Published in final edited form as:

J Int Migr Integr. 2016 November ; 17(4): 1049–1063. doi:10.1007/s12134-015-0449-6.

A Longitudinal Study of Cultural Adaptation among Mexican and Dominican Immigrant Women

Esther J. Calzada¹, Keng-Yen Huang, Maite Covas, Denise Ramirez, and Laurie Miller Brotman

New York University School of Medicine Child Study Center

Abstract

The present longitudinal study examined cultural adaptation (i.e., acculturation and enculturation) and its correlates in a sample of 189 Mexican and Dominican immigrant women. Acculturation and enculturation were measured within the domains of language competence, identity and cultural knowledge at two time points over a one-year period. Across groups and domains, cultural adaptation was generally stable over time; only American cultural knowledge showed change, and only for MA women. Several correlates of cultural adaptation were identified. For Mexican women, living in poverty and in immigrant-dense neighborhoods was associated with lower acculturation. For Dominican women, age at immigration was the most robust correlate and was associated with more acculturation and less enculturation, though poverty and neighborhood characteristics emerged as significant for Dominican women too. Findings are consistent with the notion of cultural adaptation as a complex construct that is influenced by cultural context as well as individual immigrant characteristics.

Keywords

acculturation; enculturation; Latino population; immigrant women

With the exponential growth of the Latino population in the United States (US; U.S. census Bureau, 2011), the need to understand the process of participation in US mainstream culture (known as *acculturation*), and the parallel process of maintenance of one's culture of origin (known as *enculturation*), has become increasingly clear, particularly in light of well established links between acculturation and physical and mental health outcomes among immigrant populations. For the most part, little is known about the correlates of these processes, collectively referred to as *cultural adaptation*. Moreover, understanding has relied on cross-sectional studies that reinforce a static view of acculturation and enculturation. Guided by current theory and using a longitudinal design, the present study examined the cultural adaptation of Latina women, first by considering change across domains of acculturation and enculturation and second by exploring their associations with a number of theoretically-linked correlates.

¹Corresponding author. Now at the University of Texas at Austin, School of Social Work, 1925 San Jacinto Blvd, D3500, Austin, TX 78712. Esther.calzada@nyumc.org.

Cultural Adaptation Theory

Historically, acculturation was viewed as a unidimensional phenomenon that ranged from initial contact between two groups, accommodation of the non-dominant group, and eventual assimilation into the dominant culture. The underlying assumption was that minority group members should be motivated to lose their identity during the process of acculturation for the sake of minimizing intergroup conflict (LaFromboise, Coleman, & Gerton, 1993). According to this *classic assimilation theory*, the process of conforming to majority culture was a simple matter of time (Gordon, 1961). In recognition of the role played by the receiving society, this theory was later modified to emphasize that assimilation is best achieved when minority and majority groups converge in mutual acceptance (Alba & Nee, 2003).

Some scholars, however, dispute the likelihood of mutual acceptance, arguing instead that minority status confers disadvantage that is likely to disrupt the acculturation process (Portes, Fernández-Kelly, & Haller, 2005). In the *segmented assimilation model* (Portes & Min Zhou, 1993; Portes, 2007), the acculturation process is influenced by the ways in which individual immigrant characteristics (e.g., country of origin, socioeconomic status) interact with characteristics of the receiving society (e.g., discrimination) to determine receptivity of the immigrant group (Brown & Bean, 2006; Portes & Min Zhou, 1993). This model recognizes that because of discrimination and poverty, many immigrant groups settle and assimilate into segmented, marginalized societies (Portes & Rumbaut, 2006).

Further building on the notion that acculturation may not follow a linear path, the *four-fold model* considers cultural adaptation as a developmental and interactive process that may result in change in cognition, affect and behavior on both an individual and group level for both the receiving and the immigrating society of persons (Berry, 2003). At the individual level, immigrants adopt a cultural adaptation strategy that reflects simultaneous movement along two independent dimensions (Berry, 1997): maintenance of culture of origin (i.e., enculturation) and participation within a new culture (i.e., acculturation). Rejection of the culture of origin combined with participation in the new culture is termed *assimilation*; rejection of the new culture combined with maintenance of the culture of origin is termed *separation*; simultaneous maintenance of the culture of origin and participation in the new culture is termed *integration*; and rejection of both the culture of origin and the new culture is termed *marginalization*.

Despite disagreements within and across social science disciplines, most current theories of cultural adaptation recognize it as a complex micro- and macro-level process of sustained contact between two distinct groups that follows a dynamic course, leading to shifts across time and situations (Alba, 1999; Berry, 1980; Bhatia, 2009; Bhatia & Ram, 2001; Marin, 1992; Marin & Gamba, 1996). For acculturating individuals, behavioral and cognitive adjustments appear to follow unique developmental paths (Chirkov, 2009), with behavioral changes occurring more rapidly than cognitive changes, which may not occur at all (Alba, Logan, & Stults, 2000; Felix-Ortiz et al., 1994; Keefe & Padilla, 1987; Padilla & Perez, 2003). Specifically, it appears that behavior changes related to dress and food preference happen quickly, social and communication behaviors change more slowly, and values and

beliefs are the most resistant to change (Felix-Ortiz et al., 1994; LaFromboise et al., 1993; Marin, 1993).

