Published in final edited form as:

Soc Sci Med. 2010 March ; 70(5): 677–683. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2009.11.024.

Acculturative and Neighborhood Influences on Subjective Social Status Among Spanish-Speaking Latino Immigrant Smokers

Lorraine R. Reitzel, Carlos A Mazas, Ph.D., Ludmila Cofta-Woerpel, Ph.D., Jennifer I Vidrine, Ph.D., Michael S Businelle, Ph.D., Darla E Kendzor, Ph.D., Yisheng Li, Ph.D., Yumei Cao, M.S., and David W Wetter, Ph.D.

University of Texas, M. D. Anderson Cancer Center, Houston, Texas, UNITED STATES

Lorraine R. Reitzel: lrreitze@mdanderson.org

Abstract

Subjective Social Status (SSS) reflects an individual's perception of her/his relative position in the social hierarchy. However, little is known about culturally-relevant, multilevel predictors of low SSS among low socioeconomic status (SES), minority populations. The goal of this study was to identify individual- and neighborhood-level variables predicting SSS among 297 Spanish-speaking Latino immigrant smokers living in several locations in Texas, with an emphasis on the association of SSS with acculturative and socioeconomic variables. Participants were recruited and enrolled through the National Cancer Institute's Cancer Information Service from August 2002 to March 2004. Determinants of SSS were explored using a series of linear regressions. In analyses adjusting for demographics (including objective indicators of SES), speaking Spanish at home and work and living in economically disadvantaged neighborhoods, respectively, were associated with low SSS. However, in analyses including demographics, acculturation, and neighborhood characteristics, only income, education, and acculturation remained associated with SSS. Consistent with results from a previous study in the area (Franzini & Fernandez-Esquer, 2006), less acculturation predicted low SSS among immigrant Latino smokers. However, unlike previous research, these associations were maintained after controlling for SES. Results suggest that the density of less acculturated Latinos within economically deprived neighborhoods might account for the disappearance of neighborhood effects in the final model.

Keywords

Latinos; Social Status; Acculturation; Neighborhood; Immigrants; USA; smoking

Correspondence to: Lorraine R. Reitzel, lrreitze@mdanderson.org.

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.

The authors do not have any conflicts of interest pertaining to this work.

Introduction

Subjective Social Status (SSS) reflects an individual's perception of her/his relative position in the social hierarchy (Adler, Epel, Castellazzo, & Ickovics, 2000). Known determinants of SSS include a myriad of objective socioeconomic status (SES) indicators such as income, education, and occupational status, as well as estimations of financial satisfaction, social trust, beliefs about upcoming opportunities, and the anticipation of future security (Franzini & Fernandez-Esquer, 2006; Singh-Manoux, Adler, & Marmot, 2003). Similar to SES, SSS demonstrates strong associations with both health indicators and health behaviors. For example, lower SSS has been associated with poorer self-rated physical and mental health across a range of age groups and populations (Adler et al., 2000; Adler, Singh-Manoux, Schwartz, Stewart, Matthews, & Marmot, 2008; Chen & Paterson, 2006; Demakakos, Nazroo, Breeze, & Marmot, 2008; Franzini & Fernandez-Esquer, 2006; Hu, Adler, Goldman, Weinstein, & Seeman, 2005; Ostrove, Adler, Kuppermann, & Washington, 2000; Singh-Manoux, Adler, & Marmot, 2003), as well as greater negative affect (Mendelson, Thurston, & Kubzansky, 2008; Reitzel, Vidrine, Li, Mullen, Velasquez, Cinciripini et al., 2007), depression (Adler et al., 2008; Demakakos et al., 2008), susceptibility to upper respiratory infections (Cohen, Alper, Doyle, Adler, Treanor et al., 2008), increased cortisol response upon awakening (Wright & Steptoe, 2005), hypertension (Adler et al., 2008), and reduced gray matter in the area of the brain responsible for regulating reactivity to stress (Gianaros, Horenstein, Cohen, Matthews, Brown et al., 2007). Additionally, SSS has been inversely associated with healthy dietary and physical activity habits (Ghaed & Gallo, 2007) and smoking abstinence during a specific quit attempt (Reitzel, Mazas, Cofta-Woerpel, Li, Cao et al. 2009). Although SSS is highly correlated with SES, a number of studies have supported that SSS is an incremental predictor of health indicators and behaviors (e.g., Franzini & Fernandez-Esquer, 2006; Ghaed & Gallo, 2007; Hu et al., 2005; Reitzel, Vidrine et al., 2007; Reitzel, Mazas et al., 2009; Singh-Manoux, Marmot, & Adler, 2005).

