2012

Transnationalism, Immigration Stress and Subjective Well-Being Among Ecuadorian Immigrants in London

Lucia E. Orellana-Damacela
Loyola University Chicago

Recommended Citation
http://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss/375

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License.
Copyright © 2012 Lucia E. Orellana-Damacela
LOYOLA UNIVERSITY CHICAGO

TRANSNATIONALISM, IMMIGRATION STRESS AND SUBJECTIVE WELL-BEING AMONG ECUADORIAN IMMIGRANTS IN LONDON

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

PROGRAM IN SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY

BY
LUCIA E. ORELLANA-DAMACELA

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS
AUGUST 2012
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Special thanks to Dr. R. Scott Tindale, my advisor at Loyola University Chicago, for his support, guidance, encouragement and patience. Thanks to Drs. Fred Bryant and Anne Sutter for their invaluable input in the design and analysis of this dissertation. Thanks to Dr. Yolanda Suarez-Balcazar, who was my mentor when I arrived at Loyola University, for her constant encouragement and crucial support.

Many thanks to the people at the Ecuadorian Consulate in London, and to the social service organizations and Ecuadorian-owned businesses that opened their doors for me to conduct data collection at their premises. Without their help, this study could have not been possible. Above all, my most heartfelt gratitude to the dozens of London Ecuadorians, men and women, who found time out of their busy schedules to generously take part in this research.

Special thanks to my loved ones: my parents Lucio (+) and Eugenia, my husband, Roque, and my beloved children, Roque Dario and Gabriela Eugenia. They have shared with me this long journey, if not in person, in spirit. Your encouragement, support, cheerfulness and love have given me strength, confidence and joy. I cannot thank you enough!
To my parents Lucio (+) and Eugenia, my husband Roque, and to my children Roque Dario and Gabriela, with all my unconditional love.
TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS iii
LIST OF TABLES viii
LIST OF FIGURES ix
ABSTRACT x

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION
  Purpose of the Study 1
  Structure of the Dissertation 9

CHAPTER TWO: THE ECUADORIAN COMMUNITY IN LONDON
  Antecedents: The Ecuadorian Migration 12
  Statistics of Ecuadorians in the United Kingdom 15
  The Immigrant Community in London 18
  The Lives of Ecuadorians in London 19

CHAPTER THREE: TRANSNATIONAL MIGRATION AND PRACTICES
  The Transnational Migrants 24
  Transnational Practices 27
    Transnational Public Practices 28
    Transnational Private Practices 30
  Comparing Transnational Practices 37

CHAPTER FOUR: TRANSNATIONAL PRACTICES AND PSYCHOSOCIAL FACTORS
  Psychosocial Antecedents to Transnational Practices 48
    Integration 48
    Immigration Stress 58
  Subjective Well-Being variables 62
    Transnational Social Support 62
    Self-Esteem 64
    Psychological Well-Being 67
    Transnationalism and Subjective Well-Being 69
  Demographic Antecedents 70
  Review of Purpose of Study and Hypotheses 72

CHAPTER FIVE: METHOD
  Participants 76
  Procedure 76
  Measures 77
Analysis

CHAPTER SIX: RESULTS: TRANSNATIONAL PRACTICES AND THEIR ANTECEDENTS
Univariate Analysis of Transnational Practices and their Antecedents
Correlational Analysis of Transnational Practices and their Antecedents
Preliminary Analysis
Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis of Public Transnational Practices
Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis of Private Transnational Practices
Summary of Results of the Hierarchical Regression Analyses
Review of Exploratory Questions and Hypotheses Regarding Antecedents to Transnational Practices

CHAPTER SEVEN: RESULTS: TRANSNATIONAL PRACTICES AND SUBJECTIVE WELL-BEING
Univariate Analysis of Subjective Well-Being Variables
Subjective Well-Being Variables Associations with Demographic, Immigration and Integration Factors
Analysis of the Effect of Transnational Practices on Subjective Well-Being Variables
Preliminary Analysis
Path Analyses of the Models
Overall Model Fit
Model Comparison
Parameter Estimates of the Complete Mediation Model
Analysis of Mediation and Indirect Effects
The Private Transnationalism—Self-Esteem—Psychological Well-Being Path
The Immigration Stress—Self-Esteem—Psychological Well-Being Path
Bootstrapping Analysis of Multiple Mediation
Post-Hoc Analysis
Summary of Results

CHAPTER EIGHT: DISCUSSION
Engagement in Transnational Practices
Engagement in Transnational Private Practices
Engagement in Transnational Public Practices
Antecedents to Transnational Practices
Effect of Demographic, Immigration and Integration Variables on Subjective Well-Being
Transnational Practices and Subjective Well-Being
Limitations
Future Directions
Conclusions
LIST OF TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Table 1: Percentage of Respondents Engaging in each Transnational Practice During the Last Year, Means and Standard Deviations</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 2: Intercorrelations among Items of the Transnational Practices Questionnaire</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 3: Correlations of Demographics, Immigration and Integration with Transnational Practices</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4: Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Demographics, Immigration and Private Transnational Practices Predicting Public Transnationalism</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 5: Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Demographics, Immigration and Public Transnational Practices Predicting Private Transnationalism</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 6: Correlations between Transnational Practices and Subjective Well-Being Variables</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 7: Correlations of Demographics, Immigration and Integration with Subjective Well-Being Variables</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 8: Mediation of the Effects of Private Transnationalism and Immigration Stress on Psychological Well-Being through Self-Esteem and Transnational Social Support</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 9: Percentage of Engagement on Transnational Private Practices among Ecuadorians Immigrants</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 10: Percentage of Engagement on Transnational Public Practices among Latin American Immigrants</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIST OF FIGURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Figure 1:</td>
<td>Model of Complete Mediation of the Relationship between Immigration Stress, Transnational Practices, Self-Esteem, Transnational Social Support and Psychological Well-Being</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 2:</td>
<td>Model of Partial Mediation of the Relationship between Immigration Stress, Transnational Practices, Self-Esteem, Transnational Social Support and Psychological Well-Being</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 3:</td>
<td>Standardized Estimates of the Model of Partial Mediation of the Effect of Transnational Practices on Psychological Well-Being</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 4:</td>
<td>Standardized Estimates of the Model of Complete Mediation of the Effect of Transnational Practices on Psychological Well-Being</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 5:</td>
<td>Test of Self-Esteem as a Mediator between Private Transnationalism and Psychological Well-Being</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 6:</td>
<td>Test of Self-Esteem as a Mediator between Immigration Stress and Psychological Well-Being</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 7:</td>
<td>Modified Model: Standardized Estimates of the Effect of Transnational Practices on Psychological-Well-Being</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to explore antecedents to transnational practices among Ecuadorian immigrants in London, and to determine the connection between these practices and their subjective well-being. The study examined the extent to which Ecuadorians stay linked to their home country via various transnational practices, and the association with relevant demographic, immigration and integration factors. This research also aimed at examining the relations that immigration stress and transnational practices had with subjective well-being, as measured by perceived transnational social support, self-esteem, and psychological well-being. Overall, the findings from this study indicate that gender, socio-economic status, having family in Ecuador, network integration and expectation to return to Ecuador are key to understanding London Ecuadorians’ likelihood of engaging in transnational activities. These variables, however, impacted private and public transnational practices differently. Likewise, engaging in transnational private or public practices had different effects on subjective well-being. Whereas engagement in private transnationalism had direct positive effects on both perceived transnational social support and self-esteem, engagement in public transnational activities did not have any effect on the measures of subjective well-being included. Immigration stress had significant negative impact on both self-esteem and psychological well-being, and was unrelated to transnational activities.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Migration, like most human experiences, is a unique event for each individual involved, while at the same time being a process shared each year by millions of migrants around the globe. It is unique because the great variety of factors that can affect the process of migrating, from the conditions of reception into the host society, the socio-economic context in which the migration occurs, to the socio-cultural, psychosocial and psychological resources that the individual has at her disposal to cope with the situation (Berry, 1997, 2005). For some individuals, this can be a stressful experience. This is particularly the case when migrants arrive to a society that is significantly different from theirs, and in disadvantageous conditions, as is the case for many economic and refugee migrants (Finch & Vega, 2003).

Migration is a social process with significant impact on the world economy and in the social fabric of both sending and receiving countries (Taylor, 2006). Due to its importance, migration studies are increasingly present in the economic and social science scholarly field. Moreover, the interest in this issue is not only, or primarily, academic. Debates over the impact of immigration on the host communities generate impassioned reactions from the public and fuel local initiatives aimed at regulating the permanence and influx of immigrants. By the same token, countries experiencing this outflow of
people are also having to cope with the consequences of losing the youngest, most enterprising and, sometimes, best educated of their citizens to a foreign land (Pellegrino, 2004).

Even though migration is as old as the emergence of stable human communities (Manning, 2005), the current process of globalization provides a new framework for the migration experience, points out the transnational approach to migration. Vertovec (2004) defines globalization as the worldwide interconnectedness and compression of the dimensions of space and time. Giddens (1990) emphasizes that globalization conveys the intensification of social relations around the world. Hence, places geographically distant can be linked in such a way that events happening in a given community impact the life of another one, located miles away, and vice versa. By preserving links with their communities of origin while living abroad, immigrant collectives are acting as connectors between these distant places, and exerting transforming effects on both of them (Glick Schiller, Basch, & Szanton-Blanc, 1995).

The transnational approach to migration also emphasizes the role of the advances in technologies of communications in the migration experience (Panagakos & Horst, 2006; Portes, 2003; Portes, Guarnizo, & Landolt, 1999; Schiller et al., 1995). Like never before, contemporary migrants can, potentially, sustain intense, frequent and multi-modal communication; they can maintain and re-create their informational, affective and collaborative links with relatives in their countries of origin. These communication technologies allow immigrants to engage with their native country’s groups, communities, organizations and institutions as well. Staying in touch is easier when using
technologies such as the Internet and mobile telephones (Vertovec, 2004; Horst 2006; Horst & Miller, 2005), rather than relying only on conventional mail and the occasional land phone call to do so. Affordable and fast means of traveling and transferring money and goods are also important facilitators of links maintenance. New technologies have truly made easier to be ‘transnational.’

‘Transnational migration” as a scholarly field was born in the early ‘90s (Glick Schiller, Basch, & Szanton-Blanc, 1992). This perspective emphasizes the transformation of migrants into “transmigrants” or individuals who live constantly interconnected across national border. Hence, while established within other country’s national borders, transmigrants could influence their countries of origin by means of the connections that sustain with individuals and institutions in their native country (Glick Schiller et al., 1995). The practices by which immigrants remain interconnected and linked to their home countries are called “transnational activities” or “practices” (Itzigsohn & Giorguli-Saucedo, 2002; Portes et al., 1999; Portes, 2003).

A review of the research on transnational migration has shown that the focus of these studies encompasses many areas, such as economic, political, socio-cultural and religious (Levitt & Jaworsky, 2007; Portes et al., 1999; Portes, 2003). However, perhaps due to the prevalence of anthropological, sociological and economics approaches to this issue, psychosocial constructs have been, for the most part, omitted. As a result, little is known about the impact of transnational practices on immigrants’ subjective well-being (Murphy & Mahalingam, 2004; Odera, 2007). This is particularly surprising given the considerable amount of research existent, particularly in the USA and Europe, about
immigration stressors and immigrant well-being (Bhugra, 2004; Carta, Bernal, Ardió, & Haro-Abad, 2005; Collazos, Qureshi, Antonin, & Tomas-Sabado, 2008; Finch & Vega, 2003; Hovey, 1999; Hovey & Magaña, 2000; Zarza & Sobrino Prados, 2007).

A specific group of immigrants, Ecuadorians living in the UK, is the focus of this study for two reasons. The first reason is that out-migration is of particular importance in Ecuador, a country that has lost almost 10% of its population to foreign lands (CEMLA, 2010), the youngest and most enterprising ones in particular (Pellegrino, 2004). The second reason is the paucity of research about Ecuadorians in particular, and Latin Americans in the UK in general. This is a growing community, despite its relatively small size. Based on the available data, as per calculations made for this study, there are between 13,000 and 20,000 Ecuadorians in the UK (Mateos, 2009; National Archives, 2010). More to the point, there is no research about the psychological well-being of Ecuadorians expatriates in London, nor of the role that transnational practices play, if any, on such well-being.

This depiction of the possibilities open to immigrants by the technologies of communication may seem relevant for the well-to-do immigrants, but maybe less so for the lives of low-skilled and undocumented workers. Despite the wide array of possibilities of interconnection, we might find that the lives of unskilled immigrants leave little or no time for the pleasure and/or luxury of intense long distance communication. As Ros, González, Marín and Sow (2007) point out, not much is known about how immigration and use of new technologies of information and communication are intertwined in the immigrants’ lives, and in the lives of the loved ones back in the home
country. By and large, in spite of the profusion of research and articles on the importance of immigrants’ transnational practices in general, few studies have been conducted that assess the impact of such practices on immigrants’ well-being, and their impact on their links to the home country and on their integration into the host country (Ross et al.).

Indeed, the impact of new technologies on Ecuadorian immigrant’s local and transnational social connectedness has been barely explored. Noticeable exceptions are Ramírez’ (2005) field study about the availability of communication technologies in Ecuador and among Ecuadorian immigrants in Madrid, and Mejía Estévez’s (2005, 2009) research about Ecuadorians’ ‘digital nostalgia.’

In contrast to the scarcity of information about immigrants’ adoption of new communication technologies, there is a sizable body of research about immigrants’ well-being. The extensive research on the topic demonstrates that the migratory process involves many conditions and events that have the potential to overwhelm the individuals’ capacity to cope, and negatively affect their well-being, including their psychological well-being, particularly in the case of economic migrants and ethnic minorities (Berry, 2005; Pumariega, Rothe & Pumariega, 2005). Immigrants can face various types of challenges or potential stressors, some of them related to the losses they experience during the process of migrating, including, in many cases, the separation from their loved ones. Other stressors pertain to the conditions of reception into the host society, such as whether they face discrimination or limited opportunities for socio-economic and cultural progress (Pumariega et al.; Zarza & Sobrino Prados, 2007). In
addition, the potential stressfulness of the insertion in the new society would also depend on individual level variables, such as gender, age, education, and so forth (Berry, 1997).

One of the most important psychosocial resources to cope with these potential stressors is social support. Immigrant psychological literature has consistently shown that social support has a significant beneficial direct effect on immigrant’s psychological well-being (Jasinskaja-Lahti, Liebkind, Jaakkola, & Reuter, 2006; Kiang, Grzywacz, Marin, Arcury, & Quandt, 2010), as well as a ‘buffering’ effect (Hernández, Pozo, & Alonso, 2004; Hovey & Magaña, 2000; Jasinskaja-Lahti et al.; Kiang et al., 2010; Martínez García, García Ramírez, & Maya Jariego, 2001; Ritsner, Modai, & Ponizovsky, 2000). As it happens, lack of adequate social support—which is the case among migrants more often than among native-born British (Shields & Price, 2003, 2005)—deprives immigrants of an important protecting factor against such stressors.

The migration process cannot only disrupt the individual’s social relations. It can also disrupt the sense of self, as part of the valuation we assign to our self comes from the feedback we receive from the ‘others.’ Due to the loss of socio-cultural references (Al Issa & Tousignant, 1997), the ‘demotion’ often experienced in the new environment (McIlwaine, 2007), the sense of self, or self-esteem can be also threatened. Threats to self-esteem have also been linked to unfavorable psychological outcomes among immigrants, such as depression (Hovey & Magaña, 2000; Oppdal, Røysamb, & Sam, 2004).

To summarize, from the ample literature on migrants’ psychosocial well-being, there are some variables that seem crucial to be included in an study that attempts to
analyze the impact that transnational practices have—if any—on such well-being. Social support, self-esteem and psychological well-being are of particular importance for the reasons mentioned in the previous paragraph and expanded in the following chapters.

Transnational engagements can, in turn, be instrumental in protecting against the negative effects of immigrant-related stress by giving a lifeline to the immigrants’ “old” sense of self. When immigrants stay in regular communication with their relatives and friends, and have a place in the development of their lives back home, they are also preserving their sense of identity and belonging to that community (Solé, Parella, & Cavalcanti, 2007). Similarly, transnational links could potentially ‘fill the vacuum’ of lack of trusted emotional social support. In both ways, transnational ties could potentially have a positive role on immigrant’s psychological well-being.

When immigrants help their families by sending remittances, and/or their communities via contributions to charities or hometown associations, immigrants are fulfilling duties born out of feelings of love and commitment. However, public or social transnational activities such as contributions to the hometown development, or to political parties in the native country cannot be explained by conjugal, parental, filial or familial love or sense of responsibility.

Sana (2005), analyzing data about Mexican immigrants in the USA, put forward the “status hypothesis.” Sana advanced the idea that transnational engagements (remittances) are the “fee” that immigrants pay to regain the status that they have lost in the new country. Sana found support for the hypothesis, finding that increased status in the host country was negatively associated with remittances. Transnationalism, from this
perspective, could end up playing a beneficial role to the immigrants’ self-concept. They become highly relevant to the life of their families or communities. The level of status acquired by way of their transnational engagements is often unobtainable for them in the host society. This hypothesis has not been examined from a psychological standpoint. From this perspective, the immigration experience could be stressful and threatening to the immigrants’ self-esteem. In this context, transnational engagements could function as a way to re-establish or enhance their self-concept.

That transnational practices in general, and remittances in particular, fulfill a self-esteem enhancement role would help explain why immigrants send money and gifts in cases that cannot be explained by strong links of duty and love (in other words, cases in which help goes to extended family, friends, and the community, as opposed to supporting their children, spouses, or elderly parents). It might also help explain why some of them continue doing so even at great personal sacrifices (Mcllwaine, 2007). In fact, research suggests that migrants’ commitment to transnational households could limit the extent to which they can invest in local networks, and thus develop stable local social relations. Likewise, the financial obligations to their home country household have the potential consequence of depriving them of the opportunity of investing time and resources in improving their lives in the host country (Landolt, 2001).

With respect to the relationship between transnational links and perceived social support, one study has shown association between them, and with psychological well-being (Murphy & Mahalingam, 2004). This suggests the possibility that immigrants that maintain links with their pre-migration kin and friends can derive needed social support
from those links and obtain the beneficial effect of social support on their overall psychological well-being.

**Purpose of the Study**

The present study aims at contributing to the introduction of psychosocial variables into the scholarly conversation about immigrant transnationalism, in addition to the customary demographic and socio-economic ones. To this effect, integration (or lack of)—defined as a socio-cultural variable—and immigration stress are examined as potentially significant antecedents to transnational engagements. Furthermore, this research also examines the impact of transnationalism on immigrants’ subjective well-being. Based on what the psychosocial literature on migration suggests, this study examines the impact of transnational engagements on migrants’ transnational social support, self-esteem and psychological well-being.

Additionally, this study examines the aforementioned relationships within a particular immigrant group, Ecuadorians living in London. In this way, this research aspires to contribute to a better understanding of this collective. Very little has been researched about this community, and nothing is known about their transnational practices and subjective well-being, particularly in the UK, as most of the literature about this collective has focused on the migration to the USA and to Spain. In order to examine the impact of transnational practices on Ecuadorian immigrant’s subjective well-being, this research first examines the ways and extent to which Ecuadorians in London engage in transnational practices.
This study also intends to examine the ways and extents to which this collective has embraced new technologies of communication for their transnational links. The research literature on immigrant’s use of technologies of communication is starting to build up. However, there are few studies about Ecuadorian immigrants’ use of these technologies. An exploratory examination of the characteristics of these contacts is a first step towards a clearer understanding of how communication technologies are affecting the links between immigrants and their close ones in their countries of origin.

Having advanced a distinction between private and public transnational practices, this study also aims to contributing to a better understanding of the different types of transnational practices already identified in the transnational literature, and finding out to what extent these practices are indeed engaged in by immigrants with different demographic and integration antecedents. For this purpose, some demographic variables such as gender, having a spouse or child in Ecuador, socio-economic status, time in the country, citizenship status and expectation about returning to Ecuador are included in the analysis.

Also included are other variables that are expected to have an additional impact on transnationalism. They are indicators of social integration, such as network integration and English mastery. Likewise, immigration stress is expected to increase the likelihood of transnationalism. The more worn out the immigrants are about their migratory experiences, the more likely they are to search for reassuring links with their loved ones.
Structure of the Dissertation

This chapter has presented an overview of the rationale for the study, introduced migration from a transnational approach, and reviewed the issues that are relevant to immigrants in general—and to Ecuadorians in London in particular—as they relate to their subjective well-being. The second chapter summarizes available information about Ecuadorians in London, with a brief background regarding Ecuadorian migration. The third chapter reviews transnational migration and transnational practices theory and research; it also presents an overview of the available communication technologies that facilitate transnational ties between migrants and their home country counterparts. The fourth chapter expands on the psychological well-being variables that are examined on their relationship with transnational practices, and includes demographic and integration antecedents to transnational practices. The research questions and hypotheses are also included in this chapter. The fifth chapter is the method section. The sixth chapter presents the results of the associations between demographic and integration factors, and transnational practices. The seventh chapter portrays the results of the analysis of the relationship between transnationalism and psychological well-being. Finally, chapter eight discusses the findings, presents conclusions and limitations of the study.
CHAPTER TWO
THE ECUADORIAN COMMUNITY IN LONDON

This chapter includes a brief review of how the migration to the UK fares within the context of the greater Ecuadorian migration process. The next section presents information and statistics about the number and characteristics of the Ecuadorian community in the UK in general, and in London in particular. The following section portrays London’s “super-diversity” and the Latin-American migration context in which Ecuadorians develop their daily lives. The final section reviews the information available about the characteristics and life of Ecuadorians in London.

Antecedents: The Ecuadorian Migration

Ecuador, a small South American country of 14.4m inhabitants (INEC, Instituto Nacional de Estadisticas y Censos del Ecuador, 2011), has a tradition of international out-migration since the second half of the 20th century. The number of Ecuadorians living abroad is estimated at 1.6 million in 2010, according to INEC statistics (CEMLA, 2010).

Historically, Ecuadorians had—since the decade of the 50s—migrated to the United States in a steadily and continuous manner. However, at the end of the 90s and early part of the last decade, as a response to an acute economic crisis affecting all levels of the Ecuadorian society, a new migration wave developed. The previous migration waves were mainly of males from rural and impoverished areas, which were later followed by the rest of the family (Jokisch & Pribilsky, 2002). By contrast, the migration
that started in the 90s differed from the previous ones in various respects. The first difference was its share number and speed. The previous emigration process averaged around 16,000 emigrants per year. By contrast, after 1998, the yearly average of emigrants has been 140,000. Accordingly, a total of 700,000 Ecuadorians left the country in a 44 year period during the first wave, but the same number did so in just 5 years during the second wave (Villamar, 2004).

Another difference between these waves was the destination of the emigrants. During the first period, the main receptor of emigrants was the USA. The second wave headed towards Europe (60%), mainly to Spain, (45%) and Italy. The USA continued being a destination, but to a lesser degree (32% overall) (FLACSO, 2004). In Bertoli’s (2005) calculations, 65% of the Ecuadorian emigrants between 1998 and 2003 went to Spain.

The reasons for this change in destination are twofold. First, The United States had intensified control over immigration. Hence, the entrance to the country by legal means was more unlikely, and, with increased border patrol, the entrance by illegal means became too expensive and perilous (Jokisch, 2001; Jokisch & Pribilsky, 2002). Spain, at that time, had no visa requirement for Ecuadorians traveling as tourists. The country was experiencing economic prosperity within the European Union, and needed labor force in some specific sectors such as household help, care services, construction and agriculture. In addition, the linguistic and cultural closeness between the countries made Spain an overall attractive choice for eager Ecuadorians (Villamar, 2004).
A further difference between the traditional and the new emigration was the characteristics of the emigrants. The emigration to the US was initiated by males, poor farmers from the central-south highlands. The most recent emigration has been, by contrast, very diverse in terms of ethnicity, region of origin and socio-economic background. It was pioneered by women, which comprised 68% of all Ecuadorian legal residents in Spain in 1998 (Gratton, 2007; Jokisch & Pribilsky, 2002; Villamar, 2004). They were later on followed by men and children (Ibid). This new emigration included people from all regions of Ecuador. These new migrants came from all levels of society: rural poor and urban lower, middle and professional classes affected by the crisis. It included residents from the main cities Quito and Guayaquil (FLACSO, 2004; Jokisch & Pribilsky, 2002; Villamar, 2004).

A more recent analysis indicated that two thirds of Ecuadorian migrants are of urban origin (Ortiz Moya & Guerra Paez, 2008). Most migrants were working before leaving (60%, Ibid) and were not among the poorest in the country (Alisei-Ciudad, 2004). Rather, they were better educated than the Ecuadorian population as a whole (Gratton, 2007).

Once the migration to Spain seemed to have reached “saturation” levels, Ecuadorians started to move from there to other European countries in search of new labor niches. Such movement continues today. The main countries of destination have been Great Britain, Switzerland, Belgium and Germany (FLACSO, 2004). This analysis coincides with the Ecuadorian Consul in London’s observation that many Ecuadorians
have been arriving to the United Kingdom from Spain, holding Spanish passports (Vega, 2006).

Ecuadorian migrants offer a variety of reasons to migrate: the search for new progress opportunities, mainly economic, but also educational, that they cannot foresee achieving in the home country. Many migrate to reunite with family already in the destination country (UTPL, 2003). However, the main reason seems to be the search for better jobs, as 75% of the migrant’s families stated that as their reason to migrate (Ortiz Moya & Guerra Paez, 2008).

Sociological and anthropological studies carried out in densely migrating communities show that, due to the sheer number of migrants and the effect of remittances on the spending habits of the migrant’s relatives, the desire and expectation to migrate spread widely in these communities. Migrating becomes a sort of social norm; a move necessary to keep up with (seemingly) everybody else’s progress in town. In addition, the social networks created by the massive migration facilitate the migration to localities where migrants of that community congregate (Massey, 1990; Pellegrino, 2004; Ramírez & Ramírez, 2005). Studies conducted in Ecuador about attitudes towards migration show that socially-shared perceptions about migrants’ life, often inaccurate and embellished, play also a crucial role on the decision to migrate (Goycoechea & Ramirez, 2002; Ramirez & Ramirez, 2005).

**Statistics of Ecuadorians in the United Kingdom**

Finding accurate statistics about the number of Ecuadorians living in the United Kingdom (UK) has been challenging, due to several reasons. First, there is no
information about the number of undocumented Ecuadorians living in the UK. Second, the Census does not recognize Latin Americans in general, and Ecuadorians in particular, as a separate group. Third, an unknown number of Ecuadorians arrive to the UK with European passports from countries such as Spain and Portugal, thus, not appearing as “Ecuadorians” in many national statistics.