Little is known about what variables potentially influence the different domains of cultural adaptation, though several frameworks have been proposed. Building on the seminal work of Berry (1980, 1997), these frameworks elucidate the variables believed to shape an individual's cultural adaptation; broadly, these have centered around characteristics of the society of origin and the society of settlement, of the immigrant group and the individual, and of the migration and adjustment processes (Berry, 2001). From a temporal perspective, the relevant contextual factors include: 1) *pre-migration* factors such as a) the sociopolitical and economic environment of the society of origin, and b) individual demographic characteristics, reasons for migration, knowledge of the host society, and disruption of social support networks; 2) *migration* factors related to the process of immigration such as the route, duration and safety of the migration journey; and 3) *post-migration* factors such as a) the social, economic and political environment, immigration policies and societal attitudes towards immigrants in the host society and b) individual demographic characteristics, legal/residency status, cultural distance, length of residence, and expectations in the host society (Bhatia & Ram, 2001; Portes & Rumbaut, 2001; Cabassa, 2003). These variables are posited to predict whether an individual is assimilated, separated, integrated or marginalized at a given point in time, and are also useful in understanding change in the process of cultural adaptation. In other words, the study of theoretically-based correlates can contribute to knowledge of what characteristics potentially facilitate or hinder the cultural adaptation of immigrant populations.

The Latino Immigrant Population in New York City

As the pan-Latino population continues to grow in the US, the heterogeneity of Latinos with respect to country of origin, generational status, language use, race, documented status, and a host of other variables increases with it. In recognition of this diversity, and its confounding effect in studies of cultural adaptation (Marin, 1993), we focus on two Latino subgroups residing in New York City (NYC), where nearly 1 in 5 residents is Latino. Traditionally a receiving community for Puerto Rican (PR) and Dominican (DA) immigrants, NYC now has a sizable Mexican (MA) population that is expected to surpass the PR and DA groups by 2050, at which time MAs and DAs will comprise the largest Latino groups in the city. DAs have a long and rich history in NYC, with well-established ethnic enclaves, whereas MAs are settling into communities largely inhabited by other ethnic groups (Smith, 2006). The distinct migration history of each group has implications for both neighborhood and individual-level demographics, which in turn are theoretically associated with cultural adaptation. For example, relative to DAs, MAs in NYC have lower income, lower levels of formal education and fewer employment opportunities (Yoshikawa, 2011), and thus are expected to have lower levels of acculturation. Acculturation, in turn, appears to be associated with mental health functioning.

Cultural Adaptation and Immigrant Health

Adaptation to a new culture requires at minimum behavioral shifts, and in some cases, contributes to significant stress or even psychopathology (Berry, 1997). A substantial empirical literature with Latino immigrants documents the relation between acculturation and mental and physical health (Vega & Alegria, 2001). Higher acculturation has been linked with various mental health disorders, including substance and alcohol use, depression and anxiety (e.g., Borges, Breslau, Orozco, Tancredi, Anderson, Aguilar-Gaxiola, & Medina Mora, 2011; Resor & Cooper, 2010; Schwartz et al., 2010; Shrout, Canino, Bird, et al., 1992; Vega Kolody, Aguilar-Gaxiola, Alderete, Catalano, & Caraveo-Anduaga, 1998). Moreover, studies of immigrant families suggest that parents' acculturation is associated with their parenting (Buriel, 1993; Calzada, Huang, Anicama, Fernandez, & Brotman, in press; Dumka, Roosa, & Jackson, 1997; Fridrich & Flannery, 1995; Samaniego & Gonzales, 1999) and with acculturation gaps between parents and children (Szapocznik, Santisteban, Kurtines, Perez-Vidal, & Hervis, 1984), with consequences for children's developmental outcomes (Calzada, Brotman, Huang, Bat-Chava, & Kingston, 2009). The implication is that acculturation plays a significant role in the physical and mental health of immigrants and their children (Balls Organista, Organista, & Kuraski, 2003).

The Present Study

The aim of the present study was to examine two primary tenets of cultural adaptation theory. First, we examined cultural adaptation as a dynamic construct that may shift over time. Specifically, we asked whether and in what ways acculturation/enculturation changes for Latina (MA and DA) immigrant women in NYC women over a one-year period. We hypothesized that across acculturation and enculturation dimensions, change would be seen at the knowledge (i.e., cultural knowledge) and behavioral (i.e., language competence) levels but not at the cognitive level (i.e., identity; Marin, 1993). Second, we examined variables identified in the literature as potential correlates of cultural adaptation. Though past theories have emphasized how context is believed to influence cultural adaptation (Portes & Rumbaut, 2001), limited empirical data have explored which factors are associated with which domains of cultural adaptation. In the present study, we focused on *post-migration* factors at the individual- and neighborhood-levels and we considered ethnic group (MA and DA) differences in these associations. Findings from the present study may contribute to understanding of cultural adaptation theory and may have implications for ways to promote the incorporation of immigrant groups into mainstream society as well as for models of immigrant well-being.

Method

Participants

Participants were drawn from a longitudinal study of Mexican (MA) and Dominican (DA) families assessed at two time points roughly one year apart. The sample ($N = 298$) was recruited from head start centers, private preschool programs, and private and public elementary schools in NYC between 2007–2009. The present study includes only the women from participant families who completed both Time 1 and Time 2 interviews ($n =$

199; 67%) given the study focus on change in cultural adaptation. We further limited the present sample to immigrant women ($n = 189$), given the small number of US-born women in the larger sample ($n = 10$). Participants who completed both interviews (the study sample) did not differ from others on any demographic or study variables (i.e., age, education, marital status, poverty, employment status, age of immigration, acculturation, enculturation).

