


**Acculturative and marital stress
The moderating roles of
spousal support, linguistic self-confidence, and self-esteem**

**Tasleem Damji Budhwani
School of Psychology**



**A thesis submitted to the
School of Graduate Studies and Research
of the University of Ottawa
as partial fulfilment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy**

© Tasleem Damji Budhwani, Ottawa, Canada

UMI Number. DC53275

INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

UMI

UMI Microform DC53275
Copyright 2011 by ProQuest LLC
All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code

ProQuest LLC
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P O Box 1346
Ann Arbor MI 48106-1346

Acknowledgments

I am deeply grateful to Richard Clément, for not only being my supervisor, but for also being my mentor and my friend. He has helped make my years in graduate school an enjoyable life experience and helped me keep my sanity intact. His kindness, support, wisdom and guidance have helped me through these challenging years. He has taught me the meaning of the word “poised”

I would like to thank Dr. Michael McCarrey, Dr. Sue Johnson-Douglas and Dr. Marta Young for their advice and support. This thesis would not be complete without their guidance.

I am beholden to my parents and family for teaching me the value of education and allowing me to explore many avenues before finding the right path for me. I am also extremely grateful for their support and love, even when I have been many miles away.

I would also like to thank Kimberly Noels and Peter MacIntyre for allowing me into their lab and their lives. They have both been an inspiration to me. Their jocularities in the lab and the corny Thursdays helped me through many days.

Last, but certainly not least, I would like to thank my husband and best friend, Shamez. He has always been a source of comfort, support and love. I thank him for surprising me with home cooked meals and always supporting me when I came home late. I thank him for always making me laugh, even when I had a hard time finding anything to laugh about. I also thank him for always believing in me, even when I had doubts about myself.

Abstract

When two culturally different groups come in contact, changes occur which may entail a degree of discomfort for those involved. Such acculturative stress may be compounded by dyadic adjustment in couples living through an intercultural contact experience. Acculturating individuals may experience marital problems resulting from incongruent changes in their spouse. The goal of this thesis is threefold. First, the effects of different acculturation profiles on psychological and marital adjustment were examined. Second, the congruency of the acculturation profiles between spouses from the same ethnic background and their effects on adjustment were explored. Third, the effects of incongruent acculturation profiles in married couples from the same ethnic background and potential moderators of these effects were examined. The moderators included spousal support, linguistic self –confidence in the host and native languages, and self-esteem. Eighty-six married couples from the Ismaili Muslim community were recruited from two metropolitan cities, Ottawa and Calgary, in order to participate in this project. Questionnaires were distributed that included measures of situated identity, depression, stress, marital adjustment, spousal support, linguistic self-confidence in both the host and native languages, self-esteem, and various demographic items. Analyses of variance were computed for the different hypotheses. With respect to the first goal, results indicated that those with integrated profiles reported better psychological and marital adjustment. With respect to the second goal, results indicated that spouses with incongruent acculturation profiles did not experience more depression, more stress, or less marital adjustment than spouses with congruent acculturation profiles. Last, with respect to the third goal, results show that linguistic self-confidence in English

moderated the effects of acculturative stress for couples with incongruent acculturation profiles, particularly for the wives. The last goal was re-examined using identification in specific situations, namely public and private domains. Results show that self-esteem moderated stress for couples with incongruent acculturation profiles in private situations. These results are interpreted in the context of both theoretical and applied multicultural issues. The theoretical implications include the recognition that immigrant people, and particularly immigrant women, are at risk for problems of adjustment. It is also important for researchers to recognise that couples from the same ethnic background may have incongruent acculturation profiles that can contribute to problems of adjustment, and that potential moderators can alleviate these problems. The applied implications include adjustments in immigration policy that recognise the importance of valuing both the native and host cultures, as well as disseminating knowledge about the benefits of participating in both cultural activities and with national institutions. Another implication is that marital therapists should be aware that couples from the same ethnic background may be adjusting differently to the intercultural contact, that immigrant women are particularly at risk for problems in adjustment, and that various factors, such as language self-confidence, can moderate these effects.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	ii
Abstract.....	iii
Table of Contents.....	v
List of Tables.....	ix
List of Figures.....	xvi
List of Appendices.....	xviii
Chapter 1.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	1
Theoretical Background.....	1
Acculturation and identity.....	2
Marital harmony and well-being.....	5
Moderators of Acculturative Stress.....	7
Contextual moderator.....	8
Interpersonal moderator.....	12
Intrapersonal moderator.....	15
Summary and Potential Contribution.....	18
Acculturation Profile.....	18
Congruency.....	19
Moderators.....	19
Chapter 2.....	21
Method.....	21
Overview.....	21
Participants.....	21
Measures.....	23
Situated identity.....	24
Depression.....	26
Stress.....	27
Marital adjustment.....	27
Spousal support.....	28
Anxiety when communicating in English.....	29
Anxiety when communicating in mother tongue.....	29
Competence in English.....	29
Competence in mother tongue.....	29
Self-esteem.....	30
General information.....	30
Procedure.....	30
Chapter 3.....	34
Results.....	34
Overview of the Analyses.....	34

Table of Contents (Continued)

Acculturation Profiles and Adjustment.....	36
Psychological Adjustment.....	36
Depression.....	38
Stress.....	38
Marital Adjustment.....	38
Congruency and Adjustment.....	45
Psychological Adjustment.....	45
Depression.....	46
Stress.....	46
Marital Adjustment.....	46
Combined Acculturation Profiles for Males and Females and Adjustment.....	50
Psychological Adjustment.....	51
Depression.....	51
Stress.....	53
Marital Adjustment.....	53
Moderators of Adjustment, Congruency and Gender.....	65
Spousal Support.....	65
Psychological Adjustment.....	67
Depression.....	67
Stress.....	67
Marital Adjustment.....	72
English Self-Confidence.....	76
Psychological Adjustment.....	76
Depression.....	77
Stress.....	82
Marital Adjustment.....	87
Mother Tongue Self-Confidence.....	97
Psychological Adjustment.....	97
Depression.....	97
Stress.....	97
Marital Adjustment.....	100
Self-Esteem.....	100
Psychological Adjustment.....	100
Depression.....	102
Stress.....	106
Marital Adjustment.....	110
Power.....	114
Summary.....	117
Chapter 4.....	120
Domains of Identity.....	120
Overview of the Analyses.....	120
Factor Analysis of the Identity Scales.....	120

Table of Contents (Continued)

Moderators of Adjustment, Congruency in the Public Domain and Adjustment....	124
Spousal Support.....	124
Psychological Adjustment.....	124
Depression.....	125
Stress.....	125
Marital Adjustment.....	130
English Self-Confidence.....	134
Psychological Adjustment.....	134
Depression.....	134
Stress.....	134
Marital Adjustment.....	137
Mother Tongue Self-Confidence.....	137
Psychological Adjustment.....	139
Depression.....	139
Stress.....	139
Marital Adjustment.....	142
Self-Esteem.....	144
Psychological Adjustment.....	144
Depression.....	144
Stress.....	148
Marital Adjustment.....	148
Moderators of Adjustment, Congruency in the Private Domain and Adjustment...	154
Spousal Support.....	154
Psychological Adjustment.....	154
Depression.....	154
Stress.....	157
Marital Adjustment.....	157
English Self-Confidence.....	161
Psychological Adjustment.....	164
Depression.....	164
Stress.....	167
Marital Adjustment.....	171
Mother Tongue Self-Confidence.....	174
Psychological Adjustment.....	174
Depression.....	176
Stress.....	176
Marital Adjustment.....	176
Self-Esteem.....	180
Psychological Adjustment.....	180
Depression.....	181
Stress.....	185
Marital Adjustment.....	190
Power.....	197

Table of Contents (Continued)

Chapter 5.....	199
Summary and Discussion.....	199
Summary and Potential Contributions.....	208
References.....	213

List of Tables

Table 1	
Internal Reliability of Each Measure.....	25
Table 2	
Descriptive Statistics for Males, Females and Total Samples on Scales Used in This Study.....	31
Table 3	
Correlation Matrix of Males (Above Diagonal) and Females (Below Diagonal)...	33
Table 4a	
Analysis of Variance Summary Table	
Depression as a Function of Acculturation Profiles.....	37
Table 4b	
Analysis of Variance Summary Table	
Stress as a Function of Acculturation Profiles.....	37
Table 4c	
Analysis of Variance Summary Table	
Marital Adjustment as a Function of Acculturation Profiles.....	37
Table 5	
Post Hoc Analysis of Means of Depression for Acculturation Profiles.....	40
Table 6	
Post Hoc Analysis of Means of Stress for Acculturation Profiles.....	42
Table 7	
Post Hoc Analysis of Means of Marital Adjustment for Acculturation Profiles.....	44
Table 8	
Depression as a Function of Congruency and Gender.....	47
Table 9	
Stress as a Function of Congruency and Gender.....	48
Table 10	
Marital Adjustment as a Function of Congruency and Gender.....	49
Table 11	
Depression as a Function of Combined Acculturation Profiles and Gender.....	52

List of Tables (Continued)

Table 12	
Stress as a Function of Combined Acculturation Profiles and Gender.....	54
Table 13a	
Post Hoc Analysis of Means of Stress for Combined Acculturation Profiles and Males.....	56
Table 13b	
Post Hoc Analysis of Means of Stress for Combined Acculturation Profiles and Females.....	60
Table 13c	
Post Hoc Analysis of Means of Stress for Combined Acculturation Profiles and Gender.....	64
Table 14	
Marital Adjustment as a Function of Combined Acculturation Profiles and Gender.....	66
Table 15	
Depression as a Function of Spousal Support, Congruency and Gender.....	68
Table 16	
Post Hoc Analysis of Means of Depression for Spousal Support.....	70
Table 17	
Stress as a Function of Spousal Support, Congruency and Gender.....	71
Table 18	
Marital Adjustment as a Function of Spousal Support, Congruency and Gender...73	
Table 19	
Post Hoc Analysis of Means of Marital Adjustment for Spousal Support.....75	
Table 20	
Depression as a Function of English Self-Confidence, Congruency and Gender...78	
Table 21	
Post Hoc Analysis of Means of Depression for English Self-Confidence..... 79	
Table 22	
Post Hoc Analysis of Means of Depression for English Self-Confidence and Gender.....	81

List of Tables (Continued)

Table 23	
Stress as a Function of English Self-Confidence, Congruency and Gender.....	83
Table 24	
Post Hoc Analysis of Means of Stress for English Self-Confidence and Congruency.....	85
Table 25	
Post Hoc Analysis of Means of Stress for English Self-Confidence and Gender....	88
Table 26	
Marital Adjustment as a Function of English Self-Confidence, Congruency and Gender.....	89
Table 27	
Post Hoc Analysis of Means of Marital Adjustment for English Self-Confidence...	90
Table 28	
Post Hoc Analysis of Means of Marital Adjustment for English Self-Confidence and Gender.....	92
Table 29	
Post Hoc Analysis of Means of Marital Adjustment for English Self-Confidence, Congruency and Gender.....	95
Table 30	
Depression as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence, Congruency and Gender.....	98
Table 31	
Stress as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence, Congruency and Gender.....	99
Table 32	
Marital Adjustment as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence, Congruency and Gender.....	101
Table 33	
Depression as a Function of Self-Esteem, Congruency and Gender.....	103
Table 34	
Post Hoc Analysis of Means of Depression for Self-Esteem.....	104

List of Tables (Continued)

Table 35	
Post Hoc Analysis of Means of Depression for Self-Esteem and Gender	107
Table 36	
Stress as a Function of Self-Esteem, Congruency and Gender	108
Table 37	
Post Hoc Analysis of Means of Stress for Self-Esteem	111
Table 38	
Marital Adjustment as a Function of Self-Esteem, Congruency and Gender	112
Table 39	
Post Hoc Analysis of Means of Marital Adjustment for Self-Esteem and Gender	115
Table 40	
Power Calculations for Each Hypothesis	116
Table 41	
Varimax Rotated Factor Matrices Identification to Membership Group	121
Table 42	
Depression as a Function of Spousal Support, Congruency in the Public Domain and Gender . . .	126
Table 43	
Post Hoc Analysis of Means of Depression for Spousal Support	128
Table 44	
Stress as a Function of Spousal Support, Congruency in the Public Domain and Gender.	129
Table 45	
Marital Adjustment as a Function of Spousal Support, Congruency in the Public Domain and Gender	131
Table 46	
Post Hoc Analysis of Means of Marital Adjustment for Spousal Support	133
Table 47	
Depression as a Function of English Self-Confidence, Congruency in the Public Domain and Gender	135

List of Tables (Continued)

Table 48	
Stress as a Function of English Self-Confidence, Congruency in the Public Domain and Gender.....	136
Table 49	
Marital Adjustment as a Function of English Self-Confidence, Congruency in the Public Domain and Gender.....	138
Table 50	
Depression as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence, Congruency in the Public Domain and Gender.....	140
Table 51	
Stress as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence, Congruency in the Public Domain and Gender.....	141
Table 52	
Marital Adjustment as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence, Congruency in the Public Domain and Gender.....	143
Table 53	
Depression as a Function of Self-Esteem, Congruency in the Public Domain and Gender.....	145
Table 54	
Post Hoc Analysis of Means of Depression for Self-Esteem.....	147
Table 55	
Stress as a Function of Self-Esteem, Congruency in the Public Domain and Gender.....	149
Table 56	
Marital Adjustment as a Function of Self-Esteem, Congruency in the Public Domain and Gender.....	150
Table 57	
Post Hoc Analysis of Means of Marital Adjustment for Self-Esteem and Gender..	153
Table 58	
Depression as a Function of Spousal Support, Congruency in the Private Domain and Gender.....	155
Table 59	
Post Hoc Analysis of Means of Depression for Spousal Support.....	158

List of Tables (Continued)

Table 60 Stress as a Function of Spousal Support, Congruency in the Private Domain and Gender.....	159
Table 61 Marital Adjustment as a Function of Spousal Support, Congruency in the Private Domain and Gender.....	160
Table 62 Post Hoc Analysis of Means of Marital Adjustment for Spousal Support.....	163
Table 63 Depression as a Function of English Self-Confidence, Congruency in the Private Domain and Gender.....	165
Table 64 Post Hoc Analysis of Means of Depression for English Self-Confidence.....	166
Table 65 Post Hoc Analysis of Means of Depression for English Self-Confidence and Gender.....	169
Table 66 Stress as a Function of English Self-Confidence, Congruency in the Private Domain and Gender.....	170
Table 67 Post Hoc Analysis of Means of Stress for English Self-Confidence and Gender...	173
Table 68 Marital Adjustment as a Function of English Self-Confidence, Congruency in the Private Domain and Gender.....	175
Table 69 Depression as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence, Congruency in the Private Domain and Gender.....	177
Table 70 Stress as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence, Congruency in the Private Domain and Gender.....	178

List of Tables (Continued)

Table 71 Marital Adjustment as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence, Congruency in the Private Domain and Gender.....	179
Table 72 Depression as a Function of Self-Esteem, Congruency in the Private Domain and Gender.....	182
Table 73 Post Hoc Analysis of Means of Depression for Self-Esteem.....	183
Table 74 Post Hoc Analysis of Means of Depression for Self-Esteem and Gender.....	186
Table 75 Stress as a Function of Self-Esteem, Congruency in the Private Domain and Gender.....	187
Table 76 Post Hoc Analysis of Means of Stress for Self-Esteem.....	188
Table 77 Post Hoc Analysis of Means of Stress for Self-Esteem, Congruency in the Private Domain and Gender.....	191
Table 78 Marital Adjustment as a Function of Self-Esteem, Congruency in the Private Domain and Gender.....	193
Table 79 Post Hoc Analysis of Means of Marital Adjustment for Self-Esteem and Gender...	196
Table 80 Power Calculations for Hypotheses 5 to 12 in the Public and Private Domains of Identity.....	198

List of Figures

Figure 1	
Mean Depression as a Function Acculturation Profiles	39
Figure 2	
Mean Stress as a Function of Acculturation Profiles	41
Figure 3	
Mean Marital Adjustment as a Function of Acculturation Profiles	43
Figure 4	
Mean Stress as a Function of Combined Male and Female Acculturation Profiles and Gender	55
Figure 5	
Mean Depression as a Function of Spousal Support	69
Figure 6	
Mean Marital Adjustment as a Function of Spousal Support	74
Figure 7	
Mean Depression as a Function of English Self-Confidence and Gender	80
Figure 8	
Mean Stress as a Function of English Self-Confidence and Congruency	84
Figure 9	
Mean Stress as a Function of English Self-Confidence and Gender	86
Figure 10	
Mean Marital Adjustment as a Function of English Self-Confidence, Congruency and Gender	93
Figure 11	
Mean Depression as a Function of Self-Esteem and Gender	105
Figure 12	
Mean Stress as a Function of Self-Esteem	109

List of Figures (Continued)

Figure 13	
Mean Marital Adjustment as a Function of Self-Esteem and Gender.....	113
Figure 14	
Mean Depression as a Function of Spousal Support.....	127
Figure 15	
Mean Marital Adjustment as a Function of Spousal Support.....	132
Figure 16	
Mean Depression as a Function of Self-Esteem and Gender.....	146
Figure 17	
Mean Marital Adjustment as a Function of Self-Esteem and Gender.....	151
Figure 18	
Mean Depression as a Function of Spousal Support.....	156
Figure 19	
Mean Marital Adjustment as a Function of Spousal Support.....	162
Figure 20	
Mean Depression as a Function of English Self-Confidence and Gender.....	168
Figure 21	
Mean Stress as a Function of English Self-Confidence and Gender.....	172
Figure 22	
Mean Depression as a Function of Self-Esteem and Gender.....	184
Figure 23	
Mean Stress as a Function of Self-Esteem, Congruency in the Private Domain and Gender.....	189
Figure 24	
Mean Marital Adjustment as a Function of Self-Esteem and Gender.....	194

List of Appendices

Appendix A	
Questionnaire Used in This Study.....	227
Appendix B	
Tables of Means of Nonsignificant Effects.....	250
Appendix B.1a	
Depression as a Function of Congruency.....	251
Appendix B.1b	
Depression as a Function of Gender.....	251
Appendix B.1c	
Depression as a Function of Congruency and Gender.....	251
Appendix B.2a	
Stress as a Function of Congruency.....	252
Appendix B.2b	
Stress as a Function of Gender.....	252
Appendix B.2c	
Stress as a Function of Congruency and Gender.....	252
Appendix B.3a	
Marital Adjustment as a Function of Congruency.....	253
Appendix B.3b	
Marital Adjustment as a Function of Gender.....	253
Appendix B.3c	
Marital Adjustment as a Function of Congruency and Gender.....	253
Appendix B.4a	
Depression as a Function of Combined Acculturation Profiles.....	254
Appendix B.4b	
Depression as a Function of Gender.....	254
Appendix B.4c	
Depression as a Function of Combined Acculturation Profiles and Gender.....	254

List of Appendices (Continued)

Appendix B.5	
Stress as a Function of Combined Acculturation Profiles.....	255
Appendix B.6a	
Marital Adjustment as a Function of Combined Acculturation Profiles.....	256
Appendix B.6b	
Marital Adjustment as a Function of Gender.....	256
Appendix B.6c	
Marital Adjustment as a Function of Combined Acculturation Profiles and Gender.....	256
Appendix B.7a	
Depression as a Function of Congruency.....	257
Appendix B.7b	
Depression as a Function of Gender.....	257
Appendix B.7c	
Depression as a Function of Spousal Support and Congruency	257
Appendix B.7d	
Depression as a Function of Spousal Support and Gender	258
Appendix B.7e	
Depression as a Function of Spousal Support, Congruency and Gender.....	258
Appendix B.8a	
Stress as a Function of Gender.....	259
Appendix B.8b	
Stress as a Function of Spousal Support and Gender	259
Appendix B.8c	
Stress as a Function of Spousal Support, Congruency and Gender.....	259
Appendix B.9a	
Marital Adjustment as a Function of Congruency.....	260
Appendix B.9b	
Marital Adjustment as a Function of Gender.....	260

List of Appendices (Continued)

Appendix B.9c	
Marital Adjustment as a Function of Spousal Support and Congruency	260
Appendix B.9d	
Marital Adjustment as a Function of Spousal Support and Gender	261
Appendix B.9e	
Marital Adjustment as a Function of Spousal Support, Congruency and Gender.....	261
Appendix B.10a	
Depression as a Function of Congruency.....	262
Appendix B.10b	
Depression as a Function of Gender.....	262
Appendix B.10c	
Depression as a Function of English Self-Confidence and Congruency	262
Appendix B.10d	
Depression as a Function of English Self-Confidence, Congruency and Gender.....	263
Appendix B.11a	
Stress as a Function of Congruency.....	264
Appendix B.11b	
Stress as a Function of English Self-Confidence.....	264
Appendix B.11c	
Stress as a Function of English Self-Confidence, Congruency and Gender.....	264
Appendix B.12a	
Marital Adjustment as a Function of Congruency	265
Appendix B.12b	
Marital Adjustment as a Function of English Self-Confidence and Congruency.....	265
Appendix B.13a	
Depression as a Function of Congruency.....	266
Appendix 13.b	
Depression as a Function of Gender.....	266

List of Appendices (Continued)

Appendix B.13c	
Depression as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence.....	266
Appendix B.13d	
Depression as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence and Congruency.....	266
Appendix B.13e	
Depression as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence and Gender.....	267
Appendix B.13f	
Depression as a Function of Mother-Tongue Self-Confidence, Congruency and Gender.....	267
Appendix B.14a	
Stress as a Function of Congruency.....	268
Appendix B.14b	
Stress as a Function of Gender.....	268
Appendix B.14c	
Stress as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence.....	268
Appendix B.14d	
Stress as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence and Congruency.....	268
Appendix B.14e	
Stress as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence and Gender.....	269
Appendix B.14f	
Stress as a Function of Mother-Tongue Self-Confidence, Congruency and Gender.....	269
Appendix B.15a	
Marital Adjustment as a Function of Congruency.....	270
Appendix B.15b	
Marital Adjustment as a Function of Gender.....	270
Appendix B.15c	
Marital Adjustment as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence.....	270

List of Appendices (Continued)

Appendix B.15d	
Marital Adjustment as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence and Congruency.....	270
Appendix B.15e	
Marital Adjustment as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence and Gender....	271
Appendix B.15f	
Marital Adjustment as a Function of Mother-Tongue Self-Confidence, Congruency and Gender.....	272
Appendix B.16a	
Depression as a Function of Congruency.....	273
Appendix B.16b	
Depression as a Function of Gender.....	273
Appendix B.16c	
Depression as a Function of Self-Esteem and Congruency	273
Appendix B.16d	
Depression as a Function of Self-Esteem, Congruency and Gender.....	274
Appendix B.17a	
Stress as a Function of Self-esteem and Congruency.....	275
Appendix B.17b	
Stress as a Function of Self-Esteem and Gender.....	275
Appendix B.17c	
Stress as a Function of Self-Esteem, Congruency and Gender.....	276
Appendix B.18a	
Marital Adjustment as a Function of Congruency	277
Appendix B.18b	
Marital Adjustment as a Function of Gender.....	277
Appendix B.18c	
Marital Adjustment as a Function of Self-Esteem.....	277

List of Appendices (Continued)

Appendix B.18d	
Marital Adjustment as a Function of Self-Esteem and Congruency.....	277
Appendix B.18e	
Marital Adjustment as a Function of Self-Esteem Congruency and Gender.....	278
Appendix B.19a	
Depression as a Function of Congruency in the Public Domain.....	279
Appendix B.19b	
Depression as a Function of Gender.....	279
Appendix B.19c	
Depression as a Function of Spousal Support and Congruency in the Public Domain	279
Appendix B.19d	
Depression as a Function of Spousal Support and Gender	280
Appendix B.19e	
Depression as a Function of Spousal Support, Congruency in the Public Domain and Gender.....	280
Appendix B.20a	
Stress as a Function of Congruency in the Public Domain.....	281
Appendix B.20b	
Stress as a Function of Gender.....	281
Appendix B.20c	
Stress as a Function of Spousal Support and Congruency in the Public Domain.....	281
Appendix B.20d	
Stress as a Function of Spousal Support and Gender	282
Appendix B.20e	
Stress as a Function of Spousal Support, Congruency in the Public Domain and Gender.....	282
Appendix B.21a	
Marital Adjustment as a Function of Congruency in the Public Domain	283
Appendix B.21b	
Marital Adjustment as a Function of Gender.....	283

List of Appendices (Continued)

Appendix B.21c	
Marital Adjustment as a Function of Spousal Support and Congruency in the Public Domain	283
Appendix B 21d	
Marital Adjustment as a Function of Spousal Support and Gender	284
Appendix B.21e	
Marital Adjustment as a Function of Spousal Support, Congruency in the Public Domain and Gender	284
Appendix B.22a	
Depression as a Function of Congruency in the Public Domain	285
Appendix B.22b	
Depression as a Function of Gender	285
Appendix B 22c	
Depression as a Function of English Self-Confidence and Congruency in the Public Domain	285
Appendix B 22d	
Depression as a Function of English Self-Confidence and Gender	286
Appendix B.22e	
Depression as a Function of English Self-Confidence, Congruency in the Public Domain and Gender	286
Appendix B.23a	
Stress as a Function of Congruency in the Public Domain	287
Appendix B 23b	
Stress as a Function of English Self-Confidence	287
Appendix B 23c	
Stress as a Function of English Self-Confidence and Congruency in the Public Domain	287
Appendix B 23d	
Stress as a Function of English Self-Confidence and Gender	288

List of Appendices (Continued)

Appendix B.23e Stress as a Function of English Self-Confidence, Congruency in the Public Domain and Gender..... .	288
Appendix B.24a Marital Adjustment as a Function of Congruency in the Public Domain	289
Appendix B 24b Marital Adjustment as a Function of Gender	289
Appendix B.24c Marital Adjustment as a Function of English Self-Confidence	289
Appendix B 24d Marital Adjustment as a Function of English Self-Confidence and Congruency in the Public Domain.	289
Appendix B.24e Marital Adjustment as a Function of English Self-Confidence and Gender	290
Appendix B 24f Marital Adjustment as a Function of English Self-Confidence and Congruency in the Public Domain and Gender	290
Appendix B.25a Depression as a Function of Congruency in the Public Domain	291
Appendix B.25b Depression as a Function of Gender	291
Appendix B 25c Depression as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence	291
Appendix B 25d Depression as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence and Congruency in the Public Domain	291
Appendix B 25e Depression as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence and Gender	292

List of Appendices (Continued)

Appendix B.25f Depression as a Function of Mother-Tongue Self-Confidence, Congruency in the Public Domain and Gender.....	292
Appendix B.26a Stress as a Function of Congruency in the Public Domain	293
Appendix B.26b Stress as a Function of Gender.....	293
Appendix B.26c Stress as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence.....	293
Appendix B.26d Stress as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence and Congruency in the Public Domain	293
Appendix B.26e Stress as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence and Gender.....	294
Appendix B.26f Stress as a Function of Mother-Tongue Self-Confidence, Congruency in the Public Domain and Gender.....	294
Appendix B.27a Marital Adjustment as a Function of Congruency in the Public Domain	295
Appendix B.27b Marital Adjustment as a Function of Gender.....	295
Appendix B.27c Marital Adjustment as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence.....	295
Appendix B.27d Marital Adjustment as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence and Congruency in the Public Domain	296
Appendix B.27e Marital Adjustment as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence and Gender....	297

List of Appendices (Continued)

Appendix B.28a	
Depression as a Function of Congruency in the Public Domain	298
Appendix B.28b	
Depression as a Function of Gender.....	298
Appendix B.28c	
Depression as a Function of Self-Esteem and Congruency in the Public Domain	298
Appendix B.28d	
Depression as a Function of Self-Esteem, Congruency in the Public Domain and Gender.....	299
Appendix B.29a	
Stress as a Function of Congruency in the Public Domain	300
Appendix B.29b	
Stress as a Function of Self-Esteem.....	300
Appendix B.29c	
Stress as a Function of Self-Esteem and Congruency in the Public Domain	300
Appendix B.29d	
Stress as a Function of Self-Esteem and Gender.....	301
Appendix B.29e	
Stress as a Function of Self-Esteem, Congruency in the Public Domain and Gender.....	301
Appendix B.30a	
Marital Adjustment as a Function of Gender.....	302
Appendix B.30b	
Marital Adjustment as a Function of Self-Esteem.....	302
Appendix B.30c	
Marital Adjustment as a Function of Self-Esteem and Congruency in the Public Domain.....	302
Appendix B.30d	
Marital Adjustment as a Function of Self-Esteem, Congruency in the Public Domain and Gender.....	303

List of Appendices (Continued)

Appendix B.31a	
Depression as a Function of Congruency in the Private Domain.....	304
Appendix B.31b	
Depression as a Function of Gender.....	304
Appendix B.31c	
Depression as a Function of Spousal Support and Congruency in the Private Domain	304
Appendix B.31d	
Depression as a Function of Spousal Support and Gender	305
Appendix B.31e	
Depression as a Function of Spousal Support, Congruency in the Private Domain and Gender.....	305
Appendix B.32a	
Stress as a Function of Congruency in the Private Domain.....	306
Appendix B.32b	
Stress as a Function of Gender.....	306
Appendix B.32c	
Stress as a Function of Spousal Support.....	306
Appendix B.32d	
Stress as a Function of Spousal Support and Congruency in the Public Domain	306
Appendix B.32e	
Stress as a Function of Spousal Support and Gender	307
Appendix B.32f	
Stress as a Function of Spousal Support, Congruency in the Private Domain and Gender.....	307
Appendix B.33a	
Marital Adjustment as a Function of Congruency in the Private Domain	308
Appendix B.33b	
Marital Adjustment as a Function of Gender.....	308

List of Appendices (Continued)

Appendix B.33c	
Marital Adjustment as a Function of Spousal Support and Congruency in the Private Domain	308
Appendix B.33d	
Marital Adjustment as a Function of Spousal Support and Gender.....	309
Appendix B.33e	
Marital Adjustment as a Function of Spousal Support, Congruency in the Private Domain and Gender.....	309
Appendix B.34a	
Depression as a Function of Congruency in the Private Domain.....	310
Appendix B.34b	
Depression as a Function of Gender.....	310
Appendix B.34c	
Depression as a Function of English Self-Confidence and Congruency in the Private Domain	310
Appendix B.34d	
Depression as a Function of English Self-Confidence, Congruency in the Private Domain and Gender.....	311
Appendix B.35a	
Stress as a Function of Congruency in the Private Domain	312
Appendix B.35b	
Stress as a Function of Gender.....	312
Appendix B.35c	
Stress as a Function of English Self-Confidence.....	312
Appendix B.35d	
Stress as a Function of English Self-Confidence and Congruency in the Private Domain.....	312
Appendix B.35e	
Stress as a Function of English Self-Confidence, Congruency in the Public Domain and Gender.....	313

List of Appendices (Continued)

Appendix B.36a	
Marital Adjustment as a Function of Congruency in the Private Domain.....	314
Appendix B.36b	
Marital Adjustment as a Function of Gender.....	314
Appendix B.36c	
Marital Adjustment as a Function of English Self-Confidence.....	314
Appendix B.36d	
Marital Adjustment as a Function of English Self-Confidence and Congruency in the Private Domain.....	314
Appendix B.36e	
Marital Adjustment as a Function of English Self-Confidence and Gender.....	315
Appendix B.36f	
Marital Adjustment as a Function of English Self-Confidence and Congruency in the Private Domain and Gender.....	315
Appendix B.37a	
Depression as a Function of Congruency in the Private Domain	316
Appendix B.37b	
Depression as a Function of Gender.....	316
Appendix B.37c	
Depression as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence.....	316
Appendix B.37d	
Depression as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence and Congruency in the Private Domain	316
Appendix B.37e	
Depression as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence and Gender.....	317
Appendix B.37f	
Depression as a Function of Mother-Tongue Self-Confidence, Congruency in the Private Domain and Gender.....	317

List of Appendices (Continued)

Appendix B.38a	
Stress as a Function of Congruency in the Public Domain.....	318
Appendix B.38b	
Stress as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence.....	318
Appendix B.38c	
Stress as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence and Congruency in the Private Domain	318
Appendix B.38d	
Stress as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence and Gender.....	319
Appendix B.38e	
Stress as a Function of Mother-Tongue Self-Confidence, Congruency in the Private Domain and Gender.....	319
Appendix B.39a	
Marital Adjustment as a Function of Congruency in the Private Domain	320
Appendix B.39b	
Marital Adjustment as a Function of Gender.....	320
Appendix B.39c	
Marital Adjustment as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence.....	320
Appendix B.39d	
Marital Adjustment as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence and Congruency in the Private Domain	320
Appendix B.39e	
Marital Adjustment as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence and Gender....	321
Appendix B.39f	
Marital Adjustment as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence, Congruency in the Private Domain and Gender.....	321

List of Appendices (Continued)

Appendix B.40a	
Depression as a Function of Congruency in the Private Domain.....	322
Appendix B.40b	
Depression as a Function of Gender.....	322
Appendix B.40c	
Depression as a Function of Self-Esteem and Congruency in the Private Domain....	322
Appendix B.40d	
Depression as a Function of Self-Esteem, Congruency in the Private Domain and Gender.....	323
Appendix B.41a	
Stress as a Function of Congruency in the Private Domain	324
Appendix B.41b	
Stress as a Function of Self-Esteem and Congruency in the Private Domain.....	324
Appendix B.41c	
Stress as a Function of Self-Esteem and Gender.....	324
Appendix B.42a	
Marital Adjustment as a Function of Congruency in the Private Domain	325
Appendix B.42b	
Marital Adjustment as a Function of Gender.....	325
Appendix B.42c	
Marital Adjustment as a Function of Self-Esteem.....	325
Appendix B.42d	
Marital Adjustment as a Function of Self-Esteem and Congruency in the Private Domain.....	325
Appendix B.42e	
Marital Adjustment as a Function of Self-Esteem, Congruency in the Private Domain and Gender.....	326

Chapter 1

Introduction

Statement of the Problem

Cross-cultural psychology has extensively studied the effects of intercultural contact on changes in individual ethnic identity. A predominant theme is that these changes can result in problems of adjustment and well-being entailed by acculturative stress. Research has also indicated, however, that not all acculturating individuals experience such problems; some contextual, interpersonal and intrapersonal characteristics may moderate the relationship between intercultural contact and stress. Furthermore, since for many interethnic contact is experienced concurrently with a marital relationship, that too may influence its adaptive outcome. Changes in cultural beliefs, behaviour, and role expectations of spouses, for example, can have far-reaching effects on the marital relationship, particularly if there is disagreement between the spouses with respect to acculturation issues. The main purpose of this thesis is, therefore, to examine the acculturative effects of intercultural contact in married couples from the same ethnic background, specifically Ismaili Muslims, and potential moderators of these effects.

Theoretical Background

Twenty years of research has documented the existence of a positive relationship between changes as a result of major life events and psychological

distress (Dohrenwend & Dohrenwend, 1974; Myers, Lindenthal, & Pepper, 1971; 1972; 1974; Paykel, 1974). Immigration to another country and immersion in a new culture are examples of such events. They are responsible for what cross-cultural psychology studies as changes and continuities in individual behavior related to the contact between two cultures-a process labelled acculturation (Berry, 1984).

Acculturation has been defined as culture changes which result from continuous, first hand contact between two distinct cultural groups (Redfield, Linton & Herskovits, 1936). These changes may result from differences in language, climate, dress, role expectations, and work habits which require to be reconciled because they occur among interacting individuals living interdependently in the same community. Among others, one fundamental consequence of intercultural contact is changes in one's ethnic identity. Reconciling the differences between one's original identity and the one imposed by the host culture can create problems in psychological, physiological or social functioning labelled as 'acculturative stress' (Berry & Annis, 1974).

Acculturation and identity. Berry (1984) proposed that acculturating individuals have to resolve questions of attitudes and values towards their ethnic identity when adapting to a new culture. These questions revolve around two issues: 1) the relationship one wants to maintain with the native group and 2) the desire to belong to the host group. Positive and negative answers to these two questions combine, thus defining four modes of acculturation: integration, deculturation, separation and assimilation. Integration involves maintaining a positive relationship with the culture of origin and developing a positive relationship with the new culture. It is presumed to be

associated with less stress and conflict (Berry, 1990). Conversely, deculturation is associated with a higher risk for psychological distress as it involves rejecting both ethnic groups (Park, 1928; Stonequist, 1935). Separation involves the preference for the original culture and rejection of the host group, whereas assimilation involves the rejection of the original group and preference for the host group. In a society promoting pluralism, these last two profiles may also be stress-inducing, although less so than in the deculturated profile.

Whereas Berry (1984) underlined the importance of attitudes towards these modes of acculturation, Clément and Noels (1992) were concerned with which group individuals felt they belonged to. Furthermore, they proposed that ethnic identity is not static, but is situationally variable. Depending on one's social environment, therefore, individuals can be identifying more with one particular ethnic group than the other, identifying to both groups at the same time, or identifying with neither cultural group. This implies that although people may come from the same ethnic background, they may adapt differently to the host culture depending on the social context. Moreover, depending on their ethnic identity profile, they may endure different levels of stress (Noels & Clément, 1996). Contextual factors, therefore, determine which identity is more relevant at a particular time (Noels & Clément, 1996). When interacting with ethnic members at a religious function, for example, one's native identity may be stronger than the host identity. Conversely, when interacting with host members at work, one's host identity may be more adaptive than one's native identity. These cultural interactions entail certain behaviours, values and beliefs that are appropriate

for particular situations. Considering minority group members, those individuals most likely to identify with the host group or to both their host and native groups would be in a relatively advantageous position with respect to their adaptation to the host culture. Specifically, it would be expected that (H_1) individuals who identify with the host culture or identify with both cultures, namely assimilated and integrated people, will be better psychologically adjusted than individuals who do not identify with the host culture or with either cultures, namely separated and deculturated people.

Acculturation is, therefore, a dynamic process. Through interaction with various members of the community in different contexts, social networks such as work, family and religious networks are established. One basic postulate of social network research is that people interact meaningfully as individuals, in addition to forming parts of structured and formal institutions such as religious or occupational groups (Milroy, 1980). As a result of interaction with different social networks, differences in cultural values and behaviours have to be reconciled and that process is a potential source of interpersonal stress. Being able to interact appropriately with different members of the community will, therefore, also have an effect on one's psychological health. One facet of the social network that has received little attention in the acculturation literature is the marital relationship. Research on acculturative stress has focused primarily on individuals experiencing intercultural contact and has ignored the effects of acculturative stress in a dyadic relationship. One particular problem facing the acculturating couple concerns differential changes in the spouses' ethnic identity. If couples are not able to resolve these differences or are not able to adapt appropriately

to each other in different situations, then problems in marital adjustment may occur.

Marital harmony and well-being. In general, poorer marriages are associated with increased distress, and unmarried people are happier on the average than those in troubled marriages (Doherty & Jacobson, 1982; Glenn & Weaver, 1981). Unhappily married individuals also report poorer health than do either happily married or divorced people of the same race, sex and age (Renne, 1971). Furthermore, poorer marital quality was associated with greater depression and a poorer response on three functional indices of the immune response in married women (Kiecolt-Glaser, Fisher, Ogrocki, Stout, Speicher, & Glaser, 1987), as well as with greater distress, greater depression and a poorer response on immunological assays in married men (Kiecolt-Glaser, Kennedy, Malkoff, Fisher, Speicher, & Glaser, 1988). An unsatisfactory marital relationship, therefore, may actually place an individual at greater risk than does the absence of a partner because it may itself be a source of stress.