Direct information about the number of Ecuadorians in the UK from Ecuadorian sources is not available. Overall, the migration statistics suggest that the number is considerably lower than those living in the most popular destinations. As already mentioned, the main destinations for Ecuadorians have been Spain, the USA, and Italy. Only five percent of the 1,571,450 Ecuadorians abroad live in other European countries, including the UK (Ortiz Moya & Guerra Paez, 2008). An approximate number can be computed, however, based on the fact that 5% of 1,571,450 Ecuadorian migrants live in European countries other than Spain and Italy. Assuming that 25% of that 5% reside in the UK (a somewhat conservative estimation), about 20,000 Ecuadorians could be living in Britain.

Statistics available in the UK indicate that there are approximately 13,000 Ecuadorians living in the country. As per the 2009 Labour Force Survey (as cited in Mateos, 2009), there are 8,565 Ecuadorian nationals in the UK. In addition, the National Archives state that British citizenship has been granted to a total of 4,425 Ecuadorians by birth, between 1983 and 2009 (National Archives, 2010). This hypothetical number should be seen as a conservative approximation, due to the unknown number of
Ecuadorians that might not be included in the official statistics due to their undocumented status.

More speculative calculations argue that the number of Ecuadorians living in the UK is considerably higher. James (2005), based on interviews with NGO’s, information from the Ecuadorian consulate in London and members of the community, reached the conclusion that the real number would be between 30,000 and 75,000, most of them (80-90%) in the London area (Ibid). A recent Foreign and Commonwealth Office publication stated that there are between 70,000 and 90,000 Ecuadorians living/and or visiting the UK at any given time (Foreign and Commonwealth Office, 2007).

In a personal conversation, the Ecuadorian Consul in London mentioned a similar number. In his estimations, there were between 70,000 and 100,000 Ecuadorians in England, most of them in the London area (Vega, 2006). He also stressed the difficulty of accurately stating the number of Ecuadorians residing in the country because many of them are undocumented, or have entered the UK with passports from other countries, mainly Spain. Information suggesting the likelihood of this occurrence emerged from Ecuadorian statistics. Analyses of a 2006 Survey’s question about the country of original migration has Spain at 58%, and other European countries at 1.4%; whereas a Survey from 2007, asking about the current country of residence had Spain at 49% and rest of Europe at 5% (Ortiz Moya & Guerra Paez, 2008). It is worth noticing that this trend had started even before the Spanish economy entered into deep recession and the joblessness rate soared to higher levels (BBC News, 2009; 2010).
The currently ongoing UK Census 2011 will provide more accurate information about the number of Ecuadorians in this country. Provisionally, the 13,000-20,000 range seems the most credible approximation. In contrast, it is clear that most Ecuadorians in this country are located in the London area: 77.6% of them (Spence, 2005), and primarily in the London boroughs of Lambeth and Southwark (James, 2005, based on 2004 National Statistics). Thus, the present study focused on London and its surroundings.

**The Immigrant Community in London**

London is one of the world’s prime “global cities” with people from all corners of the world arriving every day to take part in the re-making of this vibrant metropolis of almost 8 million inhabitants (Greater London Authority, 2010). A sizable percentage of the approximately five million immigrants to the UK reside in the London area (42%, or about 2,052 m) (Spence, 2005), where they account for 29% of the total population (Ibid). Recent statistics show that the majority of migrants have arrived from India, Poland, Pakistan, other European countries, USA and Africa (Office for National Statistics, 2010).

Latin Americans are a minority among the immigrant groups in England, albeit their presence is growing. Just as for the Ecuadorian population, finding out an accurate count of Latin Americans in the UK has been daunting. The difficulties encountered are similar to the aforementioned ones regarding Ecuadorians, as thousands of them are undocumented. Taking this into account, the number could be as high as twice the official count (Bermúdez, 2006). Mateos (2009), based on the 2009 Labour Force Survey,
estimated that a total of 127,921 Latin Americans are living in the UK, with Ecuador being the 4th most common country of birth, after Brazil, Colombia and Mexico.

Finding out information not only about the Ecuadorian community but also about the wider Latin American community in London is important because of the role they could play as part of the local network for Ecuadorians. Ecuadorians arriving to London find themselves in a “super-diverse” (Vertovec, 2006) city bursting with people and cultures from all the corners of the world. This diversity stands as a sharp contrast with the highly homogeneous communities from Ecuador’s small cities and rural areas. Within this context, finding linguistic and cultural peers among other Latin Americans could be an important factor in helping them negotiate their lives in the city.

**The Lives of Ecuadorians in London**

Specific research about the living conditions and the migration experience of Ecuadorians in London is remarkably scarce. In fact, extensive literature search produced only three studies (James, 2005; IOM, International Organization for Migrations, 2008; and Escuela de Economia, n.d.). Even general research about Latin Americans in the United Kingdom (with notable exceptions such as Carlisle, 2006; McIlwaine, 2007; Però, 2007) are in short supply, perhaps due to their relatively small number. Other more well-established Latin American communities in the UK, such as Colombians, have been better studied (Bermúdez, 2006; McIlwaine, 2005; Guarnizo, 2008).

The first of the three studies found about Ecuadorians in the UK (James, 2005) was a small qualitative anthropological study about Ecuadorians’ identity and integration. The study concluded that the Ecuadorian community is a growing one with established
business and cultural centers in London. The influence of the community was, however, limited, and presented low levels of inter-community cohesion. Ecuadorians felt unrepresented even within the Latin American community.

The second study (Escuela de Economia, n.d.), was a survey of about 160 Ecuadorians in London, with a focus on immigration and work. The study presented data about their occupation, time in the country, remittance sending. Overall, the Ecuadorians surveyed worked predominantly in the cleaning sector and earned wages that were comparatively low for London, but higher than what they were earning before migrating.

Finally, there was a third, smaller, mapping exercise conducted by the IOM (2008). This study included an in-depth interview with community leaders and a questionnaire completed by 32 respondents. The report compiled information about Ecuadorians in the UK with the purpose of finding out the better media conducts to communicate the organization’s message to the community. The information about means of communication usage is relevant for the present research.

A first glance to the information available about Ecuadorian immigrants suggests that this group has confronted some challenges regarding their educational level and labor qualifications. The percentage of Ecuadorians with higher-level educational qualifications (college and higher education) is, at 24.2%, below the London average of 33.6%, and the lowest among the Latin American immigrants (Spence, 2005, based on the 2001 UK Census). This percentage is, nonetheless, slightly higher than the average for Ecuadorian migrants (23%, Ortiz Moya & Guerra Paez, 2008). London Ecuadorians’
education level is also higher than the population in Ecuador (15% with college-level education, Gratton, 2007, based on 2001 Ecuador Census).

With respect to the employment rate, Ecuadorian immigrants do not fare better. They have the lowest reported employment rate among Latin American and Caribbean countries (49%), and below the 65.3% average for the whole immigrant London population (Spence, 2005). Likewise, 39% of Ecuadorians worked, as reported in the 2001 Census, on “elementary occupations” such as cleaning, which are among the lowest paid occupational activities (Ibid). It must be said, however, that these numbers are very likely outdated and should be taken only as a reference.

Regarding occupational level, a comparison between Ecuadorians’ occupation before migrating and their occupation in the UK suggest two divergent developments. Before migrating, 12% worked on managerial, professional and technical jobs, and 27% in nonqualified jobs (Ortiz Moya & Guerra Paez, 2008). In the UK, a higher proportion of Ecuadorians work at both ends of the occupational spectrum. Twenty three percent of the working age Ecuadorians work in managerial, professional or technical occupations, whereas 39% do so on “elementary occupations” (Spence, 2005). This data suggest that deskilling might have occurred for some, but other Ecuadorians might have progressed in their occupational status.

Most Ecuadorians, as is the case for other Latin Americans arriving from Andean countries (such as Colombia and Bolivia) work primarily in the services industry, specifically in the cleaning and caring sectors (McIlwaine, 2007). In these labor niches, immigrants are very likely to face long work hours, low wages and no benefits or
insurance. McIlwaine found on a sample of Latin American immigrants from the Andean countries that many reported earning less than the Living Wage for London; some did not even make the legal minimum wage. They often felt exploited by their employers, as the cleaning and service jobs that most perform require long hours, inclement schedules, and/or holding several jobs to make ends meet. Immigrant respondents reported being exhausted, stressed, and without any time left for undertaking educational advancement or leisure activities. Lack of English skills and uncertain legal status were perceived as their most important problems. Lack of health care and decent jobs and housing, alongside with psychological well-being problems such as stress and depression were also mentioned (Ibid).

Research on immigrants to the UK suggest that immigrants’ occupational achievements or misfortunes are associated with the following factors: a) fluency in English; b) lack of familiarity with institutions and limited social network; c) human capital de-valuation (such as lack of recognition of educational qualifications); d) employers preference for native workers, and discrimination (Platt, 2006). The difficulties that Ecuadorians seem to be facing to achieve occupational success in this country may be due to these factors.

An additional factor, already mentioned, that has the potential for exerting a decisive impact on the lives of Ecuadorian migrants is their legal status. The effects of an irregular status on UK migrants’ employment and earnings are considerable. Irregular migrants earn approximately 30% less than other migrants, and there is a 6% employment
gap, with irregular migrants being more likely to be out of work than the general migrant population (Gordon et al., 2009).

Under these hard conditions, networking is one of the immigrants’ main survival strategies. Networks are very helpful for recent immigrants, both before embarking on their venture (Massey, 1990), and once they have arrived to their destination (Sveinsson, 2007; McIlwaine, 2007). In London, Latin American immigrants’ networks are usually small (only 3 or 4 trusted persons); they are primarily limited to family members and co-nationals, and people from other Spanish speaking countries (James, 2005; McIlwaine, 2007). Comparatively, Ecuadorians in the New York City area seem to be just as dependent on their family and co-national and/or co-ethnic network to get settled and find jobs (Melo, 2006).

In summary, the scant information about the lives of Ecuadorian migrants in London suggests that they face several challenges, mainly due to lack of English skills and a regularized residence status, and reduced network. They are likely to work in low-paying and insecure jobs, and experience psychological distress (McIlwaine, 2007).
CHAPTER THREE
TRANSNATIONAL MIGRATION AND PRACTICES

Transnational studies emerge from a diversity of disciplines such as Anthropology, Sociology, Linguistics and Communications (Panagakos & Horst, 2006). The term was coined in by a group of anthropologists in the early 1990s (Glick Schiller et al., 1992). They noticed that immigrants actively maintained ongoing social connections with their community of origin, living their lives literally across national borders. These researchers also used the term “transmigrants” to refer to this new type of migrants. The authors in mention emphasized the link between sending and receiving societies that immigrants construct by developing and/or nurturing multi-stranded social relations.

Transnationalism, posits Vertovec (1999), refers to the multiplicity of interactions that connect people and/or other social actors—such as institutions and communities—across national borders.

The argument has been made that a new term is hardly needed for a phenomenon that is as old as migration itself (Waldinger & Fitzgerald, 2004). Portes et al. (1999) point out that even if transnational links between immigrants and their communities of origin had always existed, its study has been greatly assisted by the transnationalism framework. In addition, transnational processes scholars stress the crucial role of new communication and transportation technologies in the emergence of transnationalism. Technologies such as the internet, e-mail, digital social networks, internet-based phones and the like, present
affordable, instant and rich communication options to immigrants and their pre-migration country network. They have provided the means to staying in contact, nurturing the links with the community of origin, intervening in the live and development of the community by way of remittances, contributions, political and socio-cultural participation. In this way, these technologies have the potential for making the contemporary immigrant’s experience very different from that of previous generations (Portes et al., 1999; Vertovec, 1999).

Research on immigrant’s transnational practices was initially restricted to case studies and ethnographic observations, and several of them, as Guarnizo, Portes, & Haller (2003) point out, were liable of sampling on the dependent variable. Other social science scholars (Portes, Escobar, & Radford, 2007), have emphasized the need for a more rigorous measurement of the presence of transnational practices among immigrants, rather than assuming that all of them are “transmigrants” by default. They have proposed a more empirical definition of the concept. Portes and colleagues define transnationalism as constituted by grassroots activities conducted across national borders by actors in civil society (Ibid).

Immigrant transnationalism is a subset of transnationalism; it refers to the regular cross-borders activities that immigrants engage in, while going about their everyday lives in their country of migration (Portes et al., 2007). This definition seeks to capture the novel element that differentiates contemporary immigrants from the previous generations. Their uniqueness resides in the regularity of their sustained participation in the affairs of their home country, for which they require frequent contact across national borders. In
addition, contemporary transnationalism has reached a “critical mass” level, due to modern communication and transportation technologies. These technologies, indeed, have made possible the creation of a transnational field. Real or “virtual” border crossing are vastly facilitated and expedited by technologies more affordable plane travel, by internet, digital social networks, e-mail communication, mobile telephony and the like (Guarnizo et al., 2003).

Proponents of transnational studies on migration indicate that this approach reflects the changing nature of the phenomenon of migration, which shouldn’t be studied only in relation to the host country (including both mainstream and ‘ethnic’ communities), but should incorporate also the study of the immigrant’s links and activities that keep them in contact with their native country and society (Levitt, 2001; Vertovec, 1999). The interconnection between the places, occurring due to the immigrants’ transnational practices, was left out of the models. When included, studies about the sending countries were considered as a separate society (Itzigsohn & Giorguli-Saucedo, 2002).

However, the presence of transnational links is not constructed as being the opposite of integration in the host community (Levitt & Glick Schiller, 2004). In fact, studies in the US have shown positive links between transnational activities and integration (Portes et al., 2007; Itzigsohn & Giorguli-Saucedo, 2002). A study conducted in the Netherlands with a sample of 300 respondents from six different countries (Snel, Engbersen, & Leerkes, 2006), failed to find any effect of transnational activities on lack
of integration in the Netherlands. Migrants that were less likely to be integrated did not report more transnational activities than the more integrated ones.

**The Transnational Migrants**

It should not be automatically assumed that all migrants are “transmigrants,” or individuals who live constantly interconnected across national border (Glick Schiller et al., 1995). Rather, the scope and ways in which migrants engage in transnational activities is a question that needs to be answered empirically (Portes et al., 2007). The extent and types of transnational activities that immigrants perform have been shown to be influenced by several contextual and individual factors (Guarnizo, Sanchez, & Roach, 1999; Portes, 2003).

Regarding contextual factors, the migrant’s legal status is of paramount importance. Uncertain legal status could affect mobility between countries. It could also affect the development of other cross-border involvements. It could even impact remittances sending due to the difficulties in obtaining permanent and better paid jobs. Likewise, a regularized legal status would grant immigrants the ability to travel and conduct business and other entrepreneurial activities more freely, and, consequently, would enhance their ability to engage in transnational practices (Landolt, 2000). Conversely, those with a more precarious legal status could be less likely to feel “settled” and, consequently, more likely to preserve their transnational links (Engbersen, 2007).

Another contextual factor of importance is the availability of ways of being transnationally engaged. As Levitt (2001) pointed out, the presence of more institutions
in the community that allow immigrants to become active in different manners, would make transnational activities more likely to occur.

Among the individual factors, gender (Landolt, 2000; Portes, 2003) and education (Landolt; Engbersen, 2007) have been found to be of importance regarding type and extent of transnational engagements. The profile that emerged from these studies is that migrants engaging in transnational public practices are among the most educated in the community, and with the longest time in the host country (Itzigsohn & Giorguli-Saucedo, 2002; Portes, 2003). They are also among the wealthiest and more established migrants (Portes et al., 2007). But at the same time, they are acutely aware of the discrimination and barriers they face in the host community (Landolt, 2000; Itzigsohn & Giorguli-Saucedo).

**Transnational Practices**

Transnational practices have been defined within a narrow and a broader framework. The narrow definition asserts that transnational migration studies should focus exclusively on regular activities carried out across the borders of the adopted and the native country, and are of an economic, political or socio-cultural nature (Guarnizo et al., 2003; Portes et al., 2007). This narrow perspective would exclude private engagements such as regular communication and remittance sending to relatives. This line of studies of transnationalism stresses the importance of focusing on “non-traditional” or emergent forms of the phenomenon that are actually new, as opposed to practices that have traditionally been carried out by immigrants, such as sending remittances. The focus for these researchers is on “a new class of immigrants” who are
entrepreneurs, social and/or political activists, and who conduct their business across national borders and on a regular basis (Guarnizo et al.).

Other scholars take a broader perspective in their approach to transnational practices (Itzigsohn, Dore, Hernández, & Vázquez, 1999; Levitt, 2001) and include both symbolic and material practices that interlink the country of origin and the country of stay, even if they do not require regular physical movement, and are of a more personal nature. This broad definition includes virtual border-crossing regular activities, such as e-mail messaging, phoning and sending goods, as opposed to exclusively physical cross-border. Within this framework, transnationalism also encompasses the practices of those that symbolically recreate the home community in the host country. For many migrants, their daily lives are still intertwined with their country of origin, even though their connection with their homeland occurs mainly within the realms of the host country (e.g. buying ethnic goods, attending cultural events, participating in sporting events) (Snel et al., 2006; Levitt). This research included measurement for both a narrow and a broader definition of transnational practices.

Regarding the sphere where the transnational practices take place, narrow transnational activities pertain, for the most part, to the public sphere, whereas the broader definition includes also activities taking place in the private sphere, with a low level of institutionalization (Itzigsohn & Giorguli-Saucedo, 2002). Public practices are carried out in a wider social space, and include exchanges such as businesses or trade, or institutionalized practices such as political involvement (Ibid). For research purposes, a working typology distinguishes between three main types: socio-cultural, economic, and
political activities (Portes, Guarnizo, & Landolt, 1999). *Private practices* are the activities carried out by individuals to fulfill financial and/or affective responsibilities with kin in the home country (Itzigsohn & Giorguli-Sucedo). Prime examples of private transnational practices are communication and remittance sending activities.

**Transnational Public Practices**

Transnational public practices are those activities that reach to a wider social group, such as a town, church, or community, and include some degree of involvement with organized networks and/or institutionalized practices (Itzigsohn et al., 1999; Itzigsohn & Giorguli-Sucedo, 2002). The three main domains within these practices — socio-cultural, economic-entrepreneurial, and political — are detailed in this section.

Transnational public practices prevalence seem to vary by type of practice. That is a finding from one of the most important empirical studies on immigrants’ transnational practices conducted to date, the CIEP, Comparative Immigrant Entrepreneurship Project (Guarnizo et al., 2003; Itzigsohn & Giorguli-Sucedo, 2002; and Portes, 2003). This project examined the transnational practices of Colombian, Dominican and Salvadoran migrants to the US. A total of 1,202 responses were collected; the samples were representatives of their respective communities. In this research, they found that participation in each particular transnational activity was low, but when they were added up, the percentages of those occasionally or regularly engaging on at least one type of transnational activities reached 31%.

*Transnational socio-cultural practices.* These activities are aimed to maintain ties with the country of origin, and include practice of sociability and mutual support.
Examples of these activities are country-themed festivities and parties, and sporting events (Itzigsohn & Giorguli-Saucedo, 2002; Itzigsohn et al., 1999). Cultural practices aim to re-enacting iconic elements of the culture of the home country, such as religious celebrations and the like. Organizing and contributing to home town associations or charity organizations in the home country are also included in this category (Itzigsohn et al., 1999).

The “altruistic” contribution of immigrants to communal projects and celebrations in their hometown could be a way of acquiring status levels and power that are unreachable for them in their host country (Jones-Correa, 1998). The social recognition and status resulting from their contribution could act as palliative to the loss of status and social esteem experienced in the new country (Ibid). In a similar vein, Itzigsohn et al. (1999) study of Dominican immigrants to the USA suggested that returning to their home country was, for many, a way of attaining an enhanced social status that they could not achieve in the USA.

Likewise, other studies suggest that immigrant’s re-enactment of their native country traditions in their current land could also be a way of reaching ascendance, in this case, locally. Pallares’ (2005) study of the Ecuadorian community in Chicago, USA, concluded that a crucial purpose of festivities and other ways of “recreating” the home country in the new land (USA) was to facilitate adaptation and integration, and to gain ascendance in the new country. When migrants engage in transnational enterprises after having experiences of disadvantage and discrimination in the new country, it is called “reactive transnationalism” (Itzigsohn & Giorguli-Saucedo, 2002).
Socio-cultural practices are the most commonly carried out public activities (Itzigsohn & Giorguli-Saucedo, 2002). Approximately 8.5% of surveyed immigrants from three different Latin American countries in the USA were regularly engaged in at least one socio-cultural activity; 31% were at least occasionally involved (Ibid). A study about Colombians in the UK, conducted by Guarnizo (2008), reported that 16% of respondents participated in socio-cultural/hometown organizations in home country at least occasionally, and 9% gave money to community projects in Colombia at least once in a while during the last year.

Regarding Ecuadorians’ participation in these activities, the information available is sparse. A study conducted by CIAME (2007a) found that 15% of Ecuadorians in Italy, and 12% in Spain were involved with Ecuadorian immigrants’ organizations in their towns of current residence. Despite the lack of information about Ecuadorians’ transnational involvements in the UK, there are, however, institutions and organizations that could facilitate such transnational processes. There are several Ecuadorian organizations active in the United Kingdom, such as the Ecuador in the United Kingdom Movement (MERU), the Ecuadorian Community Association, and the Anglo-Ecuadorian Society. There are also several town or province of origin-based organizations and art and folklore groups. In addition, the Ecuadorian community in London has a very popular seasonal Football League.

*Transnational economic practices.* This category includes business and investments in the country of origin. They can be of a formal or a more informal nature (such as sporadic back and forth trips to sell goods from either country in the other one).
Economical transnationalism can provide immigrants with an alternative way to achieve socio-economic success, while, for instance, serving the nostalgic needs of their “paisanos” for food and traditional consumer goods. These transnational enterprises take advantage of the immigrant’s available networks in both countries to make business in either of them or both (Itzigsohn et al., 1999).

Portes (2003, based on CIEP data) reported that no more than 5% of surveyed immigrants from three different Latin American countries in the USA were regularly engaged in transnational economic practices (no information was provided about occasional engagements). Guarnizo’s (2008) study of Colombians in the UK indicated that 11% of them made investments in their home country in the last year at least once in a while (5% on a regular basis).

Again, no information was found about economic transnationalism among Ecuadorians in the UK. Nonetheless, evidence of intense entrepreneurial activity on the part of Ecuadorians in London is revealed by the several businesses and restaurants catering to Ecuadorians (e.g. money transfer businesses, phone and internet shops, stores selling Ecuadorian articles, food, etc) that are found in the city. These businesses are located in the areas of London where most Latin American immigrants concentrate, such as Lambeth and Southwark. The commercial areas of the Elephant and Castle Shopping Center and Seven Sisters Market are particularly appealing to Latin American small entrepreneurs.

Transnational political practices. Political activities can give more power to voices that were, in their native countries, not heard before. These practices are one of the
most powerful forms of transnational engagement (see, for example, Itzigsohn & Villacres, 2008, analysis of the mobilization for voting rights of Dominicans in New York). Matiniello & Lafleur (2008) posit that immigrant political transnationalism encompasses political activities conducted by migrants with the purpose of achieving political influence or improve their social status in their home country. To that end, they would interact with different types of institutions in the country of origin, residence or with supra-national organizations. Hence, this category includes activities directed towards the home country such as fundraising for political parties, membership in political parties, voting, participating as candidates in elections, and the like. Political practices can also be directed towards influencing the host country’s government regarding policies towards the home country or towards immigrants (Ibid). Becoming engaged in political practices linked to the home country is also a way to become engaged in local politics, asserts Landolt (2001).

Political participation is greatly facilitated by the native country’s institutions and laws. For example, migrants from countries that allow dual citizenship and voting rights to their expatriates would have more opportunities for participating in their country politics than those from countries that do not present these options (Matiniello & Lafleur, 2008). Governments from migrant sending countries, such as Ecuador, aware of the numerical and financial importance of their emigrants, have started to provide them with a variety of opportunities for political participation. Likewise, political parties have opened offices in immigrant enclaves; candidates visit immigrant communities during
their electoral campaign, to attract their vote and financial backing (Guarnizo et al., 2003).

For Ecuadorians overseas, there are new incentives for political participation, such as the legislation providing double nationality, the immigrants’ right to vote, and the opening of six seats in the Ecuadorian Parliament for immigrants representing the main regions of the world where Ecuadorians have migrated (Tribunal Supremo Electoral, 2007; SJRM, 2007). Two of these Parliamentary seats are allocated to Europe. All these measures have increased the potential for Ecuadorian migrants to become politically involved and influential.

Despite the reduced number of immigrants in the UK, there are currently ongoing activities aimed to organize Ecuadorians in London. Main purposes of these movements have been promoting candidacies for the Ecuadorian Parliament, and to develop policy proposals regarding immigrants for the Ecuadorian government. These movements are also active within the British political realm, by participating in coalitions to defend the immigrants’ rights in the UK, and to organize workers in the sectors where many Ecuadorians work, such as the cleaning sector. They have embarked on activities to organize politically the Ecuadorian community, and to link it to other Latin American organizations in London. Però (2007) has comprehensively reviewed of the political organizing taking place among Latin Americans in the London area.

The Ecuadorian government, just like other governments with large emigration contingents, has also developed strategies to increase its presence among them. For example, the National Secretary of Migrants, SENAMI, has opened Ecuadorian Houses
in cities where most Ecuadorians reside. Currently, there are Houses in New York, Madrid, Barcelona, Milan, Genoa, Caracas and London. The London Casa was opened in September 2010. These houses provide a variety of services to the community, from English classes to assistance to those that are considering returning to the country (SENAMI, 2011).

Regarding the prevalence of transnational political practices among the migrant communities, Portes (2003, CIEP data; see also Guarnizo et al., 2003) study showed that 10% of respondents from three Latin American countries in the USA were regularly involved in political activities with a home country political party (18% did so at least occasionally). In the study of Colombians in the UK, 8% reported participating in home country political parties or movements, and 23% expressed being registered to vote or having voted in their home country elections at least once in a while (Guarnizo, 2008).

Information available about the political participation of the Ecuadorian community in the UK—namely registration and voting—has shown this to be subdued, but registration has been on the rise. Statistics from the Ecuadorian electoral tribunal showed that of a total of 611 registered voters, only 283 (49%) voted in the second round of the presidential election in 2006. Two years later, 321 (37%) of a total of 877 registered to vote did vote in the 2008 Ecuadorian Referendum (Tribunal Supremo Electoral, 2008). In 2009, 458 out of 1027 (45%) voted in the Ecuadorian presidential election (Consejo Nacional Electoral, 2010).
Transnational Private Practices

Private transnational practices, or transnational kinship engagements (Levitt & Jaworsky, 2007) involve individual linkages, usually without institutional involvement, and borne out of feelings of affection and/or responsibility and duty. They are also called “everyday” activities, as opposed to professional or more formalized ones (Snel et al., 2006). These kinship engagements include communicational and monetary and goods exchange sustained between the immigrants and their relatives and friends (McIlwaine, 2007). The two “everyday” transnational private engagements examined in this study are communication and remittance practices.