SSS may demonstrate a stronger relationship with health than SES because it transcends access to material goods and resources to capture class standing, tapping into perceptions of social rank and the experience of societal inequalities and inequities (Adler et al., 2000; Franzini & Fernandez-Esquer, 2006). These factors are determinants of SSS that may be particularly relevant to the racial/ethnic minority experience, as racial/ethnic minorities have faced the preponderance of inequalities and inequities in the United States (U.S.) both historically and in the present day. Thus, the association of SES with SSS may be attenuated among racial/ethnic minorities as compared to non-Latino whites, for whom these experiences may be less relevant (Adler et al., 2008). Research supports this supposition. Objective indicators of SES are more strongly associated with SSS among whites than among blacks (Adler et al., 2008; Ostrove et al., 2000), and the same might be the case among Latinos, at least in the case of education and possibly income among pregnant Latino women (Ostrove et al., 2000). These attenuated associations between SES and SSS suggest that there may be several other variables important in determining SSS among racial/ethnic minority populations. However, as racial/ethnic minority groups have distinct histories and experiences that may shape their social standing, the additional determinants of SSS are best explored within single racial/ethnic groups (Ostrove et al., 2000). The purpose of current

study was to explore culturally-relevant, multilevel determinants of SSS among a sample of Spanish-speaking Latino smokers.

Latinos are a diverse and growing population. Currently, Latinos currently comprise over 14% of the U.S population and are the largest and fastest growing minority group (Bernstein, 2006), largely due to sustained immigration patterns from the 1960's onward. Following their arrival in the U.S., Latino immigrants undergo the process of acculturation, which is the adoption of the behaviors, attitudes, beliefs, and values of mainstream society (Abraido-Lanza, Armbrister, Florez, & Aguirre, 2006; Abraido-Lanza, Chao, & Florez, 2005; Bethel & Schenker, 2005; Cuellar, Arnois, & Maldonado, 1995). In general, increased time in the U.S. is associated with increases in acculturation. Greater acculturation, in turn, has been associated with higher SSS (Franzini & Fernandez-Esquer, 2006). Although previous literature has attributed the association between high acculturation and high SSS to the higher SES of more acculturated Latinos (Franzini & Fernandez-Esquer, 2006), it is possible that acculturation affects SSS by other means as well. For example, increased facility with the English language (a proxy for greater acculturation) could lead to higher SSS by increasing status within the Latino community or by enhancing social integration with the majority group. These acculturation-related changes may precede gains in SES, especially among first-generation immigrants. Thus, among Latinos, individual-level acculturation may be a culturally-relevant variable that is correlated with, but also functions independently of, objective SES indicators in the determination of SSS.

Similar to acculturation, the spatial assimilation of Latinos into the broader U.S. population may also affect SSS. Research indicates that newly immigrated Latinos tend to settle in "immigrant enclaves," which are neighborhoods with a high proportion of immigrants, non-English speakers, and individuals of lower socioeconomic resources (Logan, Alba, & Zhang, 2002). This segregation generally persists until residential mobility to more racially/ethnically diverse and higher SES neighborhoods can be achieved, often with an increase in individual-level acculturation and financial independence that occurs over time (Logan et al., 2002). This classical assimilation pattern has been supported for various groups of Latinos, including Mexicans, Cubans, and Dominicans (Logan et al., 2002). Because residence in more "acculturated" (e.g., more non-Latino white) and higher SES neighborhoods are valued and may increase access to societal amenities, Latinos who have achieved residential mobility may rank themselves higher in social standing than those who remain in enclaves, even after adjusting for the influence of individual-level acculturation and SES on SSS. On the other hand, perhaps the social capital, social networking, and social inclusion afforded by immigrant enclaves lends itself to higher perceptions of social standing than would be found in more acculturated but less cohesive neighborhoods, where Latinos may feel isolated from or by their neighbors (Portes & Rumbaut, 2006). Thus, neighborhood characteristics might function as culturally-relevant determinants of SSS that co-vary with individual-level variables, but contribute unique variance to perceptions of social standing among Latinos.

Previous studies on the determinants of SSS among Latinos have investigated individual-level socioeconomic (Adler et al., 2008; Franzini & Fernandez-Esquer, 2006; Ostrove et al., 2000), acculturative, and sociocultural predictors (Franzini & Fernandez-Esquer, 2006), but

none have examined the influence of neighborhood level characteristics, or focused exclusively on a largely immigrant population of Spanish-speaking Latinos. The goal of the current study was to examine determinants of SSS among (largely) immigrant Spanish-speaking Latinos smokers, with an emphasis on acculturative and socioeconomic variables measured at both the individual-and neighborhood-levels. This study is responsive to the call for research to examine the heterogeneity within immigrant groups with a multilevel framework in order to advance health disparities research (Kilbourne, Switzer, Hyman, Crowley-Matoka, & Fine, 2006; Takeuchi, Alegria, Jackson, & Williams, 2007).

Methods

Procedures

Data were from *Adiós al Fumar*, a randomized clinical trial evaluating the efficacy of a culturally sensitive smoking cessation program targeted at Spanish-speaking Latino smokers (Wetter, Mazas, Daza, Nguyen, Fouladi, Li et al., 2007). Details of the study are reported elsewhere (Reitzel, Costello, Mazas, Vidrine, Businelle, Kendzor et al., 2009; Wetter et al., 2007). The study was approved by the IRB at M. D. Anderson Cancer Center, and all appropriate ethical codes were adhered to in the conduct of this research, including those of the American Psychological Association and the Public Health Code of Ethics.

