THE COGNITIVE-AFFECTIVE STRESS PROPENSITY MODEL IN THE US AND MEXICO

J. C. WOFFORD
Department of Management - 19467
University of Texas at Arlington
Arlington, Texas 76019
Phone: 817-272-3855
Fax: 817-272-3122
wofford@exchange.uta.edu

*STEVE LOVETT
San Diego State University
Imperial Valley Campus
Calexico, CA 92231
Phone: 760-768-5601
Fax: 760-768-5631
slovett@mail.sdsu.edu

COVADONGA VILLA
Instituto Tecnologico Autonomo de Mexico
Rio Hondo No. 1
Col. Tizapan San Angel
01000 Mexico, D.F.

*corresponding author and presenter

As the globalization of business progresses, the understanding of similarities and differences in human behavior across cultures becomes increasingly important. Stress, the subject of this paper, seems to occur ubiquitously across both occupations (Sullivan & Bhagat, 1992) and cultures (Kawanishi, 1995; Sin & Cheng, 1995). A great deal of research has been devoted to the study of stress, especially in the United States.

Still, we know very little about the effect of culture on stress, or even whether the basic stress phenomena is universal or varies across cultures. The purpose of this paper is to investigate this question by comparing a Mexican and US sample. These two nations are both western, but differ in language, European heritage, dominant religion and recent histories, and can therefore provide an interesting test of the universiality of the stress phenomena.

The issue is currently unresolved. On one hand, Sin and Cheng (1995) provide evidence for a universal stress phenomena. They examined stressor factors among Hong Kong business executives, and concluded that their findings were consistent with studies in the West and that "at least some findings obtained in the West can be generalized to the East" (p. 23). On the other hand, Kawanishi (1995) found important differences in the attributions made for the causes of stress in Japan and the US. Japanese individuals showed a stronger tendency to attribute stress both to "bad luck" and to their own lack of carefulness.

Because of our emphasis on cognitive-affective mediating processes, we use the definition of stress given by Ivancevich and Matteson (1980): "an adaptive response, mediated by individual characteristics and/or psychological processes, which is a consequence of any external action, situation or event that places special physical and/or psychological demands upon a person" (p. 9). The conscious experience of stressor stimuli is termed subjective stress (Eden, 1982). The negative psychological and physiological consequences of the stress response are referred to as strain (Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek & Rosenthal, 1964).

THE CASP MODEL

Wofford and Daly (1997) and Wofford, Daly, and Juban (1996a) present a cognitive-affective stress propensity (CASP) model, which is the basic vehicle for this paper. In this model, cognitive-affective processes (CAP) mediate between stressor stimuli and subsequent outcomes. CASP moderates the relationships of stressors with the CAP mediator, and the relationships of physiological arousal and affective reactions with subjective stress and with strain. Stress propensity is conceived as a latent construct manifested by stress related personality traits or schemata. These trait schemata include locus of control (LOC), negative affectivity (NA), negative self-esteem (NSE), anger-irritability (AI), psychological magnification (PM), and cognitive affective connectivity (CAC).

Wofford, Daly, and Juban (1996b) found that five of these traits (AI was not examined) load on the CASP construct. In addition, they found significant path coefficients between CASP and subjective stress. Our primary hypothesis is that the CASP model, developed in the US, will also apply in Mexico.

H1: The CASP latent construct has significant path linkages with stress propensity constructs and also with subjective stress, psychological strain, and physiological strain for both a Mexican and US sample.

While we predict that the basic stress phenomena will be consistent across the two cultures, we do expect to find differences in the precursor and outcome variables. Our hypotheses are found below. Finally, we offer hypotheses concerning sex differences.

Locus of Control (LOC)

Internal control individuals believe that they control their own lives. External control individuals believe that their lives are under the control of powerful others, luck, fate, etc. Considerable evidence exists of the relationship between external locus of control and stress or ill-health (Hurrell & Murphy, 1991).