Communication. The technological innovations in telecommunications, mainly the mobile telephony and the Internet, provide the immigrants and their families with a wide array of options for staying in touch. Mobile phones afford tremendous flexibility to make calls and send text messages and photos from any location. The Internet—accessed via computers or via mobiles—provides an ample menu of communicative options: electronic mail, chat groups or instant messaging, social networks, message boards or web sites comment sections, internet phone calls (Skype), with or without web cams, web logs or blogs, radio podcasting, images posting and downloading, and the like. These technologies can be used in addition to the traditional ways of staying in contact such as regular mail and land phone communication. Videoconferencing is also available via various commercial venues such as cybercafés or ‘locutorios.’

Obviously, a barrier to taking full advantage of these technologically-mediated forms of communication is their physical and economical accessibility for both the
immigrants and those in their countries of origin. A second important barrier is the level of knowledge and comfort of both parts in using these technologies (Benitez, 2006; Horst, 2006; Horst & Miller, 2005; Pribilsky, 2004; Wilding, 2006).

Easiness of contact can be of great psychological and emotional benefit for the migrants and their families, particularly during the initial stages of their settlement. With non-existent or weak local social networks, immigrants are more likely to find social support with their loved ones back home. As many studies have shown, social support is instrumental to the immigrants’ subjective well-being (Jasinskaja-Lahti et al., 2006; Hovey & Magaña, 2000).

However, intense and easy communication with the family and the community in the home country might also create some challenges. Research posits that these intense links can be, for some immigrants, experienced as stressful and burdensome (Horst, 2006). The easiness of contact with the home country can increase the frequency of demands for financial and/or other types of help from relatives in need. In addition, with the help of the mobile phone, such demands can become more intrusive and originate from a wider social circle, including not only close relatives, but also distant ones and friends (Ibid). Responding to the financial demands from the home country community could expose low-skilled and low-paid remittance senders to more personal deprivation and sacrifice. Money invested in the home-community extended net of relatives is money not spent on the immigrant’s own welfare and progress in the new community (Datta et al., 2006a; McIlwaine, 2007; Martin, 2001).
Research conducted among Ecuadorians living abroad has found very frequent communication with their contacts in Ecuador. A report from Spain found that 71% of Ecuadorians stay in contact with their families in the home country at least once a week; 99% use the telephone, and only 10% the Internet (CECA, 2007). Likewise, a survey of Ecuadorians in USA, Spain and Italy showed that 98% of them stay in touch with their families. The preferred means of communication is the phone (97%) followed by e-mail (2%). A plurality stays in touch at least once a week (61%) (CIAME, 2007b).

There is scant information about use of technology-mediated forms of communication among Ecuadorian migrants in London. The small study undertaken by the International Organization for Migration in London (2008) found that 94% of their 32 Ecuadorian respondents had access to and use the Internet, most of them from home. A plurality of respondents used the Internet to stay in contact with family and friends in Ecuador. The IOM study also found that the majority of Ecuadorians use international calling cards on a home landline to stay in touch. No information was provided about the frequency of their contact. McIlwaine’s (2007) in-depth interviews of 20 South Americans in London, including Ecuadorians, found that all stayed in touch with their loved ones, most of them weekly or bi-weekly. Their preferred way to communicate was also phoning with inexpensive pre-paid phone cards. Interestingly, this report also found a wide use of the Internet as a communication tool, even among the most financially stressed immigrants. This high usage of Internet is possible in England, where Ecuadorians are very likely to find easy access to technologies of communication. The
internet penetration rate in the United Kingdom is, at 83%, one of the highest in the world (Internet World Stats, 2010).

Usage of internet as a transnational means of communication among Ecuadorian migrants could find a “bottleneck” at the Ecuador end of the communication process. In fact, in Ecuador, internet usage stands at about 22% (Supertel, 2010). However, it is important to note that many Ecuadorians, despite not having access to computers at home, school or work, can access the internet at the ubiquitous cybercafes (Carrion, 2006).

Regarding phone usage, the high rate of use among Ecuadorian immigrants coincides with a much more widespread availability of such medium in Ecuador. By 2010, there are 15.6m mobile phone subscribers in Ecuador (BuddeComm, 2011). That is 109% of the total population (due to individuals owning more than one mobile phone). By contrast, the phone density of the land lines is just 15% (Ibid).

As Vertovec (2004) described, international phone calls, particularly those made with pre-paid phone calls or via the internet, which a decade ago used to cost several dollars in developing countries, nowadays cost a few cents. The result has been an exponential increase in the number of calls worldwide. Immigrants and their families take full advantage of the phone to strengthen their interconnection. The absent ones can participate in family decision making and be more involved in the day-to-day happenings of their loved ones, particularly partners and children (Wilding, 2006).

Pre-paid cards are particularly useful because they allow users a phone service without the hassle of producing proof of income or any other documentation difficult to
obtain in poor rural areas of developing countries in order to sign a phone contract. Thru this pay system, the use of mobile phone technology has facilitated the contact between inhabitants of very remote rural areas and residents of global cities such as London (Vertovec, 2004; Lopez, 2000).

In summary, as mentioned previously, new communication technologies have enhanced the horizons of interconnection between the immigrants and their families. They can be instrumental in mitigating the negative psychosocial impact of the migration experience. Ecuadorian immigrants seem eager to stay in frequent contact with their loved ones back in Ecuador. In London, they find ample availability of these communication technologies (IOM, 2008).

*Remittances.* Remittances are the expression of long-distance social ties of obligation and solidarity between migrants and their family and friends from their countries of origin (Guarnizo, 2003). This is both a symbolic and a financial link between the immigrants and their relatives, whose importance cannot be overstated. In fact, for a high percentage of emigrants, sending remittances is the main reason to move to another country. Indeed, 83% of Ecuadorian migrants indicated that as the main reason of their departure to another country (Bendixen, 2003; CEMLA, 2010).

The moneys sent by immigrants back to their country, mainly to their families, have far reaching consequences for their countries’ economies. It is estimated that each US$ 1 sent from abroad generates US$ 2 in the economic output of its place of destination (Martin, 2005). These are small-scale activities, and of a purely personal and familiar scope. However, the aggregation of similar actions on the part of the hundreds or
thousands of immigrants from a small community can radically change the lives, fortunes and cultural references of those left behind, and indeed, of a whole town or region (Portes, 2003). It is not surprising, then, that remittances are the most studied type of transnational link.

Migrant remittances are extremely important for the Ecuadorian economy. They are the second source of revenue, surpassed only by oil exportation. Due to the recession in host countries such as USA and Spain, the amount of remittances has decreased in recent years (CEMLA, 2010). It is very likely that the amount of money remitted is higher than the official statistics, as remittances could be underestimated by as much as 10%, due to their informal flows (e.g. carried by hand) (Inter-American Development Bank, 2007). In addition, this calculation does not include the online purchase of goods that are then delivered at the immigrant’s family household in Ecuador.

Calculations about the percentage of Ecuadorian immigrants that send remittances vary by year and country of residence. Overall, more than half of the Ecuadorian migrants are remittance senders. A survey interviewing remittance receivers found that 52% of Ecuadorians families with a member living abroad receive remittances regularly (at least once a month) (FLACSO, 2004). It is estimated that as much as 14% of the Ecuadorian population receive remittances from relatives living in another country (Bendixen, 2003; CEMLA, 2010). Ecuadorian remittance recipients get money from abroad about 8 times per year. The average amount received per remittance is approximately $348 (CEMLA). A study of immigrants in USA, Spain and Italy found that 75% of Ecuadorians send remittances regularly, mostly monthly (59%) (CIAME,
Bendixen’s (2007) study in Spain showed that 86% of the Ecuadorian immigrants send remittances. Another study found an even higher percentage (97%) of Ecuadorians sending remittances from Spain, an average of 10 times a year (CECA, 2007).

The high proportion of Ecuadorians living abroad who send remittances is undoubtedly connected to the fact that Ecuadorian migrants have often left behind very close loved ones. Research data show that 27% of remittance senders are parents or spouses of the recipients; children are 29% of them; and siblings and others make up the remaining 44% (Bendixen, 2003). Another study about immigrants to Europe found that more than a third of them had left at least one child in Ecuador (Herrera, 2007, citing the SIEH, 2005, survey).

Ecuadorians in England sent a total of 31 million US dollars to Ecuador in 2006, out of almost 3 billion US dollars received as remittances in that year. This amount made England the fourth biggest country in terms of remittance sending to Ecuador (Banco Central del Ecuador, 2007). In 2008 and 2010, The UK was fifth (CEMLA, 2010; Banco Central del Ecuador, 2010). A survey about economic conditions of Ecuadorians in London reported that among those who send remittances (no percentage or number were reported), 78% do so monthly; in general, they send a median of 640 US dollars (Escuela de Economia, n.d.).

There is one aspect of remittances that is easily lost in the governments, international banks and financial institutions odes to their contribution to the economy of developing countries. While remittances constitute reliable “trouble-shutters” for those in
the country of origin, they might be highly costly, and indeed, a considerable sacrifice for immigrants at the lower end of the earning scale (Datta et al., 2006a).

**Comparing Transnational Practices**

There are few studies that offer information that make it possible to compare the private and public spheres of transnational practices. Some of them explore how they relate to variables relevant to the immigration subjective experience. The research available, which is described in the following paragraphs, suggests that these are different types of transnational activities indeed, as they are associated with different immigrants’ characteristics.

Murphy and Mahalingam (2004) designed a 21-item transnationalism scale for their study. The scale was administered to 137 West Indian immigrants to the USA. The scale comprised four domains: family/social ties, cultural ties, economic ties, and political ties. A factorial analysis of the scale showed the presence of five distinct factors, that they called “political and economic activity”, “social and cultural ties, “financial and commercial ties”, “social and family related travel”, and “social and family-related communication”. “Economic and political activism”, a public sphere transnational activities factor, was significantly and negatively related to “social and family related communication”, which includes items from the private transnational sphere. Similarly, “social and cultural ties” (public), “financial and commercial ties” (public) and “social and family-related travel” (mixed) were significantly and positively related among them, but unrelated to “social and family communication” (private). They report that the highest mean—activities engaged more often in—were ‘social and family
communication’, followed, in decreasing order, by ‘social and cultural ties’, ‘family-related travel’, ‘financial and commercial ties’; ‘political and economic ties’ were the activities less performed by respondents.

Odera (2007) studied the effect of acculturation and other variables on several psychological well-being outcomes. One of the predictors used in the study was transnationalism (adapted from Murphy & Mahalingam, 2004). The research was conducted with a sample of 209 Kenyan immigrants to the USA who responded to an Internet survey. Again, the activities with the highest frequency were family-related activities; cultural activities were next, followed by economic and political activities.

Landolt’s (2000) research about Salvadoran immigrants to the US investigated the personal dimensions impacting the extent and types of their transnational engagements. The study included demographic and socio-economic variables, as well as perceived discrimination and indicators related to their immigrant experience. Landolt constructed logistic regression models that predicted the likelihood of migrants engaging in socio-cultural, political, entrepreneurial, and household reproduction transnational activities. Interestingly, correlational analyses of the data showed that being a male was associated with all the domains of public transnationalism. The predictive value of gender, however, was absent in the logistic regression models. The author found that private and public transnational practices have different sets of predictors. Predictors of sending remittances were not having high school education and being working class. Conversely, predictors of participating in socio-cultural transnational practices were being a high school graduate, professional or entrepreneur, US citizen, and having experienced
discrimination. Significant predictors of participating in transnational political activities were having more years of education, and perceiving discrimination; being an entrepreneur was a negative significant predictor of political activity, whereas engaging in socio-cultural activities was a positive predictor. Being a wage worker, conversely, increased the likelihood of political activity. Transnational entrepreneurship was predicted by being a high school graduate and a US citizen, as well as being professional, self-employed or business owner. Being involved in socio-cultural transnational activities was also a positive predictor of transnational entrepreneurship.

Private practices seem to be more common among recent migrants, who have fresh and compelling links to the home country, as in the case of having left behind children and significant others. In fact, Suro (2005) found that remittances sending decreases over time, with ten years being the cutoff point after which frequency of remittances diminishes substantially or they stop altogether. Transnational social practices, on the other hand, increase with time in the host country (see, for example, reports of the data collected by the Comparative Immigrant Entrepreneurship Project, CIEP project, such as Guarnizo, et al., 2003; Itzigsohn & Giorguli-Saucedo, 2002; and Portes, 2003; see also Portes et al., 2007, analyzing a different set of data). Moreover, research findings indicate that having children in the country of origin (one of the main factors linked to private transnationalism) is negatively linked to engaging in transnational practices in the public sphere (Itzigsohn & Giorguli-Saucedo). The authors infer that the public and private arenas may be competing for the immigrant’s resources,
so that when they are needed in the private sphere, they are not available for the public one.

The research reviewed supports the notion that public and private transnational practices differ regarding how widespread they are among immigrants. They also differ on how often they engage in them. Immigrant’s regular participation in transnational practices of a more public nature, such as entrepreneurial, political and socio-cultural seems to be less frequent than private transnational engagements (Itzigsohn & Giorguli-Saucedo, 2002; Murphy and Mahalingam, 2004). As a whole, these results suggest that transnationalism is not as pervasive among immigrants as first thought to be, and it is, at its most narrow definition, embraced by only a minority of them (Portes, 2003).

Those engaged in private and public transnational practices seem to differ also in other respects, such as time of migration, and other personal and migration-related characteristics. These practices also seem to differ regarding how they relate to variables relevant to the immigration subjective experience (Murphy & Mahalingam, 2004). These differences will be expanded in the next chapter, as the subjective well-being variables included in this study are reviewed.
CHAPTER FOUR

TRANSNATIONAL PRACTICES AND PSYCHOSOCIAL FACTORS

This chapter comprises the following sections. The first section examines integration and immigration stress as variables likely to having an impact on transnational practices. The next section focuses on key constructs that have been put forward to assess the impact of transnational practices on subjective well-being. The third section summarizes the main demographic antecedents to transnationalism. The last section presents the questions and hypotheses that have guided this research.

Psychosocial Antecedents to Transnational Practices

Integration and stress related to the immigration experience are the two main variables identified as amenable of being significant antecedents to the extent to which Ecuadorians in London engage in transnational practices, as well as the type of said transnational activities. Several demographic variables have also been shown to be significant antecedents to transnational practices. They are detailed at the end of this chapter, before the hypotheses section.

Integration

Adaptation into a new society, referred within the framework of cross cultural psychology as ‘Acculturation,’ is a complex process that occurs when two different groups establish contact for a period of time, and change as a result of such contact. The process of adaptation is examined, from this perspective, at the sociocultural and
psychological levels (Berry, 2005; Ward, 1996). The transnational migration studies carried out with sociological perspective have emphasized the socio-economic or ‘structural’ and socio-cultural or ‘functional’ aspects of integration (Portes, 2003; Snel et al., 2006). The transnational approach to migration questions the ‘assimilationist’ tradition that defines immigrant’s integration into the host culture as a process in which their own culture has to be abandoned in order to properly integrate into the receiving culture (Guarnizo et al., 2003; Itzigsohn & Giorguli-Saucedo, 2002). Within the transnational studies framework, it has been shown that engaging in transnational endeavors is not incompatible with functional levels of integration. Concepts such as ‘assimilation’ and ‘incorporation’ have been regularly used as predictors of transnational practices (Ibid). However, these variables have been measured in a narrow way, being the preferred indicators ‘citizenship status’ and ‘time in the host country’ (Ibid). As Schwartz et al. (2006) found out, ‘years in the receiving culture’ is not a good marker for the multidimensional process of adaptation to the new society.

As a result of the contact that occurs between the groups during the acculturation process, both the nondominant and the dominant (host) group change; the burden of change falls, primarily, on the ‘nondominant’ party (the immigrant groups) (Berry 2001, 2005). This process of adaptation or ‘acculturation’ occurs within the frame of the societal strategies regarding the extent to which the society encourages or proscribes the maintenance of the cultural identity, and the extent to which the society encourages or proscribes the relationship between the groups. The society is open to ‘multiculturalism’ if it is at the encouraging end of these spectrums, accepting and respecting differences
while aiming at finding a common ground. Another possible societal strategy is the ‘melting pot,’ in which the newcomer is welcome as long as assimilates to the host society; at the other end of the spectrum, the host society and its members can embrace strategies of ‘segregation’ or ‘exclusion.’ Correspondingly, immigrants can adopt strategies of ‘integration’ when they embrace the new group while maintaining their own identity; ‘assimilation’ when they ‘leave behind’ their own culture and adopt wholeheartedly the host culture, or ‘separation’ or ‘marginalization’ when being excluded from the host society, or from both their own and the host societies. Obviously, immigrants do not have control over the host society’s strategies, and their own can only operate within its limits. Even if somebody wants to ‘assimilate’, if the host society does not allow for any form of inclusion, the immigrant’s efforts would be fruitless. Arriving to a society that excludes by ways of its legal system, institutions, or the attitude of its citizens, can be, of course, detrimental to the well-being of the migrant. As an example, there is extensive literature about the negative effect of discrimination, above and beyond any other stress related to the immigration experience (Gee et al., 2006; Collazos et al.; Rodriguez, Myers, Mira, Flores & Gracia-Hernandez, 2002).

Berry’s and colleagues’ research in this area had led them to conclude that integration is the most beneficial acculturation strategy for immigrants. Immigrants pursuing integration suffer less stress and are more successful at adapting to their adoptive country. This strategy of integration only make sense for the immigrants if the receiving society is open to accept cultural diversity and presents low levels of prejudice. Berry defined this type of societies as “multicultural.”
Research examining the relationship between integration and transnationalism has generated mixed results, but in general, it seems that they are not necessarily conflicting. Portes et al. (2007) reported that members of civic, philanthropic and political associations linked to their home country were among the better educated, higher-status members of their communities; they also had lived in the US for more than ten years, had secure legal status, and good command of the English language. The study with immigrants in the Netherlands conducted by Snel et al. (2006), conversely, researched the impact of transnational practices on integration. Similarly, this study found that transnational involvement did not interfere with immigrant integration. The integration dimension used in their study was socio-cultural integration, as opposed to socio-economic integration. They measured socio-cultural integration with two indicators: social contacts with members of the host society, and extent of migrants’ endorsement of moral standards and values of the host society.

However, this conclusion has some caveats. In the US study, based on the CIEP data, the incorporation variable was measured with time in the country, which was related to increased socio-cultural transnational practices, and with US citizenship, which was not. At the same time, having experienced discrimination was also related to increased transnational practices. Incorporation, in this case, seems to be understood in the sense of having found a steady and productive place in the host community, a place often carved within the confines of their respective “ethnic enclaves.” In other words, rather than being the opposite of integration, transnational practitioners could come to establish their integration into the host country by way of their transnational activities. From the
beginning, the authors indicate that complete integration might occur for the second or third generation, and there were no expectations of the first generation being fully immersed in the mainstream of society.

The relationship between integration and private transnationalism seems to be, however, negative. Sana’s (2005) study of data from Mexican immigrants to the USA found that immigrants who are poorly assimilated (e.g. not speaking good English, not being citizens, and not owning a house in the USA) were more likely to send remittances than their more assimilated counterparts.

The present research, while not studying the phenomenon of acculturation in all its complexity, has included indicators of integration that are more suited to measure the immigrant’s initial socio-cultural levels of insertion into the host culture. The indicators included are language mastery and social networks. Following Cuéllar, Arnold, and Maldonado (1995); Marín, Sabogal, Marin, Otero-Sabogal, and Perez-Stable (1987); and Marín and Gamba (1996), it is evident that, when immigrants cannot speak the language of the host culture, they are going to be isolated from the mainstream society. Likewise, relating with the host society means that there is some level of exchange with its members (Snel et al., 2006). From this standpoint, the diversity of the social network of the immigrant seems to be a crucial indicator of integration.

Language mastery. This dimension is a key component of acculturation (Marin & Gamba, 1996). Lack of mastery of the English language is seen by immigrants and academics alike as a main barrier to a successful structural and socio-cultural integration in the UK (Carlisle 2006; McIlwaine, 2007). Dustmann and Fabbri (2003) reported that
English fluency increases immigrants’ to the UK employment opportunities by 22 %, and is associated to wages increase of up to 20%.

Lack of knowledge of the host country’s language (English in the UK) could be also a significant deterrent for immigrants’ social integration, as it makes more difficult to develop a local native social network. This lack of integration could lead to a higher reliance on local networks of “paisanos” or fellow nationals, and/or on transnational links.

Language proficiency and use assessment via self-report subscales have been included in almost every acculturation measure. Several acculturation instruments have been developed for the Latino population in the USA (Cuéllar, Arnold & Maldonado, 1995; Marin et al., 1987; Marin & Gamba, 1996; Zea, Asner-Self, Birman, & Buki, 2003). Immigration studies using local language mastery as a measure of acculturation have usually found a positive link between language and subjective well-being variables such as self-esteem and psychological adjustment (Birman, Trickett, & Vinokurov, 2002; Padilla et al., 1998; Rumbaut, 1994).

Despite the importance of mastering the host country’ language in the lives of immigrants, most empirical transnational migration studies found so far have not included this variable. Portes et al. (2007) reported a significant association between good command of the English language and being active in transnational organizations among Latin Americans in the USA. Accordingly, the present research predicted that English mastery would be significant in the public transnationalism sphere but meaningless in the private one.
Social network diversity. Social networks are interpersonal links by which resources exchange circulate. These can be of several sorts, such as information and social and financial support (Marsden & Campbell, 1984).

A key element in the migration process, social networks play a crucial role in influencing a person’s decision to migrate and where to go. In a process that retro-feeds itself, new migrations pave the way to more migrations, by easing the difficulties of the journey for the new immigrants. Early immigrants’ help to the new ones include information about the migration process, financial help to begin the journey, as well as help with the initial settlement by providing housing, job search contacts, etc. In some sending communities, such immigration-related social networks have become so extensive that migrating becomes the norm for a particular group (e.g. among young men), so it seems that everybody has to do it. The influence of networks in the migration process even survives the economic, social and or political reasons that created the migration in the sending community in the first place (Massey & Espinosa, 1997).

For immigrants, social networks are both opportunities and constrains for social action; they channel the flow of informational, affective, and material resources (Vertovec, 2001). These networks allow immigrants to share work information, find better ways to cope with economic predicaments, develop friendships and find social support. These networks are, at least shortly after arrival, formed mainly within the boundaries of the migrants’ own ethnic group (Datta et al., 2006b). Research has shown that social networks can reduce the short-term cost of settling-in (Enchautegui, 2002). Studies conducted in the UK indicate that ethnic minority migrants are more likely to
report having lower levels of social support than the native British population (Shields & Price, 2003, 2005).

However, these networks, which are a resource for the development of valuable coping strategies for the migrants, can hinder the formation of networks beyond the limits of their ethnic group, and, to that extent, be detrimental to the migrants’ integration into the society as a whole (Datta et al., 2006b). In fact, as Hagan (1998) explores, intra-ethnic group ties that were “positive” during the initial period of adjustment after the immigration has occurred, can become “negative” at a later time, in the sense of precluding these individuals of reaching to a wider source of social resources, namely, from the “mainstream” of the host society. Enchautegui (2002) reached similar conclusions on a study based on data from the 1996 and 1996 Current Population Surveys in the US.

Research has shown that having a social network that includes nationals from the receiving country is associated with higher levels of subjective well-being among immigrant groups (Jasinskaja-Lahti et al., 2006; Martínez García, García Ramírez, & Maya Jariego, 2002). It has also been found to be a significant predictor for more instrumental benefits, such as finding a job (García Ramírez et al., 2005).

There are many key concepts amenable of analysis when examining immigrant social networks (Vertovec, 2001). The present study perspective is on the diversity of the network: whether or not transnationalism is linked to a lower degree of diversity in the local social network. If the immigrant faces difficulties building a local social network, would that make him/her more likely to intensify the transnational links to “make up” for
the lack of support? Would this focus on the community of origin, in turn, translate into less willingness or opportunities to include in his/her local social network individuals that can add new resources to the network? The present study, when exploring the diversity of the network, took into account the origin of the people in the network. For example, a network that includes immigrants from other countries and British born persons is more diverse than one composed exclusively of fellow Ecuadorians.

The rational for considering network integration an important construct in the present study is derived from the tie strength literature (Granovetter, 1973). Tie strength is a concept widely used in the study of social networks, and particularly relevant in the field of immigration studies (Vertovec, 2001). Ties are defined in a continuum between weak and strong. Strong ties imply more intimate involvement and often are geared towards satisfying the individual’s emotional and affective needs (composed mainly of family and close friends). People with strong ties are usually similar, and share a significant portion of the same network (e.g. family, co-nationals) (Marsden & Campbell, 1984).

Weak ties, by contrast, are less frequently activated, and involve less intimate contacts (e.g. acquaintances, people from different ethnic groups). They benefit the individual in a different way: they are particularly good for obtaining new information and access to new resources overall. This is due to the fact that weakly linked individuals are less likely to share the same backgrounds and experiences. For that reason, they collect resources from different sources. In short, weak ties provide informational and other type of recourse that could not be obtained from the close, strong network (Marsden
& Campbell, 1984). From this perspective, it is instrumental for the immigrants’ progress in the new country to “diversify” their network in order to have access to different sources of informational and other sort of resources.

The relationship between transnationalism and social network composition has been barely addressed. Portes (2003) study included social network as a determinant to transnationalism, and found that network size was positively associated with increased transnational entrepreneurial and political activities. That study did not find an association between scope or location of the social networks and transnationalism. The study of Snel et al. (2006) also included a question about number of local-born included in their local network, and found no association with transnationalism. Still, these studies did not analyze the composition of the network per se, namely, the proportion of people in the local network that were from the host country as opposed to being migrants themselves.

In summary, the theoretical review suggests that if immigrants’ emphasis on transnational links is a way of ‘making up’ for the scarcity of autochthonous local ties, there is the possibility of a negative relationship between network integration and transnational efforts. A negative link would also suggest that transnational practices are more likely to flourish within the confines of the ‘ethnic niche’. Conversely, the empirical studies reviewed hinted that network integration could be unrelated to public transnationalism.
Immigration Stress

Immigrants confront a series of physical and socio-cultural changes in their new surroundings. The transition can be distressing for the individuals. Referring to the acculturation experience, Immigration stress, also called acculturative stress, emphasizes that it is not the act of migrating per se, but how the conditions of the migratory process are experienced by the individual what can become the source of psychological distress, such as anxiety and depression (Berry, 2005). The elements that form part of the experience of immigration become stressful to the extent that the immigrant is unable to implement the appropriate coping mechanisms (Collazos et al, 2008; Finch, Frank, & Vega, 2004). The degree of stress that a newcomer would find when arriving to a new culture, Berry posited, depends not only on his individual characteristics, but also of the context of reception of the host society. Multicultural societies, which allow the ‘nondominant’ or ‘minority’ group to become a part of the society while keeping their own cultural uniqueness, is the counterpart to ‘integration’, which is the individual’s adaptation strategy more successful at producing healthier psychological outcomes (Berry, 2005).