Participants

Participants were 297 self-identified Spanish-speaking Latino smokers residing in Texas who called the National Cancer Institute's Cancer Information Service (1-800-4-CANCER) to request Spanish-language smoking cessation assistance. Participants were recruited from several locations in Texas (e.g., Houston, San Antonio, El Paso, and the Rio Grande Valley) via paid media (television, radio, newspaper, and direct mailings). Participants were enrolled from August 2002 to March 2004. There was an 84% participation rate among the 355 callers who expressed an interest in the study, with non-enrollment reasons including no interest ($n = 28$), ineligibility ($n = 3$), inability to contact for enrollment ($n = 19$), and incomplete data ($n = 8$). All participants completed a verbal, audiotaped informed consent.

Procedures and Measures

All data were collected via the telephone prior to quitting smoking and receiving cessation treatment.

Demographic Variables—Demographics included age, gender, marital status, annual household income, employment status, educational achievement, and ethnic heritage. Several variables were dichotomized: marital status (married vs. not married), annual household income ($\leq \$20,000$ vs. $> \$20,000$), and employment status (employed vs. unemployed). Educational attainment was an ordinal variable (< 12 years, 12–15 years, 16 years). Ethnic heritage was dichotomized (Mexican vs. other). “Other” ethnicities, including Cuban, Puerto Rican, South American, Central American, and Spaniard, were collapsed due to small cell representation.

Acculturation Variables—Individual-level acculturation variables included immigrant status, language spoken at home and work, and language for television viewing. All variables were dichotomized: immigrant vs. U.S. born, speaks only Spanish at home vs. English-only or bilingual, speaks only Spanish at work vs. English-only or bilingual, and watches television in Spanish only vs. English-only or bilingual. The use of language variables as proxies for acculturation has precedence in prior research (Bethel & Schenker, 2005; Cunradi, 2009; Franzini & Fernandez-Esquer, 2004, 2006; Logan et al., 2002).

Neighborhood-level Characteristics—Neighborhood data were procured from the 2000 U.S. Census and based on U.S. Census tracts, which have been supported as a suitable neighborhood proxy (Krieger, Chen, Waterman, Rehkopf, & Subramanian, 2003). Neighborhood-level acculturation characteristics included the proportion of residents who were: Latino or Hispanic (hereafter referred to as Latino for consistency), non-Latino white, English-only speakers, and foreign-born. Neighborhood-level SES characteristics included median household income and the proportion of residents who were: unemployed, with less than a high school degree (i.e., undereducated), and living below the poverty level.

Subjective Social Status—SSS was measured with the MacArthur Scale of Subjective Social Status (Adler, 2000). The SES ladder version of the scale was used, which presents a 10-rung ladder to represent where people stand in society, with higher rungs indicating higher status (i.e., more money, more education, and better jobs) (Adler, 2000). Participants are asked to select the rung that best represents where they think they stand relative to others in society, resulting in a ranked indicator variable with 10 possible levels. This scale has demonstrated reliability and validity among various racial/ethnic groups and in various geographic locations (Adler et al., 2000; Goodman, Adler, Kawachi, Frazier, Huang, & Colditz, 2001; Ostrove et al., 2000).

Statistical Analyses

Relationships between demographics, acculturation variables, and neighborhood characteristics were examined with Pearson, Phi, and Spearman's correlation coefficients. Linear regression models were used to explore the determinants of SSS among Spanish-speaking Latino smokers in various iterations. In Model 1, a series of unadjusted analyses were conducted to examine the independent association of each demographic, acculturative, and neighborhood variable with SSS. Model 2 explored the relation of each demographic variable on SSS while controlling for all other demographic variables. Model 3 examined the effect of each acculturation variable on SSS while controlling for all demographic variables. Model 4 examined the influence of each neighborhood characteristic on SSS while controlling for all demographics, and Model 5 addressed these effects while also controlling for all individual-level acculturation variables. Finally, Model 6 included demographic variables, acculturation variables, and neighborhood characteristics in a single model predicting SSS. Multi-level analysis was unnecessary for these data due to independence of observations (i.e., insufficient clustering, ICC = .006) (Cohen, Cohen, West, & Aiken, 2003). All statistical analyses were performed using SPSS (version 16.0).

Results

Participant characteristics are shown in Table 1. The sample was comprised largely of low SES, immigrant Latinos of Mexican heritage. SSS scores ranged from 1 to 10, with a mean of 4.33 and a standard deviation of 1.91 (not shown in Table). Correlations between selected demographics, acculturation variables, and neighborhood characteristics are shown in Table 2. Among demographic variables, ethnicity, income, and educational achievement were associated with the predictors. Specifically, individuals of Mexican heritage were more likely to reside in neighborhoods with more Latinos, fewer non-Latino whites, fewer English-only speakers, more undereducated, more unemployed, more people living below poverty, and a lower median income. Lower household income was associated with speaking only Spanish at home, watching Spanish-only television, and residence in a neighborhood with more Latinos, fewer English-only speakers, more foreign-born, more unemployed, more undereducated, more people living below poverty, and a lower median income. Lower educational achievement was associated with speaking only Spanish at home and work, watching Spanish-only television, and residence in a neighborhood with more Latinos, fewer non-Latino whites, fewer English-only speakers, more unemployed, more undereducated, more people living below poverty, and a lower median income. Age, gender, marital status and employment status were not significantly related to acculturation variables or neighborhood characteristics (results not shown).