An unsatisfactory marriage may be a result of many factors; specifically, with respect to acculturating couples, differences in language, role expectations, values and beliefs due to differences in ethnic identity may create dissatisfaction, thereby producing stress. The few research conducted on marital relationships and acculturative stress have focused primarily on interracial marriages (Cottrell, 1990) and have ignored couples from the same ethnic background.

Many problems of adjustment have been reported in studies of interracial marriages. Studies of Korean/American interracial marriages have indicated problems with poor communication because of English proficiency and cultural differences (Kim,

1978; Markoff, 1977; Ryu, 1977). Further problems have been related to acceptance by both Koreans and Americans (Hurv & Kim, 1984), issues of acculturation to American society (Chang, 1977; Hurv & Kim, 1984; Yu, 1977), and marital instability (Ryu, 1977). Research with other cultural groups have found similar patterns. British soldiers and the women they married in the early colonial India, for example, reported similar language and acculturation problems (Gaikwad, 1967; Gist & Wright, 1973). Studies of western women living in their non-western husband's country have indicated adjustment problems with respect to role expectations regarding relations with families, child-rearing and employment for women (Imamura, 1986; 1988; Nitta, 1988). These studies indicate that acculturating individuals within a marital relationship experience many difficulties in adapting to their spouse's culture. It is possible that both spouses from the same ethnic background may also face these problems. This information is, however, currently lacking. A comprehensive understanding of the acculturative process and its subsequent consequences on both partners in a marital relationship is, therefore, needed.

Considering the cultural adaptation literature within the marital context (Hurv & Kim, 1984; Kim, 1978; Yu, 1977), however, it is those individuals who identify with the host group or to both their host and native groups that are able to adapt better the host culture. Specifically, it would be expected that (H_2) individuals who identify with the host culture or identify with both cultures, namely assimilated and integrated people, will be better maritally adjusted than individuals who do not identify with the host culture or with either cultures, namely separated and deculturated people.

A further problem is the extent of congruency between the spouse's acculturation profiles. Following Clément's and Noels' (1992) model of situated identity, husbands and wives may be adjusting differently to intercultural contact and these differences in ethnic identity between spouses may cause marital disharmony. For example, spouses who are both integrated will have similar attitudes and values toward maintaining a relationship with their host and native communities. Depending on the situational context, therefore, they will be able to adapt to the cultural behaviours and values associated with that context. Conversely, if one spouse is assimilated and another is separated, for example, they will experience conflict over different cultural values and behaviours. One spouse will want to associate with their native community only, whereas the other will want to maintain a tie with only their host community. As a result of incongruent profiles, therefore, divergent beliefs and values regarding the relationship with host and native members of the community may result in problems of adjustment with their partner. It would, therefore, be expected that (H₃) psychological adjustment (i.e. depression and stress) will be poorer in couples with incongruent acculturation profiles. In addition to the extent that problems of adjustment are reflected in the dyadic context of the couples, it would be expected that (H₄) marital adjustment will be poorer in couples with incongruent acculturation profiles.

Moderators of Acculturation Stress

Not all couples experiencing marital difficulties, however, suffer psychological consequences, indicating that a variety of characteristics can modify the acculturation-stress relationship in married couples. (Berry, Kim, Minde & Mok, 1987)

These moderators have generally been categorized under three domains: contextual (i.e. interethnic climate, structural support for minorities), interpersonal (i.e. communicative abilities, work habits) and intrapersonal (i.e. locus of control, gender). The individual characteristics arising from individual perceptions of these three factors will be examined in this thesis. Based on the prevalence in the literature, this study examines one specific moderator for each domain. Specifically, spousal support, linguistic self-confidence and self-esteem were chosen to represent the contextual, interpersonal and intrapersonal domains, respectively.

Contextual moderator. In the context of marital relationships, one important characteristic underpinning harmony is perceived spousal support (Caplan, 1974; Cassel, 1976; Johnson & Sarason, 1979). Social support, in general, has been prospectively associated with mortality (Berkman & Syme, 1979; Blazer, 1982; House, Robbins, & Metzner, 1982) and has been implicated in the etiology of both physical and psychological distress (Berkman, 1985; Bloom, 1982; Cohen & Willis, 1985; Kessler & McLeod, 1985; Roy, 1978; Meyerowitz, 1983; Schulz & Decker, 1985; Slater & Depue, 1981; Turner, 1979). The combination of low support and one or more life events significantly increases symptoms of physical or psychological distress (Cobb, 1976; House 1981; Mueller, 1980). In general, therefore, social support has been effective in moderating the effects of stressful life events

It is the specific nature of the support, however, that has been identified as being important for certain situations. For example, Lieberman (1982) found that support from other relationships may not compensate for an unsatisfactory marriage. Brown

and Harris (1978), also found that a confiding relationship with a parent, sister, or friend did not compensate for a woman's lack of a confiding relationship with her spouse in terms of vulnerability to depression. Not just any significant other, therefore, can supply effective coping assistance (Thoits, 1986). Effective support may most likely come from socially similar others who have faced or are facing the same stressors (Thoits, 1986). Individuals are more likely to compare themselves with and affiliate with others who have faced the same stressful circumstances. For example, support from one's co-workers may serve to buffer certain kinds of job stress more effectively than does support from one's spouse (House, 1981). Conversely, spousal support, as opposed to support from one's co-workers, may buffer stress affecting the marital relationship. Thus, marital stress resulting from differences in cultural beliefs and values due to acculturation may be buffered by a supporting relationship with one's spouse (DeLongis, Lazarus & Folkman, 1988; Ladewig, McGee, & Newell, 1990; Morris, Robinson, Raphael & Bishop, 1991).

The literature further suggests that there are differential effects of spousal support for men and women (Acitelli & Antonucci, 1994; Brunstein, Dangelmayer, & Schultheiss, 1996; Julien & Markman, 1991). Fincham and Bradbury (1990), for example, have stated that spouses' judgments of marital satisfaction include consideration of social support from their partners. Wellman and Wellman's (1992) study confirmed the special nature of the marital relationship by showing that spouses generally exchange a wider array of social support than other network members. Subsequently, spouses may be chosen as confidants much more than other close

relatives such as parents, siblings, or children (Hoyt & Babchuk, 1983), and a majority of married people name their spouse as a confidant (Strain & Chappel, 1982).

DeLongis and colleagues (1988) examined the somatic and psychological effects of common everyday hassles among 75 married couples during a six-month period. Participants with unsupportive social relationships were more likely to experience an increase in psychological and somatic problems both on and following stressful days than were participants high in social support.

Ladewig and colleagues (1990) studied the role of social support provided by spouses, friends and relatives on the relationship between strains and depressive affect among women. Strains from three life domains, financial, marital and parental, were included. Results indicated that spousal support was negatively related to all three types of strain.

Morris and colleagues (1991) examined the relationship between the perceived adequacy of social support and post-stroke depression in 76 hospitalized patients. They discovered that social support or the perception of lack of support, particularly from a spouse, was significantly associated with both the presence and the severity of depressive disorder. Moreover, depressed patients who perceived their support to be inadequate had a longer duration of depressive illness than depressed patients who perceived their support as adequate.

The aforementioned studies have demonstrated that spousal support is an important factor in alleviating the symptoms associated with many stressful situations. Researchers such as Sarason, Sarason and Shearin (1986), however, have also

shown that variables associated with support are different for men and women, suggesting the hypothesis that the relationship between social support and marital satisfaction is different for husbands and wives. For example, as women, more than men, derive a sense of well being from the emotional qualities of marriage (Gove, Hughes, & Style, 1983; Mills, Grasmick, Morgan, & Wenk, 1992), husbands and wives may have different conceptions of marital satisfaction and spousal support within their marriage.

Acitelli and Antonucci (1994) tested this hypothesis on a sample of 69 married couples. Specifically, the hypothesis tested was that the perceptions of social support, both given and received, within the marital relationship will be more strongly related to the marital satisfaction and well-being of wives than to that of husbands. Subsequently, the separate effects of giving and receiving spousal support on spouses' marital satisfaction and well being were examined. The results support the hypothesis that perception of spousal support is more strongly related to the well being of wives than that of husbands.

Brunstein and colleagues (1996) examined the importance of social support as related to the pursuit of personal goals in accounting for individuals' satisfaction with close relationships. They distinguished between two types of goals: relationship goals are goals pursued within a close relationship and individual goals are goals pursued outside a close relationship. They found that wives' and husbands' satisfaction was differentially related to spousal support of relationship goals and individual goals. Specifically, men's satisfaction with marriage, as compared with that of women

particularly benefits from the marital support of goals pursued outside the marital relationship. Women's satisfaction with marriage, however, relied more heavily on received support for goals pursued within the relationship.

These results are consistent with the finding in Julien and Markman's (1991) study of young to mid-life couples. They found that wives' marital satisfaction was more influenced by social support from husbands than husbands' marital satisfaction was influenced by social support from wives. In addition, studies of premarital, young married, and mid-life married couples have shown that a male partner's interpersonal skills are associated more strongly with a couple's relationship satisfaction than the female partner's interpersonal skills (e.g., Murstein & Williams, 1985; Noller, 1980; White, Speisman, Jackson, Bartis, & Costos, 1986). Furthermore, in a study of young married couples, Acitelli (1992) found that the more the husband attends to the marital relationship, the happier a wife is with regard to both her marriage and her life.

In summary, there is extensive support for the moderating role of spousal support in dealing with various stressful life events. Furthermore, spousal support is related more to the marital satisfaction of wives' than of husbands'. It is, therefore, expected that spousal support will moderate the relation between incongruent acculturation profiles and psychological adjustment (H_5) and marital adjustment (H_6), particularly for wives.

Interpersonal moderator At the interpersonal level, one particular moderating factor that will be examined is linguistic self-confidence as one fundamental aspect of intercultural contact is the ability to communicate with members of the other group. In

examining factors and processes likely to influence acculturation, several authors maintain that variations in identity are a function of linguistic practices (Clément, 1984; Collier & Thomas, 1988). According to Kim (1988), patterns of communication between members of a group eventually become an established and consensual part of the system for conveying cultural information. Furthermore, because language is the primary medium through which this communication occurs, language and identity are intimately linked (Noels, Pon & Clément, 1996).

Research also recognizes that there is a link between fluency in English and adjustment (Berry et al., 1987; Kagan & Cohen, 1990). Minde (1985) reported that a greater knowledge of English was correlated with low stress ($r=.44$) for people from different countries such as Hong Kong, India and South America. Berry and Blondel (1982) reported that knowledge of Chinese and English of Vietnamese refugees prior to arrival was predictive of lower stress after arrival into Canada.

Moreover, Nicassio, Solomon, Guest and McCullough (1986) evaluated a stress-management and coping skills model of adjustment in an analysis of depression in 48 Laotian refugees living in the United States. They reported that stressful events during emigration and a lack of English proficiency were associated with depressive symptoms. English proficiency also reduced the impact of acculturative stressors on depression, suggesting that language skill may act as a stress and depression buffer in a new cultural environment.

Knowledge of one's native language has also been reported to be an important indicator of one's ethnic identity. Leclezio, Louw-Potgieter & Souchon (1985) indicated

that language, specifically spoken language, was found to be the most salient feature of social identity on Mauritian immigrants living in South Africa. Moreover, for Korean immigrants, less usage of both Korean and English was predictive of higher stress (Berry et al., 1987). These studies indicate that knowledge of both one's host and native languages reduce stress. Being able to converse in either language as socially dictated is, therefore, a potential moderator of stress. Subsequently, depending on the social context, one could prefer to communicate in one language over another. Clément and Noels (1992) reported that in the private domain, individuals identified with their own group. They conjectured that in the private domain, individuals may feel that the choice of language is largely self-governed, whereas in the community domain social norms may largely determine language use. Individuals able to communicate in both their native or host language, therefore, may feel less stress as they will be able to communicate effectively depending on their contextual demands.

The interrelations between interethnic contact, language and identity are described in Clément's sociocontextual model of second language learning (1980; 1984). Clément suggests that aspects of contact with the second language group, such as the frequency and quality of contact, lead to variations in the individuals' level of linguistic self-confidence. Self-confidence, defined as self-perceptions of communicative competence and concurrent low levels of anxiety in using the second language, leads to increased usage of and communicative competence in the second language, as well as more identification with the second language community. Thus, linguistic self-confidence has an effect on ethnic identity. Following situated identity

theory (Clément & Noels, 1992; Noels & Clément, 1996), one could conjecture that knowledge of both the native and second language would make it easier for individuals to adapt to both cultures, thereby reducing acculturative stress. It would, therefore, be expected that (H₆) linguistic self-confidence in English and (H₇) linguistic self-confidence in one's native language will moderate the relation between incongruent acculturation profiles and psychological adjustment.

Moreover, following the situated identity framework, linguistic self-confidence in both one's original and second languages are important in order to be able to adapt to different social contexts, including that of the marital relationship. An important element, within this context is communication of values, beliefs, concern, understanding and support. Being able to communicate with one's spouse in either language depending on the social situation will, accordingly, reduce stress and provide harmony. It would, therefore, be expected that (H₈) linguistic self-confidence in English and (H₉) linguistic self-confidence in one's native language will moderate the relation between incongruent acculturation profiles and marital adjustment.

Intrapersonal moderator. Lastly, one intrapersonal resource that has been postulated as moderating stress and coping is self-esteem (Berry, 1990, Hobfoll & Leiberian, 1987; Hobfoll & London, 1986). Persons who have high self-esteem resist ascribing to themselves negative attributes as a result of current difficulties (Pearlin & Schooler, 1978). These individuals tend to see themselves as able to affect the environment positively, even amidst difficulties, and are able to maintain a sense of control over their lives. Conversely, people with low self-esteem feel a lack of control

over their lives and tend to see negative events as something due to personal flaws rather than a result of external events. Thus, individuals who view themselves positively may see themselves as able to affect the environment and feel less overwhelmed during stressful situations compared to individuals who are low in self-esteem (Hobfoll & London, 1986). Some stressful situations that have been studied with respect to self-esteem as a moderator are unemployment (Jex, Cvetanovski, & Allen, 1994), war (Hobfoll & London, 1986), pregnancy (Hobfoll & Leiberman, 1987), immigration (Padilla, Wagatsuma, & Lindholm, 1985; Shin, 1994), and discrimination (Pak, Dion, & Dion, 1991).

Specifically, self-esteem has been found to moderate the effects of acculturative stress. Shin (1994) identified psychosocial predictors of depressive symptoms among 262 Korean-American immigrant women. Questionnaires included measures of depression, acculturative stress, social support and self-esteem. Depressive symptoms were related positively to acculturative stress and negatively to self-esteem. Thus, depression was experienced more when the women had lower self-esteem and were experiencing more acculturative stress.

Furthermore, Padilla and colleagues (1985) studied the experience of stress and personality variables among 114 Japanese and Japanese-American students undergoing differing degrees of acculturation. First-generation students experienced the most stress and were low in self-esteem. Moreover, a multiple-regression analysis revealed that self-esteem and acculturation level were the best predictors of stress. Thus, individuals who were the least acculturated and had the lowest self-esteem

experienced the most stress.

Young (1991) also examined the buffering effects of self-esteem on psychological health in 240 Salvadoran refugees. She reported that self-esteem was a moderator for various stressors on life satisfaction and quality of life. Refugees with high self-esteem had a higher quality of life under high migration stress compared to those with low self-esteem under similar stress levels. Moreover, individuals high in self-esteem maintained high levels of life satisfaction regardless of their stress levels, whereas individuals low in self-esteem had lower life satisfaction under conditions of increased stress. These studies indicate that self-esteem moderates the effects of stressful life-events, including the effects of intercultural contact.

In short, self-esteem is one intrapersonal factor that has been found to moderate the relationship between acculturation and stress. Intercultural contact is a time of change when differences in cultural values and behaviours need to be reconciled. If one can view having control over these changes caused by external factors, then the stress resulting from this process can be minimized. Within the social context of a marriage, marital problems that arise as a result of different cultural beliefs and values can be minimized if viewed as an external source that can be reconciled, as opposed to viewing the source as an internal trait that cannot be controlled. It would, therefore, be expected that (H_{10}) self-esteem will moderate the relation between incongruent acculturation profiles and psychological adjustment, and that (H_{11}) self-esteem will moderate the relation between incongruent acculturation profiles and marital adjustment.

Summary and Potential Contribution

In summary, research in cross-cultural psychology has predominantly observed the effects of intercultural contact on individual functioning. Results have indicated that changes in ethnic identity that accompany intercultural contact are stress-inducing as they involve reconciling differences in cultural beliefs, values and behavior

Current research on this topic is restricted in two ways. First, it fails to take into account the fact that many experience intercultural contact concurrently within a marital relationship. Differences between spouses regarding changes in cultural beliefs, values and behavior can cause problems in the marital relationship. Second, little attention is given to the fact that many acculturating individuals do not suffer from problems in psychological adjustment. There are potential contextual, interpersonal and intrapersonal characteristics that may buffer people from acculturative stress. In the absence of literature on the acculturative effects in a marital relationship in conjunction with potential moderators of this relationship, this thesis will attempt to address these limitations. Thus, the effects of acculturative stress on married couples from the same ethnic background and the moderating effects of spousal support, linguistic self-confidence in host and native languages, and self-esteem will be examined.

To that end, the proposed theoretical conjecture permits the formulation of the following hypotheses

Acculturation profile H₁ Individuals who identify with the host culture or identify with both cultures, namely assimilated and integrated people, will be better

psychologically adjusted than individuals who do not identify with the host culture or with either cultures, namely separated and deculturated people.

H₂. Individuals who identify with the host culture or identify with both cultures, namely assimilated and integrated people, will be better psychologically adjusted than individuals who do not identify with the host culture or with either cultures, namely separated and deculturated people.

Congruency. H₃: Psychological adjustment (i.e. depression and stress) will be poorer in couples with incongruent acculturation profiles.

H₄: Marital adjustment will be poorer in couples with incongruent acculturation profiles.

Moderators. H₅. Spousal support will moderate the relation between incongruent acculturation profiles and psychological adjustment.

H₆: Spousal support will moderate the relation between incongruent acculturation profiles and marital adjustment, particularly for wives.

H₇. Linguistic self-confidence in English will moderate the relation between incongruent acculturation profiles and psychological adjustment.

H₈: Linguistic self-confidence in one's native language will moderate the relation between incongruent acculturation profiles and psychological adjustment.

H₉. Linguistic self-confidence in English will moderate the relation between incongruent acculturation profiles and marital adjustment

H₁₀: Linguistic self-confidence in one's native language will moderate the relation between incongruent acculturation profiles and marital adjustment.

H₁₁: Self-esteem will moderate the relation between incongruent acculturation profiles and psychological adjustment.

H₁₂: Self-esteem will moderate the relation between incongruent acculturation profiles and marital adjustment.

A secondary objective of this thesis is to explore the relation between the moderators and adjustment in couples with incongruent acculturation profiles in specific situations. Hypotheses 5 to 12 will, accordingly, be re-examined in chapter 4, this time defining congruency between couples as relative similarity between acculturation profiles pertaining to specific situations.

Chapter 2

Method

Overview

The material used for this study consisted of a survey questionnaire that incorporated 14 different scales (see Appendix A). Married couples from the Shia Ismaili Muslim sect were the respondents. The independent variables consisted of the congruency of acculturation profiles between spouses and spouses' gender. The dependent variables consisted of psychological adjustment, as measured by depression and stress, and marital adjustment. The moderator variables included spousal support, linguistic self-confidence in both the host and native languages, and self-esteem. Of the 300 questionnaires that were handed out, 182 were returned, making the response rate 61%. However, both spouses completed only 172 of the questionnaires.

Participants

The participants of this study are Ismaili, a branch of the Shiite Muslim. Islamic societies are based upon religion, and that religious framework shapes all human behavior, both individual and collective (Akbar, 1990). The Ismailis are defined by their belief in the unbroken chain of leadership from the Prophet Muhammed to the present leader Karim Aga Khan IV, the forty-sixth spiritual leader. The belief that the Aga Khan holds a position of both secular and spiritual authority sets the Ismailis apart from other cases, in many cases making them a ``minority within a minority`` (Thompson, 1975,

p.30).

The ethnic roots of the Canadian Ismailis can be traced to the Indian subcontinent in the early 1800's when the first Aga Khan fled persecution from Persia to Bombay. In the early 1900's, many of the Asian Ismailis then immigrated to East Africa, on the suggestion of Aga Khan III, in order to improve their economic situations. Culturally, the Aga Khan III recommended that the Ismailis in Africa adopt the culture and language of the colonial power (Adams, 1974). Education was one important factor in the implementation of this goal (Hopkins, 1966).

By the early 1970's, the East African Ismailis were caught between governmental discrimination and increasingly expressed mass prejudice, and between their decreasing acceptance in East Africa and their difficulty in relocating elsewhere. The culmination of this movement in Uganda, for example, was President Amin's edict of expulsion which reduced the Asian population of that country from 90,000 to 1000 by early 1973 (Adams, 1974).

The Aga Khan IV, and present leader, encouraged the Ismaili Muslims in Africa to move to western countries like Canada and the United States. As a result of the expulsion and persecution, many businesses and properties were confiscated in Africa and many people immigrated to Canada with less than \$100 Canadian when they fled the country.

Politically, the Canadian Ismailis have been local citizens with no 'homeland' to return to, and culturally they have moved towards urban ways and values (Adams, 1974). Ismailis have a strong community that provides mutual support of various kinds

for its members. Historically, the Aga Khan has been instrumental in decreeing the importance of self-help social and economic community activities within Ismailis society (Greene & Butler, 1996). As well, the importance of education and the integration into the host community have been highly stressed. Furthermore, their spiritual leader reinterprets the Qu`ran to meet new situations. Subsequently, their life stance is based upon adjustment and coping with pressures.

Specifically, participants in this study consisted of 86 married couples from the Shia Imami Nizari sect from Ottawa, Ontario and Calgary, Alberta. Their ages ranged from 25 years to 65 years ($M = 44.2$ years, $SD = 9.25$ years), the years of residency in Canada ranged from 2 years to 64 years ($M = 20.51$ years, $SD = 6.56$ years), and the length of marriage ranged from 5 years to 41 years ($M = 20.51$ years, $SD = 6.56$ years). All of the participants were Canadian citizens, 52% had completed a college or university education, and 88% had a native language other than English. As well, 84% of the women worked outside the home.

Measures

The questionnaire included 14 different scales. In the first part of the questionnaire, linguistic competence and comfort with both one's mother tongue and English, comfort level with members of one's native and host communities and self-esteem were evaluated through 6-point Likert scales anchored at one end by "strongly disagree" and at the other end by "strongly agree". The other nine variables were measured using different scales. These measures assessed ethnic identity, psychological adjustment, marital adjustment, spousal support, and various

demographic information. In computing individual scores, some modifications were made to the original scales based on the item-total correlation of the individual items. The Cronbach's alphas of the aforementioned scales including more than one item are reported in Table 1.

Situated identity. In order to assess situated identity, 20 descriptions of everyday situations were presented followed by two 5-point scales (see Clément & Noels, 1992). These situations were selected on the basis of results of a preliminary investigation aimed at generating a complete list of the situations in which Ismaili Muslims usually find themselves. This preliminary study was conducted with 20 Ismaili Muslims, ranging in age from 18 to 56 years ($M=36$) who were asked to list, in point form, the activities they engaged in on a day-to-day basis. After eliminating improbable and redundant situations, 20 descriptions were retained.

The first scale assessed the degree of identification with the Canadian group, and the second assessed the degree of identification with the Muslim group. Corresponding to the proposition of situated identity theory, these situations were preceded by instructions explaining to the participant that, in any given situation, he/she could identify with both groups (Canadian and Muslim), with one group or with neither groups.

Table 1

Internal Reliability of Each Measure

Scale	Cronbach's Alpha
Situating Identity (Clément & Noels, 1992):	
Degree of identification with the Canadian group	.95
Degree of identification with the Muslim group	.95
Beck Depression Inventory (Beck & Steer, 1987)	.84
Psychological Stress Measure (Lemyre, Tessier & Fillion, 1990)	.92
Dyadic Adjustment Scale (Spanier, 1976)	.81
Anxiety when Communicating in English (Clément, 1988)	.75
Anxiety when Communicating in Mother Tongue (Clément, 1988)	.76
Perceived Competence in English (Clément, 1988)	.99
Perceived Competence in Mother Tongue (Clément, 1988)	.84
Rosenberg's Self-esteem Inventory (Rosenberg, 1965)	.82
Spousal Support (Procidano & Heller, 1983)	.90

For example:

When I take the bus, I feel...

Not at all						Very
Canadian	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Canadian

Not at all						Very
Muslim	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Muslim

The answers allowed the computation of two indices reflecting the level of identification with Canadians and with Muslims, such that a high score indicated a high level of identification with that group

Depression The degree of depression felt within the past week was assessed using the Amended Beck Depression Inventory (BDI-IA, Beck & Steer, 1987). This inventory consists of 12 items measuring various degrees of depression ranging from 1 to 4. An example to a one-point answer is "I do not feel sad" and an example of a four point answer is "I feel so sad or unhappy that I can't stand it". A high score indicates a high degree of depression. The BDI-II was not used as the correlation between BDI-IA and BDI-II is .93 (Beck, Steer, & Brown, 1996). To determine whether there were any differences for the BDI-IA between the Ismaili Muslim sample and the normative sample, an independent groups t test was computed. The Ismaili Muslims' scores did not differ significantly from 191 Kentucky and New Jersey outpatients. Moreover, Ismaili Muslims' scores on the BDI-IA scale indicate that this sample is minimally

depressed.

Stress. The degree of stress felt within the last four or five days was assessed using the short version of Lemyre, Tessier & Fillion's (1990) Psychological Stress Measure. The participants indicated the extent to which 25 stress symptoms were self-descriptive on an eight-point scale, from "not at all" to "extremely." An example of an item is "I am tense and nervous (overwrought)." A high score indicates a high degree of stress. To determine whether there were any differences for the Psychological Stress Measure between the Ismaili Muslim sample and the normative sample, an independent groups t test was computed. The Ismaili Muslims' scores did not differ significantly from 1529 nonclinical adults from Quebec. Moreover, Ismaili Muslims' scores on this measure indicate that this sample is experiencing average stress levels.

Marital adjustment. The quality of the marital relationship was assessed using the Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS; Spanier, 1976). The DAS is a 32-item, primarily Likert-style questionnaire developed for married and cohabiting couples utilizing 2-, 5-, 6-, and 7- point response formats. It is composed of four subscales: consensus, satisfaction, cohesion, and affectional expression. A summary score based on the total of the four subscales is commonly used in the research (Hunsley, Pinsent, Lefebvre, James-Tanner, & Vito, 1995) and Spanier (1988) recommends the use of this global index. The total DAS score has a very high internal consistency (approximately .90 or greater) for men and women in heterosexual or homosexual relationships (Carey, Spector, Lantinga, & Krauss, 1993, Kurdek, 1992). Furthermore, the DAS total score

has been found to be stable over time with a test-retest reliability over an 11-week period for married couples reported to be .96 (Stein, Girodo, & Dotzenroth, 1982). Finally, the DAS is reported to have good construct validity by being highly related to other measures of marital quality (Crane, Allgood, Larson & Griffin, 1990). To determine whether there were any differences for the DAS between the Ismaili Muslim sample and the normative sample, an independent groups t test was computed. The Ismaili Muslims' scored significantly lower than 218 married people from Pennsylvania, USA, $t(388) = 2.00$, $p < .05$. This indicates that the Ismaili Muslim sample were less maritally adjusted than the normative sample. However, Ismaili Muslims' scores on this measure indicate that this sample is fairly happily married.

Spousal support. The Perceived Social Support - Spouse Scale (PSS-Sp) was adapted from the Perceived Social Support- Family Scale (PSS-Fa; Procidano & Heller, 1983). It is a 20-item instrument designed to measure the degree one perceives his/her needs for support are fulfilled by their spouse. The items consist of "yes", "no" or "I don't know" responses. An example is "My spouse gives me the moral support I need" A larger proportion of "yes" answers indicates a perception of high spousal support.

Although measures of reliability and validity are not available for the PSS-Sp scale, internal consistency reported for the PSS-Fa was .90 (Fischer & Corcoran, 1994). Furthermore, a test-retest reliability coefficient of stability over a one-month period was .83 (Fischer & Corcoran, 1994).

Anxiety when communicating in English. Eight statements taken from Clément (1988) measured the participant's anxiety when communicating in English. An example is "I feel uneasy whenever I speak English". A high score (maximum=48) indicates feeling comfortable communicating in English.

Anxiety when communicating in mother tongue. Eight statements taken from Clément (1988) were adapted to measure the participant's anxiety when communicating in their mother tongue. If their mother tongue was English, they were instructed not to answer these items. An example is "I feel uneasy whenever I speak my mother tongue". A high score (maximum=48) indicates feeling comfortable communicating in their native language.

Competence in English. Competence in English was determined through the use of four 7-point scales (Clément, 1988). The four scales were related to reading, understanding, writing and speaking English. The participants indicated the extent to which they felt they were competent in each of these areas on scales, from (1) "not at all" to (7) "very well"

Competence in mother tongue. Competence in one's native language was determined through the same scale as mentioned above. If participants' native language was English, they were instructed not to answer the corresponding four items.

Self-esteem. Self-esteem was assessed using Rosenberg's (1965) ten-item inventory. These items are intended to measure global self-esteem and has been widely used with different age groups, ethnic groups, socio-economic levels and psychiatric conditions (Wylie, 1989). An example of an item is "On the whole, I am

satisfied with myself" A high score indicates high self-esteem.

General Information. General information concerning the participant was gathered in the final section. Demographic variables such as age, gender, country of birth, length of residency in Canada, citizenship status, years of marriage, mother tongue, education, and occupation were asked.

Table 2 provides the descriptive statistics for the following measures: Canadian situated identity, Muslim situated identity, spousal support, English self-confidence, mother tongue self-confidence, self-esteem, depression, stress, and marital adjustment. Table 3 provides the correlation matrix of the dependent variable, moderator variables, years of residency in Canada, and years of marriage for males and females.

Procedure

The author contacted participants in mosque. The couples were asked to participate in this project with the understanding of the confidentiality, anonymity, and voluntariness of their participation. The participants were provided with a self-addressed paid envelope in order to return the questionnaires. They were also contacted twice by phone the following two weeks as a follow-up reminder to mail the completed questionnaires.

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics for Males, Females and Total Sample on Scales Used in This Study

<u>Measure</u>	<u>Sample</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Maximum</u>
Canadian Situating Identity	Total	3.80	0.99	1.00	5.00
	Male	3.83	1.02	1.00	5.00
	Female	3.76	0.95	1.00	5.00
Muslim Situating Identity	Total	3.71	0.99	1.30	5.00
	Male	3.67	1.04	1.30	5.00
	Female	3.75	0.95	1.40	5.00
Spousal Support	Total	16.97	3.96	2.00	20.00
	Male	17.23	3.72	2.00	20.00
	Female	16.71	4.19	2.00	20.00
English Self-Confidence (ESC)	Total	2.21	1.10	1.00	6.00
	Male	2.18	1.11	1.00	6.00
	Female	2.24	1.09	1.00	4.28

Table 2 Continued

Measure	Sample	Mean	S.D.	Minimum	Maximum
Mother tongue Self-Confidence (MSC)	Total	2.27	1.04	1.00	5.00
	Male	2.33	0.97	1.00	4.25
	Female	2.22	1.11	1.00	5.00
Self-Esteem	Total	4.86	1.18	2.33	6.00
	Male	4.81	1.21	2.33	6.00
	Female	4.92	1.15	2.50	6.00
Depression	Total	12.71	3.18	10.00	28.00
	Male	12.73	3.46	10.00	28.00
	Female	12.69	2.91	10.00	23.00
Stress	Total	2.77	1.01	1.08	5.64
	Male	2.61	0.94	1.08	5.64
	Female	2.92	1.05	1.08	5.28
Marital Adjustment	Total	108.03	21.18	46.50	189.00
	Male	108.96	23.03	46.50	189.00
	Female	107.14	19.34	59.00	138.00

Table 3

Correlation Matrix of Males (Above Diagonal) and Females (Below Diagonal)

Variable	Spousal Support	ESC	MSC	Self-Esteem	Depression	Stress	Marital Adjustment	Years Married	Years in Canada
Spousal Support	1.00	.11	.05	.19	-.41*	-.32*	.43*	-.17	-.07
ESC	.08	1.00	-.38*	.72*	-.26*	-.14	.23*	-.17	.09
MSC	.08	-.54*	1.00	.37*	.01	.06	.32*	-.11	.07
Self-Esteem	.03	.75*	.45*	1.00	-.27*	-.18	.25*	-.12	.05
Depression	-.37*	-.40*	-.24*	-.33*	1.00	.71*	-.38*	.20	.03
Stress	-.24*	-.26*	-.05	-.21	.61*	1.00	-.35*	.03	-.08
Marital Adjustment	.56*	.16	.20	.03	-.37*	-.32*	1.00	.00	-.07
Years Married	-.04	-.11	-.03	-.03	.17	.01	-.10	1.00	.21
Years in Canada	-.01	.05	-.13	.04	-.14	-.33*	-.02	.33*	1.00

*p < .05

Chapter 3

Results

Overview of the Analyses

Prior to the analyses, individuals were first classified into their respective acculturating groups. Based on their acculturation profiles, couples were then classified as congruent or incongruent. Subsequently, four series of analyses were performed on the data. The first set of analyses explored the relation between acculturation profiles and psychological and marital adjustment. The second set of analyses evaluated the relation between the congruency of acculturation profiles between spouses and psychological and marital adjustment. The third set of analyses assessed the relation between the congruency of acculturation profiles in married couples and adjustment, taking into consideration the moderators of psychological and marital adjustment. Finally, the fourth set of analyses evaluated the statistical power related to each hypothesis.

First, in order to define individuals as high and low on ethnic identification, a median split was performed on the identification scores to both Canadian and Muslim groups for males and females. The median score for Canadian identification was 4.00 and 3.80 for Muslim identification for males, and 3.90 and 3.85, respectively, for females. Thus, individuals who fell above the median for both scales were considered integrated (N=45). Those individuals who fell below the median for both scales were classified as having a deculturated identity (N=50). Individuals were classified as having a separated identity if their scores of identification with the Muslim group were

above the median and if their scores of identification with the Canadian group were below the median (N=26). The reverse is true for the assimilation category (N=16).

Second, in order to define couples as congruent or incongruent, the acculturation profiles of each husband and wife were examined. If their acculturation profiles were similar, regardless of which acculturation mode they identified with, they were defined as a congruent couple (N=78). For example, if both husbands and wives had low identification to both the host and native groups or had high identification with both cultural groups, then they were classified as a congruent couple. Conversely, if their acculturation profiles did not correspond to each other, then they were defined as incongruent (N=58). For example, if one spouse had high identification with both cultural groups, whereas the other spouse had low identification with both cultural groups, they were then defined as an incongruent couple.

Third, in order to define the individuals as high or low on the moderators, median splits were performed on the moderator scores for males and females. The median score for spousal support was 18.00 for males and 18.00 for females. The median score for linguistic self-confidence in English was 1.86 for males and 2.00 for females. The median score for linguistic self-confidence in mother tongue was for 2.50 males and 2.00 for females. The median score for self-esteem was 5.17 for males and 5.33 for females. Thus, individuals who fell above the median were considered as high for that moderator, and those individuals who fell below the median were considered as low for that moderator.

Given two moderately correlated indices of adjustment (i.e. depression and

stress), separate sets of multivariate analyses of variance were computed on psychological adjustment indices. As well, because of the low correlation between marital adjustment and psychological adjustment variables, separate sets of analyses of variance, were computed for marital adjustment (c.f. Tabachnik & Fidell, 1996).

Acculturation Profile and Adjustment

The first set of analyses concerns the relation between acculturation profiles and psychological and marital adjustment. According to our first two hypotheses, individuals who identify with the host or both cultures, namely assimilated and integrated individuals, will be better psychologically (H_1) and maritally (H_2) adjusted than those who do not identify with the host culture or with either cultures, namely separated and deculturated individuals.

Psychological Adjustment

A MANOVA was computed on the psychological adjustment variables, specifically depression and stress, using Acculturation Profiles (deculturated, separated, assimilated, integrated) as a factor. Results show a significant multivariate main effect [Wilk's Lambda = 0.89; $p < .01$] for Acculturation Profiles. The univariate effects are reported in Tables 4a, 4b and 4c and are presented separately hereafter. In this and the following analyses, only the univariate effects corresponding to a significant multivariate effect will be considered.

Table 4a

Analysis of Variance Summary Table
Depression as a Function of Acculturation Profiles

Acculturation Profiles	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Acculturation Profiles	3	140.37	46.79	4.98 *
Error	166	1558.74	9.39	

Table 4b

Analysis of Variance Summary Table
Stress as a Function of Acculturation Profiles

Acculturation Profiles	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Acculturation Profiles	3	2.91	0.97	3.95 *
Error	166	635.78	3.83	

Table 4c

Analysis of Variance Summary Table
Marital Function as a Function of Acculturation Profiles

Acculturation Profiles	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Acculturation Profiles	3	1297.35	432.45	3.73*
Error	166	267,575.40	1611.90	

*p<.05; **p<.01

Depression. A significant main effect was obtained for Acculturation Profiles (see Figure 1). Tukey's Honestly Significant Different Test for Unequal Sample Sizes (Tukey's HSD for Unequal N) was conducted in order to assess the nature of these differences. The results show that this effect is mainly due to the significant differences between deculturated individuals and integrated individuals (see Table 5). More precisely, deculturated individuals reported higher depression than integrated individuals.

Stress. A significant main effect was obtained for Acculturation Profiles (see Figure 2). Tukey's HSD test was applied in order to assess the nature of these differences. The results show that this effect is mainly due to the significant differences between integrated individuals and deculturated and assimilated individuals (see Table 6). More precisely, integrated individuals reported lower stress than deculturated individuals and assimilated individuals.

Marital Adjustment

A one way ANOVA was computed on the marital adjustment variables using Acculturation Profiles (deculturated, separated, assimilated, integrated) as a factor. A significant main effect was obtained for Acculturation Profiles (see Figure 3). Tukey's HSD test was applied in order to assess the nature of these differences. The results show that this effect is mainly due to the significant differences between integrated individuals and deculturated individuals (see Table 7). More precisely, deculturated individuals reported lower marital adjustment than integrated individuals


Figure 1**Mean Depression as a Function of Acculturation Profiles**

Table 5

Post Hoc Analysis of Means of Depression for Acculturation Profiles

Acculturation Profiles					
Deculturated (13.75)	Separated (12.41)	Assimilated (12.67)	Integrated (11.61)	Degrees of Freedom	<u>Q</u>
X	X			3,166	2.50
X		X		2,166	2.17
X			X	4,166	5.42**
	X	X		2,166	0.42
	X		X	2,166	1.47
		X	X	3,166	2.09

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

Note. Means appear in brackets.


Figure 2**Mean Stress as a Function of Acculturation Profiles**

Table 6

Post Hoc Analysis of Means of Stress for Acculturation Profiles

Acculturation Profiles				Degrees of Freedom	<u>Q</u>
Deculturated (2.96)	Separated (2.95)	Assimilated (2.89)	Integrated (2.40)		
X	X			2,166	0.06
X		X		3,166	0.44
X			X	4,166	4.42**
	X	X		2,166	0.30
	X		X	3,166	3.14
		X	X	2,166	3.01*

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

Note. Means appear in brackets.


