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CHAPTER I.
INTRODUCTION

The Industrial Revolution in the 19th century altered the structure of society from an agricultural one to an industrial one. This societal transformation influenced the definition and status of the housewife role. In the agricultural society, housework was accorded high status because women performing these activities were viewed as essential to the functioning of the family (Gove and Tudor, 1973). This positive regard for the housewife role during this period occurred because families tended to be large. But, the place of work moved from the home to urban factories in the industrial society that followed (Gove and Tudor, 1973). During this time, the size of families began decreasing (Zopf, 1984). Modern conveniences soon were available to decrease the amount of time and skills necessary for the performance of housework. It soon became apparent that housework was accorded low prestige in the newer type of society. And, today, in postindustrial society the low status associated with housework is even more apparent.

One result of these changes has been the increasing entrance of women into the labor force. Indeed, recent decades have seen significant increases in the proportion of women participating in the labor force. While 30% of women 16 and older were in the labor force in 1930, by 1980 approximately half of the women were in the labor force (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1983). This phenomenon is related to changes that have occurred in people's attitudes toward appropriate roles for women (Molm, 1978; Smith, 1980; Thornton et al., 1983). In addition, employed women
have experienced changes regarding traditional household and childcare functions (Ericksen et al., 1979; Huber and Spitze, 1983).

In light of these changes, research has attempted to uncover the effect of such transformations on the psychological well-being of women. Findings suggest that married women experience higher levels of psychological distress than do married men (Gove and Tudor, 1973; Weissman and Klerman, 1977; Welsch and Booth, 1977; Mirowsky and Ross, 1980, 1984). But, research also indicates that women holding less traditional roles report lower levels of stress than do their peers who are tied to less prestigious household activities. For example, women who are employed outside of the home (Gove and Tudor, 1973; Weissman and Klerman, 1977; Welsch and Booth, 1977; Mirowsky and Ross, 1980, 1984), those with fewer children (Radloff, 1975), and those sharing household responsibilities equitably with their spouses (Ross et al., 1983a) have been observed to experience lower levels of psychological discomfort. According to some authors, this discrepancy occurs as a result of role stress associated with changes in women's roles that have led to low levels of prestige being assigned to housework (Gove and Tudor, 1973; Gove and Geerken, 1977). Women—as well as men—employed outside of the home have two sources of gratification (work and home), while housewives have only the latter (Ross et al., 1983a). Of course, housewives having only one source of gratification cannot overemphasize their other role when they experience stress with their home role, as can working men and women.

Another home-related factor that may help in explaining psychological distress among women is their degree of satisfaction with their marriage. This factor may indeed provide an explanation regarding the higher
distress levels found among women because wives tend to report higher levels of dissatisfaction with their marriage than do husbands (Renne, 1970). And, women's satisfaction with their marriage has also been shown to inhibit psychological distress (Pearlin, 1975; Schafer and Keith, 1980; Ross et al., 1983a).

Research examining the relationship between various factors and psychological distress among women has for the most part used Anglo (Kessler and McRae, 1982; Warr and Parry, 1982) or racially-mixed (Krause, 1982, 1984; Roberts et al., 1982; Ross et al., 1983a) samples. Krause and Markides (1985) noted the scarcity of research examining psychological distress among Chicanas--female members of Chicanos (males as well as all persons of Mexican descent). Chicanos constitute the second largest minority group in the U.S., with about 8.7 million persons or 3.8% of the U.S. total in 1980 (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1983).

The need for research studying psychological well-being among this population is timely since Chicanas are currently experiencing a number of changes similar to those observed among their Anglo counterparts. For example, the 1980 U.S. census (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1983) revealed that 49% of Chicanas 16 and older were in the labor force. Moreover, many Chicanas, particularly younger ones, are challenging traditional roles. Mirande (1977) observed that traditional Chicano-Chicana sex-role differentiations are currently undergoing transformations, especially among the younger and more educated segment of this group. Furthermore, there is reason to believe that these sex-role changes may lead to higher levels of distress for Chicanas than for Anglo women. Indeed, Chicanas have been called a triple minority (Mirande and Enriquez, 1979); in
essence, Chicanas possess three minority statuses—sex, ethnicity itself, and they are members of a group that has traditionally subjugated women in the family more intensely than other groups. Illustratively, the Report of the President's Commission on Mental Health (1978:936) noted the dilemma that Hispanic women--of which Chicanas represent a subgroup--face as a result of experiencing social change in women's roles in the Hispanic culture.

Hispanic women constitute a subpopulation that is at high risk with respect to emotional problems. They are in double jeopardy by virtue of being both women and members of an ethnic minority. Traditional Hispanic values concerning sex-role differentiation are centuries old and are often in sharp contrast with the current rapid social changes taking place in American society. The resulting value conflicts make Hispanic women (the young, in particular) highly vulnerable to emotional distress and illness.

The commission also warned that Hispanic women are likely to experience higher distress levels in going through the acculturation process than men. This admonition is consistent with Mirande and Enriquez's (1979) assertion that Chicanas have largely been delegated the task of teaching their children Mexican culture and values. Because of this dependency on Chicanas to socialize their children, Chicano society may think of these women as "sell outs" when they marry someone from another group (particularly Anglos) because they are seen as leaving the group; Chicanos marrying outside of their group are not viewed as betraying one's group to the same degree since their wives are usually brought into the Chicano group through the non-Chicana spouse taking a Spanish surname.

Thus, it should be apparent that in studying psychological distress among this group, the degree to which Chicanas are integrated into Mexican culture must be examined. Integration into Mexican culture has been observed to help individuals deal with daily life in a foreign and
oppressive society (Staples, 1971; Baca Zinn, 1975; Mirande, 1977; Keefe et al., 1979; Mirande and Enriquez, 1979). Research has demonstrated that individuals who are highly integrated into Mexican culture (Ross et al., 1983a; Ortiz and Arce, 1984), as well as those embracing characteristics of both Mexican and American culture (Ortiz and Arce, 1984), report more favorable mental health, but Chicanas integrated into Mexican culture also have been observed to suffer higher levels of distress than their male counterparts (Ortiz, 1985).

Consequently, this dissertation seeks to examine psychological distress among Chicanas using data from a national probability sample of Chicanos. Following the guidance of the literature, it is hypothesized that Chicanas holding less traditional roles, those less integrated into Mexican culture, and those having more positive relationships with their husbands experience lower levels of psychological distress. This research project differs from previous efforts in the study of psychological well-being and women's changing roles in that it seeks to establish a causal priority regarding the effect of these factors on distress; the amount of housework the husband performs and marital satisfaction will be examined as mediating between structural and cultural variables and psychological distress. In addition, this investigation examines role-stress theory in a non-Anglo population. Furthermore, since the data come from a national sample, this effort should present a broader picture than has research that has tended to examine psychological distress among Chicanas in community settings (e.g., Ross et al., 1983a).

The results of this dissertation also have practical applications. For example, practitioners such as social workers and psychologists may
help their clients deal with psychological distress by knowing factors that inhibit this condition. Indeed, if Chicanas holding less traditional roles experience lower levels of distress, as do their Anglo counterparts, then practitioners, as well as policymakers, could develop programs to help women make transitions to less traditional activities. Similarly, high-risk subgroups of Chicanas likely to undergo psychological discomfort may be identified and corrective actions can subsequently be implemented. Furthermore, the findings should help mental-health practitioners in understanding the role of Mexican culture in the psychological well-being of Chicanas.

Chapter II will review research endeavors that have examined the relationship between various structural, cultural, social-psychological factors, and psychological distress among women. In Chapter III, the procedures and statistical techniques used in examining the data on psychological distress among Chicanas will be discussed. The findings will be presented in Chapter IV, while Chapter V will discuss the applications and implications of the results concerning the effects of traditional roles and marital satisfaction on the psychological well-being of Chicanas.
CHAPTER II.
LITERATURE REVIEW

Married women have experienced higher levels of distress than married men (Gove and Tudor, 1973; Pearl, 1975; Radloff, 1975). Several researchers have postulated that this discrepancy is due to the changing roles of women in our society (Gove and Tudor, 1973; Gove and Geerken, 1977). This perspective basically argues that women holding traditional roles, which have become associated with low prestige, are likely to experience higher levels of distress than women who have made the transition to more contemporary roles and, thus, meet society’s expectations more effectively.

Theoretical Perspective

People occupy different positions in the social structure. The occupants of these positions have roles that specify the behavior expected from individuals holding these statuses in a particular society. Gove and his colleagues (Gove and Tudor, 1973; Gove and Geerken, 1977) have asserted that societal changes such as the transformation from a traditional to an industrial society have resulted in married women experiencing higher psychological distress than married men. In preindustrial society, the role of women primarily consisted of having children, childrearing, and housekeeping. During this time, people were mainly involved in agricultural activities. The family was considered a self-production unit in this type of society. A large family was viewed as a blessing since a high number of hands meant more workers were available to help with farm
chores. Consequently, women’s roles were largely seen as important because of their significant function in the maintenance of the family (Gove, 1972).

These roles changed as the Industrial Revolution made its way into Western societies, however. This revolution changed the workplace from homes to factories, which were located in the urban centers. This transformation resulted in massive urbanization, as large numbers of agricultural workers moved to the cities. It soon became apparent that in this new type of society, children no longer possessed the value that they had in agricultural areas (Zopf, 1984); this was intensified with the enactment of legislation forbidding the use of child labor. These societal and demographic changes revolutionized the role of women. Women were no longer needed to the same degree in maintaining the family because large families were no longer viewed as functional and the time and skills required for housekeeping gradually decreased (Gove, 1972). Indeed, childrearing and housekeeping activities were soon accorded low prestige.

Postindustrial society and the advent of the Women’s Movement have seen increasing proportions of women entering the labor force and attaining higher levels of education. But, traditional household activities, which are undertaken mostly by women, continue to be associated with low prestige.

Gove and his associates have further noted that women holding less traditional roles should experience lower distress levels than their more traditional counterparts. Gove and his colleagues pointed out that several factors associated with traditional roles are the breeding grounds for psychological distress. First, employed men and women possess two roles as sources of gratification--work and family. When these individuals
encounter problems adequately fulfilling one of these roles, they may concentrate their efforts on the other role. For example, a woman experiencing problems in the homefront may shift her efforts to her job; consequently, she may spend increasing amounts of time in her workplace, concentrating on her work rather than on problems at home. In contrast, the housewife has only a single source of gratification--the family. The housewife lacks the alternative outlet that her employed peers enjoy when they experience problems.

Second, Gove and his associates suggest that housework is frustrating and is accorded low prestige in our society. Indeed, the position of housewife has very few requirements for entrance. For instance, a woman—or man, for that matter—does not need a certain level of education to perform housework duties. Additionally, Oakley (1974b) indicated that the low status associated with this kind of activity had resulted in housework being considered social triviality. Glazer (1977) also noted that housework has never been defined as work because of its nonmonetary status. In addition, because women are increasingly attaining higher levels of education, the housewife role is likely to be incongruent with women's educational and intellectual attainment levels.

Finally, the role of the housewife is unstructured and invisible (Gove and Tudor, 1973). These attributes of the role permit the housewife to contemplate problems bothering her. In contrast, the more structured and visible setting of employed individuals results in a certain level of work performance. And, the work setting also may distract the individual from mulling over problems facing her or him. Moreover, the isolated nature of housekeeping means that some women may not have the daily social contact
that employed persons may have in their work environment.

Two propositions—that industrial and postindustrial societies accord low prestige to the role of housewife and that, subsequently, women holding only this position experience high levels of psychological distress—are evident in the material reviewed. Role stress theory used by Gove and his associates can be used to explain these positions (Gove and Tudor, 1972; Gove and Geerken, 1977). According to role theorists (e.g., Merton, 1957; Goode, 1960), role strain is produced when individuals acquire increasing numbers of roles and role partners. For instance, the working woman increases her roles by having role partners outside of the home who make demands on her. Nevertheless, recent research (e.g., Sieber, 1974; Gove and Geerken, 1977; Thoits, 1983) has discovered that the accumulation of roles presents the role occupant with numerous benefits that may outweigh the strain associated with their acquisition. For instance, the individual's attainment of a new role may lead to role privileges, whereby a person acquires rights or power that can be used in performing other roles. The new roles also may provide the role occupant with increasing levels of self-esteem and self-worth through her or his perception of being needed by a number of role partners. Hence, the individual having a number of roles may attain benefits that help her or him deal effectively with strain when it does occur.

The acquisition of these benefits is important when we begin examining the role bargaining that takes place between role partners. Goode (1960) asserted that individuals attempt to reduce their role strain in a manner similar to that found in the economic market, where goods and services are exchanged. Individuals are seen as seeking to maximize their rewards in
this exchange situation with their role partners. However, structural elements limit the degree to which an individual can obtain a favorable outcome in the exchange. For instance, individuals possessing few resources (e.g., economic) are not as likely to extract as much from their role partners as are people having more resources at their disposal. At this point, the benefits acquired from the accumulation of roles enter the picture. These benefits can be used in the exchange relationship to obtain services from one's role partner.

This theoretical perspective can be applied to the examination of women in postindustrial society. Less traditional women, such as those employed outside of the home and those having high levels of education, are likely to obtain more favorable outcomes in their negotiations, or role bargains, with their husbands for help with low prestigious household activities than their more traditional peers. Indeed, less traditional women are likely to possess resources acquired from their roles outside of the home that can be used as bargaining chips on the negotiation table. For example, a man with an employed spouse has the benefits of having two paychecks in the family; he may opt for helping his wife perform housekeeping activities if she threatens to quit her job. Consequently, less traditional women are likely to attain more help from their husbands with household activities.

In turn, this less traditional relationship between the husband and wife in the performance of housework is likely to increase the woman's satisfaction with her husband. Indeed, women who receive help from their spouses in these activities are likely to perceive their marital relationship more favorably since they are not solely relegated to the less
prestigious housekeeping activities. In contrast, women who are the sole performers of these chores are likely to feel more frustrated with their husbands for not lending a hand. Even employed women, being less traditional, may experience marital dissatisfaction if they do not receive help from their spouses; for example, an employed woman who has sole responsibility in the housekeeping sphere is likely to feel frustrated with her husband since she in essence is performing two jobs—inside and outside the home—and has failed to attain a favorable outcome in negotiating with her husband regarding these chores.

Finally, marital satisfaction and nontraditional housework performance, along with structural and cultural factors, are likely to influence women's psychological distress levels. Women having less traditional roles, those receiving more help from their husbands with housekeeping activities, and those who report higher levels of satisfaction with their husbands are likely to report more positive mental well-being than women in more traditional roles, those obtaining less help from their spouses, and those experiencing higher levels of dissatisfaction with their husbands.

Comments from the Literature

This theoretical perspective can also be used in examining Chicanas. The literature points to several structural and cultural factors that are likely to influence nontraditional housework roles, marital satisfaction, and psychological distress (Figure 2.1). For example, employment status, children in the household, education, and age have been found to be related to nontraditional housework performance. In addition, integration into
Figure 2.1. Variables and causal ordering suggested by the literature to explain psychological distress
Mexican culture is likely to exert an influence on the degree to which Chicanas receive help from their husbands in the performance of housekeeping. Furthermore, the structural variables and the amount of housework the husband performs have been observed to have an effect on marital satisfaction. Moreover, these structural and cultural factors along with a more nontraditional housework division of labor and marital satisfaction have been shown to influence psychological well-being among this group of women.

**Structural factors and nontraditional housework performance**

Although women, even when employed outside of the home, continue performing most of the housework (Huber and Spitze, 1983), several factors have been related to the amount of work the husband performs in the house. For the most part, less traditional women tend to receive more help from their spouses than their more traditional peers.

Research suggests that women's employment outside of the home is related to a more equitable division of labor within the home. Some researchers have found that the wife's employment increases the amount of time the husband devotes to housework (Blood and Wolfe, 1960; Blood, 1963; Heer, 1963; Buric and Zelevic, 1967; Safilios-Rothschild, 1969; Scanzoni, 1970; Epstein, 1971; Holmstrom, 1972; Young and Willmott, 1973; Bahr, 1974; Layne and Lowe, 1977; Pleck, 1979), child care (Bird et al., 1984), and decision making (Rodman, 1972; Scanzoni, 1979). Wolfe (1959) argued that working women acquire financial and intellectual resources from their employment which make them less dependent on their husbands. These resources then influence more equitable conditions in the home. After
studying married couples in Philadelphia, Ericksen et al. (1979) concluded that husbands were more likely to share in housework activities if the wife was employed full-time than if she was only working part-time or not at all. Similarly, Perrucci et al. (1978) found that husbands whose wives were not employed performed fewer household activities than those whose wives were employed. In addition, Bird et al. (1984) discovered that husbands whose wives were employed were more likely to share in child care, housekeeping, and meal preparation than those with unemployed wives in a study of married college administrators. Furthermore, Huber and Spitze (1983) observed that women's employment status was positively related to their perception of husband's housework activities in a national probability sample of couples.