Similar research has not been conducted in Mexico; however, Diaz-Guerrero (1988) describes North Americans as "autonomous" and "self-sufficient," and Mexicans as "fatalistic" (p.186). This description is also supported by evidence from the language. An English speaker who drops an object, for example, commonly describes the event actively, as something that he or she has done: "I dropped it." A Spanish speaker, however, often describes the same event as something that happened to the speaker: "Se me cayo," or, loosely, "it fell to me." Accordingly, we expect the Mexican sample to show a more external locus of control than the US sample.

H2: Mexican subjects are more external in locus of control than are US subjects.

Negative Affectivity (NA)

High NA individuals tend to focus more on the negative side of the world, have a less favorable self-view, and are more dissatisfied with themselves and their lives. Results of a study by Brief, Burke, George, Robinson, and Webster (1988) suggest that NA often inflates relationships between work-stress measures and psychological symptoms.

Whereas no direct studies are available that compare Mexican with US individuals on negative affectivity, Diaz-Guerrero describes US citizens as more tense as compared to their Mexican counterparts. We hypothesize that:

H3: US subjects are higher in negative affectivity than are Mexican subjects.

Negative Self-Esteem (NSE)

Individuals with low self-esteem include in their schemata critical evaluations and negative emotions associated with the construct "self.@ DeLongis, Folkman, and Lazarus (1988) found that individuals with low self-esteem were more likely to experience an increase in psychological

and somatic problems than were individuals high in self-esteem. Rosenberg's (1965) study of more than 500 US high-school students found correlations between negative self-esteem and depressive emotion, and several indicators of anxiety.

We found no research comparisons of US negative self-esteem levels with those in Mexico. Because our sample is made up of college students, and since Mexican college students tend to be more affluent relative to the general population of Mexico than US college students relative to the US population, we hypothesize that, for this sample:

H4: US subjects are higher in negative self-esteem than the Mexican subjects.

Anger-Irritability (AI)

The type A/B behavior pattern (TABP) is complex characterized by high need for achievement, competitiveness, hostility, and time-urgency. Moser and Dyck (1989) showed that Type A's retain hostile self-schemas, which are activated by failure even when the failure was unavoidable. Spence, Helmreich and Pred (1987) identified the two underlying dimensions of TABP as Achievement Strivings (AS) and Impatience-Irritability (II). Subsequently, Bluen, Barling, and Burns (1990) indicated that AS is positively related to various performance indexes, whereas II is associated with illness. The II dimension has been further refined, dropping an impatience construct but retaining anger and irritability (AI) (Robbins, Spence & Clark, 1991).

Diaz-Guerrero (1988) indicate the US individuals are "a bit aggressive in their interpersonal relations" (p. 186), confirming the folk wisdom in Mexico that US people are irritable and quick to anger. We hypothesize that,

H5: US subjects are higher in anger-irritability than are Mexican subjects.

Psychological Magnification (PM)

Psychological magnification is the tendency for an affective response to stimulate cognitive processes such as worry or rumination. This cyclical process heightens and prolongs the affective responses as working memory is stimulated through a looping process. Affects have a snowball effect as the cycle of images and emotions expands (Carlson & Carlson, 1984).

In individualistic nations such as the US ties between individuals are loose, whereas in collectivistic countries like Mexico people are integrated into cohesive in-groups, which protect them in exchange for loyalty (Hofstede, 1991). Social contacts permit the venting and handling of negative emotions, so we suspect that the greater individualism of the US may result in greater psychological magnification. We suggest that:

H6: US subjects are higher in psychological magnification than Mexican subjects.

Cognitive-Affective Connectivity (CAC)

When concepts such as self, family, or work have strong linkages with affective concepts such as anger, fear, or guilt, cognitive-affective connectivity (CAC) and propensity toward strain are high (Wofford & Daly, 1997). CAC is reflected in a culture by emotions that are evoked by situations commonly experienced in that culture.