As shown in Table 1, MA ($n = 95$) and DA ($n = 94$) women differed on most demographic characteristics. For example, compared to DA women, MA women were more likely to be married to or living with the child's father and to live in homes with more adults. MA women were also younger, less likely to have graduated from high school and less likely to be working for pay. At the neighborhood level, MA women resided in 28 zip-code and 49 census tracts, and DA women resided in 15 zip-code and 34 census tracts throughout NYC. According to census data (US Census Bureau, 2010), the neighborhoods were, on average, immigrant-dense Latino neighborhoods, although there was some diversity. The neighborhoods in which the MA women lived were 57% (range = 11–89%) pan-Latino, 13% (range = 0–45%) Mexican, and 44% (range = 11–75%) immigrant. The neighborhoods where DA women lived were 72% (range = 14–93%) pan-Latino, 47% (range = 2–76%) Dominican, and 48% (range = 12–61%) immigrant.

Measures

Cultural Adaptation—The *Abbreviated Multidimensional Acculturation Scale* (AMAS; Zea, Asner-Self, Birman, & Buki, 2003) is a measure of cultural adaptation (i.e., acculturation, enculturation) that can be used with any ethnic group. The AMAS measures three domains: cultural knowledge, language competence and identity. The AMAS allows for an assessment of multiple domains of cultural adaptation over time along both dimensions of acculturation and enculturation, which is critically important when examining change, because different domains are more or less susceptible to change (Marin, 1992; Zea, Asner-Self, Birman, & Buki, 2003).

The 42 AMAS items are rated from 1 (*not at all*) to 4 (*extremely well*). All domains are measured for both the culture of origin (enculturation) and mainstream/ “US American” culture (acculturation), allowing for an examination of cultural adaptation as a bidimensional construct. The AMAS was developed and standardized in English and Spanish with Latinos from various countries of origin and has adequate psychometric properties (Zea et al., 2003). Sample items include “I feel like I am part of US/MA/DA culture,” (identity) “How well do you know the history of US/MA/DR?” (knowledge) and “How well do you speak English with strangers?” (language). Internal consistencies were high for all subscales for MAs and DAs ($\alpha = .90-.95$).

Correlates of Cultural Adaptation—Individual-level demographic predictors (i.e., education, poverty, marital status) and indicators of cultural contact (i.e., language spoken in the home, language spoken at work, participation in US work training program, frequency of communication with and visits to country of origin, and age at immigration) were measured using a demographic questionnaire. Neighborhood-level demographic characteristics were obtained by geo-coding participants' addresses and mapping them onto census tracts to

assess the ethnic and immigrant composition of the community as recorded in the 2005–2009 census.

Procedure

Participants were recruited by bilingual research staff through preschool programs serving Latino children throughout NYC between June 2007 and July 2009. Survey questionnaires were administered verbally to women who were interested and provided consent. The majority of women (99% of MA and 94% of DA) chose to be interviewed in Spanish. Upon completing the two-hour assessment (which also included other measures as part of the larger study), women were paid a small stipend for their participation. Participants were contacted between ten to twelve months later for participation in a second interview. Time 2 interviews were identical to Time 1 and occurred on average 12.56 (SD=2.05) months after the first interview.

Results

Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics for all study variables. In addition to individual- and neighborhood- level demographic differences, MA and DA women differed on most cultural variables assessed. DA women were more likely to communicate daily with family and friends in their countries of origin and were more likely to have visited their countries of origin. Relative to MA women, DA women were more acculturated (i.e., higher US American identity, higher US American cultural knowledge and higher English language competence) and more enculturated on the ethnic cultural knowledge and Spanish language competence domains. There were no differences in the levels of ethnic identity between MA and DA women.

Acculturation and Enculturation over Time

To examine whether and in which domains acculturation and enculturation change over a one-year period (Aim 1), paired t-tests were conducted separately for the MA and DA samples. Results are presented in Table 2. Results indicated that MA women increased in their American cultural knowledge, but showed no other changes. DA women did not show any changes in acculturation or enculturation.

Correlates of Acculturation and Enculturation

To examine correlates of cultural adaptation (Aim 2), we considered three sets of variables — *individual demographic characteristics* (i.e., education, poverty, marital status), *cultural contact* (i.e., language spoken in the home, language spoken at work, participation in US work training program, frequency of communication with and visits to country of origin, and age at immigration), and *neighborhood demographic characteristics* (i.e., % immigrant, % Latino, %MA/DA in the neighborhood census tracts). Hierarchical multivariate regression analyses were conducted with individual factors in Step 1, cultural factors in Step 2, and neighborhood factors in Step 3. Data were drawn from Time 1 for the correlates and from Time 2 for cultural adaptation. A multivariate mixed effects model using the SAS PROC MIXED procedure (SAS 9.1.3 Software, 2002) was applied to adjust for nesting of participants within neighborhood census track. Analyses were conducted separately for each

of the six acculturation/enculturation scales as well as for each ethnic subsample (i.e., MA, DA). Tables 3a and 3b show regression results for MAs and DAs, respectively.