Such findings also have been demonstrated among Chicanos. For example, Hawkes and Taylor's (1975) study of Chicano farm workers found that working wives were more likely to have egalitarian relationships with their husbands in household activities and decision making than their nonemployed peers. In an intensive observational study of eight Chicano families in New Mexico, Baca Zinn (1980) noted that women's labor-force status contributed to greater egalitarianism in housework and decision making.

But, other researchers examining various racial and ethnic groups have discovered that women's labor-force participation is not necessarily related to egalitarianism in housework (Walker, 1970; Oakley, 1974a; Bryson et al., 1976; Walker and Woods, 1976; Robinson, 1977; Stafford et al., 1977; Berk and Berk, 1979), child care (Krause and Markides, 1985), and decision making (Huber and Spitze, 1983).
The evidence is inconclusive on whether the number of children in the household is positively related to the amount of housework the husband performs. Several researchers have demonstrated that husbands whose wives are employed outside of the home devote more time to household chores when an infant is present (Szalai et al., 1973; Szalai, 1975; Berk and Berk, 1979). Similarly, others have discovered that the amount of help rendered by the husband is positively related to both the presence and the number of children in the home (Campbell, 1970; Farkas, 1976). Still others (Layne and Lowe, 1977) have observed that as the number of children in the household increases, the parents reallocate housework chores to older children but not to each other. Perrucci et al. (1978) discovered that the number of children living in the home was negatively associated with the husband's household activities, contrary to their prediction. The literature failed to include any studies examining this relationship among Chicanos, unfortunately. Nevertheless, some indirect evidence suggests that an increase in the number of children at home is likely to result in the delegation of household activities to the children (Alvirez et al., 1981). Alvirez and his colleagues pointed out that Chicanos are taught to take responsibilities early in their lives and this is likely to be evident in the performance of chores around the home.

Socioeconomic and demographic variables also have been examined in relation to the degree to which husbands help with housework chores. Education has been observed to positively influence the amount of housework the husband does (Iglehart, 1980). For example, Ericksen et al. (1979) found a positive relationship between wife's education and the degree to which she receives help from her husband in housework and child care.
activities. Huber and Spitze (1983) discovered that the wife's education was positively associated with her perception of her husband's housework performance. This relationship has also been observed in Mexico (Cromwell et al., 1973) and in Puerto Rico (Weller, 1968). In contrast, Perrucci et al. (1978) discovered a negative relationship between wife's education and husband's family role performance, although these researchers did not limit activities to those typically assigned to women (e.g., washing dishes), but included chores generally performed by men (e.g., car repair). Finally, Richmond (1976) found no relationship between decision making and wife's education among Cubans in the U.S.

Age is likely to exert a negative influence on nontraditional housework performance, although the evidence is indirect. Older women have consistently been observed to hold more traditional attitudes regarding sex roles (Mason et al., 1976; Tickamyer, 1979; Townsend and Gurin, 1981). These attitudes, in turn, are likely to negatively influence the degree to which women have equitable relationships with their husbands in housework and decision-making activities.

**Ethnic integration and nontraditional housework performance**

Before examining the literature on the relationship between ethnic integration and nontraditional housework performance, a discussion of the importance of Mexican culture in Chicano life is in order. Chicanos today represent one of the ethnic groups that for the most part have failed to assimilate into U.S. Anglo society. Several social and demographic factors are responsible for this fact. The proximity of Mexico to Chicanos has been largely influential in the continued adherence to Mexican culture.
among members of this group (Mirande, 1977). This nearness to Mexico has resulted in heavy interaction back and forth across the border among both Chicanos and Mexicans. In addition, large numbers of Mexicans continue to immigrate, both legally and illegally, to the U.S.

Furthermore, Chicanos have historically been concentrated in the Southwest (Arizona, California, Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas). Indeed, according to the U.S. Bureau of the Census (1983), approximately 83% of the Mexican-origin population in this country was living in these states in 1980. Consequently, these factors facilitate the heavy interaction between people from both sides of the border and help in the Chicanos' maintenance of Mexican culture and the Spanish language. Alvarez (1973) asserted that European immigrants would have had more difficulty shedding their culture and language if they would not have had to cross an ocean to arrive in the U.S.

Early research on the Chicano family indicated that Mexican culture socialized women to be submissive, self-abnegating, and to place the highest priority on motherhood; in contrast, men were socialized to be superior, dominant, and promiscuous (Humphrey, 1944; Jones, 1948; Penalosa, 1968; Diaz-Guerrero, 1975). Many of these investigations were highly speculative and failed to provide any empirical substance to their arguments. More recent research has been highly critical of the methodological procedures and assumptions used by early researchers (Padilla and Ruiz, 1973; Nieto Senor, 1977; Cromwell and Ruiz, 1979; Andrade, 1980, 1982; Vasquez and Gonzalez, 1981; Zapata and Jaramillo, 1981).

Although most recent investigators have been critical of their earlier
counterparts for overemphasizing male dominance and female submissiveness, Ortiz (1985) pointed out that acknowledgement exists regarding the continued presence of traditional sex-role values among Chicanos. Alvirez et al. (1981) painted the socialization of the Chicana in the traditional Chicana family, stressing that this was an ideal image and was not representative of all families. These authors noted that the Chicanita (young Chicana) begins learning her role early in life. The young girl is granted much less freedom than her brothers and starts playing the role of mother and homemaker by helping the mother perform household chores and caring for younger siblings. As an adolescent, she is chaperoned and protected from suitors. Finally, when she marries, she is ready to perform the same role fulfilled by her mother. Similarly, Limon (1980) examined the socialization significance of the girls’ folkgame, "La Vieja Inez" ("Old Inez"), found in Mexican culture. Limon noted that the game teaches girls the appropriate role of mother by transmitting the following information: the home is safe, leaving the home leads to danger, and all girls grow up and leave the protective presence of the mother to become mothers themselves.

Changes in sex roles are occurring in the sex-role division of labor among Chicano males and females, however (Baca Zinn, 1980; Ybarra, 1982). Grebler et al. (1970) argued that changes in work situations, exposure to changing values regarding sex roles, and higher levels of living have led to the transformation of sex roles among Chicanos. Mirande and Enriquez (1979) partially credited the recent awareness among Chicanas regarding their subordinate position and their subsequent demands for altering these roles. Nevertheless, these authors suggested that some of the oppression
Chicanas experience today comes from aspects of Mexican culture. They argue that norms within this culture continue to relegate Chicanas to domestic or menial positions. This is best exemplified by the role generally assigned to women within the Chicano Movement, where they primarily served expression-oriented functions and prepared food during gatherings.

Although early studies (Madsen, 1964; Rubel, 1966; Tharp et al., 1968) suggested that acculturation influenced egalitarianism in the Chicano family, more recent investigations (Grebler et al., 1970; Hawkes and Taylor, 1975; Cromwell and Cromwell, 1978; Baca Zinn, 1980) have indicated that acculturation level is not related to equitable sex-role activities among Chicanos. Several researchers have observed that egalitarianism in household chores and decision making predominates among Chicano families (Cromwell and Ruiz, 1979; Staples and Mirande, 1980). In addition, Baca Zinn (1980) noted that although egalitarianism was the common form of sex-role distribution among couples, families continued adhering to Mexican culture. Hawkes and Taylor (1975) found no association between these two variables and Ybarra (1982) demonstrated that assimilation was not related to egalitarianism in household chores and childrearing practices among Chicano spouses. Similar findings have been reported among Cubans in the U.S. (Richmond, 1976).

Although these studies have demonstrated that egalitarianism pervades in the Chicano family, most researchers have only used simple measures of acculturation (e.g., Ybarra, 1982); indeed, Chicanos are commonly divided into two groups (high and low) regarding their level of acculturation using language and citizenship variables. Wider variability of this measurement
may reveal different findings. In addition, bivariate relationships have generally been used to examine the association between acculturation and egalitarianism (e.g., Hawkes and Taylor, 1975; Ybarra, 1982). More sophisticated statistical techniques utilizing a multivariate framework may produce different results. Moreover, the samples used in examining this association have been relatively small. For instance, Baca Zinn (1980) study consisted of observing eight Chicano families in New Mexico. Similarly, Hawke and Taylor's (1975) investigation examined one occupational group--farm workers. And, Ybarra's study examined couples in a city in California. It is likely that a multivariate analysis using an ethnic integration scale with a wider variability examining a national sample of Chicanos may reveal that women more integrated into Mexican culture will have lower levels of egalitarian sex-role activities than their less integrated peers, although both sets of women may live in predominantly egalitarian households as these researchers have suggested. Recent indirect evidence suggests this to be the case; Ortiz and Cooney (1984), using data from the youth cohort of the National Longitudinal Surveys, observed that first-generation Hispanic females, supposedly highly integrated into Hispanic culture, reported more traditional sex-role attitudes than did second- and third-generation Chicanas and Anglos. And, it has been suggested that sex-role attitudes influence sex-role behavior (Stafford et al., 1977; Clark et al., 1978; Scanzoni, 1978; Huber and Spitze, 1983).
Structural factors and marital satisfaction

The literature also suggests that several factors influence marital satisfaction. The relationship between wives' labor-force participation and marital satisfaction is unclear (Gove and Peterson, 1980). Some researchers (Campbell et al., 1976; Glenn and Weaver, 1978) analyzing national surveys have observed that wives' employment status has very little effect on their level of satisfaction with their marriage. In contrast, Burke and Weir (1976) discovered that employed wives of professional husbands reported higher levels of satisfaction with their marriage than did housewives. Several other investigations have discovered a negative association between wives' labor-force participation and marital satisfaction, particularly among lower-class respondents (Nye and Hoffman, 1963). This relationship has been observed among Chicanos. For example, Bean et al. (1977), studying Chicano couples in Austin, Texas, found that both husbands and wives reported higher levels of affective satisfaction with their marriage when the wife was not working. Moreover, Ross et al. (1983a) revealed that the wife's employment status was negatively associated with both the husband's and wife's level of satisfaction with their marriage among Anglos, Mexicans, and Mexican Americans.

The presence and number of children in the household has been observed to be negatively related to marital satisfaction among couples (Figley, 1973; Ryder, 1973; Miller, 1975, 1976; Nevill and Damico, 1975; Campbell et al., 1976; Houseknecht, 1979; Veevers, 1979; Sollie and Miller, 1980; Glenn and McLanahan, 1982). Indeed, several researchers argue that increasing family size is associated with a decrease in the amount of time couples spend together and this, in turn, may influence marital satisfaction.
(Luckey and Bain, 1970; Houseknecht, 1979; Feldman, 1981; Abbott and Brody, 1985). Glenn and Weaver (1978) discovered that the presence of children under six years of age resulted in lower levels of satisfaction among Anglo women. In addition, Bean et al. (1977) observed that both Chicano husbands and wives reported greater affective satisfaction with their marriage when fewer children lived in the home.

The association between age and marital satisfaction is not clear. For instance, a number of researchers have discovered a curvilinear relationship between these two variables, with high levels of satisfaction occurring in the early years of marriage and during the late middle age years (Burr, 1970; Rollins and Feldman, 1970; Stinnet et al., 1972; Rollins and Cannon, 1974; Spanier et al., 1975; Anderson et al., 1983). It has been suggested that the decrease in marital satisfaction during the middle stages is possibly due to the stress associated with raising children and the responsibilities that people have to aging parents during this period (Markides and Hoppe, 1985). The rising level of marital satisfaction later has been believed to be due to a strain toward consistency (Kerckhoff, 1966), whereby the longer a couple lives together the more likely they are to develop shared values and world views which are conducive to a happy marriage. Schafer and Keith (1981) pointed out that couples tend to experience a feeling of "we-ness" as the marital relationship matures. In their study of Chicano couples, Bean et al. (1977) found a positive relationship between age and affective marital satisfaction among both husbands and wives. In contrast, Markides and Hoppe (1985), examining three generations of Chicanas, observed successively decreasing levels of satisfaction from younger to older generations.
Finally, education has been shown to have a positive effect on marital satisfaction (Blood and Wolfe, 1960). For instance, Ross et al. (1983a) found that more educated Anglos, Mexicans, and Mexican Americans tended to report higher levels of satisfaction with their marriage than their less educated counterparts.

**Ethnic integration, nontraditional housework performance, and marital satisfaction**

Examination of the literature failed to reveal any study examining the relationship between ethnic integration and marital satisfaction among Chicanos. Perhaps ethnic integration does not have a direct effect on marital satisfaction, but only an indirect one via the amount of housework that a husband does. Indeed, research has consistently demonstrated that egalitarianism in the family is positively related to marital satisfaction (Scanzoni, 1970). The sharing of housekeeping and decision making between husbands and wives is likely to lead to a more harmonious relationship between them since one is not subordinate to the other in this sphere. For instance, Blood and Wolfe (1960) observed that Detroit couples reported higher levels of marital satisfaction when the housework activities were done on an equitable basis. Centers et al. (1971), examining data from a sample of Los Angeles husbands and wives, discovered a positive relationship between egalitarianism and marital satisfaction. Also, Bean et al. (1977) found that Chicano husbands and wives indicated higher levels of satisfaction with their marriage when decisions were made in an egalitarian manner.
Structural factors and psychological distress

Research concerned with the effects of women's labor-force participation and psychological distress initially limited itself to the comparison of psychological well-being among working women and housewives (Krause and Märkides, 1985). Although the findings are not consistent (Pearlin, 1975; Wright, 1978; Northcutt, 1980; Cleary and Mechanic, 1983; Rendely et al., 1984), research suggests that for the most part working women experience lower levels of psychological distress than do housewives (Bart, 1970; National Center for Health Statistics, 1970; Birnbaum, 1975; Cumming et al., 1975; Radloff, 1975; Ferree, 1976a, 1976b; Gove and Geerken, 1977; Welsch and Booth, 1977; Haw, 1982; Krause, 1982; Tebbets, 1982; Warr and Parry, 1982; Ross et al., 1983a). For example, after studying psychiatric records, Gove and Geerken (1977) observed that working wives possessed fewer psychological symptoms than did housewives. In addition, Ferree (1976a, 1976b) examined the self-images of working-class women and found that those who held jobs reported higher levels of overall satisfaction with their lives than did their unemployed counterparts. Furthermore, Krause (1982) discovered that housewives in a city in Ohio were more likely than employed wives to suffer from a variety of psychological symptoms, largely because of conflicting sex-role expectations between themselves and their husbands. Also, Warr and Parry (1982) reported that the positive relationship between work and psychological well-being was of greatest strength among single and working-class women.

The relationship between labor-force status and psychological distress also has been observed among Chicanas. Ross et al. (1983a) examined Anglo,
Mexican, and Mexican American women in twin border cities, one in the United States and the other in Mexico; they noted that employed women in each group reported lower levels of psychological distress. In addition, Roberts and Roberts (1982) observed that employed Chicanas reported fewer depressive symptoms than did housewives. But, Krause and Markides (1985) found that work exhibited a significantly positive effect on women's psychological well-being only among divorced and separated Chicanas in one Texas city.

Research has increasingly turned to the examination of home-related factors in attempts to explain psychological distress. Several investigators have demonstrated that the presence of children in the household has a negative effect on the psychological well-being of women (Pearlin, 1975; Radloff, 1975; Gove and Geerken, 1977; Kessler and McRae, 1981; Veroff et al., 1981). Radloff (1975) demonstrated that regardless of employment status, women having children less than six years of age were particularly likely to suffer from psychological distress. Similarly, Krause and Markides (1985) discovered that divorced and separated Chicanas in San Antonio with children of these ages experienced lower levels of psychological well-being than those not having children in this age group; however, they failed to observe this relationship among married women. Also, Kandel et al. (1985) found a positive association between the number of children living at home and depression among women living in the New York City metropolitan area.