Figure 3**Mean Marital Adjustment as a Function of Acculturation Profiles**

Table 7

Post Hoc Analysis of Means of Marital Adjustment for Acculturation Profiles

Acculturation Profiles					
Deculturated (103.35)	Separated (105.05)	Assimilated (106.26)	Integrated (115.47)	Degrees of Freedom	<u>Q</u>
X	X			2,166	0.47
X		X		3,166	0.86
X			X	4,166	4.53**
	X	X		2,166	0.29
	X		X	3,166	2.82
		X	X	2,166	2.68

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

Note. Means appear in brackets.

In summary, the first and second hypotheses with respect to acculturation profiles and psychological and marital adjustment, respectively, were supported. Individuals who identified with both cultures, namely integrated people, reported lower depression, lower stress and higher marital adjustment than individuals who did not identify with either culture, namely deculturated people.

Congruency and Adjustment

The second set of analyses concerns the relation between congruency of acculturation profiles between spouses and psychological and marital adjustment. According to the third and fourth hypotheses, respectively, couples whose acculturation profiles are congruent will be better psychologically (H_3) and maritally (H_4) adjusted than couples whose acculturation profiles are incongruent.¹

Psychological Adjustment

A repeated measures MANOVA was computed on the psychological adjustment variables, specifically depression and stress, using as a between factor Congruency (congruent vs. incongruent) and, as a within factor, Gender (male vs. female). Results of the MANOVA show a significant multivariate main effect [Wilk's Lambda = 0.86; $p < .01$] for Gender. The univariate effects are reported separately hereafter.

¹ Length of marriage and length of years in Canada, were originally used as covariates in the 2 x 2 repeated measures MANCOVA and ANCOVA. Since they did not significantly affect the results, they were omitted from further computations

Depression. All main effects and interactions are reported in Table 8. No significant main effect that correspond to a multivariate effect was obtained for the measure of depression (see Appendix B.1a, B.1b and B.1c for the means). Thus, couples with incongruent acculturation profiles couples did not report higher depression than couples with congruent acculturation profiles.

Stress. All main effects and interactions are reported in Table 9. A significant main effect was obtained for Gender. Higher stress was experienced by females ($M=2.93$) than by males ($M=2.61$).

No significant main effect for Congruency or two-way interaction that correspond to multivariate effects were obtained (see Appendix B.2a, B.2b and B.2c for the means). Thus, couples with incongruent acculturation profiles did not report higher stress than couples with congruent acculturation profiles.

Marital Adjustment

A 2 x 2 repeated measures ANOVA was computed on marital adjustment, using as a between factor Congruency (congruent vs. incongruent) and, as a within factor, Gender (male vs. female). All main effects and interactions are reported in Table 10. No significant main effects or two-way interaction were obtained for the measure of marital adjustment (see Appendix B.3a, B.3b and B.3c for the means). Thus, couples

Table 8

Depression as a Function of Congruency and Gender

Between-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	84	1281.84	15.26	
Congruency (C)	1	9.76	9.76	0.43

Within-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	84	438.48	5.22	
Gender (G)	1	0.16	0.16	0.86
C x G	1	0.04	0.04	0.93

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

Table 9

Stress as a Function of Congruency and Gender

Between-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	84	125.16	1.49	
Congruency (C)	1	2.18	2.18	1.47
Within-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	84	42.84	0.51	
Gender (G)	1	4.26	4.26	8.40**
C x G	1	0.01	0.01	0.02

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

Table 10

Marital Adjustment as a Function of Congruency and Gender

Between-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	84	62,276.76	741.39	
Congruency (C)	1	1166.70	1166.70	1.57

Within-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	84	13,205.64	157.21	
Gender (G)	1	48.94	48.94	0.31
C x G	1	21.94	21.94	0.13

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

marital adjustment (see Appendix B.3a, B.3b and B.3c for the means). Thus, couples with incongruent acculturation profiles did not report lower dyadic adjustment than couples with congruent acculturation profiles.

In summary, although the results indicate that females are more stressed than males, the third and fourth hypotheses regarding the congruency of acculturation profiles of spouses and psychological and marital adjustment, respectively, were not supported. Thus, couples with incongruent acculturation profiles did not significantly report higher depression, higher stress or lower marital adjustment than couples with congruent acculturation profiles.

Combined Acculturation Profiles for Males and Females and Adjustment

The previous analyses confounded all aspects of congruency and all aspects of incongruency. The following analyses were meant to test the relation between acculturation profiles in males and females and adjustment. First, based on the acculturation profiles determined by the median splits conducted earlier, individuals were classified as integrated, assimilated, separated or deculturated. Once the individuals were classified according to their acculturation profiles, the combined acculturation profiles of males and females were determined. From these determinations, 14 possible classifications were obtained (Male, Female): Deculturated, Deculturated (D,D); Separated, Separated (S,S); Assimilated, Assimilated (A,A); Integrated, Integrated (I,I); Deculturated, Separated (D,S); Deculturated, Assimilated (D,A);

Deculturated (S,D); Assimilated, Deculturated (A,D); Assimilated, Separated (A,S), Assimilated, Integrated (A,I), Integrated, Deculturated (I,D); Integrated, Separated (I,S), and Integrated, Assimilated (I,A). In this sample, two combinations, Separated Male and Assimilated Female and Separated Male and Integrated Female, were not obtained from the data.¹

Psychological Adjustment

The repeated measures MANOVA computed on the psychological adjustment indices, specifically depression and stress, used as a between factor, Combined Acculturation Profiles (DD, SS, AA, II, DS, DA, DI, SD, AD, AS, AI, ID, IS, IA), and, as a within factor, Gender (male vs female) Results show a significant multivariate main effect [Wilk's Lambda = 0.87, $p < .01$] for Gender and a significant multivariate interaction [Wilk's Lambda = 0.59; $p < .05$] for Combined Acculturation profiles and Gender. The univariate effects are reported separately hereafter

Depression All effects and interactions are reported in Table 11. No significant main effects or two-way interaction that correspond to multivariate effects were obtained for the measurement of depression (see Appendix B 4a, B 4b and B 4c for the means).

¹ Length of marriage and length of years in Canada, were originally used as covariates in the 14 x 2 repeated measures MANCOVA and ANCOVA Since they did not significantly affect the results, they were omitted from further computations

Table 11

Depression as a Function of Combined Acculturation Profiles and Gender

Between-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	72	1020.96	14.18	
Combined Acculturation Profiles (CAP)	13	270.27	20.79	1.47

Within-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	72	378.00	5.25	
Gender (G)	1	0.13	0.13	0.02
CAP x G	13	60.19	4.63	0.88

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

Stress. All effects and interactions are reported in Table 12. A significant main effect for Gender was obtained. Females ($M=2.93$) reported more stress than males ($M=2.61$).

A significant two-way interaction was also obtained for Combined Acculturation Profiles and Gender (see Figure 4). Tukey's HSD test was applied in order to assess the nature of these differences. Table 13a reports the comparison of means of stress for males, Table 13b reports the comparison of means of stress for females, and Table 13c reports the comparison of means of stress for males and females. The results show that this effect is due to the significant differences between males and females in a relationship in which the husband is integrated and the wife is either separated or assimilated. As well, this effect is due to the significant differences between males and females when both spouses are assimilated. More precisely, wives are more stressed when they have a unicultural identity, whereas the husband has a bicultural identity. Moreover, wives are more stressed than husbands even when both spouses identify with the host culture. No other significant main effects that correspond to multivariate effects were obtained for the measure of stress (see Appendix B.5 for the means).

Marital Adjustment

The 14 x 2 repeated measures ANOVA computed on the marital adjustment variable involved as a between factor, Combined Acculturation Profiles (DD, SS, AA, II, DS, DA, DI, SD, AD, AS, AI, ID, IS, IA), and, as a within factor, Gender (male vs. female).

Table 12

Stress as a Function of Combined Acculturation Profiles and Gender

Between-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	72	100.80	1.40	
Combined Acculturation Profiles (CAP)	13	26.78	2.06	1.47

Within-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	72	31.68	0.44	
Gender (G)	1	2.72	2.72	6.23*
CAP x G	13	11.05	0.85	1.94*

*p<.05; **p<.01

Figure 4

Mean Stress as a Function of Combined Male and Female Acculturation Profiles




Table 13a

Post Hoc Analysis of Means of Stress for Combined Acculturation Profiles and MalesCombined Acculturation Profiles (Male, Female)Male

D,D (2.92)	S,S (2.05)	A,A (2.48)	I,I (2.26)	D,S (3.04)	D,A (3.12)	D,I (2.65)	S,D (2.57)	A,D (2.84)	A,S (3.68)	A,I (2.26)	I,D (2.52)	I,S (2.83)	I,A (2.41)	Degrees of Freedom	Q
X									X					4,113	1.10
	X								X					14,113	2.19
		X							X					10,113	1.62
			X						X					12,113	2.05
				X					X					3,113	0.86
					X				X					2,113	0.75
						X			X					7,113	1.32
							X		X					8,113	1.49
								X	X					5,113	1.01
									X	X				13,113	1.87
									X		X			9,113	1.40
									X			X		6,113	1.09
									X				X	11,113	1.68
X					X									3,113	0.59
	X				X									13,113	2.49
		X			X									9,113	1.49
			X		X									11,113	2.55
				X	X									2,113	0.19
					X	X								6,113	0.95
					X		X							7,113	1.23
					X			X						4,113	0.49
					X					X				12,113	1.89

*p<.05; **p<.01

Note. Means appear in brackets.

Table 13a Continued

Male

D,D (2.92)	S,S (2.05)	A,A (2.48)	I,I (2.26)	D,S (3.04)	D,A (3.12)	D,I (2.65)	S,D (2.57)	A,D (2.84)	A,S (3.68)	A,I (2.26)	I,D (2.52)	I,S (2.83)	I,A (2.41)	Degrees of Freedom	Q
					X						X			8,113	1.06
					X							X		5,113	0.59
					X								X	10,113	1.56
X				X										2,113	0.36
	X			X										12,113	2.31
		X		X										8,113	1.31
			X	X										10,113	2.31
					X		X							5,113	0.79
				X			X							6,113	1.10
				X				X						3,113	0.35
				X						X				11,113	1.71
				X							X			7,113	0.92
				X								X		4,113	0.42
				X									X	9,113	1.39
X	X													11,113	2.58
X		X												7,113	1.30
X			X											9,113	3.15
X						X								4,113	0.65
X							X							5,113	1.04
X								X						2,113	0.16
X										X				10,113	1.78
X											X			6,113	0.80
X												X		3,113	0.22
X													X	8,113	1.38

p<.05; **p<.01

Note. Means appear in brackets.

Table 13a Continued

Male

D,D (2.92)	S,S (2.05)	A,A (2.48)	I,I (2.26)	D,S (3.04)	D,A (3.12)	D,I (2.65)	S,D (2.57)	A,D (2.84)	A,S (3.68)	A,I (2.26)	I,D (2.52)	I,S (2.83)	I,A (2.41)	Degrees of Freedom	Q
	X							X						10,113	1.39
		X						X						6,113	0.63
			X					X						8,113	1.16
						X		X						3,113	0.31
							X	X						4,113	0.48
								X		X				9,113	0.99
								X			X			5,113	0.47
								X				X		2,113	0.02
								X					X	7,113	0.73
	X											X		9,113	1.58
		X										X		5,113	0.71
			X									X		7,113	1.36
						X						X		2,113	0.33
							X					X		3,113	0.53
										X		X		8,113	1.10
											X	X		4,113	0.50
												X		6,113	0.81
	X					X							X	8,113	1.21
		X				X								4,113	0.34
			X			X								6,113	0.93
						X	X							2,113	0.16
						X				X				7,113	0.75
						X					X			3,113	0.21
						X							X	5,113	0.46

*p<.05; **p<.01

Note. Means appear in brackets.

Table 13a Continued

Male

D,D (2.92)	S,S (2.05)	A,A (2.48)	I,I (2.26)	D,S (3.04)	D,A (3.12)	D,I (2.65)	S,D (2.57)	A,D (2.84)	A,S (3.68)	A,I (2.26)	I,D (2.52)	I,S (2.83)	I,A (2.41)	Degrees of Freedom	Q
	X						X							7,113	1.21
		X					X							3,113	0.21
			X				X							5,113	0.44
							X			X				6,113	0.68
							X				X			2,113	0.09
							X						X	4,113	0.35
	X										X			6,113	0.83
		X									X			2,113	0.70
			X								X			5,113	0.52
										X	X			4,113	0.44
											X		X	3,113	0.19
	X	X												5,113	1.00
		X	X											3,113	0.65
		X								X				4,113	0.48
		X											X	2,113	0.15
	X												X	4,113	0.79
			X										X	3,113	0.31
										X			X	2,113	0.41
	X		X											3,113	0.62
			X							X				2,113	0.00
	X									X				2,113	0.46

*p<.05; **p<.01

Note. Means appear in brackets.

Table 13b
Post Hoc Analysis of Means of Stress for Combined Acculturation Profiles and Females

Combined Acculturation Profiles (Male, Female)															
Female															
A,A (3.43)	A,D (1.78)	A,I (2.52)	I,I (2.42)	I,A (3.64)	A,S (4.28)	D,D (3.11)	D,S (2.90)	S,D (3.25)	I,S (4.67)	I,D (1.96)	S,S (2.79)	D,A (3.22)	D,I (2.48)	Degrees of Freedom	Q
X									X					4,113	2.89
	X								X					14,113	4.67
		X							X					10,113	4.15
			X						X					12,113	5.38*
				X					X					3,113	1.99
					X				X					2,113	0.50
						X			X					7,113	3.73
							X		X					8,113	3.57
								X	X					5,113	2.87
									X	X				13,113	4.38
									X		X			9,113	3.80
									X			X		6,113	2.93
									X				X	11,113	3.96
X					X				X					3,113	1.14
	X				X				X					13,113	3.01
		X			X				X					9,113	2.32
			X		X				X					11,113	2.68
				X	X				X					2,113	0.84
					X	X			X					6,113	1.69
					X		X		X					7,113	1.86
					X			X						4,113	1.39
					X					X				12,113	2.79

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

Note. Means appear in brackets.

Table 13b Continued

Female

A,A (3.43)	A,D (1.78)	A,I (2.52)	I,I (2.42)	I,A (3.64)	A,S (4.28)	D,D (3.11)	D,S (2.90)	S,D (3.25)	I,S (4.67)	I,D (1.96)	S,S (2.79)	D,A (3.22)	D,I (2.48)	Degrees of Freedom	<u>Q</u>
					X						X			8,113	1.06
					X							X		5,113	1.43
					X								X	10,113	2.30
X				X										2,113	0.46
	X			X										12,113	3.17
		X		X										8,113	2.34
			X	X										10,113	3.30
				X		X								5,113	1.43
				X			X							6,113	1.63
				X				X						3,113	0.86
				X						X				11,113	2.86
				X							X			7,113	1.87
				X								X		4,113	0.92
				X									X	9,113	2.24
X	X													11,113	2.91
X		X												7,113	2.00
X			X											9,113	2.99
X						X								4,113	0.95
X							X							5,113	1.24
X								X						2,113	0.42
X										X				10,113	2.59
X											X			6,113	1.49
X												X		3,113	0.49
X													X	8,113	1.92

*p<.05; **p<.01

Note. Means appear in brackets.

Table 13b Continued

Female

A,A (3.43)	A,D (1.78)	A,I (2.52)	I,I (2.42)	I,A (3.64)	A,S (4.28)	D,D (3.11)	D,S (2.90)	S,D (3.25)	I,S (4.67)	I,D (1.96)	S,S (2.79)	D,A (3.22)	D,I (2.48)	Degrees of Freedom	Q
	X							X						10,113	2.59
		X						X						6,113	1.60
			X					X						8,113	2.46
						X		X						3,113	0.42
							X	X						4,113	0.82
								X		X				9,113	2.27
								X			X			5,113	1.07
								X				X		2,113	0.07
								X					X	7,113	1.56
	X											X		9,113	2.54
		X										X		5,113	1.54
			X									X		7,113	2.37
						X						X		2,113	0.33
							X					X		3,113	0.75
										X		X		8,113	2.22
											X	X		4,113	1.00
												X		6,113	1.49
	X					X							X	8,113	2.65
		X				X								4,113	1.60
			X			X								6,113	3.30
						X	X							2,113	0.62
						X				X				7,113	2.29
						X					X			3,113	0.95
						X							X	5,113	1.51

*p<.05; **p<.01

Note. Means appear in brackets.

Table 13b Continued
Female

A,A (3.43)	A,D (1.78)	A,I (2.52)	I,I (2.42)	I,A (3.64)	A,S (4.28)	D,D (3.11)	D,S (2.90)	S,D (3.25)	I,S (4.67)	I,D (1.96)	S,S (2.79)	D,A (3.22)	D,I (2.48)	Degrees of Freedom	Q
	X						X							7,113	1.97
		X					X							3,113	0.84
			X				X							5,113	1.42
							X			X				6,113	1.66
							X				X			2,113	1.97
							X						X	4,113	0.85
	X										X			6,113	1.78
		X									X			2,113	0.59
			X								X			5,113	1.46
										X	X			4,113	1.10
											X		X	3,113	0.63
	X	X												5,113	1.26
		X	X											3,113	0.27
		X								X				4,113	0.95
		X											X	2,113	0.08
	X												X	4,113	1.13
			X										X	3,113	0.84
										X			X	2,113	0.14
	X		X											3,113	1.28
			X							X				2,113	0.92
	X									X				2,113	0.27

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Note Means appear in brackets.

Table 13c

Post Hoc Analysis of Means of Stress for Combined Acculturation Profiles and Gender

Combined Ethnic Identification	Male	Female	Degrees of Freedom	<u>Q</u>
D,D	2.92	3.11	2,72	1.31
S,S	2.05	2.79	2,72	2.50
A,A	2.48	3.43	2,72	3.20*
I,I	2.26	2.42	2,72	1.11
D,S	2.90	3.04	2,72	0.47
D,A	3.12	3.22	2,72	0.42
D,I	2.65	2.48	2,72	0.44
S,D	2.57	3.25	2,72	2.95
A,D	2.84	1.78	2,72	2.26
A,S	3.68	4.28	2,72	0.91
A,I	2.26	2.52	2,72	0.78
I,D	2.52	1.96	2,72	1.19
I,S	2.82	4.67	2,72	4.81*
I,A	2.41	3.64	2,72	3.71*

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

All effects and interactions are reported in Table 14. No significant main effects or two-way interaction were obtained for the measurement of marital adjustment (see Appendix B.6a, B.6b, and B.6c for the means).

In summary, the combination of bicultural ethnic identification of males and unicultural ethnic identification of females was particularly stressful for females. When wives identified solely with one culture, whereas her husband identified with both cultures, they were more stressed than their husband. Furthermore, even when both spouses identified only with the host culture, wives were still more stressed than their husband.

Moderators of Adjustment, Congruency and Gender

The third set of analyses concerns the effects of a set of moderators, specifically spousal support, linguistic self-confidence in the host and native languages and self-esteem, on the psychological and marital adjustment of couples with incongruent acculturation profiles.¹

Spousal Support

According to our fifth and sixth hypotheses, respectively, spousal support will moderate the relation between the congruency of acculturation profiles and psychological (H_5) and marital adjustment (H_6).

¹ Length of marriage and length of years in Canada, were originally used as covariates in the 2 x 4 x 2 repeated measures MANCOVA and ANCOVA. Since they did not significantly affect the results, they were omitted from further computations.

Table 14

Marital Adjustment as a Function of Combined Acculturation Profiles and Gender

Between-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	72	49,889.52	692.91	
Combined Acculturation Profiles (CAP)	13	13,553.67	1042.59	1.50

Within-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	72	11,332.08	157.39	
Gender (G)	1	222.36	222.36	1.41
CAP x G	13	1895.14	145.78	0.93

*p<.05; **p<.01

Psychological Adjustment

The repeated measures MANOVA computed on the psychological adjustment variables, specifically depression and stress, used as between factors, Congruency (congruent vs. incongruent), and Spousal Support (male low: female low; male low: female high; male high: female low; male high: female high) and, as a within factor, Gender (male vs. female). Results of the MANOVA show a significant multivariate main effect for Spousal Support [Wilk's Lambda = 0.79, $p < .01$] and for Gender [Wilk's Lambda = 0.92; $p < .05$]. The univariate effects are reported separately hereafter

Depression All effects and interactions are reported in Table 15. A significant main effect was obtained for Spousal Support (see Figure 5). Tukey's HSD test was applied in order to assess the nature of these differences. The results show that this effect is mainly due to the significant differences between couples in which both spouses experienced low spousal support and by couples in which both spouses experienced high spousal support (see Table 16). More precisely, couples experienced less depression when husbands and wives felt supported by their spouses than when they did not feel supported.

No other significant main effects, two-way interactions or three-way interaction that correspond to multivariate effects were obtained (see Appendix B.7a, B.7b, B.7c, B.7d, and B.7e for the means). Thus, spousal support was not a moderator of depression for couples with incongruent acculturation profiles, regardless of gender.

Stress All effects and interactions are reported in Table 17. A significant main effect was obtained for Gender. Females are more stressed than males. No other

Table 15

Depression as a Function of Spousal Support, Congruency and Gender

Between-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	78	1044.42	13.39	
Spousal Support (SS)	3	215.28	71.76	5.35**
Congruency (C)	1	16.54	16.54	1.24
SS x C	3	47.01	15.67	1.17

Within-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	78	419.64	5.38	
Gender (G)	1	1.43	1.43	0.27
SS x G	3	18.3	6.10	1.13
C x G	1	0.01	0.01	0.00
SS x C x G	3	1.35	0.45	0.08

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Figure 5

Mean Depression as a Function of Spousal Support




Table 16

Post Hoc Analyses of Means of Depression for Spousal Support

Spousal Support (Male; Female)				Degrees of Freedom	<u>Q</u>
Male: low; Female: low (13.97)	Male: low; Female: high (12.70)	Male: high; Female: low (12.52)	Male: high; Female: high (11.37)		
X	X			2,78	1.95
X		X		3,78	1.93
X			X	4,78	5.87**
	X	X		2,78	0.20
	X		X	3,78	1.99
		X	X	2,78	1.50

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

Note. Means are reported in brackets.

Table 17

Stress as a Function of Spousal Support, Congruency and Gender

Between-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	78	106.86	1.37	
Spousal Support (SS)	3	9.54	3.18	2.32
Congruency (C)	1	5.41	5.41	3.95*
SS x C	3	10.71	3.57	2.60*

Within-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	78	39.78	0.51	
Gender (G)	1	1.64	1.64	3.22*
SS x G	3	1.50	0.50	0.97
C x G	1	0.21	0.21	0.40
SS x C x G	3	1.35	0.45	0.88

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

significant main effects, two-way interactions or three-way interaction that correspond to multivariate effects were obtained (see Appendix B.8a, B.8b and B.8c for the means). Thus, spousal support was not a moderator of stress for couples with incongruent acculturation profiles, regardless of gender.

Marital Adjustment

The 2 x 4 x 2 repeated measures ANOVA computed on marital adjustment, used as between factors, Congruency (congruent vs. incongruent), and Spousal Support (male low: female low; male low: female high; male high: female low; male high: female high) and, as a within factor, Gender (male vs. female). All effects and interactions are reported in Table 18.

A significant main effect was obtained for Spousal Support (see Figure 6). Tukey's HSD test was applied in order to assess the nature of these differences. The results show that this effect is mainly due to the significant differences between couples in which both spouses experienced low spousal support compared to when both spouses experienced high spousal support and when the husband experienced lower spousal than his wife (see Table 19). More precisely, couples report better marital adjustment when the wife feels supported by her husband.

No other significant main effects, two-way interactions or three-way interactions were obtained. Thus, spousal support was not a moderator of marital adjustment for couples with incongruent acculturation profiles, regardless of gender (see Appendix B.9a, B.9b, B.9c, B.9d and B.9e for the means).

Table 18

Marital Adjustment as a Function of Spousal Support, Congruency and Gender

Between-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	78	52,332.54	670.93	
Spousal Support (SS)	3	8768.82	2922.94	4.36**
Congruency (C)	1	2227.54	2227.54	3.32
SS x C	3	1131.84	377.28	0.56

Within-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	78	12,032.28	154.26	
Gender (G)	1	60.80	60.80	0.39
SS x G	3	289.11	96.37	0.62
C x G	1	25.59	25.59	0.17
SS x C x G	3	701.85	233.95	1.52

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Figure 6

Mean Marital Adjustment as a Function of Spousal Support




Table 19

Post Hoc Analyses of Means of Marital Adjustment for Spousal Support

Spousal Support (Male; Female)				Degrees of Freedom	<u>Q</u>
Male: low; Female: low (99.32)	Male: low; Female: high (117.35)	Male: high; Female: low (113.75)	Male: high; Female: high (112.91)		
X	X			4,78	3.92*
X		X		3,78	2.71
X			X	2,78	4.34**
	X	X		2,78	0.56
	X		X	3,78	0.94
		X	X	2,78	0.16

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

Note. Means are reported in brackets.

In summary, higher depression is experienced by couples when both spouses do not feel supported by each other, more stress is experienced by wives than by husbands, and lower marital adjustment is experienced by couples when the wife does not feel supported by her husband.

The fifth and sixth hypotheses with respect to spousal support as a moderator of psychological and marital adjustment, respectively, for couples with incongruent acculturation profiles were not supported. Thus, spousal support was not a moderator for depression, stress or marital adjustment for couples with incongruent acculturation profiles, regardless of gender.

English Self-Confidence

According to the seventh and ninth hypotheses, English self-confidence will moderate the relation between the congruency of acculturation profiles and psychological (H_7) and marital (H_9) adjustment, respectively.

Psychological Adjustment

The repeated measures MANOVA computed on the psychological adjustment variables, specifically depression and stress, used as between factors, Congruency (congruent vs. incongruent), and English Self-Confidence (male high: female high; male high: female low; male low: female high; male low: female low) and, as a within factor, Gender (male vs. female). Results of the MANOVA show a significant multivariate main effect for English Self-Confidence [Wilk's Lambda = 0.84; $p < .05$] and for Gender [Wilk's Lambda = 0.88; $p < .01$]. As well, the results show a significant interaction between English Self-Confidence and Congruency [Wilk's Lambda = 0.81;

$p < .01$] and between English Self-Confidence and Gender [Wilk's Lambda = 0.85, $p < .05$]. The univariate effects are reported separately hereafter.

Depression. All effects and interactions are reported in Table 20. A significant main effect was obtained for English Self-Confidence (see Table 21 for the means). Tukey's HSD test was applied in order to assess the nature of these differences. The results show that this effect is mainly due to the significant differences between couples in which both spouses reported low English self-confidence compared to when both spouses reported high English self-confidence and when the husband reported higher confidence in English than his wife (see Table 21). More precisely, couples experienced higher depression when the wife reports lower confidence in English than her husband.

A significant two-way interaction was obtained for English Self-Confidence and Gender (see Figure 7). Tukey's HSD test was applied in order to assess the nature of these differences. The results show that this effect is due to the significant differences for women in relationships in which they have lower confidence in English than their husband compared to when they have higher confidence in English than their husband, when both spouses have high confidence in English and when both spouses have low confidence in English. The results further show that this effect is also due to the significant differences between males and females in a relationship in which the husband reports higher confidence in English than his wife (see Table 22). More precisely, wives experience higher depression when they are in a relationship in which they have lower confidence in the second language than their husband.

Table 20

Depression as a Function of English Self-Confidence, Congruency and Gender

Between-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	78	1047.54	13.43	
English Self-Confidence (E)	3	164.67	54.89	4.08**
Congruency (C)	1	2.82	2.82	0.21
E x C	3	49.80	16.60	1.24

Within-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	78	369.72	4.74	
Gender (G)	1	3.70	3.70	0.78
E x G	3	46.05	15.35	3.24*
C x G	1	0.09	0.09	0.02
E x C x G	3	19.86	6.62	1.40

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Table 21

Post Hoc Analyses of Means of Depression for English Self-Confidence

English Self-Confidence (Male; Female)					
Male: high; Female: high (11.55)	Male: high; Female: low (14.48)	Male: low; Female: high (12.61)	Male: low; Female: low (13.17)	Degrees of Freedom	<u>Q</u>
X	X			4,78	4.58**
X		X		2,78	1.71
X			X	3,78	3.51*
	X	X		3,78	2.45
	X		X	2,78	2.04
		X	X	2,78	0.90

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

Note. Means are reported in brackets.

Figure 7

Mean Depression as a Function of English Self-Confidence and Gender




Table 22

Post Hoc Analyses of Means of Depression for English Self-Confidence and Gender

Gender								Degrees of Freedom	Q
Male				Female					
M: high; F: high (11.92)	M: high; F: low (13.18)	M: low; F: high (12.78)	M: low; F: low (13.23)	M: high; F: high (11.19)	M: high; F: low (15.78)	M: low; F: high (12.44)	M: low; F: low (13.11)		
X	X							3,127	1.69
X		X						2,127	1.19
X			X					4,127	2.44
	X		X					2,127	0.07
		X	X					3,127	0.62
	X	X						2,127	0.45
				X	X			4,127	6.16**
				X		X		2,127	1.73
				X			X	3,127	3.58*
					X	X		3,127	3.75*
					X		X	2,127	3.57*
						X	X	2,127	0.93
X				X				2,78	1.90
	X				X			2,78	3.96*
		X				X		2,78	0.54
			X				X	2,78	0.31

*p<.05; **p<.01

Note. Means are reported in brackets.

No other significant main effects, two-way interactions or three-way interaction that correspond to multivariate effects were obtained (see Appendix B 10a, B 10b, B 10c and B.10d for the means). Thus, English self-confidence was not a moderator of depression for couples with incongruent acculturation profiles

Stress. All effects and interactions are reported in Table 23. A significant main effect was obtained for Gender. Higher stress was reported by females ($M=2.93$) than by males ($M=2.61$)

A significant two-way interaction was obtained for English Self-Confidence and Congruency (see Figure 8). Tukey's HSD test was applied in order to assess the nature of these differences. The results show that this effect is due to the significant differences in incongruent couples when both spouses have high confidence in English compared to when the wife is more confident in English than her husband, and when both spouses have low confidence in English compared to when the husband is more confident than his wife. The results further show that this effect is also due to the significant differences between couples with incongruent acculturation profiles and couples with congruent acculturation profiles in which the husband reports higher confidence in English than his wife (see Table 24). More precisely, couples with incongruent acculturation profiles experience higher stress when the wives have lower confidence in the second language than their husband.

A significant two-way interaction was also obtained for English Self-Confidence and Gender (see Figure 9). Tukey's HSD test was applied in order to assess the nature of these differences. The results show that this effect is due to the significant

Table 23

Stress as a Function of English Self-Confidence, Congruency and Gender

Between-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	78	100.62	1.29	
English Self-Confidence (E)	3	7.95	2.65	2.06
Congruency (C)	1	3.94	3.94	3.06
E x C	3	15.24	5.08	3.95*

Within-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	78	35.10	0.45	
Gender (G)	1	4.48	4.48	9.92**
E x G	3	4.53	1.51	3.35*
C x G	1	0.24	0.24	0.53
E x C x G	3	1.89	0.63	1.40

*p<.05; **p<.01

Figure 8

Mean Stress as a Function of English Self-Confidence and Congruency




Table 24


Post Hoc Analyses of Means of Stress for English Self-Confidence and Congruency

Congruency								Degrees of Freedom	
Congruent Couple (Male, Female)				Incongruent Couple (Male, Female)					
M high, F high (2 49)	M high, F low (2 29)	M low, F high (2 65)	M low, F low (2 94)	M high, F high (2 63)	M high, F low (4 02)	M low, F high (2 35)	M low, F low (2 83)		
X	X							2,127	0 60
X		X						2,127	0 59
X			X					3,127	2 09
	X	X						3,127	0 98
	X		X					4,127	1 98
		X	X					2,127	1 10
				X	X			3,127	4 36**
				X		X		2,127	0 67
				X			X	2,127	0 74
					X	X		4,127	3 58
					X		X	2,127	3 49*
						X	X	3,127	1 11
X				X				2,78	0 49
	X				X			2,78	3 56*
		X				X		2,78	0 56
			X				X	2,78	0 36

*p< 05, **p< 01 Note Means are reported in brackets

Figure 9

Mean Stress as a Function of English Self-Confidence and Gender



differences between women in relationships in which the husband has higher confidence in English than his wife compared to when the wife has higher confidence in English than her husband and when both spouses have high confidence in English. The results also show that this effect is due to the significant differences between women in relationships when both spouses are confident in English compared to when both spouses are not confident in English. The results further show that this effect is due to the significant differences between males and females in a relationship in which the husband reports higher confidence in English than his wife and when both spouses report low confidence in English (see Table 25). More precisely, wives experience higher stress when they have lower confidence in the second language than their husband. No other significant main effects, two-way interactions or three-way interaction that correspond to multivariate effects were obtained (see Appendix B.11a, B.11b and B.11c for the means).

Marital Adjustment

The 2 x 4 x 2 repeated measures ANOVA computed on marital adjustment used as between factors, Congruency (congruent vs. incongruent), and English Self-Confidence (male high: female high; male high: female low; male low: female high; male low: female low) and, as a within factor, Gender (male vs. female). All effects and interactions are reported in Table 26.

A significant main effect was obtained for English-Self-Confidence (see Table 27 for the means). Tukey's HSD test was applied in order to assess the nature of these differences. The results show that this effect is mainly due to the significant difference

Table 25

Post Hoc Analyses of Means of Stress for English Self-Confidence and Gender

Gender								Degrees of Freedom	Q
Male				Female					
M: high; F: high (2.51)	M: high; F: low (2.62)	M: low; F: high (2.52)	M: low; F: low (2.68)	M: high; F: high (2.61)	M: high; F: low (3.69)	M: low; F: high (2.48)	M: low; F: low (3.09)		
X	X							3,127	0.48
X		X						2,127	0.05
X			X					4,127	1.02
	X	X						2,127	0.36
	X		X					2,127	0.26
		X	X					3,127	0.71
				X	X			3,127	4.69**
				X		X		2,127	0.58
				X			X	2,127	2.89*
					X	X		4,127	4.40**
					X		X	2,127	2.59
						X	X	3,127	2.72
X				X				2,78	0.84
	X				X			2,78	5.29**
		X				X		2,78	0.21
			X				X	2,78	3.40*

*p< 05, **p<.01

Note Means are reported in brackets.

Table 26

Marital Adjustment as a Function of English Self-Confidence, Congruency and Gender

Between-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	78	54,951.78	104.51	
English Self-Confidence (E)	3	5757.60	1919.20	2.72*
Congruency (C)	1	1041.28	1041.28	1.48
E x C	3	571.38	190.46	0.27

Within-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	78	11,345.10	145.15	
Gender (G)	1	545.43	545.43	3.76*
E x G	3	1150.47	383.49	2.64*
C x G	1	464.18	464.18	3.20
E x C x G	3	1146.24	382.08	2.63*

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Table 27

Post Hoc Analyses of Means of Marital Adjustment for English Self-Confidence

English Self-Confidence (Male; Female)				Degrees of Freedom	<u>Q</u>
Male: high; Female: high (113.75)	Male: high; Female: low (112.50)	Male: low; Female: high (102.83)	Male: low; Female: low (100.91)		
X	X			2,78	0.27
X		X		3,78	2.43
X			X	4,78	3.84*
	X	X		2,78	1.75
	X		X	3,78	2.49
		X	X	2,78	0.43

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

Note. Means are reported in brackets.

between couples in which both spouses have high English self-confidence and both spouses have low English self-confidence (see Table 27). More precisely, couples report lower marital adjustment when both spouses have low confidence in the second language than when they both have high confidence in the second language.

A significant main effect was obtained for Gender. Males ($M=108.50$) reported better marital adjustment than females ($M=107.56$).

A significant two-way interaction was obtained for English Self-Confidence and Gender (see Table 28 for the means). Tukey's HSD test was applied in order to assess the nature of these differences. The results show that this effect is due to the significant differences between women in relationships in which both spouses are confident in English compared to when both spouses are not confident in English and when the wife is more confident in English than her husband. The results further show that this effect is due to the significant differences between couples in which both spouses reported high English self-confidence and by couples in which the husband reported lower confidence in English than his wife (see Table 28). More precisely, lower marital adjustment is experienced by wives when they have higher confidence in the second language than their husband.

A significant three-way interaction was obtained for English Self-Confidence, Congruency and Gender (see Figure 10). Tukey's HSD test was applied in order to assess the nature of these differences. The results show that this effect is due to the significant differences between males in an incongruent relationship and males in a congruent relationship in which both spouses have high confidence in English. The

Table 28

Post Hoc Analyses of Means of Marital Adjustment for English Self-Confidence and Gender


Gender								Degrees of Freedom	<u>Q</u>
Male				Female					
M: high; F: high (111.94)	M: high; F: low (116.41)	M: low; F: high (108.91)	M: low; F: low (101.33)	M: high; F: high (115.56)	M: high; F: low (108.60)	M: low; F: high (96.75)	M: low; F: low (100.48)		
X	X							2,108	0.88
X		X						2,108	0.61
X			X					3,108	2.89
	X	X						3,108	1.23
	X		X					4,108	2.95
		X	X					2,108	1.53
				X	X			2,108	1.37
				X		X		4,108	3.81*
				X			X	3,108	4.11*
					X	X		3,108	1.95
					X		X	2,108	1.59
						X	X	2,108	0.75
X				X				2,78	1.70
	X				X			2,78	2.15
		X				X		2,78	3.50*
			X				X	2,78	0.39

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

Note Means are reported in brackets.

Figure 10

Mean Marital Adjustment as a Function of English Self-Confidence (ESC), Congruency and Gender



results further show that this effect is also due to the significant differences between males and females in an incongruent relationship in which the wife reports higher confidence in English than her husband (see Table 29). More precisely, males experience better marital adjustment when both spouses are confident in English in a congruent relationship than in an incongruent relationship. Furthermore, in an incongruent relationship, lower marital adjustment is experienced by wives when they are more confident in the second language than their husbands. No other significant main effect or two-way interaction was obtained (see Appendix B 12a and B 12b for the means).

In summary, wives are more depressed and more stressed when they have *lower* confidence in the second language than their husband. Furthermore, wives are also less maritally adjusted when they have *higher* confidence in the second language than their husband.

The seventh and ninth hypotheses with respect to English self-confidence as a moderator of psychological and marital adjustment, respectively, for couples with incongruent acculturation profiles were supported for the measures of stress and marital adjustment, particularly for females. Wives, in an incongruent relationship, experience more stress when they have lower confidence in the second language than their husband, and are *less* maritally adjusted when they have *more* confidence in the second language than their husband. That is, when the wife feels less confident in English than her husband, she is more stressed but better adjusted in her marriage.

Table 29

Post Hoc Analyses of Means of Marital Adjustment for English Self-Confidence, Congruency and Gender

Congruent Couple								Incongruent Couple								Degrees of Q Freedom	
Male				Female				Male				Female					
M:high; F:high	M:high; F:low	M:low; F:high	M:low; F:low	M:high; F:high	M:high; F:low	M:low; F:high	M:low; F:low	M:high; F:high	M:high; F:low	M:low; F:high	M:low; F:low	M:high; F:high	M:high; F:low	M:low; F:high	M:low; F:low		
(119.45)	(115.17)	(103.03)	(104.88)	(120.07)	(113.36)	(104.47)	(103.31)	(104.43)	(117.64)	(114.79)	(97.78)	(111.05)	(103.83)	(89.03)	(97.66)		
X	X															2,108	0.58
X		X														4,108	2.73
X			X													3,108	3.06
	X	X														3,108	1.49
	X		X													2,108	1.42
		X	X													2,108	0.32
				X	X											2,108	0.91
				X		X										3,108	2.60
				X			X									4,108	3.53
					X	X										2,108	1.09
					X		X									3,108	1.39
						X	X									2,108	0.20
								X	X							3,108	1.88
								X		X						2,108	1.12
								X			X					2,108	1.12
									X	X						2,108	0.28
									X		X					4,108	2.64
										X	X					3,108	1.77

*p<.05; **p<.01

Note Means are reported in brackets.