Diaz-Guerrero (1988) makes an important distinction between physical and interpersonal reality. "North Americans see external reality as something that they must dominate and subject to their will . . . However, surprisingly, Mexicans presume that the interpersonal reality can be modified to their will. Interpersonal reality is not given or set, as it frequently is for the North Americans (The neighbors are hostile. Mr. Smith is a snob). Interpersonal reality is fluid because "I" am a part of that reality and "I" am capable of modifying it" (p. 49, our translation).

If Mexican individuals feel more in control of their interpersonal reality, it follows that negative interpersonal events should be less likely to result in negative feelings. We expect that:

H7: Cognitive-affective connectivity is lower in the Mexican than in the US sample.

Subjective Stress and Strain

We expect US subjects to be more aware of stress, because stress is less well recognized in the Hispanic culture. In fact, the Spanish word for stress "estres" is simply a corruption of the English word. In addition, because Mexican individuals are believed to be calmer and to have deeper social supports, we expect their psychological strain to be less than their US counterparts.

The evidence for physiological strain is in terms of self-reported health symptoms. We expect these symptoms to be more likely to be recognized in the US sample. Simply because of economic development, health problems in general are more solvable in the US through drugs or medical attention, and are therefore more likely to be recognized. Mexicans are more likely to adapt to or resign themselves to minor health problems, even to the point of not recognizing them. Accordingly, we hypothesize that:

H8: US subjects are higher in subjective stress, psychological strain, and physiological strain than the Mexican subjects.

Sex Differences

Substantial evidence of sex differences in the stress phenomena exists (Jick & Mitz, 1985; Russo, 1985). Wofford, Daly, and Juban (1996b) found a higher loading for men of NA on CASP, whereas women had higher loadings on psychological magnification. Women also had a higher path coefficient for the CASP with subjective stress. Also, Nelson and Quick (1985) suggested that women experience more strain than men. Finally, Cooper and Davidson (1982) found that women have higher rates of psychological and emotional discomfort.

Given the above results, we hypothesize that for both samples:

H9: Men have higher scores on negative affectivity and anger-irritability than women.

H10: Women have higher scores than men on psychological magnification, negative self-esteem, locus of control, subjective stress, psychological strain and physiological strain.

METHOD

Sample and Procedures

Samples were obtained from two university student populations located in Mexico City and in a metropolitan area in the southwestern United States. The US sample is made up of 358 subjects (203 males and 155 females). The Mexican sample includes 121 subjects (61 females and 60 males). Ninety-three percent of the subjects had full-time work experience. They had worked for an average of 2.8 years of full-time and 4.0 years of part-time employment.

The US sample came to a research facility in groups and completed instruments that assessed psychological traits, perceived psychological stress, subjective stress, physiological strain, and demographic information. The Mexican sample completed the same instruments (translated by the Spanish speaking researchers into Spanish) during regular class sessions.

Measurements

Trait measures assessed included: negative affectivity (Levin & Stokes, 1989), self-esteem (Eagly, 1967), anger-irritability (Robbins, Spence & Clark, 1991) and locus of control (Rotter, 1966). The psychological magnification scale assessed the extent to which subjects experience increasing emotional intensity after a stimulus, dwell on other situations associated with the emotions initially stimulated, and mentally recreate bad scenes of life experiences associated with the elicited emotions (Wofford, et al., 1997).

The CAC measure assesses the extent to which an individual's conceptual memory is linked with affective memory (Wofford, et al., 1996). The first subscale assesses the degree to which positive affects such as happiness, excitement, surprise, pleasure, and calmness are associated with self, family, social life, and school. The second subscale assesses negative affects such as fear, boredom, and guilt. A total CAC test score was obtained by reversing the scores of the positive affect items.

The subjective stress measure developed by the authors measured the subjects= perception of the amount of stress experienced at school. The perceived psychological strain instrument

assessed the extent of subjects: worry, depression, anxiety, sensitivity to criticism, embarrassment, and crying. The physiological strain instrument listed seventeen health symptoms (nausea, headaches, etc.) and asked subjects to indicate whether they had the symptoms in the past 30 days and whether they had been severe enough to see a doctor (Chen & Spector, 1991).