Furthermore, childless individuals have been shown to rate themselves in equal or better mental health in comparison with people who have children (Veevers, 1979). Huber and Spitze (1983) noted that childless
adults generally report higher levels of life satisfaction and psychological well-being than do those having children. However, Gove and Geerken (1977) discovered that after approximately seven years of marriage, childless couples experience lower levels of mental health. Finally, while the empty-nest period may be thought to result in a negative relationship between the presence of children and psychological discomfort because this period is commonly associated with distress, empirical research (Deutscher, 1964, 1969; Clausen, 1972; Rollins and Cannon, 1974; Glenn, 1975; Harkins, 1978) has demonstrated that women in this stage do not find their lives empty or meaningless; nevertheless, this period is still traumatic for some women (Peterson, 1968).

Several studies have failed to support the negative relationship between children in the home and mental well-being, however. For example, Ross et al. (1983a) observed that the presence of children in the household did not have an effect on the psychological well-being of Anglo, Mexican, and Mexican American women in the El Paso/Ciudad Juarez area. Similarly, in a sample of married women in Akron, Ohio, Krause (1982) found no relationship between children and psychological distress.

The relationship between age and psychological distress is not clear, although the majority of the evidence appears to point to a negative association between the variables. For example, Radloff (1975) reported that women less than 25 years of age were more likely to experience depression than older women. In addition, Vega et al. (1984) observed a negative relationship between age and psychological distress among Anglos and Chicanos in a California county, although this association was only significant for the former group. Similarly, Ross et al. (1983c) found
that older individuals were less likely to experience psychological distress than their younger neighbors in the El Paso/Ciudad Juarez area. Other researchers have discovered a curvilinear relationship between the two variables (Gaitz and Scott, 1972). For instance, Quesada et al. (1978) found that younger and older blacks and Chicanos in a southwestern city experienced a high incidence of depression, while middle age members of these groups reported lower levels, although this association was more intense among blacks due to a higher incidence of depression among blacks 60 and older. When Quesada et al. examined the relationship between age and depression in a multivariate framework, however, they observed a significantly positive association between the two variables, although it was not significant among Chicanos. Others also have failed to find a relationship between age and mental well-being (Mirowsky and Ross, 1980; Kandel et al., 1985).

Researchers have consistently discovered a negative relationship between education and psychological distress (Levitt and Lubin, 1975). For example, Kandel et al. (1985) demonstrated that more educated women in New York City were less likely to experience depression than their less educated peers. Vega et al. (1984) found identical results among Anglos and both English- and Spanish-speaking Chicanos in a California county. Similarly, Quesada et al. (1978) found an inverse relationship between education and depression among blacks and Chicanos in a southwestern city. Finally, Mirowsky and Ross (1980), working with data from two surveys (New Hampshire and El Paso/Ciudad Juarez), found that low education was distressful for Anglos and blacks but not for Chicanos.
Ethnic integration and psychological distress

It has been suggested that an individual's culture may have positive as well as negative consequences for mental well-being. On the one hand, culture can protect the individual member from stress by providing meaning and coherence to the daily life of the person (Helman, 1984). Baca Zinn (1975) noted that Chicanos' adherence to Mexican culture and reliance on the family have served to protect members of this group from problems encountered in interacting with the larger Anglo society. These factors helped individuals deal with stressful situations more effectively than if they were isolated from their culture.

The culture may also contribute to the prevalence of distress among individuals adhering to the cultural values and norms, however. Indeed, it has been suggested that differential treatment of women in the Mexican and other Hispanic cultures may prove stressful to them (Ortiz, 1985). And, evidence exists suggesting that Chicanas integrated into Mexican culture experience higher psychological distress levels. For example, Ortiz (1985) found that integration into Mexican culture was beneficial to the mental well-being of men but not of women. By the same token, it has been demonstrated that Chicanos, particularly women, acculturated into Anglo society report higher levels of mental health; Ortiz and Arce (1984) argued that unacculturated Chicanos are likely to experience higher levels of stress than their more acculturated peers because the former are more likely to encounter stressful situations such as low socioeconomic status, immigration status, language barriers, and discrimination. Indeed, Vega et al. (1984) found that Chicanos interviewed in Spanish and having low levels of English proficiency and education--thus, supposedly less
acculturated—reported more psychological symptoms than Anglos and Chicanos interviewed in English in a California county. Also, Fabrega (1970) found that Chicano outpatients who had low levels of acculturation experienced more severe mental health than those with higher acculturation levels.

This positive relationship between ethnic integration and psychological distress has also been observed among other Hispanic groups. Torres-Matrullo (1976) observed that more acculturated mainland Puerto Rican women reported more positive mental health than less acculturated women; several years later, she (1980) failed to find this relationship among Puerto Rican males. Similarly, Szapocznik and Kurtines (1980), studying psychological distress among Cuban mothers and sons, discovered that acculturation led to lower levels of distress among mothers but higher levels among their sons.

But, other researchers have found a curvilinear relationship between acculturation and psychological distress. For example, Fabrega and Wallace (1968) observed that Chicano psychiatric patients were more likely to be in a middle position between "acculturated" and "traditional" than their non-patient peers who tended to be in one of the polar positions. Conversely, Ortiz and Arce (1984) found the opposite curvilinear association. These researchers discovered that bilingual Chicanos experienced more favorable psychological well-being than those speaking solely English or Spanish. Still others have failed to find any relationship between acculturation and mental well-being (Cuellar et al., 1981; Ross et al., 1983c).
Nontraditional housework performance and psychological distress

Several investigators have demonstrated that women whose husbands help with housework (Zur-Szpiro and Longfellow, 1982; Ross et al., 1983b; Krause and Markides, 1985) and child care (Kessler and McRae, 1982) tend to experience higher levels of psychological well-being than their peers who receive little or no help from their husbands. Indeed, Ross et al. (1983b) discovered that the amount of housework performed by the husband had a negative effect on the wife’s depression level, regardless of her labor-force status. In addition, women’s sex-role attitudes have been shown to be related to psychological distress; women attain psychological benefits from their employment when their jobs are consistent with their views regarding appropriate roles for women (Scanzoni and Fox, 1980; Kessler and McRae, 1982; Krause and Markides, 1985), although Krause (1982, 1984) reported that not only must a woman’s sex-role orientation be consistent with her work, but that her husband must also share similar attitudes.

Research also suggests that Hispanic women holding more traditional sex-role orientations are more likely to experience psychological distress than their less traditional peers. Soto and Shaver (1982) discovered a positive relationship between traditional sex-role attitudes and psychosomatic symptoms among Puerto Rican women. But, Markides and Vernon (1984) failed to observe any relationship between traditional sex-role attitudes and distress among Chicanas in San Antonio, Texas.

Marital satisfaction and psychological distress

The importance of marital satisfaction as a factor influencing psychological distress levels of women also has been addressed. Ross et
al. (1983a) noted that since women tend to report higher levels of marital
dissatisfaction than do men, this factor may provide information regarding
the discrepancy in distress levels between men and women. Indeed, research
has demonstrated that marital satisfaction decreases psychological distress
(Pearlin, 1975; Schafer and Keith, 1980). In addition, marital
satisfaction has been shown to be positively related to measures of overall
happiness (Bradburn, 1969; Campbell et al., 1976; Campbell, 1981).
Moreover, Ross et al. (1983a) found that Anglos, Mexicans, and Mexican
Americans reporting high degrees of satisfaction with their marriage
experienced lower levels of psychological distress.

The Model

Following the guidance of the literature, a model is proposed for
examining psychological stress among Chicanas (Figure 2.2). Five
variables--employment status, number of children in the home, ethnic
integration, age, and education--constitute the exogenous variables in the
model. Employment status and number of children in the household are
treated as exogenous variables because the literature is not clear
concerning the cause-effect structure of these variables (see Waite and
also constitutes an exogenous variable because the degree to which one
retains aspects of Mexican culture is largely influenced by experiences
during socialization. Furthermore, age and education are influenced by
factors outside of the model and are used as control variables. Three
variables--nontraditional housework performance, marital satisfaction, and
psychological distress--constitute the endogenous variables, with the
Figure 2.2 Hypothesized relationships between variables observed as important in explaining psychological distress in the literature review
latter being the ultimate dependent variable.

The exogenous variables are expected to affect the degree of nontraditional housework performance found in the family in different manners. For example, age, ethnic integration, and number of children in the household are predicted to be negatively related to the amount of housework the husband performs. Older Chicanas, those who are highly integrated into Mexican culture, and those who have more children living at home are likely to participate in more traditional housework. In contrast, employment outside of the home and education are expected to positively influence the degree of help the woman receives from her husband with housework. Working Chicanas and those possessing high levels of education are likely to acquire more help from their husbands because these women tend to possess more prestige and decision-making power and are likely to make more demands from their husbands.

In turn, nontraditional housework performance and the structural variables are predicted to influence marital satisfaction. It can be argued that older Chicanas, being generally more socially mature and better equipped to deal with marital problems confronting them, are likely to be more satisfied with their marriage. In addition, the literature suggests that women possessing higher levels of education tend to be happier with their marriage (Ross et al., 1983a); perhaps more educated women have learned more effective strategies for dealing with problems than their less educated peers. Also, women whose husbands help with housework are likely to feel more satisfied with their spouse than their counterparts who do not receive this help. On the other hand, women's employment has been observed to have a negative impact on marital satisfaction. This is particularly
likely to occur when women fail to obtain any help from their husbands in housework activities. But, the employed woman who can negotiate a better deal with her husband in the performance of these chores is likely to experience a more positive level of satisfaction with her spouse. Also, the number of children in the home has been shown to be negatively related to marital satisfaction. Indeed, children in the home--and employment for that matter--place demands on women that may decrease the time a couple spends together; this decline in companionship may reduce marital satisfaction. Moreover, it is expected that ethnic integration will not affect marital satisfaction directly, but only indirectly through nontraditional housework activities.

Finally, the amount of housework performed by the husband, marital satisfaction, and the exogenous variables are expected to influence psychological distress. Age, education, employment status, and nontraditional housework performance are hypothesized to decrease levels of psychological distress. The literature tends to demonstrate that older people and those possessing higher levels of education are likely to experience higher levels of mental well-being. It has been argued that employment for wives provides them with another source of gratification where they can seek refuge when problems burden them. This may lead working Chicanas to experience lower distress levels. In addition, Chicanas whose husbands provide more help with housework are likely to experience higher levels of mental well-being. On the other hand, number of children in the home and ethnic integration are hypothesized to be positively related to psychological distress. Indeed, the presence of children signifies that the woman, and to some degree the husband, must
look after them for their well-being. This creates distress since parents often worry about the well-being of their children at all stages of their children's life cycle (e.g., infant, child, teenager). And, of course, the higher the number of children that a woman must care for, the higher her distress level is likely to be. In addition, women adhering to Mexican culture, which continues to some degree to subordinate women, are likely to experience higher distress levels than their less traditional peers. Furthermore, women who report higher levels of marital satisfaction are predicted to experience lower levels of psychological distress. Of course, women facing marital disharmony are likely to worry about this problem and, thus, may experience lower psychological well-being than their counterparts who are more satisfied with their spouse.
CHAPTER III.
METHODS

Study Description

Data were available from the 1979 Chicano Survey to examine the proposed model. The survey was conducted by the Survey Research Center of the University of Michigan with the financial support of the National Institute of Mental Health and the Ford Foundation. The survey’s major purpose was to collect a statistically representative and comprehensive data set concerning the social, economic, and psychological status of Chicanos.

Sample

Interviews were conducted in a probability sample of Mexican ancestry households in five Southwestern states (Arizona, California, Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas) and in the Chicago metropolitan area. This coverage is estimated to include nearly 90% of the Mexican ancestry population that was present in the United States in 1979 (Arce, 1985). Mexican ancestry households were defined as those in which the primary provider, his or her spouse, or both, were at least of half Mexican ancestry. If only one of the spouses were eligible, that person was interviewed; if both were eligible, the respondent was randomly chosen. Nearly 11,000 households were screened to examine ancestry; of these, almost 1,300 were of Mexican descent and 991 interviews were completed. For a detailed description of the sampling design, see Arce and Santos (1982). Interviews occurred between February and September of 1979 and were conducted by a field staff
of 54 bilingual interviewers, with the interviews conducted in Spanish or English depending on the respondent's preference. The interview schedule numbered 210 pages, with questions in Spanish appearing on the left-hand side of the open booklet and questions in English on the right-hand side. This provided ease in switching to another language, if the respondent desired. The interviews took an average of three hours and twenty minutes to complete.

Only 402 women who were currently living with a spouse at the time of the interview are included in this analysis. Missing data lowered this total. Mean scores were imputed for missing data when only one indicator composed of at least three items appeared as missing. This procedure yielded the final sample of 372 cases; thus, a total of 30 cases had too much data missing to apply mean imputation.

Measures

Some variables included in the model were measured with single indicators, while multiple dimensions are reported for others. Several procedures were used to develop multiple indicators of concepts. Factor analysis was performed on items thought to measure some underlying construct. Items loading at least moderately (0.40) were chosen to constitute an indicator. In some cases, factor analysis demonstrated that only one factor existed, but one or more items did not load very heavily on that factor. In such a case, the item was kept if it made theoretical sense. In addition, the standardized item alpha was used to assess the reliability of the indicator. Cronbach (1951) pointed out that indicators having modest coefficients are not uninterpretable. Similarly, Nunnally
(1978) recommended that in exploratory research coefficients in the range of 0.70 or higher are accepted. This level (0.70) will be used to assess the reliability of the indicators in this analysis.

**Exogenous variables**

In the proposed model, five variables constitute exogenous variables, with the first four of these having only one indicator. The questions on the interview schedule used to gather information on the items used in the analysis can be found in Appendix A. In addition, summary statistics for all measures used in the analysis are provided in Table 3.1. Age is the respondent's age at last birthday. The average age for women in this sample is nearly 37. The number of years that the respondent attended school is called "education." The women had an average of 8.8 years of schooling. Number of children in the household includes only the number of children under 18 who live at home. An average of 2.3 children were found in the home's of the respondents. Employment status is defined by whether the respondent was employed outside of the home at the time of the interview. Women who were not employed were assigned a value of "0" on this variable, while employed women were assigned a "1." Nearly 36% (35.8%) of the women were employed.

Ethnic integration is measured by three sets of indicators. First, cultural preference refers to the degree to which respondents wish to engage in Mexican cultural activities. Respondents were asked to indicate the degree to which they would like to participate in five activities characteristic of Mexican culture: watching Spanish-language television programs, listening to Spanish-language radio programs, going to Mexican
Table 3.1. Ranges, means, and standard deviations for indicators used to measure the exogenous and endogenous variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment status</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural preference</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican contact</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish use</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nontraditional housework performance</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital harmony</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory communication</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological symptoms</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical symptoms</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^ This refers to the percentage of women who were employed at the time of the survey.
movies, going to performances by Mexican entertainers, and reading Spanish-language newspapers and magazines. One additional item asked respondents to indicate the degree to which they want their children to retain Mexican culture. Respondents expressed their desire for engaging in these activities along a four-point scale (1, not like it at all; 2, like it a little; 3, quite a bit; 4, like it very much). Factor analysis revealed that these six items loaded on only one factor (Table 3.2). In addition, the standardized item alpha coefficient is 0.75 and, thus, meets the criterion suggested by Nunnally (1978). The mean score on cultural preference is 18.1, indicating a relatively strong preference for Mexican culture.

Second, contact with Mexicans refers to the degree to which respondents interact with people of Mexican ancestry. The indicator consists of respondents' answers to two questions about the proportion of their friends and neighbors who are of Mexican descent. For each item, the respondent chose the proportion along a four-point scale (1, none; 2, few; 3, most; 4, all). Factor analysis suggested that the two items loaded on the same factor. Although the standardized item reliability was not as high as desired (0.65), the indicator has theoretical relevance since the amount of contact that a person has with persons of Mexican descent should influence the degree to which the person will be integrated into Mexican culture.