Some of the potential stressors faced by immigrants are related to the losses they experience during the process of migrating, including, in many cases, the separation from their loved ones. Other stressors pertain to the conditions of reception into the host society: whether they face discrimination or limited opportunities for socio-economic and cultural progress (Pumariega et al., Zarza & Sobrino Prados, 2007). In addition, the potential stressfulness of the insertion in the new society would also depend on individual
level variables that intervene in shaping the relationship between the individual and the host society, such as gender, age, education, and so forth (Berry, 1997). For example, a highly educated, fluent in the host language ‘expatriate’ that arrives with a job offer will face less potential stressors that somebody with basic job skills and no knowledge of the language, who is in search of a job.

The challenges faced by immigrants from developing countries are depicted elsewhere: long hours in insecure jobs without benefits, low wages, fear of deportation if not having a legalized status, perceived low levels of social support, lack of knowledge about “how things work” in the new society, loss of social status and socio-cultural markers (Aroian, Norris, Tran, & Schappler-Morris, 1998; Carta et al., 2005; Collazos et al; Evans et al., 2005; Finch & Vega, 2003; Hovey, 1999; Padilla et al., 1998; Pumariega et al., 2005; Shields & Price, 2003, 2005; Sullivan & Rehm, 2005). In a study conducted in London and Madrid, Wright-Revolledo (2007) found that several losses, such as loss of their family and community relationships, social support, language, connectedness and social status, and confronting prejudice and discrimination were main threats to the well-being of Peruvian immigrants.

Discrimination is among the most detrimental stressors for immigrants. Discrimination is the occurrence of behaviors aimed to treat differently and to deprive of opportunities to individuals and/or groups based on their group membership (Essed, 1996; Jones, 1997). In addition to the tangible costs of discrimination for those experiencing it, there are also significant psychological costs. Discrimination in general, and racial and ethnic discrimination in particular, has been shown to have a detrimental
effect on psychological well-being, contributing to ailments such as depression and other psychiatric symptoms (Essed, 1996; Gee et al., 2006; Jasinskaja-Lahti et al., 2006; Kessler, Mickelson, & Williams, 1999; Noh & Kaspar, 2003; Shields & Price, 2003). A UK study of ethnic minority migrants supports the relationship between perception of discrimination and decreased psychological well-being. Shields and Price (2003) found that migrants that feel that they can be subject to racial harassment are significantly more likely to have lower levels of psychological well-being than other migrants.

Research about Ecuadorian immigrants to Spain have also shown negative effects of perceived discrimination, as it was significantly associated with psychological distress (González-Castro & Ubillos, 2009; Llacer, et al., 2009).

Despite the consistent findings regarding the negative psychological effect of discrimination, there is also a set of findings that apparently contradict this general assert, as some studies have shown the relationship between discrimination and self-esteem to be non-significant (Branscombe, Schmitt, & Harvey, 1999). These authors’ research shows that the relationship between discrimination and self-esteem has both a negative and a positive pathway. As they cancel each other out, the relationship appears to be non-existent. The negative path is the one traditionally shown regarding other psychological well-being measures: experiences of discrimination decrease the sense of self-worth. However, there is an additional path, indirect, between these variables. Discrimination increases the in-group identification with the group of reference; such identification, in turn, acts to increase the individuals’ self-esteem. The series of studies bases on this
model have been carried out with minority groups as well as other groups likely to experience discrimination (Branscombe et al.).

There are several ways in which it is thought that discrimination can be detrimental to the self-concept. One of the main theories is provided by the symbolic interaction framework. Cooley (1983) indicates that the self is constructed through interaction with significant others. Other’s appraisal informs one’s own sense of self, in a psychological phenomenon equivalent to a mirror reflection. If the perception of an immigrant returned by the others that surround him/her in the host society is negative, that can—ultimately—jeopardize his/her sense of self-worth (Crocker, 1999).

In response to the threat to self-esteem that discrimination imposes on individuals, they can opt for several coping strategies. Ethnic identification is one of them. In fact, studies conducted on African-Americans have shown that ethnic identification and in-group socializing can ameliorate the impact of discrimination (Branscombe et al., 1999; Essed, 1996).

From this theoretical perspective, transnational links from relatives and friends from the home country might become the “in-group” with which the individual identifies and relates, thus contributing to improve immigrants’ well-being when they experience discrimination.

Among immigration stressors, perception of discrimination has been included in previous empirical studies on transnational migration. Perceived discrimination has been found a significant positive predictor of transnational public engagements (Itzigsohn & Saucedo, 2002; Landolt, 2000; Portes, 2003). For immigrants living in foreign cultures,
and having left behind family and friends, transnational ties can be a source of comfort and “buffer” against the external threats to the sense of self and to their self-esteem that they could experience in the new environment (Jones-Correa, 1998). In contrast, Murphy & Mahalingam (2004)’s correlational analysis found a negative association between general stress and transnational communication; however, transnational communication was unrelated to perceived racial discrimination among a sample of West Indian immigrants in the USA.

The review conducted suggests that immigrants with higher levels of immigration-related stress could be more likely to engage in transnational practices.

**Subjective Well-Being Variables**

As indicated in the introduction section, the subjective well-being variables that were examined as amenable of being influenced by transnational activities were social support as it relates to transnational links, self-esteem and psychological well-being.

**Transnational Social Support**

Social support is defined as the social interactions that assist or provide individuals with a feeling of attachment perceived as loving and caring (Hobfoll & Stokes, 1988). The two more encompassing forms of support are emotional and instrumental (Pierce, Sarason, Sarason, Joseph, & Henderson, 1996). Instrumental support is the provision of material goods or help; emotional support is expressed through caring, loving, and accepting behaviors.

Sarason, Shearin, Pierce, and Sarason (1987) emphasized that the type of support most closely linked to psychological well-being is the perceived availability of support,
rather than the support actually received. Similarly, research comparing the relationship between perceived and received social support in a multinational sample showed that perceived support was a better predictor of self-esteem than received support was (Goodwin, Costa, & Adonu (2004).

Social support’s impact on psychological well-being can be via a ‘main effect’, in which the benefits to the individual are irrespective of the level of stress. A ‘buffering’ effect, on the other hand, occurs when social support’s impact consists of minimizing or reducing the negative effect of life stressors (Barrera, 1986; Cohen & Wills, 1985).

Studies on immigrant communities have shown such beneficial direct effects of social support on psychological well-being. Research has also shown social support exerting moderating and mediational roles on the relationship between immigration-related stressors and psychological well-being (Hernández et al., 2004; Hovey & Magaña, 2000; Jasinskaja-Lahtı et al., 2006; Kiang et al., 2010; Martínez García et al., 2001; Ritsner et al., 2000). Deficits in the levels of social support available have been linked to increased depression and anxiety (Leavy, 1983). In a study to validate a social support measure for sojourners, Ong and Ward (2005), found that instrumental and socio-emotional social support were significantly negatively related to depression. As it happens, lack of adequate social support—which is the case among migrants more often than among native-born British (Shields & Price, 2003, 2005)—deprives immigrants of an important protecting factor against such stressors.

Results about the effect of transnational linkages on immigrants’ available social support have been mixed. Murphy & Mahalingam’s (2004) research with West Indians in
the USA reported a significant association between social support and transnational communication. On the contrary, Odera’s (2007) study about Kenyans in the USA showed no significant association between transnationalism and social support.

Studies linking transnational communication or transnational support and psychological well-being have also found positive associations. Pantelidou and Craig (2006) research with Greeks in the UK reported that the number of friends and relatives in the home country with whom they stayed in touch was significantly and negatively associated with culture shock. Jasinskaja-Lahti et al. (2006) also reported a positive effect of home country networks on the psychological well-being of immigrants from the former Soviet Union in Finland. Moreover, a study about psychological well-being of Ecuadorian immigrants in Spain showed that transnational social support from relatives back in Ecuador was a better buffer against the negative effects of discrimination on their psychological well-being than any type of local support (González-Castro & Ubillos, 2009).

These results, albeit mixed, suggest the possibility that immigrants who can rely on their transnational links for emotional and instrumental support can, to some extent, supplement or substitute their local network with their already established—although distant—one, and in this way, increase their perceived social support and overall psychological well-being.

**Self-Esteem**

Self-esteem refers to the individuals’ perception of their self-worth, significance and capableness (Rosenberg, 1989). This perception is partly drawn from social
interactions. Because of that, changes and transitions in the social environment can modify the individuals’ self-esteem. As such, the changes that the immigrants experience in the social surrounding, and the loss of status that accompany such changes, could be threatening to their previous levels of self-esteem. Accordingly, it is plausible that they could engage in strategies to try to “restore” their self-esteem. A way of achieving that could be by preserving their previous social group of reference via transnational links.

As depicted in the section pertaining to the immigrant’s experience in the United Kingdom, Ecuadorians are very likely to experience a lowering in their social standing. This is due to several factors such as their lack of knowledge of the language, of how things are done in England, to an insecure legal status (when that is the case), to a reduced or non-existent social network, to the lack of recognition of their educational or professional attainments in the home country, to the consequent de-skilling when they join the work force, to discrimination, and so forth. All of these challenges can, potentially, be threatening to the immigrants’ self-esteem.

One of the strongest psychological motivations for action is the desire to protect and maintain a sense of self, a self-concept, when it is threatened by the environment. If the barriers to increase the social standing within one community seem to be insurmountable, a feasible way to increase such standing is by changing the reference group. This change might be even more psychological seamless if it is directed towards the group that was indeed the referent for the immigrant up until his/her moving abroad.

From this perspective, the immigrant transnational engagements, carried out mainly due to the affection and closeness to the loved ones left behind, could also play a
beneficial role on the immigrant’s sense of self. Being able to provide to relatives in need, and to contribute to his town development, in addition to being ways in which an immigrant exerts his sense of responsibility and duty towards his own, could also validate his sense of worth by enhancing his importance to others (Sana, 2005).

In short, the dynamic proposed regarding these variables is: immigrants engage in transnational engagements out of a variety of reasons, chief among them feelings of affection and responsibility. The role that their efforts to contribute to their loved ones welfare cannot be minimized. Transnational links and engagements can also contribute to preserve the immigrants’ sense of self and self-esteem. This additional effect of engaging in transnational activities become more important if the immigrant’ self-esteem is threatened by the series of hurdles already mentioned, such as lack of understanding of the new cultural surroundings, discrimination and lowered social status. Under these circumstances, immigrants could be more likely to regain a more favorable sense of self when embarking in transnational activities.

Self-esteem has been studied as an outcome variable of psychological health (Cavazos-Rehg & DeLucia-Waack, 2009; Rumbaut, 1994; Sam, D. L., 2000), as a predictor of psychological health (Nesdale, Rooney, & Smith, 1997; Nesdale & Mak, 2003; Paradise & Kernis, 2002), or as a mediator between individual or sociocultural characteristics and psychological health (Oppedal et al., 2004; Yamawaki, Nelson, & Omori, 2011). The positive impact of self-esteem on psychological well-being, found in the general population, has also been found among immigrant populations (Nesdale et al.; Nesdale & Mak; Oppedal et al.).
In brief, self-esteem is an important construct in this study because the loss of socio-cultural references caused by the migratory experience (Al Issa & Tousignant, 1997) can disrupt the immigrants’ self-concept. Engaging in transnational practices, by way of preserving links to important “anchors” of the self-concept, might play a positive role in helping immigrants increase or “regain” their self-esteem. Transnational engagements would also have a positive effect on psychological well-being, since self-esteem has consistently been linked to favorable psychological outcomes among immigrants (Oppedal et al., 2004).

Psychological Well-Being

Many studies on psychological well-being of immigrants have focused on mental health. Immigration stressors, the research examined has shown, can affect a variety of elements of psychological functioning; they can, in particular, produce anxiety and depression (Pumariega et al., 2005; Kiang et al., 2010). However, it shouldn’t be assumed an automatic causation between immigration and mental health problems. As Collazos et al. (2008) review, studies that made that assumption were guilty of methodological fallacies, such as leaving unmeasured important mediators and environmental and psychosocial constructs.

Immigration is a complex experience of change, (Aroian et al., 1998; Bhugra, 2004). Even if the decision to migrate was a voluntary one, the changes and the challenges faced can be overwhelming. This experience encompasses losses, such as the loss of the proximity to family and friends, the cultural surrounding, the homeland, status, contact with the ethnic group, and so on (Carta et al., Zarza & Sobrino Prados,
At the same time, the person has hopes and expectations about what is possible to accomplish in the new land (Ibid). When the immigration journey is particularly stressful and dangerous, it can provoke what psychiatrists call the “Ulysses syndrome” which includes, among other characteristics, depressive symptoms and anxiety. The development of this syndrome progresses as the immigrant’s hopes face the difficulties, hardships and obstacles such as discrimination and difficulties in finding job, housing and so forth. In the case of undocumented immigrants, the fears of being deported add up to this already stressful situation (Bhugra, 2004; Carta et al.; Sullivan & Rehm, 2005; Zarza & Sobrino Prados).

Research about the effect of migration on psychological well-being among immigrants has produced mixed results. Overall, there is some evidence that immigrants are, in general, healthier than non-migrants from their own country (Cuéllar, 2000). The results in other studies have been mixed. A large sample study using the General Health Questionnaire 12 (GHQ12) as a measure of mental health, found that a higher percentage of ethnic minority immigrants in the UK report a significantly greater number of psychological distress indicators than their white-UK born counterpart. There were no specific numbers for Latin Americans (Shields & Price, 2003). Research conducted with Mexican immigrants to the US has shown that they experience more stress than US-born individuals of Mexican descend (Cuéllar, Bastida, & Braccio, 2004).

Immigrant psychological well-being has been shown to be associated with higher socio-economic status (Jasinskaja-Lahti et al., 2006). In the UK, unemployment and poverty among immigrants have been linked to more psychological distress (Shields &
Price, 2005). Similarly, Brugha et al. (2004) suggested, based on a large scale survey of households in Britain, that differences between levels of psychiatric disorders between ethnic minorities and white British were mostly explained by their level of socio-economic disadvantage.

**Transnationalism and Subjective Well-Being**

Information about the impact of transnationalism on immigrants’ subjective well-being is sparse. Murphy and Mahalingam (2004), on a study about transnational practices of West Indian immigrants to the USA found that the global measure of transnationalism was positively related to depression and perceived social support, but unrelated to anxiety, stress and perceived discrimination.

In the same study, the variables perceived social support, stress, perceived discrimination, anxiety and depression were found to have the following associations with the transnationalism subscales: Cultural and Social ties and Financial and Commercial ties were found to be significantly and positively related to perceived social support. Social and Family-related communication was negatively and significantly related to perceived stress. This subscale was also negatively related to anxiety, and significantly and positively linked to perceived social support. Intriguingly, political and economic transnationalism were positively related to depression and anxiety. Perceived discrimination was not related to any transnational practice.

By contrast, a study using a similar instrument to measure transnational practices among Kenyans in the USA (Odera, 2007) did not find any impact of transnational
practices on social support or on any psychological health outcomes, such as subjective well-being, somatic and depressive symptoms.

**Demographic Antecedents**

Gender, socio-economic status, years in the host country, legal status and having or not immediate family (children, spouse) in the home country have been included in previous studies and have shown various degrees of association with transnationalism. Age was also included as a demographic predictor in the present study.

In terms of gender, transnational public practices seem to be a male territory, Portes’ (2003) study suggests. More specifically, the immigrants more likely to pursue these activities are married men. For instance, men’s political participation surpassed that of women by as much as 200 percent. Conversely, there are suggestions that women are more involved than men in private transnational activities (Pessar, 2000). No predictions were made about differences in transnational engagements as a function of age.

With respect to educational level, several studies have shown that the better educated immigrants (high school or more) are more likely to engage in entrepreneurial and other type of transnational public practices than their less educated counterparts (Landolt, 2001; Portes, 2003). Conversely, they would be less likely to send remittances. A 1998 study of Latinos in the US showed that each additional year of education reduced remittance sending by 7% (Lowell & de la Garza, 2000).

Regarding the relationship between public transnational practices and socio-economic status, Itzigsohn & Giorguli-Saucedo (2002) found that having no resources (as in being unemployed) was negatively related to public transnational practices. However,
these activities seemed to occur independently of how much resources the immigrant had, once they had ensured their basic livelihood. In Landolt’s research (2000), higher income is also linked to increased transnational entrepreneurship. In Snel et al study (2006), respondents with higher socio-economic status were significantly more likely to be involved in professional economic practices.

*Legal status* permeates the totality of the immigrant experience and indeed affects the degree to which they can truly engage in transnational and national activities. For example, a legalized status would allow immigrants to travel freely back and forth between the country of migration and the one of origin; open bank accounts that facilitate money transfer; obtain better paid jobs, which in turn facilitates sending remittances or investing in the home country, etc. (Menjivar, 2006). Landolt’s (2000) Salvadorans study found that having a U.S citizenship significantly predicted involvement in public transnationalism, such as entrepreneurship or socio-cultural activities.

Regarding the impact of *time spent in the country of migration*, the longer the immigrant has stayed in the host country, the more likely he/she is to be involved in transnational public practices. This is reported in the studies based on the data collected in the USA by the Comparative Immigrant Entrepreneurship Project (CIEP), such as Guarnizo, et al., 2003; Itzigsohn & Giorguli-Saucedo, 2002; and Portes, 2003; and Portes et al., 2007, analyzing a different set of data. Conversely, Suro (2005) found that remittances sending decreases over time, with ten years being the cutoff point after which frequency of remittances diminishes substantially or they stop altogether.
Review of Purpose of Study and Hypotheses

As detailed in this and the previous chapters, the study explores the impact of demographic, immigration and integration-related antecedents on private and public transnational practices. This research also examines the impact of transnational practices on social support, self-esteem and psychological well-being. The mediation of social support and self-esteem on the impact of transnationalism on well-being is also studied.

In short, this research addresses the following themes and questions relating the transnational engagements of Ecuadorian immigrants. For most exploratory questions, no hypotheses are presented.

Questions and hypotheses related to antecedents to transnational practices.

Exploratory Questions: How often do Ecuadorians communicate with their family and friends in Ecuador? How often do they send remittances? What are their main means of communication? Do these variables change with length of time in the UK? Based on the review of the literature, the tendency will be for them to decrease in frequency as length of stay in the UK increases.

Private transnationalism comprises two main activities: communications and remittances/goods sending. They are significantly and positively correlated.

The following demographic and migration-related variables are hypothesized to be significant antecedents to transnational practices:

1. Being male is a significant positive antecedent to public transnational practices (*PUT*). No predicted gender differences are expected regarding private transnational practices (*PRT*).
2. Having children and/or spouse in Ecuador significantly increases the likelihood of engaging in PRTs. The impact of this variable on PUTs is negligible or negative.

3. SES is significantly and positively related to PUTs. No significant relationship is expected with PRTs.

4. English mastery is a significant predictor of PUTs, but not of PRTs.

5. Network integration is negatively associated with PUTs and PRTs.

6. Time in the new country has a different impact on transnational practices. Over time, PUTs will increase, whereas PRTs remain stable or decrease.

7. Being a legal resident/citizen significantly increases the likelihood of engaging in PUTs. Legal status does not have a significant impact, or, if any, a negative one, on PRTs.

8. PUTs and PRTs are significant predictors of each other. Their positive correlation is medium to low, rather than high.

*Analysis of the mediation model.* Figure 1 depicts the hypothesized role of transnational social support and self-esteem as complete mediators of the relationship between transnational practices and well-being.
The hypotheses depicted on the model are as follows:

a. There is a direct positive effect of Immigration Stress (IS) on Transnational practices (TP).

b. There is a direct negative effect of IS on Psychological Well-being (PWB).

c. There is a direct negative effect of IS on Self-esteem (SE), and an indirect positive effect via TP.

d. There is a direct positive effect of transnational social support (TSS) on SE

e. There is a direct positive effect of TP on TSS and on SE.

f. TSS and SE have a direct positive effect on PWB.

g. The effect of TP on PWB is totally mediated by TRA SUP and SELF EST.
An alternative model was also tested, in which a direct path from transnational practices to psychological well-being was added. A better fit of this model, compared to the previous one, would show lack of support for the hypothesized complete mediation of the effect of transnational practices on psychological well-being via transnational support and self-esteem. Figure 2 depicts this alternative model.

Figure 2. Model of Partial Mediation of the Relationship between Immigration Stress, Transnational Practices, Self-Esteem, Transnational Social Support and Psychological Well-Being
CHAPTER FIVE

METHOD

This chapter introduces the characteristics of the study participants, the procedures, measures and analyses used in the present study.

Participants

Participants consisted of 174 adult Ecuadorians residing in London and its surrounding areas who voluntarily agreed to take part in the study. Percentages of male and female respondents were 61% (106) and 39% (68) respectively. Their ages ranged from 21 to 68, with the mean age being 39 years ($SD = 9.6$). Their time living in England ranged from 1 to 43 years, with a mean of 11 years ($SD = 5.7$). The majority of respondents (71%) had lived in England between 8 and 15 years.

Most participants lived in London (94%). They resided in 19 of the 32 city Boroughs. Sixty five percent came from three Boroughs: Lambeth (33%), Southwark (23%), and Lewisham (9.2%). See Appendix A for additional demographic information.

Procedure

Participants were recruited at various places in London frequented by Ecuadorians. The Ecuadorian Consulate in London opened its doors for the researcher to interview persons waiting for consular services. Participants were also recruited at Ecuadorian restaurants, shops, churches and sporting events. For example, the researcher contacted the pastor of a church frequented by Ecuadorians; the pastor gave the
researcher her consent to attend the church gatherings, where she could introduce herself and the research and ask for volunteers to answer the questionnaire after the meeting. In addition, some social service organizations allowed the researcher to interview Ecuadorians attending their services. In public places, like shopping centers or sporting venues, potential participants were approached by the researcher, a Spanish native speaker. They were asked if they were Ecuadorian, and if they would be interested in taking part in a study. If they were Ecuadorians and were interested, they were briefed about the study and given the informed consent form. Those who agreed to take part in the study completed the questionnaires in-site, individually or in small groups. If needed, an English version of the instrument was also available. All the participants preferred to answer in Spanish. Participants were reassured about the anonymity of their responses and of their right to stop their participation at any time; if so they wished (the Consent form is included in Appendix B). Participants responded to the questionnaire at their own pace, in the locations where they were recruited. They took between 20 and 45 minutes to answer the questionnaire. After they finished they were debriefed and thanked.

**Measures**

Participants received a 5-page set of instruments, consisting of the Transnational Practices Questionnaire, the English Proficiency and Social Network Integration Questionnaires, the Demands of Immigration Scale, the Transnational Social Support Questionnaire, the Self-Esteem Scale, the Mental Health Inventory-5 (MHI-5), and a demographic information questionnaire. The instruments were available to the respondents in both English and Spanish.
The Spanish versions of some questionnaires were readily available from the scales developers, as is the case for the English proficiency questionnaire, the Rosenberg self-esteem scale, the Social support questionnaire, the Demands of Immigration scale, and the MHI-5. The other questionnaires were translated into Spanish by a bi-lingual researcher (the author of this study), and then back into English by another bi-lingual scholar.

Transnational Practices Questionnaire. The questions for this 13-item long instrument were adapted from the Comparative Immigrant Entrepreneurship Project (CIEP) questionnaire (Itzigsohn & Giorguli-Saucedo, 2002; Guarnizo et al., 2003; and Portes, 2003), and from Snel et al. (2006). No psychometric information about these instruments was provided in the mentioned studies. The resulting instrument included questions pertaining to socio-cultural (5), economic (2) and political (4) public practices. Two items regarding the private sphere of transnationalism inquired about frequency of communications and remittances. Examples of questions are “In the last two years, how often have you… participated in charity organizations active in Ecuador?” “In the last two years, how often have you…made investments in Ecuador?” Questions are responded on a 1 (never) to 7 (very often) scale. Average scores were obtained for each scale, as well as a total private and a total public transnational practices score. For the present study, the questionnaire’s alpha reliability coefficient was satisfactory (.81). This questionnaire is presented in Appendix C.

In addition, questions further exploring immigrants’ private engagements with their relatives in Ecuador were also included in the demographic questionnaire. A set of
four questions asked participants whether or not they have family members who live in Ecuador, the frequency of their communications and sending of remittances and goods. These questions have been developed for purposes of this study. The items about frequency of contact were answered on a 1 to 7 scale (from never to once a day or more). To obtain a total score of private transnationalism, the items about frequency of contacts were averaged. The total public transnationalism score was also obtained by summing up and dividing the total by the number of valid items.

*English Mastery.* English mastery is one of the two indicators of integration used in this study. Respondent’s perceived English mastery was measured with a 4-item questionnaire extracted from the English linguistic proficiency section of the Bidimensional Acculturation Scale for Hispanics, BAS (Marin & Gamba, 1996). The complete scale has 24 items, and the original language proficiency dimension measures both English and Spanish proficiency in six items each. For the present study, only the English proficiency section was used, since the target respondents were immigrants with Spanish as their native language. Hence, this study used Marin and Gamba’s own Spanish version of the scale. The scores for each item are on a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 to 5. The overall language proficiency score was obtained by summing up the individual items response and dividing the total by the number of valid items. The overall scale has satisfactory internal consistency, from .81 to .97 (Marin & Gamba). The authors reported a Cronbach’s alpha reliability of .90 for the Hispanic domain and .96 for the non-Hispanic domain. This study found an alpha reliability of .94 for the English
proficiency section. An example of a question is “How well do you…read in English”. This questionnaire is included in Appendix C.

_Social Network Integration_. Social network integration is the second indicator of integration. As has been previously reported, a diverse network is an indicator of greater integration in the host country society. The Social Networks questionnaire, developed for this study, included questions about the size and origin of the immigrants’ local network. As indicated in the review section, this questionnaire was aimed at succinctly measuring network diversity. The network diversity index was obtained by computing the percentage of the UK based-immigrant’s network that was not Ecuadorian or Latin American. Respondents were asked to indicate the approximate number of people in their local (UK) network, and the number of them that are from Ecuador, from other Latin American countries, from other countries, and from the UK (see Appendix C).