For MA women, few correlates of cultural adaptation were found. At the *individual demographic characteristic* level, women who were poor had lower American cultural knowledge and English language competence compared to women who were not poor. In addition, women who had higher education had lower American identity than women who had lower education. In examining *cultural contact*, MA women who received job training in the US had higher American cultural knowledge and English language competence. Of the *neighborhood demographic characteristics*, women living in immigrant-dense communities had lower American identity. Collectively, the three domains of contextual characteristics explained 34 to 60% of variance in acculturation, and 42% to 63% of variance in enculturation.

For DA women, several correlates in each domain were related to acculturation. At the *individual demographic* level, higher levels of formal education were related to more American cultural knowledge and English language competence. DA women who were married or classified as poor had lower English language competence than women who were single or not poor. In terms of *cultural contact*, DA women who communicated frequently with friends and relatives in their country of origin (the Dominican Republic) had higher ethnic identity than those who communicated less frequently. In addition, women who immigrated before age 18 had higher American but lower ethnic cultural knowledge, and higher English but lower Spanish language competence, than women who immigrated after 18. At the *neighborhood demographic characteristics* level, DA women who lived in Latino-dense communities had lower American identity, but those in Dominican enclaves had higher American identity. The three domains of predictors explained 56% to 76 % of variance in acculturation, and 53% to 61% of variance in enculturation.

Discussion

The present study used longitudinal data to examine acculturation and enculturation in immigrant women from two large and growing Latino subgroups in the US, Dominican (DA) and Mexican Americans (MA). We found significant differences in the cultural adaptation of the two groups. Compared to DA women, MA women had lower levels of acculturation across all domains (i.e., knowledge, identity, language competence), and group demographic characteristics may explain these differences. For example, MA women had lower levels of formal education and higher levels of poverty, which may have resulted in fewer opportunities to participate in mainstream American culture (Portes, 2007).

Interestingly, MA women were also less enculturated than DA women, which may similarly reflect background demographic characteristics, as these differences were seen specifically in terms of knowledge and language, the two domains that may be most influenced by socioeconomic status. Knowledge, a measure of one's familiarity with a country's history, traditions, politics, and popular culture, may require reading or access to popular media that may be easier for women from a higher socioeconomic status. Language, a measure of proficiency that includes written language skills, may be confounded with formal education. At the neighborhood level, MA women were less likely than DA women to live in an ethnic

enclave, and thus may have had fewer cultural exchanges that contribute to cultural knowledge. Still, the level of ethnic identity of DA and MA women did not differ, and across all domains, enculturation was high for both groups.

In examining acculturation/enculturation over time (Aim 1), we found that cultural adaptation was highly stable over a one-year period for both DA and MA women. One exception was an increase in the American cultural knowledge of MA (but not DA) women. This finding is consistent with past research that suggests that change in knowledge occurs more quickly than change in other domains of cultural adaptation (Marin, 1993). That change was seen among MA but not DA women may reflect the low levels of initial American cultural knowledge of MA women, compared with DA women who reported a moderate and stable level of American cultural knowledge. Generally, though, the lack of change was unexpected. The stability seen across domains of enculturation suggests that MA and DA immigrant women retain important aspects of their respective cultures of origin, even after living in the US an average of 10 years; according to the cultural buffers hypothesis, this may serve an important protective factor for the health and well-being of Latina immigrants (Smith & Silva, 2011). On the other hand, the stability seen on most domains of acculturation suggests that the processes of gaining competence in English, learning about US American culture and adopting a US American identity may be difficult for MA and DA women, which may hinder assimilation and meaningful participation in mainstream society (e.g., workforce, social networks, health and social services).

An examination of the correlates of cultural adaptation (Aim 2) provides a glimpse into potential contextual influences in the cultural adaptation process. For MA women, we found that poverty was associated with lower levels of US American cultural knowledge and English language competence, whereas participation in job training in the US was associated with more acculturation in these two domains. Poverty—and the social isolation that often characterizes poor communities—may hinder acculturation. (In support of this, poverty was also related to lower levels of English language competence among DA women.) In contrast, participation in a workforce activity, such as job training, may provide women with the opportunity to actively engage with mainstream society, facilitating the learning of culture-based knowledge and practice of English language skills.

It's worth noting that, for MA women, we found no correlates of any domain of enculturation. It may be that among foreign-born populations, pre- (rather than post-) migration factors are more salient to the formation of ethnic identity and ethnic cultural knowledge, if only because of a stronger temporal link. Indeed, with some exception (described below), post-migration factors were not generally associated with the enculturation of DA women either.

For DA women, the most robust correlate of cultural adaptation was age at immigration. Women who immigrated before the age of 18 had higher English language competence and American cultural knowledge but lower Spanish language competence and ethnic cultural knowledge. Age at immigration did not impact identity; for DA women who had immigrated to the US as children and adolescents, it may have been difficult to retain their cultural knowledge and Spanish proficiency at the same time that they were committed to an identity

rooted in their Dominican heritage. Regular communication with friends and family in the Dominican Republic was associated with a higher ethnic identity, suggesting the viability of an ongoing, post-migration strategy for maintaining a strong identification with one's culture of origin.

For US American identity, neighborhood characteristics appeared to be the most salient correlate. American identity was higher for women living in neighborhoods with fewer immigrants (for MA women) and fewer Latinos (for DA women), perhaps because more diverse neighborhoods gave mothers more exposure to different aspects of mainstream American society with which they could identify. Interestingly, though, American identity was also higher for DA women living in Dominican enclaves (neighborhoods with a concentration of Dominican residents). More work is needed to better understand how immigrant populations form a new identity, even as they maintain their ethnic identity, especially considering the protective benefits of doing so (Phinney, 1990).