Among predictor variables, watching Spanish-only television was associated with residence in neighborhoods with more unemployment and lower median income. Speaking Spanish-only at work was associated with living in neighborhoods with fewer non-Latino whites, more unemployed, more undereducated, more poverty, and lower median income. Individual-level acculturation variables (with the exception of immigrant status) demonstrated modest intercorrelations, and neighborhood characteristic variables demonstrated high intercorrelations (Table 2).

The relations between demographic, acculturative, and neighborhood predictors and SSS are shown in Table 3. In unadjusted analyses, lower SSS was significantly associated with less income, less education, watching Spanish-only television, speaking only Spanish at home and work; and living in neighborhoods with more Latinos, fewer non-Latino whites, fewer English-only speakers, more foreign-born, more undereducated, more unemployment, more poverty, and lower median household income, respectively. In analyses adjusting for all other demographic variables aside from the one being examined, only low income and low education predicted lower SSS. After adjusting for all demographics (age, gender, ethnic heritage, marital status, yearly household income, education, and employment status), low SSS remained significantly associated with speaking Spanish only at home and work, and residence in neighborhoods with more undereducated, more poverty, and lower median income. However, after adjusting for both demographic variables and acculturation variables, the effects of neighborhood characteristics disappeared. Finally, education, income, and language spoken at home remained significant predictors of SSS in a single model that included demographics, acculturation variables, and neighborhood characteristics ($p = .04$ for overall model). Results suggest that effects of the neighborhood characteristics

found in the previous analysis were fully accounted for by the effects of acculturation variables on SSS.

Discussion

Little is known about culturally-relevant, multilevel predictors of low SSS among low SES minority populations. In this sample of low SES, Spanish-speaking, immigrant Latino smokers, low acculturation and greater neighborhood-level economic disadvantage, respectively, were associated with low SSS even after controlling for demographics that included income, education, and employment status. Thus, despite the statistically significant correlations between individual- and neighborhood-level SES, socioeconomic characteristics of the neighborhood still contributed unique variance to the determination of SSS among Latinos. However, in a full model that included both individual and neighborhood characteristics, only individual-level income, education, and acculturation remained associated with SSS. Specifically, Latinos with less income, less education, and who spoke only Spanish at home perceived themselves as lower in social status than their higher income, higher educated, English-only or bilingual counterparts.

This study was cross-sectional in nature and lacked the ability to examine causal pathways for associations between low acculturation and low SSS. However, a potential mechanism underlying this relationship is the emotional, social, and economic challenges faced by less acculturated Latinos, who have increased difficulty communicating and navigating within the larger U.S. society (Logan et al., 2002; Portes & Rumbaut, 2006). As acculturation increases with time in the U.S., communication and integration with the majority society would be expected to improve, as would SSS. This effect would be similar to longitudinal patterns seen with objective SES indicators among Latinos (Logan et al., 2002), and those suggested by cross-sectional studies of SSS among Latino groups that varied in level of acculturation (Franzini & Fernandez-Esquer, 2006). On the other hand, alternative mechanisms for associations between acculturation and SSS might be considered in light of reverse causation: perhaps lower SSS inhibits the opportunity to become more acculturated. In this case, unemployment, older age, and a lack of financial resources may underlie this relationship. Longitudinal studies of acculturation and SSS may help to inform the true nature of this association and its underlying mechanisms. It is worthy of notation that the current sample was largely (94%) comprised of immigrants with limited time in the U.S. As such, the association between acculturation and SSS may have been particularly salient for these participants. Future research might explore whether time in the U.S. functions as a moderator of the relationship between acculturation and SSS among Latinos.

Our results differed from Franzini and Fernandez-Esquer's (2006) results in which acculturation did not predict SSS after adjusting for SES. However, our sample was comprised of Spanish-speaking Latino immigrants, a subgroup among whom the effects of SES on SSS were the smallest in the Franzini and Fernandez Esquer (2006) study, perhaps due to a restriction in range on SES variables. Thus, acculturation might play a larger role in predicting SSS among our participants than among a more diverse sample of Latinos. Additionally, Franzini and Fernandez Esquer's (2006) language variable encompassed Spanish only and mostly Spanish speakers, whereas the present study considered the latter

group as falling within the “bilingual” category. These differences may have contributed to disparate findings.

This study allowed insight into interrelationships between individual- and neighborhood-level acculturative and socioeconomic characteristics among Latinos. According to the spatial assimilation model, less acculturated and lower SES Latinos would be expected to live in immigrant enclaves, marked by low neighborhood-level acculturation and SES, whereas more acculturated and higher SES immigrants would live in racially/ethnically and socioeconomically diverse neighborhoods (Logan et al., 2002). Moreover, this pattern might be more prevalent among Latinos of certain heritages (e.g., Mexicans versus Puerto Ricans; South, Crowder, & Chavez, 2005). In this study, low individual-level SES and Mexican ethnicity were almost consistently associated with residence in neighborhoods that might be characterized as immigrant enclaves. Unexpectedly, individual-level acculturation did not appear to be highly associated with neighborhood-level acculturation (with the exception of language at work and the proportion of non-Latino whites in the neighborhood). Associations between individual-level acculturation and neighborhood-level SES, however, were more in line with expectations. Among immigrants living in ethnic enclaves, increased acculturation may precede increased SES. In our sample, the lack of association between acculturation at the individual and neighborhood levels might be attributable to acculturated participants not having enough time in the U.S. to build the SES necessary to achieve residential mobility. This is in line with research suggesting that residential mobility may be less likely for first- than second-generation Latinos (South et al., 2005).