Table 29 Continued

Congruent Couple								Incongruent Couple								Degrees of <u>Q</u> Freedom	
Male				Female				Male				Female					
M:high; F:high (119.45)	M:high; F:low (115.17)	M:low; F:high (103.03)	M:low; F:low (104.88)	M:high; F:high (120.07)	M:high; F:low (113.36)	M:low; F:high (104.47)	M:low; F:low (103.31)	M:high; F:high (104.43)	M:high; F:low (117.64)	M:low; F:high (114.79)	M:low; F:low (97.78)	M:high F:high (111.05)	M:high F:low (103.83)	M:low; F:high (89.03)	M:low; F:low (97.66)		
												X	X			2,108	1.03
												X		X		4,108	2.39
												X			X	3,108	2.25
													X	X		3,108	1.44
													X		X	2,108	0.82
														X	X	2,108	0.90
X				X												2,78	0.21
								X				X				2,78	2.13
	X				X											2,78	0.34
									X				X			2,78	2.81
		X				X										2,78	0.36
			X				X			X				X		2,78	3.70*
								X								2,78	0.60
												X			X	2,78	0.03
X								X								2,108	2.91*
	X								X							2,108	1.75
		X								X						2,108	0.28
			X								X					2,108	1.08
				X								X				2,108	1.21
					X								X			2,108	1.59
						X								X		2,108	1.27
							X								X	2,108	1.01

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

Note Means are reported in brackets.

Mother Tongue Self-Confidence

According to the eighth and tenth hypotheses, mother tongue self-confidence will moderate the relation between the congruency of acculturation profiles and psychological (H_8) and marital (H_{10}) adjustment, respectively.

Psychological Adjustment

The repeated measures MANOVA computed on the psychological adjustment variables, specifically depression and stress, used as between factors, Congruency (congruent vs. incongruent), and Mother Tongue Self-Confidence (male high: female high; male high: female low; male low: female high; male low: female low) and, as a within factor, Gender (male vs. female). Results of the MANOVA show that no significant main effects or interactions were obtained.

Depression. All effects and interactions are reported in Table 30. No significant main effects, two-way interactions or three-way interaction that correspond to multivariate effects were obtained for the measure of depression (see Appendix B.13a, 13b, 13c, 13d, 13e and 13f for the means). Thus, self-confidence in the native language was not a moderator of depression for couples with incongruent acculturation profiles.

Stress. All effects and interactions are reported in Table 31. No significant main effects, two-way interactions or three-way interaction that correspond to multivariate effects were obtained (see Appendix B.14a, 14b, 14c, 14d and 14e for the means). Thus, confidence in the native language was not a moderator of stress for couples with incongruent acculturation profiles.

Table 30

Depression as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence, Congruency and Gender

Between-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	78	1191.06	15.27	
Mother Tongue Self-Confidence (MT)	3	32.22	10.74	0.70
Congruency (C)	1	0.66	0.66	0.04
MT x C	3	63.27	21.09	1.38

Within-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	78	404.82	5.19	
Gender (G)	1	0.46	0.46	0.09
MT x G	3	2.01	0.67	0.12
C x G	1	1.07	1.07	0.21
MT x C x G	3	28.08	9.36	1.80

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Table 31

Stress as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence, Congruency and Gender

Between-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	78	121.68	1.56	
Mother Tongue Self-Confidence (MT)	3	2.79	0.93	0.59
Congruency (C)	1	0.97	0.97	0.62
MT x C	3	0.63	0.21	0.13

Within-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	78	39.78	0.51	
Gender (G)	1	3.89	3.89	7.65**
MT x G	3	0.27	0.09	0.17
C x G	1	0.05	0.05	0.11
MT x C x G	3	2.28	0.76	1.50

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

Marital Adjustment

The 2 x 4 x 2 repeated measures ANOVA computed on marital adjustment used as between factors, Congruency (congruent vs. incongruent), and Mother Tongue Self-Confidence (male high: female high; male high: female low; male low: female high; male low: female low) and, as a within factor, Gender (male vs. female). All effects and interactions are reported in Table 32. No significant main effects, two-way interactions or three-way interaction were obtained for the measure of marital adjustment (see Appendix B.15a, 15b, 15c, 15d, 15e and 15f for the means). Thus, confidence in the native language was not a moderator of marital adjustment for couples with incongruent acculturation profiles.

In summary, the eighth and tenth hypotheses regarding the congruency of acculturation profiles of spouses and mother tongue self-confidence was not supported in any of the adjustment indices. Thus, mother tongue self-confidence was not a moderator of depression, stress, or marital adjustment for couples with incongruent acculturation profiles.

Self-Esteem

According to the eleventh and twelfth hypotheses, self-esteem will moderate the relation between the congruency of acculturation profiles and psychological (H_{11}) and marital (H_{12}) adjustment, respectively.

Psychological Adjustment

The repeated measures MANOVA computed on the psychological adjustment variables, specifically depression and stress, used as between factors, Congruency

Table 32

Marital Adjustment as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence, Congruency and Gender

Between-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	78	59,560.80	763.60	
Mother Tongue Self-Confidence (MT)	3	1449.72	483.24	0.63
Congruency (C)	1	245.17	245.17	0.32
MT x C	3	1143.33	381.11	0.50

Within-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	78	12,098.58	155.11	
Gender (G)	1	8.09	8.09	0.05
MT x G	3	645.51	215.17	1.39
C x G	1	45.94	45.94	0.30
MT x C x G	3	360.24	120.08	0.77

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

(congruent vs. incongruent), and Self-Esteem (male low: female low; male low: female high; male high: female low; male high: female high) and, as a within factor, Gender (male vs. female). Results of the MANOVA show a significant multivariate main effect for Self-Esteem [Wilk's Lambda = 0.80; $p < .01$] and for Gender [Wilk's Lambda = 0.85; $p < .01$]. As well, the results show a significant interaction between Self-Esteem and Gender [Wilk's Lambda = 0.83; $p < .05$]. The univariate effects are reported separately hereafter

Depression. All effects and interactions are reported in Table 33. A significant main effect was obtained for Self-Esteem (see Table 34 for the means). Tukey's HSD test was applied in order to assess the nature of these differences. The results show that this effect is due to the significant differences between couples in which both spouses reported low self-esteem and when both spouses reported high self-esteem. The results also show that this effect is due to the significant differences between couples in which the wife reported higher self-esteem than her husband and when the wife reported lower self-esteem than her husband. As well, the results are due to the significant differences between couples in which the husband reported higher self-esteem than his wife and when both couples reported high self-esteem (see Table 34). More precisely, couples experience higher depression when the wife has lower self-esteem than her husband.

A significant two-way interaction was obtained for Self-Esteem and Gender (see Figure 11). Tukey's HSD test was applied in order to assess the nature of these differences. The results show that this effect is due to the significant differences

Table 33

Depression as a Function of Self-Esteem, Congruency and Gender

Between-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	78	971.88	12.46	
Self-Esteem (SE)	3	671.73	100.05	8.03**
Congruency (C)	1	19.08	19.08	1.53
SE x C	3	36.09	12.03	0.97

Within-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	78	360.36	4.62	
Gender (G)	1	2.74	2.74	0.59
SE x G	3	75.99	25.33	4.62**
C x G	1	0.47	0.47	0.10
SE x C x G	3	4.65	1.55	0.34

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Table 34


Post Hoc Analyses of Means of Depression for Self-Esteem

		Self-Esteem (Male; Female)		Degrees of Freedom	Q
Male: low; Female: low (13.86)	Male: low; Female: high (12.32)	Male: high; Female: low (15.14)	Male: high; Female: high (11.31)		
X	X			2,78	2.72
X		X		2,78	1.94
X			X	3,78	5.73**
	X	X		3,78	3.75*
	X		X	2,78	1.78
		X	X	4,78	5.75**

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$ Note. Means are reported in brackets.

Figure 11

Mean Depression as a Function of Self-Esteem and Gender



between males in a relationship in which both spouses have high self-esteem compared to when both spouses have low self-esteem and when the husband has lower self-esteem than his wife. The results further show that this effect is due to significant differences between females in a relationship in which both spouses have low self-esteem compared to when both spouses have high self-esteem. Furthermore, this effect is due to significant differences between females in a relationship in which the wife has lower self-esteem than her husband compared to when they both have low self-esteem, when the wife has higher self-esteem than her husband, and when they both have high self-esteem. Moreover, the results show that this effect is due to the significant differences between males and females in a relationship in which the husband reports higher self-esteem than his wife and when he reports lower self-esteem than his wife (see Table 35). More precisely, wives experience higher depression when they are in a relationship in which they have lower self-esteem than their husband, similarly, higher depression is experienced by husbands when they have lower self-esteem than their wife. Thus spouses who reported lower self-esteem than their marital partner, experienced more depression.

No other significant main effects, two-way interactions or three-way interaction that correspond to multivariate effects were obtained (see Appendix B 16a, B 16b, B 16c and B 16d for the means). Thus, self-esteem was not a moderator of depression for couples with incongruent acculturation profiles.

Stress All effects and interactions are reported in Table 36. A significant main effect was obtained for Self-Esteem (see Figure 12). Tukey's HSD test was applied in

Table 35

Post Hoc Analyses of Means of Depression for Self-Esteem and Gender

Gender									
Male				Female					
M low, F. low (14 11)	M low, F high (13 21)	M high, F low (13 47)	M high, F high (11 25)	M low, F low (13 61)	M low, F high (11 43)	M high, F low (16 83)	M high, F high (11 37)	Degrees of Freedom	Q
X	X							3,129	1 36
X		X						2,129	0 82
X			X					4,129	5 49**
	X	X						2,129	0 29
	X		X					2,129	2 95*
		X	X					3,129	2 84
				X	X			2,129	3 29**
				X		X		2,129	4 13**
				X			X	3,129	4 30**
					X	X		3,129	6 12**
					X		X	2,129	0 09
						X	X	4,129	6 98**
X				X				2,78	1 32
	X				X			2,78	3 10**
		X				X		2,78	4 69**
			X				X	2,78	0 31

*p< 05, **p< 01

Note Means are reported in brackets


Table 36

Stress as a Function of Self-Esteem, Congruency and Gender

Between-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	78	102.18	1.31	
Self-Esteem (SE)	3	17.73	5.91	4.51**
Congruency (C)	1	5.20	5.20	3.97*
SE x C	3	6.48	2.16	1.65

Within-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	78	36.66	0.47	
Gender (G)	1	5.40	5.40	11.55**
SE x G	3	2.61	0.87	1.85
C x G	1	0.03	0.03	0.07
SE x C x G	3	3.57	1.19	2.54

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Figure 12**Mean Stress as a Function of Self-Esteem**

order to assess the nature of these differences. The results show that this effect is mainly due to the significant differences between couples in which both spouses experienced high self-esteem compared to when the husband reported higher self-esteem than his wife and when both spouses experienced high self-esteem (see Table 37). More precisely, couples experience higher stress when the wife reports lower self-esteem than her husband.

A significant main effect was obtained for Gender. Females ($M=2.93$) reported higher stress than males ($M=2.61$).

No significant two-way interactions or three-way interaction that correspond to multivariate effects were obtained (see Appendix B.17a, B.17b and B.17c for the means). Thus, self-esteem is not a moderator of stress for couples with incongruent acculturation profiles.

Marital Adjustment

The 2 x 4 x 2 repeated measures ANOVA computed on marital adjustment, used as between factors, Congruency (congruent vs. incongruent) and Self-Esteem (male low: female low; male low: female high; male high: female low; male high: female high) and, as a within factor, Gender (male vs. female). All effects and interactions are reported in Table 38. A significant two-way interaction was obtained for Self-Esteem and Gender (see Figure 13). Tukey's HSD test was applied in order to assess the nature of these differences. The results show that this effect is due to the significant differences between males in a relationship in which the husband reports higher self-esteem than his wife and when both spouses report low self-esteem. The results

Table 37

Post Hoc Analyses of Means of Stress for Self-Esteem

Self-Esteem (Male; Female)				Degrees of Freedom	<u>Q</u>
Male: low; Female: low (3.05)	Male: low; Female: high (2.71)	Male: high; Female: low (3.35)	Male: high; Female: high (2.43)		
X	X			2,78	1.85
X		X		2,78	1.39
X			X	3,78	4.30**
	X	X		3,78	2.62
	X		X	2,78	1.52
		X	X	4,78	4.25*

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$ Note. Means are reported in brackets.

Table 38

Marital Adjustment as a Function of Self-Esteem, Congruency and Gender


Between-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	78	57,689.58	739.61	
Self-Esteem (SE)	3	3578.07	1192.69	1.61
Congruency (C)	1	1558.76	1558.76	2.10
SE x C	3	268.29	89.43	0.12

Within-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	78	11,511.24	147.58	
Gender (G)	1	364.14	364.14	2.47
SE x G	3	1589.52	529.84	3.59*
C x G	1	6.95	6.95	0.05
SE x C x G	3	127.41	42.47	0.29

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Figure 13

Mean Marital Adjustment as a Function of Self-Esteem and Gender



further show that that this effect is due to the significant differences between males and females in a relationship in which the husband reports higher self-esteem than his wife (see Table 39). More precisely, husbands are better maritally adjusted when they have higher self-esteem than their wife.

No significant main effects, other two-way interactions or three-way interaction were obtained for the measure of marital adjustment (see Appendix B.18a, B.18b, B.18c, B.18d and B.18e for the means). Thus, self-esteem is not a moderator of marital adjustment for couples with incongruent acculturation profiles.

In summary, men and women are more depressed when they have lower self-esteem than their spouse, couples are more stressed when they are in a relationship in which wives have lower self-esteem than their husband, and husbands are better maritally adjusted when they have higher self-esteem than their wife.

Furthermore, the eleventh and twelfth hypotheses with respect to self-esteem as a moderator for incongruent couple was not supported for any of the adjustment indices. Thus, self-esteem is not a moderator of depression, stress and marital adjustment for couples with incongruent acculturation profiles.

Power

In order to assess the probability of finding true differences, power analyses were conducted for each hypothesis (see Table 40). As can be seen Hypotheses 1 and 2 have high power estimates, indicating that there is a good chance of detecting true differences. Hypotheses 3 to 12, however, have very low power estimates, with the exception of Hypothesis 7, indicating that the probability of

Table 39

Post Hoc Analyses of Means of Marital Adjustment for Self-Esteem and Gender

Gender								Degrees of Freedom	Q
Male				Female					
M: low; F: low (101.09)	M: low; F: high (103.71)	M: high; F: low (124.84)	M: high; F: high (111.99)	M: low; F: low (104.21)	M: low; F: high (106.28)	M: high; F: low (106.97)	M: high; F: high (110.57)		
X	X							2,108	0.56
X		X						4,108	4.23*
X			X					3,108	2.90
	X	X						3,108	3.31
	X		X					2,108	1.72
		X	X					2,108	2.28
				X	X			2,108	0.43
				X		X		3,108	0.49
				X			X	4,108	1.70
					X	X		2,108	0.11
					X		X	3,108	0.90
						X	X	2,108	0.64
X				X				2,78	1.45
	X				X			2,78	0.79
		X				X		2,78	4.41**
			X				X	2,78	0.65

*p<.05; **p<.01

Note. Means are reported in brackets.

Table 40

Power Calculations for Each Hypothesis

<u>Hypothesis</u>	<u>Power*</u>
1	0.93
2	0.83
3	0.17
4	0.23
5	0.07
6	0.06
7	0.79
8	0.41
9	0.09
10	0.17
11	0.12
<u>12</u>	<u>0.05</u>

* alpha = .05

detecting true differences are very small.

Summary

The preceding analyses were conducted in order to assess the relation between ethnic identity and psychological and marital adjustment, the congruency of acculturation profiles and psychological and marital adjustment, as well as the moderators of psychological and marital adjustment and the congruency of acculturation profiles. Accordingly, several analyses were conducted to assess these relations.

First, integrated people reported lower stress, lower depression and better marital adjustment than deculturated people. Thus, the first and second hypotheses were supported.

Second, couples with incongruent acculturation profiles did not report higher depression, higher stress or lower marital adjustment than couples with congruent acculturation profiles. Thus, the third and fourth hypotheses were not supported.

Third, the relation between particular combinations of male and female acculturation profiles and adjustment were examined. The results indicated that females were more stressed than males in a relationship when they had a unicultural identity, whereas the husband had a bicultural identity.

Fourth, couples felt more depressed when spouses did not feel supported by each other. In general, wives reported more stress. Moreover, couples reported better marital adjustment when wives felt supported by their husband. With respect to the fifth and sixth hypotheses, however, spousal support was not a moderator of depression,

stress or marital adjustment for couples with incongruent acculturation profiles, particularly for wives.

Fifth, women reported higher depression and higher stress than men when they had lower confidence in English than their husband, but also reported lower marital adjustment when they had higher confidence in English than their husband. With respect to the seventh and ninth hypotheses, English self-confidence was a moderator of stress and marital adjustment for couples with incongruent acculturation profiles, particularly for wives.

Sixth, mother tongue self-confidence was not a moderator of depression, stress or marital adjustment for couples with incongruent acculturation profiles. Thus, the eighth and tenth hypotheses were not supported.

Last, higher depression was reported by spouses when they had lower self-esteem than their marital partner, higher stress was reported by couples when the wife had lower self-esteem than her husband, and better marital adjustment was reported by husbands when they had higher self-esteem than their wife. The eleventh and twelfth hypotheses were not supported, however, as self-esteem was not a moderator of psychological or marital adjustment for couples with incongruent acculturation profiles.

These analyses indicated that certain factors may moderate the relation between congruency of acculturation profiles of spouses and adjustment. Although the previous analyses were conducted on situationally determined acculturation profiles, the specific types of situation were not examined. As mentioned earlier, situated identity theory posits that ethnic identity may vary as a function of various situations. The following

analyses will explore the relation between moderators of adjustment and the congruency of acculturation profiles in specific situations. Accordingly, Hypotheses 5 to 12 will be re-examined in each situation.

Chapter 4

Domains of Identity

Overview of the Analyses

As for the previous analyses, the following examine the relation between moderators of psychological and marital adjustment in couples with incongruent acculturation profiles. The following analyses, however, examines this relationship in *specific situations*. Prior to these analyses, factor analysis was applied in order to outline the nature of the situations.

Factor Analysis of the Identity Scales

In order to delineate domains of situated ethnic identification, two separate factor analyses were conducted on the Canadian and Muslim situated identity scales, respectively. The model used was principal extraction coupled with Varimax factor rotation. Using as criterion eigenvalues greater than one, two factors were produced in each case. The resulting matrices for the Canadian and Muslim scales appear in Table 41.

For the Canadian scale, the first factor accounting for 53% of the variance shows appreciable loadings (i.e. greater than 0.50 or smaller than -0.50) from eight variables. These include “when individuals are with their spouse”, “when they are with their friends”, “when they are at home”, and “when they are with social contacts”. Furthermore, variables including “when thinking about life goals”, “when listening to music”, “when participating in cultural activities”, and “when preparing food” also correspond to the same factor. These variables suggest that this factor corresponds to

Table 41
Varimax Rotated Factor Matrices: Identification to Membership Group

Items	Canadian		Muslim	
	I	II	I	II
When I....				
1. take the bus	0.27	0.74*	0.73*	0.22
2. read the newspaper	0.18	0.78*	0.76*	0.30
3. am with my spouse	0.68*	0.22	0.18	0.78*
4. listen to music	0.61*	0.28	0.29	0.69*
5. am dealing with work personnel	0.36	0.68*	0.79*	0.15
6. am dealing with salesclerks	0.23	0.80*	0.83*	0.17
7. am thinking about relations between Canadian and Muslim	0.56	0.41	0.44	0.39
8. think about where I would like to settle down	0.58	0.43	0.41	0.47
9. am with my friends	0.70*	0.34	0.41	0.66*
10. watch T.V.	0.44	0.63*	0.60*	0.42
11. read for pleasure	0.55	0.60	0.63	0.41
12. think about my life's goals	0.74*	0.32	0.34	0.59*
13. participate in cultural activities	0.71*	0.16	0.12	0.68*
14. listen to the radio	0.53	0.59	0.60	0.54
15. prepare food	0.72*	0.36	0.32	0.59*
16. am at home	0.72*	0.34	0.12	0.81*
17. think about politics	0.36	0.59*	0.72*	0.27
18. am with social contacts	0.62*	0.37	0.36	0.61*
19. travel	0.43	0.53*	0.73*	0.28
20. watch movies	0.52	0.58	0.49	0.57

* This item was used in the computation of the identity index.

a Private Domain of identity.

For the Canadian scale, the second factor accounting for 61% of the cumulative variance shows appreciable loadings from seven variables. These include when taking the bus, when dealing with work personnel, when dealing with salesclerks, and when traveling. Furthermore, when reading the newspaper, when watching T.V., and when thinking about politics also correlate with the same factor. These loadings suggest that this factor corresponds to a Public Domain of identity.

For the Muslim scale, the variables that appreciably load on the two factors are almost identical. Factor one, however, corresponds here to the Public Domain, whereas factor two corresponds to the Private Domain. Factor one includes variables such as taking the bus, dealing with work personnel, dealing with salesclerks, traveling, reading the newspaper, watching T.V., and thinking about politics. Factor two includes variables such as being with their spouse, being with their friends, being at home, being with social contacts, thinking about life goals, listening to music, participating in cultural activities, and preparing food.

In order to compute domain-specific indices of identity, only the variables that were common to the corresponding factors across the Canadian and Muslim scales were retained. Subsequently, five items with appreciable loadings on both factors were eliminated from the Canadian scale and four items were eliminated from the Muslim scale. The variables selected to represent the factors for the Canadian and Muslim scales are identified with an asterisk in Table 41.

Subsequently, two series of analyses were conducted. The first set of analyses

explored the relationship between the congruency of acculturation profiles in the public domain in married couples and adjustment, taking into consideration the moderators of psychological and marital adjustment. The second set of analyses assessed the same relation, this time in the private domain. Individuals were defined as high or low on the moderators based on the previously computed median splits for each moderator

First, in order to define individuals as high and low on ethnic identification, a median split was performed on the identification scores to both Canadian and Muslim groups in the public and private domains for males and females. For the public domain, the median score for Canadian identification was 4.57 and 3.13 for Muslim identification for males, and 3.13 and 3.00, respectively, for females. For the private domain, the median score for Canadian identification was 3.63 and 3.13 for Muslim identification for males, and 4.50 and 4.63, respectively, for females. Thus, individuals who fell above the median for both scales were considered integrated. Those individuals who fell below the median for both scales were classified as having a deculturated identity. Individuals were classified as having a separated identity if their scores of identification with the Muslim group were above the median and if their scores of identification with the Canadian group were below the median. The reverse is true for the assimilation category.

Second, in order to define couples as congruent or incongruent, the acculturation profiles of each husband and wife for the respective domains were examined. If their acculturation profiles were similar, regardless of which acculturation mode they identified with, they were defined as a congruent couple. For example, if

both husbands and wives had low identification to both the host and native groups or had high identification with both cultural groups, then they were classified as a congruent couple in either the public or private domain. Conversely, if their acculturation profiles did not correspond to each other, then they were defined as incongruent. For example, if one spouse had high identification with both cultural groups, whereas the other spouse had low identification with both cultural groups, they were then defined as an incongruent couple in either the public or private domain.¹

Moderators of Adjustment, Congruency in the Public Domain and Gender

The first set of analyses concerns the moderators of adjustment and the congruency of acculturation profiles between spouses in the public domain.

Spousal Support

According to our fifth and sixth hypotheses, spousal support will moderate the relation between the congruency of acculturation profiles in the public domain and psychological (H₅) and (H₆) adjustment.

Psychological Adjustment

The repeated measures MANOVA computed on the psychological adjustment variables, specifically depression and stress, used as between factors, Congruency in the Public Domain (congruent vs. incongruent), and Spousal Support (male low: female low; male low: female high, male high: female low; male high: female high) and, as a

¹ Length of marriage and length of years in Canada, were originally used as covariates in the 2 x 4 x 2 repeated measures MANCOVAs and ANCOVAs. Since they did not significantly affect the results, they were omitted from further computations.

within factor, Gender (male vs. female). Results of the MANOVA show a significant multivariate main effect for Spousal Support [Wilk's Lambda = 0.82, $p < .05$]. The univariate effects are reported separately hereafter.

Depression. All effects and interactions are reported in Table 42. A significant main effect was obtained for Spousal Support (see Figure 14). Tukey's HSD test was applied in order to assess the nature of these differences. The results show that this effect is mainly due to the significant differences between couples in which both spouses experienced low spousal support and by couples in which both spouses experienced high spousal support (see Table 43). More precisely, couples experienced less depression when husbands and wives felt supported by their spouse than when they did not feel supported by their spouse.

No other significant main effects, two-way interactions or three-way interaction that correspond to multivariate effects were obtained (see Appendix B.19a, B.19b, B.19c, B.19d and B.19e for the means). Thus, spousal support was not a moderator of depression for couples with incongruent acculturation profiles in public situations, regardless of gender.

Stress. All effects and interactions are reported in Table 44. No significant main effects, two-way interactions or three-way interaction that correspond to multivariate effects were obtained (see Appendix B.20a, B.20b, B.20c, B.20d and B.20e for the means). Thus, spousal support was not a moderator of stress for couples with incongruent acculturation profiles in public situations, regardless of gender.

Table 42

Depression as a Function of Spousal Support, Congruency in the Public Domain and Gender

Between-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	76	1026.00	13.50	
Spousal Support (SS)	3	180.96	60.32	4.59**
Congruency (CPUB) in the Public Domain	1	8.41	8.41	0.64
SS x CPUB	3	64.80	21.60	1.64

Within-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	76	408.88	5.38	
Gender (G)	1	1.98	1.98	0.37
SS x G	3	15.63	5.21	0.97
CPUB x G	1	3.96	3.96	0.74
SS x CPUB x G	3	9.24	3.08	0.54

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Figure 14

Mean Depression as a Function of Spousal Support




Table 43

Post Hoc Analyses of Means of Depression for Spousal Support

		Spousal Support (Male; Female)		Degrees of Freedom	<u>Q</u>
Male: low; Female: low (13.79)	Male: low; Female: high (12.70)	Male: high; Female: low (12.20)	Male: high; Female: high (11.44)		
X	X			2,76	1.69
X		X		3,76	2.13
X			X	4,76	5.28**
	X	X		2,76	0.56
	X		X	3,76	1.90
		X	X	2,76	1.00

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$ Note. Means are reported in brackets.

Table 44

Stress as a Function of Spousal Support, Congruency in the Public Domain and Gender

Between-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	76	110.20	1.45	
Spousal Support (SS)	3	5.97	1.99	1.37
Congruency (CPUB) in the Public Domain	1	2.62	2.62	1.81
SS x CPUB	3	5.46	1.82	1.25

Within-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	76	38.76	0.51	
Gender (G)	1	0.82	0.82	1.59
SS x G	3	1.32	0.44	0.86
CPUB x G	1	0.76	0.76	1.49
SS x CPUB x G	3	1.92	0.64	1.24

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

Marital Adjustment

The 2 x 4 x 2 repeated measures ANOVA computed on marital adjustment used as between factors, Congruency in the Public Domain (congruent vs. incongruent) and Spousal Support (male low: female low; male low: female high; male high: female low; male high: female high) and, as a within factor, Gender (male vs. female).

All effects and interactions are reported in Table 45. A significant main effect was obtained for Spousal Support (see Figure 15). Tukey's HSD test was applied in order to assess the nature of these differences. The results show that this effect is mainly due to the significant differences between couples in which both spouses experienced low spousal support compared to when the husband experienced lower spousal support than his wife and when both spouses experienced high spousal support (see Table 46). More precisely, couples report better marital adjustment when the wife feels supported by her husband.

No other significant main effects, two-way interactions or three-way interaction were obtained (see Appendix B.21a, B.21b, B.21c, B.21d and B.21e for the means). Thus, spousal support was not a moderator of marital adjustment for couples with incongruent acculturation profiles in public situations, regardless of gender.

In summary, lower depression is experienced by couples when both spouses feel supported by each other and better marital adjustment is experienced by couples when the wife feels supported by her husband. However, the fifth and sixth hypotheses with respect to spousal support as a moderator of psychological and marital adjustment for couples with incongruent acculturation profiles in public domains were not

Table 45

Marital Adjustment as a Function of Spousal Support, Congruency in the Public Domain and Gender

Between-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	76	51,933.08	683.33	
Spousal Support (SS)	3	8487.87	2892.29	4.23**
Congruency (CPUB) in the Public Domain	1	1464.88	1464.88	2.14
SS x CPUB	3	249.24	83.08	0.12
Within-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	76	12,046.00	158.50	
Gender (G)	1	14.04	14.04	0.09
SS x G	3	306.51	102.17	0.64
CPUB x G	1	2.32	2.32	0.01
SS x CPUB x G	3	655.50	218.50	1.38

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$


Figure 15**Mean Marital Adjustment as a Function of Spousal Support**

Table 46

Post Hoc Analyses of Means of Marital Adjustment for Spousal Support

		<u>Spousal Support (Male; Female)</u>		Degrees of Freedom	<u>Q</u>
Male: low; Female: low (99.73)	Male: low; Female: high (117.35)	Male: high; Female: low (114.95)	Male: high; Female: high (112.96)		
X	X			4,76	3.78*
X		X		3,76	2.83
X			X	2,76	4.12**
	X	X		2,76	0.37
	X		X	3,76	0.92
		X	X	2,76	0.36

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

Note. Means are reported in brackets.

supported.

English Self-Confidence

According to the seventh and ninth hypotheses, English self-confidence will moderate the relation between the congruency of acculturation profiles in the public domain and psychological (H_7) and marital (H_9) adjustment, respectively.

Psychological Adjustment

The repeated measures MANOVA computed on the psychological adjustment variables, specifically depression and stress, used as between factors, Congruency in the Public Domain (congruent vs. incongruent), and English Self-Confidence (male high: female high; male high: female low, male low: female high; male low: female low) and, as a within factor, Gender (male vs. female). Results of the MANOVA show a significant multivariate main effect for Gender [Wilk's Lambda = 0.92, $p < .05$]. The univariate effects are reported separately hereafter.

Depression. All effects and interactions are reported in Table 47. No significant main effects, two-way interactions or three-way interaction that correspond to multivariate effects were obtained (see Appendix B.22a, B.22b, B.22c, B.22d and B.22e for the means). Thus, English self-confidence was not a moderator of depression for couples with incongruent acculturation profiles in public situations.

Stress. All effects and interactions are reported in Table 48. A significant main effect was obtained for Gender. Higher stress was reported by females ($M=2.92$) than by males ($M=2.59$).

Table 47

Depression as a Function of English Self-Confidence, Congruency in the Public Domain and Gender

Between-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	76	996.36	13.14	
English Self-Confidence (E)	3	101.64	33.88	2.58**
Congruency (CPUB) in the Public Domain	1	22.74	22.74	1.73
E x CPUB	3	66.00	22.00	1.68

Within-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	76	367.08	4.83	
Gender (G)	1	1.09	1.09	0.23
E x G	3	27.06	9.02	1.87
CPUB x G	1	1.70	1.70	0.35
E x CPUB x G	3	19.89	6.63	1.37

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Table 48

Stress as a Function of English Self-Confidence, Congruency in the Public Domain and Gender

Between-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	76	104.12	1.37	
English Self-Confidence (E)	3	3.36	1.12	0.82
Congruency (CPUB) in the Public Domain	1	3.72	3.72	2.71
E x CPUB	3	9.69	3.23	2.35

Within-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	76	34.96	0.46	
Gender (G)	1	2.76	2.76	6.02**
E x G	3	3.18	1.06	2.32
CPUB x G	1	0.13	0.13	0.28
E x CPUB x G	3	2.01	0.67	1.47

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

No other significant main effects, two-way interactions or three-way interaction that correspond to multivariate effects were obtained (see Appendix B.23a, B.23b, B.23c, B.23d and B.23e for the means). Thus, English self-confidence was not a moderator of stress for couples with incongruent acculturation profiles in public situations

Marital Adjustment

The 2 x 4 x 2 repeated measures ANOVA computed on marital adjustment used as between factors, Congruency in the Public Domain (congruent vs incongruent), and English Self-Confidence (male high: female high, male high: female low, male low: female high; male low: female low) and, as a within factor, Gender (male vs female)

All effects and interactions are reported in Table 49. No significant main effects, two-way interactions or three-way interaction that correspond to multivariate effects were obtained (see Appendix B.24a, B.24b, B.24c, B.24d, B.24e and B.24f for the means). Thus, English self-confidence was not a moderator of marital adjustment for couples with incongruent acculturation profiles in public situations

In summary, couples experience less depression when both spouses feel confident in their host language. Furthermore, females are more stressed than males. However, the seventh and ninth hypotheses with respect to English self-confidence as a moderator of depression, stress and marital adjustment for incongruent couple in public situations were not supported.

Mother Tongue Self-Confidence

According to the eighth and tenth hypotheses, mother tongue self-confidence will moderate the relation between the congruency of acculturation profiles in the public

Table 49

Marital Adjustment as a Function of English Self-Confidence, Congruency in the Public Domain and Gender

Between-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	76	53,633.96	705.71	
English Self-Confidence (E)	3	5263.92	1754.64	2.49
Congruency (CPUB) in the Public Domain	1	2278.63	2278.63	3.23
E x CPUB	3	816.63	272.21	0.39

Within-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	76	11,503.36	151.36	
Gender (G)	1	169.67	169.67	1.12
E x G	3	701.13	233.71	1.54
CPUB x G	1	82.14	82.14	0.54
E x CPUB x G	3	928.92	309.64	2.05

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

domain and psychological (H_8) and marital (H_{10}) adjustment, respectively.

Psychological Adjustment

The repeated measures MANOVA computed on the psychological adjustment variables, specifically depression and stress, used as between factors, Congruency in the Public Domain (congruent vs. incongruent), and Mother Tongue Self-Confidence (male high: female high; male high: female low; male low: female high; male low: female low) and, as a within factor, Gender (male vs. female). Results of the MANOVA show a significant multivariate main effect for Gender [Wilk's Lambda = 0.92; $p < .05$]. The univariate effects are reported separately hereafter.

Depression. All effects and interactions are reported in Table 50. No significant main effects, two-way interactions or three-way interaction that correspond to multivariate effects were obtained for the measure of depression (see Appendix B.25a, B.25b, B.25c, B.25d, B.25e and B.25f for the means). Thus, self-confidence in the native language was not a moderator of depression for couples with incongruent acculturation profiles in public situations.

Stress. All effects and interactions are reported in Table 51. A significant main effect was obtained for Gender. Higher stress was experienced by females ($M=2.92$) than by males ($M=2.59$).

No other significant main effects, two-way interactions or three-way interaction were obtained (see Appendix B.26a, B.26b, B.26c, B.26d, B.26e and B.26f for the means). Thus, confidence in the native language was not a moderator of stress for couples with incongruent acculturation profiles in public situations.

Table 50

Depression as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence, Congruency in the Public Domain and Gender

Between-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	76	1098.96	14.46	
Mother Tongue (MT) Self-Confidence	3	27.99	9.33	0.65
Congruency (CPUB) in the Public Domain	1	17.87	17.87	1.24
MT x CPUB	3	101.67	33.89	2.34

Within-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	76	424.84	5.59	
Gender (G)	1	2.07	2.07	0.37
MT x G	3	6.21	2.07	0.19
CPUB x G	1	1.04	1.04	0.19
MT x CPUB x G	3	4.68	1.56	0.28

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

Table 51

Stress as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence, Congruency in the Public Domain and Gender

Between-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	76	111.72	1.47	
Mother Tongue (MT) Self-Confidence	3	3.78	1.26	0.86
Congruency (CPUB) in the Public Domain	1	2.09	2.09	1.43
MT x CPUB	3	7.05	2.35	1.60

Within-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	76	40.28	0.53	
Gender (G)	1	3.98	3.98	7.52**
MT x G	3	0.33	0.11	0.00
CPUB x G	1	0.00	0.00	0.00
MT x CPUB x G	3	1.65	0.55	1.05

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Marital Adjustment

The 2 x 4 x 2 repeated measures ANOVA computed on marital adjustment used as between factors, Congruency in the Public Domain (congruent vs. incongruent), and Mother Tongue Self-Confidence (male high: female high; male high: female low; male low: female high; male low: female low) and, as a within factor, Gender (male vs. female).

All effects and interactions are reported in Table 52. A significant main effect was obtained for Congruency in the Public Domain. Couples with congruent acculturation profiles in the public domain ($M=111.95$) reported better marital adjustment than couples with incongruent acculturation profiles ($M=102.20$).

No other significant main effects, two-way interactions or three-way interaction were obtained for the measure of marital adjustment (see Appendix B.27 a, B.27b, B.27c, B.27d and B.27e for the means). Thus, confidence in the native language was not a moderator of marital adjustment for couples with incongruent acculturation profiles in public situations.

In summary, although couples with incongruent acculturation profiles in the public domain report lower marital adjustment than couples with congruent acculturation profiles, the eighth and tenth hypotheses regarding the congruency of acculturation profiles of spouses in the public domain and mother tongue self-confidence was not supported in any of the adjustment indices. Thus, mother tongue self-confidence was not a moderator of depression, stress, or marital adjustment for couples with incongruent acculturation profiles in public situations.

Table 52

Marital Adjustment as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence, Congruency in the Public Domain and Gender

Between-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	76	57,899.08	761.83	
Mother Tongue (MT) Self-Confidence	3	1639.44	546.48	0.72
Congruency (CPUB) in the Public Domain	1	3023.29	3029.29	3.97*
MT x CPUB	3	1262.49	420.83	0.55

Within-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	76	12,115.16	159.41	
Gender (G)	1	18.47	18.47	0.12
MT x G	3	724.47	241.49	1.51
CPUB x G	1	21.28	21.28	0.13
MT x CPUB x G	3	320.94	106.98	0.67

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Self-Esteem

According to the eleventh and twelfth hypotheses, self-esteem will moderate the relation between the congruency of acculturation profiles in the public domain and psychological (H_{11}) and marital (H_{12}) adjustment, respectively

Psychological Adjustment

The repeated measures MANOVA computed on the psychological adjustment variables, specifically depression and stress, used as between factors, Congruency in the Public Domain (congruent vs incongruent), and Self-Esteem (male low female low, male low female high, male high female low, male high female high) and, as a within factor, Gender (male vs female) Results of the MANOVA show a significant multivariate main effect for Self-Esteem [Wilk's Lambda = 0.83, $p < .05$] and for Gender [Wilk's Lambda = 0.92, $p < .05$] The univariate effects are reported separately hereafter

Depression All effects and interactions are reported in Table 53 A significant main effect was obtained for Self-Esteem (see Figure 16) Tukey's HSD test was applied in order to assess the nature of these differences The results show that this effect is mainly due to the significant differences between couples in which both spouses reported low self-esteem compared to couples in which the wife reported lower self-esteem than her husband and compared to couples in which both spouses experienced high self-esteem (see Table 54) More precisely, couples experience higher depression when the wife has lower self-esteem than her husband

Table 53

Depression as a Function of Self-Esteem, Congruency in the Public Domain and Gender

Between-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	76	951.52	12.52	
Self-Esteem (SE)	3	193.29	64.43	5.14**
Congruency (CPUB) in the Public Domain	1	20.04	20.04	1.50
SE x CPUB	3	29.61	9.87	0.79

Within-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	76	354.16	4.66	
Gender (G)	1	0.75	0.75	0.16
SE x G	3	52.74	17.58	3.78**
CPUB x G	1	0.37	0.37	0.08
SE x CPUB x G	3	8.85	2.95	0.63

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


Figure 16**Mean Depression as a Function of Self-Esteem**

Table 54

Post Hoc Analyses of Means of Depression for Self-Esteem

		Self-Esteem (Male; Female)		Degrees of Freedom	<u>Q</u>
Male: low; Female: low (13.66)	Male: low; Female: high (12.34)	Male: high; Female: low (14.22)	Male: high; Female: high (11.32)		
X	X			2,76	2.31
X		X		2,76	0.83
X			X	3,76	5.16**
	X	X		3,76	2.49
	X		X	2,76	1.79
		X	X	4,76	4.33*

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

Note. Means are reported in brackets.

