p. 113-128.
- LaFramboise T, Coleman H, Gerton J. Psychological impact of biculturalism: Evidence and theory. *Psychological Bulletin*. 1993; 114:395–412. [PubMed: 8272463]
- Lechuga J. Is acculturation a dynamic construct ? The influence of priming culture on acculturation. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*. 2008; 30:324–339.
- Mena FJ, Padilla AM, Maldonado M. Acculturative stress and specific coping strategies among immigrant and later generation college students. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*. 1987; 9:207–225.
- Moyerman DR, Forman BD. Acculturation and adjustment : A meta-analytic study. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*. 1992; 14:163–200.
- Organista, PB.; Organista, KC.; Kurasaki, K. Acculturation advances in theory, measurement, and applied research. Chun, KM.; Organista, PB.; Marin, G., editors. Washington, DC: APA; 2002. p. 139-161.
- Ormel J, Wohlfarth T. How neuroticism, long-term difficulties, and life situation change influence psychological distress: A longitudinal model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 1991; 60:744–755. [PubMed: 2072254]
- Padilla AM, Perez W. Acculturation, social identity, and social cognition: A new perspective. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*. 2003; 25:35–55.

- Quay, HC. The behavioral reward and inhibition system in childhood behavior disorders. In: Bloomingdale, LM., editor. Attention deficit disorder. Vol. 3. Elmsford, NY: Pergamon Press; 1988. p. 176-186.
- Radloff L. The CES-D scale: A self-report depression scale for research in the general population. *Applied Psychological Measurement*. 1977; 1:385-401.
- Ryder AG, Alden LE, Paulhus DL. Is acculturation unidimensional or bidimensional? A head-to-head comparison in the prediction of personality, self-identity, and adjustment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 2000; 79:49-65. [PubMed: 10909877]
- Safdar S, Lay C, Struthers W. The process of acculturation and basic goals: Testing a multidimensional individual difference acculturation model with Iranian immigrants in Canada. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*. 2003; 52:555-579.
- Safdar S, Struthers W, van Oudenhoven PJ. Acculturation of Iranians in the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Netherlands: A test of multidimensional individual difference acculturation model. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*. 2009; 40:468-491.
- Schmitz, PG. Acculturation styles and health. In: Iwawaki, S.; Kashima, Y.; Leung, KS., editors. *Innovations in cross-cultural psychology*. Amsterdam: Swets & Zeitlinger; 1992. p. 360-370.
- Schmitz, PG. Acculturation and adaptation processes among immigrants in Germany. In: Bouvy, AM.; van de Vijver, FJR.; Schmitz, PG., editors. *Journeys into cross-cultural psychology*. Amsterdam: Swets & Zeitlinger; 1994. p. 142-147.
- Smart JF, Smart DW. Acculturative stress: The experience of the Hispanic immigrant. *The Counseling Psychologist*. 1995; 23:25-42.
- Spielberger, CD.; Krasner, SS.; Solomon, EP. The experience, expression and control of anger. In: Janisse, MP., editor. *Health psychology: Individual differences and stress*. New York: Springer-Verlag; 1988. p. 89-108.
- Ward C, Kennedy A. Locus of control, mood disturbance, and social difficulty during cross-cultural transitions. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*. 1992; 16:175-194.
- Zheng X, Berry JW. Psychological adaptation of Chinese sojourners in Canada. *International Journal of Psychology*. 1991; 26:451-470.

Figure 1. Hypothesized Model

Figure 2.
Final Model with Direct Effect Estimates. *** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$, $^{\dagger}p = .06$

Demographic Variables**Table 1**

	Frequency	%
Generation	92	30.9
First	146	49.0
Second	22	7.4
Third	27	9.1
Fourth	11	3.7
Fifth		
Attended Elementary School		
Mexico	121	40.6
U.S.A.	171	57.4
Both Mexico and U.S.A	6	2.0
Perceived Identity of El Paso		
Hispanic	103	34.6
Mixed Hispanic/American	195	65.4
Relatives in Latin America		
Yes	130	44.7
No	161	54.0
Place of Birth		
Mexico	103	34.6
U.S.A	190	63.8
Self-Perceived Acculturation Status		
Very Mexican	69	23.2
Mostly Mexican	79	26.5
Bicultural	117	39.3
Mostly Anglicized	23	7.7
Very Anglicized	3	1.0

Note. Some proportions do not add to 100% due to missing data.

Table 2

Correlations Between Demographic Variables and Assimilation

	1	2	3	4	5
1. Assimilation					
2. Generation	.66**				
3. Years Lived U.S.	.80**	.56**			
4. Border Crossings	-.60**	-.35**	-.62**		
5. Place of Birth	.54**	.59**	.55**	-.25**	
6. Self-Perceived Acculturation Status	.71**	.45**	.59**	-.40**	.40**

Note.

** p < .001.

** p < .05.