To our knowledge, no prior studies have investigated the influence of neighborhood characteristics on SSS. Results from the present investigation indicate that economic deprivation in the neighborhood can contribute to low SSS among Latinos, independent of individual-level SES. This result is not surprising given the association of neighborhood economic deprivation with crime, reduced social capital, and deficits in the built environment that might impact perceived social standing. However, this effect appeared largely attributable to the effects of acculturation on SSS. The likely reason for this result is the density of less acculturated immigrant Latinos in economically disadvantaged neighborhoods. However, the possibility of residual confounding by individual-level variables is also a consideration. For example, the measurement of individual-level income in this study might have been improved by accounting for remittances sent to non-U.S. relatives. Likewise, our SES indicators might have included the measurement of wealth. Future studies might benefit from improving the measurement on both individual and neighborhood variables. For example, the assessment of subjective perceptions of the neighborhood or systematic social observations of neighborhood deprivation might have reduced the measurement error associated with the use of Census-based neighborhood variables. Also, although the use of language proxies for the estimation of individual-level acculturation is common in research with Latinos (Bethel & Schenker, 2005; Cunradi, 2009; Franzini & Fernandez-Esquer, 2004, 2006; Logan et al., 2002), the measurement of acculturation might have been improved with the addition of a more sophisticated and precise acculturation instrument.

The present study improved upon prior research on SSS determinants by expanding the examination of acculturation to include neighborhood-level proxies (e.g., proportion of Latinos, non-Latino whites, English-only speakers, and foreign-born residents). Although neighborhood-level acculturation variables predicted SSS in the unadjusted analyses, they were no longer significant predictors after controlling for demographics (including SES). Thus, socioeconomic variables appeared to demonstrate stronger associations with SSS than neighborhood acculturation variables in our sample. Future studies may improve upon our methodology to further explore the relationship between neighborhood-level acculturation and SSS. This might include consideration of demographic characteristics of the recruitment areas (e.g., population density; Logan et al., 2002; South et al., 2005), as well as the impact of time in the U.S. on associations between neighborhood-level acculturation and SSS. Additionally, investigating neighborhood characteristics at the block group rather than the tract level may have been more representative of actual neighborhood conditions.

External validity to the broader Latino population might be limited by this study's focus on treatment-seeking Spanish-speaking Latino smokers, who may differ from non-treatment seeking smokers, from Latinos who would prefer English language cessation counseling, or from non-smokers in important ways. Moreover, the overrepresentation of female Latino smokers in the sample might affect the generalizability of results to the broader population of Latinas. Additional study limitations include the restriction of range in SES within the sample, which may have limited our results.

Latinos are a growing, but understudied population at risk for the development of health disparities – about which little is known. The goal of the current study was to examine multilevel predictors of SSS among Spanish-speaking Latino smokers, with an emphasis on acculturative and socioeconomic variables. To the best of our knowledge, this study is the first to examine neighborhood characteristics in the determination of SSS among a largely Latino immigrant sample. Results indicated the importance of individual-level acculturation on SSS by demonstrating a robust association of less acculturation with low social standing. Neighborhood characteristics also predicted SSS in this population. However, findings suggested that the effects of neighborhoods were largely accounted for by individual-level factors such as acculturation, income, and education.

Acknowledgments

This research was supported by grants from the Minority Health Research and Education Program of the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (K01DP001120). We would like to acknowledge the National Cancer Institute's Cancer Information Service for their contributions to the original research project, *Adiós al Fumar*, from which our data were derived. Additionally, the authors would like to thank Drs. Ellen Cromley, Luisa Franzini, and Maria Fernandez-Esquer for their mentoring contributions to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention award (K01DP001120) that supported this work. Authors would also like to express great appreciation for the thoughtful comments of anonymous reviewers in response to an earlier version of this manuscript.

References

- Abraido-Lanza AF, Armbrister AN, Florez KR, Aguirre AN. Toward a theory-driven model of acculturation in public health research. *Am J Public Health*. 2006; 96(8):1342–1346. [PubMed: 16809597]