No other significant main effects, two-way interactions or three-way interaction that correspond to multivariate effects were obtained (see Appendix B 28a, B 28b, B.28c and B.28d for the means). Thus, self-esteem was not a moderator of depression for couples with incongruent acculturation profiles in public situations.

Stress All effects and interactions are reported in Table 55 A significant main effect was obtained for Gender. Females ($M=2.92$) reported higher stress than males ($M=2.59$).

No other significant main effects, two-way interactions or three-way interaction that correspond to multivariate effects were obtained (see Appendix B.29a, B.29b, B.29c, B.29d and B.29e for the means) Thus, self-esteem is not a moderator of stress for couples with incongruent acculturation profiles in public situations

Marital Adjustment

The 2 x 4 x 2 repeated measures ANOVA computed on marital adjustment used as between factors, Congruency in the Public Domain (congruent vs incongruent), and Self-Esteem (male low female low; male low female high, male high female low, male high female high) and, as a within factor, Gender (male vs female)

All effects and interactions are reported in Table 56 A significant main effect was obtained for Congruency in the Public Domain Couples with incongruent acculturation profiles in the public domain ($M=116.00$) reported lower marital adjustment than couples with congruent acculturation profiles ($M=104.53$)

A significant two-way interaction was obtained for Self-Esteem and Gender (see Figure 17) Tukey's HSD test was applied in order to assess the nature of these

Table 55

Stress as a Function of Self-Esteem, Congruency in the Public Domain and Gender

Between-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	76	107.16	1.41	
Self-Esteem (SE)	3	10.20	3.40	2.42
Congruency (CPUB) in the Public Domain	1	1.75	1.75	1.25
SE x CPUB	3	1.41	0.47	0.33
Within-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	76	39.52	0.52	
Gender (G)	1	3.03	3.03	5.86*
SE x G	3	1.08	0.36	0.69
CPUB x G	1	0.06	0.06	0.11
SE x CPUB x G	3	0.63	0.21	0.41

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Table 56


Marital Adjustment as a Function of Self-Esteem, Congruency in the Public Domain and Gender

Between-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	76	55,481.52	730.02	
Self-Esteem (SE)	3	4776.03	1592.01	2.18
Congruency (CPUB) in the Public Domain	1	3468.20	3468.20	4.75*
SE x CPUB	3	498.81	163.27	0.22
Within-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	76	10,764.64	141.64	
Gender (G)	1	349.40	349.40	2.47
SE x G	3	1815.00	605.00	4.27**
CPUB x G	1	55.81	55.81	0.39
SE x CPUB x G	3	689.01	229.67	1.62

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Figure 17

Mean Marital Adjustment as a Function of Self-Esteem and Gender



differences. The results show that this effect is due to significant differences between males in relationships in which the husband reports higher self-esteem than his wife compared to when both spouses report high self-esteem, when both spouses report low self-esteem and when the wife reports higher self-esteem than her husband. The results further show that this effect is due to the significant differences between males and females in a relationship in which the husband reports higher self-esteem than his wife (see Table 57). More precisely, husbands are better maritally adjusted when they have higher self-esteem than their wife.

No other significant main effects, two-way interactions or three-way interaction were obtained for the measure of marital adjustment (see Appendix B 30a, B 30b, B 30c and B.30d for the means).

In summary, couples experience more depression when wives have lower self-esteem than their husband, females are more stressed than males, and husbands report better marital adjustment when they have more self-esteem than their wife. However, the eleventh and twelfth hypotheses with respect to self-esteem as a moderator for incongruent couples were not supported for any of the adjustment indices. Thus, self-esteem is not a moderator of depression, stress and marital adjustment for couples with incongruent acculturation profiles in public situations.

Table 57

Post Hoc Analyses of Means of Marital Adjustment for Self-Esteem and Gender

Gender								Degrees of Freedom	Q
Male				Female					
M: low; F: low (100.32)	M: low; F: high (103.83)	M: high; F: low (133.01)	M: high; F: high (111.16)	M: low; F: low (104.71)	M: low; F: high (107.35)	M: high; F: low (111.42)	M: high; F: high (110.28)		
X	X							2,104	0.74
X		X						4,104	5.83**
X			X					3,104	2.87
	X	X						3,104	4.63**
	X		X					2,104	1.54
		X	X					2,104	3.91**
				X	X			2,104	0.55
				X		X		4,104	1.20
				X			X	3,104	1.47
					X	X		3,104	0.65
					X		X	2,104	0.62
						X	X	2,104	0.20
X				X				2,76	2.03
	X				X			2,76	1.11
		X				X		2,76	5.44**
			X				X	2,78	0.41

*p<.05; **p<.01

Note. Means are reported in brackets.

Moderators of Adjustment, Congruency in the Private Domain and Gender

The second set of analyses concerns the moderators of adjustment and the congruency of acculturation profiles between spouses in the private domain ¹

Spousal Support

According to our fifth and sixth hypotheses, respectively, spousal support will moderate the relation between the congruency of acculturation profiles in the private domain and psychological (H₅) and marital (H₆) adjustment

Psychological Adjustment

The repeated measures MANOVA computed on the psychological adjustment variables, specifically depression and stress, used as between factors, Congruency in the Private Domain (congruent vs. incongruent), and Spousal Support (male low female low; male low female high; male high female low, male high female high) and, as a within factor, Gender (male vs female) Results of the MANOVA show a significant multivariate main effect for Spousal Support [Wilk's Lambda = 0.82, $p < .05$]. The univariate effects are reported separately hereafter

Depression. All effects and interactions are reported in Table 58. A significant main effect was obtained for Spousal Support (see Figure 18). Tukey's HSD test was applied in order to assess the nature of these differences. The results show that this effect is mainly due to the significant differences between couples in which both

Length of marriage and length of years in Canada, were originally used as covariates in the 2 x 4 x 2 repeated measures MANCOVAs and ANCOVAs. Since they did not significantly affect the results, they were omitted from further computations.


Table 58

Depression as a Function of Spousal Support, Congruency in the Private Domain and Gender

Between-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	76	1060.20	13.95	
Spousal Support (SS)	3	163.35	54.45	3.90**
Congruency (CPRIV) in the Private Domain	1	3.47	3.47	0.25
SS x CPRIV	3	25.65	8.55	0.61

Within-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	76	399.00	5.25	
Gender (G)	1	0.00	0.00	0.00
SS x G	3	17.85	5.95	1.13
CPRIV x G	1	6.66	6.66	1.27
SS x CPRIV x G	3	12.60	4.20	0.80

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Figure 18**Mean Depression as a Function of Spousal Support**

spouses experienced low spousal support and by couples in which both spouses experienced high spousal support (see Table 59). More precisely, couples experienced less depression when husbands and wives felt supported by their spouse than when they did not feel supported by their spouse.

No other significant main effects, two-way interactions or three-way interaction that correspond to multivariate effects were obtained (see Appendix B.31a, B.31b, B.31c, B.31d and B.31e for the means). Thus, spousal support was not a moderator of depression for couples with incongruent acculturation profiles in private situations regardless of gender.

Stress. All effects and interactions are reported in Table 60. No significant main effects, two-way interactions or three-way interaction were obtained that correspond to multivariate effects (see Appendix B.32a, B.32b, B.32c, B.32d, B.32e and B.32f for the means). Thus, spousal support was not a moderator of stress for couples with incongruent acculturation profiles in private situations, regardless of gender.

Marital Adjustment

A 2 x 4 x 2 repeated measures ANOVA was computed on marital adjustment using as between factors Congruency in the Private Domain (congruent vs. incongruent), and Spousal Support (male low: female low; male low: female high; male high: female low; male high: female high) and, as a within factor, Gender (male vs. female).

All effects and interactions are reported in Table 61. A significant main effect

Table 59

Post Hoc Analyses of Means of Depression for Spousal Support

Spousal Support (Male; Female)				Degrees of Freedom	<u>Q</u>
Male: low; Female: low (13.64)	Male: low; Female: high (12.70)	Male: high; Female: low (13.03)	Male: high; Female: high (11.42)		
X	X			3,76	1.41
X		X		2,76	0.79
X			X	4,76	4.84**
	X	X		2,76	0.36
	X		X	2,76	1.88
		X	X	3,76	2.05

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$ Note. Means are reported in brackets.

Table 60

Stress as a Function of Spousal Support, Congruency in the Private Domain and Gender

Between-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	76	115.52	1.52	
Spousal Support (SS)	3	6.33	2.11	1.39
Congruency (CRIV) in the Private Domain	1	0.53	0.53	0.35
SS x CPRIV	3	0.69	0.23	0.15

Within-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	76	40.28	0.53	
Gender (G)	1	1.81	1.81	3.40
SS x G	3	1.47	0.49	0.91
CPRIV x G	1	0.02	0.02	0.03
SS x CPRIV x G	3	0.39	0.13	0.24

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

Table 61

Marital Adjustment as a Function of Spousal Support, Congruency in the Private Domain and Gender

Between-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	76	53,122.48	698.98	
Spousal Support (SS)	3	8245.26	2748.42	3.93**
Congruency (CPRIV) in the Private Domain	1	944.91	944.91	1.35
SS x CPRIV	3	1550.55	516.85	0.74
Within-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	76	11,545.16	151.91	
Gender (G)	1	29.58	29.58	0.19
SS x G	3	342.36	114.12	0.75
CPRIV x G	1	88.21	88.21	0.58
SS x CPRIV x G	3	1148.10	382.70	2.52

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

was obtained for Spousal Support (see Figure 19). Tukey's HSD test was applied in order to assess the nature of these differences. The results show that this effect is mainly due to the significant differences between couples in which both spouses experienced low spousal support and couples in which both spouses experienced high spousal support (see Table 62). More precisely, in private situations, couples report lower marital adjustment when spouses do not feel supported by each other.

No other significant main effects, two-way interactions or three-way interaction were obtained (see Appendix B.33a, B.33b, B.33c, B.33d and B.33e for the means). Thus, spousal support was not a moderator of marital adjustment for couples with incongruent acculturation profiles in private situations, regardless of gender.

In summary, lower depression and couples experience better marital adjustment when both spouses feel supported by each other. However, the fifth and sixth hypotheses with respect to spousal support as a moderator of psychological and marital adjustment, respectively, for couples with incongruent acculturation profiles in private domains were not supported.

English Self-Confidence

According to the seventh and ninth hypotheses, English self-confidence will moderate the relation between the congruency of acculturation profiles in the private domain and psychological (H_7) and marital (H_9) adjustment, respectively.

Figure 19

Mean Marital Adjustment as a Function of Spousal Support




Table 62

Post Hoc Analyses of Means of Marital Adjustment for Spousal Support

		<u>Spousal Support (Male; Female)</u>		Degrees of Freedom	Q
Male: low; Female: low (100.67)	Male: low; Female: high (117.35)	Male: high; Female: low (115.49)	Male: high; Female: high (113.69)		
X	X			4,76	3.56
X		X		3,76	2.74
X			X	2,76	4.04**
	X	X		2,76	0.29
	X		X	3,76	0.76
		X	X	2,76	0.33

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$ Note. Means are reported in brackets.

Psychological Adjustment

The repeated measures MANOVA computed on the psychological adjustment variables, specifically depression and stress, used as between factors, Congruency in the Private Domain (congruent vs. incongruent), and English Self-Confidence (male high: female high; male high: female low; male low: female high; male low: female low) and, as a within factor, Gender (male vs. female). Results of the MANOVA show a significant multivariate main effect for English Self-Confidence [Wilk's Lambda = 0.83; $p < .05$] and Gender [Wilk's Lambda = 0.88; $p < .01$]. Results also show a significant multivariate interaction between English Self-Confidence and Gender [Wilk's Lambda = 0.84; $p < .05$]. The univariate effects are reported separately hereafter.

Depression. All effects and interactions are reported in Table 63. A significant main effect was obtained for English Self-Confidence (see Table 64 for the means). Tukey's HSD test was applied in order to assess the nature of these differences. The results show that this effect is mainly due to the significant differences between couples in which both spouses reported high English self-confidence compared to when the husband reported higher confidence in English than his wife and when both spouses reported low English self-confidence (see Table 64). More precisely, higher depression is experienced by couples when the wife feels less confident in the second language than her husband.

Table 63

Depression as a Function of English Self-Confidence, Congruency in the Private Domain and Gender

Between-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	76	1046.52	13.77	
English Self-Confidence (E)	3	167.25	55.75	4.05**
Congruency (CPRIV) in the Private Domain	1	0.10	0.10	0.01
E x CPRIV	3	26.10	8.70	0.63
Within-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	76	370.88	4.88	
Gender (G)	1	3.43	3.43	0.70
E x G	3	39.69	13.23	2.72*
CPRIV x G	1	4.33	4.33	0.89
E x CPRIV x G	3	6.39	2.13	0.44

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Table 64

Post Hoc Analyses of Means of Depression for English Self-Confidence

English Self-Confidence (Male; Female)				Degrees of Freedom	<u>Q</u>
Male: high; Female: high (11.49)	Male: high; Female: low (14.45)	Male: low; Female: high (13.17)	Male: low; Female: low (13.06)		
X	X			4,76	4.56**
X		X		3,76	2.68
X			X	2,76	3.30*
	X	X		2,76	1.65
	X		X	3,76	2.12
		X	X	2,76	0.17

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

Note. Means are reported in brackets.

A significant two-way interaction was obtained for English Self-Confidence and Gender (see Figure 20). Tukey's HSD test was applied in order to assess the nature of these differences. The results show that this effect is due to the significant differences between females in a relationship in which the husband reports higher confidence in English than his wife compared to when both spouses report high confidence in English, when both spouses report low confidence in English, and when the wife reports higher confidence in English than her husband. This effect is also due to the significant differences between females in a relationship in which both spouses report low confidence in English compared to when both spouses report high confidence in English. The results further show that this effect is due to the significant differences between males and females in a relationship in which the husband reports higher confidence in English than his wife and when both spouses report low confidence in English (see Table 65). More precisely, wives are more depressed when they have less confidence in the second language than their husband.

No other significant main effects, two-way interactions or three-way interaction that correspond to multivariate effects were obtained (see Appendix B.34a, B.34b, B.34c and B.34d for the means). Thus, English self-confidence was not a moderator of depression for couples with incongruent acculturation profiles in private situations.

Stress. All effects and interactions are reported in Table 66. A significant main effect was obtained for Gender. Higher stress was reported by females ($\underline{M}$ =2.92) than by males ($\underline{M}$ =2.59).

Figure 20

Mean Depression as a Function of English Self-Confidence and Gender




Table 65

Post Hoc Analyses of Means of Depression for English Self-Confidence and Gender

Gender								Degrees of Freedom	Q
Male				Female					
M: high; F: high (11.79)	M: high; F: low (13.19)	M: low; F: high (13.33)	M: low; F: low (13.21)	M: high; F: high (11.19)	M: high; F: low (15.71)	M: low; F: high (13.00)	M: low; F: low (12.92)		
X	X							2,124	1.86
X		X						4,124	2.11
X			X					3,124	2.57
	X	X						3,124	0.16
	X		X					2,124	0.03
		X	X					2,124	0.16
				X	X			4,124	5.99**
				X		X		3,124	2.48
				X			X	2,124	3.13*
					X	X		2,124	3.01*
					X		X	3,124	3.65*
						X	X	2,124	0.11
X				X				2,76	1.07
	X				X			2,76	5.03**
		X				X		2,76	0.35
			X				X	2,76	3.38*

*p<.05; **p<.01 Note. Means are reported in brackets.

Table 66

Stress as a Function of English Self-Confidence, Congruency in the Private Domain and Gender

Between-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	76	112.48	1.48	
English Self-Confidence (E)	3	8.31	2.77	1.88
Congruency (CPRIV) in the Private Domain	1	1.31	1.31	0.89
E x CPRIV	3	0.78	0.26	0.17
Within-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	76	35.72	0.47	
Gender (G)	1	4.29	4.29	9.12**
E x G	3	4.65	1.55	3.29*
CPRIV x G	1	0.03	0.03	0.06
E x CPRIV x G	3	1.11	0.37	0.79

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

A significant two-way interaction was obtained for English Self-Confidence and Gender (see Figure 21). Tukey's HSD test was applied in order to assess the nature of these differences. The results show that this effect is due to the significant differences between females in a relationship in which the husband reports higher confidence in English than his wife compared to when both spouses report high confidence in English and when the wife reports higher confidence in English than her husband. The results further show that this effect is due to the significant differences between males and females in a relationship in which the husband reports higher confidence in English than his wife (see Table 67). More precisely, wives are more stressed when they have less confidence in the second language than their husband.

No other significant main effects, two-way interactions or three-way interaction that correspond to multivariate effects were obtained (see Appendix B.35a, B.35b, B.35c, B.35d and B.35e for the means). Thus, English self-confidence was not a moderator of stress for couples with incongruent acculturation profiles in private situations.

Marital Adjustment

The 2 x 4 x 2 repeated measures ANOVA computed on marital adjustment used as between factors, Congruency in the Private Domain (congruent vs. incongruent), and English Self-Confidence (male high: female high; male high: female low; male low: female high; male low: female low) and, as a within factor, Gender (male vs. female).


Figure 21**Mean Stress as a Function of English Self-Confidence and Gender**

Table 67

Post Hoc Analyses of Means of Stress for English Self-Confidence and Gender

Gender								Degrees of Freedom	Q
Male				Female					
M: high; F: high (2.47)	M: high; F: low (2.66)	M: low; F: high (2.64)	M: low; F: low (2.66)	M: high; F: high (2.60)	M: high; F: low (3.70)	M: low; F: high (2.51)	M: low; F: low (3.09)		
X	X							4,120	0.77
X		X						2,120	0.71
X			X					3,120	1.06
	X	X						3,120	0.07
	X		X					2,120	0.00
		X	X					2,120	0.09
				X	X			3,120	4.45**
				X		X		2,120	0.38
				X			X	2,120	2.74
					X	X		4,120	4.08*
					X		X	2,120	2.50
						X	X	3,120	2.45
X				X				2,76	1.90
	X				X			2,76	3.96*
		X				X		2,76	0.54
			X				X	2,76	0.31

*p<.05; **p<.01

Note. Means are reported in brackets.

All effects and interactions are reported in Table 68. No significant main effects, two-way interactions or three-way interaction were obtained (see Appendix B.36a, B.36b, B.36c, B.36d, B.36e and B.36f for the means). Thus, English self-confidence was not a moderator of marital adjustment for couples with incongruent acculturation profiles in private situations.

In summary, wives experience more depression and stress when they have lower confidence in the host language than their husband. However, the seventh and ninth hypotheses with respect to English self-confidence as a moderator of depression, stress and marital adjustment for couples with incongruent acculturation profiles in private situations were not supported.

Mother Tongue Self-Confidence

According to the eighth and tenth hypotheses, mother tongue self-confidence will moderate the relation between the congruency of acculturation profiles in the private domain and psychological (H_8) and marital (H_{10}) adjustment, respectively.

Psychological Adjustment

The repeated measures MANOVA computed on the psychological adjustment variables, specifically depression and stress, used as between factors, Congruency in the Private Domain (congruent vs. incongruent), and Mother Tongue Self-Confidence (male high: female high; male high: female low; male low: female high; male low: female low) and, as a within factor, Gender (male vs. female). Results of the MANOVA show a significant multivariate main effect for Gender [Wilk's Lambda = 0.84; $p < .05$]. The univariate effects are reported separately hereafter.

Table 68

Marital Adjustment as a Function of English Self-Confidence, Congruency in the Private Domain and Gender

Between-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	76	56,555.40	744.15	
English Self-Confidence (E)	3	5735.01	1911.67	2.57
Congruency (CPRIV) in the Private Domain	1	943.79	943.79	1.27
E x CPRIV	3	368.40	122.80	0.17

Within-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	76	11,305.00	148.75	
Gender (G)	1	195.20	195.20	1.31
E x G	3	451.53	150.51	1.01
CPRIV x G	1	82.15	82.15	0.55
E x CPRIV x G	3	1141.62	380.54	2.56

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Depression. All effects and interactions are reported in Table 69. No significant main effects, two-way interactions or three-way interaction that correspond to multivariate effects were obtained for the measure of depression (see Appendix B.37a, B.37b, B.37c, B.37d, B.37e and B.37f for the means). Thus, self-confidence in the native language was not a moderator of depression for couples with incongruent acculturation profiles in private situations.

Stress. All effects and interactions are reported in Table 70. A significant main effect was obtained for Gender. Higher stress was experienced by females ($M=2.92$) than by males ($M=2.59$).

No other significant main effects, two-way interactions or three-way interaction that correspond to multivariate effects were obtained (see Appendix B.38a, B.38b, B.38c, B.38d and B.38e for the means). Thus, confidence in the native language was not a moderator of stress for couples with incongruent acculturation profiles in private situations.

Marital Adjustment

The 2 x 4 x 2 repeated measures ANOVA computed on marital adjustment used as between factors, Congruency in the Private Domain (congruent vs. incongruent), and Mother Tongue Self-Confidence (male high: female high; male high: female low; male low: female high; male low: female low) and, as a within factor, Gender (male vs. female).

All effects and interactions are reported in Table 71. No significant main effects, two-way interactions or three-way interaction were obtained for the measure of marital

Table 69

Depression as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence, Congruency in the Private Domain and Gender

Between-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	76	1216.00	16.00	
Mother Tongue (MT) Self-Confidence	3	27.81	9.27	0.58
Congruency (CPRIV) in the Private Domain	1	0.40	0.40	0.03
MT x CPRIV	3	5.79	1.93	0.12
Within-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	76	403.56	5.31	
Gender (G)	1	0.03	0.03	0.01
MT x G	3	8.40	2.80	0.53
CPRIV x G	1	5.29	5.29	1.00
MT x CPRIV x G	3	17.49	5.83	1.10

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

Table 70

Stress as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence, Congruency in the Private Domain and Gender

Between-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	76	118.56	1.56	
Mother Tongue (MT) Self-Confidence	3	3.06	1.02	0.65
Congruency (CPRIV) in the Private Domain	1	1.68	1.68	1.08
MT x CPRIV	3	0.72	0.24	0.16
Within-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	76	40.28	0.53	
Gender (G)	1	4.77	4.77	9.07**
MT x G	3	0.48	0.16	0.30
CPRIV x G	1	0.26	0.26	0.49
MT x CPRIV x G	3	1.89	0.63	1.20

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Table 71

Marital Adjustment as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence, Congruency in the Private Domain and Gender

Between-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	76	58,255.52	766.52	
Mother Tongue (MT) Self-Confidence	3	1385.79	461.93	0.60
Congruency (CPRIV) in the Private Domain	1	1482.86	1482.86	1.93
MT x CPRIV	3	2735.88	911.96	1.19

Within-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	76	11,898.56	156.56	
Gender (G)	1	1.34	1.34	0.01
MT x G	3	871.56	290.52	1.86
CPRIV x G	1	21.52	21.52	0.14
MT x CPRIV x G	3	536.91	178.97	1.14

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

adjustment (see Appendix B.39a, B.39b, B.39c, B.39d, B.39e and B.39f for the means).

Thus, confidence in the native language was not a moderator of marital adjustment for couples with incongruent acculturation profiles in private situations.

The eighth and tenth hypotheses with respect to self-confidence in the native language as a moderator of depression and stress, as well as marital adjustment, respectively, for incongruent couple in private situations were not supported in any of the adjustment indices.

Self-Esteem

According to the eleventh and twelfth hypotheses, self-esteem will moderate the relation between the congruency of acculturation profiles in the private domain and psychological (H_{11}) and marital (H_{12}) adjustment, respectively.

Psychological Adjustment

The repeated measures MANOVA computed on the psychological adjustment variables, specifically depression and stress, used as between factors, Congruency in the Private Domain (congruent vs. incongruent), and Self-Esteem (male low: female low; male low: female high; male high: female low; male high: female high) and, as a within factor, Gender (male vs. female). Results of the MANOVA show a significant multivariate main effect for Self-Esteem [Wilk's Lambda = 0.80; $p < .01$] and for Gender [Wilk's Lambda = 0.86; $p < .01$]. Results also show a significant multivariate interaction between Self-Esteem and Gender [Wilk's Lambda = 0.84; $p < .05$], as well as between Self-Esteem, Congruency in the Private Domain and Gender [Wilk's Lambda = 0.84; $p < .05$]. The univariate effects are reported separately hereafter.

Depression. All effects and interactions are reported in Table 72. A significant main effect was obtained for Self-Esteem (see Table 73 for the means). Tukey's HSD test was applied in order to assess the nature of these differences. The results show that this effect is mainly due to the significant differences between couples when both spouses experienced high self-esteem compared to couples in which the wife reported lower self-esteem than her husband and when both spouses reported low self-esteem (see Table 73). More precisely, couples experience higher depression when the wife has lower self-esteem than her husband does.

A significant two-way interaction was obtained for Self-Esteem and Gender (see Figure 22). Tukey's HSD test was applied in order to assess the nature of these differences. The results show that this effect is due to the significant differences between males in a relationship in which both spouses report high self-esteem compared to when the husband reports lower self-esteem than his wife and when both spouses report low self-esteem. The results further show that this effect is due to the significant differences between females in a relationship in which the wife reports lower self-esteem than her husband compared to when both spouses report low self-esteem, when the wife reports higher self-esteem than her husband, and when both spouses report high self-esteem. As well, this effect is due to the significant differences between females in a relationship in which both spouses report low self-esteem compared to when both spouses report high self-esteem. Moreover, the results show that this effect is due to the significant differences between males and females in a relationship in which the husband reports higher self-esteem than his wife and when he

Table 72

Depression as a Function of Self-Esteem, Congruency in the Private Domain and Gender

Between-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	76	975.84	12.84	
Self-Esteem (SE)	3	236.64	78.88	6.14**
Congruency (CPRIV) in the Private Domain	1	4.07	4.07	0.32
SE x CPRIV	3	10.68	3.56	0.28

Within-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	76	338.96	4.46	
Gender (G)	1	1.46	1.46	0.33
SE x G	3	59.94	19.98	4.48**
CPRIV x G	1	2.18	2.18	0.49
SE x CPRIV x G	3	13.74	4.58	1.03

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


Table 73

Post Hoc Analyses of Means of Depression for Self-Esteem

		Self-Esteem (Male; Female)		Degrees of Freedom	Q
Male: low; Female: low (13.56)	Male: low; Female: high (12.41)	Male: high; Female: low (14.82)	Male: high; Female: high (11.30)		
X	X			2,76	1.98
X		X		2,76	1.85
X			X	3,76	4.93**
	X	X		3,76	3.15
	X		X	2,76	1.92
		X	X	4,76	5.19**

*p<.05; **p<.01

Note. Means are reported in brackets.

Figure 22**Mean Depression as a Function of Self-Esteem and Gender**

reports lower self-esteem than his wife (see Table 74). More precisely, spouses experience higher depression when they are in a relationship in which they have lower self-esteem than their marital partner, particularly for wives.

No other significant main effects, two-way interactions or three-way interaction that correspond to multivariate effects were obtained (see Appendix B.40a, B.40b, B.40c and B.40d for the means). Thus, self-esteem was not a moderator of depression for couples with incongruent acculturation profiles in private situations.

Stress. All effects and interactions are reported in Table 75. A significant main effect was obtained for Self-Esteem (see Table 76 for the means). Tukey's HSD test was applied in order to assess the nature of these differences. The results show that this effect is mainly due to the significant differences between couples in which both spouses reported high self-esteem and couples in which both spouses reported low self-esteem (see Table 76) . More precisely, couples experienced lower stress when both spouses have high self-esteem.

A significant main effect was obtained for Gender. Females ($M=2.92$) reported more stress than males ($M=2.59$).

A significant three-way interaction was obtained for Congruency in the Private Domain, Self-Esteem and Gender (see Figure 23). Tukey's HSD test was applied in order to assess the nature of these differences. The results show that this effect is due to the significant differences between females in an incongruent relationship

Table 74

Post Hoc Analyses of Means of Depression for Self-Esteem and Gender

Gender									
Male				Female					
M: low; F: low (13.85)	M: low; F: high (13.26)	M: high; F: low (13.31)	M: high; F: high (11.23)	M: low; F: low (13.26)	M: low; F: high (11.56)	M: high; F: low (16.33)	M: high; F: high (11.37)	Degrees of <u>Q</u> Freedom	
X	X							3,123	0.88
X		X						2,123	0.68
X			X					4,123	4.94**
	X	X						2,123	0.06
	X		X					2,123	3.05*
		X	X					3,123	2.65
				X	X			2,123	2.53
				X		X		2,123	3.88**
				X			X	3,123	3.55*
					X	X		3,123	5.37**
					X		X	2,123	0.28
						X	X	4,123	6.30**
X				X				2,76	1.53
	X				X			2,76	3.01 *
		X				X		2,76	4.29*
			X				X	2,78	0.40

*p<.05; **p<.01

Note. Means are reported in brackets.

Table 75

Stress as a Function of Self-Esteem, Congruency in the Private Domain and Gender

Between-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	76	105.64	1.39	
Self-Esteem (SE)	3	13.68	4.56	3.29*
Congruency (CPRIV) in the Private Domain	1	2.17	2.17	1.56
SE x CPRIV	3	1.41	0.47	0.34

Within-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	76	36.48	0.48	
Gender (G)	1	4.96	4.96	10.43**
SE x G	3	1.23	0.41	0.86
CPRIV x G	1	0.09	0.09	0.20
SE x CPRIV x G	3	3.75	1.25	2.63

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Table 76


Post Hoc Analyses of Means of Stress for Self-Esteem

		Self-Esteem (Male; Female)		Degrees of Freedom	<u>Q</u>
Male: low; Female: low (2.99)	Male: low; Female: high (2.72)	Male: high; Female: low (3.18)	Male: high; Female: high (2.40)		
X	X			2,76	1.42
X		X		2,76	0.85
X			X	3,76	3.91*
	X	X		3,76	1.83
	X		X	2,76	1.69
		X	X	4,76	3.50
*p<.05; **p<.01					

Note. Means are reported in brackets.

Figure 23

Mean Stress as a Function of Self-Esteem, Congruency in the Private Domain and Gender



in which the wife reports lower self-esteem than her husband compared to when the wife reports higher self-esteem than her husband and when both spouses report high self-esteem. The results further show that this effect is due to the significant differences between males and females in a congruent relationship in which the wife reports higher self-esteem than her husband. Moreover, the results show that this effect is due to the significant differences between males and females in an incongruent relationship in which the husband reports higher self-esteem than his wife (see Table 77). More precisely, in an incongruent relationship in private situations, wives experience higher stress when they have lower self-esteem than their husband.

No other significant main effect or two-way interactions that correspond to multivariate effects were obtained (see Appendix B.41a, B.41b and B.41c for the means). Thus, self-esteem is a moderator of stress for couples with incongruent acculturation profiles in private situations.

Marital Adjustment

The 2 x 4 x 2 repeated measures ANOVA computed on marital adjustment used as between factors, Congruency in the Private Domain (congruent vs. incongruent), and Self-Esteem (male low: female low; male low: female high, male high: female low; male high: female high) and, as a within factor, Gender (male vs. female).

All effects and interactions are reported in Table 78. A significant two-way interaction was obtained for Self-Esteem and Gender (see Figure 24).

Table 77

Post Hoc Analyses of Means of Stress for Self-Esteem, Congruency in the Private Domain and Gender

Congruent Couple								Incongruent Couple								Degrees of Freedom	
Male				Female				Male				Female					
M:low; F:low (2.72)	M:low; F:high (2.32)	M:high; F:low (2.63)	M:high; F:high (2.16)	M:low; F:low (3.00)	M:low; F:high (3.23)	M:high; F:low (3.11)	M:high; F:high (2.35)	M:low; F:low (3.03)	M:low; F:high (2.89)	M:high; F:low (2.89)	M:high; F:high (2.32)	M:low; F:low (3.22)	M:low; F:high (2.45)	M:high; F:low (4.09)	M:high; F:high (2.79)		
X	X															3,123	1.16
X		X														2,123	0.21
X			X													4,123	2.30
	X	X														2,123	0.62
	X		X													2,123	0.45
		X	X													3,123	1.08
				X		X										3,123	0.67
				X			X									2,123	0.26
				X				X								2,123	2.67
					X	X										2,123	0.24
					X		X									4,123	2.47
						X	X									3,123	1.75
								X	X							2,123	0.46
								X			X					2,123	0.41
								X				X				4,123	2.75
									X		X					2,123	0.00
												X	X			3,123	2.02
												X	X			2,123	1.76

*p<.05; **p<.01

Note. Means are reported in brackets.

Table 77 Continued

Congruent Couple								Incongruent Couple								Degrees of Q Freedom	
Male				Female				Male				Female					
M:low; F:low (2 72)	M:low; F:high (2 32)	M:high; F:low (2 63)	M:high; F:high (2 16)	M:low; F:low (3 00)	M:low; F:high (3 23)	M:high; F:low (3 11)	M:high; F:high (2 35)	M:low; F:low (3 03)	M:low; F:high (2 89)	M:high; F:low (2 89)	M:high; F:high (2 32)	M:low; F:low (3 22)	M:low; F:high (2 45)	M:high; F:low (4 09)	M:high; F:high (2 79)		
												X	X			3,123	2.55
												X		X		2,123	2.55
												X			X	2,123	1.67
													X	X		4,123	4.55**
													X		X	2,123	1.21
														X	X	3,123	4.00*
X				X												2,76	1.72
								X				X				2,76	0.95
	X				X											2,76	2.94*
										X				X		2,76	1.91
		X				X										2,76	1.20
											X				X	2,76	4.24**
			X				X									2,75	1.03
											X				X	2,76	2.80
X								X								2,123	1.22
	X								X							2,123	1.50
		X								X						2,123	0.54
			X								X					2,123	0.65
					X							X				2,123	0.86
						X							X			2,123	2.05
							X								X	2,123	2.03
								X							X	2,123	1.78

*p< .05, **p<.01 Note. Means are reported in brackets.

Table 78


Marital Adjustment as a Function of Self-Esteem, Congruency in the Private Domain and Gender

Between-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	76	56,822.16	747.66	
Self-Esteem (SE)	3	4327.17	1442.39	1.93
Congruency (CPRIV) in the Private Domain	1	1845.45	1845.45	2.47
SE x CPRIV	3	1683.51	561.17	0.75
Within-Subject Effect	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Square	Mean Square	F
Within Cells	76	11,222.92	147.67	
Gender (G)	1	446.75	446.75	3.02
SE x G	3	1710.69	570.23	3.86**
CPRIV x G	1	139.22	139.22	0.94
SE x CPRIV x G	3	275.34	91.78	0.62

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

Figure 24

Mean Marital Adjustment as a Function of Self-Esteem and Gender



Tukey's HSD test was applied in order to assess the nature of these differences. The results show that this effect is due to the significant differences between males in a relationship in which the husband reports higher self-esteem than his wife compared to when both spouses report low self-esteem, when both spouses report high self-esteem and when the husband reports lower self-esteem than his wife. The results further show that this effect is due to the significant differences between males and females in a relationship in which the husband reports higher self-esteem than his wife (see Table 79). More precisely, husbands are better maritally adjusted when they have higher self-esteem than their wife.

No other significant main effects, two-way interactions or three-way interaction were obtained for the measure of marital adjustment (see Appendix B.42a, B.42b, B.42c, B.42d and B.42e for the means). Thus, self-esteem is not a moderator of marital adjustment for couples with incongruent acculturation profiles in private situations.

In summary, spouses are more depressed when they have lower self-esteem than their marital partner, particularly wives, and husbands experience better marital adjustment when they have higher self-esteem than their wife.

The eleventh hypothesis with respect to self-esteem as a moderator for incongruent couples was supported for the measure of stress. In private situations, wives in incongruent relationships experience more stress when they have lower self-esteem than their husband. The twelfth hypothesis with respect to self-esteem as a moderator of marital adjustment was not supported. In brief, identifying specific situations for couples in an incongruent relationship in this study was only relevant for the factor of self-esteem and for private situations.

Table 79

Post Hoc Analyses of Means of Marital Adjustment for Self-Esteem and Gender

Gender								Degrees of Freedom	Q
Male				Female					
M: low; F: low (101.05)	M: low; F: high (106.18)	M: high; F: low (128.73)	M: high; F: high (112.22)	M: low; F: low (104.56)	M: low; F: high (107.64)	M: high; F: low (109.14)	M: high; F: high (111.30)		
X	X							2,104	1.06
X		X						4,104	4.87**
X			X					3,104	2.92
	X	X						3,104	3.53*
	X		X					2,104	1.25
		X	X					2,104	2.91*
				X	X			2,104	0.64
				X		X		3,104	0.81
				X			X	4,104	1.78
					X	X		2,104	0.24
					X		X	3,104	0.76
						X	X	2,104	0.38
X				X				2,76	1.58
	X				X			2,76	0.45
		X				X		2,76	4.83**
			X				X	2,78	0.42

*p<.05; **p<.01 Note. Means are reported in brackets.

Power

In order to assess the probability of finding true differences, power analyses were conducted for each hypothesis (see Table 80). As can be seen Hypotheses 5 to 12, in both the public and private domains of identity have low power estimates, indicating that the probability of detecting true differences are very small.

Table 80

Power Calculations for Hypotheses 5 to 12 in the Public and Private Domains of Identity

<u>Hypothesis</u>	<u>Power</u>	
	<u>Public</u>	<u>Private</u>
5	0.12	0.15
6	0.22	0.47
7	0.39	0.06
8	0.34	0.06
9	0.05	0.05
10	0.20	0.38
11	0.08	0.08
<u>12</u>	<u>0.04</u>	<u>0.06</u>

Chapter 5

Summary and Discussion

The main purpose of this thesis was to examine the effects of acculturative stress on married couples from the same ethnic background, as well as the moderating effects of spousal support, linguistic self-confidence in the host and native languages, and self-esteem. The dependent variables were depression, stress and marital adjustment. A second objective of the thesis explored how the congruency of couples in different situations, namely public and private situations, may influence the results of the aforementioned analyses.

First, considering the impact of acculturation profiles, the results indicated that individuals who identified with both cultures, specifically integrated people, reported lower depression and stress than individuals who did not identify with either culture, specifically deculturated people. Furthermore, wives were more stressed when they identified with only one culture, while their husband identified with both cultures.

Pertaining to these results, many studies indicate that those who do not identify with any culture tend to be highly stressed, and those who seek to remain separate from the host culture are also highly stressed. In contrast, those who are integrated are minimally stressed, and assimilation leads to intermediate levels of stress (Berry et al., 1987). Being able to feel similar to both the host and native members of the community, therefore, may best ameliorate some of the effects of acculturative stress.