Third, the degree to which respondents speak Spanish to relatives and friends and its use in various situations is called "Spanish use." Respondents were asked to indicate the degree they used English and Spanish in speaking with their spouse, father, mother, siblings, children,
Table 3.2. Factor analysis and alpha coefficients for six latent variables measured with multiple indicators composed of multiple items (factor analysis was performed separately for each set of items composing the indicators)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator and Items</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural Preference</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish television</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish radio</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican movies</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican entertainers</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish newspapers/magazines</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children maintain Mexican culture</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized Item Alpha</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mexican Contact</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbors</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized Item Alpha</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spanish Use</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siblings</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussing intimate things</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When angry</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized Item Alpha</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nontraditional Housework Performance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dishes</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized Item Alpha</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.2. (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator and Items</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irritated/resentful</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk more</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arguments</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand better</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More aware</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standardized Item Alpha (Satisfactory Communication)</strong></td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standardized Item Alpha (Marital Harmony)</strong></td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Psychological Distress</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ill health</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortness of breath</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heart beating hard</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dizzy spells</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nightmares</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gained weight when troubled</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hands trembling</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hands sweating</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couldn’t get going</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drank alcohol when troubled</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Took medicines/drugs to relax</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ate too much when troubled</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trouble sleeping</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nervousness</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headaches</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of appetite when troubled</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upset stomach</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty getting up</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lose weight when troubled</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standardized Item Alpha**                     | 0.78     | 0.77    |          |
and friends; in discussing personal or intimate subjects, and when they were angry. Respondents indicated their language use in these situations along a five-point scale (1, English only; 2, mostly English; 3, both equally; 4, mostly Spanish; 5, Spanish only). Factor analysis demonstrated that the eight items loaded only on one factor with regard to the use of Spanish. Since some items were not applicable to certain respondents (e.g., women with no children), respondents’ scores on applicable items were summed and averaged, with higher scores representing a higher use of Spanish. The standardized item reliability for this indicator is relatively high (0.95). Ethnic integration, then, reflects the degree to which the respondent wishes to retain Mexican culture, has contact with persons representing Mexican culture, and the extent to which the person continues speaking Spanish.

**Endogenous variables**

Nontraditional housework performance was measured with four items summed as one indicator. Respondents were asked to indicate who generally did certain activities (cooking, laundry, washing dishes, shopping for groceries) and who did them when this person could not perform the chores. A nine-point scale ranging from traditional to nontraditional division of housework was developed using this information: 1, respondent performed the activity all of the time; 2, respondent performed the activity most of the time, but received help when she was unable from another person besides her husband; 3, respondent performed the activity most of the time, but received help from her husband; 4, another person besides her husband performed the activity most of the time, but she helped; 5, respondent
equally performed the chore with her husband, or someone besides herself and her husband performed the activity all of the time; 6, someone besides the respondent or her husband performed the chore most of the time, but the husband sometimes helps; 7, husband performed the activity most of the time, but received help from the wife at times; 8, husband performed the chore most of the time, but received help from someone besides his wife; and 9, husband performed the activity all of the time.

The scale essentially reflects the amount of work performed by one spouse, relative to his or her partner. Scores above five indicate that the husband is performing proportionately more of the housework than is his wife. Conversely, scores below five suggest that the wife is performing proportionately more of the work than is her husband. And, a score of five indicates that both partners are performing the same amount of work—either half or none. Hence, higher scores represent a more nontraditional housework division of labor, while lower scores suggest a more traditional setting. Factor analysis revealed that the four items constitute one factor, although the shopping item loads less heavily on the factor. The standardized item alpha is not as high as one would like to see (0.66). Summary statistics provided by the factor analysis programs suggests that the alpha coefficient would increase to 0.73 if the shopping item were deleted, but this requires a decision concerning whether we want to decrease the variability or not. The latter choice was made and the item was kept. In addition, Oakley (1974a) lists all of these items as components of the housework role.

Marital satisfaction was measured with two sets of items. The first set, satisfactory communication, reflects women's expressed positive
evaluation of their husbands' level of communication. Women were asked to respond to how often they wished their husbands talked more about what they think, understood them better, and were more aware of their needs along a four-point scale (1, many times; 2, sometimes; 3, hardly ever; 4, never). The second set, marital harmony, reflects the degree to which the woman has experienced a lack of conflict—explicitly or implicitly—with her husband. Women were asked to respond along the same scale as that used to measure the items forming the first set regarding how often they felt irritated or resentful with what their husband does or does not do and how often they have arguments. Factor analysis revealed that the items forming both sets load on one factor. The standardized item alpha for each indicator is approximately 0.75. Consequently, marital satisfaction reflects the degree to which women perceive that they have a harmonious relationship with their husbands, with higher scores indicating higher satisfaction.

Finally, psychological distress is measured using two sets of measures. Nineteen items from the Gurin scale (Gurin et al., 1960) related to psychological distress were included on the questionnaire. Respondents were asked to indicate how often they experienced these symptoms along a four-point scale (1, never; 2, hardly ever; 3, sometimes; 4, many times), with higher scores reflecting a higher degree of distress. Factor analysis revealed three factors among these items. Seven load on the first factor above 0.40 and load less heavily on the other two factors. These items include having nightmares, trouble getting to sleep or staying asleep, nervousness or feeling fidgety and tense, loss of appetite, upset stomach, difficulty getting up, and tendency to lose weight when something important is bothering the person. These items appear to tap a psychological symptom
factor and reflect the degree to which a person experiences psychological discomfort due to problems confronting the individual. Six items load on the second factor: ill health that affected the amount of work a person did, shortness of breath even when the person is not exercising or working hard, heart beating hard, dizzy spells, hands trembling enough to bother the individual, and the use of medicines or drugs to help the person when she feels tense, worried, or nervous. These items appear to tap a physical dimension of stress; this factor can be called physical symptoms and reflects the degree to which the respondent has experienced physical ailments or signs that may be due to problems confronting the individual. Although the presence of headaches loads moderately on the first two factors (0.41), the decision was made not to use the item because it failed to uniquely load on either the psychological or physical symptoms. Only two items--gained weight when something important is bothering the person and eaten too much when she feels tense, worried, or nervous load on the third factor; this factor is not used in the analysis. Consequently, two factors representing both psychological and physical symptoms of psychological distress were constructed. Since the two factors are moderately correlated \((r = 0.57)\), the factors are treated as two indicators of psychological distress.

**Statistical Analysis**

LISREL (Linear Structural Relationship) analysis will be used to estimate coefficients for the proposed model. Before discussing LISREL, however, path analysis will be examined to get a better appreciation of the advantages associated with the use of LISREL. Both of these techniques
share the use of structural equation models in which variables can appear as both independent and dependent variables in different structural equations depending on the causal ordering of the variables. In fact, the structural portion of LISREL is a path analytic procedure.

Path analysis

Path analysis was developed by Wright (1921). Path analysis is an ordinary-least-squares technique used to examine causal models formulated by researchers based upon previous research and theoretical considerations (Pedhazur, 1982). Wright (1934:193) pointed out that it is intended to combine the quantitative information given by the correlations with such qualitative information as may be at hand on causal relations to give a quantitative interpretation.

One of the advantages of using path analysis is that the researcher is forced to make explicit his or her theoretical reasoning and assumptions concerning the model (Pedhazur, 1982).

According to some observers, however, the use of path analysis has become a fad. For example, Miller and Stokes (1975:193) pointed out that "One even hears the wail that the widespread acceptance of the technique has worked to limit what will be published." Similarly, Coser (1975:692) added that "the editor of a major sociological journal, explained with some pride, no matter what the substantive merits of the paper might be, he would refuse to accept contributions using old-fashioned tabular methods rather than techniques of regression and path analysis."

The use of this technique requires the researcher to make at least five assumptions (Pedhazur, 1982). First, the relations among the variables in the model are linear, additive, and causal. Hence,
curvilinear, multiplicative, and interaction relations are inappropriate. Second, each residual is not correlated with any preceding variable(s). This implies that the residuals are not correlated among themselves. In addition, this assumption further implies that specification error is not present since all relevant variables are assumed to be included in one's model. Third, there is a one-way causal flow in the model. Consequently, reciprocal causation between variables is not allowed. Fourth, the variables are measured on an interval scale. Finally, the variables are measured without error.

Pedhazur (1982) pointed out that these assumptions are very difficult to meet in applied settings, especially in nonexperimental ones. He asserted that while path analysis assumes that variables are measured without error, this is rarely—if ever—achieved in the social sciences, with most measures having at best moderate reliabilities. In addition, while path analysis assumes that errors are random, many sources of error in the social sciences are nonrandom or systematic. Furthermore, many of the variables that social scientists are interested in are abstract concepts such as motivation, intelligence, and satisfaction. Thus, Pedhazur (1982) argued that it is unrealistic to assume that a single indicator can adequately measure such abstract concepts as one would have to when using path analysis. Moreover, he pointed out that it is unrealistic to expect residuals to be uncorrelated among themselves, particularly in longitudinal studies where respondents are surveyed more than once on the same measures. Finally, he indicated that many of the relationships between variables that social scientists are interested in
are reciprocal in nature; such models, of course, would be inappropriate with path analysis.

**LISREL**

Pedhazur (1982) noted that, given enough information, LISREL can be used to examine causal models with multiple indicators of latent variables, reciprocal causation, measurement errors, correlated errors, and correlated residuals. LISREL was developed by Karl Joreskog (1973). LISREL V is a computer package used to estimate unknown coefficients in a set of linear structural equations (Joreskog and Sorbom, 1983). The variables included in these equations may be either observed or unobserved latent variables related to empirical indicators.

The structural part of the model which specifies the relationships between endogenous and exogenous and among endogenous variables is similar to traditional path analysis. However, the use of multiple indicators allows the researcher to estimate measurement error associated with the concepts of interest. Because of the estimation of measurement error, the researcher is able to obtain more accurate estimates of path coefficients. When the researcher does not have multiple indicators to measure a concept, he or she must assume that the single indicator measures the concept perfectly and there is no measurement error.

Estimation using LISREL is based on maximum-likelihood. This technique is based on the assumption that the observed variables have a multivariate normal distribution (Joreskog and Sorbom, 1983). Wonnacott and Wonnacott (1972) noted that the basic idea involved in this estimation technique is that it seeks to find the hypothetical population value that
is most likely to have generated the observed sample. Illustratively, Mulaik (1972:162) pointed out that in the absence of the population parameters

...we can take arbitrary values and treat them as if they were population parameters and ask ourselves what is the likelihood...of observing certain values for the variables on a single observation drawn from such a population. If we have more than one observation, then we can ask what is the joint likelihood of obtaining such a sample of observation vectors? Finally we can ask: What values for the population parameters make the sample observations have the greatest joint likelihood? When we answer this question, we will take such values to be maximum-likelihood estimators of the population parameters.

LISREL has two components: a structural equation model and a measurement model. The structural equation model is used to estimate the relationships between exogenous and endogenous variables and among endogenous variables. The structural equation model is represented by:

\[ \eta = \beta \eta + \Gamma \xi + \zeta \]

where \( \eta \) (eta) is a vector of endogenous variables; \( \xi \) (xi) is a vector of exogenous variables; \( \beta \) (beta) is a matrix of coefficients representing the effects of endogenous on endogenous variables; \( \Gamma \) (gamma) is a matrix of coefficients representing the effects of exogenous variables on endogenous variables; and \( \zeta \) (zeta) is a vector of residuals or errors in the equations (Pedhazur, 1982).

The measurement model specifies the relationships between the unobserved exogenous and endogenous concepts and the observed, empirical indicators of the concepts. The measurement model has two sets of equations. The first of these represents the exogenous part of the model and is defined by:

\[ x = \Lambda \xi + \delta \]
where \( x \) is a vector of measures of independent variables; \( \Lambda_X \) (lambda X) is a matrix of loadings of \( x \) on the unobserved exogenous variables; and \( \delta \) (delta) is a vector of measurement errors associated with the \( x \)'s (Pedhazur, 1982). The second set of equations represents the endogenous part of the model and is defined by:

\[
y = \Lambda_Y \eta + \epsilon
\]

where \( y \) is a vector of measures of dependent variables; \( \Lambda_Y \) (lambda y) is a matrix of loadings of \( y \) on the unobserved endogenous variables; and \( \epsilon \) (epsilon) is a vector of measurement errors associated with the \( y \)'s (Pedhazur, 1982).

In order to obtain estimates for one's model, the researcher must specify the following eight matrices:

1. \( \Lambda_Y \) (lambda y) represents the loadings of the indicators of endogenous variables on the latent endogenous variables.
2. \( \Lambda_X \) (lambda x) represents the loadings of the indicators of exogenous variables on the latent exogenous variables.
3. \( \beta \) (beta) represents the coefficients of the effects of latent endogenous variables on latent endogenous variables.
4. \( \Gamma \) (gamma) represents the coefficients of the effects of latent exogenous variables on latent endogenous variables.
5. \( \Phi \) (phi) is a variance-covariance matrix of the latent exogenous variables.
6. \( \Psi \) (psi) is a variance-covariance matrix of the residuals.
7. \( \Theta_\epsilon \) (theta epsilon) is a variance-covariance matrix of measurement errors associated with the \( y \)'s.
8. \( \Theta_\delta \) (theta delta) is the variance-covariance matrix of measurement errors associated with the \( x \)'s.

Before specifying the matrices for the model to be analyzed, we can examine the measurement and structural equation portions of the model (Figure 3.1). Five variables (age, education, employment status, children, and ethnic integration) represent the exogenous variables in the model. These variables are the \( x_i \) variables. Each variable is measured by one or more empirical indicators called the \( x \) variables. As can be
Figure 3.1. Proposed LISREL model to be used in explaining psychological distress among Chicanas
seen, only ethnic integration is measured by multiple indicators (i.e., $x_5$, cultural preference; $x_6$, Mexican contact; $x_7$, Spanish use). Since $x_1$ to $x_4$ (i.e., age, education, employment status, and children) are assumed to perfectly measure their respective exogenous variable, a value of one is assigned as the lambda $x$, signifying a loading of 1.0 of each of these on its respective exogenous variable. When using multiple indicators to measure a concept, the user must assign the metric of one of the indicators to the latent variable. Hence, the lambda of cultural preference on ethnic integration is set to one; because of this, cultural preference is called the reference variable for ethnic integration. The lambdas--$\lambda_{65}$ and $\lambda_{75}$--representing the loadings of the remaining two indicators are then freed to be estimated. The first subscript in the lambdas as well as other parameters refers to the dependent variable, while the latter represents the independent variable. For instance, with regard to $\lambda_{65}$, $x_6$ is the dependent variable (as shown by the direction of the arrow in the model), while $\xi_5$ is the independent variable. The measurement error associated with each $x$ is represented by delta; the delta associated with the first four variables is zero because we are assuming that the indicators measure each of their respective latent variables perfectly.

Three variables (nontraditional housework performance, marital satisfaction, and psychological distress) are the endogenous variables. The first is measured with a single indicator ($y_1$), while each of the last is measured with two indicators (marital satisfaction: $y_2$, marital harmony; $y_3$, satisfactory communication; psychological distress: $y_4$, psychological symptoms; $y_5$, physical symptoms). The lambda $y$'s represent
the loadings of the indicators on their respective latent variable. The error term associated with each y variable is called epsilon.

The structural part of the model consists of the proposed relationships both between exogenous and endogenous variables and among endogenous variables. The relationships between the exogenous variables and the endogenous variables are represented by gammas. The first subscript refers to the dependent variable, while the latter represents the independent variable. Note that one path—from ethnic integration to marital satisfaction—is not present in the model since we are proposing that ethnic integration only affects marital satisfaction indirectly through nontraditional housework performance. The relationships among the endogenous variables are represented by betas. The residual of each endogenous variable is symbolized by zeta.

Although these data are cross-sectional, the model shows a cause-effect structure. Because of the absence of a strictly temporal sequence regarding the ordering of the variables, this action must be justified theoretically. Indeed, the literature examined points to this cause-effect structure.