- Abraido-Lanza AF, Chao MT, Florez KR. Do healthy behaviors decline with greater acculturation?: Implications for the Latino mortality paradox. *Soc Sci Med.* 2005; 61:1243–1255. [PubMed: 15970234]
- Adler N. Social Status Ladder. John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Research Network on Socioeconomic Status and Health; 2000. Available from: <http://www.macses.ucsf.edu/Research/Psychosocial/notebook/subjective.html>
- Adler N, Singh-Manoux A, Schwartz J, Stewart J, Matthews K, Marmot MG. Social status and health: a comparison of British civil servants in Whitehall-II with European- and African-Americans in CARDIA. *Soc Sci Med.* 2008; 66(5):1034–1045. [PubMed: 18180089]
- Adler NE, Epel ES, Castellazzo G, Ickovics JR. Relationship of subjective and objective social status with psychological and physiological functioning: Preliminary data in healthy white women. *Health Psych.* 2000; 19(6):586–592.
- Bernstein R. Nation's Population One-Third Minority. 2006
- Bethel JW, Schenker MB. Acculturation and smoking patterns among Hispanics: A review. *Am J Prev Med.* 2005; 29(143–148)
- Chen E, Paterson LQ. Neighborhood, family, and subjective socioeconomic status; How do they restate to adolescent health? *Health Psych.* 2006; 25:704–714.
- Cohen S, Alper CM, Doyle WJ, Adler NA, Treanor JJ, Turner RB. Objective and subjective socioeconomic status and susceptibility to the common cold. *Health Psych.* 2008; 27:268–274.
- Cohen, J.; Cohen, P.; West, SG.; Aiken, LS. Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences. 3rd. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum; 2003.
- Cohen S, Doyle WJ, Baum A. Socioeconomic status is associated with stress hormones. *Psychosom Med.* 2006; 68(3):414–420. [PubMed: 16738073]
- Cuellar I, Arnois B, Maldonado R. Acculturation rating scale for Mexican-Americans: A revision of the original ARSMA scale. *J Hisp Beh Sci.* 1995; 17:275–304.
- Cunradi CB. Intimate partner violence among Hispanic men and women: the role of drinking, neighborhood disorder, and acculturation-related factors. *Violence Vict.* 2009; 24(1):83–97. [PubMed: 19297887]
- Demakakos P, Nazroo J, Breeze E, Marmot M. Socioeconomic status and health: the role of subjective social status. *Soc Sci Med.* 2008; 67(2):330–340. [PubMed: 18440111]
- Franzini L, Fernandez-Esquer ME. Socioeconomic, cultural, and personal influences on health outcomes in low income Mexican-origin individuals in Texas. *Soc Sci Med.* 2004; 59(8):1629–1646. [PubMed: 15279921]
- Franzini L, Fernandez-Esquer ME. The association of subjective social status and health in low-income Mexican-origin individuals in Texas. *Soc Sci Med.* 2006; 63(3):788–804. [PubMed: 16580107]
- Ghaed SG, Gallo LC. Subjective social status, objective socioeconomic status, and cardiovascular risk in women. *Health Psychol.* 2007; 26(6):668–674. [PubMed: 18020837]
- Gianaros PJ, Horenstein JA, Choen S, Matthews KA, Brown SM, Flory JD, Critchley HD, Manuck SB, Hariri AR. Perigenual anterior cingulate morphology covaries with perceived social standing. *Soc Cogn Affect Neurosci.* 2007; 2:161–173. [PubMed: 18418472]
- Goodman E, Adler NE, Kawachi I, Frazier AL, Huang B, Colditz GA. Adolescents' perceptions of social status: development and evaluation of a new indicator. *Pediatrics.* 2001; 108(2):E31. [PubMed: 11483841]
- Hu P, Adler NE, Goldman N, Weinstein M, Seeman TE. Relationship between subjective social status and measures of health in older Taiwanese persons. *J Am Geriatr Soc.* 2005; 53(3):483–488. [PubMed: 15743294]
- Kilbourne AM, Switzer G, Hyman K, Crowley-Matoka M, Fine MJ. Advancing health disparities research within the health care system: a conceptual framework. *Am J Public Health.* 2006; 96(12):2113–2121. [PubMed: 17077411]
- Krieger N, Chen JT, Waterman PD, Rehkopf DH, Subramanian SV. Race/ethnicity, gender, and monitoring socioeconomic gradients in health: a comparison of area-based socioeconomic measures--the public health disparities geocoding project. *Am J Public Health.* 2003; 93(10):1655–1671. [PubMed: 14534218]

- Logan JR, Alba RD, Zhang W. Immigrant enclaves and ethnic communities in New York and Los Angeles. *Am Soc Rev*. 2002; 67:299–322.
- Mendelson T, Thurston RC, Kubzansky LD. Affective and cardiovascular effects of experimentally-induced social status. *Health Psych*. 2008; 27(4):482–489.
- Ostrove JM, Adler NE, Kuppermann M, Washington AE. Objective and subjective assessments of socioeconomic status and their relationship to self-rated health in an ethnically diverse sample of pregnant women. *Health Psych*. 2000; 19(6):613–618.
- Portes, A.; Rumbaut, RG. *Immigrant America: A portrait*. Berkeley: University of California Press; 2006.
- Reitzel LR, Costello TJ, Mazas CA, Vidrine JI, Businelle MS, Kendzor DE, et al. Low-level smoking among Spanish-speaking Latino smokers: Relationships with demographics, tobacco dependence, withdrawal, and cessation. *Nicotine Tob Res*. 2009; 11(2):178–184. [PubMed: 19246627]
- Reitzel LR, Mazas CA, Cofta-Woerpel L, Li Y, Cao Y, Businelle MS, Cinciripini PM, Wetter DW. Subjective Social Status affects smoking abstinence during acute withdrawal through affective mediators. *Addiction*. 2009 revise/resubmit.
- Reitzel LR, Vidrine JI, Li Y, Mullen PD, Velasquez MM, Cinciripini PM, et al. The influence of subjective social status on vulnerability to postpartum smoking among young pregnant women. *Am J Public Health*. 2007; 97(8):1476–1482. [PubMed: 17600249]
- Singh-Manoux A, Adler NE, Marmot MG. Subjective social status: its determinants and its association with measures of ill-health in the Whitehall II study. *Soc Sci Med*. 2003; 56(6):1321–1333. [PubMed: 12600368]
- Singh-Manoux A, Marmot MG, Adler NE. Does subjective social status predict health and change in health status better than objective status? *Psychosom Med*. 2005; 67(6):855–861. [PubMed: 16314589]
- South SJ, Crowder K, Chavez E. Migration and spatial assimilation among U.S. Latinos: classical versus segmented trajectories. *Demography*. 2005; 42(3):497–521. [PubMed: 16235610]
- Takeuchi DT, Alegria M, Jackson JS, Williams DR. Immigration and mental health: diverse findings in Asian, black, and Latino populations. *Am J Public Health*. 2007; 97(1):11–12. [PubMed: 17138903]
- Wetter DW, Mazas C, Daza P, Nguyen L, Fouladi RT, Li Y, et al. Reaching and treating Spanish-speaking smokers through the National Cancer Institute's Cancer Information Service. A randomized controlled trial. *Cancer*. 2007; 109(2 Suppl):406–413. [PubMed: 17149758]
- Wright CE, Steptoe A. Subjective socioeconomic position, gender and cortisol responses to waking in an elderly population. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*. 2005; 30(6):582–590. [PubMed: 15808928]