For women, identification with both cultures is particularly important. In western society, men have traditionally been the providers and have had greater authority within the family, whereas women have been responsible for housekeeping and childcare (Rachlin, 1987). Demographic changes, however, such as the increase in dual-income families and single-parent families, have precipitated a reexamination of expected and actual gender roles (Li & Caldwell, 1987). Women, today, are now breadwinners as well as parents (Lee, Duxbury, Higgins and Mills, 1992). For immigrant women, this means that not only are they responsible for the traditional maternal and spousal roles, but they now have to also successfully integrate into the host environment. There is, therefore, compounded pressure on immigrant women to adapt to the host culture, as well as to identify with their traditional native culture.

This buttresses the initial proposition of this thesis to the effect that many immigrants experience acculturative stress within a dyadic relationship. It is important, therefore, to examine the relation between the congruency of acculturation profiles between spouses and adjustment. When examining this relationship within a general framework of congruency, the results indicated that incongruent couples did not experience higher depression, higher stress or lower marital adjustment as hypothesized. Although our study indicates that there were differences in cultural adaptation, religious homogamy may have been contributing to the lack of findings between the incongruency of acculturation profiles and adjustment. The distinction between religious versus cultural homogamy, therefore, may be an important consideration for this sample. Couples in religious homogamous marriages share

similar socialization experiences (Liao & Stevens, 1994). Conversely, couples in heterogamous marriages are less likely to share similar values and attitudes and are more likely to disagree about a variety of issues (Liao & Stevens, 1994). As Muslim values and beliefs are a way of life, perhaps the Ismaili Muslim couples in this study shared enough similarities to counteract the negative effects on adjustment from being incongruent in terms of their acculturation profiles. Thus, the more general issue of the genesis of acculturative stress needs to take into account the very specific dimensions along which tension is likely to be felt.

Furthermore, with a detailed analysis of specific combinations of congruent and incongruent acculturation profiles, results indicated that the separated women in this sample experienced more stress, especially when their husband was integrated. Women who did not identify with the host culture experienced more stress because they may be unable to successfully fulfil their work-role. Thus, within the dyadic context of acculturation, the general issue of incongruency and adjustment may not be meaningful, whereas the particular kinds of incongruent acculturation profiles are important to examine.

The fact that dyadic incongruity generally did not have a direct effect on adjustment does not, however, entirely detract from the perspective proposed here. The results indicate that moderators play an important role in ameliorating problems of adjustment in couples with incongruent acculturation profiles.

In the context of the study of couples, spousal support was deemed an obvious factor influencing adjustment and particularly, dyadic adjustment. In general, couples

were more depressed if spouses did not feel supported by each other and wives were less adjusted in their marriage if they did not feel supported by their husband. Spousal support, however, did not moderate depression, stress or marital adjustment, particularly for females, in couples with incongruent acculturation profiles.

Relevant to these findings, Wellman and Wellman's (1992) study shows that other kin and friends are plausible alternatives to spouses as confidants or members of social networks. When disagreements arise, members of incongruent marriages may be more likely to discuss important issues with relatives or friends, particularly when the issue relates to characteristics not shared by the spouse. Thus, the associated cultural differences between spouses in incongruent marriages may strengthen the important social ties with family members or friends that share similar values and beliefs to the possible detriment of the relationship between the spouses.

Julien and Markman (1991) propose that when marriages are a source of stress, help from outside sources, rather than from one's spouse, may moderate the negative effects of marital stress on health and may help resolve marital conflict. Their findings were consistent with their predictions. Husbands' and wives' higher levels of marital distress were associated with higher degrees of seeking help from outside the marriage.

Furthermore, Ladewig and colleagues (1990) hypothesized that because both spouses are likely to be involved in problems with the financial or parental domains, each may be viewed by the other as a contributor to the problem, and subsequently may not be seen as a source of support. On the other hand, spouses may play an important buffering or coping assistance role if the source of strain originates outside

the home. Their results indicated that spousal support did not moderate the effects of marital, parental or financial strain.

With Ismaili Muslims, in particular, community support plays a very important role in adaptation and adjustment. The Ismaili community has both formal and informal institutions of support. Formal institutions, for example, include resettlement committees that help new Ismaili immigrants integrate into both the Ismaili and Canadian communities. This is done through providing financial support, employment opportunities, and opportunities to learn about Canadian cultural norms, as well as an opportunity to express their own cultural practices. Formal institutions also include mediation committees that provide services in resolving conflicts, such as family, marital or business disputes. Informal aid includes providing emotional support at times of crises such as a death in the family or illness. In future studies, therefore, it may be worthwhile to examine other sources of support likely to moderate the effects of psychological and marital adjustment for couples with incongruent acculturation profiles.

Moreover, when contacting couples to participate in the study, only one spouse was approached. This person, in turn, had to explain the study to their spouse and request their participation. This would require good communication between the spouses, as well as relatively good support from each other. Thus, the couples who did not participate, or when only one couple participated, may have had lower spousal support than those couples who did participate. As indicated, participants reported relatively high spousal support, although median splits were performed to determine high and low groups on spousal support. As well, because the powers of these

analyses were very low, true differences may not have been detected. Thus, another consideration for future research would be to include the participation of larger number of couples and personally contacting both spouses to request their participation.

Whereas spousal support is a particular factor influencing adjustment with the marital context, in the general context of intercultural contact and adaptation, being able to communicate with both host and native members of the community was another obvious factor influencing adjustment. Although it was hypothesized that linguistic self-confidence in both the host and native languages would moderate the relation between ethnic incongruency and adjustment, our results indicated that only self-confidence in English moderated the effects of acculturative stress.

Knowledge of one's native language may not be an important marker of ethnic identity for Muslims. Muslims around the world are similar in many of their cultural beliefs and practices, but do not necessarily share the same native language. Ismaili Muslims in Canada, for example, have emigrated from different parts of the world. There is no one uniform native language that is spoken and understood by all. In the mosques, some of the religious ceremonies are conducted in English because English is the most predominantly understood language of Ismaili Muslims in Canada. Ismaili Muslim identity in Canada, therefore, may not be influenced by knowledge of one's native language, but may rather be influenced by following and practising the fundamental principles and ethics of the faith. As well, the majority of the spouses within this study spoke the same language. The continued usage of the native language with each other will highly influence the competence in that language,

subsequently leading to little or no variation between spouses in the linguistic self-confidence in the mother tongue. Thus, the more general issue of cultural adaptation needs to take into account that religious identity may be a more important factor in determining cultural identity than linguistic self-confidence in the native language, particularly for spouses from the same ethnic background.

Although self-confidence in one's native language was not an important moderator for Ismaili Muslims, self-confidence in the host language played an important moderating role, particularly for wives. They were more depressed when they had lower confidence in the second language than their husband. Furthermore, wives in incongruent relationships experienced more stress when they had lower confidence in the second language than their husband, but lower marital adjustment when they had higher confidence in the second language than their husband.

In order to lessen the effects of acculturative stress, immigrants may have to learn the new language and cultural norms in order to interact effectively with host members in either the work or social environments, as well as to establish supportive networks in the host country. For immigrant men and women, therefore, knowledge of the host language is an important coping tool for interaction in the host community. Relevant to these findings, many studies indicate that knowledge of English ameliorates the effects of acculturative stress in immigrant people (e.g. Berry et al., 1987; Kagan & Cohen, 1990).

For women, in particular, the dual role of home-maker and wage-earner places an emphasis on being able to communicate in the host language in order to fulfil these

roles. When the wife is unable to communicate effectively in her host language, especially when her husband can, it may place a risk in being unable to satisfy her wage-earning role. Thus, stress is experienced. When she can communicate in the host language, but her husband has difficulty, it may place a risk on marital adjustment.

The woman may recognise that her husband may not be able to adequately fulfil his role as the wage earner, thereby placing more pressure on her. Thus, the more general issue of intercultural adaptation needs to take into consideration the importance of being able to communicate in the host language with respect to ameliorating the effects of acculturative stress. Furthermore, the interaction of gender role expectations and communication may result in detrimental situations for women.

Besides linguistic self-confidence as an interpersonal factor, this study examined the role of self-esteem as an intrapersonal factor acting to protect individuals from acculturative stress. In this study, it was hypothesized that self-esteem would moderate the effects of acculturative stress in couples with incongruent acculturation profiles based on many studies indicating that self-esteem moderates the effects of stressful life events, including the effects of intercultural contact for people in general (Padilla et al., 1985; Young, 1991), and for women, in particular (Hobfoll & Lieberman, 1987; Shin, 1994).

In general, couples were more depressed when spouses had lower self-esteem than their marital partner. Couples were also more stressed when the wife had lower self-esteem than her husband. Husbands, however, were better maritally adjusted when they had higher self-esteem than their wife.

Pertaining to these results, Reitzes and Mutran (1994), found that higher self-esteem was positively related to the commitment to worker, spouse and parental roles. Self-esteem may, therefore, buffer the stress of role overload. In this sample, low self-esteem was related to stress in women, indicating that women with low self-esteem may not have been able to reduce the stress of having multiple roles. Reitzes and Mutran (1994) further found that identity meanings in the role of spouse are related positively to self-esteem only for men. High self-esteem, therefore, may contribute positively to the role of spouse for men.

Results also indicated that self-esteem was not a moderator of marital adjustment. Persons who have high self-esteem resist ascribing to themselves negative attributes as a result of current difficulties (Pearlin & Schooler, 1978). These individuals tend to see themselves as maintaining a sense of control over their lives. When conflict arises in the marriage as a result of different views between spouses, people may feel unable to control these differences. Thus, individuals who view themselves positively may also see themselves as able to affect the environment that is within their control, but changing their spouse's views may not be something within their control. Self-esteem, therefore, would not be a moderator of marital adjustment as this involves the self and significant other, but may rather be a moderator of psychological adjustment as it involves only the self.

Results further indicated that self-esteem does moderate stress in couples with incongruent acculturation profiles, particularly for women, in private situations. Specifically, women in incongruent relationships in the private domain experienced

more stress when they had lower self-esteem. The incongruency of acculturation profiles between spouses may cause women in particular, to question their identity. Specifically, this incongruity between spouses may challenge wives' beliefs of their marital role in the private domain, whereas their work role in the public domain may not be affected by this incongruity. High self-esteem may, therefore, protect their identity from these challenges, and ameliorate the stress. When examining the effects of intrapersonal factors on acculturation issues, it may be worthwhile to investigate the specific domains in which challenges to identity are being made. Thus, the more general issue of intercultural adaptation needs to take into account domain variation.

In future studies, it may be important to note the importance of self-esteem in moderating stressful effects on the self, as well as examine the role of self-esteem in the private contexts of identity. As well, because the powers of these analyses were very low, true differences may not have been detected. Thus, once again, another consideration for future research would be to include the participation of larger number of couples.

Summary and Potential Contributions

Taking into account the low power of the statistical procedures applied to the data, as well as the relative reliability of the scales, these results indicate the importance of examining acculturative effects within a dyadic relationship and the impact of moderators on adjustment. These results further demonstrate that immigrant women, in particular, are at risk for problems in adjustment. Moreover, linguistic self-confidence in the host language and self-esteem are important moderators of

adjustment for women in incongruent relationships. Women, today, are expected to contribute to the home, as well as to society. This includes working in order to earn money, maintaining the household, taking care of the children and fulfilling their spousal roles, and in many cases, their familial roles. Immigrant women, therefore, have to be able to maintain a traditional lifestyle while actively participating in the host culture. Future research should, therefore, place an emphasis on examining the effects of acculturation on married immigrant women and the moderators that ameliorate these effects.

This study elucidates many elements of the acculturative process within the marital context, and potential moderators that ameliorate the effects on psychological and marital adjustment. The next step involves taking these findings and examining their contributions to the field of cultural and marital adjustment.

First, with respect to immigration policy, Berry (1997) suggests the development of national policies that neither force assimilation nor separation, nor lead to deculturation. Public education and social legislation, for example, can promote the idea of valuing one's own culture and feelings of belonging to the host culture. At the individual level, disseminating knowledge about the beneficial effects of cultural maintenance and social support can ameliorate the stress of assimilation. As well, participation in national institutions, such as school and work, can reduce the stress associated with separation (Berry, 1997). Thus, promoting integration may alleviate acculturative stress.

Second, with respect to marital therapy, assumptions about similarities between spouses from the same culture need to be re-examined. This study indicates that cultural differences can occur, even though couples are from the same ethnic background. These differences, in turn, can cause problems in psychological and marital adjustment. Thus, therapists need to be aware of their own assumptions of cultural homogamy between spouses from the same ethnic background. It would be necessary, therefore, to identify the each spouse's current ethnic identity profile as each profile may differentially affect the spouse's specific needs (Baptiste, Hardy, & Lewis, 1997).

Third, It is important for the marital therapist to create an alliance with both partners in order to create a safe and understanding environment (Johnson, 1996). The therapist should, therefore, be aware of identifying or being more empathic with either partner (Baptiste, 1984). It should be noted, however, that although incongruent acculturation profiles may contribute to problems in adjustment for both men and women, it is the wives who are particularly at risk for problems in psychological and marital adjustment.

Last, it would be important to recognise that certain factors may moderate the relationship between marital and psychological adjustment, particularly self-esteem and knowledge of English, as indicated by our study. Thus, within the context of therapy, enhancing self-esteem in order to help spouses cope with the changes and resulting conflict would be beneficial in alleviating psychological distress. Normalising the experiences of acculturative stress and potential conflicts in identity, for example, may

help immigrants realise that they are not alone in this experience. Validating the stress and depression they feel, as well the marital problems they encounter may also alleviate these feelings of distress.

This research also indicates that disseminating information about the beneficial effects of second language learning may eventually help alleviate psychological and marital stress. For this particular culture, as well, providing information about community support may also help alleviate the distress associated with intercultural contact.

These steps are just a few components to keep in mind when either researching or working with ethnic couples. They also highlight the findings that were observed in this study. Taken together, the results of the various analyses reported here make three main contributions to our understanding of the congruency of ethnic identity in spouses.

First, the results show that identity choice influences adjustment within the interactive context of intimate relationships. Second, they show that linguistic self-confidence in the host language and self-esteem play important moderating roles in ameliorating the effects of acculturative stress. Third, the risks of acculturative stress are greater in immigrant women due to the dual role of home-maker and wage-earner and that these moderators play an especially important role for women in alleviating these risks.

Current theories of acculturation posit the importance of identification mode as a precursor of adjustment. While supporting such an approach, this research further claims the importance of examining the acculturative experience in the dyadic context of spousal relationships. It also underlines the impact of contextual, interpersonal, and

intrapersonal moderators on mental health and marital adjustment. In view of these finding, approaches to acculturation should consider the intimate interactive context in which cultural contact is experienced.

References

Acitelli, L.K. (1992). Gender differences in relationship awareness and marital satisfaction among young married couples. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 18, 102-110.

Acitelli, L.K., & Antonucci, T.C. (1994). Gender differences in the link between marital support and satisfaction in older couples. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67, 688-698.

Adams, B. N. (1974). Urban skills and religion: Mechanisms for coping and defense among the Ugandan Asians. Social Problems, 22, 28-42.

Akbar, M.A. (1990). Entrepreneurship and Indian Muslims. Delhi: Manak Publications.

Baptiste, D.A. (1984). Marital and family therapy with racially/culturally intermarried stepfamilies: Issues and guidelines. Family Relations, 33, 373-380.

Baptiste, D.A., Hardy, K.V., & Lewis, L. (1997). Family therapy with English Caribbean immigrant families in the United States: Issues of emigration, immigration, culture, and race. Contemporary Family Therapy, 19, 337-359.

Beck, A.T. & Steer, R.A. (1987). Manual for the Beck Depression Inventory. San Antonio, TX: The Psychological Corporation.

Beck, A.T., Steer, R.A., & Brown, G.K. (1996). Beck Depression Inventory (2nd Ed.). San Antonio, TX: The Psychological Corporation.

Berkman, L.F (1985). The relationship of social networks and social support to morbidity and mortality. In S. Cohen & S.L. Syme (Eds.), Social support and health

(pp.241-262). New York: Academic.

Berkman, L.F., & Syme, S.L. (1979). Social networks, hose resistance and mortality: A nine-year follow-up study of Alameda county residents. American Journal of Epidemiology, 109, 186-204.

Berry, J.W. (1984). Cultural relations in plural societies: Alternatives to segregation and their sociopsychological implications. In N. Miller & M. Brewer (Eds.), Groups in contact (pp. 11-27). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Berry, J.W. (1990). Psychology of acculturation. In R. Brislin (Ed.), Applied cross-cultural psychology (Vol. 14). (pp. 232-253). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Berry, J.W. (1997). Immigrant's perceptions of host attitudes and their reconstruction of cultural groups. Applied Psychology: An International Review, 46, 5-68.

Berry, J. W., & Annis, R. C. (1974). Acculturative stress: The role of ecology, culture and differentiation. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 5, 382-405.

Berry, J.W., & Blondel (1982). Psychological adaptation of Vietnamese refugees in Canada. Canadian Journal of Community Mental Health, 1, 81-88.

Berry, J.W., Kim, U., Minde, T., & Mok, D. (1987). Comparative studies of acculturative stress. International Migration Review, 21, 491-511.

Blazer, D.G. (1982). Social support and mortality in an elderly community population. American Journal of Epidemiology, 115, 684-694.

Bloom, J. (1982). Social support, accommodation to stress and adjustment to breast cancer. Social Science and Medicine, 16, 1329-1338.

Brown, G. W., & Harris, T. (1978). *Social origins of depression*. New York: Free Press.

Brunstein, J.C., Dangelmayer, G., & Schultheiss, O. (1996). Personal goals and social support in close relationships: Effects on relationship mood and marital satisfaction. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 71, 1006-1019.

Caplan, G. (1974). Support systems and community mental health. New York: Behavioral Publications.

Carey, M.P., Spector, I.P., Lantinga, L.J., & Krauss, D.J. (1993). Reliability of the Dyadic Adjustment Scale. Psychological Assessment, 5, 238-240.

Cassel, J. (1976). The contribution of the social environment to host resistance. American Journal of Epidemiology, 104, 107-123.

Chang, W.H. (1977). Communication and acculturation. In H. Kim (Ed.), The Korean diaspora (pp.135-153). Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-Clio, Inc.

Clément, R. (1980). Ethnicity, contact and communicative competence in a second language. In H. Giles, W.P. Robinson, & P.M. Smith (Eds.), Language: Social psychological perspectives (pp. 147-154). Oxford: Pergamon.

Clément, R. (1984). Aspects socio-psychologiques de la communication inter-ethniques et de l'identité sociale. Recherches Sociologiques, 15, 293-312.

Clément, R. (1988). Echelles d'attitude et de motivation reliées aux rapports interethniques. Unpublished manuscript, University of Ottawa.

Clément, R., & Noels, K.A. (1992). Towards a situated approach to ethnolinguistic identity: The effects of status on individuals and groups. Journal of

Language and Social Psychology, 11, 203-232.

Cobb, S. (1976). Social support as a moderator of life stress. Psychosomatic Medicine, 38, 300-314.

Cohen, S., & Willis, T.A. (1985). Stress, social support, and the buffering hypothesis. Psychological Bulletin, 98, 310-357

Collier, M.J., & Thomas M. (1988). Cultural identity: An interpretative perspective. In Y.Y. Kim & W.B. Gudykunst (Eds.), Theories in intercultural communication (pp. 99-121). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Cottrell, A. B. (1990). Cross-national marriages: A review of the literature. Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 21, 151-169.

Crane, D.R., Allgood, S.M., Larson, J.H., & Griffin, W. (1990). Assessing marital quality with distressed and nondistressed couples: A comparison and equivalency table for three frequently used measures. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 52, 87-93.

DeLongis, A., Lazarus, R.S., & Folkman, S. (1988). The impact of daily stress on health and mood: Psychological and social resources as mediators. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54, 486-495.

Doherty, W.J., & Jacobson, N.S. (1982). Marriage and the family. In B.B. Wolman (Ed.), Handbook of developmental psychology. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Dohrenwend, B.S., & Dohrenwend, B.P. (1974). Stressful life events: Their nature and effects. New York: Wiley.

Fincham, F.D., & Bradbury, T.N. (1990). Social support in marriage: The role of social cognition. Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 9, 31-42.

Fischer, J., & Corcoran, K. (1994). Measures for clinical practice: Volume 2. New York: The Free Press.

Gaikwad, V.R. (1967). The Anglo-Indians. Bombay: Asia Publishing House.

Glenn, N.D., & Weaver, C.N. (1981). The contribution of marital happiness to global happiness. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 43, 161-168.

Gist, N.P & Wright, R.D. (1973). Marginality and identity: Anglo-Indians as a racially-mixed minority in India. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Gove, W.R., Hughes, M. & Style, C.B. (1983) Does marriage have positive effects on the psychological well-being of the individual? Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 24, 122-131.

Greene, P.G. & Butler, J.S. (1996). The minority community as a natural business incubator. Journal of Business Research, 36, 51-58.

, Hobfoll, S.E., & Leiberman, J.R. (1987). Personality and social resources in immediate and continued stress resistance among women. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52, 18-26.

, Hobfoll, S.E., & London, P (1986). The relationship of self-concept and social support to emotional distress among women during war. Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 4, 189-203.

Hopkins, E. (1966). Racial minorities in British East Africa. In S. Diamond & F.G. Burke (Eds.), The transformation of East Africa. New York: Basic Books.

- House, J.S. (1981). *Work stress and social support*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- House, J.S., Robbins, C., & Metzner, H.L. (1982). The association of social relationships and activities with mortality: Prospective evidence from the Tecumseh Community Health Study. American Journal of Epidemiology, 116, 123-140.
- Hoyt, D.R., & Babchuk, N. (1983). Adult kinship networks: The selective formation of intimate ties with kin. Social Forces, 62, 84-101.
- Hunsley, J., Pinsent, C., Lefebvre, M., James-Tanner, S., & Vito, D. (1995). Construct validity of the short forms of the dyadic adjustment scale. Family Relations, 44, 231-237
- Hurh, W.M. & Kim, K.C. (1984). Korean immigrants in America. Rutherford, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press.
- Imamura, A. E. (1986). Husband-wife role misunderstanding: The case of an international marriage. International Journal of Sociology of the Family, 16, 37-47.
- Imamura, A. E. (1988). The loss that has no name: Social womanhood of foreign wives in international marriages. Gender and Society, 2, 291-307
- Jex, S.M., Cvetanovski, J., & Allen, S.J. (1994). Self-esteem as a moderator of the impact of unemployment. Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 9, 69-80.
- Johnson, J.H., & Sarason, I.G. (1979). Moderator variables in life stress research. In I.G. Sarason & C.D. Spielberger (Eds.), Stress and anxiety (Vol. 6). Washington, D.C.: Hemispheric Publishing.

Johnson, S.M. (1996). The practice of emotionally focused marital therapy: Creating connection. New York: Brunner/Mazel

Julien, D., & Markman, H.J. (1991). Social support and social networks as determinants of individual and marital outcomes. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 8, 549-568.

Kagan, H., & Cohen, J. (1990). Cultural adjustment of international students. Psychological Science, 1, 133-137

Kessler, R.C., & McLeod, J.D. (1985). Social support and mental health in community samples. In S. Cohen & S. L. Syme (Eds.) Social support and health (pp.219-240). New York: Academic.

Kiecolt-Glaser, J.K., Fisher, B.S., Ogrocki, P., Stout, J.C., Speicher, C.E., & Glaser, R. (1987). Marital quality, marital discord, and immune function. Psychosomatic Medicine, 49, 13-33.

Kiecolt-Glaser, J. K., Kennedy, S., Malkoff, S., Fisher, L., Speicher, C. E., & Glaser, R. (1988). Marital discord and immunity in males. Psychosomatic Medicine, 50, 213-229.

Kim, B.C. (1978). Pioneers in intermarriage: Korean women in the United States. In H.H. Sunoo & D.S. Kim (Eds.), Korean women: In a struggle for humanization (pp. 59-95). Memphis, TE: The Association for Korean Christian Scholars.

Kim, Y.Y. (1988). Communication and cross-cultural adaptation. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Kurdek, I.A. (1992). Dimensionability of the Dyadic Adjustment Scale; Evidence from heterosexual and homosexual couples. Journal of Family Psychology, 6, 22-35.

Ladewig, B.H., McGee, G.W., & Newell, W. (1990). Life strains and depressive affect among women.: Moderating effects of social support. Journal of Family Issues, 11, 36-47.

Leclezio, M.K., Louw-Potgieter, & Souchon, M.B.S. (1985). The social identity of Mauritian Immigrants in South Africa. The Journal of Social Psychology, 126, 61-69.

Lee, C., Duxbury, L., Higgins C., & Mills, S. (1992). Strategies used by employed parents to balance the demands of work and family. Optimum: The Journal of Public Sector Management, 23, 60-79.

Lemyre, L., Tessier, R., & Fillion, L. (1990). Mesure du stress psychologique (MSP): Manuel d'utilisation [Psychological Stress Measure]. Brossard, Quebec: Éditions Behaviora.

Li, J.T., & Caldwell, R.A. (1987). Magnitude and directional effects of marital sex-role incongruence on marital adjustment. Journal of Family Issues, 8, 97-110.

Liao, T.F., & Stevens, G. (1994). Spouses, homogamy, and social networks. Social Forces, 73, 693-707.

Lieberman, M.A. (1982). The effects of social supports on response to stress. In L. Goldberger & S. Brenitz (Eds.), Handbook of stress: Theoretical and clinical aspects (pp. 74-84). New York: Academic Press.

Markoff, R. (1977). Intercultural marriage: Problem areas. In W. Tseng, J.F. McDermot, Jr., & T.W. Maretzki (Eds.), Adjustment in intercultural marriage (pp. 51-61).

Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Meyerowitz, B. (1983). Postmastectomy coping strategies and quality of life. Health Psychology, 2, 117-132.

Mills, R.J., Grasmick, H.G., Morgan, C.S., & Wenk, D. (1992). The effects of gender, family satisfaction and economic strain on psychological well-being. Family Relations, 41, 440-445.

Milroy, L. (1980). Social networks. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Minde, T. (1985). Foreign student adaptation at Queen's university. Unpublished B.A. Honors Thesis, Queen's University.

Morris, P.L., Robinson, R.G., Raphael, B., & Bishop, D. (1991). The relationship between the perception of social support and post-stroke depression in hospitalized patients. Psychiatry, 54, 306-315.

Mueller, D.P. (1980). Social networks: A promising direction for research on the relationship of the social environment to psychiatric disorder. Social Science and Medicine, 14, 147-161.

Murstein, B.I. & Williams, P..D. (1985). Assortative matching for sex-role and marriage adjustment. Personality and Individual Differences, 6, 195-201.

Myers, J., Lindenthal, J.J., & Pepper, M. (1971). Life events and psychiatric impairment. Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, 152, 149-157

Myers, J., Lindenthal, J.J., & Pepper, M. (1972). Life events and mental status: A longitudinal study. Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 13, 398-406.

Myers, J., Lindenthal, J.J., & Pepper, M. (1974). Social class, life events, and psychiatric symptoms: A longitudinal study. In B.S. Dohrenwend & B. P. Dohrenwend (Eds.), Stressful life events: Their nature and effects (pp. 191-205). New York: Wiley.

Nicassio, P.M., Solomon, G.S., Guest, S.S., & McCullough, J.E. (1986). Emigration stress and language proficiency as correlates of depression in a sample of Southeast Asian refugees. International Journal of Social Psychiatry, 32, 22-28.

Nitta, F. (1988). Kokusai Kekkon: Trends in intercultural marriage in Japan. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 12, 205-232.

Noels, K.A., & Clément, R. (1996). Communicating across cultures: Social determinants and acculturative consequences. Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, 28, 214-228.

Noels, K.A., Pon, G. & Clément, R. (1996). Language identity and adjustment: The role of linguistic self-confidence in the acculturation process. Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 15, 246-264.

Noller, P. (1980). Misunderstandings in married communication: A study of couples' nonverbal communication. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39, 1135-1148.

Padilla, A.M., Wagatsuma, Y., & Lindholm, K.J. (1985). Acculturation and personality as predictors of stress in Japanese and Japanese-Americans. Journal of Social Psychology, 125, 295-305.

Pak, A.W., Dion, K., & Dion, K.K. (1991). Social-psychological correlates of experienced discrimination: Test of the double jeopardy hypothesis. International

Journal of Intercultural Relations, 15, 243-254.

Park, R. E. (1928). Human migration and the marginal man. American Journal of Sociology, 5, 881-893.

Paykel, E. S. (1974). Life stress and psychiatric disorder: Applications of the clinical approach. In B.S. Dohrenwend & B. P. Dohrenwend (Eds.), Stressful life events: Their nature and effects (pp. 135-149). New York: Wiley.

Pearlin, L.I., & Schooler, C. (1978). The structure of coping. Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 19, 2-22.

Procidano, M.E., & Heller, K. (1983). Measures of perceived social support from friends and from family: Three validation studies. American Journal of Community Psychology, 11, 1-24.

Rachlin, V.C. (1987). Fair vs. Equal role relations in dual-career and dual-earner families: Implications for family interventions. Family Relations, 36, 187-192.

Redfield, R., Linton, R., & Herskovits, M.J. (1936). Memorandum on the study of acculturation. American Psychologist, 38, 149-152.

Reitzes, D.C., & Mutran, E.J. (1994). Multiple roles and identities: Factors influencing self-esteem among middle-aged working men and women. Social Psychology Quarterly, 57, 313-325.

Renne, K.S. (1971). Health and marital experience in an urban population. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 23, 338-350.

Rosenberg, M. (1965). Society and the adolescent self-image. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Roy, A. (1978). Vulnerability factors and depression in women. British Journal of Psychiatry, 133, 106-110.

Ryu, J.P. (1977). Koreans in America: A demographic analysis. In H. Kim (Ed.), The Korean diaspora (pp.205-228). Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-Clio, Inc.

Sarason, I.G., Sarason, B.R., & Shearin, E.N. (1986). Social support as an individual difference variable: Its stability, origins, and relational aspects. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50, 845-855.

Schulz, R., & Decker, S. (1985). Long-term adjustment to physical disability: The role of social support, perceived control, and self-blame. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 48, 1162-1172.

Shin, K.R.(1994). Psychosocial predictors of depressive symptoms in Korean-American women in New York City. Women & Health, 21, 73-82.

Slater, J., & Depue, R.A. (1981). The contributions of environmental events and social support to serious suicide attempts in primary depressive disorder. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 90, 275-285.

Spanier, G.B. (1976). Measuring dyadic adjustment: New scales for assessing the quality of marriage and similar dyads. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 38, 15-27.

Spanier, G.B. (1988). Assessing the strengths of the Dyadic Adjustment Scale. Journal of Family Psychology, 2, 92-94.

Stein, S.J., Givido, M., & Dotzenroth, S. (1982). The interrelationship and reliability of a multilevel behavior-based assessment package for distressed couples

Journal of Behavioral Assessment, 4, 343-360.

Stonequist, E. V. (1935). The problem of the marginal man. American Journal of Sociology, 7, 1-12.

Strain, L.A., & Chappel, N.L. (1982). Confidants: Do they make a difference in quality of life? Research on Aging, 4, 479-502.

Tabachnick, B.G. & Fidell, L.S. (1996). Using multivariate statistics (3rd Ed.). New York: Harper Collins.

Thoits, P.A. (1986). Social support as coping assistance. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 54, 416-423.

Thompson, G. (1975). The Ismailis in Uganda. In M. Twaddle (Ed.), Expulsion of minority essays on Ugandan Asians (p. 30-52). London: Athlone Press.

Turner, S.L. (1979). Disability among schizophrenics in a rural community: Services and social support. Research in Nursing and Health, 2, 151-161.

Wellman, B., & Wellman, B. (1992). Domestic affairs and network relations. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 9, 385-409.

White, K.M., Speisman, J.C., Jackson, D., Bartis, S., & Costos, D. (1986). Intimacy maturity and its correlates in young married couples. Personality and Social Psychology, 50, 152-162.

Wylie, R.C. (1989). Measures of self-concept. Lincoln, NB: University of Nebraska Press.

Young, M. Y (1991). The adjustment of Salvadoran refugees: Stressors, resources and well-being. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Western

Ontario, London, Ontário, Canada.

Yu, C. (1977). The correlate of cultural assimilation of Korean immigrants in the United States. In H. Kim (Ed.), The Korean diaspora (pp.167-176). Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-Clio, Inc.

Appendix A

Questionnaire Used in the Study

Appendix A

Questionnaire

This investigation is designed to study phenomena related to psychological well-being and marital adjustment in general and ethnic identity in particular. We will ask you questions concerning inter-ethnic contact, ethnic identity, language behavior, and psychological and marital adjustment. Your participation does not involve personal discomfort or risk of any kind and requires approximately 35-60 minutes of your time. **It is also very important to return both yours and your spouses completed questionnaires in the provided envelope.**

Your answers to any or all questions will be treated with the strictest confidence. Nowhere in this questionnaire do you have to identify yourself. For the results of this survey to be meaningful, it is important that you be as accurate and as frank as possible in your answers. If you do not want to answer any particular question, or for that matter, the entire questionnaire, **you are not obligated to do so.** However, the usefulness of your participation is dependent upon the level of attention you will give each question. We, therefore, ask you to answer all items unless it is important to you personally to omit certain ones. By having read this and agreed to fill out the questionnaire, your consent to participate in this study will be assumed. A summary of the results of the study will be available. If you are interested in obtaining a copy, please contact Tasleem Damji before March 15 at (403) 293-2221 or Dr. Richard Clément or Tasleem Damji at (613) 562-5800 ext. 4287 after March 15.

Thank you.

Richard Clément, Ph.D.
Tasleem Damji, Ph.D. candidate
School of Psychology
University of Ottawa
125 University
Ottawa, Ontario
K1N 6N5

The following sections contain a number of statements with which some people agree and others disagree. There are no right or wrong answers since many people have different opinions. **Please rate how much you personally agree or disagree with these statements** -- How much they reflect how you feel or think personally. Use the following scale:

Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree	Does not Apply
1	2	3	4	5	6	9

If in any given situation the statement does not apply to you, write 9 in the corresponding space. For each statement, write in the left margin the number corresponding to the amount of your agreement or disagreement.

- _____ 1. When I'm with Muslim friends I feel completely able to relax and be myself.
- _____ 2. When I'm with Canadian friends I feel completely able to relax and be myself.
- _____ 3. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.
- _____ 4. When I make a telephone call, I get mixed up if I have to speak English.
- _____ 5. I share the same approach to life that most of my Muslim friends do.
- _____ 6. I share the same approach to life that most of my Canadian friends do.
- _____ 7. At times I think I am no good at all.
- _____ 8. Every time that I meet an English-speaking person and I speak with him/her in English, I feel relaxed.
- _____ 9. Muslims who know me trust me and respect me.
- _____ 10. Canadians who know me trust me and respect me.

Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree	Does not Apply
1	2	3	4	5	6	9

If in any given situation the statement does not apply to you, write 9 in the corresponding space. For each statement, write in the left margin the number corresponding to the amount of your agreement or disagreement.

_____ 11. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.

_____ 12. I feel uneasy whenever I speak English.

_____ 13. No matter what happens, I know that Muslim members of my family will always be there for me should I need them.

_____ 14. No matter what happens, I know that Canadian members of my family will always be there for me should I need them.

_____ 15. I am able to do things as well as most other people.

_____ 16. In a restaurant, I feel calm and confident when I have to order a meal in English.

_____ 17. When I want to go out and do things, I know that many of my Muslim friends would enjoy doing these things with me.

_____ 18. When I want to go out and do things, I know that many of my Canadian friends would enjoy doing these things with me.

_____ 19. I feel I do not have much to be proud of.

_____ 20. I feel confident and relaxed when I have to ask for directions in English.

_____ 21. Muslims close to me let me know they think I'm a worthwhile person.

_____ 22. Canadians close to me let me know they think I'm a worthwhile person.

Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree	Does not Apply
1	2	3	4	5	6	9

If in any given situation the statement does not apply to you, write 9 in the corresponding space. For each statement, write in the left margin the number corresponding to the amount of your agreement or disagreement.

- _____ 23. I certainly feel useless at times.
- _____ 24. I feel comfortable when I speak English among friends where there are people who speak English.
- _____ 25. I feel very close to some of my Muslim friends.
- _____ 26. I feel very close to some of my Canadian friends.
- _____ 27. I feel that I'm a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others.
- _____ 28. I get shy speaking English with a superior.
- _____ 29. Muslims close to me provide help in finding solutions to my problems.
- _____ 30. Canadians close to me provide help in finding solutions to my problems.
- _____ 31. I wish I could have more respect for myself.
- _____ 32. I get nervous every time I have to speak in English to a salesclerk.
- _____ 33. My Muslim friends would take the time to talk over my problems, should I ever want to.
- _____ 34. My Canadian friends would take the time to talk over my problems, should I ever want to.
- _____ 35. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.

Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree	Does not Apply
1	2	3	4	5	6	9

If in any given situation the statement does not apply to you, write 9 in the corresponding space. For each statement, write in the left margin the number corresponding to the amount of your agreement or disagreement.

_____ **36.** Even when I am with my Muslim friends I feel alone.

_____ **37** Even when I am with my Canadian friends I feel alone.

_____ **38.** I take a positive attitude toward myself.

If your mother tongue is English, you do not have to answer the following 8 questions.

_____ **39.** When I make a telephone call, I get mixed up if I have to speak my Mother Tongue.

_____ **40.** Every time that I meet someone who speaks my Mother Tongue and I speak with him/her in my Mother Tongue, I feel relaxed.

_____ **41.** I feel uneasy whenever I speak my Mother Tongue.

_____ **42.** In a restaurant, I feel calm and confident when I have to order a meal in my Mother Tongue.

_____ **43.** I feel confident and relaxed when I have to ask for directions in my Mother Tongue.

_____ **44.** I feel comfortable when I speak my Mother Tongue among friends where there are people who speak my Mother Tongue.

_____ **45.** I get shy speaking my Mother Tongue with a superior.

_____ **46.** I get nervous every time I have to speak in my Mother Tongue to a salesclerk.

PLEASE READ THESE DIRECTIONS CAREFULLY BEFORE CONTINUING

The purpose of the next section of the questionnaire is to examine interpersonal relations and ethnic identity by asking your opinions regarding different types of interactions. Several researchers agree that an individual's identity may change depending upon the situation that he/she is in. For example, in some situations you could identify yourself as a Canadian, in other situations as a Muslim, whereas in others you may not identify with either of these two groups.

On the pages which follow, you will find several situations. In each case, evaluate your level of identification to each of the two groups. For example, in one situation, you may identify yourself as very "Canadian", and not at all "Muslim". In this case you would mark the extreme ends of the scale in the following manner.

1. You are visiting a neighbour.

Not at all						Very
Canadian	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	Canadian

Not at all						Very
Muslim	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	Muslim

In other situations you may not identify with either of these two groups: that is, your ethnic identity may not be important in this situation. In this case you would use the two scales in the following manner:

1. You are visiting a neighbour.

Not at all						Very
Canadian	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	Canadian

Not at all						Very
Muslim	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	Muslim

In other situations, you may identify with both groups at the same time. In this case you might use the two scales in the following manner:

1. You are visiting a neighbour.

Not at all						Very
Canadian	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	Canadian

Not at all						Very
Muslim	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	Muslim

In still other situations, you may feel a little "Canadian" and a little "Muslim". Each scale, therefore, can be used independently of the other. That is, if you feel slightly "Canadian" you can **also** feel slightly "Muslim".