The measurement model for the exogenous variables takes the form:

\[
X = \Lambda_X \xi + \delta
\]
The measurement model for the endogenous variables takes the form:

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
  y_1 \\
y_2 \\
y_3 \\
y_4 \\
y_5
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
  1 & 0 & 0 \\
  0 & 1 & 0 \\
  0 & \lambda_{32} & 0 \\
  0 & 0 & \lambda_{53}
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}
  \eta_1 \\
  \eta_2 \\
  \eta_3 \\
  \eta_4
\end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix}
  \epsilon_1 \\
  \epsilon_2 \\
  \epsilon_3 \\
  \epsilon_4
\end{bmatrix}
\]

and yields the following equations for the y's:

\[
\begin{align*}
y_1 &= \eta_1 + \epsilon_1 \\
y_2 &= \eta_2 + \epsilon_2 \\
y_3 &= \lambda_{32} \eta_2 + \epsilon_3 \\
y_4 &= \eta_3 + \epsilon_4 \\
y_5 &= \lambda_{53} \eta_3 + \epsilon_5
\end{align*}
\]

The structural model takes the form:

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
  \eta_1 \\
  \eta_2 \\
  \eta_3
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
  0 & \beta_{31} & 0 \\
  \beta_{31} & 0 & \beta_{32} \\
  \beta_{21} & \beta_{31} & 0
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}
  \eta_1 \\
  \eta_2 \\
  \eta_3
\end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix}
  \gamma_{11} & \gamma_{12} & \gamma_{13} & \gamma_{14} & \gamma_{15} \\
  \gamma_{21} & \gamma_{22} & \gamma_{23} & \gamma_{24} & \gamma_{25} \\
  \gamma_{31} & \gamma_{32} & \gamma_{33} & \gamma_{34} & \gamma_{35}
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}
  \xi_1 \\
  \xi_2 \\
  \xi_3 \\
  \xi_4 \\
  \xi_5
\end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix}
  \xi_1 \\
  \xi_2 \\
  \xi_3 \\
  \xi_4 \\
  \xi_5
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
\eta = \beta \eta + \Gamma \xi + \zeta
\]
and yields the following structural equations for the latent endogenous variables:

\[
\eta_1 = \gamma_{11} \xi_1 + \gamma_{12} \xi_2 + \gamma_{13} \xi_3 + \gamma_{14} \xi_4 + \gamma_{15} \xi_5 + \xi_1 \\
\eta_2 = \gamma_{21} \xi_1 + \gamma_{22} \xi_2 + \gamma_{23} \xi_3 + \gamma_{24} \xi_4 + \xi_2 \\
\eta_3 = \gamma_{31} \xi_1 + \gamma_{32} \xi_2 + \gamma_{33} \xi_3 + \gamma_{34} \xi_4 + \gamma_{35} \xi_5 + \xi_3
\]

The phi matrix of variances and covariances between latent exogenous variables takes the form:

\[
\phi = \begin{bmatrix}
\phi_{11} & \phi_{12} \\
\phi_{21} & \phi_{22} \\
\phi_{31} & \phi_{32} & \phi_{33} \\
\phi_{41} & \phi_{42} & \phi_{43} & \phi_{44} \\
\phi_{51} & \phi_{52} & \phi_{53} & \phi_{54} & \phi_{55}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

The psi matrix of variances and covariances has zeros on the subdiagonal because we are assuming that the residual terms are not correlated:

\[
\psi = \begin{bmatrix}
\psi_{11} & \psi_{12} \\
0 & \psi_{22} & \psi_{33}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

The theta delta variance-covariance matrix of the measurement errors associated with the X variables is a diagonal matrix because the model assumes that the measurement errors are uncorrelated:

\[
\Theta_\delta = \begin{bmatrix}
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \theta_{55} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \theta_{66} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \theta_{77}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

The variance of the error terms for X_1 to X_4 are set to zero because the corresponding endogenous latent variables are measured with a single
indicator and, thus, are assumed to be measured without error.

The theta epsilon variance-covariance matrix of the measurement errors associated with the $y$ variables is a diagonal matrix because the measurement errors are assumed to be uncorrelated:

$$\Theta_e = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & \theta_{22} & 0 & \theta_{33} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \theta_{44} & \theta_{55} \end{bmatrix}$$

The measurement error associated with $y_{11}$ is set to zero because this indicator is assumed to perfectly measure traditional housework performance.

Examination of the proposed model reveals several assumptions. First, the errors (zetas) associated with the latent endogenous variables are uncorrelated with latent independent variables ($x_i$'s). Second, the measurement errors associated with the indicators ($y$'s) of the endogenous variables are uncorrelated with the latent endogenous variables (etas). Third, the measurement errors associated with the indicators ($x$'s) of the exogenous variables are uncorrelated with the latent exogenous variables ($x_i$'s). Fourth, the error terms associated with the latent endogenous variables (zetas), indicators ($y$'s) of the latent endogenous variables (epsilon), and indicators ($x$'s) of the latent exogenous variables (deltas) are mutually uncorrelated (Joreskog and Sorbom, 1983).

The LISREL user has a choice regarding the form in which he or she wants to input the data. The user has the option of inputting raw data, a correlation matrix, or a covariance matrix. For the estimation of the proposed model, the correlation matrix will be used as input data. Using the correlation matrix as input, the LISREL output provides the user with
structural coefficients that are standardized regression coefficients. Consequently, because these coefficients are scale-free, one can compare the relative contribution of various independent variables to the explanation of the dependent measure within the model. However, when comparing more than one group, such as employed women versus nonemployed women, the covariance matrix is used because this matrix provides unstandardized regression coefficients, which can then be used to compare coefficients between groups but not coefficients within a model.

Estimation of the parameters involves fitting the covariance matrix (sigma) generated by the assumptions made in the structural and measurement equations to the sample covariance matrix (Hoelter, 1983). The overall goodness-of-fit between the proposed model and the sample variance-covariance matrix can be assessed by a chi-square test. Small chi-square values suggest that the model closely fits the observed data, while large values indicate a poor fit. However, sample size has been observed to also influence the chi-square value, with larger samples increasing this value and, thus, decreasing the probability of attaining a good fit between the proposed model and the observed data (Bentler and Bonett, 1980). Consequently, one must be cautious in interpreting the chi-square value since a large sample may influence the researcher to reject a theoretically useful model.

To deal with this problem, Hoelter (1983) developed a technique for assessing the goodness-of-fit for models estimated with large samples. This technique, called "critical N" (CN), involves estimating the sample size that must be reached in order to judge favorably the fit of a model on a statistical basis. The index is computed by the following formula:
where \( z_{\text{crit}} \) is the critical value of the normal distribution for a selected probability level; \( df \) refers to the degrees of freedom; \( x^2 \) is the chi-square value associated with the model; \( N \) is the sample size; and \( G \) is the number of groups analyzed simultaneously. Unfortunately, there are no firm guidelines regarding the \( CN \) that must be attained to render a close fit between a proposed model and the observed data. However, Hoelter (1983) suggested that a good rule of thumb is to treat values exceeding 200 \((G)\) as the level indicating a good fit. Hence, a \( CN \) exceeding 200 \((G)\) will be treated as signifying an adequate fit between the proposed model and the observed data in the analysis.

In addition, the LISREL output provides two other pieces of information that may be used to assess the fit of the model to the data. First, the adjusted goodness of fit index (A.G.F.I.) is a measure of the relative amount of the variance and covariance that is jointly accounted for by the model (Joreskog and Sorbom, 1983). The index ranges from zero to one, with a higher index signifying a better fit of the model to the data. Joreskog and Sorbom (1983) pointed out the the adjusted goodness of fit index is independent of the chi-square value and is fairly robust against departures from normality. Second, the root mean square residual is a measure of the average of the residual variances and covariances, with lower scores signifying a better correspondence between the model and the data. Consequently, these three pieces of information—critical \( N \), adjusted goodness of fit, and the root mean square residual—will be used in assessing the fit of the proposed model to the observed data.
Often researchers are interested in evaluating the fit of several models. For instance, one may discover that a specific path between two variables is significant but was not included in one's proposed model. This information is provided by the Modification Index which can be specified as output in the LISREL program. This index provides the user information regarding the approximate decrease in the chi-square value--and, thus, a better fit--if the different fixed parameters were set free and allowed to be estimated. If the researcher has a theoretical justification, he or she can free such a parameter to be estimated in a second model. When two models are nested (hierarchical)--that is, the "new" model can be obtained by freeing one or more parameters from the previous model--then the two models can be compared by examining the difference in the chi-square values of the two models and the difference in degrees of freedom associated with the two. Joreskog (1978:448) suggested that

if the drop in (chi-square) is large compared to the difference in degrees of freedom, this is an indication that the change made in the model represents a real improvement. If, on the other hand, the drop in (chi-square) is close to the difference in number of degrees of freedom, this is an indication that the improvement in fit is obtained by "capitalizing on chance" and the added parameters may not have any real significance.

Conversely, the researcher may discover that a specific path in the model is insignificant, as indicated by t-scores associated with each estimated parameter. If the researcher has theoretical justifications and seeks parsimony, the path may be fixed to zero. The researcher can then compare the changes in the chi-square value and degrees of freedom from one model to the next, provided the two models are nested; the new model is attained by fixing one or more parameters that were included as free in
the previous model. If the change in the chi-square value is less than the change in the number of degrees of freedom, the researcher concludes that fixing the path to zero does not significantly worsen the fit of the model to the data. On the other hand, a change in the chi-square value that is larger than the change in degrees of freedom signifies that the "new" model fits the data significantly worse than does the previous one.
CHAPTER IV.
FINDINGS

LISREL Analysis of Total Sample

LISREL analysis shows that in Model 1 only employment status exhibits a significant effect on nontraditional housework performance (Figure 4.1; the correlation matrix used as input data can be seen in Appendix B, Table B.1); coefficients that are significant at the 0.05 level of statistical significance are denoted with an asterisk. Women who are employed outside of the home tend to receive more help from their husbands in the performance of housework activities. Consequently, it appears that women can use their employment status in obtaining a more favorable outcome from their husbands in the area of housekeeping. It was expected that education would lead to the woman receiving more help from her husband with housework, but this is not the case. Although the gamma is not significant, women possessing higher levels of education receive less help from their husbands with these chores. The number of children in the household and the degree to which women are integrated into Mexican culture have negative influences on the amount of housework the husband performs; although these relationships are not significant, they are in the expected direction.

Nontraditional housework performance has a positive effect on marital satisfaction. Indeed, women receiving more help from their husbands with household functions tend to be more satisfied with their spouses, as predicted. Education has a significant negative effect on marital satisfaction, with more educated women reporting higher levels of
Figure 4.1. Initial LISREL estimates for the entire sample of Chicanas (for phis, see Appendix C)
dissatisfaction, contrary to expectations. Age, although not significantly, has a positive effect on marital satisfaction. In addition, as expected, a higher number of children in the home leads to a lower degree of marital satisfaction. Finally, employment status has a negative effect on marital satisfaction.

Marital satisfaction has a relatively strong effect on psychological distress. Women who report higher levels of satisfaction with their spouse tend to experience lower levels of psychological distress. Employment status also has a significant negative influence on psychological distress. Nontraditional housework performance, contrary to expectations, has a positive influence on psychological distress. Women receiving more help from their husbands with household chores report higher levels of psychological discomfort. The remaining variables have less of an impact on psychological well-being, although only one of the four exhibits relationships in the expected directions. Women more integrated into Mexican culture tend to experience higher levels of psychological distress. But, women living with a high number of children at home tend to report lower levels of psychological discomfort. Also, older women report higher levels of psychological discomfort, contrary to expectations. Finally, education exhibits no relationship with psychological distress.

Examination of the total, direct, and indirect effects of the independent variables on the dependent variables may provide a clearer picture in the explanation of psychological distress among Chicanas. The procedure used to present these different effects comes from the tradition of Alwin and Hauser (1975). The LISREL program contains a procedure
developed by Fox (1980) to decompose the total effects of independent variables on dependent ones. The coefficients presented in the model (Figure 4.1) are the direct effects. Hence, to obtain indirect effects, one subtracts the direct effects from the total effects.

Since nontraditional housework performance is the first dependent variable, the independent variables only have a direct effect on this factor (Table 4.1). However, review of marital satisfaction and psychological distress provides information regarding the different types of effects. Examination of the direct and indirect effects of the independent variables influencing marital satisfaction shows that for the most part the effects are direct and in the same direction. For instance, education and number of children have a direct negative impact on marital satisfaction, and a negative indirect relationship through lower levels of nontraditional housework performance. Women’s employment has a direct negative effect on marital satisfaction, but this effect is tempered when women receive help from their husbands with housework. Consequently, employed women are likely to report higher degrees of marital satisfaction when they receive help from their spouses with household chores. In contrast, women who do not receive this help are likely to experience a great deal of frustration with their spouses for their failure to help pick up the load in the homefront.

The relationships of the independent variables on psychological distress are not as clear. Indeed, only one variable--education--has a direct and indirect relationship with psychological distress in the same direction (positive). Most of the effect of education on distress is indirect through its negative effect on marital satisfaction. Several
Table 4.1. Decomposition of the effects of independent on dependent variables for Model 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Total Effect</th>
<th>Direct Effect</th>
<th>Indirect Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nontraditional Housework Performance</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-.074</td>
<td>-.074</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children</td>
<td>-.088</td>
<td>-.088</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethnic Integration</td>
<td>-.096</td>
<td>-.096</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Satisfaction</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-.115</td>
<td>-.107</td>
<td>-.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td>-.075</td>
<td>-.092</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children</td>
<td>-.068</td>
<td>-.058</td>
<td>-.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethnic Integration</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nontraditional Housework Performance</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Distress</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>-.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td>-.080</td>
<td>-.120</td>
<td>.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>-.053</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethnic Integration</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>-.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nontraditional Housework Performance</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>-.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marital Satisfaction</td>
<td>-.392</td>
<td>-.392</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
variables have a direct positive effect on psychological distress, but a negative indirect one. Age has a positive influence on distress, but a negative indirect one through marital satisfaction. Hence, older women for the most part experience higher levels of psychological discomfort, but those having satisfactory marital relationships are likely to experience lower distress levels. Similarly, nontraditional housework role has a positive impact on psychological distress, but a negative indirect one through marital satisfaction. Women who receive more help from their husbands with household responsibilities, then, report marginally higher levels of distress, but this distressful situation becomes less severe when the couple experiences a positive relationship. Furthermore, employed women experience lower levels of psychological discomfort, but those reporting unsatisfactory relationships with their husbands face higher levels of distress. And, the number of children in the home has a negative influence on psychological distress, but a positive indirect effect through marital satisfaction.

The model has a chi-square value of 78.19 with 32 degrees of freedom (Table 4.2). The probability level associated with the chi-square statistic is 0.00. Recall that low chi-square values and high probability levels indicate that models fit the data adequately because this suggests little difference between the variance-covariance matrix associated with the proposed model and the actual variance-covariance matrix. This does not appear to be the case with the proposed model. However, the chi-square value is also influenced by the sample size. The Critical N test developed by Hoelter (1983) to deal with this problem shows a value of 233, exceeding the value of 200 suggested by Hoelter to indicate an
Table 4.2. Diagnostic tools for evaluating the fit of Models 1 and 2 to the data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diagnostic Tools</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>78.19</td>
<td>80.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees of Freedom</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistical Probability Level</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical N</td>
<td>233.39</td>
<td>250.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodness-of-Fit Index</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Goodness-of-Fit Index</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Mean Square Residual</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
adequate fit. Other statistics such as the goodness-of-fit index, adjusted goodness-of-fit index, and the root mean square residual also demonstrate that the model fits the data reasonably well (Table 4).

Examination of the Modification Index, which provides information regarding the amount by which the chi-square value associated with the model would decrease if other parameters were allowed to be estimated, failed to show anything that was theoretically logical. Another model (not shown here) was examined to test whether ethnic integration did not affect marital satisfaction directly. This model had a chi-square value of 78.05 with 31 degrees of freedom. In order for this hypothesis to be rejected, the chi-square difference between the two models would have to exceed the difference in the degrees of freedom (1) associated with both models. This is not the case; the chi-square value only decreased by 0.14. Hence, inclusion of the direct effect of ethnic integration on marital satisfaction does not significantly improve the fit of the model to the data.

Model 1 was reexamined with the exception that one of the items--shopping--comprising the nontraditional housework performance indicator was eliminated. Factor analysis revealed that this item loaded less heavily on the underlying factor. However, since it was decided that the items loaded on only one factor and shopping also constitutes part of the tasks required for maintenance of the household, the item was kept for the first analysis. To determine whether this item is influential in the unexpected findings regarding the relationships between education and nontraditional housework performance and the latter and psychological distress, the model was ran without the item on shopping. Unfortunately,
this model failed to provide a meaningful solution. The estimation of the model resulted in a negative variance associated with the psychological symptoms indicator. Examination of the individual items constituting the nontraditional housework performance indicator shows that the shopping item is the only item that is related to the two psychological distress indicators. This appears worrisome because the stability of the model comes into question.

Because of this uneasiness, a path analysis model was examined which did not include the shopping item in the nontraditional housework performance variable. In order to examine this model, several modifications were made. First, since the ethnic integration items were measured with differing scales, only the indicator loading most heavily on the ethnic integration underlying dimension--Spanish use--was included to represent ethnic integration. Second, since the marital satisfaction--marital harmony and satisfactory communication--and psychological distress--psychological symptoms and physical symptoms--indicators were measured with the same scale, the items constituting each of the two indicators were summed to represent marital satisfaction and psychological distress, respectively. The results are quite similar to those found using the LISREL model including the shopping item (Figure 4.2). More importantly, both the gamma representing the relationship between education and nontraditional housework performance (-0.07 in the LISREL model and -0.06 in the path analysis model) and the beta associated with the relationship between nontraditional housework performance and psychological distress (0.07 in the LISREL model and 0.08 in the path analysis model) are similar in both models. Hence, examination of the
Figure 4.2. Path analysis model with the "shopping" item excluded from the nontraditional housework performance variable (for correlations among exogenous variables, see Appendix C)
LISREL and path analysis models fail to suggest any great difference when the shopping item is included or excluded.