Table 1

Participants' Demographics and Predictors of Subjective Social Status

		N = 297	Social Status Score
Demographic and Predictor Variables		% or M (SD), range	Unadjusted
Demographics			M(SD)
Age		41.15 (11.40)	
Gender	Female	45%	4.32 (2.00)
	Male	55%	4.34 (1.84)
Ethnic heritage	Other	33%	4.28 (2.10)
	Mexican	67%	4.35 (1.82)
Marital Status	Not married	68%	4.20 (2.09)
	Married	32%	4.39 (1.83)
Yearly household income	\$20,000	45%	4.95 (1.74)
	< \$20,000	55%	3.85 (1.87)
Education	< 12 years	50%	3.83 (1.67)
	12–15 years	38%	4.83 (2.01)
	16 years	12%	4.83 (2.04)
Employment status	Not employed	27%	4.34 (2.04)
	Employed	73%	4.34 (1.85)
Acculturation Variables			
Immigration status	U.S.-born	6%	4.94 (2.18)
	Immigrant	94%	4.29 (1.90)
TV language	English only/Bilingual	63%	4.51 (1.90)
	Spanish only	37%	4.02 (1.91)
Home language	English only/Bilingual	38%	4.80 (1.92)
	Spanish only	62%	4.04 (1.85)
Work language	English only/Bilingual	71%	4.54 (1.92)
	Spanish only	29%	3.65 (1.54)
Neighborhood Characteristics			
Proportion of Latinos		0.51 (.27), range = .05 – 1.00	.
Proportion of non-Latino whites		0.30 (.23), range = 0 – .91	.
Proportion speaking English-only		0.48 (.23), range = .02 – .95	.
Proportion foreign-born		0.29 (.15), range = .02 – .67	.
Proportion unemployed		0.37 (.10), range = .16 – .68	.
Proportion with < high school education		0.36 (.20), range = .12 – .82	.
Proportion living below poverty		0.18 (.11), range = .01 – .73	.
Median household income/1000		\$36.7K (\$14.6K), range = \$9 - \$101.1K	.

Table 2
Correlations between Selected Demographics, Acculturation Variables, and Neighborhood Characteristics

	Demographics			Acculturation Variables				Neighborhood Characteristics							
	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Demographics															
1. Ethnicity (REF= Mexican)	1														
2. Household income (REF = <20K)	0.01	1													
3. Education (REF= <12 years)	0.19 *	0.14	1												
Acculturation Variables															
1. Immigration status (REF = immigrant)	-0.03	0.09	0.04	1											
2. TV Language (REF = Spanish only)	0.08	0.13 *	0.26 **	0.08	1										
3. Home language (REF = Spanish only)	0.06	0.19 **	0.12 *	0.15 *	0.30 **	1									
4. Work language (REF = Spanish only)	0.04	0.07	0.31 **	0.08	0.43 **	0.27 **	1								
Neighborhood Characteristics															
1. Proportion of Latinos	-0.25 **	-0.15 *	-0.18 *	-0.07	-0.06	0.06	-0.11	1							
2. Proportion of non-Latino whites	0.17 *	0.11	0.12 *	0.11	0.09	-0.04	0.14 *	-0.74 **	1						
3. Proportion of English-only speakers	0.16 *	0.14 *	0.15 *	0.08	0.06	-0.05	0.10	-0.94 **	0.77 **	1					
4. Proportion of foreign-born	0.03	-0.15 *	-0.08	-0.09	-0.07	-0.04	-0.04	0.55 **	-0.56 **	-0.75 **	1				
5. Proportion of unemployed	-0.32 **	-0.14 *	-0.20 **	-0.09	-0.16 *	0.03	-0.21 *	0.69 **	-0.64 **	-0.60 **	0.27 **	1			
6. Proportion with < high school education	-0.23 **	-0.20 **	-0.24 **	-0.10	-0.12	-0.05	-0.20 *	0.81 **	-0.77 **	-0.76 **	0.60 **	0.78 **	1		
7. Proportion living below poverty	-0.25 **	-0.19 *	-0.14 *	-0.10	-0.10	0.01	-0.22 *	0.68 **	-0.74 **	-0.66 **	0.48 **	0.77 **	0.84 **	1	