We ask you to give your first impression of yourself, as you are, without reference to who you would like to be or who you would have liked to have been.

47. When I take the bus, I feel...

Not at all						Very
Canadian	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	Canadian

Not at all						Very
Muslim	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	Muslim

48. When I read the newspaper, I feel...

Not at all						Very
Canadian	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	Canadian

Not at all						Very
Muslim	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	Muslim

49. When I am with my spouse, I feel...

Not at all						Very
Canadian	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	Canadian

Not at all						Very
Muslim	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	Muslim

50. When I listen to music, I feel...

Not at all						Very
Canadian	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	Canadian

Not at all						Very
Muslim	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	Muslim

51. When dealing with work personnel, I feel...

Not at all						Very
Canadian	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	Canadian

Not at all						Very
Muslim	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	Muslim

52. When dealing with salesclerks, I feel...

Not at all Canadian	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	Very Canadian
Not at all Muslim	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	Very Muslim

53. When thinking about relations between Canadians and Muslims, I feel...

Not at all Canadian	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	Very Canadian
Not at all Muslim	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	Very Muslim

54. When I think about where I would want to settle down, I feel...

Not at all Canadian	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	Very Canadian
Not at all Muslim	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	Very Muslim

55. When I am with my friends, I feel...

Not at all Canadian	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	Very Canadian
Not at all Muslim	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	Very Muslim

56. When I watch T.V., I feel...

Not at all Canadian	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	Very Canadian
Not at all Muslim	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	Very Muslim

57. When I read for pleasure, I feel...

Not at all						Very
Canadian	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	Canadian

Not at all						Very
Muslim	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	Muslim

58. When I think about my life's goals, I feel...

Not at all						Very
Canadian	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	Canadian

Not at all						Very
Muslim	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	Muslim

59. When I participate in cultural activities, I feel...

Not at all						Very
Canadian	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	Canadian

Not at all						Very
Muslim	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	Muslim

60. When I listen to the radio, I feel...

Not at all						Very
Canadian	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	Canadian

Not at all						Very
Muslim	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	Muslim

61. When I prepare food, I feel...

Not at all						Very
Canadian	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	Canadian

Not at all						Very
Muslim	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	Muslim

62. When I am at home, I feel...

Not at all Canadian	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	<u>(4)</u>	<u>(5)</u>	Very Canadian
Not at all Muslim	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	<u>(4)</u>	<u>(5)</u>	Very Muslim

63. When I think about politics, I feel...

Not at all Canadian	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	<u>(4)</u>	<u>(5)</u>	Very Canadian
Not at all Muslim	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	<u>(4)</u>	<u>(5)</u>	Very Muslim

64. In my social contacts, I feel...

Not at all Canadian	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	<u>(4)</u>	<u>(5)</u>	Very Canadian
Not at all Muslim	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	<u>(4)</u>	<u>(5)</u>	Very Muslim

65. When I travel, I feel...

Not at all Canadian	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	<u>(4)</u>	<u>(5)</u>	Very Canadian
Not at all Muslim	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	<u>(4)</u>	<u>(5)</u>	Very Muslim

66. When I watch movies, I feel...

Not at all Canadian	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	<u>(4)</u>	<u>(5)</u>	Very Canadian
Not at all Muslim	<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	<u>(4)</u>	<u>(5)</u>	Very Muslim

On this section there are groups of statements. Please read each group of statements carefully. Then pick out the one statement in each group which best describes the way **you have been feeling the PAST WEEK, INCLUDING TODAY**. Circle the number beside the statement you picked. *Be sure to read all the statements in each group before making your choice.*

-
- | | | |
|------------|---|--|
| 67. | 1 | I do not feel sad. |
| | 2 | I feel sad. |
| | 3 | I feel sad all the time and I can't snap out of it. |
| | 4 | I feel so sad or unhappy that I can't stand it. |
|
 | | |
| 68. | 1 | I am not particularly discouraged about the future. |
| | 2 | I feel discouraged about the future. |
| | 3 | I feel I have nothing to look forward to. |
| | 4 | I feel that the future is hopeless and that things cannot improve. |
|
 | | |
| 69. | 1 | I do not feel like a failure. |
| | 2 | I feel I have failed more than the average person. |
| | 3 | As I look back on my life, all I can see is a lot of failures. |
| | 4 | I feel I am a complete failure as a person. |
|
 | | |
| 70. | 1 | I get as much satisfaction out of things as I used to. |
| | 2 | I don't enjoy things the way I used to. |
| | 3 | I don't get real satisfaction out of anything anymore. |
| | 4 | I am dissatisfied or bored with everything. |
|
 | | |
| 71. | 1 | I don't feel particularly guilty. |
| | 2 | I feel guilty a good part of the time. |
| | 3 | I feel guilty most of the time. |
| | 4 | I feel guilty all the time. |
|
 | | |
| 72. | 1 | I don't feel disappointed in myself. |
| | 2 | I am disappointed in myself. |
| | 3 | I am disgusted with myself. |
| | 4 | I hate myself. |
|
 | | |
| 73. | 1 | I have not lost interest in other people. |
| | 2 | I am less interested in other people than I used to. |
| | 3 | I have lost most of my interest in other people. |
| | 4 | I have lost all of my interest in other people. |

74. 1 I make decisions as well as I ever could.
2 I put off making decisions more than I used to.
3 I have greater difficulty in making decisions than before.
4 I can't make decisions at all anymore.
75. 1 I don't feel I look worse than I used to.
2 I am worried that I am looking unattractive.
3 I feel that there are permanent changes in my appearance that make me look unattractive.
4 I believe that I look ugly.
76. 1 I can work as well as before.
2 It takes an extra effort to get started at doing something.
3 I have to push myself very hard to do anything.
4 I can't do any work at all.
77. 1 I don't get more tired than usual.
2 I get tired more easily than I used to.
3 I get tired from doing almost anything.
4 I am too tired to do anything.
78. 1 I haven't lost much weight, if any, lately.
2 I have lost more than 5 pounds.
3 I have lost more than 10 pounds.
4 I have lost more than 15 pounds.

For each statement, write in the left margin the number corresponding to the degree to which it applies to you recently, that is in the last 4 or 5 days. Note, there is no right or wrong answer. All that is important is that you indicate your personal feelings. Give your global immediate impression. The numbers from 1 to 8 signify:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
not at all	not really	very little	a bit	some	much	very much	extremely

RECENTLY, THAT IS IN THE LAST 4 OR 5 DAYS:

- ___ 79. I am tense and nervous (overwrought).
- ___ 80. I feel that my throat is tight or that my mouth is dry.
- ___ 81. I feel rushed, I do not seem to have enough time.
- ___ 82. I have a tendency to skip meals or to forget to eat.
- ___ 83. I go over ideas in my mind over and over again; I juggle ideas; I have repetitive thoughts; my head is full of thoughts.
- ___ 84. I feel lonely, isolated, misunderstood.
- ___ 85. I suffer from physical aches and pains: sore back, headaches, tensed neck, stomach aches.
- ___ 86. I feel preoccupied, tormented or worried.
- ___ 87. I have sudden changes in bodily temperature (very warm or very cold).
- ___ 88. I forget about meetings or things I have to do or to get.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
not	not	very	a	some	much	very	extremely
at all	really	little	bit			much	

- ___ **89.** I cry (easily).
- ___ **90.** I feel tired.
- ___ **91.** My jaws are tight.
- ___ **92.** I feel calm.
- ___ **93.** I sigh heavily or I have to catch my breath suddenly.
- ___ **94.** I have diarrhea, intestinal cramps or constipation.
- ___ **95.** I feel anxious, worried or distraught.
- ___ **96.** I startle easily; things or noises make me jump.
- ___ **97.** I take more than half an hour to fall asleep.
- ___ **98.** I feel confused; my thoughts are muddled; I lack concentration and I cannot focus my attention.
- ___ **99.** My facial features are drawn; I have bags or rings under my eyes.
- ___ **100.** I feel a great weight on my shoulders.
- ___ **101.** I feel restless; I need to move constantly; I cannot stay still.
- ___ **102.** I have difficulty controlling my reactions, emotions, moods or gestures.
- ___ **103.** I feel stressed.

Most persons have disagreements with their relationships. Please indicate below the appropriate extent of agreement or disagreement between you and your partner for each item on the following list. For each statement, write in the left margin the number corresponding to the amount of your agreement or disagreement. Note, there is no right or wrong answer. All that is important is that you indicate your personal feeling.

Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6

- | | |
|-------|---|
| _____ | 104. Handling family finances. |
| _____ | 105. Matters of recreation. |
| _____ | 106. Religious matters. |
| _____ | 107. Demonstration of affection. |
| _____ | 108. friends. |
| _____ | 109. Sex relations. |
| _____ | 110. Conventionality (correct or proper behavior). |
| _____ | 111. Philosophy of life. |
| _____ | 112. Ways of dealing with in-laws. |
| _____ | 113. Aims, goals, and things believed important. |
| _____ | 114. Amount of time spent together. |
| _____ | 115. Making major decisions. |
| _____ | 116. Household tasks. |
| _____ | 117. Leisure time interests. |
| _____ | 118. Career decisions. |

Please indicate below approximately how often the following items occur between you and your partner.

All the time 1	Most of the time 2	More often than not 3	Occasionally 4	Rarely 5	Never 6
-------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------	---------------------------	---------------------	--------------------

- _____ 119. How often do you discuss or have you considered divorce, separation, or terminating the relationship?
- _____ 120. How often do you or your mate leave the house after a fight?
- _____ 121. In general, how often do you think things between you and your partner are going well?
- _____ 122. Do you confide in your mate?
- _____ 123. Do you ever regret that you married?
- _____ 124. How often do you and your partner quarrel?
- _____ 125. How often do you and your mate "get on each other's nerves"?

Every day 5	Almost every day 4	Occasionally 3	Rarely 2	Never 1
----------------------------	-----------------------------------	---------------------------	---------------------	--------------------

- _____ 126. Do you kiss your mate?

All of them 5	Most of them 4	Some of them 3	Very few of them 2	None of them 1
------------------------------	-------------------------------	-------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------------------

- _____ 127. Do you and your mate engage in outside interests together?

Never	Less than once a month	Once or twice a month	Once a day	More often
1	2	3	4	5

_____ 128. Have a stimulating exchange of ideas.

_____ 129. Laugh together.

_____ 130. Calmly discuss something.

_____ 131. Work together on a project.

There are some things about which couples sometimes agree and sometimes disagree. Indicate if either item below caused differences of opinions or problems in your relationship during the past few weeks. (Circle yes or no).

YES NO 132. Being too tired for sex.

YES NO 133. Not showing love.

134. The numbers on the following line represent different degrees of happiness in your relationship. The middle point, "happy", represents the degree of happiness of most relationships. Please circle the number that best describes the degree of happiness, all things considered, of your relationship.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Extremely Unhappy	Fairly Unhappy	A little Happy	Happy	Very Happy	Extremely Happy	Perfect

The statements which follow refer to feelings and experiences which occur to most people at one time or another in their relationships with their **spouse**. For each statement there are three possible answers: Yes, No, Don't Know. Please circle the answer you choose for each item.

- | | | | |
|-----|----|------------|---|
| Yes | No | Don't Know | 135. My spouse gives me the moral support I need. |
| Yes | No | Don't Know | 136. I get good ideas about how to do things or make things from my spouse. |
| Yes | No | Don't Know | 137. Most other people are closer to their spouse than I am. |
| Yes | No | Don't Know | 138. When I confide in my spouse, I get the idea that it makes him/her uncomfortable. |
| Yes | No | Don't Know | 139. My spouse enjoys hearing about what I think. |
| Yes | No | Don't Know | 140. My spouse shares many of my interests. |
| Yes | No | Don't Know | 141. My spouse comes to me when they have problems or need advice. |
| Yes | No | Don't Know | 142. I rely on my spouse for emotional support. |
| Yes | No | Don't Know | 143. I could go to my spouse if I were just feeling down, without feeling funny about it later. |
| Yes | No | Don't Know | 144. My spouse and I are very open about what we think about things. |
| Yes | No | Don't Know | 145. My spouse is sensitive to my personal needs. |
| Yes | No | Don't Know | 146. My spouse comes to me for emotional support. |
| Yes | No | Don't Know | 147. My spouse is good at helping me solve problems. |
| Yes | No | Don't Know | 148. I have a deep sharing relationship with my spouse. |
| Yes | No | Don't Know | 149. My spouse gets good ideas about how to do things or |

make things from me.

Yes No Don't Know **150.** When I confide in my spouse, it makes me uncomfortable.

Yes No Don't Know **151.** My spouse seeks me out for companionship.

Yes No Don't Know **152.** I think that my spouse feels that I'm good at helping him/her solve problems.

Yes No Don't Know **153.** I don't have a relationship with my spouse that is as close as other people's relationships with their spouse.

Yes No Don't Know **154.** I wish my spouse was much different.

For each of the following domains of activity, please evaluate the proportion of Muslims and non-Muslims in each domain. Check the percentage that best describes your relationships.

155. Among my neighbourhood:

No Muslims at all All Muslims

0% 25% 50% 75% 100%

156. Among my friends:

No Muslims at all All Muslims

0% 25% 50% 75% 100%

157. Among the students/co-workers with which I have regular social contact:

No Muslims at all All Muslims

0% 25% 50% 75% 100%

158. Among the salesclerks in the stores I go to:

No Muslims at all All Muslims

0% 25% 50% 75% 100%

For each statement, write in the left margin the number corresponding to the amount of your evaluation **on your knowledge of English**. Note, there is no right or wrong answer. All that is important is that you indicate your personal feeling. For example, if you think that you can read "a little" English, write down 3 on the left margin.

<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	<u>(4)</u>	<u>(5)</u>	<u>(6)</u>	<u>(7)</u>
not at all		a little		quite well		extremely fluently

Please evaluate the following aspects:

_____ 159. I read English...

_____ 160. I understand English...

_____ 161. I write English...

_____ 162. I speak English...

Now, for each statement, write in the left margin the number corresponding to the amount of your **evaluation on your knowledge of your Mother Tongue**. Note, there is no right or wrong answer. All that is important is that you indicate your personal feeling. For example, if you think that you can read "a little" in your Mother Tongue, write down 3 on the left margin.

What is your mother tongue (the first language you learned)? _____
(If it is English, you do not have to answer the following 4 questions)

<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>(3)</u>	<u>(4)</u>	<u>(5)</u>	<u>(6)</u>	<u>(7)</u>
not at all		a little		quite well		extremely fluently

Please evaluate the following aspects:

_____ 163. I read my Mother Tongue...

_____ 164. I understand my Mother Tongue...

_____ 165. I write my Mother Tongue...

_____ 166. I speak my Mother Tongue...

General Information

167. Age: _____ years.
168. Gender: Male ___ Female ___
169. What is your country of birth? _____
170. What is the country of birth of your spouse? _____
171. How long have you been in Canada _____ years
172. You are presently in Canada as....
- 1) an exile
 - 2) landed immigrant
 - 3) Canadian citizen by birth
 - 4) Canadian citizen by naturalization
 - 5) student
173. Years of Marriage: _____ years
174. What is your mother tongue (the first language you learned)?

175. What is your highest academic level that you have obtained?
- 1) primary school
 - 2) high school
 - 3) college
 - 4) university
176. What is your current occupation?
- 1) without employment
 - 2) non-specialized worker
 - 3) specialized worker
 - 4) services
 - 5) professional
 - 6) other (please specify) _____

177. If you have children, how many do you have? _____
178. What are the ages of you children? _____
179. Why did you immigrate to Canada?
- 1) political reasons
 - 2) family reasons (e.g. reunification)
 - 3) economic reasons
 - 4) educational reasons (e.g. to study)
 - 5) marriage in Canada
 - 6) other please specify: _____

Thank you for your participation.

Please remember to send both yours and your spouses completed questionnaires in the provided postage paid envelope.

Sincerely,
Tasleem Damji Budhwani

Appendix B

Tables of Means of Nonsignificant Effects

Appendix B.1a
Depression as a Function of Congruency

Congruency	Means
Congruent Couple:	12.52
Incongruent Couple:	13.00

Appendix B.1b
Depression as a Function of Gender

Gender	Means
Male:	12.79
Female:	12.73

Appendix B.1c
Depression as a Function of Congruency and Gender

Congruent	Incongruent	Means
Male		12.53
Female		12.50
	Male	13.05
	Female	12.96

Appendix B.2a
Stress as a Function of Congruency

Congruency	Means
Congruent Couple:	2.68
Incongruent Couple:	2.91

Appendix B.2b
Stress as a Function of Gender

Gender	Means
Male:	2.63
Female:	2.91

Appendix B.2c
Stress as a Function of Congruency and Gender

Congruent	Incongruent	Means
Male		2.53
Female		2.83
	Male	2.74
	Female	3.08

Appendix B.3a
Marital Adjustment as a Function of Congruency

Congruency	Means
Congruent Couple:	110.13
Incongruent Couple:	104.81

Appendix B.3b
Marital Adjustment as a Function of Gender

Gender	Means
Male:	108.02
Female:	106.93

Appendix B.3c
Marital Adjustment as a Function of Congruency and Gender

Congruent	Incongruent	Means
Male		110.32
Female		109.95
	Male	105.72
	Female	103.90

Appendix B.4a
Depression as a Function of Combined Acculturation profiles

Means

<u>D,D</u>	S,S	A,A	I,I	D,S	D,A	D,I
13.87	11.80	11.80	11.50	13.84	14.20	13.43
S,D	A,D	A,S	A,I	I,D	I,S	I,A
13.30	11.00	17.50	11.25	10.75	13.33	12.28

Appendix B.4b
Depression as a Function of Gender

Gender	Means
Male	12.88
Female	12.81

Appendix B.4c
Depression as a Function of Combined Acculturation profiles and Gender

Male

<u>D,D</u>	S,S	A,A	I,I	D,S	D,A	D,I	S,D	A,D	A,S	A,I	I,D	I,S	I,A
13.79	11.60	12.00	11.62	15.69	14.00	14.33	12.20	11.00	18.00	11.00	10.50	12.33	12.31

Female

<u>D,D</u>	S,S	A,A	I,I	D,S	D,A	D,I	S,D	A,D	A,S	A,I	I,D	I,S	I,A
13.95	12.00	11.60	11.38	12.00	14.40	12.52	14.40	11.00	17.00	11.50	11.00	14.33	12.25

Appendix B.5

Stress as a Function of Combined Acculturation profiles

Means

D,D	S,S	A,A	I,I	D,S	D,A	D,I
3.02	2.42	2.96	2.34	2.97	3.17	2.57
S,D	A,D	A,S	A,I	I,D	I,S	I,A
2.91	2.31	3.98	2.39	2.24	3.75	3.03

Appendix B.6a

Marital Adjustment as a Function of Combined Acculturation profiles

Means

<u>D,D</u>	S,S	A,A	I,I	D,S	D,A	D,I
104.12	111.19	102.08	117.82	91.68	101.93	113.59
S,D	A,D	A,S	A,I	I,D	I,S	I,A
105.49	121.65	96.67	110.87	123.16	114.01	88.86

Appendix B.6b

Depression as a Function of Gender

Gender	Means
Male	108.92
Female	105.81

Appendix B.6c

Depression as a Function of Combined Acculturation profiles and Gender

Male

<u>D,D</u>	S,S	A,A	I,I	D,S	D,A	D,I	S,D	A,D	A,S	A,I	I,D	I,S	I,A
102.12	117.88	105.72	117.80	91.50	99.85	110.81	111.19	120.50	103.33	104.98	126.00	119.67	93.50

Female

<u>D,D</u>	S,S	A,A	I,I	D,S	D,A	D,I	S,D	A,D	A,S	A,I	I,D	I,S	I,A
106.12	104.50	98.43	117.84	91.86	104.02	116.38	99.78	122.80	90.00	116.75	120.32	108.33	84.22

Appendix B.7a
Depression as a Function of Congruency

Congruency	Means
Congruent	12.24
Incongruent	13.04

Appendix B.7b
Depression as a Function of Gender

Gender	Means
Male	12.76
Female	12.52

Appendix B.7c
Depression as a Function of Spousal Support and Congruency

Spousal Support (Male;Female)	Congruency	Means
M:low; F:low	Congruent	13.29
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	14.65
M:low; F:high	Congruent	12.90
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	12.50
M:high; F:low	Congruent	11.17
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	13.88
M:high; F:high	Congruent	11.61
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	11.13

Appendix B.7d

Depression as a Function of Spousal Support and Gender

Spousal Support (Male;Female)	Gender	Means
M:low; F:low	Male	14.19
M:low; F:low	Female	13.76
M:low; F:high	Male	13.30
M:low; F:high	Female	12.10
M:high; F:low	Male	12.54
M:high; F:low	Female	12.50
M:high; F:high	Male	11.00
M:high; F:high	Female	11.74

Appendix B.7e

Depression as a Function of Spousal Support, Congruency and Gender

Spousal Support (Male;Female)	Congruency	Gender	Means
M:low; F:low	Congruent	Male	13.42
M:low; F:low	Congruent	Female	13.16
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	Male	14.96
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	Female	14.35
M:low; F:high	Congruent	Male	13.40
M:low; F:high	Congruent	Female	12.40
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	Male	13.20
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	Female	11.80
M:high; F:low	Congruent	Male	11.33
M:high; F:low	Congruent	Female	11.00
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	Male	13.75
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	Female	14.00
M:high; F:high	Congruent	Male	11.32
M:high; F:high	Congruent	Female	11.89
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	Male	10.69
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	Female	11.58

Appendix B.8a

Stress as a Function of Gender

Gender	Means
Male	2.64
Female	2.89

Appendix B.8b

Stress as a Function of Spousal Support and Gender

Spousal Support (Male;Female)	Gender	Means
M:low; F:low	Male	2.88
M:low; F:low	Female	3.15
M:low; F:high	Male	2.58
M:low; F:high	Female	2.44
M:high; F:low	Male	2.82
M:high; F:low	Female	3.21
M:high; F:high	Male	2.29
M:high; F:high	Female	2.78

Appendix B.8c

Stress as a Function of Spousal Support, Congruency and Gender

Spousal Support	Congruency	Gender	Means
M:low; F:low	Congruent	Male	2.60
M:low; F:low	Congruent	Female	2.92
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	Male	3.16
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	Female	3.38
M:low; F:high	Congruent	Male	2.29
M:low; F:high	Congruent	Female	2.36
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	Male	2.87
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	Female	2.52
M:high; F:low	Congruent	Male	2.44
M:high; F:low	Congruent	Female	2.28
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	Male	3.20
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	Female	4.14
M:high; F:high	Congruent	Male	2.51
M:high; F:high	Congruent	Female	2.92
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	Male	2.08
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	Female	2.63

Appendix B.9a

Marital Adjustment as a Function of Congruency

Congruency	Means
Congruent	115.47
Incongruent	106.20

Appendix B.9b

Marital Adjustment as a Function of Gender

Gender	Means
Male	111.60
Female	110.07

Appendix B.9c

Marital Adjustment as a Function of Spousal Support and Congruency

Spousal Support (Male;Female)	Congruency	Means
M:low; F:low	Congruent	102.99
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	95.65
M:low; F:high	Congruent	126.92
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	107.79
M:high; F:low	Congruent	118.13
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	109.38
M:high; F:high	Congruent	113.85
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	111.97

Appendix B.9d

Marital Adjustment as a Function of Spousal Support and Gender

Spousal Support (Male;Female)	Gender	Means
M:low; F:low	Male	100.61
M:low; F:low	Female	98.03
M:low; F:high	Male	116.45
M:low; F:high	Female	118.26
M:high; F:low	Male	117.17
M:high; F:low	Female	110.33
M:high; F:high	Male	112.17
M:high; F:high	Female	113.65

Appendix B.9e

Marital Adjustment as a Function of Spousal Support, Congruency and Gender

Spousal Support (Male;Female)	Congruency	Gender	Means
M:low; F:low	Congruent	Male	105.11
M:low; F:low	Congruent	Female	100.88
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	Male	96.11
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	Female	95.18
M:low; F:high	Congruent	Male	129.23
M:low; F:high	Congruent	Female	124.60
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	Male	103.67
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	Female	111.92
M:high; F:low	Congruent	Male	117.59
M:high; F:low	Congruent	Female	118.67
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	Male	116.76
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	Female	102.00
M:high; F:high	Congruent	Male	111.04
M:high; F:high	Congruent	Female	116.66
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	Male	113.30
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	Female	110.63

Appendix B.10a
Depression as a Function of Congruency

Congruency	Means
Congruent	12.80
Incongruent	13.11

Appendix B.10b
Depression as a Function of Gender

Gender	Means
Male	12.78
Female	13.13

Appendix B.10c
Depression as a Function of English Self-Confidence and Congruency

English Self-Confidence (Male;Female)	Congruency	Means
M:low; F:low	Congruent	13.39
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	12.95
M:low; F:high	Congruent	11.50
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	13.72
M:high; F:low	Congruent	15.50
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	13.47
M:high; F:high	Congruent	12.95
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	13.39

Appendix B.10d

Depression as a Function of English Self-Confidence, Congruency and Gender

English Self-Confidence (Male;Female)	Congruency	Gender	Means
M:low; F:low	Congruent	Male	13.56
M:low; F:low	Congruent	Female	13.22
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	Male	12.67
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	Female	13.24
M:low; F:high	Congruent	Male	11.33
M:low; F:high	Congruent	Female	11.67
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	Male	13.56
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	Female	13.89
M:high; F:low	Congruent	Male	17.17
M:high; F:low	Congruent	Female	13.83
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	Male	14.40
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	Female	12.53
M:high; F:high	Congruent	Male	11.20
M:high; F:high	Congruent	Female	12.90
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	Male	11.17
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	Female	10.94

Appendix B.11a
Stress as a Function of Congruency

Congruency	Means
Congruent	2.59
Incongruent	2.96

Appendix B.11b
Stress as a Function of English Self-Confidence

English Self-Confidence (Male; Female)	Means
M:low; F:low	2.88
M:low; F:high	2.50
M:high; F:low	3.15
M:high; F:high	2.56

Appendix B.11c
Stress as a Function of English Self-Confidence, Congruency and Gender

English Self-Confidence (Male;Female)	Congruency	Gender	Means
M:low; F:low	Congruent	Male	3.03
M:low; F:low	Congruent	Female	2.63
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	Male	3.15
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	Female	2.73
M:low; F:high	Congruent	Male	2.43
M:low; F:high	Congruent	Female	2.27
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	Male	2.53
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	Female	2.76
M:high; F:low	Congruent	Male	4.76
M:high; F:low	Congruent	Female	3.28
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	Male	2.62
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	Female	1.95
M:high; F:high	Congruent	Male	2.57
M:high; F:high	Congruent	Female	2.69
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	Male	2.66
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	Female	2.32

Appendix B.12a

Marital Adjustment as a Function of Congruency

Congruency	Means
Congruent	110.47
Incongruent	104.53

Appendix B.12b

Marital Adjustment as a Function of English Self-Confidence and Congruency

English Self-Confidence (Male;Female)	Congruency	Means
M:low; F:low	Congruent	97.72
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	104.09
M:low; F:high	Congruent	101.91
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	103.75
M:high; F:low	Congruent	110.74
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	114.26
M:high; F:high	Congruent	107.74
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	119.76

Appendix B.13a

Depression as a Function of Congruency

Congruency	Means
Congruent	12.59
Incongruent	12.44

Appendix B.13b

Depression as a Function of Gender

Gender	Means
Male	12.58
Female	12.46

Appendix B.13c

Depression as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence

Mother Tongue Self-Confidence (Male; Female)	Means
M:low; F:low	12.89
M:low; F:high	11.43
M:high; F:low	12.85
M:high; F:high	12.90

Appendix B.13d

Depression as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence and Congruency

Mother Tongue Self-Confidence (Male;Female)	Congruency	Means
M:low; F:low	Congruent	13.10
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	12.68
M:low; F:high	Congruent	11.00
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	11.86
M:high; F:low	Congruent	12.01
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	13.68
M:high; F:high	Congruent	13.66
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	12.15

Appendix B.13e

Depression as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence and Gender

Mother Tongue Self-Confidence (Male;Female)	Gender	Means
M:low; F:low	Male	12.99
M:low; F:low	Female	12.78
M:low; F:high	Male	11.26
M:low; F:high	Female	11.60
M:high; F:low	Male	12.65
M:high; F:low	Female	13.05
M:high; F:high	Male	12.92
M:high; F:high	Female	12.89

Appendix B.13f

Depression as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence, Congruency and Gender

Mother Tongue Self-Confidence (Male;Female)	Congruency	Gender	Means
M:low; F:low	Congruent	Male	13.44
M:low; F:low	Congruent	Female	12.75
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	Male	12.55
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	Female	12.82
M:low; F:high	Congruent	Male	10.67
M:low; F:high	Congruent	Female	11.33
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	Male	11.86
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	Female	11.86
M:high; F:low	Congruent	Male	12.50
M:high; F:low	Congruent	Female	11.54
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	Male	12.80
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	Female	14.57
M:high; F:high	Congruent	Male	13.29
M:high; F:high	Congruent	Female	14.03
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	Male	12.54
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	Female	11.75

Appendix B.14a
Stress as a Function of Congruency

Congruency	Means
Congruent	2.63
Incongruent	2.81

Appendix B.14b
Stress as a Function of Gender

Gender	Means
Male	2.54
Female	2.90

Appendix B.14c
Stress as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence

Mother Tongue Self-Confidence (Male; Female)	Means
M:low; F:low	2.70
M:low; F:high	2.59
M:high; F:low	2.68
M:high; F:high	2.92

Appendix B.14d
Stress as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence and Congruency

Mother Tongue Self-Confidence (Male;Female)	Congruency	Means
M:low; F:low	Congruent	2.82
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	2.58
M:low; F:high	Congruent	2.69
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	2.48
M:high; F:low	Congruent	2.66
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	2.70
M:high; F:high	Congruent	3.08
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	2.77

Appendix B.14e

Stress as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence and Gender

Mother Tongue Self-Confidence (Male;Female)	Gender	Means
M:low; F:low	Male	2.83
M:low; F:low	Female	2.57
M:low; F:high	Male	2.85
M:low; F:high	Female	2.33
M:high; F:low	Male	2.87
M:high; F:low	Female	2.49
M:high; F:high	Male	3.06
M:high; F:high	Female	2.78

Appendix B.14f

Stress as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence, Congruency and Gender

Mother Tongue Self-Confidence (Male;Female)	Congruency	Gender	Means
M:low; F:low	Congruent	Male	2.99
M:low; F:low	Congruent	Female	2.66
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	Male	2.68
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	Female	2.49
M:low; F:high	Congruent	Male	2.81
M:low; F:high	Congruent	Female	2.57
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	Male	2.88
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	Female	2.08
M:high; F:low	Congruent	Male	3.09
M:high; F:low	Congruent	Female	2.23
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	Male	2.64
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	Female	2.75
M:high; F:high	Congruent	Male	3.16
M:high; F:high	Congruent	Female	2.99
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	Male	2.97
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	Female	2.58

Appendix B.15a

Marital Adjustment as a Function of Congruency

Congruency	Means
Congruent	108.63
Incongruent	105.78

Appendix B.15b

Marital Adjustment as a Function of Gender

Gender	Means
Male	106.95
Female	107.46

Appendix B.15c

Marital Adjustment as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence

Mother Tongue Self-Confidence (Male; Female)	Means
M:low; F:low	102.50
M:low; F:high	106.52
M:high; F:low	110.86
M:high; F:high	108.95

Appendix B.15d

Marital Adjustment as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence and Congruency

Mother Tongue Self-Confidence (Male;Female)	Congruency	Means
M:low; F:low	Congruent	101.08
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	103.73
M:low; F:high	Congruent	106.15
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	106.88
M:high; F:low	Congruent	112.17
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	109.55
M:high; F:high	Congruent	103.73
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	114.18

Appendix B.15e

Marital Adjustment a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence and Gender

Mother Tongue Self-Confidence (Male;Female)	Gender	Means
M:low; F:low	Male	100.22
M:low; F:low	Female	104.77
M:low; F:high	Male	111.54
M:low; F:high	Female	101.49
M:high; F:low	Male	110.10
M:high; F:low	Female	111.62
M:high; F:high	Male	108.00
M:high; F:high	Female	109.91

Appendix B.15f

Marital Adjustment as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence, Congruency and Gender

Mother Tongue Self-Confidence (Male;Female)	Congruency	Gender	Means
M:low; F:low	Congruent	Male	96.10
M:low; F:low	Congruent	Female	106.06
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	Male	104.35
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	Female	103.48
M:low; F:high	Congruent	Male	110.63
M:low; F:high	Congruent	Female	101.67
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	Male	112.44
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	Female	101.32
M:high; F:low	Congruent	Male	111.14
M:high; F:low	Congruent	Female	113.20
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	Male	109.06
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	Female	110.04
M:high; F:high	Congruent	Male	103.82
M:high; F:high	Congruent	Female	103.63
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	Male	112.17
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	Female	116.19

Appendix B.16a

Depression as a Function of Congruency

Congruency	Means
Congruent	12.77
Incongruent	13.55

Appendix B.16b

Depression as a Function of Gender

Gender	Means
Male	13.01
Female	13.31

Appendix B.16c

Depression as a Function of Self-Esteem and Congruency

Self-Esteem (Male;Female)	Congruency	Means
M:low; F:low	Congruent	13.07
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	14.65
M:low; F:high	Congruent	12.42
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	12.21
M:high; F:low	Congruent	14.17
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	16.13
M:high; F:high	Congruent	11.42
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	11.20

Appendix B.16d

Depression as a Function of Self-Esteem, Congruency and Gender

Self-Esteem (Male;Female)	Congruency	Gender	Means
M:low; F:low	Congruent	Male	13.18
M:low; F:low	Congruent	Female	12.95
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	Male	15.04
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	Female	14.26
M:low; F:high	Congruent	Male	13.29
M:low; F:high	Congruent	Female	11.57
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	Male	13.14
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	Female	11.29
M:high; F:low	Congruent	Male	12.93
M:high; F:low	Congruent	Female	15.40
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	Male	14.00
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	Female	18.25
M:high; F:high	Congruent	Male	11.33
M:high; F:high	Congruent	Female	11.50
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	Male	11.17
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	Female	11.23

Appendix B.17a
Stress as a Function of Self-Esteem and Congruency

Self-Esteem (Male;Female)	Congruency	Means
M:low; F:low	Congruent	2.89
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	3.22
M:low; F:high	Congruent	2.77
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	2.65
M:high; F:low	Congruent	2.69
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	4.02
M:high; F:high	Congruent	2.38
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	2.47

Appendix B.17b
Stress as a Function of Self-Esteem and Gender

Self-Esteem (Male;Female)	Gender	Means
M:low; F:low	Male	2.93
M:low; F:low	Female	3.18
M:low; F:high	Male	2.69
M:low; F:high	Female	2.73
M:high; F:low	Male	2.86
M:high; F:low	Female	3.85
M:high; F:high	Male	2.24
M:high; F:high	Female	2.61

Appendix B.17c

Stress as a Function of Self-Esteem, Congruency and Gender

Self-Esteem (Male;Female)	Congruency	Gender	Means
M:low; F:low	Congruent	Male	2.79
M:low; F:low	Congruent	Female	3.00
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	Male	3.07
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	Female	3.36
M:low; F:high	Congruent	Male	2.44
M:low; F:high	Congruent	Female	3.09
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	Male	2.94
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	Female	2.37
M:high; F:low	Congruent	Male	2.31
M:high; F:low	Congruent	Female	3.07
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	Male	3.41
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	Female	4.62
M:high; F:high	Congruent	Male	2.30
M:high; F:high	Congruent	Female	2.46
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	Male	2.18
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	Female	2.77

Appendix B.18a

Marital Adjustment as a Function of Congruency

Congruency	Means
Congruent	112.22
Incongruent	105.20

Appendix B.18b

Marital Adjustment as a Function of Gender

Gender	Means
Male	110.41
Female	107.01

Appendix B.18c

Marital Adjustment as a Function of Self-Esteem

Self-Esteem (Male; Female)	Means
M:low; F:low	102.65
M:low; F:high	104.99
M:high; F:low	115.91
M:high; F:high	111.28

Appendix B.18d

Marital Adjustment as a Function of Self-Esteem and Congruency

Self-Esteem (Male;Female)	Congruency	Means
M:low; F:low	Congruent	104.21
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	101.09
M:low; F:high	Congruent	108.14
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	101.85
M:high; F:low	Congruent	121.56
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	110.25
M:high; F:high	Congruent	114.98
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	107.58

Appendix B.18e

Marital Adjustment as a Function of Self-Esteem, Congruency and Gender

Self-Esteem (Male;Female)	Congruency	Gender	Means
M:low; F:low	Congruent	Male	103.48
M:low; F:low	Congruent	Female	104.94
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	Male	98.71
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	Female	103.48
M:low; F:high	Congruent	Male	105.53
M:low; F:high	Congruent	Female	110.74
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	Male	101.88
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	Female	101.83
M:high; F:low	Congruent	Male	130.92
M:high; F:low	Congruent	Female	112.20
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	Male	118.76
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	Female	101.75
M:high; F:high	Congruent	Male	114.81
M:high; F:high	Congruent	Female	115.15
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	Male	109.17
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	Female	106.00

Appendix B.19a**Depression as a Function of Congruency in the Public Domain**

Congruency	Means
Congruent	12.24
Incongruent	12.83

Appendix B.19b**Depression as a Function of Gender**

Gender	Means
Male	12.68
Female	12.39

Appendix B.19c**Depression as a Function of Spousal Support and Congruency in the Public Domain**

Spousal Support (Male;Female)	Congruency	Means
M:low; F:low	Congruent	12.93
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	14.65
M:low; F:high	Congruent	13.60
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	11.80
M:high; F:low	Congruent	11.00
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	13.40
M:high; F:high	Congruent	11.42
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	11.47

Appendix B.19d

Depression as a Function of Spousal Support and Gender

Spousal Support (Male;Female)	Gender	Means
M:low; F:low	Male	13.96
M:low; F:low	Female	13.63
M:low; F:high	Male	13.30
M:low; F:high	Female	12.10
M:high; F:low	Male	12.35
M:high; F:low	Female	12.05
M:high; F:high	Male	11.11
M:high; F:high	Female	11.78

Appendix B.19e

Depression as a Function of Spousal Support, Congruency in the Public Domain and Gender

Spousal Support (Male;Female)	Congruency	Gender	Means
M:low; F:low	Congruent	Male	13.10
M:low; F:low	Congruent	Female	12.76
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	Male	14.82
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	Female	14.50
M:low; F:high	Congruent	Male	14.80
M:low; F:high	Congruent	Female	12.40
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	Male	11.80
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	Female	11.80
M:high; F:low	Congruent	Male	11.50
M:high; F:low	Congruent	Female	10.50
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	Male	13.20
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	Female	13.60
M:high; F:high	Congruent	Male	10.94
M:high; F:high	Congruent	Female	11.89
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	Male	11.27
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	Female	11.67

Appendix B.20a

Stress as a Function of Congruency in the Public Domain

Congruency	Means
Congruent	2.55
Incongruent	2.88

Appendix B.20b

Stress as a Function of Gender

Gender	Means
Male	2.62
Female	2.81

Appendix B.20c

Stress as a Function of Spousal Support and Congruency in the Public Domain

Spousal Support (Male;Female)	Congruency	Means
M:low; F:low	Congruent	2.72
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	3.14
M:low; F:high	Congruent	2.55
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	2.47
M:high; F:low	Congruent	2.30
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	3.43
M:high; F:high	Congruent	2.62
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	2.48