Statistical Analysis

Structural equation models (SEM) procedures were used to analyze the data. SEM allows a confirmatory approach toward determining the nature of the underlying structure (Harris & Schaubroeck, 1990), and can assess the relationships between constructs without the bias usually introduced from measurement error (Judd, Jessor & Donovan, 1986). By using SEM rather than regression, researchers can examine the relationships between many sets of variables without the attenuation problem. On the other hand, a problem of SEM and the latent variable approach is the influence of unmeasured variables. SEM will produce the most desirable parameter estimates from the sample data whether or not important constructs have been left out of the model.

Because each latent construct should have three or more indicators, the items for the measures of subjective stress, psychological strain, and physiological strain were randomly divided into three subscales. Reliabilities for these subscales were low; however, SEM is robust for lack of reliability of measures.

RESULTS

The correlations, means, and standard deviations for the dependent variables and independent variables are shown in Table 1. Correlations for the Mexican sample are shown above the diagonal, with those for the US sample below.

Reliabilities for the US sample were: psychological magnification - .88; cognitive affective connectivity - .84; negative self-esteem - .66; negative affectivity - .63; anger-irritability - .89; locus of control - .63; three subjective stress subscales - .53, .72, and .43; three psychological strain subscales - .61, .43, and .68; and three physiological strain subscales - .58, .49, and .37. For the Mexican sample the reliabilities were: psychological magnification - .78; cognitive affective connectivity - .91; negative self-esteem - .86; negative affectivity - .72; anger-irritability - .76; locus of control - .54; subjective stress subscales - .48, .76, and .43; psychological strain subscales - .70, .56, and .54; and physiological strain subscales - .26, .51, and .32.

Insert Table 1 about here

Structural Equation Models Analyses

All SEM analyses were conducted using the observed variance-covariance matrix. Because of the large sample size, the comparative fit index (CFI) was used to evaluate goodness-of-fit (Bagozzi & Yi, 1989). A CFI of .90 or higher indicates a good fit of the model to the data.

The goodness-of-fit indices indicate that the hypothesized model provides a good fit with the data for the Mexico sample (χ^2 = 137.1, df = 81, $\underline{p} < .01$; CFI = .91) and the US sample (χ^2 = 270.2, df = 81, $\underline{p} < .01$; CFI = .91). These fit statistics support Hypothesis 1, that the hypothesized causal model is an appropriate representation of *both* the US and Mexican samples.

The parameter values for both samples are shown in Table 2 and Figure 1. All of the CASP indicators and responses obtained statistically significant loadings for both samples.

Insert Table 2 and Figure 1 about here

Analysis of Cultural Differences in Relationships among Variables

Multisample analysis procedures in EQS were then used to test for significant differences between the covariance matrices and fit statistics for the Mexico and US samples. To test whether the path coefficients for CASP with subjective stress are the same for Mexico and US, we tested for equality of the path coefficients and factor loadings between the two samples using the Lagrange Multiplier Test (LMTEST). The parameters are constrained to be equal and if the probability value of the chi-square statistic of a parameter is low ($\underline{p} < .05$), this suggests that the assumption of equality of the parameter among the samples may be rejected. The LMTEST indicates that the path coefficients for CASP with psychological strain ($\chi^2 = 6.6$, $\underline{p} < .01$) and for subjective stress with psychological strain ($\chi^2 = 15.0$, $\underline{p} < .01$) differ among cultures, whereas the path coefficients for CASP with subjective stress, CASP with strain and subjective stress with physiological strain did not differ among samples (Table 2).