There are several limitations to the present study that warrant mention. First, we relied on two time points, twelve months apart, in our examination of cultural adaptation as a dynamic construct. Given the fluidity that is believed to characterize acculturation and enculturation, assessments across multiple time points would provide a more comprehensive understanding of cultural adaptation as a process. An examination of change over a longer period of time is also important because some domains of cultural adaptation are not expected to change within a one-year period; indeed, the present study findings suggest that across all domains, cultural adaptation may be relatively slow to change. In addition, other predictor variables, including pre-migration and migration factors, while beyond the scope of this study, are important to consider in future studies. Information about the ethnicity and acculturation of partners and other family members in the home is also likely to play a key role in women's acculturation processes.

An additional limitation is the reliance on a relatively small sample from two specific Latino ethnic groups, and caution is warranted in generalizing findings to other Latino subgroups. Finally, without data on the association between cultural adaptation and psychological functioning, it is not clear how cultural adaptation relates to well-being among Latina immigrant women. Although past cross-sectional studies suggest that health and mental health problems are associated with acculturation (Vega & Alegria, 2001), prospective longitudinal studies are needed to establish how the process of cultural adaptation impacts health.

In spite of these limitations, the present study is unique in its examination of cultural adaptation across dimensions (acculturation, enculturation), domains (language competence, cultural knowledge, identity), ethnic group (Dominican, Mexican), and time. It contributes to a small but important literature on the correlates of cultural adaptation, implicating poverty (MA and DA), job training (MA), age of immigration (DA) and immigrant/ethnic background of neighbors (MA and DA) as particularly salient contextual characteristics. Study findings are consistent with theories that point to the sociocultural context as a key determinant of acculturation and enculturation (Chirkov, 2009; Portes, 2007), and more specifically, with the notion that contextual characteristics that are beyond the control of the

individual immigrant influence the cultural adaptation process in meaningful ways (Portes, 2007; Schmitz, 1998; Weinreich, 1998; Weinreich, 2008). As suggested by numerous social scientists, cultural adaptation does appear to be fluid, multidimensional and influenced by a complex interplay of individual and ecological characteristics. If these findings bear out, it may be that social policies (related to work opportunities for example) are needed to facilitate cultural adaptation and, perhaps, promote well-being among Latina women.

References

- Alba, RD.; Nee, V. *Remaking the American mainstream: Assimilation and the new immigration*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press; 2003.
- Balcazar H, Castro FG, Krull JL. Cancer Risk Reduction in Mexican American Women: The Role of Acculturation, Education, and Health Risk Factors. *Health Education & Behavior*. 1995; 22(1):61–84.
- 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. The psychology of immigration. *Journal of Social Issues*. 2001; 57(3):615–631.
- Berry, JW. Conceptual approaches to acculturation. In: Chun, K.; Balls-Organista, P.; Marin, G., editors. *Acculturation: Advances in theory, measurement, and applied research*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association; 2003. p. 17-37.
- Berry, JW.; Sam, D. Acculturation and adaptation. In: Berry, JW.; Segall, MH.; Kagitcibasi, C., editors. *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology: Vol. 3. Social behavior and applications*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon; 1997. p. 291-326.
- Bhatia S, Ram A. Theorizing identity in transnational and diaspora cultures: A critical approach to acculturation. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*. 2009; 33:140–149.
- Birman D, Trickett EJ, Vinokurov A. Acculturation and adaptation of soviet Jewish refugee adolescents: Predictors of adjustment across life domains. *American Journal of Community Psychology*. 1994; 30(5):85–607.
- Borges G, Breslau J, Orozco R, Tancredi DJ, Anderson H, Aguilar-Gaxiola S, Mora ME. A cross-national study on Mexico-US migration, substance use and substance use disorders. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*. 2011; 117(1):16–23. [PubMed: 21296509]
- Brown, SK.; Bean, FD. Assimilation models, old and new: Explaining a long-term process. 2006. Retrieved from Migration Policy Institute website:<http://www.migrationinformation.org/USfocus/display.cfm?ID=442>
- Buriel R. Childrearing orientations in Mexican American families: Influences of generation & socio-cultural factors. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 1993; 55:987–1000. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/352778>.
- Buriel R, Mercado R, Rodriguez J, Chavez JM. Mexican American disciplinary practices and attitudes toward child maltreatment: A comparison of foreign- and native-born mothers. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*. 1991; 13:78–94. DOI: 10.1177/07399863910131006
- Burnam MA, Hough RL, Karno M, Escobar JI, Telles CA. Acculturation and lifetime prevalence of psychiatric disorders among Mexican American in Los Angeles. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*. 1987; 28:89–102. [PubMed: 3571910]
- Cabassa LJ. Measuring acculturation: Where we are and where we need to go. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*. 2003; 25(2):127–146.
- Calzada EJ, Huang KY, Anicama C, Fernandez Y, Brotman LM. Test of a cultural framework of parenting with Latino families of young children. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*. 2012; 18:285–296. [PubMed: 22686147]
- Calzada EJ, Brotman LM, Huang Y, Bat-Chava Y, Kingston S. Parent cultural adaptation and child functioning in culturally diverse, urban families of preschoolers. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*. 2009; 30:515–524. [PubMed: 20559417]