Appendix B.20d
Stress as a Function of Spousal Support and Gender

Spousal Support (Male;Female)	Gender	Means
M:low; F:low	Male	2.78
M:low; F:low	Female	3.08
M:low; F:high	Male	2.58
M:low; F:high	Female	2.44
M:high; F:low	Male	2.80
M:high; F:low	Female	2.93
M:high; F:high	Male	2.33
M:high; F:high	Female	2.77

Appendix B.20e
Stress as a Function of Spousal Support, Congruency in the Public Domain and Gender

Spousal Support (Male;Female)	Congruency	Gender	Means
M:low; F:low	Congruent	Male	2.57
M:low; F:low	Congruent	Female	2.88
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	Male	2.99
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	Female	3.29
M:low; F:high	Congruent	Male	2.65
M:low; F:high	Congruent	Female	2.45
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	Male	2.51
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	Female	2.43
M:high; F:low	Congruent	Male	2.62
M:high; F:low	Congruent	Female	1.98
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	Male	2.98
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	Female	3.89
M:high; F:high	Congruent	Male	2.35
M:high; F:high	Congruent	Female	2.90
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	Male	2.32
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	Female	2.64

Appendix B.21a

Marital Adjustment as a Function of Congruency in the Public Domain

Congruency	Means
Congruent	115.18
Incongruent	107.32

Appendix B.21b

Marital Adjustment as a Function of Gender

Gender	Means
Male	111.63
Female	110.86

Appendix B.21c

Marital Adjustment as a Function of Spousal Support and Congruency in the Public Domain

Spousal Support (Male;Female)	Congruency	Means
M:low; F:low	Congruent	105.27
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	94.19
M:low; F:high	Congruent	120.33
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	114.38
M:high; F:low	Congruent	119.19
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	110.70
M:high; F:high	Congruent	115.92
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	110.00

Appendix B.21d

Marital Adjustment as a Function of Spousal Support and Gender

Spousal Support (Male;Female)	Gender	Means
M:low; F:low	Male	101.18
M:low; F:low	Female	98.28
M:low; F:high	Male	116.45
M:low; F:high	Female	118.26
M:high; F:low	Male	117.20
M:high; F:low	Female	112.70
M:high; F:high	Male	111.71
M:high; F:high	Female	114.21

Appendix B.21e

Marital Adjustment as a Function of Spousal Support, Congruency in the Public Domain and Gender

Spousal Support (Male;Female)	Congruency	Gender	Means
M:low; F:low	Congruent	Male	106.69
M:low; F:low	Congruent	Female	103.85
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	Male	95.67
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	Female	92.71
M:low; F:high	Congruent	Male	124.30
M:low; F:high	Congruent	Female	116.36
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	Male	108.60
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	Female	120.17
M:high; F:low	Congruent	Male	117.38
M:high; F:low	Congruent	Female	121.00
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	Male	117.01
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	Female	104.40
M:high; F:high	Congruent	Male	114.51
M:high; F:high	Congruent	Female	117.34
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	Male	108.92
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	Female	111.09

Appendix B.22a**Depression as a Function of Congruency in the Public Domain**

Congruency	Means
Congruent	12.43
Incongruent	13.30

Appendix B.22b**Depression as a Function of Gender**

Gender	Means
Male	12.77
Female	12.96

Appendix B.22c**Depression as a Function of English Self-Confidence and Congruency in the Public Domain**

English Self-Confidence (Male;Female)	Congruency	Means
M:low; F:low	Congruent	12.74
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	13.22
M:low; F:high	Congruent	12.80
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	13.43
M:high; F:low	Congruent	15.54
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	12.00
M:high; F:high	Congruent	12.12
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	11.06

Appendix B.22d

Depression as a Function of English Self-Confidence and Gender

English Self-Confidence (Male;Female)	Gender	Means
M:low; F:low	Male	12.84
M:low; F:low	Female	13.12
M:low; F:high	Male	13.00
M:low; F:high	Female	13.23
M:high; F:low	Male	14.79
M:high; F:low	Female	12.75
M:high; F:high	Male	11.20
M:high; F:high	Female	11.97

Appendix B.22e

Depression as a Function of English Self-Confidence, Congruency in the Public Domain and Gender

English Self-Confidence (Male;Female)	Congruency	Gender	Means
M:low; F:low	Congruent	Male	12.45
M:low; F:low	Congruent	Female	13.02
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	Male	13.22
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	Female	13.22
M:low; F:high	Congruent	Male	13.00
M:low; F:high	Congruent	Female	12.60
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	Male	13.00
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	Female	13.86
M:high; F:low	Congruent	Male	17.25
M:high; F:low	Congruent	Female	13.83
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	Male	12.33
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	Female	11.67
M:high; F:high	Congruent	Male	11.36
M:high; F:high	Congruent	Female	12.89
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	Male	11.06
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	Female	11.06

Appendix B.23a

Stress as a Function of Congruency in the Public Domain

Congruency	Means
Congruent	2.54
Incongruent	2.89

Appendix B.23b

Stress as a Function of English Self-Confidence

English Self-Confidence (Male; Female)	Means
M:low; F:low	2.85
M:low; F:high	2.56
M:high; F:low	2.89
M:high; F:high	2.57

Appendix B.23c

Stress as a Function of English Self-Confidence and Congruency in the Public Domain

English Self-Confidence (Male;Female)	Congruency	Means
M:low; F:low	Congruent	2.77
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	2.92
M:low; F:high	Congruent	2.48
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	2.63
M:high; F:low	Congruent	3.64
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	2.15
M:high; F:high	Congruent	2.68
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	2.46

Appendix B.23d

Stress as a Function of English Self-Confidence and Gender

English Self-Confidence (Male;Female)	Gender	Means
M:low; F:low	Male	3.05
M:low; F:low	Female	2.64
M:low; F:high	Male	2.49
M:low; F:high	Female	2.63
M:high; F:low	Male	3.32
M:high; F:low	Female	2.47
M:high; F:high	Male	2.62
M:high; F:high	Female	2.52

Appendix B.23e

Stress as a Function of English Self-Confidence, Congruency in the Public Domain and Gender

English Self-Confidence (Male;Female)	Congruency	Gender	Means
M:low; F:low	Congruent	Male	2.93
M:low; F:low	Congruent	Female	2.61
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	Male	3.17
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	Female	2.67
M:low; F:high	Congruent	Male	2.39
M:low; F:high	Congruent	Female	2.58
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	Male	2.59
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	Female	2.68
M:high; F:low	Congruent	Male	4.36
M:high; F:low	Congruent	Female	2.93
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	Male	2.28
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	Female	2.01
M:high; F:high	Congruent	Male	2.64
M:high; F:high	Congruent	Female	2.72
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	Male	2.60
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	Female	2.32

Appendix B.24a

Marital Adjustment as a Function of Congruency in the Public Domain

Congruency	Means
Congruent	112.32
Incongruent	103.57

Appendix B.24b

Marital Adjustment as a Function of Gender

Gender	Means
Male	109.14
Female	106.75

Appendix B.24c

Marital Adjustment as a Function of English Self-Confidence

English Self-Confidence (Male; Female)	Means
M:low; F:low	101.66
M:low; F:high	102.64
M:high; F:low	114.27
M:high; F:high	113.22

Appendix B.24d

Marital Adjustment as a Function of English Self-Confidence and Congruency in the Public Domain

English Self-Confidence (Male;Female)	Congruency	Means
M:low; F:low	Congruent	99.59
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	103.72
M:low; F:high	Congruent	98.75
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	106.53
M:high; F:low	Congruent	110.02
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	118.53
M:high; F:high	Congruent	105.94
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	120.50

Appendix B.24e

Marital Adjustment as a Function of English Self-Confidence and Gender

English Self-Confidence (Male;Female)	Gender	Means
M:low; F:low	Male	101.74
M:low; F:low	Female	101.57
M:low; F:high	Male	299.16
M:low; F:high	Female	106.12
M:high; F:low	Male	110.98
M:high; F:low	Female	117.57
M:high; F:high	Male	115.13
M:high; F:high	Female	111.31

Appendix B.24f

Marital Adjustment as a Function of English Self-Confidence, Congruency in the Public Domain and Gender

English Self-Confidence (Male;Female)	Congruency	Gender	Means
M:low; F:low	Congruent	Male	101.54
M:low; F:low	Congruent	Female	97.64
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	Male	101.95
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	Female	105.50
M:low; F:high	Congruent	Male	90.47
M:low; F:high	Congruent	Female	107.03
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	Male	107.85
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	Female	105.22
M:high; F:low	Congruent	Male	104.78
M:high; F:low	Congruent	Female	115.26
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	Male	117.19
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	Female	119.87
M:high; F:high	Congruent	Male	109.41
M:high; F:high	Congruent	Female	102.46
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	Male	120.85
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	Female	120.15

Appendix B.25a

Depression as a Function of Congruency in the Public Domain

Congruency	Means
Congruent	12.15
Incongruent	12.47

Appendix B.25b

Depression as a Function of Gender

Gender	Means
Male	12.57
Female	12.47

Appendix B.25c

Depression as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence

Mother Tongue Self-Confidence (Male; Female)	Means
M:low; F:low	12.63
M:low; F:high	11.60
M:high; F:low	13.06
M:high; F:high	12.80

Appendix B.25d

Depression as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence and Congruency in the Public Domain

Mother Tongue Self-Confidence (Male;Female)	Congruency	Means
M:low; F:low	Congruent	12.00
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	13.09
M:low; F:high	Congruent	11.25
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	14.87
M:high; F:low	Congruent	11.58
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	11.62
M:high; F:high	Congruent	13.25
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	12.00

Appendix B.25e

Depression as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence and Gender

Mother Tongue Self-Confidence (Male;Female)	Gender	Means
M:low; F:low	Male	12.81
M:low; F:low	Female	12.44
M:low; F:high	Male	11.50
M:low; F:high	Female	11.71
M:high; F:low	Male	12.69
M:high; F:low	Female	13.43
M:high; F:high	Male	12.87
M:high; F:high	Female	12.72

Appendix B.25f

Depression as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence, Congruency in the Public Domain and Gender

Mother Tongue Self-Confidence (Male;Female)	Congruency	Gender	Means
M:low; F:low	Congruent	Male	12.42
M:low; F:low	Congruent	Female	11.57
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	Male	13.20
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	Female	13.30
M:low; F:high	Congruent	Male	11.50
M:low; F:high	Congruent	Female	11.75
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	Male	11.50
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	Female	11.67
M:high; F:low	Congruent	Male	14.75
M:high; F:low	Congruent	Female	14.99
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	Male	10.63
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	Female	11.88
M:high; F:high	Congruent	Male	13.05
M:high; F:high	Congruent	Female	13.13
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	Male	12.68
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	Female	12.32

Appendix B.26a

Stress as a Function of Congruency in the Public Domain

Congruency	Means
Congruent	2.55
Incongruent	2.81

Appendix B.26b

Stress as a Function of Gender

Gender	Means
Male	2.50
Female	2.86

Appendix B.26c

Stress as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence

Mother Tongue Self-Confidence (Male; Female)	Means
M:low; F:low	2.57
M:low; F:high	2.56
M:high; F:low	2.68
M:high; F:high	2.90

Appendix B.26d

Stress as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence and Congruency in the Public Domain

Mother Tongue Self-Confidence (Male;Female)	Congruency	Means
M:low; F:low	Congruent	2.82
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	2.58
M:low; F:high	Congruent	2.69
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	2.48
M:high; F:low	Congruent	2.66
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	2.70
M:high; F:high	Congruent	3.08
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	2.77

Appendix B.26e

Stress as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence and Gender

Mother Tongue Self-Confidence (Male;Female)	Gender	Means
M:low; F:low	Male	2.76
M:low; F:low	Female	3.05
M:low; F:high	Male	2.56
M:low; F:high	Female	2.81
M:high; F:low	Male	2.28
M:high; F:low	Female	2.84
M:high; F:high	Male	2.42
M:high; F:high	Female	2.73

Appendix B.26f

Stress as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence, Congruency in the Public Domain and Gender

Mother Tongue Self-Confidence (Male;Female)	Congruency	Gender	Means
M:low; F:low	Congruent	Male	2.72
M:low; F:low	Congruent	Female	2.14
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	Male	2.73
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	Female	2.70
M:low; F:high	Congruent	Male	2.74
M:low; F:high	Congruent	Female	2.56
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	Male	2.94
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	Female	2.01
M:high; F:low	Congruent	Male	3.41
M:high; F:low	Congruent	Female	2.96
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	Male	2.22
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	Female	2.16
M:high; F:high	Congruent	Male	3.09
M:high; F:high	Congruent	Female	2.86
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	Male	3.00
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	Female	2.66

Appendix B.27a

Marital Adjustment as a Function of Congruency in the Private Domain

Congruency	Means
Congruent	110.77
Incongruent	103.93

Appendix B.27b

Marital Adjustment as a Function of Gender

Gender	Means
Male	106.69
Female	107.46

Appendix B.27b

Marital Adjustment as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence

Mother Tongue Self-Confidence (Male; Female)	Means
M:low; F:low	102.20
M:low; F:high	105.85
M:high; F:low	110.53
M:high; F:high	109.72

Appendix B.27c

Marital Adjustment as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence and Congruency in the Public Domain

Mother Tongue Self-Confidence (Male;Female)	Congruency	Means
M:low; F:low	Congruent	101.08
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	103.73
M:low; F:high	Congruent	106.15
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	106.88
M:high; F:low	Congruent	112.17
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	109.55
M:high; F:high	Congruent	103.73
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	114.18

Appendix B.27d

Marital Adjustment a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence and Gender

Mother Tongue Self-Confidence (Male;Female)	Gender	Means
M:low; F:low	Male	100.23
M:low; F:low	Female	104.18
M:low; F:high	Male	111.22
M:low; F:high	Female	100.63
M:high; F:low	Male	109.84
M:high; F:low	Female	111.22
M:high; F:high	Male	108.68
M:high; F:high	Female	110.75

Appendix B.27e

Marital Adjustment as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence, Congruency in the Public Domain and Gender

Mother Tongue Self-Confidence (Male;Female)	Congruency	Gender	Means
M:low; F:low	Congruent	Male	94.00
M:low; F:low	Congruent	Female	101.39
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	Male	106.45
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	Female	106.97
M:low; F:high	Congruent	Male	106.97
M:low; F:high	Congruent	Female	96.65
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	Male	115.18
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	Female	104.60
M:high; F:low	Congruent	Male	99.36
M:high; F:low	Congruent	Female	103.35
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	Male	120.32
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	Female	119.09
M:high; F:high	Congruent	Male	108.34
M:high; F:high	Congruent	Female	107.50
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	Male	109.03
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	Female	113.99

Appendix B.28a

Depression as a Function of Congruency in the Public Domain

Congruency	Means
Congruent	12.45
Incongruent	13.32

Appendix B.28b

Depression as a Function of Gender

Gender	Means
Male	12.80
Female	12.97

Appendix B.28c

Depression as a Function of Self-Esteem and Congruency in the Public Domain

Self-Esteem (Male;Female)	Congruency	Means
M:low; F:low	Congruent	13.21
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	14.11
M:low; F:high	Congruent	12.50
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	12.19
M:high; F:low	Congruent	12.75
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	15.69
M:high; F:high	Congruent	11.34
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	11.30

Appendix B.28d

Depression as a Function of Self-Esteem, Congruency in the Public Domain and Gender

Self-Esteem (Male;Female)	Congruency	Gender	Means
M:low; F:low	Congruent	Male	13.26
M:low; F:low	Congruent	Female	13.15
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	Male	14.49
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	Female	13.72
M:low; F:high	Congruent	Male	13.83
M:low; F:high	Congruent	Female	11.17
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	Male	12.75
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	Female	11.63
M:high; F:low	Congruent	Male	11.50
M:high; F:low	Congruent	Female	14.00
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	Male	13.95
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	Female	17.42
M:high; F:high	Congruent	Male	11.11
M:high; F:high	Congruent	Female	11.58
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	Male	11.52
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	Female	11.08

Appendix B.29a

Stress as a Function of Congruency in the Public Domain

Congruency	Means
Congruent	2.67
Incongruent	2.93

Appendix B.29b

Stress as a Function of Self-Esteem

Self-Esteem (Male; Female)	Means
M:low; F:low	2.94
M:low; F:high	2.71
M:high; F:low	3.07
M:high; F:high	2.44

Appendix B.29c

Stress as a Function of Self-Esteem and Congruency in the Public Domain

Self-Esteem (Male;Female)	Congruency	Means
M:low; F:low	Congruent	2.91
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	3.07
M:low; F:high	Congruent	2.73
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	2.69
M:high; F:low	Congruent	2.69
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	3.45
M:high; F:high	Congruent	2.36
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	2.52

Appendix B.29d

Stress as a Function of Self-Esteem and Gender

Self-Esteem (Male;Female)	Gender	Means
M:low; F:low	Male	2.87
M:low; F:low	Female	3.10
M:low; F:high	Male	2.68
M:low; F:high	Female	2.74
M:high; F:low	Male	2.70
M:high; F:low	Female	3.44
M:high; F:high	Male	2.27
M:high; F:high	Female	2.60

Appendix B.29e

Stress as a Function of Self-Esteem, Congruency in the Public Domain and Gender

Self-Esteem (Male;Female)	Congruency	Gender	Means
M:low; F:low	Congruent	Male	2.77
M:low; F:low	Congruent	Female	3.05
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	Male	2.98
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	Female	3.15
M:low; F:high	Congruent	Male	2.65
M:low; F:high	Congruent	Female	2.82
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	Male	2.72
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	Female	2.66
M:high; F:low	Congruent	Male	2.52
M:high; F:low	Congruent	Female	2.86
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	Male	2.88
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	Female	4.02
M:high; F:high	Congruent	Male	2.17
M:high; F:high	Congruent	Female	2.54
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	Male	2.37
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	Female	2.66

Appendix B.30a

Marital Adjustment as a Function of Gender

Gender	Means
Male	112.08
Female	108.44

Appendix B.30b

Marital Adjustment as a Function of Self-Esteem

Self-Esteem (Male; Female)	Means
M:low; F:low	102.52
M:low; F:high	105.59
M:high; F:low	122.21
M:high; F:high	110.72

Appendix B.30c

Marital Adjustment as a Function of Self-Esteem and Congruency in the Public Domain

Self-Esteem (Male;Female)	Congruency	Means
M:low; F:low	Congruent	105.93
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	99.10
M:low; F:high	Congruent	109.76
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	101.42
M:high; F:low	Congruent	132.44
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	111.99
M:high; F:high	Congruent	115.85
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	105.59

Appendix B.30d

Marital Adjustment as a Function of Self-Esteem, Congruency in the Public Domain and Gender

Self-Esteem (Male;Female)	Congruency	Gender	Means
M:low; F:low	Congruent	Male	106.15
M:low; F:low	Congruent	Female	105.71
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	Male	94.49
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	Female	103.72
M:low; F:high	Congruent	Male	104.69
M:low; F:high	Congruent	Female	114.84
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	Male	102.97
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	Female	99.87
M:high; F:low	Congruent	Male	146.50
M:high; F:low	Congruent	Female	118.38
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	Male	119.52
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	Female	104.46
M:high; F:high	Congruent	Male	116.83
M:high; F:high	Congruent	Female	114.87
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	Male	105.49
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	Female	105.68

Appendix B.31a

Depression as a Function of Congruency in the Private Domain

Congruency	Means
Congruent	12.89
Incongruent	12.51

Appendix B.31b

Depression as a Function of Gender

Gender	Means
Male	12.70
Female	12.70

Appendix B.31c

Depression as a Function of Spousal Support and Congruency in the Private Domain

Spousal Support (Male;Female)	Congruency	Means
M:low; F:low	Congruent	13.17
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	14.10
M:low; F:high	Congruent	13.00
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	12.40
M:high; F:low	Congruent	13.75
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	12.30
M:high; F:high	Congruent	11.63
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	11.22

Appendix B.31d

Depression as a Function of Spousal Support and Gender

Spousal Support (Male;Female)	Gender	Means
M:low; F:low	Male	13.77
M:low; F:low	Female	13.51
M:low; F:high	Male	13.30
M:low; F:high	Female	12.10
M:high; F:low	Male	12.65
M:high; F:low	Female	13.40
M:high; F:high	Male	11.06
M:high; F:high	Female	11.79

Appendix B.31e

Depression as a Function of Spousal Support, Congruency in the Private Domain and Gender

Spousal Support (Male;Female)	Congruency	Gender	Means
M:low; F:low	Congruent	Male	12.94
M:low; F:low	Congruent	Female	13.42
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	Male	14.61
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	Female	13.60
M:low; F:high	Congruent	Male	13.80
M:low; F:high	Congruent	Female	12.20
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	Male	12.80
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	Female	12.00
M:high; F:low	Congruent	Male	12.50
M:high; F:low	Congruent	Female	15.00
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	Male	12.80
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	Female	11.80
M:high; F:high	Congruent	Male	11.25
M:high; F:high	Congruent	Female	12.00
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	Male	10.87
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	Female	11.57

Appendix B.32a

Stress as a Function of Congruency in the Private Domain

Congruency	Means
Congruent	2.70
Incongruent	2.85

Appendix B.32b

Stress as a Function of Gender

Gender	Means
Male	2.64
Female	2.92

Appendix B.32c

Stress as a Function of Spousal Support

Spousal Support (Male; Female)	Means
M:low; F:low	2.89
M:low; F:high	2.51
M:high; F:low	3.14
M:high; F:high	2.57

Appendix B.32d

Stress as a Function of Spousal Support and Congruency in the Private Domain

Spousal Support (Male;Female)	Congruency	Means
M:low; F:low	Congruent	2.77
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	3.02
M:low; F:high	Congruent	2.32
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	2.70
M:high; F:low	Congruent	3.20
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	3.07
M:high; F:high	Congruent	2.53
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	2.62

Appendix B.32e

Stress as a Function of Spousal Support and Gender

Spousal Support (Male;Female)	Gender	Means
M:low; F:low	Male	2.74
M:low; F:low	Female	3.05
M:low; F:high	Male	2.58
M:low; F:high	Female	2.44
M:high; F:low	Male	2.91
M:high; F:low	Female	3.37
M:high; F:high	Male	2.33
M:high; F:high	Female	2.81

Appendix B.32f

Stress as a Function of Spousal Support, Congruency in the Private Domain and Gender

Spousal Support (Male;Female)	Congruency	Gender	Means
M:low; F:low	Congruent	Male	2.57
M:low; F:low	Congruent	Female	2.97
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	Male	2.91
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	Female	3.13
M:low; F:high	Congruent	Male	2.32
M:low; F:high	Congruent	Female	2.31
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	Male	2.84
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	Female	2.57
M:high; F:low	Congruent	Male	2.98
M:high; F:low	Congruent	Female	3.42
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	Male	2.83
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	Female	3.31
M:high; F:high	Congruent	Male	2.34
M:high; F:high	Congruent	Female	2.71
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	Male	2.33
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	Female	2.90

Appendix B.33a

Marital Adjustment as a Function of Congruency in the Private Domain

Congruency	Means
Congruent	114.95
Incongruent	108.65

Appendix B.33b

Marital Adjustment as a Function of Gender

Gender	Means
Male	112.36
Female	111.25

Appendix B.33c

Marital Adjustment as a Function of Spousal Support and Congruency in the Private Domain

Spousal Support (Male;Female)	Congruency	Means
M:low; F:low	Congruent	103.04
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	98.30
M:low; F:high	Congruent	124.12
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	110.59
M:high; F:low	Congruent	121.01
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	109.98
M:high; F:high	Congruent	111.64
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	115.75

Appendix B.33d

Marital Adjustment as a Function of Spousal Support and Gender

Spousal Support (Male;Female)	Gender	Means
M:low; F:low	Male	102.09
M:low; F:low	Female	99.24
M:low; F:high	Male	116.45
M:low; F:high	Female	118.26
M:high; F:low	Male	118.44
M:high; F:low	Female	112.55
M:high; F:high	Male	112.46
M:high; F:high	Female	114.93

Appendix B.33e

Marital Adjustment as a Function of Spousal Support, Congruency in the Private Domain and Gender

Spousal Support (Male;Female)	Congruency	Gender	Means
M:low; F:low	Congruent	Male	104.23
M:low; F:low	Congruent	Female	101.85
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	Male	99.96
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	Female	96.64
M:low; F:high	Congruent	Male	130.49
M:low; F:high	Congruent	Female	117.75
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	Male	102.40
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	Female	118.77
M:high; F:low	Congruent	Male	121.52
M:high; F:low	Congruent	Female	120.50
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	Male	115.35
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	Female	104.60
M:high; F:high	Congruent	Male	109.64
M:high; F:high	Congruent	Female	113.63
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	Male	115.28
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	Female	116.22

Appendix B.34a

Depression as a Function of Congruency in the Private Domain

Congruency	Means
Congruent	13.01
Incongruent	13.07

Appendix B.34b

Depression as a Function of Gender

Gender	Means
Male	12.88
Female	13.21

Appendix B.34c

Depression as a Function of English Self-Confidence and Congruency in the Private Domain

English Self-Confidence (Male;Female)	Congruency	Means
M:low; F:low	Congruent	13.28
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	12.84
M:low; F:high	Congruent	12.33
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	14.00
M:high; F:low	Congruent	14.91
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	14.00
M:high; F:high	Congruent	11.76
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	11.21

Appendix B.34d

Depression as a Function of English Self-Confidence, Congruency in the Private Domain and Gender

English Self-Confidence (Male;Female)	Congruency	Gender	Means
M:low; F:low	Congruent	Male	12.77
M:low; F:low	Congruent	Female	13.79
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	Male	13.06
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	Female	12.63
M:low; F:high	Congruent	Male	11.83
M:low; F:high	Congruent	Female	12.83
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	Male	14.17
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	Female	13.83
M:high; F:low	Congruent	Male	16.42
M:high; F:low	Congruent	Female	13.38
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	Male	15.00
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	Female	13.00
M:high; F:high	Congruent	Male	11.17
M:high; F:high	Congruent	Female	12.36
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	Male	11.21
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	Female	11.21

Appendix B.35a

Stress as a Function of Congruency in the Private Domain

Congruency	Means
Congruent	2.69
Incongruent	2.89

Appendix B.35b

Stress as a Function of Gender

Gender	Means
Male	2.61
Female	2.97

Appendix B.35c

Stress as a Function of English Self-Confidence

English Self-Confidence (Male; Female)	Means
M:low; F:low	2.87
M:low; F:high	2.57
M:high; F:low	3.18
M:high; F:high	2.54

Appendix B.35d

Stress as a Function of English Self-Confidence and Congruency in the Private Domain

English Self-Confidence (Male;Female)	Congruency	Means
M:low; F:low	Congruent	2.95
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	2.80
M:low; F:high	Congruent	2.55
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	2.60
M:high; F:low	Congruent	3.37
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	3.00
M:high; F:high	Congruent	2.70
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	2.37

Appendix B.35e

Stress as a Function of English Self-Confidence, Congruency in the Private Domain and Gender

English Self-Confidence (Male;Female)	Congruency	Gender	Means
M:low; F:low	Congruent	Male	3.16
M:low; F:low	Congruent	Female	2.75
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	Male	3.02
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	Female	2.57
M:low; F:high	Congruent	Male	2.31
M:low; F:high	Congruent	Female	2.79
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	Male	2.71
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	Female	2.49
M:high; F:low	Congruent	Male	4.02
M:high; F:low	Congruent	Female	2.71
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	Male	3.38
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	Female	2.62
M:high; F:high	Congruent	Male	2.75
M:high; F:high	Congruent	Female	2.65
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	Male	2.44
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	Female	2.30

Appendix B.36a

Marital Adjustment as a Function of Congruency in the Private Domain

Congruency	Means
Congruent	110.82
Incongruent	105.41

Appendix B.36b

Marital Adjustment as a Function of Gender

Gender	Means
Male	109.35
Female	106.89

Appendix B.36c

Marital Adjustment as a Function of English Self-Confidence

English Self-Confidence (Male; Female)	Means
M:low; F:low	101.76
M:low; F:high	103.29
M:high; F:low	113.22
M:high; F:high	114.19

Appendix B.36d

Marital Adjustment as a Function of English Self-Confidence and Congruency in the Private Domain

English Self-Confidence (Male;Female)	Congruency	Means
M:low; F:low	Congruent	97.93
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	105.58
M:low; F:high	Congruent	100.04
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	106.54
M:high; F:low	Congruent	110.00
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	116.44
M:high; F:high	Congruent	113.67
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	114.72

Appendix B.36e

Marital Adjustment as a Function of English Self-Confidence and Gender

English Self-Confidence (Male;Female)	Gender	Means
M:low; F:low	Male	101.27
M:low; F:low	Female	102.25
M:low; F:high	Male	100.61
M:low; F:high	Female	105.97
M:high; F:low	Male	110.16
M:high; F:low	Female	116.27
M:high; F:high	Male	115.50
M:high; F:high	Female	112.89

Appendix B.36f

Marital Adjustment as a Function of English Self-Confidence, Congruency in the Public Domain and Gender

English Self-Confidence (Male;Female)	Congruency	Gender	Means
M:low; F:low	Congruent	Male	96.23
M:low; F:low	Congruent	Female	99.64
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	Male	106.31
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	Female	104.86
M:low; F:high	Congruent	Male	96.20
M:low; F:high	Congruent	Female	103.88
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	Male	105.02
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	Female	108.06
M:high; F:low	Congruent	Male	102.83
M:high; F:low	Congruent	Female	117.17
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	Male	117.50
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	Female	115.38
M:high; F:high	Congruent	Male	118.27
M:high; F:high	Congruent	Female	109.07
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	Male	112.73
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	Female	116.71

Appendix B.37a

Depression as a Function of Congruency in the Private Domain

Congruency	Means
Congruent	12.46
Incongruent	12.57

Appendix B.37b

Depression as a Function of Gender

Gender	Means
Male	12.53
Female	12.50

Appendix B.37c

Depression as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence

Mother Tongue Self-Confidence (Male; Female)	Means
M:low; F:low	12.66
M:low; F:high	11.60
M:high; F:low	13.06
M:high; F:high	12.72

Appendix B.37d

Depression as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence and Congruency in the Private Domain

Mother Tongue Self-Confidence (Male;Female)	Congruency	Means
M:low; F:low	Congruent	12.42
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	12.91
M:low; F:high	Congruent	11.60
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	11.60
M:high; F:low	Congruent	11.31
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	12.81
M:high; F:high	Congruent	13.95
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	12.50

Appendix B.37e

Depression as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence and Gender

Mother Tongue Self-Confidence (Male;Female)	Gender	Means
M:low; F:low	Male	12.91
M:low; F:low	Female	12.42
M:low; F:high	Male	11.50
M:low; F:high	Female	11.70
M:high; F:low	Male	12.69
M:high; F:low	Female	13.43
M:high; F:high	Male	12.89
M:high; F:high	Female	12.56

Appendix B.37f

Depression as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence, Congruency in the Private Domain and Gender

Mother Tongue Self-Confidence (Male;Female)	Congruency	Gender	Means
M:low; F:low	Congruent	Male	13.00
M:low; F:low	Congruent	Female	11.83
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	Male	12.82
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	Female	13.00
M:low; F:high	Congruent	Male	10.80
M:low; F:high	Congruent	Female	12.40
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	Male	12.20
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	Female	11.00
M:high; F:low	Congruent	Male	12.88
M:high; F:low	Congruent	Female	13.74
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	Male	12.50
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	Female	13.13
M:high; F:high	Congruent	Male	12.72
M:high; F:high	Congruent	Female	13.18
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	Male	13.06
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	Female	11.94

Appendix B.38a

Stress as a Function of Congruency in the Private Domain

Congruency	Means
Congruent	2.56
Incongruent	2.79

Appendix B.38b

Stress as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence

Mother Tongue Self-Confidence (Male; Female)	Means
M:low; F:low	2.61
M:low; F:high	2.54
M:high; F:low	2.68
M:high; F:high	2.88

Appendix B.38c

Stress as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence and Congruency in the Private Domain

Mother Tongue Self-Confidence (Male;Female)	Congruency	Means
M:low; F:low	Congruent	2.63
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	2.58
M:low; F:high	Congruent	2.80
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	2.29
M:high; F:low	Congruent	2.80
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	2.57
M:high; F:high	Congruent	2.95
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	2.82

Appendix B.38d

Stress as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence and Gender

Mother Tongue Self-Confidence (Male;Female)	Gender	Means
M:low; F:low	Male	2.76
M:low; F:low	Female	2.45
M:low; F:high	Male	2.86
M:low; F:high	Female	2.23
M:high; F:low	Male	2.81
M:high; F:low	Female	2.56
M:high; F:high	Male	3.06
M:high; F:high	Female	2.71

Appendix B.38e

Stress as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence, Congruency in the Private Domain and Gender

Mother Tongue Self-Confidence (Male;Female)	Congruency	Gender	Means
M:low; F:low	Congruent	Male	2.88
M:low; F:low	Congruent	Female	2.39
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	Male	2.64
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	Female	2.51
M:low; F:high	Congruent	Male	3.27
M:low; F:high	Congruent	Female	2.32
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	Male	2.45
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	Female	2.14
M:high; F:low	Congruent	Male	2.98
M:high; F:low	Congruent	Female	2.63
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	Male	2.65
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	Female	2.49
M:high; F:high	Congruent	Male	3.01
M:high; F:high	Congruent	Female	2.89
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	Male	3.12
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	Female	2.53

Appendix B.39a

Marital Adjustment as a Function of Congruency in the Private Domain

Congruency	Means
Congruent	110.77
Incongruent	103.93

Appendix B.39b

Marital Adjustment as a Function of Gender

Gender	Means
Male	107.25
Female	107.46

Appendix B.39c

Marital Adjustment as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence

Mother Tongue Self-Confidence (Male; Female)	Means
M:low; F:low	102.54
M:low; F:high	106.66
M:high; F:low	110.53
M:high; F:high	109.68

Appendix B.39d

Marital Adjustment as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence and Congruency in the Private Domain

Mother Tongue Self-Confidence (Male;Female)	Congruency	Means
M:low; F:low	Congruent	100.98
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	104.10
M:low; F:high	Congruent	103.97
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	109.36
M:high; F:low	Congruent	100.35
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	120.71
M:high; F:high	Congruent	110.43
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	108.98

Appendix B.39e

Marital Adjustment as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence and Gender

Mother Tongue Self-Confidence (Male;Female)	Gender	Means
M:low; F:low	Male	99.89
M:low; F:low	Female	105.19
M:low; F:high	Male	111.90
M:low; F:high	Female	101.42
M:high; F:low	Male	109.84
M:high; F:low	Female	111.22
M:high; F:high	Male	108.20
M:high; F:high	Female	111.17

Appendix B.39f

Marital Adjustment as a Function of Mother Tongue Self-Confidence, Congruency in the Private Domain and Gender

Mother Tongue Self-Confidence (Male;Female)	Congruency	Gender	Means
M:low; F:low	Congruent	Male	95.01
M:low; F:low	Congruent	Female	106.96
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	Male	104.77
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	Female	103.43
M:low; F:high	Congruent	Male	109.40
M:low; F:high	Congruent	Female	98.53
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	Male	114.40
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	Female	104.31
M:high; F:low	Congruent	Male	99.55
M:high; F:low	Congruent	Female	101.14
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	Male	120.13
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	Female	121.30
M:high; F:high	Congruent	Male	110.53
M:high; F:high	Congruent	Female	110.34
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	Male	105.86
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	Female	111.99

Appendix B.40a

Depression as a Function of Congruency in the Private Domain

Congruency	Means
Congruent	12.83
Incongruent	13.21

Appendix B.40b

Depression as a Function of Gender

Gender	Means
Male	12.91
Female	13.13

Appendix B.40c

Depression as a Function of Self-Esteem and Congruency in the Private Domain

Self-Esteem (Male;Female)	Congruency	Means
M:low; F:low	Congruent	13.47
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	13.64
M:low; F:high	Congruent	12.70
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	12.11
M:high; F:low	Congruent	14.17
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	15.47
M:high; F:high	Congruent	11.00
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	11.59

Appendix B.40d

Depression as a Function of Self-Esteem, Congruency in the Private Domain and Gender

Self-Esteem (Male;Female)	Congruency	Gender	Means
M:low; F:low	Congruent	Male	13.17
M:low; F:low	Congruent	Female	13.77
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	Male	14.54
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	Female	12.75
M:low; F:high	Congruent	Male	13.40
M:low; F:high	Congruent	Female	12.00
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	Male	13.11
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	Female	11.11
M:high; F:low	Congruent	Male	13.00
M:high; F:low	Congruent	Female	15.33
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	Male	13.61
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	Female	17.33
M:high; F:high	Congruent	Male	10.79
M:high; F:high	Congruent	Female	11.21
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	Male	11.66
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	Female	11.53

Appendix B.41a**Stress as a Function of Congruency in the Private Domain**

Congruency	Means
Congruent	2.69
Incongruent	2.96

Appendix B.41b**Stress as a Function of Self-Esteem and Congruency in the Private Domain**

Self-Esteem (Male;Female)	Congruency	Means
M:low; F:low	Congruent	2.86
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	3.12
M:low; F:high	Congruent	2.78
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	2.67
M:high; F:low	Congruent	2.87
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	3.49
M:high; F:high	Congruent	2.25
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	2.55

Appendix B.41c**Stress as a Function of Self-Esteem and Gender**

Self-Esteem (Male;Female)	Gender	Means
M:low; F:low	Male	2.87
M:low; F:low	Female	3.11
M:low; F:high	Male	2.61
M:low; F:high	Female	2.84
M:high; F:low	Male	2.76
M:high; F:low	Female	3.60
M:high; F:high	Male	2.24
M:high; F:high	Female	2.57

Appendix B.42a

Marital Adjustment as a Function of Congruency in the Private Domain

Congruency	Means
Congruent	114.05
Incongruent	106.16

Appendix B.42b

Marital Adjustment as a Function of Gender

Gender	Means
Male	112.04
Female	108.16

Appendix B.42c

Marital Adjustment as a Function of Self-Esteem

Self-Esteem (Male; Female)	Means
M:low; F:low	102.80
M:low; F:high	106.91
M:high; F:low	118.93
M:high; F:high	111.76

Appendix B.42d

Marital Adjustment as a Function of Self-Esteem and Congruency in the Private Domain

Self-Esteem (Male;Female)	Congruency	Means
M:low; F:low	Congruent	105.92
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	99.69
M:low; F:high	Congruent	113.61
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	100.21
M:high; F:low	Congruent	126.13
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	111.74
M:high; F:high	Congruent	110.53
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	112.99

Appendix B.42e

Marital Adjustment as a Function of Self-Esteem, Congruency in the Private Domain and Gender

Self-Esteem (Male;Female)	Congruency	Gender	Means
M:low; F:low	Congruent	Male	105.18
M:low; F:low	Congruent	Female	106.66
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	Male	96.93
M:low; F:low	Incongruent	Female	102.45
M:low; F:high	Congruent	Male	114.83
M:low; F:high	Congruent	Female	112.40
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	Male	97.53
M:low; F:high	Incongruent	Female	102.89
M:high; F:low	Congruent	Male	138.34
M:high; F:low	Congruent	Female	113.92
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	Male	119.10
M:high; F:low	Incongruent	Female	104.37
M:high; F:high	Congruent	Male	109.94
M:high; F:high	Congruent	Female	111.11
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	Male	114.50
M:high; F:high	Incongruent	Female	111.48