As a test of differences between the two cultural samples on the loadings of indicators, LMTEST examined the equality of the factor loadings for the indicators of each construct for Mexico sample data as compared to the US sample data. For this analysis, each of the factor loadings was constrained to be equal across cultural groups. The chi-square statistics indicated that the Mexico sample obtained higher loadings than the US sample on one of the indicators of subjective stress ($\chi^2 = 3.6$, $\underline{p} < .05$) and one of the indicators of psychological strain ($\chi^2 = 14.6$, $\underline{p} < .01$). The Mexico sample also obtained higher loadings for the psychological magnification indicator of CASP ($\chi^2 = 9.9$, $\underline{p} < .01$). The US sample obtained higher loadings on CASP for CAC ($\chi^2 = 6.7$, $\underline{p} < .01$), for NA ($\chi^2 = 13.1$, $\underline{p} < .01$), and for AI ($\chi^2 = 5.0$, $\underline{p} < .01$). In brief, psychological magnification provides a stronger indicator of stress propensity for the Mexico sample, while for the US sample stress propensity is manifest more strongly with CAC, NA, and AI. However, it is important to note that, despite these differences, the overall model fits the data across both samples.

ANOVA Tests for the Effects of Sample and Sex

ANOVA analyses were used to tests hypotheses 2 - 10 (Table 3).

Hypothesis 2 was not supported. Locus of control was not significantly different between the two groups ($F = 2.6$, $p > .05$).

Hypothesis 3 was supported. As expected, negative affectivity scores for the US sample were higher than for the Mexican sample.

Hypothesis 4 was also supported. Negative self-esteem was greater among US students than among Mexican students.

Results relating to hypothesis 5 were in the opposite direction to that expected. Mexican students were higher on anger-irritability than were US students.

Hypothesis 6 and 7 were supported. US subjects were higher in psychological magnification and in cognitive-affective connectivity than were Mexican subjects.

Hypothesis 8 was not supported. Subjective stress and physiological strain were not different among the two cultures; whereas, psychological strain was higher for the Mexican sample than for the US sample.

No differences were found between men and women on the scores for any of the stress related personality traits. Thus, hypothesis 9 was not supported. Hypothesis 10 was supported. Women were higher than men on subjective stress, psychological strain, and physiological strain.

Insert Table 3 about here

DISCUSSION

As expected, the basic model provides a good fit of the data for each cultural sample. Thus, the general structure of the relationships of the stress response that were examined in this study is consistent across cultures.

Some differences were found in indicators of stress propensity across the cultures. First, the LMTEST demonstrated that stress propensity of US students in this sample was defined more in terms of negative affectivity and cognitive-affective connectivity; whereas, for Mexican students it was defined more in terms of psychological magnification. High stress US students manifest this propensity by having greater feelings of negativity about life and greater neuroticism. Mexican students manifest their stress propensity more through a heightening spiral of prolonged emotions following an initial emotional stimulation.

Second, ANOVA tests show the differences in mean scale scores for the stress related traits across cultural samples. The data support our hypotheses for most of the traits. US subjects had higher scale scores for psychological magnification, cognitive-affective connectivity, and negative affectivity. The Mexico sample was higher only for anger-irritability.

Sex differences were not found between stress propensity indicators, but women were higher in subjective stress, psychological strain, and physiological strain. Because these stress response outcomes are higher for women and the stress propensity indicators are low, we speculate that women face more stressors in their lives than do men in both cultures.

As with any study involving a limited sample, a major concern is the quality of the samples taken in each country. Clearly, generalization beyond the types of student groups involved cannot be made. In addition, there is the concern that differences may exist in the reliabilities of the instruments across cultures and languages. We did find differences in the reliabilities of some of the instruments across the cultural groups. We expect the effects of these differences to be greater for the ANOVA comparisons than for the EQS analyses because SEM analyses tend to be robust for unreliability of instruments.

CONCLUSION

Certainly, we must be cautious in generalizing the results of stress research from one culture to another. Indeed, our results show differing stress related trait schemata between the Mexican and US samples. Stress propensity also appears to be manifested by the various traits in different degrees across cultures. None-the-less, the overall results from both of the samples are quite similar (Figure 1). This study provides more evidence for than against a universal stress phenomena.