- Chirkov V. Critical psychology of acculturation: What do we study and how do we study it, when we investigate acculturation? *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*. 2009; 33:94–105.
- 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(3):275–304.
- Dumka LE, Roosa MW, Jackson KM. Risk, conflict, mothers' parenting, and children's adjustment in low-income, Mexican immigrant, and Mexican American families. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 1997; 59:309–323. Retrieved from <http://www3.interscience.wiley.com>.
- Félix-Ortiz M, Newcomb MD, Myers H. A multidimensional measure of cultural identity for Latino and Latina adolescents. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*. 1994; 16:99–115.
- Fridrich AH, Flannery DJ. The effects of ethnicity and acculturation on early adolescent delinquency. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*. 1995; 4:69–87. DOI: 10.1007/BF02233955
- Fulgini A. A comparative longitudinal approach to acculturation among children from immigrant families. *Harvard Educational Review*. 2001; 71:566–578.
- Gonzales, NA.; Knight, GP.; Morgan-Lopez, A.; Saenz, D.; Sirolli, A. Acculturation and the mental health of Latino youth: An integration and critique of the literature. In: Contreras, J.; Neal-Barnett, A.; Kerns, K., editors. *Latino children and families in the United States: Current research and future directions*. Westport, CT: Praeger; 2002. p. 45-74.
- Gordon MM. Assimilation in America: Theory and reality. *Journal of American Academy of Arts and Sciences*. 1961; 90(2):263–285.
- Hollis, M. *The philosophy of social science: An introduction*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press; 1994.
- Kalmijn M, Tubergen FV. A comparative perspective on intermarriage: Explaining differences among National-Origin groups in the United States. *Demography*. 2010; 47(2):459–479. [PubMed: 20608106]
- Kaplan MS, Marks G. Adverse effects of acculturation: Psychological distress among Mexican American young adults. *Social Science Medicine*. 1990; 31(12):1313–1319. [PubMed: 2287960]
- LaFromboise T, Coleman HL, Gerton J. Psychological impact of biculturalism: Evidence and theory. *Psychological Bulletin*. 1993; 114(3):395–412. [PubMed: 8272463]
- Lazarus RS. Acculturation isn't everything. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*. 1997; 46:39–43.
- Marin, G. Issues in the measurement of acculturation among Hispanics. In: Giesenger, KF., editor. *Psychological testing of Hispanics*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association; 1992. p. 235-251.
- Marin, G. Influence of acculturation on familism and self-identification among Hispanics. In: Bernal, ME.; Knights, GP., editors. *Ethnic Identity: Formation and transmission among Hispanics and other minorities*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press; 1993. p. 191-196.
- Marin G, Gamba RJ. A new measurement of acculturation for Hispanics: The Bidimensional Acculturation Scale for Hispanics (BAS). *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*. 1996; 18(3): 297–316.
- Moscicki EK, Locke BZ, Rae DS, Boyd JH. Depressive symptoms among Mexican Americans: The Hispanic health and nutrition examination survey. *American Journal of Epidemiology*. 1989; 130(2):348–360. [PubMed: 2750730]
- Organista, KC. The relationship between acculturation and ethnic minority mental health. In: Organista, PB.; Kuraski, K., editors. *Acculturation: advances in theory, measurement, and applied research*. Washington, D.C: American Psychological Association; 2003. p. 139-161.
- Padilla AM, Perez W. Acculturation, social identity, and social cognition: A new perspective. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Science*. 2003; 25(1):35–55.
- Phinney JS. Ethnic identity in adolescents and adults: Review of research. *Psychological Bulletin*. 1990; 108:499–514. [PubMed: 2270238]
- Pick S. Berry in Legoland. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*. 1997; 46:49–52.
- Portes A. Migration, Development, and Segmented Assimilation: A Conceptual Review of the Evidence. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*. 2007; 610:73–97.