_Demands of Immigration Scale_. Immigration stress was measured with 6 items from the scale (Aroian et al., 1998), plus two items derived from local research about London Latin American immigrants’ main concerns (McIlwaine, 2007). The DI was developed by Aroian and colleagues to measure demands emanating from the migration experience, and the level of stressfulness associated to such experiences. The questionnaire items were identified in studies with Polish, Irish and former Soviet Union immigrants to the US (Ibid). Later on, the ensuing 23-item instrument has been used with various groups such as Arab speaking immigrants (Aroian, Kaskiri, & Templin, 2008a) and Latin Americans in Spain (Aroian, Norris, González de Chávez Fernández, & García Averasturi, 2008b).
The DI comprises six subscales: Loss, Discrimination, Not at Home, Novelty, Occupation, and Language. One item representing each subscale is included in the current study. Given the high internal consistency of the total scale, it was expected that these individual items were highly inter-correlated. The items chosen to represent the six subscales were the ones with the highest factor loading on their respective subscales (Aroian et al., 1998). The following example is the item belonging to the occupation subscale: “I have fewer career opportunities than British people”.

To ensure that the items included in the scale were relevant to the immigration-related concerns of Ecuadorians in the UK, they were compared to the main concerns listed by Latin American interviewed for a study recently conducted in London (McIlwaine, 2007). Their concerns were in the areas of English mastery, legal status, finding fairly paid jobs, discrimination, sorting out the cultural challenges, and understanding how things work in England. Four of the six items selected from the DI scale matched the list of local concerns; two items regarding sense of loss and not being at home did not appear in the list of local concerns. However, these items were not removed from the scale because they address the link between the immigrants and the home country, and were, therefore, relevant to the present study of transnational links.

In addition, there were two issues listed as main concerns by the UK immigrants that were not covered by the scale: the concerns about the legal status, and about the cultural differences between the home country and British cultures. Two items regarding these issues were added to the scale.
The resulting 8-item Demands of Immigration scale used a 6-point response scale ranging from 1 (not at all) to 6 (very much) (Aroian et al., 1998). The higher the score, the more distressful the demand has been for the respondent over the past three months. To obtain the grand total, the individual item scores were added and divided by the number of valid items.

The scale has high internal reliability, with alpha coefficients of .95 and .94 for different subsamples. As for the test-retest reliability, it was \( r = .89 \) and \( .92 \) for different subsamples over a 3-week period (Aroian et al., 1998; Aroian & Norris, 2000). The study using the Spanish language version of the scale reported a coefficient alpha of .90 for the total scale (Aroian et al., 2008b). The Spanish version was used in this study, and reached high internal reliability, with a Cronbach alpha coefficient of .86. Reliability was the same for the original 6 questions and for the 8-questions version. This scale is included in Appendix C.

**Transnational Social Support.** Transnational social support was measured with an adaptation of the family and friends subscales of the Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support, or MSPSS (Dahlem, Zimet, & Walker, 1991). This scale measures the respondents’ perception of adequacy of socio-emotional support available to them. The MSPSS consists of three subscales: family, friends and significant others, with four items each. Items are responded on a scale ranging from ‘very strongly disagree’ (1) to ‘very strongly agree’ (7). Each subscale score is computed by summing up the responses for each item and then dividing that total by the number of items responded.
The original items from the family and friends subscale are thematically equivalent, even those that are slightly differently worded. For example, whereas one item of the family scale says “My family really tries to help me”, the equivalent item in the friends subscale states “My friends really try to help me”. For purposes of this study, these two subscales were combined by using the expression “family and/or friends”. Thus, the transnational support subscale says “My family and/or friends in Ecuador really try to help me”.

The MSPSS has been widely used with diverse types of populations, such as former Soviet Union immigrants to Israel (Ritsner et al., 2000), Latino youth in the US (Edwards, 2004), Latino immigrants in the US (Dunn & O’Brien, 2009) and has demonstrated adequate internal consistency. It has shown to be negatively correlated to anxiety and depression (Zimet, Dahlem, Zimet, & Farley, 1988). Construct reliability was examined by Edwards by evaluating the correlations with a perceived family support subscale and it was found satisfactory for studies with Latinos in the US.

In a confirmation study of the scale conducted with a sample of urban college students, the internal reliability—obtained by using Cronbach’s coefficient alpha—was .90. For the family subscale, it was .90, .94 for the friends, and .95 for the significant others (Daherm, Zimet & Walker, 1991). Test-retest reliability value for the scale at 2 to 3 months was .85, .85 for the family subscale, .75 for the friends, and .72 for the significant other (Zimet et al., 1988). Previous studies conducted by the scale developers using a variety of samples have reported similar levels of internal reliability (Ibid).
In a study conducted with a sample of ethnic minorities in the USA, the coefficient alpha for the total scale was .93. The family, friends, and significant other subscales alpha coefficients were .91, .89, and .91 respectively (Canty-Mitchell & Zimet, 2000).

The MSPSS has also been used to measure social support with immigrant populations in Murphy and Mahalingam’s (2004) study about transnational links and mental health of West Indian immigrants to the US. Their research reports a Cronbach’s alpha of .90 for the scale.

This instrument has been translated into Spanish and applied to college students in Spain (Landeta & Calvete, 2002). This Spanish language version of the MSPSS presented levels of reliability similar to the English version. The Cronbach’s coefficient alpha for the total scale was .89; .89 for the family, .92 for the friends, and .89 for the significant others subscales. Landeta and Calvete’s Spanish translation is used in this dissertation research. In this study, the Cronbach alpha coefficient was .95, indicating a high level of internal consistency. In Dunn & O’Brien’s study (2009), using their own Spanish translation of the instrument, the internal consistency was .87.

Two additional items were developed for this study and included in the transnational social support subscale: a) “I can count on my family and/or friends to help me with my personal and business matters back in Ecuador”, and b) “My family and friends in Ecuador truly appreciate my efforts to help them and my community”. The first one addressed instrumental help, which can be critical for immigrants to continue conducting their affairs from afar, if needed. The second item addressed the issue of
whether or not immigrants feel that their efforts, if any, to help their family or their
community back home were recognized and appreciated. These topics were included
because previous studies about immigrants’ transnational links show that immigrants
both help to and are helped by their families in their native countries (Basch, 2001). This
scale is included in Appendix C.

*Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale.* The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale was also
included (Rosenberg, 1989). This scale is widely used to measure generalized self-
esteam. Examples of items are “On the whole, I am satisfied with myself”. This is a 10-
item scale, 5 of which are reverse scored. The general score is obtained by averaging the
scores for the 10 items, with higher scores indicating higher self-esteem. Although
Rosenberg designed this as a 4-point scale, other authors, such as Shahani, Dipboye, &
Phillips (1990), and Greenberger, Chen, Dmitrieva, and Farruggia (2002) have used it as
a 6-point scale, which is the range adapted from this study. The mentioned study reported
an internal reliability of .80 for the scale. The items range from 1 (strongly agree) to 6
(strongly disagree).

Self-esteem has been consistently related with psychological well-being, and
inversely related to depression and anxiety (Rosenberg, 1985). This scale has been widely
translated and validated in many languages (Schmitt & Allik, 2005). There are several
Spanish language versions. The one selected for this study is a recent version validated
with college students in Spain (Martín-Albo, Núñez, Navarro & Grijalvo, 2007). This
version has been translated using the parallel back-translation procedure (Brislin, 1986),
which consists of a bilingual person translating the scale to the target language; then
another bilingual person non familiar with the scale translates it back to the original language. The authors of this translation used the described procedure twice and then a committee of four scholars proceeded to assess the resulting version. The resulting instrument showed good internal reliability, with coefficient alpha of .85 and .88 in two different applications. The test-retest reliability after 4 weeks was also a satisfactory .84 (Martín-Albo et al.). The Rosenberg scale is presented in Appendix C.

*Mental Health Inventory – 5.* Immigrant’s sense of psychological well-being is measured with this instrument, the MHI-5, which is a five-item mental health subscale of the Medical Outcomes Survey Short Form Health Survey—MOS SF-36—a health-related quality of life measure (Ware & Sherbourne, 1992). The SF-36 is one of the most widely used quality of life measures in the world. It was originally devised as a non-clinical measure to be used in general population surveys, including diverse populations, as well as in clinical research (McHorney, Ware, Lu, & Sherbourne, 1994).

The initial Mental Health Scale in the MOS was 38-items long. Subsequently, studies were conducted to select the five items that best resembled the original scale (Berwick et al., 1991). The MHI-5 measures Anxiety (1 item), Depression (2 items), Positive affect (2 items), and behavioral/Emotional Control (1 item) (Ibid). The reliability and validity of this measure has been extensively reported in numerous epidemiological and clinical studies. Stewart, Hays & Ware (1988) working with a MOS sample of 11186 adults, reported a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of .88 for the 5-item scale. For a smaller sample (2471) from the baseline of the Medical Outcomes study, the reliability for the scale was .90 (Rand Corporation, n.d.).
The MHI-5 has been used and validated with Spanish speaking samples as a component of the SF-36, or by itself, in Spain (Alonso, Prieto & Antó, 1995), the USA (Rand Corporation, 1994), Mexico (Lara, M. A., Navarro, C., Mondragón, L., Norma Rubí, N. A., Lara, M. C., 2002), and Latin America (Ruiz Cortes, Carreño, Martinez, Juarez, & Medina, 2006). The research in Spain was part of the 15-country wide International Quality of Life Assessment Project (Alonso et al.). The Spanish version of the instrument used in this research has been developed and validated to be used for health studies in the USA (Rand Corporation).

The scale’s items were coded on a scale from 1 to 6, and then averaged to obtain a total score, with two items being reverse scored: Items were scored so higher scores indicated a more favorable mental health status. The English and Spanish versions of the instrument are included in Appendix C.

Demographic Information Questionnaire. The demographic questionnaire includes questions about the respondents’ personal and socio-economic characteristics such as gender, age, marital status, education level, job status, income. It also contains questions about the location of their family members and about their immigrants’ experiences, such as immigration status, time in the UK and the like (see Appendix C).

Analysis

Power analysis. To ensure adequate power to the statistical tests, an a-priori sample size for multiple regression was estimated. Cohen (1988) suggests using an alpha level of .05 and a desired statistical power of .8. The effect size was deemed to be small
(.15). Given a total of nine independent variables, the sample size needed for conducting the multiple regressions was estimated at 113 (Cohen, 1988; Green, 1991).

Main analyses. Two hierarchical multiple regressions were conducted, with private and public transnational practices as the dependent variables, respectively. Demographic variables were introduced in the first step, immigration and integration variables in the second, and the other transnational activity plus expectation to return to Ecuador in the third step. This analysis was computed with the software SPSS 11.

A path analysis was performed to test the effect of Transnational Practices on the subjective indicators of well-being: Transnational Social Support, Self-Esteem and Psychological Well-being. Two models were tested: one in which transnational practices has a direct effect on psychological well-being, and one in which such effect is completely mediated by social support and self-esteem. These models are shown at the end of Chapter Four. This analysis was performed with the software AMOS 5 and Mplus.
CHAPTER SIX
RESULTS: TRANSNATIONAL PRACTICES AND THEIR ANTECEDENTS

There were two main analysis conducted in this study: the first one comprised two hierarchical multiple regression analyses with public and private transnational practices as outcome variables, with eight independent variables each. The purpose of these regression analyses was to explore which demographic and immigration-related variables were meaningful antecedents to transnational practices among Ecuadorians living in London.

The second main analysis was a path analysis that examined the relationship between transnational practices and psychosocial measures of well-being such as immigration stress, perceived transnational support, self-esteem and psychological well-being.

The findings from the first main analysis—the hierarchical regression analyses—are reported in this chapter. This chapter also includes the responses to the exploratory questions formulated at the end of chapter four, as well as to the hypotheses regarding demographic and immigration antecedents to transnationalism.

The findings from the second main analysis are presented in the next results chapter. That chapter reports the findings of the path analysis, and responses pertaining to the set of hypotheses related to the relationship between transnational practices and subjective well-being variables.
Univariate Analysis of Transnational Practices and their Antecedents

Demographic, immigration and integration univariate information of respondents is presented first. Information regarding gender, age and time in England has been provided already at the beginning of the Method Chapter. Here, the remaining demographic and immigration variables are described. Additional respondents’ demographic information is provided in Appendix A.

Having family in Ecuador. Seventy nine percent of the sample had immediate family in Ecuador, namely spouse and/or children (22% of the total sample), and parents and/or siblings (75%).

Socio-economic status. This composite measure was obtained by combining income, education level and occupation. The mean for this variable was 2.41 ($SD = .89$) on a 1 to 5 scale. The majority of respondents had studied up to High School (37%), followed by those who had some college (33%). The most frequent occupational category was manual labor (62%); 74% of respondents indicated having salaries lower than £20,000 per year (about $31,000).

Residency status. This question had a high missing rate, as 33 out of the 174 respondents did not answer it. Of those responding, 62% were British citizens or permanent residents.

Network integration. This variable, measured by the proportion of non-Spanish speaking people that was part of their local network (people with whom they socialize frequently in England) had a mean of 34.16 ($SD = 24.45$) on a 0 to 100 scale.
English mastery. The mean for this variable was 3.62 \( (SD = 1.01) \) on a 1 to 5 scale, with higher numbers indicating greater mastery. Respondents’ highest score in this questionnaire was on the item about their ability to understand media in English; their ability to write in English had the lowest scores.

Expectation to return to Ecuador. Almost half of respondents (49\%) thought they will return for sure or were very likely to return to Ecuador. The mean for this question was 2.61 \( (SD = 1.24) \) on a 1 to 5 scale, with higher scores indicating higher likelihood of not returning.

Transnational practices. Frequency of engagement greatly varied across practices. Table 1 shows the percentage that declared having performed such practices during the last year. Means and Standard Deviations are also shown.

Overall, as expected, transnational private practices were performed more often than public ones. Ninety eight percent of Ecuadorians reported having been in contact with family and friends in their native country. The mode for this question was 7 (65\%) on a 1–to-7 scale, with 7 equating to being in contact once a month or more often. An additional question explored in more details the frequency of their contact. A plurality of respondents (52\%) reported being in contact with their relatives at least weekly; 24\% maintained contact on a monthly or bi-weekly basis.

Respondents reported engaging less often in sending remittances or presents to relatives in Ecuador, than in communicating with them. Still, this was the third most often performed transnational activity, with 93 \% of respondents having sent remittances to Ecuador during the last year. The mode for this question was also 7 (37\%).
The most performed public transnational activity, and second overall, was having read, listened to or watched news or information about Ecuador in the last year, with 94% of respondents having done it. The mode was also 7 (43%).

The next most performed activities were participating in Ecuadorian-related events in England (65%, Mode = 1, 35%), Traveling to Ecuador (65%, Mode = 1, 35%), and having made investments in that country (51%, Mode = 1, 49%).

The activities that participants had engaged in less often during the last year were political ones; 17% had contributed to or participated in Ecuadorian political parties or movements. Twenty four percent of respondents had participated in Ecuadorian political events in England.

Given the seemingly large mean difference between the frequency of engagement in private and public transnational practices, a paired-samples t-test was conducted. The difference between the two was indeed statistically significant, \( t(173) = -23.18, p < .001 \). Participants were significantly more likely to have performed private transnational practices than public ones during the last year. Means and Standard Deviation for private practices was 5.44 (1.63); they were 2.50 (1.08) for public practices.

The items’ correlations were examined next. Items’ intercorrelations ranged from .00 to .71. The strongest correlations were found among socio-cultural practices (items a, b and c; \( r = .67 \) for a-b, .55 for a-c, .and .71 for b-c), and between private practices (items l and m; \( r = .55 \)). Table 2 presents the correlation scores for all the items.
Table 1. Percentage of Respondents Engaging in each Transnational Practice During the Last Year, Means and Standard Deviations (N = 174).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transnational Practices</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Participated in social or cultural organizations in Ecuador</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Helped community projects in Ecuador</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Contributed to social care organizations in Ecuador</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Participated in Ecuadorian social, cultural events in England</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Traveled to Ecuador to visit or attend events</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Made investments in Ecuador</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Conducted businesses serving the Ecuadorian community in England</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Participated in Ecuadorian political parties or movements</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Participated in Ecuadorian political campaigns or events in England</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Registered to vote or voted in Ecuadorian elections</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Read, listened to or watched Ecuador news</td>
<td>94.2</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Been in contact with family and friends in Ecuador</td>
<td>98.2</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Sent remittances and/or gifts to family in Ecuador</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transnational Practices Questionnaire internal reliability. Cronbach alpha and item-total correlations were produced to examine the questionnaire’s internal consistency. The alpha reliability coefficient was satisfactory (.81). Item-total correlation ranged from .29 for frequency of contact and .32 for remittances sending, to .59 for participating in social or cultural organizations in Ecuador. All the public transnationalism items were more highly correlated to the total than the private transnationalism ones (which were only two items). Alpha coefficients if each item was deleted were all lower than the actual coefficient. The difference between the public and private transnationalism items supported measuring them as separate outcomes in the regression analyses.
Table 2. Intercorrelations among Items of the Transnational Practices Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>g</th>
<th>h</th>
<th>i</th>
<th>j</th>
<th>k</th>
<th>l</th>
<th>m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Participated in social or cultural organizations in Ecuador</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Helped community projects in Ecuador</td>
<td>.67***</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Contributed to social care organizations in Ecuador</td>
<td>.55***</td>
<td>.71***</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Participated in socio-cultural Ecuadorian events in England</td>
<td>.37***</td>
<td>.41***</td>
<td>.39***</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Travelled to Ecuador to visit or attend events</td>
<td>.34***</td>
<td>.24***</td>
<td>.30***</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Made investments in Ecuador</td>
<td>.26***</td>
<td>.29***</td>
<td>.37***</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.33***</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Made businesses for the community in England</td>
<td>.33***</td>
<td>.39***</td>
<td>.37***</td>
<td>.35***</td>
<td>18**</td>
<td>.32***</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Participated in Ecuadorian political parties</td>
<td>.38***</td>
<td>.39***</td>
<td>.31***</td>
<td>.28***</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.45***</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Participated in Ecuadorian political events in England</td>
<td>.43***</td>
<td>.36***</td>
<td>.34***</td>
<td>.28***</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.45***</td>
<td>.63***</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Registered to vote or voted in Ecuadorian elections</td>
<td>.37***</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.28***</td>
<td>.26***</td>
<td>.39***</td>
<td>.30***</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.35***</td>
<td>.37***</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Read, listened to or watched Ecuadorn news</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.30***</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Been in contact with family and friends in Ecuador</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.38***</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Sent remittances and/or gifts to family in Ecuador</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.23***</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.24***</td>
<td>.32***</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.28***</td>
<td>.55***</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$; ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$ (2-tailed).
Correlational Analysis of Transnational Practices and their Antecedents

For the purpose of examining the impact of demographic, immigration and integration variables on transnational practices, two hierarchical regression analyses were conducted with transnational practices as the outcome variables. The demographic variables initially planned to enter in the analyses were gender, age, socio-economic status (SES), and having immediate family in Ecuador. Immigration variables were time in the UK, immigration status; integration variables were network integration, English skills and expectation to return to Ecuador; the other transnational practice was also included as predictors.

Due to low response to demographic items that required filling out information, such as year of birth and year arriving in England, as well as the question about citizenship/residency status, these variables had to be omitted from the analysis. In order to examine whether or not the results were different for this set of respondents, an independent sample t-test was performed, with the respondents to the three mentioned demographic questions as one group ($n = 118$), versus those not including these responses ($n = 56$). Results of the tests with private and public transnational practices as the dependent variables resulted in no significant differences between the groups, $t(172) = -.71$, n.s. for public transnationalism, and $t(172) = .14$, n.s for private transnational practices. As the Levene test for equality of variances was not significant, equal variances were assumed.

An examination of the correlation scores of the demographic and immigration variables with transnationalism is shown in Table 3. This table includes the means of
public and private transnational practices; as well as the two private transnationalism items: communications and remittance sending. None of the immigration variables (e.g. length of residence in the UK, citizenship status, English mastery, and network integration) was significantly related to either transnational practice, with the exception of network integration’s low but significant association with transnational communication.

Some demographic variables were significantly related to transnational practices. Having family members other than spouse or children in Ecuador was significantly and positively related to private communication practices. Being male was significantly related to engaging more often in transnational public practices. Age was also significantly associated to public transnationalism, with more mature people being more active in the transnational sphere.

Expectation to return to Ecuador was significantly associated to both types of transnational practices, with remittance sending in particular. As this question’s higher scores represent lower expectations of returning to Ecuador, the negative association between the variables indicates that respondents with less expectation of returning were less frequently engaged in both types of transnational practices.

Public and private transnational practices were significantly and positively associated to each other ($r = .30, p < .001$), and so were communication and remittances ($r = .55, p \leq 0.001$). Those more frequently engaging in one type of transnational practices were also more frequently engaged in the other. As mentioned in the previous section, despite their moderate correlation, both types of practices differ significantly in
terms of how often they are performed, with private practices being performed significantly more often than public ones.

The lack of association between having spouse or children in Ecuador and private transnationalism—which applied to both men and women respondents—was counter-intuitive and unexpected. To further explore the association between having family in Ecuador and frequency of communication, a Pearson correlation was computed between the family in Ecuador variables and an additional measure of frequency of contact with a more sensitive metric (ranging from never being in contact to daily contact on a 1 to 7 scale). Results were again non-significant, showing no association between having family in Ecuador and frequency of contact. In addition, Pearson correlations between having children, having spouse and having any other family member in Ecuador and transnational practices (communication and remittances) were computed for each gender. This analysis showed that indeed, for men, having children or partner in Ecuador did not have any impact on private transnationalism; whereas having any family in Ecuador was positively associated with frequency of sending remittances \((r = .22, p < .05)\). For women, there was a significant association between having family members other than spouse or children in Ecuador and frequency of remittance sending \((r = .27, p < .05)\) and frequency of communication \((r = .40, p \leq .01)\). Finally, women data showed a negative association between frequency of communication and having a partner in Ecuador \((r = -.34, p \leq .01)\).

This analysis uncovers that the lack of association between having immediate family in Ecuador and frequency of communication was hiding the fact that men and women had different communication frequencies depending on whether or not they have
a partner back in Ecuador. Whereas this made no difference for men, women
communicated less often with their partners back in Ecuador. Nonetheless, due to the
small size of these subgroups, these results shall be taken as suggestions for further
exploration rather than answers per se. An explanation that could not be tested in this
study is that frequency of contact is determined by having a wider array of family and
friends in Ecuador than those specifically asked about in this questionnaire (e.g. spouse,
children, parents and siblings).

Time in England was also examined as a possible intervening variable regarding
transnational engagements and having children in Ecuador. It was observed that all but
one of those respondents who stayed in touch ‘somewhat often’ or less frequently have
been in England for 11 years or more. In summary, the correlational analyses showed that
a plurality of demographic and immigration variables was not related to transnational
practices; and those that were correlated had weak-to-moderate degree correlation, as
shown in Table 3.
Table 3. Correlations of Demographics, Immigration and Integration with Transnational Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Private TP</th>
<th>Public TP</th>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>Remittances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Gender (being male)</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Age</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Spouse/children in Ec</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Other family in Ecuador</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.22**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. SES</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Time in England</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Residency Status</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Network integration</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. English Skills</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. No Return Expected</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Private TP</td>
<td>.30***</td>
<td>.84***</td>
<td>.91***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Public TP</td>
<td></td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>0.29***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.55***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$; ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$ (2-tailed).

Preliminary Analysis

Sample size and missing data. Sample size requirements for the hierarchical regressions were calculated as follows: at an alpha level of .05, an anticipated effect size of .15, and a desired statistical power of .8, the sample size had to be 113 or larger (Cohen, 1988, Green, 1991). At 174, this sample size exceeded these requirements.

Regarding missing data, there were scattered missing responses to individual questionnaire items. Some demographic questions had lower response rates. For example, of a total of 139 respondents that reported being employed, 129 marked their salary.
Other demographic questions with lower response rates were year of birth (n = 140), citizenship status (n = 141), and time in England (n = 142). As to not lower the number of cases valid, these variables were dropped from the regression analyses.

Before conducting the main analysis, the data was screened for outliers; the normality and linearity of the variables was examined, as was the homogeneity of variances and potential problems with multicollinearity. These examinations are detailed below.

*Normality and linearity.* Analyses of the univariate skewness and kurtosis suggested that the distribution of the variables included in the analysis did not depart significantly from normality, as all exhibited values smaller than $\pm 2$. However, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test of normality was significant for all the variables, suggesting that they were affected by non-normality in their distribution.

Inspection of the z scores found two univariate outliers in the variable public transnational practices. The regression analyses that included this variable were performed with and without the outliers. No differences were found in the level of significance and the variables included in the final models. The results reported are from the data set without outliers.

Leverage and Mahalanobis scores showed no multivariate outlier in the data. Leverage cutoff was computed following Stevens’ formula: $3(k+1)/n$ (Stevens, 1996). Mahalanobis score’s was compared to the critical value at $p = .001$, as recommended by Tabachnick & Fidell (2001). Elimination of the outliers did not improve the K-S results.
Standardized residuals’ skewness and kurtosis values were well below the $\pm 2$ cutoff. They were -.46 ($SE = .20$) and -.07 ($SE = .41$) respectively for the residuals generated with transnational private practices as the dependent variable, and .77 ($SE = .20$) and .50 ($SE = .41$) with public transnational practices as the dependent variable.

To assess linearity, the standard deviations of the dependent variables were compared to the standard deviation of the residuals. The dependent variables’ standard deviations were larger than the residuals’ (SD of private transnational practices was 1.60, 1.31 the residual’s; for public transnational practices, SD was 1.02, .87 for the residual). When that is the case, nonlinearity is not considered a problem (Garson, 2010). A further examination of the linearity of the residuals revealed one case with a residual larger than $\pm 3$ in the private transnational practices as DV regression output. The case was excluded from the regression analysis. A visual observation of the standardized residuals regression and the Normal P-P plot of regression standardized residuals did not show great departures from normality. They suggested that the assumption of normally distributed residual error has been met.

*Homogeneity of variances.* An examination of the residual’s plots revealed this to be of concern, particularly for private transnational practices as DV. Variables plots were disperse, signing the low correlation levels that most of them had with the dependent variable. In compliance with this assumption, residuals should appear randomly dispersed across all levels of the dependent variable (Stevens, 1996). In this study, the data seemed unevenly grouped. Small to moderate violations of this assumption have small impact on the regression estimates, asserts Fox (2005).
**Multicolinearity.** An examination of the VIF and Tolerance scores showed no signs of multicollinearity among the predictors, as the VIF scores were considerably lower than 10, and Tolerance values were considerably higher than .10 (Kline, 1998). Condition indexes and variance proportions were also examined. No condition index was higher than .30, and none had more than two variable proportions higher than .50 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). Overall, these test indicated that multicollinearity is not a problem for this data set.

