# Coping with Work and Family Stress on Risky Behaviors and Perceived Stress

Marivic Torregosa, PhD, RN-FNP[1], Marcus Antonius Ynalvez, PhD[1], Rosario Benavides[1], Nandita Chaudhuri PhD[2], David Cabrera[2] , and Christopher Craddock, PhD[3]

Texas A&M International University Laredo, Texas, USA [1]

Public Policy Research Institute, Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas, USA [2]

Serving Children and Adults in Need (SCAN), Laredo, Texas, USA[3]

## Introduction

- HIV/AIDS is a global epidemic that claims 18,000 lives annually in the United States.
- Hispanics account for 12% of new HIV cases.
- This a cause for alarm as this minority group encounter increasing health disparities when compared to other ethnic groups.
- HIV diagnosis and treatment are delayed due to lack of understanding about the U.S. health care system, eligibility requirements to receive care, high mortality rate from the HIV/AIDS; fear about revealing ones immigration status, and stigmatization attached to HIV/AIDS.

## Literature Review

- A link exists between bicultural stress and risky behaviors among recent Hispanic immigrants.
- Perceptions of discrimination and identity confusion were found associated with risky behaviors and cultural stress.
- Bicultural stress are linked to greater risk for depression and cigarette use.
- Mexican-Americans residing in US-Mexico border towns are at high risk for binge drinking.
- Increased binge drinking among *colonia* residents, border areas where local government regulation is minimal.
- Increased bar establishments in US-Mexico border towns.
- Given the challenges and vulnerabilities immigrants face, evidenced-based interventions to reduce risks are much needed.

## Purpose of the Study

- To examine the effect of the an evidence-based programming on the risky behaviors and perceived stress among young Hispanic residents in a U.S. southern border city.

## Methods

- Hispanic college students ages 18-24 were recruited from a Hispanic serving institution.
- Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval was sought and granted.
- Epidemiological study using permuted block design with equal sizes in the treatment and control group was used.
- Data collection points: (i) baseline, (ii) exit, (iii) 3-month follow-up.
- Intervention *n*= 318; control *n* = 228
- Main independent variable is *Coping with Work and Family Stress.*
- Dependent variables are: (i) perceive stress, (ii) substance use risk, (iii) sexual control.

## Analytical Techniques

- Analysis of variance, and normal error regression using IBM SPSS.
- All *p*-values below the 5% type-1 error rate were considered statistically significant.

## Table 1: Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive Statistics

| Baseline | M | Median | SD | Min | Max |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Age | 20.9 | 21 | 1.87 | 18 | 27 |
| Gender (1 = male; 0 = female) | 0.26 | 0 | 0.44 | 0 | 1 |
| Employment (1 = yes; 0 = no) | 0.35 | 0 | 0.48 | 0 | 1 |
| Perceived stress | 1.26 | 1.30 | 0.31 | 0.10 | 2 |
| Substance use risk | 0.81 | 0.10 | 1.72 | 0 | 9.60 |
| Sexual control | 3.31 | 3.50 | 0.70 | 0.83 | 4 |
| Exit | | | | | |
| Perceived stress | 1.15 | 1.10 | 0.31 | 0 | 1.90 |
| Substance use risk | 0.74 | 0 | 1.67 | 0 | 11.60 |
| Sexual control | 3.42 | 3.67 | 0.63 | 0.83 | 4 |
| 3-month follow up | | | | | |
| Perceived stress | 1.12 | 1.10 | 0.29 | 0.20 | 1.90 |
| Substance use risk | 0.72 | 0 | 1.69 | 0 | 9 |
| Sexual control | 3.47 | 3.83 | 0.60 | 1.17 | 4 |