A Revised Model

After finding a model that adequately fits the data, researchers seek parsimony. That is, researchers are interested in finding less complicated models that can explain phenomenon just as adequately as more complex ones. Examination of the proposed model shows that employment status is the only exogenous variable that has a significant effect on psychological distress. The remaining exogenous variables may affect psychological discomfort only indirectly through nontraditional housework performance and marital satisfaction. Credence is lent to this hypothesis by examining the direct effects of these variables on the three endogenous variables (Figure 4.1). With the exception of employment status and age, the weakest direct effect of the exogenous variables on the endogenous ones occurs in the relationship with psychological distress.

Consequently, a more parsimonious model (Model 2) is examined. In order for us not to reject this "new" model, we must witness an increase in the chi-square value from the proposed model to the latter that is less than the change in the degrees of freedom (4). The change in the chi-square value is 2.05 with a difference of 4 degrees of freedom (Table 4.2). Thus, the more complex model does not fit the data significantly better than does the more parsimonious one. The Critical N (250) associated with this model exceeds the criterion of 200 set by Hoelter. The goodness-of-fit and the adjusted goodness-of-fit indices and the root mean square residual suggest that the more parsimonious model compares
favorably to the former model. In addition, comparison of the coefficients present in both models (Figures 4.1 and 4.3) shows little difference in the magnitude and direction of the relationships.

Comparison of Unemployed and Employed Women

Because employment status is significantly related to psychological distress and it is represented by a dummy variable, this final model (Model 2) will be examined using employed and unemployed women separately. However, it should be noted that since the number of cases associated with each group is small (unemployed, 243; employed, 129) the results should be interpreted cautiously. For women in both groups, education, number of children in the home, and ethnic integration have a negative influence on the amount of work the husband performs (Figures 4.4 and 4.5; the variance-covariance matrices used as input for these models appear in Appendix D, Table D.1).

Although nontraditional housework performance has a significant effect on marital satisfaction when the total sample is examined, this factor fails to significantly influence marital satisfaction when women are analyzed separately by employment status. Nevertheless, the relationship is positive, as expected. Only education among women who are not employed outside of the home has a significant effect on women's level of satisfaction with their spouses. Unemployed women with higher levels of education report higher levels of frustration with their spouses.

Marital satisfaction continues to be the dominant factor influencing psychological distress among both groups of women. Again, women who
Figure 4.3. Revised LISREL estimates for the entire sample of Chicanas (for phis, see Appendix C)
Figure 4.4 LISREL estimates for unemployed Chicanas (for phis, see Appendix C)
Figure 4.5 LISREL estimates for employed Chicanas (for phis, see Appendix C)
report higher levels of satisfaction with their spouses tend to experience lower levels of psychological distress. However, nontraditional housework performance exhibits a significant positive effect on psychological discomfort among working women. Employed women who receive more help from their spouses experience more psychological distress than their counterparts who receive less help. Among unemployed women, nontraditional housework performance does not affect psychological distress, but has an indirect positive effect through marital satisfaction. Hence, women who are not employed who receive more help with household chores from their husbands experience higher levels of marital satisfaction, which, in turn, decreases the psychological discomfort faced by these women.

Comparatively speaking, the model representing employed women fits the data better. The model for the unemployed women has a chi-square value (72.30) that is twice as large as that for the employed women (Table 4.3). The probability associated with the latter model is 0.28. These diagnostic tools suggest that the model for employed women fits the data adequately. However, the chi-square value is influenced by the sample size, with smaller samples decreasing this value. This is the case with this model. Indeed, the Critical N shows a value of 174.2 for this model, which is below the criterion of 200 suggested by Hoelter to indicate that models fit the data adequately. Nevertheless, comparison of the Critical N, goodness-of-fit, adjusted goodness-of-fit indices, and the root mean square residual shows that the model for the employed women fits the data better than does that used to examine unemployed women.
Table 4.3. Diagnostic tools for evaluating the fit of the models for unemployed and employed women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diagnostic Tools</th>
<th>Unemployed</th>
<th>Employed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>72.30</td>
<td>36.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees of Freedom</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistical Probability Level</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical N</td>
<td>164.94</td>
<td>174.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodness-of-Fit Index</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Goodness-of-Fit Index</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Mean Square Residual</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The models representing the two groups can be examined to determine whether they demonstrate that the groups differ on various relationships between variables. This is done by testing three matrices—beta, gamma, and phi—for equality between the two groups. Before testing the equalities of the individual matrices, however, a test for the overall equality of the three matrices is conducted. Several steps are involved in testing these models. First, the two models are examined separately, as has been done (Figures 4.4 and 4.5; Table 4.3). The chi-square values and the degrees of freedom are summed for both models. For our two models, we obtain a chi-square value of 108.50 (group 1, 72.30; group 2, 36.20), and 64 degrees of freedom (32 for each group); the Critical N is 300.4, which fails to exceed the criterion of 400 (200 multiplied by the number of groups) needed to evaluate the fit of the model to the data favorably. These statistics, then, serve as comparison points to determine whether the matrices associated with each model differ. The first model sets the beta, gamma, and phi matrices to be equal to one another (Model 3A). This model hypothesizes that the betas, gammas, andphis of the unemployed women equal those of the employed women. This model yields a chi-square value of 148.87, with 84 degrees of freedom. Both the chi-square value and degrees of freedom of Model 3A are subtracted from those of the sum of the individual models (Figures 4.4 and 4.5; Table 4.4). The difference, then, is a chi-square value of 40.37, with 20 degrees of freedom (Table 4.4). Examination of the chi-square significance table shows that the critical value associated with 20 degrees of freedom at the 0.005 level of statistical significance is 40.00. Since the observed difference surpasses this value, the null
Table 4.4. LISREL models used to examine equality of several matrices for unemployed and employed women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base Model</td>
<td>108.50</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 3A</td>
<td>148.87</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>40.37</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>&lt;.005</td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 3B</td>
<td>112.55</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&gt;.100</td>
<td>Fail to reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 3C</td>
<td>111.24</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&gt;.050</td>
<td>Fail to reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 3D</td>
<td>110.35</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&gt;.100</td>
<td>Fail to reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 3E</td>
<td>117.51</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>9.01</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>&gt;.100</td>
<td>Fail to reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 3F</td>
<td>136.19</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>27.69</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>&lt;.005</td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
hypotheses is rejected and it is concluded that the two groups have different beta, gamma, and phi matrices.

Which of the matrices are different? First, it is hypothesized that the betas of the unemployed women equal those of the employed women (Model 3B). The model has a chi-square value of 112.55, with 67 degrees of freedom (Table 4.4); the difference in the chi-square value is 4.05, with a change of 3 degrees of freedom. This difference has a probability greater than 0.10. Hence, we fail to reject the hypothesis that the betas of the first group equal those of the second. But, examination of Figures 4.4 and 4.5 demonstrates that there is a difference in the beta associated with the relationship of nontraditional housework performance and psychological distress, as well as that of marital satisfaction and psychological distress. However, once again examination of the hypotheses testing each individual equality (Models 3C and 3D, respectively) fails to confirm any significant differences between the two groups in the beta structure (Table 4.4). Hence, although the relationship between nontraditional housework performance and psychological distress is significant among employed women, the difference is not large enough between the two groups to render the betas different.

The next hypothesis postulates that the gamma matrix of unemployed women equals that of the employed women (Model 3E). Once again, the hypothesis is not rejected (Table 4.4). The difference in the gamma matrix is not large enough to constitute a significant difference. Examination of the two models (Figures 4.4 and 4.5) suggests that this does appear to be the case since most gamma coefficients—with the exception of the relationship between children in the home and
nontraditional housework performance— are similar in direction and magnitude.

The final hypothesis suggests that the phi matrix of the unemployed women equals that of the employed group (Model 3F). This model renders a difference in the chi-square value of 27.69, with a change of 10 degrees of freedom (Table 4.4). This difference is significant at the 0.005 level of statistical significance. Therefore, the difference observed when the betas, gammas, and phis were set equal to each other for the two groups appears to result because of the difference in the phi matrix. This suggests that perhaps there is a higher degree of multicollinearity among the exogenous variables of one of the groups. Examination of the correlations among these variables demonstrates this to be the case (Table 4.5). For instance, age is more strongly correlated with the remaining exogenous variables among unemployed women. In contrast, the relationships are almost nonexistent among employed women, with the exception of the relationship between education and age. This higher degree of multicollinearity helps explain the relatively inadequate fit of the model to the data among the unemployed group.
Table 4.5. Zero-order correlations among exogenous variables for unemployed and employed women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Status and Variables</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Children</th>
<th>Ethnic Integration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unemployed</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Integration</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.68</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employed</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Integration</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.59</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Women experience comparatively higher levels of psychological distress than men; Gove and his colleagues (Gove and Tudor, 1973; Gove and Geerken, 1977) have used role-stress theory to explain this discrepancy. Societal transformations from a traditional society to an industrial and later a post-industrial one have resulted in a decrease in the prestige associated with housework. In addition, research has shown that employed women experience more positive levels of psychological well-being than do unemployed women.

Perusal of the literature suggested a model that could be used in examining psychological distress among Chicanas. Employed women and those possessing higher levels of education have resources that can be used in negotiations with their spouses regarding the performance of housework activities. However, older women, those living with more children in the home, and those more integrated into Mexican culture were expected to obtain less help with housework from their husbands.

Women who receive more help with the less prestigious housekeeping chores were predicted to report higher levels of satisfaction with their spouses. Similarly, older women and more educated ones possess resources obtained from daily living and exposure to problem-solving techniques that allow them to have more positive relationships with their husbands. But, employed women and those with a higher number of children in the household were likely to have negative influences on the marital relationship because work and children may make demands on the woman—and the husband—
that may decrease the amount of time the couple can share. However, the negative effect of employment on marital satisfaction can be tempered when women are able to attain help from their husband in the homefront.

Less traditional women were thought to possess resources that allow them to cope with problems more effectively and, thus, were expected to experience lower levels of psychological distress. Employment presents women with a source of gratification other than the family that can serve as an outlet for them when they are burdened with problems in other arenas of life. At the same time, working can help women in achieving higher degrees of independence and self-worth. Women who were able to receive more help from their spouses with household chores were considered to be likely to experience lower levels of psychological discomfort because this help is likely to keep women from being overburdened with responsibilities. In addition, women who had more positive relationships with their husbands were expected to report higher levels of psychological well-being because they generally would not have marital problems to worry about. And, the literature suggested that older individuals were likely to experience lower levels of psychological distress. In contrast, the presence of children in the home and integration into Mexican culture were hypothesized to increase psychological discomfort.

Summary of Findings

The results show mixed support for the model. It was found that less traditional women are not always more successful at attaining help from their husbands with housework chores. In fact, more educated women report receiving less help from their spouses with these activities.
Nevertheless, employed women are able to obtain more help from their husbands with household responsibilities. In addition, women living with more children and those more integrated into Mexican culture tend to receive less help from their spouses with housework.

Women who received more help from their spouses report higher levels of marital satisfaction, as do older women. However, employed women and those having more children living at home experience higher levels of marital disharmony. For employed women, this negative effect is tempered when they are able to obtain help from their husbands with household chores. Moreover, more educated women tend to be less satisfied with their spouses.

Finally, employed women and those who report more favorable relationships with their husbands experience less psychological distress. But, women having fewer children and higher levels of education do not experience lower levels of psychological discomfort, as was predicted. And, ethnic integration only slightly influences psychological distress in a positive direction.

Examination of separate models based upon employment status demonstrates few differences between the two groups. However, education has a significant negative impact on marital satisfaction only among unemployed women, while the amount of housework performed by the husband has a significant positive effect on psychological distress among working women.
Discussion

Chicanas working outside of the home may use their employment status in obtaining a more favorable outcome in the role bargaining concerning housework. This is consistent with reports of other researchers (e.g., Hawkes and Taylor, 1975; Perrucci et al., 1978; Ericksen et al., 1979; Baca Zinn, 1980; Huber and Spitze, 1983; Bird et al., 1984). But, women who live in homes with higher numbers of children receive less help from their husbands with housework, although the relationship is not significant. In such cases, the husband may not feel the responsibility to help the wife with these chores because the children can pick up the slack. This result is in accordance with the negative relationship between number of children at home and the amount of housework the husband performs observed by Perrucci et al. (1978). And, Chicanas who are more integrated into Mexican culture tend to receive less help from their spouses with these chores, even though the association is not significant. These women are likely to hold more rigid attitudes regarding sex-role activities. Perhaps these attitudes are translated into the wife performing more of the housework. Furthermore, women more integrated into this culture are likely to be married to Chicanos who share similar ideas concerning the sexual division of labor.

One puzzling finding is that more educated women receive less help with housework from their husbands than do their less educated counterparts. This is contradictory to the results of others (e.g., Weller, 1968; Cromwell et al., 1973; Ericksen et al., 1979; Iglehart, 1980; Huber and Spitze, 1983); however, Perrucci et al. (1978) reported a similar finding. It may be that Chicanas who receive more education are
exposed to less traditional ways of thinking, as well as greater expectations regarding the equality of sex roles. Thus, more educated women may perceive their husbands as performing low levels of housework because this help is expected of them, whereas less educated Chicanas may have lower expectations in the amount of housework the husband should do and, consequently, may view low levels of help as relatively more significant contributions. Examination of couples' level of educational attainment reveals that more educated women tend to have higher levels of education than their husbands, while less educated Chicanas generally have lower levels than their spouses. Illustratively, in almost half (47.3%) of the marriages where the wife has less than nine years of schooling, the husband has completed more years of schooling; however, husbands enjoy this advantage in less than one-third of the cases when the wife has between nine and eleven years of education (32.1%) or twelve or more years of schooling (30.4%). Hence, the two groups of women may have different perceptions concerning what constitutes a significant contribution in husbands' performance of housework.

Women who receive higher levels of help from their husbands with household chores tend to experience higher levels of marital satisfaction. This result is similar to the relationship found by Centers et al. (1971). In addition, the number of children living at home has a negative impact on marital satisfaction. This is consistent with results noted by others (e.g., Bean et al., 1977; Veivers, 1979; Sollie and Miller, 1980; Glenn and McLanahan, 1982). Children, especially younger ones, may make demands and place strains on women—and on men to some degree—that may cut into the time the couple spends together. This decline in time spent together
may lead to marital strain, if one partner feels neglected. The presence of children also presents the possibility of conflict concerning the manner of raising or disciplining the children.

Furthermore, Chicanas employed outside of the home are likely to experience higher levels of marital dissatisfaction. This relationship between employment status and marital satisfaction has also been discovered by others (e.g., Nye and Hoffman, 1963; Bean et al., 1977; Ross et al., 1983a). These women may indirectly receive a greater amount of exposure in the workplace regarding the lives of other couples besides their immediate friends and may acquire higher levels of expectations concerning their satisfaction with their husbands. In addition, employed women may acquire higher expectations regarding their husbands' behavior because the women may attain status levels that are more equal to those of their spouses. Curiously, working Chicanas are able to obtain more help from their husbands with housework, and higher levels of aid lead to higher levels of marital satisfaction; but working women experience lower levels of satisfaction. This suggests that the negative effect of labor-force participation on marital satisfaction is tempered when the woman is able to attain more help from her husband with housework responsibilities.

However, contrary to expectations, Chicanas possessing higher levels of education tend to report lower levels of marital satisfaction. This finding is in accordance with the argument that more educated women are exposed to less traditional attitudes regarding sex roles and may acquire higher expectations concerning their husbands' behavior. In this regard, more educated Chicanas may attain knowledge on characteristics in a relationship that constitute a healthy marriage and, thus, may have higher
expectations regarding satisfactory levels with their husbands. When employed and unemployed women are examined separately, education has a significant negative effect on marital satisfaction only among women who are not working. This suggests that women having higher levels of education may feel higher levels of frustration with their housewife role. Indeed, the Chicana is likely to realize that her skills and abilities are not being fully utilized. These feelings of frustration are particularly likely to be present when the woman believes that her husband is not doing a proper amount of work around the house.