- Portes A, Fernández-Kelly P, Haller W. Segmented assimilation on the ground: The new second generation in early adulthood. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*. 2005; 28(6):1000–1040.
- Portes, A.; Rumbaut, RG. *Legacies: The story of the immigrant second generation*. Berkeley: University of California; 2001. Not everyone is chosen: Segmented assimilation and its detrimants; p. 44–69.
- Portes, A.; Rumbaut, RG. *Immigrant America: A Portrait*. 3. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press; 2006.
- Portes A, Zhou M. The second generation: segmented assimilation and its variants. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*. 1993; 530(1):74–96.
- Resor MR, Cooper TV. Club drug use in Hispanic college students. *The American Journal on Addictions*. 2010; 19:319–324. [PubMed: 20653638]
- Rudmin WF. Critical history of the acculturation psychology of assimilation, separation, integration, and marginalization. *Review of General Psychology*. 2003; 7(1):3–37.
- Samaniego RY, Gonzales NA. Multiple mediators of the effects of acculturation status on delinquency for Mexican American adolescents. *American Journal of Community Psychology*. 1999; 27:189–210. DOI: 10.1023/A:1022883601126 [PubMed: 10425699]
- Schmitz, PG. Is Berry's model of acculturation useful in understanding individual and group differences of acculturative behavior?. Paper presented at the 14th Congress of the International Association of Cross-Cultural Psychology; Bellingham, WA. 1998 Aug.
- Schwartz SJ, Unger JB, Zamboanga BL, Szapocznik J. Rethinking the concept of acculturation: Implications for theory and research. *American Psychologist*. 2010; 65(2):237–51. [PubMed: 20455618]
- Shrout PE, Canino GJ, Bird HR, Rubio-Stipec M, Bravo M, Burnam MA. Mental health status among Puerto Ricans, Mexican Americans, and Non-Hispanic Whites. *American Journal of Community Psychology*. 1992; 20(6):729–52. [PubMed: 1302447]
- Smith, RC. *Mexican New York: transnational lives of new immigrants*. Berkeley, CA: Univ. of California Press; 2006.
- Smith TB, Silva L. Ethnic identity and personal well-being of people of color: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*. 2011; 58:42–60. [PubMed: 21171745]
- Szapocznik J, Santisteban D, Kurtines WM, Perez-Vidal A, Hervis O. Bicultural Effectiveness Training: A treatment intervention for enhancing intercultural adjustment in Cuban American families. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*. 1984; 6:317–344.
- U.S. Census Bureau. Hispanic population: 2010. 2011. Retrieved from <http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/briefs/c2010br-04.pdf>
- Vega, WA.; Alegria, M. Latino mental health and treatment in the United States. In: Aguirre-Molina, M.; Molina, C.; Zambrana, R., editors. *Health Issues in the Latino Community*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bassey; 2001. p. 179–208.
- Vega WA, Kolody B, Aguilar-Gaxiola S, Alderete E, Catalano R, Caraveo-Anduaga J. Lifetime prevalence of *DSM-III-R* psychiatric disorders among urban and rural Mexican Americans in California. *Archives of General Psychiatry*. 1998; 55(9):771–778. [PubMed: 9736002]
- Weinrich, P. From acculturation to enculturation: Intercultural, intracultural and intrapsychic mechanisms. Paper presented at the 14th Congress of the International Association of Cross-Cultural Psychology; Bellingham, WA. 1998 Aug.
- Weinrich P. 'Enculturation', not 'acculturation': Conceptualising and assessing identity processes in migrant communities. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*. 2009; 33:124–139.
- Yoshikawa, H. *Immigrants raising citizens: Undocumented parents and their young children*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation; 2011.
- Zea MC, Asner-Self KK, Birman D, Buki LP. The Abbreviated Multidimensional Acculturation Scale: Empirical validation with two Latino/Latina samples. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology*. 2003; 9(2):107–126. [PubMed: 12760324]

Table 1**Mexican American and Dominican American Demographic Characteristics**

Individual Demographics	Mexican American		Dominican American		<i>t</i> / χ^2	<i>p</i>
	<i>M</i> / %	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i> / %	<i>SD</i>		
Age	30.5	(5.08)	35.8	(6.22)	-6.32	<.001
# adults in home	2.8	(1.14)	1.8	(.72)	6.97	<.001
Marital status (married)	88.4		64.5		14.98	<.001
Education (High School or above)	41.1		69.1		15.07	<.001
Poverty (income to need ratio 1)	72.3		60.7		2.51	.11
Years in the US	9.03	(4.12)	11.76	(5.87)	-3.64	<.001
Cultural Contact						
Language environment at home						
Spanish only	40.0		28.7		2.66	.10
Bilingual	60.0		71.3			
Language environment at work*						
Spanish only	10.6		33.3		37.97	<.001
English only	8.5		26.9			
Bilingual	80.9		40.8			
Job Training in US	41.5		50.0		1.37	.24
Communication with COO						
Never	1.1		2.1		29.67	<.001
Monthly	49.4		12.8			
Weekly	49.5		85.1			
	%		%			
Visits COO (past 5 years)						
Never	81.4		19.1		77.12	<.001
One or two times	17.9		48.9			
3 times	1.1		31.9			
Age at immigration (< 18 years)	28.6		18.9		2.34	.13

	Mexican American		Dominican American		t / χ^2	p
	$M / \%$	SD	$M / \%$	SD		
Individual Demographics						
Neighborhood Demographics						
% Latino	57.0		72.2		-5.13	<.001
% immigrant	44.0		47.6		-1.71	.09
% Mexican	13.0		4.6		6.51	<.001
% Dominican	14.9		46.5		-10.72	<.001

Note. COO = Country of origin.

* 81% of Mexican American and 40% of Dominican American women not working.

Table 2

Descriptive statistics and paired t-tests for stability of acculturation and enculturation

	Mexican American				Dominican American			
	Time 1		Time 2		Time 1		Time 2	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Am Identity	1.95	(.86)	1.92	(.82)	2.77	(.88)	2.70	(.90)
Am Cult Know	1.58	(.48)	1.70	(.51)	2.24	(.54)	2.27	(.48)
Eng Lang Comp	1.77	(.48)	1.74	(.48)	2.15	(.67)	2.17	(.65)
Eth Identity	3.91	(.36)	3.92	(.29)	3.88	(.31)	3.85	(.38)
Eth Cult Know	2.84	(.68)	2.93	(.63)	3.18	(.58)	3.19	(.63)
Sp Lang Comp	3.69	(.45)	3.73	(.40)	3.85	(.33)	3.83	(.33)

Note. Based on the Abbreviated Multidimensional Acculturation Scale. Am Identity = US American Identity; Am Cult Know = US American Cultural Knowledge; Eng Lang Comp = English Language Competence; Eth Identity = Ethnic Identity; Eth Cult Know = Ethnic Cultural Knowledge; Sp Lang Comp = Spanish Language Competence.