Summarizing the findings regarding data assumptions to conduct linear regressions, skewness and kurtosis statistics suggested normality of the sample. Two univariate outliers were taken off the data set, as was a case with an out-of-bound residual. No multivariate outliers were found. Examination of residuals showed them to be normally distributed; SDs of the dependent variables were larger than those of the residuals, suggesting linearity was not a problem. Homogeneity of variances seemed of concern, as data were slightly grouped rather than randomly disperse. Overall, it was concluded that the data was fit to perform the linear regression analyses without transformations that could hinder interpretation.

**Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis of Public Transnational Practices**

To examine the impact of demographic and immigration variables on transnational practices, as well as public and private transnational practices’ on one another, two hierarchical multiple regression analyses were conducted, one for each type of transnationalism. Independent variables were gender, English proficiency, socio-economic status, proportion of non-Spanish speaking local network, having partner or
children in Ecuador, having other immediate family members in Ecuador (parents and siblings), intention to return to Ecuador, and private or public transnational practices.

The independent variables were entered in three steps. Demographic variables were entered in step 1, immigration variables in step 2, and intention to return and private transnationalism in step 3. Table 4 presents the results of the analysis.

As the table shows, the model obtained on step 1 was significant, $F(4,136) = 4.43, p < .01$. The demographic variables accounted for 12% of the variance in Public Transnational Practices. At this step two variables had significant effects on the dependent variable: being male ($\beta = .29, p < .001$), and higher socio-economic status ($\beta = .17, p < .05$) were positively associated to public transnationalism.

The model obtained in step 2, with the added integration variables, was also significant, $F(6,134) = 3.90, p = .001$. The demographic variables previously significant continued being so at this step. Only one of the integration variables—Having a larger proportion of non-Spanish speaking people in the network—was significant; this variable had a negative association with the dependent variable ($\beta = -.20, p < .05$). At this step, the variables explained 15% of the variance of the dependent variable.

At step 3, the model was again significant, $F(8,132) = 8.38, p < .001$. Of the two added variables, only private transnationalism was significant, ($\beta = .43, p < .001$). Overall, these variables accounted for 34% of the variance of public transnationalism.

To further explore the model, the same regression was run for the group that responded as not being citizens or residents. Because the number of this group is relatively small ($n = 44$), these results are to be taken only as a reference. For this group,
the overall model was still significant, and explained a larger proportion of the variance of public transnationalism (41%). The three steps were significant; step 3, $F(8, 36) = 3.15$, $p < .01$. The only two significant predictors were gender ($\beta = .34, p < .05$), with men being more likely to engage in public transnationalism, just like in the overall sample, and SES ($\beta = .30, p < .05$). The predictive value of these two variables was slightly larger than in the overall sample.

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis of Private Transnational Practices

The independent variables were entered in three steps. Demographic variables were entered first, followed by Integration variables, with Intention to return and Public transnational practices next. Table 5 presents the results of this analysis.

The model obtained on step 1 was significant, $F(4, 136) = 3.40$, $p < .05$. The demographic variables accounted for 11% of the variance in Private Transnational Practices. Only one variable had a significant effect on the dependent variable: having immediate family in Ecuador (other than spouse and/or children) was significantly associated with increased private transnationalism ($\beta = .29, p = .001$).

The model obtained in step 2—in which the immigration variables were added—was also significant, $F(6, 134) = 2.74$, $p < .05$. At this step, only having Family in Ecuador was significant, as English skills and Proportion of non-Spanish speaking network were not significant. Eleven percent of the variance of the dependent variable was explained by the model.

At step 3, the model was again significant, $F(8, 132) = 8.71$, $p < .001$, and other demographic and immigration variables reached significance. Being male was
significantly and negatively associated with the dependent variable ($\beta = -.20, p < .01$), which in turn was positively associated with Proportion of Non-Spanish-speakers in the network ($\beta = .23, p < .01$). The two added variables had significant associations with the dependent variable: Public transnationalism ($\beta = .42, p < .001$) was positively related to Private transnational practices, whereas Expectation to Return’s significant relationship with the dependent variable was negative ($\beta = -.23, p < .01$). Higher scores indicate lower expectation to go back to Ecuador; thus, the negative association between the variables suggests that people expecting to not return to Ecuador were significantly less likely to engage in private transnational practices. Overall, the variables in the model accounted for 35% of the variance of private transnationalism.

This regression was also run for the group that responded as not being citizens or residents. Because the number of this group is relatively small ($n = 44$), these results are to be taken only as a reference. The overall model was still significant, and explained a slightly smaller proportion of the variance of private transnationalism (27%). None of the steps was significant; step 3, $F(8,36) = 1.64, p = .15$. Only one predictor was significant: Return to Ecuador ($\beta = -.33, p < .05$). Returning to Ecuador was a better predictor of transnational private activities for the non-citizen/resident group than for the overall sample.
Table 4. Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Demographics, Immigration and Private Transnational Practices Predicting Public Transnationalism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SEB</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Δ R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.09**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.29***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse/Children in Ecuador</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other family in Ecuador</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.31***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse/Children in Ecuador</td>
<td>-7.84</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other family in Ecuador</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network integration</td>
<td>-8.77</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Mastery</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.30***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.33***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.28***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse/Children in Ecuador</td>
<td>-2.79</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other family in Ecuador</td>
<td>7.04</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network integration</td>
<td>-1.10</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Mastery</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return to Ecuador</td>
<td>-6.52</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Transnationalism</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.43***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p ≤ .05, **p ≤ .01, ***p ≤ .001.
Table 5. Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Demographics, Immigration and Public Transnational Practices Predicting Private Transnationalism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SEB</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>△ R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td></td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.06*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-1.11</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>-2.99</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse/Children in Ecuador</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other family in Ecuador</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>0.29***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse/Children in Ecuador</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other family in Ecuador</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>0.29***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network integration</td>
<td>8.59</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Skills</td>
<td>6.81</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.31***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.66</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-0.20**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse/Children in Ecuador</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other family in Ecuador</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>0.23**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network integration</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>0.23**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Mastery</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return to Ecuador</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-0.23**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transnationalism</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>0.42***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p ≤ .05, ** p ≤ .01, *** p ≤ .001.
Summary of Results of the Hierarchical Regression Analyses

Overall models regarding the effect of demographic and immigration variables on transnational practices were significant, accounting for similar levels of variance for private and public transnationalism.

Public transnational practices were significantly impacted by gender, with males being more likely to engage in transnational practices than their female counterpart. Higher socio-economic status was also associated to higher levels of public transnationalism, as was having a higher proportion of Spanish-speaking people in the local network. Finally, engagement in private transnationalism was associated to engagement in public transnationalism.

Private transnational practices were also significantly associated with gender, but in the opposite direction: females were more likely to engage in private transnational practices. Also in the opposite direction was the impact of proportion of non-Spanish speaking people in the local network; in this case, it was positively associated with higher levels of private transnationalism. Having family in Ecuador, while not significantly related to public transnationalism, was associated with higher levels of private transnational practices. Expectation of not returning to Ecuador was significantly related to lower levels of private transnationalism, but did not have any impact on public transnationalism.

This pattern of results suggest that the two types of transnational practices, while sharing some similarities, are also the result of different sets of demographic, immigration and immigration variables.
Review of Exploratory Questions and Hypotheses Regarding Antecedents to Transnational Practices

The findings regarding exploratory questions and hypotheses related to demographic immigration and integration antecedents to transnational practices are summarized below.

Frequency of communication. Ecuadorians stayed in frequent contact with their relatives in the country. Ninety eight percent had been in contact during the last year; 65% had been in contact at least once a month, and 52% of the total kept in touch on a weekly basis at the least.

Frequency of remittance sending. As indicated in previous paragraphs, most Ecuadorians (93%) had sent remittances to Ecuador in the last year. Thirty seven percent did so monthly or more often.

Main means of communication. A total of 162 respondents chose one or more favorite media to stay in contact with their family and friends in Ecuador. The most popular medium was e-mail (100, 62%), followed by regular phone (95, 59%), mobile phone (89, 55%), others, such as web cams, internet phone, etc. (65, 40%), websites and social network sites (38, 23%), and regular mail (16, 10%).

Relationship between communication and remittances. As expected, these two items were significantly related, although their relationship was only moderately strong ($r = .55, p < .001$).

Gender. It was hypothesized that being male is a significant positive antecedent to public transnational practices. This hypothesis was supported, as being male was a
significant predictor of public transnational practices. The hypothesis that there are no gender differences regarding private transnational practices was not supported; females were significantly more likely to engage in private transnational activities than males.

*Family in Ecuador.* It was predicted that having children and/or spouse in Ecuador would significantly increase the likelihood of engaging in private transnationalism. This hypothesis was not supported; as this variable had no impact on the outcome. However, having extended family in Ecuador was associated with significantly higher levels of private transnational practices. The prediction that the impact of this variable on public transnational practices would be negligible or negative was supported, as none of the two predictors had an impact on this outcome.

*Socio-economic status.* The hypothesis that SES is significantly and positively related to public transnationalism was supported, as was its expected non-significant relationship with private transnational practices.

*English mastery.* The hypothesized significance of this variable as a predictor of public transnational practices was not supported, whereas its predicted lack of significance for private transnationalism was supported.

*Network integration.* This variable, which was measured by the proportion of non-Spanish speaking people in the network, was hypothesized to be negatively associated with both transnational practices. That was the case for public transnationalism, as having a higher proportion of non-Spanish-speaking people in the local network was linked to decreases in transnational public practices. The hypothesis
was not supported in the case of private practices, as it was a significant predictor of higher levels of this outcome.

*Expectation to return to Ecuador.* This was considered to be a significant predictor for both types of transnational practices. Indeed, increased levels of expecting not to return to Ecuador were negatively and significantly associated to frequency of private, but not to public transnationalism. Ecuadorians expecting to return were not engaging more frequently in transnational public activities, but they did so in private ones, than those expecting not to return.

*Private and public transnationalism.* They were expected to be significant predictors of each other, although to a moderate degree. That was the case, as indicated by their correlations and their predictive power once the demographic and immigration-related variables were accounted for. They were, despite their moderate relationship, the best predictors of each other.

*Time in England.* As previously stated, this variable was not entered in the regressions due to its low response rate. Pearson correlation coefficients suggested no support for the hypothesis that as time in England increases, so do public transnational practices; time did not have an impact on frequency of engaging in public transnational practices either.

*Residency status.* This variable was not entered in the regressions due to low response. Pearson correlation coefficients showed no significant association with transnationalism. Thus, the prediction that being a permanent resident/citizen significantly increases the frequency of engaging in public transnationalism was not
supported. Conversely, this result supported the hypothesis that legal status does not have a significant impact on private transnational engagements.

The breakdown of prediction regarding antecedents to public transnationalism is as follows. Predictions of significant association that were supported were: being a male was indeed significantly and positively associated with engaging in public transnational activities. Higher socio-economic status was associated with higher public transnational engagement, as was engagement in private transnational practices. The predicted negative association with network integration was supported: having a higher proportion of non-Spanish-speaking people in the network was negatively associated with public transnationalism. One prediction of non-significant association was supported: Having family in Ecuador did not have an impact on public transnationalism. Predictions of significant association that were not supported were: English mastery did not have an impact on public transnationalism, and neither did expectation to return to Ecuador. There were not predictions of non-significant association that were not supported.

The breakdown of prediction regarding antecedents to private transnationalism is as follows. Predictions of significant association that were supported were: Expectation to return to Ecuador was positively associated with engagement in private transnational practices, as was the association between frequency of engagement in public and private transnational practices. Two predictions of non-significant association were supported: socio-economic status did not have an impact on private transnationalism, and neither did English mastery. Predictions of significant association that were not supported were: having spouse/children in Ecuador, which was expected to positively influence private
transnational practices, did not have an impact on this outcome. However, having other family members in Ecuador was associated with increased levels of private transnationalism. Network integration was significantly associated to private transnationalism, but in the opposite direction to what was predicted: the more diverse the network, the more frequent the involvement in private transnationalism. There was one Prediction of non-significant association that was not supported: It was predicted no gender differences regarding private transnationalism; instead, the results indicated that women engaged in these practices more frequently than men did.
CHAPTER SEVEN

RESULTS: TRANSMATIONAL PRACTICES AND SUBJECTIVE WELL-BEING

In this chapter, the focus was on examining the results related to the variables of subjective well-being, particularly in their relationship with transnational practices. First, the univariate analysis and intercorrelations of these variables are presented; then, the bivariate associations between subjective well-being variables and demographic, immigration and integration variables are explored. Finally, the results of the path analyses linking transnational and subjective well-being variable are presented. The variables included were immigration stress, transnational social support, self-esteem, and psychological well-being.

Univariate Analysis of Subjective Well-Being Variables

Immigration stress. This variable was measured with the Demands of Immigration scale which comprised 8 items rated on a 1 to 6 scale, with higher scores indicating higher levels of immigration stress. The total DIS score for each respondent was computed by averaging their item responses. Mean score was 2.65 (SD = 1.01). Cronbach alpha coefficient for this scale suggested a high level of internal consistency (.86). Item-total correlations for the scale items ranged from .49 to .69. As Table 6 shows, this variable was moderately correlated to self-esteem and psychological well-being.

Transnational Social Support. The Transnational Social Support Scale’s 7 items scale measures the amount of perceived social support that Ecuadorians receive from
their family and friends in Ecuador. Total scores were obtained by averaging the scale items. Measured on a 1 to 7 scale, higher scores indicate higher levels of perceived support. Mean score was 4.64 (SD = 1.83). Cronbach alpha coefficient was .95, indicating a high level of internal consistency. Item-total correlation ranged from .73 to .89. Besides its associations with self-esteem and with psychological well-being, both in a positive direction, transnational social support was also associated with private transnationalism, as shown on Table 6.

*Self-esteem.* The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale, used for this variable, comprises 10 items, 5 of them reversed scored. The total score was obtained by averaging the items. Mean score for this scale was 4.60 on a 1 to 6 scale. (SD = .83). The internal consistency as indicated by Cronbach alpha coefficient was acceptable (.65), the item-total correlation was low for some items, ranging from .11 to .50. In addition to being significantly correlated with immigration stress, self-esteem had small associations with private transnationalism and transnational support, and a moderate one with psychological well-being, as shown on Table 6.

*Psychological well-being.* This variable was measured with the five-item Mental Health Inventory. Its total score was obtained by reverse-scoring two items, and averaging individual items. Mean was 4.48 on a 1 to 6 scale, with higher numbers indicating higher levels of psychological well-being (SD = 1.04). Internal consistency was adequate, with a Cronbach alpha coefficient of .81; item-total correlations for the scale items ranged from .49 to .73. In addition to being moderately related to immigration
stress and self-esteem, as Table 6 shows, this variable was also weakly associated with private transnationalism.

Table 6. Correlations between Transnational Practices and Subjective Well-Being Variables (N= 174)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Private Transnationalism</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Public Transnationalism</td>
<td>.30***</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Immigration Stress</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Self-Esteem</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.41***</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Transnational Support</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Psychological Well-Being</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.47***</td>
<td>.48***</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < (2-tailed).

Subjective Well-Being Variables Associations with Demographic, Immigration and Integration Factors

This section examines the associations between the indicators of subjective well-being and the demographic, immigration and integration variables examined in the previous sections in their associations with transnationalism. Having family in England, a demographic variable considered relevant to the subjective well-being of the immigrants was also included for analysis. Table 7 presents the associations between the variables. They are, in general, higher than the correlations that these same demographic, immigration and integration variables had with transnational practices. Significant correlations ranged from moderate (.48 for English skills and immigration stress), to small (.16 for network integration and psychological well-being).
There were seven variables significantly correlated to *immigration stress*. Age was the only one to be significantly related in a positive direction, suggesting that perceived immigration stress increase with age. Socio-economic status and residency status significant correlation with immigration stress was negative; respondents that were better off perceived their immigration experience as less stressful, and so did those with a more secure legal status in the country. A more diverse network (as measured by the proportion of non-Spanish speaking people in the local network) and higher proficiency in English were also associated with decreased levels of immigration stress. Higher expectation of staying in England was also associated to lower levels of immigration stress. Finally, having family in England was also correlated to lower levels of perceived immigration stress.

*Transnational support* was not associated to any of the variables in a significant way. This lack of association is not surprising, since this variable measured mainly support from transnational links.

*Self-esteem* was significantly associated with four of the variables that were also correlated with immigration stress: socio-economic status, network integration, English mastery and having family in England (dummy coding). The positive direction of the correlation indicates that higher levels of these variables are associated with higher levels of self-esteem in the respondents.

*Psychological well-being* correlated significantly with three variables: network integration, English mastery, and having family in England. These associations were
positive as well. English mastery had the highest correlation, just like with the other psychosocial well-being variables.

Overall, the variables associated with more psychosocial well-being variables and having the highest correlations were English mastery, Socio-economic status and network integration, with residency status being also moderately associated with immigration stress. This set of variables showed their best predictive value towards immigration stress. Table 7 shows the correlations.

Table 7. Correlations of Demographics, Immigration and Integration with Subjective Well-Being Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Immigration Stress</th>
<th>Transnat. Support</th>
<th>Self-Esteem</th>
<th>Psych. Well-being</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Gender (being male)</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Age</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Spouse/children in Ecuador</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Other family in Ecuador</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. SES</td>
<td>-.37***</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.25***</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Time in England</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Residency Status</td>
<td>-.37***</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Network integration</td>
<td>-.28***</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.27***</td>
<td>.16*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. English mastery</td>
<td>-.48***</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.30***</td>
<td>.23**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Return Expectations</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Family in England</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.18*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p \leq .05$; **$p \leq 0.01$, ***$p \leq 0.001$ (2-tailed).
Analysis of the Effect of Transnational Practices on Subjective Well-Being Variables

Public and private transnational practices seem to diverge in important aspects, as indicated by their different predictors and by their inter-item correlations. The two private practices of communication and remittance sending had higher correlation between them and lower ones with the items from the public transnationalism subscale. These previous findings suggest that it would be more appropriate for the path analysis model to include both transnational practices as separate variables. Their relationship with the subjective well-being variables was considered to be substantially different, as the only significant path for public practices would be towards private transnationalism. Conversely, private transnationalism, as the hypotheses for this analysis indicate, was expected to have significant direct or indirect paths with all the other variables. In addition to transnational practices, the model includes the following variables: immigration stress, transnational support, self-esteem, and psychological well-being.

Preliminary Analysis

Before conducting the main analysis, a preliminary analysis reviewed the appropriateness of the data regarding its sample size, the model identification, and whether or not the data met the assumptions required to conduct a SEM path analysis.

Sample size and missing data. Anderson and Gerbing (1988) recommend a minimum size of 150 to conduct SEM analyses. Thompson (2002) asserts that an appropriate sample size should have at least a 10:1 cases to observed indicators ratio. With 172 cases (as two univariate outliers were eliminated from the data set) for 6 observed indicators, the 29:1 ratio is well above the recommended minimum.
An additional criterion to assess the appropriateness of the sample size is to measure it against the complexity of the model, as indicated by the number of estimated parameters. Kline (1998) recommends the ratio of cases to parameters to be no lower than 5:1. In the most complex model examined in this study, the number of parameters to be estimated was 22. Thus, the 8:1 ratio for a sample size of 172 was considered appropriate.

These guidelines regarding the case-to-parameters ratio precluded the conduction of a full measurement model of the Transnational Practices scale. The ratio for such analysis would have been of 4 cases per each parameter, as this model had 45 parameters to be estimated.

Further support for the adequacy of the present sample size was provided by a post-hoc index provided by the statistical software Amos. Hoelter’s Critical N is an index that evaluates the adequacy of the sample size to yield and adequate model fit for an $X^2$ test (Byrne, 2001). CN values of 200 or higher indicate that the sample size is adequate. For the partial mediation model, the CN values exceeded such benchmark; they were 1477 at the .05 level and 2013 at the .01 levels, whereas for the mediation only model it was 742 at the .05 level, and 990 at the .01 level.

Regarding missing data, as the variables included in this analysis were scales total scores, there was no missing data on the analysis variables per se. If a questionnaire had data missing on one item, the total average score was obtained from the remaining items.

**Outliers.** An examination of $z$ scores showed two outliers for the variable public transnationalism. Outliers were defined as responses with a standardized score in excess
of 3.29 \( (p < .001 \text{ in a two-tailed test}) \) (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). Results are reported with and without these outliers.

**Model identification and degrees of freedom.** The models to be analyzed are recursive, since all causal effects are specified to be unidirectional, and their disturbances are assumed to be uncorrelated (Kline, 1998). Recursive path model do not have extra identification requirements beyond having more data points than number of estimated parameters. The models in the present study are overidentified, as the number of data points (21) for the partial mediation model exceeds the number of estimated parameters (16). Thus, the partial mediation model has five degrees of freedom whereas the total mediation model has six (21 data points, 15 parameters). The formula used to compute the number of data points is \( p(p+1)/2 \) where \( p \) is the number of observed variables (Byrne, 2001).

**Multicollinearity.** In order for the SEM estimates to be produced, the variables must be exempt of multicollinearity (Klem, 2000; Kline, 1998). Whereas bivariate collinearity is easy to spot—as correlations of .90 or higher indicate the presence of collinearity (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001)—assessing multicollinearity requires special tests. The Pearson correlation coefficients between the variables were examined to assess bivariate collinearity (see Table 6). For this sample, correlations ranged from .00 to .48, so there was no suggestion of multicollinearity being a problem for this dataset.

To assess multivariate collinearity, tolerance scores were obtained from the Linear Regression procedure output on SPSS. Kline (1998) indicates that tolerance values lower than .10 suggests multicollinearity. The tolerance test values for the data ranged
from .45 to .93. Tabachnick and Fidell (2001, citing Belsely, Kuh, and Welsch, 1980) suggest examining the condition index and variance proportions to detect multicollinearity. These values were also obtained from the SPSS regression output. Criteria for multicollinearity are a condition index higher than .30, combined with at least two variance proportions of .50 or more for an individual factor. For the present data, the highest condition index was .27. Overall, these tests clear the data from suspicious of multicollinearity.

Analysis of assumptions and requirements for path analyses. Path analyses conducted in SEM packages are based on Maximum Likelihood. This estimation method assumes that the non-grouping variables are scaled in intervals, and have multivariate normal distribution (Klem, 2000). However, Maximum Likelihood has shown to be resilient to violations of normality (Chow & Bentler, 1995, as cited in Klem, 2000; Hoyle, 2000). Regarding the first assumption, all the variables in the model are continuous, on scales of five or larger, as is recommended in SEM (Byrne, 2001).

To assess multivariate normality, a first step was to detect multivariate outliers by generating the Mahalanobis distance measure. This value indicates the multivariate distance between the scores of an individual case and the sample means or “centroids” (Kline, 1998). As recommended by Tabachnick and Fidell (2001), the p <.001 level was the cutoff to detect multivariate outliers. These scores were obtained from AMOS 5. No multivariate outliers were found.

An examination of the individual variables showed some univariate skewness and kurtosis. Skewness ranged from .07 to 1.27, none of them of severe concern, as their
absolute values are below what would be considered “extreme”. Univariate kurtosis ranged from -.05 to 1.4 and were also below the absolute value that would be unequivocally considered dangerous (estimated at ±3 and 8, respectively, Kline, 1998). Mardia test showed no multivariate kurtosis, as the 1.27 value was no significant (c.r. .85). These results suggest that the sample is adequate for the path analysis detailed next.

Path Analyses of the Models

Two models were tested via path analyses: a less constrained model which included a direct link between transnational practices and psychological well-being, and the hypothesized model, in which such direct link was omitted. The partially mediated model challenged the hypothesis that private transnationalism had an effect on psychological well-being that was fully mediated by transnational support and self-esteem. Figures 1 and 2 depict these models.

The models were first assessed by examining the indexes of overall fit. A total of four fit indexes, two absolute and two incremental ones are reported, in addition to the $X^2$. The absolute indexes are the Goodness of Fit Index (GFI) and the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA). The incremental indexes are the Comparative Fit Index (CFI) and the TLI or Tucker-Lewis Index. Finally, the ECVI, Expected Cross-Validation Index was also reported. These indexes were described in the method section. It is worth noticing that the CFI is among the incremental fit indexes that have been shown not to be influenced by sample size (Marsh, Balla, & Hau, 1996).

Next, the hypothesized complete mediation model was compared to the alternative model, the partial mediation model. Because these models are nested, they are
amenable to comparing their \( X^2 \) and find whether or not their differences are significant. A significant difference would indicate the supremacy of one model over other on accounting for the sample data. If two models are not significantly different, then the most parsimonious one (the one with more degrees of freedom) should be preferred (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988). Finally, the parameter estimates of the best model were examined, the meditations were tested and the indirect effects analyzed.

**Overall Model Fit**

An overall model’s fit is satisfactory when the chi square is non-significant, the \( X^2 / df \leq 3 \), the GFI and CFI are above .95, the TLI is close to 1.00, and the RMSEA lower than .05. In comparing models, the one with the lower ECVI should be preferred (Kline, 1998; Byrne, 2001).

**Partial mediation model.** This model is presented in Figure 3. It includes a direct effect from private transnationalism to psychological well-being, in addition to the effects mediated by self-esteem and transnational support. This model is also satisfactory; its chi square is not significant, and all the other indices are adequate, \( X^2 \) (5, \( N = 172 \)) = 1.28, \( p = .94; X^2 / df = .26 \), GFI = .99; CFI = 1.00; TLI 1.09; RMSEA = .00, ECVI .20.

**Complete mediation model.** This model is presented in Figure 4. The goodness of fit indices generated for this model strongly support an adequate fit to the data. The chi square is not significant, and all the other indices are satisfactory, as the GFI, CFI and TLI are close to 1.00, and the RMSEA is lower than .05. The actual scores were as follows: \( X^2 \) (6, \( N = 172 \)) = 2.90, \( p = .82; X^2 / df = .48 \), GFI = .99; CFI = 1.00; TLI = 1.06; RMSEA = .00, ECVI .19.
Model Comparison

As both models seem to be good fits for the data, a significant test of their chi squares difference was computed, $\Delta \chi^2 = 1.62$, $\Delta df = 1$; $p = \text{n.s. at} .01$ level. Since the test of the models’ chi square difference revealed it to be non-significant, the most parsimonious one was chosen: the fully mediated model. Concurrently, its ECVI was also slightly smaller. All the same, as it is usually the case when the elimination of a path made no difference in the overall model, the transnational private practices-psychological well-being path added to create the partial mediation model was non-significant. The next part of the analysis focuses on the complete mediation model.
Figure 3. Standardized Estimates of the Model of Partial Mediation of the Effect of Transnational Practices on Psychological Well-Being

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001, n.s = no significant.
*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001, n.s = no significant.