## Table 2: Perceived Stress

| | Variables | B | Std. Error | Beta | *p* | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Baseline | (Constant) | 1.782 | 0.262 | | 0 | |
| | Age | -0.025 | 0.013 | -0.150 | 0.054 | |
| | Gender (1 = male; 0 = famale) | -0.070 | 0.051 | -0.101 | 0.171 | |
| | Employment ( 1= yes; 0 = no) | 0.108 | 0.049 | 0.169 | 0.030 | * |
| | Group (1 = intervention; 0= control ) | -0.048 | 0.046 | -0.077 | 0.294 | |
| Exit | (Constant) | 1.467 | 0.261 | | 0 | |
| | Age | -0.011 | 0.013 | -0.068 | 0.363 | |
| | Gender (1 = male; 0 = famale) | -0.030 | 0.052 | -0.042 | 0.567 | |
| | Employment ( 1= yes; 0 = no) | 0.030 | 0.048 | 0.047 | 0.535 | |
| | Group (1 = intervention; 0= control ) | -0.141 | 0.046 | -0.223 | 0.003 | ** |
| 3-month F/U | (Constant) | 1.216 | 0.264 | | 0 | |
| | Age | -0.001 | 0.013 | -0.007 | 0.922 | |
| | Gendr (1 = male; 0 = famale) | -0.042 | 0.048 | -0.064 | 0.382 | |
| | Employment ( 1= yes; 0 = no) | 0.031 | 0.046 | 0.052 | 0.494 | |
| | Group (1 = intervention; 0= control ) | -0.122 | 0.044 | -0.208 | 0.006 | ** |

## Table 3: Risk of Substance Use

| | Variables | B | Beta | *p* | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Baseline | (Constant) | -2.062 | | 0.154 | |
| | AGE | 0.115 | 0.125 | 0.098 | |
| | Gender ( 1= male; 0 = female) | 0.511 | 0.131 | 0.068 | |
| | Employment ( 1 = yes; 0 = no) | 0.771 | 0.215 | 0.005 | ** |
| | Group ( 1 = intervention; 0 = control) | 0.097 | 0.028 | 0.698 | |
| Exit | (Constant) | -2.463 | | 0.080 | |
| | Age | 0.147 | 0.165 | 0.030 | * |
| | Gender ( 1= male; 0 = female) | 0.408 | 0.108 | 0.143 | |
| | Employment ( 1 = yes; 0 = no) | 0.316 | 0.093 | 0.222 | |
| | Group ( 1 = intervention; 0 = control) | -0.174 | -0.051 | 0.487 | |
| 3-month F/U | (Constant) | -2.974 | | 0.048 | |
| | AGE | 0.155 | 0.160 | 0.030 | * |
| | Gender ( 1= male; 0 = female) | 0.551 | 0.144 | 0.045 | * |
| | Employment ( 1 = yes; 0 = no) | 0.768 | 0.221 | 0.003 | ** |
| | Group ( 1 = intervention; 0 = control) | -0.078 | -0.023 | 0.753 | |

## Table 4: Sexual Control

| | Variables | B | Beta | *p* | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Baseline | (Constant) | 5.041 | | 0 | |
| | Age | -0.084 | -0.224 | 0.004 | ** |
| | Gender ( 1 = male; 0 = female) | -0.189 | -0.119 | 0.105 | |
| | Employment (1 = yes; 0 = no) | 0.026 | 0.018 | 0.816 | |
| | Group (1 = intervention; 0 = control) | 0.117 | 0.082 | 0.260 | |
| Exit | (Constant) | 5.785 | | 0 | |
| | Age | -0.112 | -0.336 | 0 | *** |
| | Gender ( 1= male; 0 = female) | -0.271 | -0.191 | 0.007 | ** |
| | Employment (1 = yes; 0 = no) | 0.065 | 0.051 | 0.477 | |
| | Group (1 = intervention; 0 = control) | 0.054 | 0.043 | 0.543 | |
| 3-month F/U | (Constant) | 5.545 | | 0 | |
| | Age | -0.095 | -0.274 | 0 | *** |
| | Gender (1 = male; 0 = female) | -0.226 | -0.165 | 0.022 | * |
| | Employment (1 = yes; 0 = no) | -0.021 | -0.017 | 0.822 | |
| | Group (1 = intervention; 0 = control) | 0.017 | 0.014 | 0.847 | |

## Findings

- Intervention group had lower mean in perceived stress compared to the control group at (i) exit and, (ii) at 3-month follow-up.
- No significant impact of intervention on participants' substance use risk across time.
- No significant impact of intervention on participants' sexual control skills across time.

## Conclusion

- Our results suggest that our intervention strategy had efficacy on reducing stress upon exit and three months after exit; but the same claim cannot be said about substance use risk, and sexual control.
- Interestingly, age is linked with level of sexual control; older respondents manifested low levels of control compared to younger ones.

## Acknowledgements

- Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) #1H79SP021349-01 REVISED FAIN: SP021349
- Dr. Ken Tobin, Director, Center for Earth and Environmental Studies (CEES)
- Texas A&M International University Office of Sponsored Research
- SCAN (Serving Children and Adults in Need)