Marital satisfaction has the greatest effect on psychological distress. Chicanas who report more positive relationships with their husbands tend to experience lower levels of psychological discomfort. This finding is in accordance with those of several other investigators (e.g., Pearlin, 1975; Ross et al., 1980; Schafer and Keith, 1980; Ross et al., 1983a). Of course, the absence of problems with one’s spouse indicates that the person has one less thing to worry about.

Employed Chicanas also experience higher levels of psychological well-being. Other researchers (e.g., Gove and Tudor, 1973; Radloff, 1975; Gove and Geerken, 1977; Haw, 1982; Krause, 1982; Tebbets, 1982; Warr and Parry, 1982; Ross et al., 1983a) have observed the same relationship between these two factors. Chicanas working outside of the home, as do Chicanos, have two sources of gratification—their family and job. Persons having two outlets can place emphasis on the other role when they encounter problems with one of these spheres. Furthermore, employment outside of the house generally requires the woman’s full attention and, thus, does not allow her to contemplate problems that may be confronting
her, whereas the isolated nature of the housewife role provides no such refuge.

But, Chicanas who receive more help from their husbands with housework tend to experience slightly higher levels of psychological distress, contrary to expectations. This finding is in contradiction to those of Zur-Szpiro and Longfellow (1982), Ross et al. (1983b), and Krause and Markides (1985). Perhaps the distress arises when a husband does housework unwillingly. If the woman must coerce her husband to perform such activities, she may experience distress. It may also be that even though the husband provides help, this may not be enough to meet all the woman’s responsibilities adequately. This is perhaps most evident among employed women, who tend to receive more help from their husbands in household responsibilities, but the level may not be enough to relieve her of much of her duties. Indeed, examination of employed and unemployed women separately reveals that this relationship is only prevalent among working women. Another possible explanation for this anomaly concerns the causal ordering of the variables. The presence of high levels of psychological discomfort among women may require that the husband lend a hand with household responsibilities. This would suggest that higher levels of psychological stress would cause a more nontraditional housework division of labor. Nevertheless, the level of psychological distress the Chicana experiences is likely to be less severe when she has a positive marital relationship.

Several other variables were not related to psychological distress in the predicted directions, although these were not significant. Chicanas living with more children in the home experience lower levels of
psychological discomfort. Although this finding is in opposition to those of several researchers (e.g., Pearl, 1975; Radloff, 1975; Gove and Geerken, 1977; Kessler and McRae, 1981), Ross et al. (1983a) similarly found no significant association between children and psychological distress among Chicanas. This may suggest that children are a source of gratification in Chicano culture and the presence of young people in the house may help women cope with everyday problems. Older Chicanas also tend to report higher levels of psychological distress. Perhaps the triple jeopardy hypothesis--being female, old, and a member of a minority group--can explain the distress that these women experience.

To what extent can these findings be generalized to various groups in American society? Obviously since the Chicano Survey is a representative sample of Chicanos living in five southwestern states and the Chicago metropolitan area, the results are applicable to Chicanas making their homes in these places. Examination of data from the 1980 U.S. Bureau of the Census' Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS) for currently married women living with their spouses in these areas (Arizona, California, Colorado, Illinois, New Mexico, and Texas) demonstrates that the women in the Chicano Survey sample are similar to those in the public-use sample (mean age: Chicano Survey, 36.9; PUMS, 36.6; mean years of education completed: Chicano Survey, 8.8; PUMS, 8.8; percentage of women employed: Chicano Survey, 35.8% (1979); PUMS, 39.5% (1980)). Hence, these similarities further point to the generalizability of the findings to women living in these areas.

The findings are less applicable for women living outside of the southwest and Chicago. Chicanas making their homes outside of these
places generally have higher levels of socioeconomic well-being than southwest Chicanas, although their levels are likely to approximate those living in Chicago. For instance, women living in these places generally possess higher levels of education (mean years of education, 9.9 compared to 8.8 for women used in this study) and have higher proportions of employment (44.3% compared to 35.8%) than women in the Chicano Survey. These women also are likely to have a lower degree of contact with Mexican culture and are more likely to resemble Anglos in their attitudes and behaviors than are southwest Chicanas. Nevertheless, both groups of Chicanas share minority-group status and a common cultural background.

One can also ask whether the findings can be generalized to other groups of Hispanic women in the U.S. Generalizations to such groups are more difficult. Indeed, there is much diversity among the different Hispanic groups. Perhaps Puerto Ricans most closely resemble Chicanos in socioeconomic characteristics, with Cubans being the most different. These similarities and differences among these three groups can be observed in the following statistics from the 1980 census (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1983): median age for total population (Chicanos, 21.8; Puerto Ricans, 22.3; Cubans, 37.5); percentage of women 25 and older who graduated from high school (Chicanas, 36.3%; Puerto Ricans, 39.1%; Cubans, 53.3%); percentage of females 16 and older who are employed (Chicanas, 44.0%; Puerto Ricans, 34.8%; Cubans, 51.3%); median family income (Chicanos, $16,962; Puerto Ricans, $13,411; Cubans, $21,577).

Consequently, the similarities in the socioeconomic achievements of Chicanos and Puerto Ricans in the U.S. make generalizations to this group more probable than to any other Hispanic group. However, the two cultures are distinct and regional differences enter the picture. Indeed, while
the majority of Chicanos are found in the Southwest, Puerto Ricans tend to prefer the Northeast. Approximately 74% of the Puerto Rican population was found in this region in 1980, with almost half (48.8%) of the nation’s Puerto Ricans living in New York alone.

Still, Chicanas share several characteristics with women from other Hispanic groups. The most overwhelming one concerns the general Hispanic culture, although this may take different forms within each group. Hispanic culture has traditionally placed males in the dominant position, but this is rapidly changing. Hispanic women, in comparison to those from other ethnic groups in the U.S., tend to face higher degrees of subordination within the culture. Hence, Chicanas and other Hispanic women are likely to be facing similar problems in their experiences with changing sex roles. Also, the three major Hispanic groups experience similar degrees of geographic segregation. For instance, Chicanos are primarily found in the Southwest, Puerto Ricans in the Northeast, and Cubans in Florida. The heavy concentration of persons of these groups in a few states signifies that people are likely to continue adhering to their respective cultures because they have others surrounding them who share similar beliefs and values. Chicanas also share a common non-English language (i.e., Spanish) with other groups of Hispanic women.

Generalizations to other minority groups are more difficult. Yet, Chicanas and black women have faced similar experiences. For instance, both groups have historically found themselves in the lower rungs of the socioeconomic ladder. In addition, both have encountered discrimination, which has an impact on the psychological well-being of individuals. And, both groups have used the extended family in coping with everyday life.
But, the cultures of the two groups differ significantly. It has been pointed out that black children do not learn a rigid division of sex roles as do those from other groups in the socialization process (White, 1972). Indeed, research has shown that black males tend to perform a substantial amount of the housework chores in black families (Stack, 1975; White, 1972).

Similarly, it is difficult to generalize the findings to white women. Chicanas and white women do not share the characteristic of being a female member of a minority group. The two groups also possess significantly different cultures. It also appears Chicanos do not view the traditional role of housewife as negatively as do Anglos (Ross et al., 1983c). One can also examine the feminist ideology of Chicanas and Anglo women to observe how this role is viewed. Both groups of women have similar goals: egalitarian relations between the sexes and increased independence for women (Mason, 1980). But, the ideologies also contain several differences. For example, Mason (1980) analyzed skits performed by the Teatro Campesino, a group of performers presenting skits on farmworker and general Chicano issues, and pointed out that while Anglo women reject and devalue the traditional female role, Chicanas value the role and are seeking to enhance the status that has been prescribed to it. Mason observed that several patterns emerge from the skits, such as a commitment to family, community, and Chicano culture, as well as equal respect for the contributions and abilities of males and females, including roles traditionally performed by women. In addition, Mason revealed that while Anglo feminists seek to make changes to benefit women, Chicana feminists strive to make gains for all Chicanos. Consequently,
Vasquez and Gonzalez (1981) pointed out that Chicanas are involved in dual strategies of attaining equality as women within the context of families and as minority group members in the general society.

Limitations

Several limitations associated with this research must be noted. First, data were not gathered for husbands regarding their levels on various factors examined in this analysis. For instance, availability of information on the degree to which the husband is integrated into Mexican culture, his perceptions on the amount of help he provides his wife with household chores, his degree of marital satisfaction, and the degree to which he experiences psychological distress could present different results than those observed.

Second, the low degree to which the model explained nontraditional housework performance and marital satisfaction is bothersome. The scale used to measure nontraditional housework performance was developed for this study. Several items asked the respondents to report who generally performed different tasks in the home. Unfortunately, very little variance was observed in the responses to these items, with most of the chores performed by the woman. Fortunately, a follow-up question asked the respondent to indicate who performed the task when the person who generally did the chore was unable to do it, however. This information provided a way of increasing the variance since the degree of housework performed by the wife and the husband could be assessed. But, persons vary in the amount of time they spend performing these activities. In addition, a person who provides help to the person who generally does the
activity may do so only once a year or five months out of the year. Hence, the measure of nontraditional housework performance is limited. Moreover, the response category "both equally," referring to the husband and wife performing the particular activity equally, was created after the data were collected; women who shared the performance of any activity equally had to ask the interviewer to write this response on the instrument.

One important variable influencing marital satisfaction was not available. The length of time a couple has been married has been observed to have an effect on marital satisfaction (Gove and Peterson, 1980). However, age can be considered a proxy for length of marriage since older individuals generally have been married for a longer time than their younger counterparts. In addition, one item comprising one of the indicators of marital turmoil concerned the degree to which the couple had arguments. Although this item may indeed signal marital strife, it also can represent a positive effect on marital satisfaction because the couple can communicate their hostilities to each other. This information can, then, be used in understanding one's partner better. In contrast, when such outlets are unavailable, the hostility may remain vented inside of the individuals.

Third, the small number of women who were currently married and living with their husbands at the time of the survey made more thorough analysis difficult. For instance, a larger sample would have made several other comparisons besides employment status possible, such as a comparison between native Chicanas and Mexican-born Chicanas.
Fourth, employment status refers to whether or not the woman was employed at the time of the survey. Hence, women not working at the time, but having worked for a relatively long period of time shortly before the survey are viewed as unemployed. In addition, the amount of time the woman worked per week was not available for analysis. Consequently, women working full-time and part-time are not disaggregated. Availability of such data may provide further information.

Suggestions for Further Research

The inclusion of several other factors in studying psychological distress among Chicanas could provide valuable information in understanding this phenomenon. First, an investigation interviewing both spouses regarding their perceptions of the amount of housework they perform, sex-role attitudes, degree of marital satisfaction, and levels of psychological discomfort could help in providing a more thorough analysis of the proposed model. Second, the examination of men and nonmarried persons could assess whether similar findings are observed among these different subpopulations. Third, the level of status inconsistency between the wife and husband could provide a new perspective for understanding marital satisfaction and psychological distress among married Chicanas. The findings regarding the negative effect of education on nontraditional housework performance and marital satisfaction hint at this area of investigation. Fourth, the influence of the extended-family support system on the psychological well-being of older unmarried men and women is another area that deserves examination. Finally, a longitudinal analysis should be undertaken to observe how changes in household
structure influence nontraditional housework performance, marital satisfaction, and psychological distress. Such an approach could also provide information regarding lag periods between the change in household structure and the amount of housework performed by the husband, for example.

Applications and Implications

The findings of this investigation can be applied in mental health, family counseling, and policymaking settings. The results show that employment has positive benefits in the psychological well-being of Chicanas. Thus, family practitioners and policymakers should make efforts for the establishment of training programs that can provide useful skills to make Chicanas valuable contributors to society. Such programs could serve as preventive measures regarding psychological discomfort. Employment ultimately could provide women with a sense of independence that may be translated to a higher level of psychological well-being.

However, the results also demonstrate that employed women are likely to experience marital dissatisfaction. One reason for this may be that women fail to receive adequate amounts of help with child care and housework chores. Hence, policymakers should seek to establish child-care centers that are accessible and affordable to Chicanas. Child-care centers could be situated in the same building where women are receiving training or working. Neighborhood child-care centers can also be established in areas containing large proportions of Chicanos. Child-care centers could serve the purpose of helping women deal with logistics and financial problems concerning the care of their children during working
hours. Unemployed women who wish to work but cannot because of child-care responsibilities can additionally benefit from such centers.

In addition, family practitioners could establish programs to promote less rigid sex roles concerning the performance of housework activities. Employed women who receive help from their husbands with these chores are less likely to feel overburdened. Family practitioners could work with the Chicano media to promote the image of the helping husband who is not disturbed by lending a hand to his wife with housework responsibilities. Hence, Spanish-language radio, television, and magazines can be mobilized in these efforts. The Anglo media can also be pressured to discontinue the portrayal of houseworkers as being only women. Indeed, the media are likely to have the greatest impact in the relatively near future in the transformation of housework chores from being the sole responsibility of women to a more egalitarian division of labor. Still, these changes are unlikely to be immediate because such behavior is influenced by socialization, which occurs over many years.

Moreover, policymakers and family practitioners could establish counseling centers to help both employed and unemployed women deal with marital and psychological problems. Great effort should be made to insure that the counselors be bilingual and have an understanding of Chicano culture. The centers should also have flexible hours and be located close to Chicano neighborhoods. These suggestions would help in not deterring Chicanas from seeking help when they need it.

The results of this dissertation have additional implications for sociology. For the most part, the overwhelming majority of research examining the relationship between changing roles of women and
psychological distress has concentrated on Anglo women. Indeed, the literature only revealed a handful of studies examining Chicanas, but these tended to have community-specific settings. This present effort adds to the literature by providing information regarding the association of the changing roles and psychological well-being among Chicanas using data from a larger setting.

Another contribution of this investigation concerns the examination of role-stress theory as used by Gove and his colleagues (Gove and Tudor, 1973; Gove and Geerken, 1977) to explain the effect of traditional roles on the psychological well-being of women. The causal-ordering structure of factors affecting psychological distress used in this analysis presents a more sophisticated manner of examination than generally observed in the literature. In addition, the results suggest that traditional Chicanas do not necessarily face the same experiences in psychological discomfort encountered by their Anglo peers. These results also suggest differences in the manner in which the traditional roles of women are viewed in Chicano and Anglo culture.

Furthermore, the results provide information regarding the impact of ethnic integration on the relationship between husbands and wives in the performance of housework. The findings fail to show the caricatured Chicano couple where the wife performed all the housework, while her husband sat back ruling his kingdom. At the same time, however, those women who are more integrated into Mexican culture tend to receive less help from their husbands with these activities, although the relationship is not significant.
Moreover, the findings add to the literature in its discovery of a nonsignificant relationship between ethnic integration and psychological distress, although the association is in a positive direction. Hence, a woman's integration into Mexican culture does not necessarily have a significant negative impact on her psychological well-being. Positive elements of this culture may help the individual member cope with problems when they arise. For instance, the extended family has long been central to the Chicano; the help the Chicana receives from this network is likely to outweigh the negative impact of less favorable elements of this culture, such as the relatively rigid division of sex roles.

Also, the use of multiple indicators—cultural preference, Spanish-language use, and contact with persons of Mexican descent—to measure ethnic integration provides a more sophisticated approach to the measurement of this concept than that observed in the literature. Although it is common to think of integration into Mexican culture involving multiple spheres, researchers have continued using single measures, notably primary language used and citizenship status, to measure ethnic integration. The use of the multiple-indicator approach for measuring ethnic integration may be responsible for the failure to replicate the significant relationships between ethnic integration and other variables observed by others.

In sum, the findings of this dissertation have implications for social scientists working in both applied and basic settings. This analysis is unique because it examines the relationship between traditional sex roles, marital satisfaction, and psychological distress among Chicanas living in the Southwest and Chicago, a group whose lives
are currently being influenced by two cultures--Anglo and Mexican. Consequently, the findings provide an understanding of the manners in which changing women's roles affect their marital relationships and psychological well-being in a bi-cultural setting.
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APPENDIX A: SELECTED QUESTIONS FROM INTERVIEW SCHEDULE
D1. We need to know how many people live in this house, counting all adults and children, including babies. How many live here in total?