Table 3

Table 3a. Correlates of Acculturation and Enculturation in Mexican American Women

Individual	Acculturation						Enculturation					
	Am Identity			Am Cult Know			Eng Lang Comp			Eth Identity		
	B	SE	P	B	SE	P	B	SE	P	B	SE	P
Education level	-0.39	0.19	0.05	0.03	0.11	0.78	0.00	0.11	0.97	-0.10	0.07	0.18
Marital Status	-0.03	0.30	0.92	-0.19	0.18	0.29	-0.01	0.17	0.93	-0.11	0.11	0.35
Poverty Status	-0.06	0.20	0.78	-0.26	0.12	0.04	-0.29	0.12	0.02	0.07	0.08	0.39
Cultural Contact												
Language at home												
Spanish only	-0.14	0.34	0.68	0.02	0.18	0.90	-0.17	0.17	0.34	-0.04	0.13	0.79
Bilingual	0.48	0.45	0.30	0.25	0.25	0.32	0.07	0.23	0.76	0.15	0.17	0.39
Language at work												
Spanish only	0.11	0.35	0.75	0.05	0.19	0.81	0.20	0.18	0.28	-0.08	0.13	0.58
English only	0.48	0.40	0.25	0.43	0.22	0.07	-0.10	0.20	0.64	0.14	0.15	0.38
Bilingual	-0.77	0.66	0.26	-0.13	0.36	0.72	-0.07	0.33	0.84	0.10	0.25	0.68
Job Training in US	-0.10	0.21	0.64	0.37	0.11	0.00	0.33	0.11	0.01	-0.06	0.08	0.48
Communicate COO	0.07	0.13	0.57	0.07	0.07	0.32	0.06	0.06	0.35	-0.05	0.05	0.35
Visit COO	-0.09	0.16	0.60	0.04	0.09	0.66	0.12	0.08	0.17	0.04	0.06	0.55
Immigration < 18yrs	-0.24	0.25	0.35	0.24	0.14	0.11	0.23	0.13	0.10	-0.07	0.10	0.47
Neighborhood												
% Latino	-0.01	0.60	0.99	0.43	0.41	0.31	0.02	0.33	0.94	-0.19	0.25	0.46
% immigrants	-2.13	0.67	0.01	-0.23	0.45	0.61	-0.13	0.38	0.73	0.15	0.28	0.60
% Mexican	-0.91	1.09	0.41	-1.14	0.75	0.15	-0.12	0.61	0.84	0.40	0.45	0.39
R ²	.55			.34			.60			.55		
										.63		
												.42

Table 3b. *Correlates of Acculturation and Enculturation in Dominican American Women*

	Acculturation						Enculturation					
	Am Identity			Am Cult Know			Eng Lang Comp			Eth Identity		
	B	SE	P	B	SE	P	B	SE	P	B	SE	P
Individual												
Education level	-0.20	0.24	0.40	0.31	0.11	0.01	0.77	0.14	.0001	-0.17	0.10	0.09
Marital status	0.02	0.25	0.94	-0.03	0.12	0.80	-0.31	0.15	0.04	-0.05	0.11	0.67
Poverty status	0.02	0.22	0.95	-0.10	0.11	0.37	-0.32	0.13	0.02	-0.03	0.10	0.79
Cultural Contact												
Language at home												
Spanish only	0.06	0.33	0.85	-0.01	0.17	0.94	0.02	0.17	0.90	-0.14	0.15	0.33
Bilingual	0.46	0.42	0.27	-0.24	0.21	0.25	-0.13	0.22	0.54	-0.13	0.18	0.47
Language at work												
Spanish only	0.02	0.32	0.96	-0.07	0.16	0.69	-0.08	0.17	0.64	0.07	0.14	0.61
English only	-0.72	0.52	0.18	-0.03	0.27	0.92	0.39	0.27	0.16	0.19	0.23	0.42
Bilingual	0.38	0.37	0.31	0.14	0.18	0.44	0.36	0.19	0.07	0.04	0.16	0.83
Job Training in US	0.37	0.22	0.10	0.04	0.11	0.71	0.07	0.12	0.52	-0.01	0.10	0.92
Communicate COO	-0.23	0.15	0.13	-0.10	0.07	0.18	-0.15	0.08	0.06	0.16	0.06	0.02
Visit COO	0.03	0.08	0.69	0.03	0.04	0.49	0.05	0.04	0.31	0.00	0.04	0.92
Immigration < 18yrs	0.21	0.30	0.49	0.30	0.14	0.04	0.60	0.16	0.00	-0.08	0.13	0.56
Neighborhood												
% Latino	-3.15	1.30	0.02	-0.86	0.74	0.25	-0.40	0.72	0.58	0.26	0.62	0.68
% immigrants	-1.64	2.07	0.44	-0.93	1.33	0.49	-0.23	1.15	0.85	-1.59	1.09	0.15
% Dominican	3.43	1.61	0.04	1.19	0.99	0.24	0.35	0.89	0.70	0.69	0.81	0.40
R ²	.56			.49			.76			.48		.53

Note. Education level (1=high school or more). Marital status (1=married/living with partner, 0=Single); COO = Country of origin; Language at work (reference group= not working); Language at home (reference group= no partner); Communicate with COO (0= never, 4= daily); Visit COO (0= never, 4= more than 3 times). Significant results bolded.