REFERENCES

Bagozzi, R. & Yi, Y. (1989). On the use of structural equation models in experimental designs, Journal of Marketing Research, 26: 271-284.

Bluen, S. D., Barling, J. & Burns, W. (1990). Predicting sales performance, job satisfaction, and depression by using the achievement strivings an impatience-irritability dimensions of Type A behavior. Journal of Applied Psychology, 75: 212-216.

Brief, A. P., Burke, M. J., George, J. M., Robinson, B. S. & Webster, J. (1988). Should negative affectivity remain an unmeasured variable in the study of job stress? Journal of Applied Psychology, 70: 202-214.

Carlson, L & Carlson, R. (1984). Affect and psychological magnification: Derivations from Tomkins' script theory, Journal of Personality, 52: 36-45.

Chen, P. Y. & Spector, P. E. (1991). Negative affectivity as the underlying cause of correlations between stressors and strains. Journal of Applied Psychology, 76, 398-407.

Cooper, C. & Davidson, M. (1982). The high cost of stress on women managers. Organizational Dynamics, 10, 44-53.

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

Diaz Guerrero, R. (1988). Psicologio del Mexicano. Mexico D.F., Ed. Trillias.

Eagly, A. H. (1967). Involvement as a determinant of response to favorable and unfavorable information. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Monograph, 7: 1-15.

Eden, D. (1982). Critical job events, acute stress, and strain: A multiple interrupted time series. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 30: 312-329.

Harris, M. M. & Schaubroeck, J. (1990). Confirmatory modeling in organizational behavior/human resource management: Issues and applications. Journal of Managment, 16, 337-360.

Hofstede, G. (1991). Culture and organizations: Software of the mind. McGraw Hill, University Press, Cambridge.

Hurrell, J. J., Jr. & Murphy, L. R. (1991). Locus of control, job demands, and health. In Cary L. Cooper and Roy Payne (Eds.) Personality and stress: Individual differences in the stress process. Wiley series in occupational stress, pp. 133-149. Chichester, England: Wiley.

Ivancevich, J. M. & Matteson, M. T. (1980). Stress and work: A managerial perspective. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.

Jick, T. D. & Mitz, L. F. (1985). Sex Differences in work stress. Academy of Management Review, 10, 408-420.

Judd, C. M., Jessor, R. & Donovan, J. E. (1986). Structural equation models and personality research, Journal of Personality, 54, 149-195.

Kahn, R. L., Wolfe, D. M., Quinn, R. P., Snoek, J. D. & Rosenthal, R. A. (1964). Organizational stress: Studies in role conflict and ambiguity. New York: Wiley.

Kawanishi, Y. (1995). The effects of culture on beliefs about stress and coping: Causal attributions of Anglo-American and Japanese persons, Journal of Contemporary Psychotherapy, 25, 49-60.

Levin, I. & Stokes, J. P. (1989). Dispositional approach to job satisfaction: Role of negative affectivity. Journal of Applied Psychology, 74: 752-758.

Moser, C. G. & Dyck, D. G. (1989). Type A Behavior, uncontrollability, and the activation of hostile self-schemata responding. Journal of Research in Personality, 23: 248-267.

Nelson, D. L. & Quick, J. C. (1985). Professional women: Are distress and disease inevitable? Academy of Management Review, 10, 206-218.

Robbins, A. S., Spence, J. T. & Clark, H. (1991). Psychological determinants of health and performance: The tangled web of desirable and undesirable characteristics. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 61: 755-765.

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

Rotter, J. B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal vs. external control of reinforcement. Psychological Monographs, 80 1, Whole No. 609.

Russo, N. F. (1985). A women's mental health guide, American Psychological Association, Washington D. C.

Sin, L. & Cheng, D. (1995). Occupational stress and health among business executives: An exploratory study in an oriental culture. International Journal of Management, 12, 14-25.

Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R. L. & Pred, R. S. (1987). Impatience versus achievement strivings in the Type A pattern: Differential effects on student's health and academic achievement. Journal of Applied Psychology, 72: 522-528.

Sullivan, S. E. & Bhagat, R. S. (1992). Organizational stress, job satisfaction and job performance: Where do we go from here? Journal of Management, 18, 353-374.

Wofford, J. C. & Daly, P. S. (1997). A cognitive-affective approach to understanding individual differences in stress propensity and resultant strain. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, (in press).

Wofford, J. C., Daly, P. S. & Juban, R. (1996a). Cognitive processes, strain, and stress: Structural equation models analysis. Personality and Individual Differences, 20, 703-714.

Wofford, J. C., Daly, P. S. & Juban, R. (1996b). Cognitive processes, strain, and stress: A structural equation models analysis. Department of Management, Working Paper - #207.

TABLE 1. Correlations, Means, and Standard Deviations *

Variable	MEAN	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1. PM	59.2(50.1)	12.4(8.5)	--	.53	.41	.43	.58	.19	.42	.35	.49	.57	.59	.61	.12	.32	.23	.07
2. CAC	92.1(86.1)	16.1(18.4)	.48	--	.55	.61	.40	.33	.36	.40	.45	.62	.54	.64	.37	.26	.32	-.02
3. SE	24.2(12.7)	7.2(6.0)	.36	.59	--	.58	.37	.26	.38	.36	.37	.49	.39	.50	.18	.24	.15	.03
4. NA	29.4(26.8	7.0(6.2)	.53	.68	.67	--	.37	.30	.26	.28	.23	.46	.36	.43	.27	.27	.22	-.06
5. AI	32.3(34.2	8.7(9.6)	.52	.40	.20	.40	--	.16	.41	.42	.45	.53	.47	.53	.16	.36	.28	.12
6. LOC	17.2(16.8)	2.5(2.2)	.18	.33	.26	.29	.18	--	.19	.09	.18	.19	.12	.28	.18	.07	.06	-.02
7. SS1	5.9(5.6)	1.4(1.7)	.29	.30	.27	.31	.28	.18	--	.64	.66	.54	.46	.46	.17	.18	.23	.08
8. SS2	8.2(8.2)	2.0(2.3)	.39	.48	.38	.46	.34	.22	.60	--	.69	.48	.40	.44	.15	.22	.21	.03
9. SS3	9.2(9.0)	2.4(2.6)	.36	.36	.33	.37	.33	.23	.61	.71	--	.56	.54	.58	.23	.28	.30	.23
10. PSYS1	11.3(12.1)	2.5(2.8)	.53	.43	.48	.53	.38	.15	.21	.32	.33	--	.66	.61	.42	.39	.39	.05
11. PSYS2	8.8(9.4)	2.0(2.1)	.47	.42	.36	.48	.41	.18	.35	.37	.36	.54	--	.57	.26	.42	.34	.18
12. PSYS3	9.1(9.3)	2.3(2.1)	.62	.58	.44	.61	.49	.28	.31	.41	.39	.58	.60	--	.33	.30	.41	.14
13. PHYS1	8.0(8.1)	1.6(1.4)	.23	.24	.15	.21	.28	.14	.19	.23	.19	.27	.36	.42	--	.46	.51	.26
14. PHYS2	8.5(8.5)	1.6(1.6)	.28	.20	.15	.26	.27	.12	.12	.19	.21	.27	.37	.38	.49	--	.48	.18
15. PHYS3	6.5(6.4)	1.2(1.2)	.23	.29	.19	.25	.27	.13	.19	.24	.22	.20	.26	.38	.45	.51	--	.13
16. Sex	.4(.5)	.5(.5)	.06	-.03	.04	-.05	.04	.01	.07	.06	.16	.05	.29	.12	.19	.09	.12	--