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

D2. Now I'd like to know a little about each one, first yourself.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. What is he/she to you? (FIRST NAME)</th>
<th>b. Male or female</th>
<th>c. How old is he/she?</th>
<th>d. In what state was he/she born?</th>
<th>e. What is he/she doing now?</th>
<th>f. How many years was he/she in school in total?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. RESPONDENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. FEMALE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. MALE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. FEMALE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. MALE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. FEMALE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. MALE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. FEMALE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. MALE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. FEMALE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. MALE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. FEMALE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. MALE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. FEMALE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. MALE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. FEMALE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. MALE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. FEMALE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. MALE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. FEMALE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IF MORE SPACE IS NEEDED, USE SUPPLEMENTAL FAMILY FORM AND CHECK THIS BOX [ ]
1. Are you working now?
   1. YES
   5. NO
   (NEXT PAGE)

2. Have you worked for pay in 1977 or 1978?
   1. YES
   5. NO

3. Have you ever worked for pay?
   1. YES
   5. NO

4. What was the last work you did for money?

5. What kind of business or industry was that in?

6. When did you first start working at that job? MONTH/YEAR

7. When did you stop working at that job? MONTH/YEAR

8. What are the reasons why you have not worked since then?

9. Has there been a time since then when you wanted to have a job?
   1. YES
   5. NO
   (NEXT PAGE)

10. What are the reasons you have never worked?

11. Was there ever a time in your life when you wanted to get a job?
   1. YES
   5. NO

12. When was that? MONTH/YEAR

13. What happened that you didn't find work?
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S1. Now I am going to ask you some questions about the things you like most.

Let's start with music:

a. Who is your favorite musician or singer? ____________________________ :19-20

b. What is your favorite dish or meal? ________________________________ :21

c. If you and your family could take a vacation and could travel, where would you like to visit? ________________________________ :22-24

d. Which is your favorite sport? ________________________________ :25-26

S2. Think about your family. What aspects of Mexican culture would you like them to maintain the most? (PROBE FOR FULL RESPONSE)

_________________________________________________________________________:27-32

S3. What do you think people of Mexican descent in the United States have most in common? (PROBE FOR AT LEAST THREE RESPONSES)

_________________________________________________________________________:33-36

S4. I am going to ask you about several things that some people do. Assuming you could do these things, how much would you like to do them? (HAND & CARD). Use this card to answer whether you would like it very much, quite a bit, like it a little, or not like it at all. Remember, I want to know how much you would like doing them if they were available.

How much do/would you like to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How much do/would you like to</th>
<th>LIKE IT VERY MUCH</th>
<th>QUITE A BIT</th>
<th>LIKE IT A LITTLE</th>
<th>NOT LIKE IT AT ALL</th>
<th>DON'T KNOW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Watch Spanish language TV programs</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>:39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Listen to Spanish language radio programs</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>:40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Go to Mexican movies</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>:41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Go to performances by Mexican entertainers</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>:42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Read Spanish language newspapers or magazines</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>:43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Have your children maintain Mexican traditions when they grow up</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>:44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Now I'd like to ask you about how much discrimination or unfair treatment you think different groups face in the United States. Think about American Indians. Do you think American Indians face a lot of discrimination, some discrimination, a little, or no discrimination at all? (RAND CARD 15).

Please use this card for your answers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A LOT</th>
<th>SOME</th>
<th>A LITTLE</th>
<th>NONE</th>
<th>DON'T KNOW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. American Indians</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Asian Americans (Chinese, Japanese, etc.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. People of Mexican descent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Blacks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. People of Cuban descent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. People of Puerto Rican descent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have some questions about the people you know or see nowadays. How many of your friends, now, are of Mexican descent? All of them, most of them, a few of them, or none of them?


How many of your neighbors, now, are of Mexican descent?


How many of your co-workers, now, are of Mexican descent?

**Please answer the next questions by giving one of the following responses**
(MARK R CARD 3) IF QUESTION IS "NOT APPLICABLE," MARK "N/A.

| L16. Do(es)/did ________________ speak to you in English or in Spanish? |
|-------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| ENG.                          | SPAN.          | N/A            |
| a. your husband/wife          | 1 2 3 4 5 9   | 145            |
| b. your father                | 1 2 3 4 5 9   | 146            |
| c. your mother                | 1 2 3 4 5 9   | 147            |
| d. your brothers and sisters  | 1 2 3 4 5 9   | 148            |
| e. your children              | 1 2 3 4 5 9   | 149            |

| L17. Do/did you speak to ___________ in English or in Spanish? |
|-------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| ENG.                          | SPAN.          | N/A            |
| a. your husband/wife          | 1 2 3 4 5 9   | 150            |
| b. your father                | 1 2 3 4 5 9   | 151            |
| c. your mother                | 1 2 3 4 5 9   | 152            |
| d. your brothers and sisters  | 1 2 3 4 5 9   | 153            |
| e. your children              | 1 2 3 4 5 9   | 154            |

| L18. What do you use with most of your friends? | 1 2 3 4 5 9 | 155 |
| L19. What do you use with your fellow workers on the job? | 1 2 3 4 5 9 | 156 |
| L20. With which do you feel most at ease when you are talking about personal or intimate things? | 1 2 3 4 5 9 | 157 |
| L21. What do you use when you are angry? | 1 2 3 4 5 9 | 158 |
| L22. What is used at your church service? | 1 2 3 4 5 9 | 159 |

| L23. Are you using more, about the same amount, or less English than you were using ten years ago? |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| 1. MORE                          | 2. SAME        | 3. LESS        | 1. MORE        |

| L24. Are you using more, about the same amount, or less Spanish than you were using ten years ago? |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| 1. MORE                          | 2. SAME        | 3. LESS        | 1. MORE        |
Now I'd like to ask you about who does certain chores around the house. Please tell me generally who does it?

a. cooks the main meal for the family?  
   If doesn't do it, who does it?  
   Respondent | Spouse | Children | R's Mother | R's Father | Other Relative | Other | No One | N.A.  
   1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 9  
   63  

b. does the laundry?  
   If doesn't do it, who does it?  
   Respondent | Spouse | Children | R's Mother | R's Father | Other Relative | Other | No One | N.A.  
   1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 9  
   65  

c. washes the dishes?  
   If doesn't do it, who does it?  
   Respondent | Spouse | Children | R's Mother | R's Father | Other Relative | Other | No One | N.A.  
   1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 9  
   67  

d. shops for groceries?  
   If doesn't do it, who does it?  
   Respondent | Spouse | Children | R's Mother | R's Father | Other Relative | Other | No One | N.A.  
   1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 9  
   69  

e. takes out the garbage?  
   If doesn't do it, who does it?  
   Respondent | Spouse | Children | R's Mother | R's Father | Other Relative | Other | No One | N.A.  
   1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 9  
   71  

f. takes care of the car when it has problems?  
   If doesn't do it, who does it?  
   Respondent | Spouse | Children | R's Mother | R's Father | Other Relative | Other | No One | N.A.  
   1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 9  
   73  

g. feeds the baby?  
   If doesn't do it, who does it?  
   Respondent | Spouse | Children | R's Mother | R's Father | Other Relative | Other | No One | N.A.  
   1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 9  
   76  

h. bathes the baby?  
   If doesn't do it, who does it?  
   Respondent | Spouse | Children | R's Mother | R's Father | Other Relative | Other | No One | N.A.  
   1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 9  
   77  

i. dresses or changes the baby?  
   If doesn't do it, who does it?  
   Respondent | Spouse | Children | R's Mother | R's Father | Other Relative | Other | No One | N.A.  
   1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 9  
   79  

CHECKPOINT P  
DOES R HAVE CHILDREN 5 OR YOUNGER?  
1. Yes  
5. No  
GO TO CHECK Q (NEXT PAGE)  

   "DOES R HAVE CHILDREN 5 OR YOUNGER?"  
   Respondent | Spouse | Children | R's Mother | R's Father | Other Relative | Other | No One | N.A.  
   1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 9  
   75  

   g. feeds the baby?  
   If doesn't do it, who does it?  
   Respondent | Spouse | Children | R's Mother | R's Father | Other Relative | Other | No One | N.A.  
   1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 9  
   76  

   h. bathes the baby?  
   If doesn't do it, who does it?  
   Respondent | Spouse | Children | R's Mother | R's Father | Other Relative | Other | No One | N.A.  
   1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 9  
   77  

   i. dresses or changes the baby?  
   If doesn't do it, who does it?  
   Respondent | Spouse | Children | R's Mother | R's Father | Other Relative | Other | No One | N.A.  
   1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 9  
   79
H4. Using the answers on this card (HAND R CARD 12)

How often have you:

1. Felt irritated or resentful with what your wife/husband did or didn't do; would you say many times, sometimes, hardly ever, or never?  
   - MANY TIMES  
   - SOME TIMES  
   - HARDLY EVER  
   - NEVER  

2. Wished your wife/husband talked more about how (s)he feels or thinks?  
   - MANY TIMES  
   - SOME TIMES  
   - HARDLY EVER  
   - NEVER  

3. Had arguments with your wife/husband?  
   - MANY TIMES  
   - SOME TIMES  
   - HARDLY EVER  
   - NEVER  

4. Wished that your wife/husband understood you better?  
   - MANY TIMES  
   - SOME TIMES  
   - HARDLY EVER  
   - NEVER  

5. Wished that your wife/husband were more aware of your needs?  
   - MANY TIMES  
   - SOME TIMES  
   - HARDLY EVER  
   - NEVER  

H5. Here are some statements concerning marriage and raising children (HAND R CARD 13)

I would like you to tell me whether you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree with each statement.

1. Raising children should be just as important to a man as it is to a woman.
   - 1. S.A.  
   - 2. A.  
   - 3. D.  
   - 4. S.D.  
   - 8. D.K.  

2. Husbands should make all the important decisions in a marriage.
   - 1. S.A.  
   - 2. A.  
   - 3. D.  
   - 4. S.D.  
   - 8. D.K.  

3. It is O.K. if a wife with young children has a job outside the home, if she wants.
   - 1. S.A.  
   - 2. A.  
   - 3. D.  
   - 4. S.D.  
   - 8. D.K.  

4. Men shouldn't do housework.
   - 1. S.A.  
   - 2. A.  
   - 3. D.  
   - 4. S.D.  
   - 8. D.K.  

5. It is O.K. for a wife to earn more money than her husband.
   - 1. S.A.  
   - 2. A.  
   - 3. D.  
   - 4. S.D.  
   - 8. D.K.  

6. A wife should do whatever her husband wants.
   - 1. S.A.  
   - 2. A.  
   - 3. D.  
   - 4. S.D.  
   - 8. D.K.
Using this card, (HAND P CARD 18), how often have the following happened to you in the last few years, **many times, some times, hardly ever, never**.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How often have you (had/been):</th>
<th>MANY TIMES</th>
<th>SOME TIMES</th>
<th>HARDLY EVER</th>
<th>NEVER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Ill health that affected the amount of work you do</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Bothered by shortness of breath even when you were not exercising or working hard</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Bothered by your heart beating hard</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Dizzy spells</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Bothered by nightmares</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Gained weight when something important bothered you</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Hands trembling enough to bother you</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Hands sweating so that they feel damp and clammy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Times when you just couldn't get going</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Drank alcoholic beverages to help you when you feel tense, worried or nervous</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. To take medicines or drugs to help you when you feel tense, worried, or nervous</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Eaten too much when you feel tense, worried, or nervous</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Trouble getting to sleep or staying asleep</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Bothered by nervousness or feeling fidgety and tense</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Trouble from headaches</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. Loss of appetite</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. Bothered by an upset stomach</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. Difficulty in getting up in the morning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s. Tendency to lose weight when something important is bothering you</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B: CORRELATION MATRIX
Table B.1. Zero-order correlations among indicators of exogenous and endogenous variables used as input for the LISREL model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>X1</th>
<th>X2</th>
<th>X3</th>
<th>X4</th>
<th>X5</th>
<th>X6</th>
<th>X7</th>
<th>Y1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X1</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2</td>
<td>-.295</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.223</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X4</td>
<td>-.150</td>
<td>-.152</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X5</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>-.227</td>
<td>-.146</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X6</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>-.304</td>
<td>-.151</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>.219</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X7</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>-.634</td>
<td>-.155</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>.399</td>
<td>.409</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y1</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>-.098</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>-.097</td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>-.186</td>
<td>-.105</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>-.089</td>
<td>-.105</td>
<td>-.037</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y4</td>
<td>-.098</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>-.055</td>
<td>-.052</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>-.087</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>-.065</td>
<td>-.092</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* X1 = age; X2 = education; X3 = employment status; X4 = children; X5 = cultural preference; X6 = Mexican contact; X7 = Spanish use; Y1 = nontraditional housework performance; Y2 = marital harmony; Y3 = satisfactory communication; Y4 = psychological symptoms; Y5 = physical symptoms.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Y2</th>
<th>Y3</th>
<th>Y4</th>
<th>Y5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.581</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.266</td>
<td>-.223</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.202</td>
<td>-.157</td>
<td>.572</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C: PHI MATRICES
Table C.1. Phi matrices representing the relationships among exogenous variables for Figures 4.1 to 4.4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Employment Status</th>
<th>Children</th>
<th>Ethnic Integration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Figure 4.1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Integration</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Figure 4.2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Integration</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.63</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Figure 4.3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Integration</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Figure 4.4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>171.71</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-17.71</td>
<td>16.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>-4.79</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Integration</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>-3.74</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Figure 4.5</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>89.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-4.88</td>
<td>13.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
<td>-1.89</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Integration</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-4.15</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D: VARIANCE-COVARIANCE MATRICES
Table D.1. Variance-covariance matrices used as input for LISREL models for unemployed and employed women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>X1</th>
<th>X2</th>
<th>X3</th>
<th>X4</th>
<th>X5</th>
<th>X6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unemployed</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X1</td>
<td>171.709</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2</td>
<td>-17.713</td>
<td>16.013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3</td>
<td>-4.790</td>
<td>-.558</td>
<td>3.378</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X4</td>
<td>3.315</td>
<td>-2.773</td>
<td>.366</td>
<td>14.596</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X5</td>
<td>1.128</td>
<td>-1.792</td>
<td>.404</td>
<td>-.881</td>
<td>2.137</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X6</td>
<td>3.509</td>
<td>-3.283</td>
<td>.395</td>
<td>1.696</td>
<td>.673</td>
<td>1.640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y1</td>
<td>3.302</td>
<td>-1.372</td>
<td>-.382</td>
<td>.662</td>
<td>-.198</td>
<td>.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2</td>
<td>2.421</td>
<td>-1.262</td>
<td>-.175</td>
<td>-.678</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>.241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3</td>
<td>4.628</td>
<td>-1.135</td>
<td>-.373</td>
<td>-.469</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y4</td>
<td>-4.872</td>
<td>2.615</td>
<td>-.743</td>
<td>1.456</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>-1.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5</td>
<td>9.694</td>
<td>-.714</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>3.061</td>
<td>.443</td>
<td>.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employed</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X1</td>
<td>89.969</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2</td>
<td>-4.882</td>
<td>13.695</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3</td>
<td>-.535</td>
<td>-1.886</td>
<td>2.917</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X4</td>
<td>-1.068</td>
<td>-3.655</td>
<td>1.475</td>
<td>16.670</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X5</td>
<td>-1.756</td>
<td>-1.241</td>
<td>.438</td>
<td>1.669</td>
<td>2.164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X6</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>-2.747</td>
<td>.586</td>
<td>2.368</td>
<td>.860</td>
<td>1.610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y1</td>
<td>2.588</td>
<td>.587</td>
<td>-1.211</td>
<td>1.833</td>
<td>-.963</td>
<td>-.427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2</td>
<td>2.512</td>
<td>-.307</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.477</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3</td>
<td>1.518</td>
<td>1.489</td>
<td>-.600</td>
<td>-.445</td>
<td>-.289</td>
<td>-.293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y4</td>
<td>-7.293</td>
<td>-.201</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.640</td>
<td>.508</td>
<td>.301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y5</td>
<td>.902</td>
<td>-.553</td>
<td>-.259</td>
<td>-.096</td>
<td>.252</td>
<td>.429</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* X1 = age; X2 = education; X3 = employment status; X4 = children; X5 = cultural preference; X6 = Mexican contact; X7 = Spanish use; Y1 = nontraditional housework performance; Y2 = marital harmony; Y3 = satisfactory communication; Y4 = psychological symptoms; Y5 = physical symptoms.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1.282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.868</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Y1</th>
<th>Y2</th>
<th>Y3</th>
<th>Y4</th>
<th>Y5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.192</td>
<td>-.794</td>
<td>-1.759</td>
<td>7.642</td>
<td>10.458</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>