	Demographics			Acculturation Variables				Neighborhood Characteristics							
	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
8. Median household income	0.18 *	0.18 *	0.15 *	0.07	0.14 *	-0.02	0.18 *	-0.65 **	0.75 **	0.64 **	-0.48 **	-0.67 **	-0.76 **	-0.82 **	1

Note: Pearson coefficients are reported for continuous variables, Phi coefficients for dichotomous variables, and Spearman's coefficients for correlations involving the ordinal variable (education). REF = reference group.

** Denotes significance at the p 0.001 level.

* Denotes significance at the p 0.05 level.

Table 3

Relations of Demographics and Predictors with Subjective Social Status (SSS).

Demographic and Predictor Variables	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5		Model 6	
	Unstandardized	$\beta(SE)$	Unstandardized	$\beta(SE)$	Unstandardized	$\beta(SE)$	Unstandardized	$\beta(SE)$	Unstandardized	$\beta(SE)$	Unstandardized	$\beta(SE)$
Demographics												
Age	0.01(.01)		0.01(.01)		.		.		.		-0.01(.01)	
Gender												
Female	-0.01(.22)		-0.10(.22)		.		.		.		-0.25(.28)	
Male	REF		REF		.		.		.		REF	
Ethnic heritage												
Other	-0.07(.24)		-0.26(.23)		.		.		.		-0.51(.30)	
Mexican	REF		REF		.		.		.		REF	
Marital status												
Not married	0.19(.24)		-0.09(.24)		.		.		.		-0.05(.28)	
Married	REF		REF		.		.		.		REF	
Yearly household income												
me \$20,000	1.10(.21)**		0.98(.23)**		.		.		.		0.59(.28)*	
< \$20,000	REF		REF		.		.		.		REF	
Education												
	0.65(.16)**		0.59(.16)**		.		.		.		0.51(.20)*	
Employment status												
Not employed	<.01(.25)		0.24(.26)		.		.		.		-0.89(.66)	
Employed	REF		REF		.		.		.		REF	
Acculturation Variables												
Immigration status												
U.S.-born	0.65(.47)		.		0.69(.46)		.		.		0.86(.60)	
Immigrant	REF		.		REF		.		.		REF	
TV language												
English only/Bilingual	0.49(.23)*		.		0.19(.23)		.		.		-0.13(.31)	
Spanish only	REF		.		REF		.		.		REF	
Home language												
English only/Bilingual	0.76(.22)**		.		0.51(.22)*		.		.		0.65(.29)*	
Spanish only	REF		.		REF		.		.		REF	
Work language												
English only/Bilingual	0.89(.27)**				0.56(.27)*						0.32(.33)	
Spanish only	REF				REF						REF	
Neighborhood Characteristics												
Proportion of Latinos												
	-1.02(.43)*				-0.48(.44)				-0.16(.50)		-0.50(2.41)	

Demographic and Predictor Variables	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6
	Unstandardized β (SE)	Unstandardized β (SE)	Unstandardized β (SE)	Unstandardized β (SE)	Unstandardized β (SE)	Unstandardized β (SE)
Proportion of non-Latino whites	1.53(.49) [*]			0.93(.50)	0.59(.57)	0.30(1.11)
Proportion speaking English-only	1.10(.51) [*]			0.46(.51)	0.08(.57)	-2.23(3.27)
Proportion foreign-born	-1.73(.77) [*]			-0.81(.77)	-0.37(.84)	-0.71(2.39)
Proportion unemployed	-2.87(1.16) [*]			-1.72(1.22)	-1.32(1.46)	0.36(2.42)
Proportion with < high school education	-2.26(.57) ^{**}			-1.28(.60) [*]	-0.94(.70)	-1.01(2.18)
Proportion living below poverty	-3.65(1.06) ^{**}			-2.32(1.14) [*]	-2.20(1.39)	-1.89(3.27)
Median household income/1000	0.03(.01) ^{**}			0.02(.01) [*]	0.01(.01)	<.01(.02)

Note: Table values represent relevant coefficients for variables of interest in linear regression analyses predicting Subjective Social Status (SSS). Model 1: Results of unadjusted univariate analyses predicting SSS. Model 2: Results for the effect of each demographic variable on SSS, while adjusting for other demographic variables. Model 3: Results for the effect of each individual-level acculturative variable on SSS, while adjusting for demographic variables. Model 4: Results for the effect of each neighborhood characteristic on SSS, while adjusting for demographic variables. Model 5: Results for the effect of each neighborhood characteristic on SSS, while adjusting for demographic variables and individual-level acculturation variables. Model 6: Results from a single model predicting SSS including demographics, individual-level acculturation variables and neighborhood characteristics. REF = Reference group.

^{**} Denotes significance at the p = 0.001 level.

^{*} Denotes significance at the p = 0.05 level.