Numbers in parentheses are from the data set that includes outliers (N = 174).

Figure 4. Standardized Estimates of the Model of Complete Mediation of the Effect of Transnational Practices on Psychological Well-Being
Parameter Estimates of the Complete Mediation Model

The parameter estimates of the model did not show any problem with out-of-range correlations, negative error variances or standard errors that are too large. The standardized residuals were lower than 2.58, so they did not flag any area of concern (Byrne, 2001). As the paths were suitable for further analysis, their statistical significance was examined next.

To assess the statistical significance of the different paths, the critical ratios (c.r.), were examined first. Critical ratios are the parameter estimates divided by their standard errors. At .05 significance level, the critical ratios have to be > ± 1.96 for the null hypothesis to be rejected. Any non-significant parameter is of no importance for the model (Byrne, 2001). As Figure 4 shows, there are six significant direct paths, and three non-significant direct paths. The significant estimates ranged from .16 for the private transnationalism—self-esteem path, to -.42 for the immigration stress—self-esteem path. The other four significant paths are private—public transnationalism, private transnationalism—transnational social support, immigration stress—psychological well-being, and self-esteem—psychological well-being

Analysis of Mediation and Indirect Effects

The next step on this analysis was to assess the significance of the indirect paths. The model includes the following indirect paths: a) transnational social support—self-esteem—psychological well-being, b) immigration stress—self-esteem—psychological well-being, c) private transnational practices—transnational social support—self-esteem,
d) private transnational practices—transnational social-support—psychological well-being, and e) private transnational practices—self-esteem—psychological well-being.

Based on Baron and Kenny (1986), Kenny, Kashi, & Bolger (1998), recommend a sequence of four conditions in testing mediated effects in structural models. These conditions are:

a) Show that the exogenous variable is related to the outcome variable, which establishes that there is indeed a direct effect upon which a mediation can take place. This step was included even though it has been questioned whether it is a necessary prerequisite for mediation to exist (Kenny et al., 1998). Mediation, is said, can exist even in the absence of this condition (MacKinnon & Fairchild, 2009). Currently, fulfillment of the second and third conditions is considered sufficient to determine whether or not to test for significance of the indirect effects (Ibid).

b) Show that the exogenous variable is related to the hypothesized mediational variable(s);

c) Show that the hypothesized mediator is related to the outcome while the exogenous variable is held constant. If the overall fit of this model is adequate, then their path coefficients are examined; and

d) Add the direct effect to the model tested in step c. If the previously significant direct effect is reduced to non-significant by the inclusion of the mediator(s), then these results are consistent with a complete mediation. If the direct effect is reduced but remains significant, the results are consistent with a partial mediation.
Next, the indirect effects significance was established with the Sobel test. To complement this analysis, bootstrapping was also used to assess significance by finding the confidence limits for the mediated effects. Bootstrapping is a better way of obtaining such confidence limits because it does not assume normality in the sample distribution; thus, it is more appropriate for sampling distributions of the mediated effects, which are usually non-normal (MacKinnon & Fairchild, 2009). This is particularly the case in small samples (Preacher & Hayes, 2008). The Mplus software was used to execute the bias-corrected bootstrapping.

Only two indirect paths fulfilled conditions b) and c), namely, that the paths from the predictor to the mediator and from the mediator to the outcome were significant. Accordingly, only these two paths are tested for significance: the path private transnationalism—self-esteem—psychological well-being and the path immigration stress—self-esteem—psychological well-being.

**The Private Transnationalism—Self-Esteem—Psychological Well-Being Path**

This path was first analyzed isolated from the overall model. The first of the four conditions was met for this path: the direct path from private transnationalism to psychological well-being had a standardized coefficient of .16, which is significant at the .05 level. This result shows that there is a direct effect, albeit a small one, in which the mediation can take place (although this is not necessary). The second condition, that the predictor (private transnationalism) was related to the mediator (self-esteem) was also met: the standardized coefficient of this path was .19, which is significant at the .05 level.
The third condition, that the mediator was related to the predictor was also met. The path from self-esteem to psychological well-being, while holding private transnationalism constant was .48, significant at the .001 level. The standardized indirect effect of private transnationalism on psychological well-being was .09.

Finally, the direct effect of the predictor on the outcome was added to the previous model. This path, which was significant at the first step, became non-significant at this point, while the path from self-esteem to psychological well-being was slightly reduced to .46, still significant to the .001 level. In this model, 23% of the variance of psychological well-being is explained by the predictors. To establish the significance of the indirect effect, the Sobel test was performed (Baron & Kenny, 1986) and showed this effect to be significant at the .05 level (c.r. 2.34, $SE = .02$, $p < .05$). The results of this test of mediation are shown in Figure 5. In the general model, this indirect effect was still significant (c.r. = 2.05, $SE = .01$, $p < .05$).

Hence, the relationship between private transnationalism and psychological well-being was completely mediated by self-esteem, and this mediation reached significance levels.
**Test of Self-Esteem as a Mediator between Private Transnationalism and Psychological Well-Being**

The Immigration Stress—Self-Esteem—Psychological Well-Being Path

An examination of the conditions specified by Baron & Kenny (1986) showed all of them being met: all the paths were significant, as Figure 6 illustrates. The Sobel test showed this indirect effect to be significant (standardized indirect estimate is -.14, $SE = .04$, c.r. -3.62, $p < .001$) in the isolated mediation model, as well as in the general model (standardized indirect estimate is -.13, $SE = .04$, c.r. -3.52, $p < .001$). In the isolated model, the variables explained 32% of the variance of psychological well-being.

Immigration stress paths towards self-esteem and psychological well-being were negative and significant; with the introduction of self-esteem in the isolated model, the direct path immigration stress—psychological well-being was reduced (from -.48 to -.34) but still significant ($p<.001$). Likewise, when immigration stress was added to the self-esteem—psychological well-being path, its positive significance got reduced (from .48 to .34) but the path remained significant ($p<.001$). In this model, the relationship between
immigration stress and psychological well-being was partially mediated by self-esteem, and this mediation was significant.

***p<.001
Note. The number to the left of the slash in the immigration stress-psychological well-being path is the path coefficient before self-esteem was entered into the analysis. The number to the left of the slash in the self-esteem-psychological well-being path is the path coefficient without immigration stress being entered in the model.

Figure 6. Test of Self-Esteem as a Mediator between Immigration Stress and Psychological Well-Being

**Bootstrap Analysis of Multiple Mediation**

Bootstrapping, which is a procedure that consists of extracting a large number of samples from the data set estimate indirect effects from those samples, and generate 95% confidence intervals regarding the effect size of the indirect effects. The number of resamplings conducted is 5,000, which is the recommended number (Hayes, 2009). This procedure is particularly suited to examine multiple mediations (Preacher & Hayes, 2008). Several authors recommend working with bias-corrected intervals (Ibid; Mallinckrodt, Abraham, Wei, & Russell, 2006). The bias corrected bootstrapping for the indirect, direct, and total effects of the variables impacting psychological well-being are presented in Table 8.
The first effect to be examined was the two paths from transnational practices to psychological well-being, which included self-esteem as potential mediator in one path, and transnational social support in the other. An effect is significant when the range from the lower to the higher end of the interval does not include zero. That was the case for the total effect, which had a point estimate of .09, and BC (bias corrected) bootstrap confidence intervals of .01-.19. Interestingly, despite both the total indirect (point estimate .05, BC confidence intervals of .01-.09) and the total effect for this variable being significant, none of the indirect paths or the direct effect reached significance. By comparison, the transnational practices-self-esteem-psychological well-being path was significant when tested with the Sobel test. Here, it barely missed significance.

The second effect examined, the immigration stress-psychological well-being path had its total (point estimate -.49, BC confidence intervals of -.63 to -.36), total indirect (point estimate -.13, BC confidence intervals of -.21 to -.07), and direct effects (point estimate -.36, BC confidence intervals of -.49 to -.23) all significant. One of the specific paths: immigration stress-self-esteem-psychological well-being was also significant (point estimate -.13, BC confidence intervals of -.21 to -.07), whereas the other, via private transnationalism, was not. The path that included self-esteem was also significant when tested with the Sobel test.
Table 8. Mediation of the Effects of Private Transnationalism and Immigration Stress on Psychological Well-Being through Self-Esteem and Transnational Social Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effects</th>
<th>Point Estimate</th>
<th>Product of Coefficients</th>
<th>P value</th>
<th>Bootstrapping bias-corrected 95% CI.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>z</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRT → PWB</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>.03*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Indirect</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>.03*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Indirect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRT→SE→PWB</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRT→TSS→PWB</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IS → PWB</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-.49</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-7.21</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Indirect</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-3.64</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Indirect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS→PRT→PWB</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.038</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS→SE→PWB</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-3.85</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-5.25</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 5000 bootstrap samples
A $z$ value 1.96 or larger (*$p < .05$) indicates a significant indirect effect.
PRT: private transnationalism; PWB: psychological well-being; SE: self-esteem; TSS: transnational social support; IS: immigration stress

**Post-Hoc Analysis**

There were not modification indices suggestions for model improvement. Re-specifying the model by eliminating the non-significant paths—namely, the paths from immigration stress to private transnationalism, from transnational social support to self-esteem and to psychological well-being—led to a more parsimonious model that was not
significantly different from the hypothesized model, $\Delta \chi^2 = 4.80$, $\Delta df = 3$; $p = \text{n.s. at } .01$ level.

However, since this was an empirically-driven model, rather than a theoretically specified one, it carries the risk of capitalizing on chance. For this reason, it should be taken more as a future hypotheses generator rather than as a result in itself. This model is shown in Figure 7.
Figure 7. Modified Model: Standardized Estimates of the Effect of Transnational Practices on Psychological Well-Being

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001, n.s = no significant.
Summary of Results

The results obtained suggest that private transnational practices exert, at the most, a moderate influence on subjective well-being outcomes as measured in this study. Public transnational practices did not have any effect on the outcome variables. Overall, immigration stress had the strongest impact on both self-esteem and psychological well-being; this impact was of a negative nature. The hypotheses tested in the path analysis are reviewed below.

a. There is a direct positive effect of Immigration Stress (IS) on Transnational practices (PRT and PUT).

This hypothesis was not supported, as the effect of the predictor on the outcome variables was non-significant. There was no evidence that transnational practices were increased by increased levels of perceived difficulty and hardship in the immigrant’s experience.

b. There is a direct negative effect of IS on Psychological Well-being (PWB).

This hypothesis was supported; the effect of this predictor was negative and moderately significant (−.34), \( p < .001 \). Also, there was some significant indirect effect via self-esteem. An examination of the conditions specified by Baron & Kenny (1986) showed that all of them were met, as all the paths were significant. The Sobel test also showed this indirect effect to be significant, and so did the bootstrapping.

 Whereas immigration stress did not have an impact on transnational practices, it did have a moderately significant and negative impact on key components of subjective well-being such as self-esteem and psychological well-being.
c. There is a direct negative effect of IS on Self-esteem (SE), and an indirect positive effect via PRT.

The first part of this hypothesis, as presented in the previous paragraphs, was supported. Immigration stress had a significant negative impact on self-esteem; the standardized estimate for this path was -.42, *p* < .001. The second part was not supported, as the relationship with transnational practices was non-significant.

d. There is a direct positive effect of transnational social support (TSS) on SE.

This hypothesis was not supported. This path was at the verge of significance. Indeed, when the data was analyzed with the two outliers, this path became significant; this was the only important difference in the results obtained with the dataset with outliers. Transnational social support does not seem to have an impact on self-esteem.

e. There is a direct positive effect of PRT on TSS and on SE.

These hypotheses were supported, as private transnationalism was associated with increased levels of perceived transnational support and self-esteem. The impact on transnational support was somewhat larger than the impact on self-esteem (standardized estimate of .21, *p* < .01 for the former, and .16, *p* < .05 for the latter)

f. TSS and SE have a direct positive effect on PWB.

The first part of this hypothesis was not supported, as the path from transnational support to psychological well-being was not significant in the overall model. Self-esteem, on the other hand, was a significant predictor of psychological well-being, as previous research has shown. The association was moderate, as the standardized estimate was .32, *p* < .001.
g. The effect of PRT on PWB is totally mediated by TSS and SE.

As previously detailed, transnational support did not mediate the relationship between private transnationalism and psychological well-being, since its relationship with the outcome variable was non-significant. Conversely, self-esteem was a significant mediator of the relationship, as the indirect effect of the predictor on psychological well-being was shown to be significant by the Sobel test. Such mediation was also complete: in the model isolating private transnationalism and psychological well-being, the impact was significant; the addition of the mediation variable reduced such direct impact to non-significant levels. This indirect path was not significant when analyzed in the context of the overall model. The bootstrapping analysis also showed that this indirect effect via self-esteem was significant.

h. PRT has a significant direct effect on Public Transnationalism PUT.

Just as suggested by the results of the hierarchical regressions detailed in the previous chapter, there was a significant path between these variables, the standardized estimate was .35, \( p < .001 \).

i. PUT has no direct effect on or is affected by any other variable in the model.

Indeed, the purpose of including this variable in the model was to show that it was not going to be significantly related to any variable in the model other than transnational private practices. As there were no suggestions in the SEM output regarding modification indexes, this hypothesis was supported. Likewise, adding paths from public transnationalism to the well-being variables did not improve the model and none of the paths were significant.
CHAPTER EIGHT

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to investigate antecedents and psychosocial consequences of transnational practices among Ecuadorian immigrants in London. More specifically, this study examined the impact that demographic and integration-related factors had on the ways and extents to which Ecuadorian immigrants stay linked to their home country via various transnational practices. In addition, this research aimed at examining the impact that engaging in transnational practices had on immigrants’ subjective well-being, as measured by their perceived transnational social support, self-esteem, and psychological well-being.

This chapter examines the implications of the results of this study. First, the findings regarding the exploratory questions and hypotheses are summarized and their possible explanations are presented, discussed and compared to findings from previous literature. Next, the theoretical and research implications of these findings are examined. This chapter concludes with a review of the limitations of the study, suggestions for further research and conclusions.

Overall, the findings from this study indicate that demographic and integration-related variables such as gender, socio-economic status, having family in Ecuador, network integration and expectation to return to Ecuador are important to understanding London Ecuadorians’ likelihood of engaging in transnational activities. These variables,
however, impacted private and public transnational practices in different ways. Similarly, engaging in transnational public or private practices had different effects on subjective well-being. Whereas engagement in public transnational activities did not have any impact on the measures of subjective well-being, engagement in private transnationalism had direct positive effects on both perceived transnational social support and self-esteem. Private transnationalism also had an indirect effect on psychological well-being, via self-esteem.

**Engagement in Transnational Practices**

The exploratory questions about transnational practices, listed at the end of Chapter Three, inquired about frequency of engagement in transnational private practices: a) How often do Ecuadorians communicate with their family and friends in Ecuador? b) How often do they send remittances? and c) What are their main means of communication? The results of these questions are compared to the available literature. Next, the frequency of engagement in public transnational practices is also examined in relation with results available from other studies.

**Engagement in Transnational Private Practices**

As suggested by other studies (Itzigsohn & Giorguli-Saucedo, 2002; Landolt, 2000; Murphy and Mahalingam, 2004), transnational private practices were performed significantly more often than public ones. Private practices comprised communicating with family and friends in Ecuador, and sending gifts and/or remittances. In the present research, 98% of respondents reported being in contact with family and friends in Ecuador during the last year; most of them did so with a weekly frequency. As Table 9
shows, these percentages are similar to those reported in a study conducted with Ecuadorian immigrants in USA, Spain and Italy (CIAME, 2007b). Regarding remittance sending, the response for this study—91.3% indicating to having sent remittances during the past two years—is at the upper end of previous findings for Ecuadorians living in other countries, as shown in Table 9. This result is, however, similar to the finding from a study conducted recently about Colombians in the London area, in which is reported that 89.77% of respondents sent remittances to their country (Guarnizo, 2008).

The results regarding preferred means of communication were not exactly comparable to previous studies. The question in the CIAME (2007b) study seemed to allow for a single response, whereas the present study’s question was a multiple choice one. Still, given that respondents in the current study mentioned computer-mediated communication (e-mail, internet phone, social networks, etc.) more frequently than phone, it suggested that this medium has higher importance for this study’s sample. A possible explanation for this difference is that the present study is more recent, and an increase in the use of these technologies might have occurred in the two years separating the studies. Alternatively, the difference could be due to country variations in the use of internet among immigrants, although the countries’ usage rates do not seem to suggest that. The usage rates per country are, with the exception of Italy, very similar (Italy, 52%; Spain, 72%; USA, 76%; UK, 75% (Internet World Stats, 2010).
Table 9. Percentage of Engagement on Transnational Private Practices among Ecuadorians Immigrants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transnational Private Practices</th>
<th>Ecuadorians in USA ¹</th>
<th>Ecuadorians in Spain ¹</th>
<th>Ecuadorians in Italy ¹</th>
<th>Ecuadorians in UK (this study)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>98.3 (62.1 weekly)</td>
<td>98.4 (54.9 weekly) (71 weekly)³</td>
<td>99.0 (67.0 weekly)</td>
<td>98.0 (52.0 weekly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remittances</td>
<td>69.7 (62.2 monthly)</td>
<td>78.6 (61.3 monthly) 86.0 ²</td>
<td>76.8 (53.3 monthly)</td>
<td>91.3 (37.0 monthly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred mean of communic.</td>
<td>Phone 96%</td>
<td>Phone 98% Phone 99%³ Internet 10%³</td>
<td>Phone 96%</td>
<td>E-mail 62% phone 59% mobile 55% other internet 63% mail 10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The most frequent occurrence is indicated in parentheses.

**Engagement in Transnational Public Practices**

An examination of engagement in public transnational activities showed, not surprisingly, that the most frequent activities were those that did not require physical mobilization to Ecuador. Reading news about the home country (94%) and participating in Ecuadorian-related events in England (65%) were the most frequently performed. However, traveling to Ecuador was also performed by the same percentage of respondents (65%). The least frequent activities were political, such as having participated in Ecuadorian political parties or movements (16.7%) and participated in Ecuador-related political campaigns in England (24.1%).
These results could not be compared to equivalent studies as there is no previous research data about Ecuadorians’ engagement in public socio-cultural, economic and political transnational engagements. In its place, Table 10 compares results from studies about transnational activities of immigrants from other Latin American countries to the US and the UK (Colombians, Dominicans and Salvadorans). Only activities included in at least one other study in addition to the present research are displayed.

The first two practices included in Table 10 pertain to the socio-cultural sphere. They are “participating in hometown/cultural organizations” and “contributing to community projects.” The percentages shown suggest that Ecuadorians engage in these practices more often than their Colombian and Dominican counterparts, but less than the Salvadorans in the US. The third practice, “making investment in home country”, pertain to the area of economic transnationalism. Ecuadorians seem to be more involved in this practice than the other nationalities for which data was available. In the area of political participation, which is expressed in the last three items in the table, the following results are noted: Ecuadorians, along with Colombians in London, have the lowest participation in home country’s political parties or movements. The last two political items are: “having registered/voted in home country elections” and “following home country news activities.” The only comparison sample for these activities is of Colombians in London. Ecuadorians were more likely to engage in both of these practices than their Colombian local counterparts. The comparison showed that the response from Ecuadorians in London does not seem to differ in a significant way from the other nationalities in the areas of socio-cultural transnationalism, where they are at the upper end of the frequency
spectrum. In the area of economic transnationalism, Ecuadoreans seem to be more involved in investing in the home country than the other nationals.

Table 10. Percentage of Engagement on Transnational Public Practices among Latin American Immigrants *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transnational Practices</th>
<th>Col. in US¹</th>
<th>Dom.in US¹</th>
<th>Salv.in US¹</th>
<th>Col. in London²</th>
<th>Ecu. in London⁴</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participated in socio-cultural/hometown organizations in home country</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>16.28</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gave money to community projects in home country</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>9.39</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made investments in home country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.5³</td>
<td>25.24</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in home country political parties or movements</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>8.45</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered to vote/voted in home country elections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22.96</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Followed home country news</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>83.25</td>
<td>87.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This table reports percentage of respondents engaging in the activities at least once in a while for Colombians, Dominicans, Salvadorans and Ecuadoreans ¹ (Portes, 2003); ² (Guarnizo, 2008); ³ (Landolt, 2000); ⁴ (this study).

**Antecedents to Transnational Practices**

The impact of selected demographic, immigration and integration factors on transnational activities was examined via hierarchical regression analyses and bivariate correlations. The findings stressed the differences between public and private transnational activities. While moderately correlated, these practices were determined by different sets of demographic and integration factors. For example, an examination of the
impact of demographic factors showed that transnational public practices were conducted significantly more often by men and by people of higher socio-economic status. These findings are similar to what previous studies have found (Portes, 2003; Itzigsohn & Giorguli-Saucedo, 2002; Landolt, 2000). A possible reason for this gender difference in this study’s sample is that men are more likely to work than women (91% vs. 69%), and consequently, they might be more likely to be involved in entrepreneurial economic transnationalism. Another possible explanation advanced in Itzigsohn & Giorguli-Saucedo (2005) regarding the gender difference is that men are more likely to lose social status in the migration process, whereas women are more likely to “gain” status. Men’s engagement in transnational public activities could be, under this perspective, a “reactive” way to regain social standing. The reason for men feeling that they lose out when migrating is that they might find themselves in a culture and a social context less conducive to relive the ideology of ‘Machismo’ that still permeates Latin American culture. This ideology dictates that the ‘public’ sphere and the leadership roles that they entail are primarily a male territory. This attitude is clearly conveyed in the expression ‘La mujer en la casa, el hombre en la calle’ (the woman in the house, the man in the street) (Ortiz & Davis, 2009). A study conducted by Orellana-Damacela (2009), suggests that this attitude is still present. A content analysis of photos and messages sent by Ecuadorian migrants to Ecuadorian online newspapers showed a significant gender difference in the way the photo senders portrayed themselves: whereas men self-presented in public places and work settings, women were more likely to self-portray in private spaces and in social events.
Private transnational activities were conducted significantly more often, in this study, by women and by people having extended family members in Ecuador. The prediction was that there would be no gender differences. Women’s higher involvement in transnational private activities has been suggested before (Pessar, 2000). Conversely, Soehl & Waldinger’s (2010) analysis of a National Survey of Latinos in the US revealed that men were more likely to send remittances. These findings are in line with the gender social roles discussed above. In the same study, migrants having children in their home country were more likely to send remittances and to communicate than the migrant with children living in the US. As indicated in the results section, a very intriguing finding in this study has been that parents with children in Ecuador (20% of the sample) were not more likely to communicate or send remittances than those without children in Ecuador. A possible explanation for this result is that the measurement of remittances used in this study, while asking for frequency, did not ask for ‘intensity’ or ‘amount’ of remittances. So, those having children in Ecuador might have sent remittances and/or items as often as the other respondents, but in higher amounts. Also, as mentioned before, those who have children in Ecuador but engage less often have been, with one exception, living in England for 11 years or more.

Further exploration of the data from the small subgroup having children in Ecuador gave indications that suggest more engagement than what has been captured by the analysis so far. The correlation between the two transnational private activities (communication and sending remittances) increased from .55 for the total sample to .64, \(p < .001\) for both) for this subgroup. Likewise, the correlation between Expectation of
Returning to Ecuador and communication and remittance sending increased from -.16 to -.38 ($p < .05$ for both) for the former; it increased from -.24 ($p < .01$) to -.56 ($p < .001$) for remittance sending. Individuals with children in Ecuador who were in more frequent contact or sent remittances more frequently, were more likely to be planning a return to Ecuador than individuals without children. An additional characteristic of this group is that those having children in Ecuador were more likely to be non-citizens/residents, ($r=.36$, $p < .001$). This moderate correlation between having a child in Ecuador and not being a citizen or resident could partially explain why the child is not with the parent. It is possible that an insecure legal status has made it impossible to bring the child to England.

Regarding the relationship between socio-economic status and transnationalism, there are two main competing theories of transnational involvement, when it goes beyond the private sphere (Sana, 2005). The first posits that engaging in transnational activities is a way to gain ‘status’, which has been lost during the migration process. According to this theory, as the social status improves, transnationalism should decrease (This would be similar to the Assimilation strategy within the Acculturation framework. The ‘integration’ theory states that transnationalism is a way to participate into the host society (for example, representing organizations or groups from their country vis-à-vis local institutions or organizations). From this perspective, the relationship between socio-economic status and transnationalism should be positive. The results of this study support the second alternative, as socio-economic status was a significant positive predictor of public transnationalism.
Return to Ecuador was, as expected, a significant predictor of private activities. Planning a return and staying in touch go hand in hand and most likely reinforce each other: the more they stay in contact, the more desire to go back, and vice versa. More unexpected was the lack of association between expectation to return and public transnationalism. This result suggests that some immigrants engaging in these activities might not be motivated just by their desire to keep strong ties vis-a-vis a possible return. Other explanations seem plausible, such as altruistic motivations, or motivations linked to their lives in the host country—England. As has been suggested, immigrant’s transnational endeavors can be a way to carve their own cultural, social, political, and/or economic spaces and make progress in their standing in their current place; transnationalism can become a mode of incorporation into the host society (Landolt, 2000; Levitt, DeWind, & Vertovec, 2003; Pallares, 2005). The only other study found that included ‘expectation to return,’ as an antecedent to transnationalism (Portes, 2003), reported an association between family and friends believing the immigrant will return, and immigrant’s engagement in political and sociocultural transnational activities. In the present study, the respondents were asked about their own expectation of returning. It might be that the different results are due to the ‘others’ interpreting engagement in transnational pursuits as a sign of the immigrant’s commitment to return, which might or not coincide with the immigrant’s own expectations.

Among the integration indicators, namely network integration and English mastery, only network integration had a significant impact—negative—on public transnational activities, as respondents with local networks including more English-
speaking people were less likely to engage in public transnationalism. Conversely, people engaging more often in transnational private practices had a more integrated network. The link between transnational public practices and a more Spanish-speaking network was expected, and gives support to the notion that transnational activities occur, for this group, in an ethnic ‘niche.’ This finding does not align with previous research in which social network indicators were unrelated to public transnationalism (Portes, 2003; Snel et al., 2006). A possible explanation for this discrepancy could be that these studies did use other measures of social network (ratio of nonlocal to local ties, and number of local people in the network), as opposed to measuring the proportion of people in the local network that were from the host country, as was done in the current study. It is also interesting to mention that network size, on the other hand, did not relate significantly with transnationalism in this study, whereas it did so in Portes’s research.