Note: PM - psychological magnification, CAC - cognitive-affective connectivity, NSE - negative self-esteem (reverse scored), NA - negative affectivity, AI - anger-irritability, LOC - locus of control, SS1 to SS3 - three randomly selected subscales of subjective stress measure, PSYS1 to PSYS3 - subscales of psychological strain measure, PHYS1 to PHYS3 - subscales of physiological strain measure, * .USA sample n = 358, r above .10 p < .05 level, r above .13 p < .051 . Mexico sample n = 121, r above .18 p < .05 and r above .23 p < .01

TABLE 2
SEM Fit Statistics for Stress Propensity Model with USA and Mexican Samples

Statistic	Stress Propensity Model		
	Mexican Sample	USA Sample	Cross-Sample Fit
χ^2	137.1 (df=81)	270.2 (df=81)	476.3 (df=182)
Comparative-fit-index (CFI)	.91	.91	.90
Normed fit index (NFI)	.85	.88	.85
Nonnormed fit index (NNFI)	.91	.89	.89
CONSTRUCTS Variables	Mexican Standardized Loadings	USA	LMTEST X^2
SUBJECTIVE STRESS			
SS1	.76**	.62**	3.6**
SS2	.80**	.89**	3.2
SS3	.76**	.70**	.5
PSYCHOLOGICAL STRAIN			
PSYS1	.82**	.71**	14.6**
PSYS2	.73**	.69**	1.4
PSYS3	.79 **	.81**	.5
PHYSIOLOGICAL STRAIN			
PHYS1	.69**	.63**	.4
PHYS2	.68**	.70**	.0
PHYS3	.72**	.68**	.7
CASP			
PM	.74**	.60**	9.9**
CAC	.68**	.75**	6.7**
NSE	.66**	.62**	2.3
NA	.71**	.78**	13.1**
AI	.50**	.54**	5.0**
LOC	.32**	.31**	.1
PATH COEFFICIENTS			
CASP --> Subjective Stress	.54**	.61**	3.0
CASP --> Psychological Strain	.88**	.83**	6.6**
CASP --> Physiological Strain	.46**	.46**	.2
SS --> Psychological Strain	.10*	.12**	15.0**
SS --> Physiological Strain	.09	.08	.0

Loadings and path coefficients for Mexico and US samples, PM - Psychological magnification, CAC - Cognitive-affective-connectivity, NSE - Negative self-esteem, NA - Negative affectivity, LOC - Locus of control, CASP - Cognitive-affective stress propensity, SS - subjective stress, PSYS - Psychological strain, PHYS - Physiological strain.

TABLE 3. Differences between the Means of Trait, Subjective Stress, and Strain for Mexican and USA Samples

Variables	Mexico Means		USA Means		Sex	Sample
	M	F	M	F	F	F
Psychological Magnification	49.6	50.7	58.5	60.0	1.8	55.7*
Cognitive-Affective Connectivity	86.6	65.7	92.5	91.7	.3	11.2**
Negative Affectivity	27.2	24.4	29.7	29.0	1.4	12.5*
Anger-Irritability	33.0	35.4	32.0	32.7	1.8	3.7**
Negative Self-Esteem	12.6	12.8	23.9	24.5	.7	248.8*
Locus of Control	16.9	16.7	17.2	17.2	.0	2.6
Subjective Stress	22.0	23.7	22.7	23.9	7.2*	.6
Psychological Strain	29.9	31.8	28.4	30.4	14.1*	5.6*
Physiological Strain	22.7	24.4	23.0	23.9	8.8*	.0

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

Figure 1 Legend

Note: values in front of parenthesis are US data, values in parentheses are Mexico data, SS1, SS2, SS3 - subjective stress subscales, PSYS1, PSYS2, PSYS3 - psychological strain, PHYS1, PHYS2, PHYS3 - physiological strain, CASP - cognitive-affective stress propensity, PM - psychological magnification, CAC - cognitive-affective connectivity, NSE - negative self-esteem, NA - negative affectivity, LOC - locus of control.