In sum, regarding the integration level of immigrants who engage in transnational public activities more frequently, it seems that immigrants with more successful ways of incorporation into the host society, as indicated by their socioeconomic status, are also more likely to engage in said practices. However, that seems to be only partially the case for socio-cultural integration, as network integration was a significant negative predictor of public transnationalism. Conversely, network integration was positively and significantly associated with private transnationalism. Therefore, this study has provided a mixed, not conclusive response, to the question of whether transnationalism and integration are incompatible or complementary.
Effect of Demographic, Immigration and Integration Variables on Subjective Well-Being

Demographic and immigration characteristics (gender, age, socio-economic status, family in Ecuador, time in the country) and integration factors (English mastery, network integration, expectation of return to Ecuador) were examined in their correlations with the outcomes of subjective well-being. The variables included in this study as indicators of subjective well-being were transnational support, self-esteem and psychological well-being. Immigration stress was included as a possible antecedent to transnational activities, and likely to have a negative effect on subjective well-being.

Gender differences were not found for immigration stress or for any of the psychological well-being variables. Similarly, Hovey & Magaña (2000) reported no gender differences in acculturative stress scores, anxiety or depression on a sample of Mexican farmworkers in the US. However, there are many studies in which women have reported higher levels of stress (Aroian, 2008b; Cuéllar et al., 2004; Flores, Tschann, Dimas, Pasch, & Groat, 2008; Odera, 2007). Aroian’s study about Latin Americans in the Canary Islands specified that the immigration stress experienced by women was higher than men’s in the areas of loss and occupation. Sense of loss decreased for these respondents with time on the Islands. As this study’s respondents have been away from their country longer than the Islands’ sample (11 vs. 4 years), it is possible that the effect of ‘loss’ has diminished with time. Regarding the occupation-related stress, Aroian points out that 84% of the women in her study migrated without a partner. In those cases, as
they are the main or sole bread winner, occupational stress is more likely. By contrast, in the current study’s sample, 75% of the women are married or have a partner with them.

Immigration stress was significantly associated—in a negative direction—with socio-economic status, residency status, network integration and English mastery. These findings support the extensive literature indicating that lower socio-economic status, insecure residency status, lack of a native local network, and insufficient knowledge of the local language are important contributors to immigrant stress (Cuéllar et al., 2004; Finch & Vega, 2003; Flores et al., 2008; Sullivan & Rehm, 2005). During the course of their immigration experience of acculturation, some immigrants lose the socio-economic status they had held in their native country (Berry, 1997). This can happen, for example, when their educational qualifications are not recognized, or when they are unable to get jobs at their skills level (Datta et al., 2006b; Platt, 2006; McIlwaine, 2007). That seems to be the case for this study’s respondents, as 52% had at least some college (with 19% of them having at least a college degree), whereas only 17% of the workers had jobs in professional, managerial or entrepreneurial positions. Hovey (1999), in a study conducted with Central American immigrants in the US, also found that insufficient social support was associated to higher levels of stress.

The subjective well-being variables—self-esteem and psychological well-being—were positively and significantly associated with local social network variables: having family in England and having a diverse local network. The contribution of social networks and support for immigrants’ well-being has been very well established (Hernández et al., 2004; Hovey & Magaña, 2000; Kiang et al., 2010; Ritsner et al., 2000).
The capacity of social support to ‘buffer’ the negative impact of immigration and acculturation stressors has been verified in research using a variety of instruments to measure immigration or acculturation stress and psychological well-being and mental health constructs (Jasinskaja-Lahti et al., 2006; Martínez García et al., 2001). More in particular, these findings support previous research showing the psychological benefits of having a social network that includes also local nationals (Jasinskaja-Lahti et al.; Martínez García et al., 2002). Paradoxically, for all its positive and protective value, large and diverse local networks and social support for immigrants are scarce. In fact, research conducted in the UK asserts that ethnic minority migrants are more likely to have lower levels of social support than the native British population (Shields & Price, 2003, 2005). Other studies have found similar results in other countries, such as Martínez García et al., comparing Moroccan and Peruvian immigrant’s networks and support with what is available to native Spaniards. Likewise, Almeida, Molnar, Kawachi, & Subramanian (2008) found that Mexican-born immigrants to the US received more support from their family and less from friends than their US-born counterpart. The deficiencies of a small and homogeneous social network are clearly exposed by Viruell-Fuentes & Schulz (2009). They conducted a qualitative study to explore social ties among first and second generation Mexicans in the US. First generation interviewees stressed that their limited social ties, usually restricted to a few family members and other migrants facing similar predicaments, could sometimes be used to the point of over exhaustion. It is not difficult to imagine that, under these circumstances, social ties could become one more source of stress rather than a ‘buffer’ against it. Moreover, immigrants at lower socio-economic
status are likely to have even more limited social support. Almeida et al. reported that
individuals with lower SES received more family support, whereas higher SES
individuals got more support from their friends.

Socio-economic status was positively and significantly related to self-esteem, but
not to psychological well-being. As such, this research failed to find the positive
relationship between higher socio-economic status and well-being reported in other
studies (Brugha et al. 2004; Jasinskaja-Lahti et al., 2006; Shields & Price, 2005).

Having family in Ecuador was unrelated to the measures of psychosocial well-
being; that was also the case for Expectation of returning to Ecuador. However, staying in
contact with family and friends in the home country was significantly associated in the
correlational analysis with social support, self-esteem and psychological well-being. This
has also been the case in studies with other immigrant groups (Murphy & Mahalingam,
2004; Pantelidou & Craig, 2006).

Despite transnational social support not being associated with the measures of
subjective well-being, two variables related to the availability of the local network—
network integration and having family in England—showed, in the correlational analysis,
significant associations with self-esteem and psychological well-being. This finding
replicates other studies with various immigrants groups (Jasinskaja-Lahti et al., 2006;
Martínez García et al., 2002; Oppedal et al., 2004). As reported by Jasinskaja-Lahti et al.,
contact with host networks—in the present study, a network including more host
contacts—were better at offering protection against immigration stressors (discrimination
in Jasinskaja-Lahti’s study) than local co-ethnic networks. As several authors have
argued, social network and support are complex constructs, and it has been the case that some approaches are more suitable than others to find different types of effects. For example, Hovey & Magaña (2000) studied how apt the network is to provide support. Martínez Garcia et al. (2001) focused on the satisfaction with the network. It is part of the complexity of studying social support that it can be more effective under some circumstances than others: research has shown that social support can be less effective in high stress situations (Barrera, 1986; Hernández et al., 2004, Ritsner, 2000). That was the case with the Russian sample of immigrants to Finland included in Jasinskaja-Lahti et al. When facing discrimination, social support was not effective to protect them against its negative effects. Social support can also be analyzed from a functional (availability, use of the network, appraisal) or from a structural perspective (size of the network, composition, etc.) (Cohen & Wills, 1985). In this study, the functional measure of support used, adapted from Dahlem et al. (1991) and aimed at measuring perception of adequacy of the socio-emotional transnational support available, failed to capture any effect of social support on the subjective well-being variables. Clearly, it was important to measure the satisfaction with the availability of local social support. As this is the case, the measures of local support included, albeit structural (network composition and presence/absence of family members) did show a significant relation with the well-being variables.

The other variable used as an indicator of integration in this study, language mastery, was also significantly associated in a positive direction with self-esteem and psychological well-being, and significantly and negatively associated with immigration
stress. Previous research has also shown the positive association of host country language skills with positive outcomes of adaptation and well-being (Birman, Trickett, & Vinokurov, 2002; Padilla et al., 1998; Rumbaut, 1994). Other studies with Latin Americans and other immigrants in the UK have also reported the importance of knowing English, as it open and makes possible better interaction with locals, which is, in turn, beneficial for the immigrants to improve their social network and their opportunities in the job market (Dustmann & Fabbri, 2000; McIlwaine, 2007).

Overall, the variables with the strongest associations with psychosocial well-being outcomes were socio-economic status, network integration and English mastery. These findings suggest the importance of structural as well as socio-cultural integration for immigrants’ subjective well-being, of which there is ample research support (Berry, 2005; Birman, Trickett, & Vinokurov, 2002; Jasinskaja-Lahti et al., 2006).

**Transnational Practices and Subjective Well-Being**

A path analysis was conducted to examine the connections between transnational activities and the subjective well-being variables: immigration stress, transnational support, self-esteem and psychological well-being. The overall fit of the model, depicted in figure 4, was satisfactory, despite the fact that not all the paths predicted to be significant reached significance. The model was successful at explaining 33% of the variance of psychological well-being, 22% of variance of self-esteem, and only 4% of the variance of transnational support. The most robust statistical contribution of this study has been to add to the extensive literature showing the negative impact, in this case,
association, between immigration stress and indicators of subjective well-being, such as self-esteem and psychological well-being.

The lack of relationship between immigration stress and the frequency of engagement in transnational practices was unexpected. This result suggests that the importance of transnational connections to the respondents’ subjective well-being was not linked to the perceived difficulties they had to confront in their lives abroad. Murphy & Mahalingam (2004)’s study with Caribbean immigrants in the US reports a negative association between general stress and transnational communication. Communication, however, was unrelated to perceived racial discrimination. The immigration stress instrument used in the present study includes the topic of discrimination, in addition to other immigration stressors. In both studies, thus, it seems that communicative exchanges with family and friends abroad might not be ‘relevant’ to offset the issues confronted locally, such as discrimination. The lack of association between immigration stress and transnational communication does not support the notion of transnationalism being ‘reactive’ and originated on the immigrant’s looking for a ‘refuge’ from the stressful immigrant situation (Itzigsohn & Giorguli-Saucedo, 2002). The rewards for maintaining these links, other studies have shown, appeal to different needs and emotional connections that need further exploration As Viruell-Fuentes & Schulz (2009) analyzes, transnational links are a very valuable source of emotional strength for Mexican-born migrants living in the US. In this study, this beneficial effect was reflected on private transnationalism’s positive association with self-esteem.
Immigration stress was associated with lower levels of subjective well-being: immigrants that reported higher levels of perceived immigration stress also reported lower levels of self-esteem and psychological well-being. Researchers who have reported similar associations or effects, have used a variety of measures of well-being, from measures of anxiety and depression, mental health, to overall life satisfaction ones (Aroian, 2008b; Carta et al., 2005; Hovey & Magaña, 2000; Kiang et al., 2010; Jasinskaja-Lahti et al., 2006; Shields & Price, 2003; Thoman & Suris, 2004).

As predicted, transnational private practices, rather than public ones, had a positive effect on perceived transnational social support. Thus, this association was similar to what Murphy & Mahalingam (2004) reported on a sample of West Indian immigrants to the USA, although their measure of social support did not specify a locality, so it could be either transnational or local. It must be noticed that there is at least one study showing no such association (Odera, 2007). In contrast, the potential psychological benefits of public transnational practices, if any, were not captured by the models examined in this study. The academic focus on transnational public practices has not come from the field of psychology; hence, the study of these practices has not included psychosocial variables so far, the few aforementioned exceptions notwithstanding. Comparison with other studies is, therefore, very limited. In Murphy & Mahalingam, the overall measure of transnationalism (including both private and public aspects) was significantly correlated with social support, life satisfaction and depression. The transnationalism subscales were related to several indicators of well-being, such as: anxiety was positively and significantly correlated with Political activism and negatively
correlated with social and family-related communication; depression was correlated with political transnationalism; life satisfaction was correlated with Social & Family-related Travel. It emerges from these results that, just like in the current study, the aspects of transnational engagements that are positive for the individual’s well-being are those pertaining to the sphere of personal communication and contacts, whereas the ‘public’ ones, such as political activism, are linked to more negative outcomes, or in the case of the present study, had no effect on well-being. In Odera’s study of Kenyan immigrants in the US, a similar global measure of transnationalism found it not being a significant predictor of depression, somatic symptoms, subjective health or social support.

Whereas the benefits of transnational exchanges and communication did not translate into relevant social support, they still had a positive relevance in the psychological well-being of the immigrants, as their positive and significant association with self-esteem shows. This significant link, which was predicted, couldn’t be compared to other empirical studies; no research on immigrant transnationalism that included self-esteem was found. Self-esteem is, however, constantly included as a crucial indicator of well-being in studies with immigrant groups, both as an outcome or as a mediator between other individual characteristics or environmental stressors (Nesdale et al., 1997; Nesdale & Mark, Oppedal et al., 2004). Engagement in private transnational practices, as predicted, had also an indirect positive impact on psychological well-being, via self-esteem. The most important transnational activity in regards to subjective well-being was staying in contact with family and friends in Ecuador; this was the item with the highest correlation with the outcomes, $r = 22, p < .01$ with self-esteem, and $.17, p < .05$ with
psychological well-being. The relationship of these variables with remittance sending was not significant.

The fact that transnational private practices were good predictors of transnational social support, which in turn failed to have predictive significance in relation to self-esteem and psychological well-being (albeit it barely missed significance levels), was intriguing. Thus, these research findings differed from the study with immigrants in Norway conducted by Oppedal et al. (2004). In that study, friend social support’s impact on mental health was mediated by self-esteem, whereas family and classmates support affected mental health directly. The social support—psychological well-being association has been found among different immigrant groups, such as Mexicans in the USA, migrants from several ex-Soviet Union countries to Russia, and migrants in Spain (Hovey & Magaña, 2000; Jasinskaja-Lahti et al, 2006; Kiang et al., 2010; Martínez García et al., 2001; Ritsner et al., 2000). Among Ecuadorians in Spain in particular, transnational social support has been shown to have a positive impact on said well-being (González-Castro & Ubillos, 2009). A possible explanation for this lack of association is that the type of support measured with regard to transnational ties—and indeed, the type of support that transnational ties would be able to provide—was not relevant to offset the negative impact of immigration stress on psychological well-being. Perception of emotional support might be less relevant to immigrant’s well-being than other types of support that can only be provided by local networks, such as active support regarding local concerns (Hernández et al., 2004).
Similarly, given the negative association between immigration stress and psychological well-being, it might be that even if the social support provided by transnational ties was relevant, it might not be enough to offset said stress. As Barrera (1986) observed regarding social support, its efficacy can be reduced under conditions of great stress. Indeed, studies with immigrants have shown that under conditions of more elevated stress, the protective effect of social support decreased or ceased (Hernández et al., 2004; Ritsner et al., 2000). Jasinskaja-Lahti et al. (2006), in their study with a sample of Russian immigrants in Finland, also found a lack of positive impact of home country-based social support on psychological well-being under conditions of discrimination. They observed that frequent negative experiences of exclusion, which were detrimental to these immigrants’ well-being, were also a reason for them to increase their transnational interactions. This phenomenon has also been described as ‘reactive transnationalism’ (Itzigsohn & Giorguli-Saucedo, 2002). However, there was no evidence of a link between the levels of immigration stress and the levels of transnational practices and support in the present study. Furthermore, a hierarchical regression was conducted to explore this point. Psychological well-being was the outcome variable, with several demographic and integration measures, immigration stress, transnational private practices and support, and the interaction between immigration stress and transnational private practices as the predictors. No effect for such interaction was found, although, as expected, immigration stress was a significant predictor.

The positive relationship between self-esteem on psychological well-being, has been well-established within social psychology research (Paradise & Kernis, 2002;
Yamawaki et al., 2011), and has been found in studies with immigrants as well (Nesdale et al., 1997; Nesdale & Mak, 2003). Self-esteem, as the aspect of the self-concept that evaluates itself and assigns self-worth (Rosenberg, 1989), is particularly ‘at risk’ during the process of migration. During this process, the surroundings, the groups of references, the ‘value’ that the others assign to the person change, with the potential to affect this evaluative part of the self-concept, as he or she has to learn new skills to master the new surroundings. For example, Padilla et al. (1998) found that immigrants being proficient in English reported higher self-esteem. In this study, self-esteem was also significantly associated with English skills, as well as high higher socio-economic status, network integration and having family in England.

In sum, the overall model analyzed in the present research portrayed the positive effects of private transnational engagements on psychological well-being as unrelated to immigration stress. These positive effects were small and indirect, by way of improving self-esteem. That transnational practices impacted psychological well-being via self-esteem and not via transnational social support suggests that the communication links with kin and friends are more important for the sense of self and identity than for the support that the immigrant can get from those exchanges.

The notion that engaging in transnational activities could contribute to improve immigrants’ social standing or status has been empirically supported from a sociological framework (Sana, 2005). It has also been shown that immigration, with the loss of psycho-social referents that it might bring, as well as ‘demotion’ in social standing (McIlwaine, 2007), can negatively impact immigrants’ self-esteem (Oppedal et al., 2004).
Conversely, immigrants with pre-migration low self-esteem could find it more difficult to respond proactively to the new situations created by the transition, and might be at more risk of developing more psychological distress (Bhugra, 2004). Transnational practices’ positive association with psychological well-being via self-esteem suggests that these practices could, indeed, play a role in improving immigrants’ self-image. When immigrants can fulfill what they perceive to be their duties, or see themselves as important contributors to the well-being of their loved ones by providing social, material or emotional support, that could help them ‘reassemble’ their self-image and self-worth dislocated by their immigration experience. To my knowledge, this hypothesis has not been examined from a psychological perspective. The findings of the present study suggest that further exploration of this topic is warranted.

**Limitations**

This study is a first approximation to the examination of the demographic and immigration factors associated with transnational practices, and the association of these practices with immigrants’ subjective well-being. Limitations of this study arise in the areas of the design of the study, the characteristics of the sample, the data collection, and the instruments employed. The cross-sectional and correlational design of this study exerted limitations in the ability to determine causality, and findings should be interpreted with this consideration in mind. Deepening the causal understanding of the processes would require conducting longitudinal studies that include pre-migration measures in addition to the usual post-migration ones. Also, it must be stressed that the information was collected via self-report and relied on the respondents’ recollection of
the event, as there was no actual tracking of transnational interactions, or social network contacts during a period of time.

Regarding the characteristics of the sample, the first limitation is that this was a convenience sampling, where all the Ecuadorian persons available at a particular place, such a restaurant or shop, were approached to be interviewed. The places visited to recruit participants were mainly in the boroughs of Southwark and Lambeth, in addition to the Ecuadorian consulate, which is in Westminster. This was the result of not being able to identify viable ‘recruitment’ places in the other boroughs, as most of the restaurants, shops, sports fields, etc., visited by Ecuadorians are in those areas. The available information suggests that these boroughs are the ones with more Ecuadorians (James, 2005), as was the case in this research as well. For this reason, there is no guarantee that the sample as drawn is representative of the Ecuadorian population in the London area. Furthermore, the lack of accurate statistics about Ecuadorians limits the possibility of comparing this sample to the population. A possible bias resulting from this focus is that the sample might have been more tilted towards ‘transnationalism’ than a sample of Ecuadorians recruited at random in different places of the city. Two additional biases were detected: first, when approaching a group or a family, the persons usually taking the lead to respond the questionnaire were men; in the case of families, women were often taking care of the kids while the husband was filling up the questionnaire. Efforts were made to approach more women and sometimes tactfully ask for the woman to answer the questionnaire instead of the male companion. To compound this challenge, there were fewer women to interview, and they were more likely than men to reject
answering the questionnaire. Despite the efforts to interview more women, the sample has a percentage of men that is higher than the percentage of Ecuadorian men listed in the Census (60% male respondents vs. 46% in the Census (IOM, 2008).

A second limitation regarding the sample was mentioned to me by a few respondents and people knowledgeable about the Ecuadorian community in the city. They indicated that people that go to public places to shop and to eat at restaurants are more likely to be those with legal permit to be in the country. This observation suggests that the present sample might have underrepresented the Ecuadorians without a secure residency status. Furthermore, it is possible that, in addition to not being present, the persons without a secure residency status could also have been more likely to reject the offer to answer the questionnaire. Even if the persons with insecure residency status accepted answering the questionnaire, it seems plausible that the high number of non-responses to this question is due to people’s discomfort or reluctance to indicate such status. Due to the high non-response rate for this item, it was not included in the hierarchical regression analyses. This low response happened regardless of the fact that the question about legal status presented two options: ‘yes’ or ‘no’ to being a citizen or permanent resident. A ‘no’ answer did include, then, a wide array of other non-permanent residency options such as work permits, student permit, temporary visa, etc.

When filling out the questionnaire, respondents did not answer the items at the same rate. To be able to collect the information that was considered the most important, the subjective well-being variables were always at the beginning of the questionnaire, and the demographic questions at the end. So it happened that more demographic questions
went unanswered than other type of questions, particularly those questions requiring to write down information, such as year of arrival to England, and place and year of birth. Due to this lower response rate, the variable age was also taken out of the regression analyses.

Another limitation of the study is that, precisely in order to avoid respondents’ fatigue, the questionnaire was kept as short as possible, and variables of relevance to the study had to be left out. Still, some respondents indicated that they found the questionnaire somewhat long. The most important ‘misses’ were not including a measure of local social support equivalent to the one used to measure transnational support. Psychological well-being was measured with the MHI-5, an inventory of mental health that was chosen because, despite its shortness, has proved to be very good at measuring the type of psychological distress associated with migration experience, such as depression and anxiety. The inclusion of other measures of psychological well-being, such as a ‘positive’ measure could have offered a more rounded view of the links between immigration stress, transnational practices, and subjective well-being.

The development of the questionnaire to measure transnational practices had the shortcoming of having applied a similar metric of frequency to activities that were too dissimilar; for example, the frequency of travelling or voting cannot be the same as the frequency of making phone calls. The questionnaires already existing had the same challenge, and some authors had opted for a more ambiguous wording of the frequency. Based on the information about frequency of transnational events, the questionnaire could be divided in subsections with different metrics.
The sample size was, at 174, just right for the analyses performed. However, having had a larger sample would have allowed to offsetting the nonresponses to the questions about time in England, age and residency status so that these variables could have been included in the regression analyses.

**Future Directions**

The results of the current study suggest that building the link between the fields of transnational studies and social psychology has been a worthy inquest. Further developments should explore other areas of subjective well-being to find the “reward” or the motivation to undertake transnational public practices, since none of the subjective well-being variables were associated to these activities. Self-esteem, in particular, could be increased by the involvement in contributions that increase the self-value, such as charitable contributions and other involvements of that sort. On the other hand, it could be that the instrument designed to measure transnational activities did not measure all of them, or did not measure them well (hence the low correlation between items).

Furthermore, the Transnational Activities Scale could be further developed, improving its’ internal correlation, and defining one-dimensional subscales (e.g. socio-cultural, political, economic). Indeed, the Transnational Activities Scale is an instrument in need of further development. As it has been adapted from the field of economics and immigration studies to the field of psychology; further studies with other populations, selecting questions for which a similar metric could work appropriately are tasks necessary to build a more robust instrument.
Particular areas that merit further exploration are the ways in which transnational private practices have a positive impact on self-esteem. Is it, as asserted in sociological studies, that these practices improve immigrant’s social-esteem by validating their social standing? If that is the case, then would that contribute to increase their self-esteem?

Regarding transnational support, it would be necessary to measure other types of support as well, such as local native and co-ethnic support to more comprehensively examine their contribution to psychological well-being and whether or not they are related, and in which way, with transnational practices in the context of migration.

Further insights into the present research topic can be achieved by planning a longitudinal study that tracks the immigrants’ changes in transnational practices and subjective well-being indicators. Such design would be better suited to examine causality and directionality among the variables.

**Conclusions**

The present study has contributed to the understanding of the transnational experience of the Ecuadorian immigrants in London. The findings stressed the differences between public and private transnational practices. While moderately correlated, these practices were determined by different sets of demographic, immigration and integration factors. For example, whereas public transnational practices were conducted more often by men and by people with less integrated networks and higher socio-economic status, private transnational practices were conducted more often by women and by those having a more integrated network, and regardless of their socio-economic status.
More importantly, these transnational practices had a different impact on the subjective well-being variables measured in this study. Transnational private practices, communication in particular, had a positive association with self-esteem; conversely, public transnationalism was not associated with such variables. This finding suggests that transnational links contribute to the immigrant’s well-being by improving their self-evaluation, rather than by providing functional supports. By being afar, it is less possible for the immigrant’s family and friends abroad to provide support on their pressing and current needs. Nonetheless, they provide the immigrant with a lifeline to the sense of self, of what is true to her regardless of where she is, or how good or bad her current situation is. In a different vein, the motivations to engage in public transnational activities, such as entrepreneurial activities or political activism seem to be more ‘functional’ and rather linked to the immigrants desire to find their way within the new surroundings. The benefits to their psychological well-being of such endeavors, if any, were more nuanced and not captured by the measures in use.

As previous studies have extensively shown, the demands that the immigration experience places on immigrants was linked to negative subjective well-being outcomes. Immigrants that reported higher levels of perceived immigration stress also reported lower levels of self-esteem and psychological well-being. Unexpectedly, the frequency of engagement in transnational practices was not related to immigration stress. These results suggest that transnational links are beneficial for the immigrant regardless of the perceived difficulties they had to confront in their lives abroad. There is no indication
that they are ‘reactive’ ways of dealing with the stressfulness of their situation as immigrants.

Additionally, this study contributed to identifying factors that could exert a detrimental effect on immigrants’ subjective well-being, such as lack of proficiency in the English language, insecure residency status, and low social network integration. The first two had already been identified as key concerns by other Latin American immigrants in London. In this way, this study is providing further advancement to a better understanding of the vicissitudes and needs of a collective that have been, until very recently, outside the “radar” of social research in England.

In the debate about whether or not integration and public transnational practices are conflicting propositions, this study has found support for the idea that immigrants with more successful ways of incorporation into the host society are also more likely to engage in said practices (or, it could be said as well that immigrants that engage in transnational public activities achieve higher socio-economic status); they are not, however, necessarily more socio-culturally integrated with the host society.

This study constitutes a “bridge” between the fields of transnational migration and social psychology, since most research on this topic has been conducted within the frameworks of economic, sociologic and ethnographic studies. Furthermore, in the studies that had included social psychological variables, transnationalism has been positioned primarily as a predictor of psychological health outcomes, whereas this study has also examined transnational practices as they relate with demographic, immigration and integration factors.
In a more general way, transnational practices, particularly remittances and communications, are widespread activities undertaken daily by millions of migrants worldwide. Whereas studies about the economic impact of these activities have been extensively studied, there has been less attention to the possible consequences of those practices on their subjective well-being. For these consequences to be considered when designing social policies at both the sending and the receiving countries, they first have to be studied. Hence, it is my hope that this research can contribute to a better understanding of the implications of transnational practices, within the milieu of the immigration experience, on the immigrants’ well-being.

As a final observation, I must say that while I have referred to the respondents in this study as migrants all along, a good portion of them would not recognize themselves under that denomination. Many see themselves as British as well as Ecuadorians; people that day to day are contributing with their hard work, alongside other people born in this country and elsewhere, to the betterment of themselves, their families and their communities, just like everybody else in this country. The roots that many Ecuadorians have in this country are deep, as they are married to British partners (14%), have had children in this country, are citizens or have the legal right to reside indefinitely in the United Kingdom (62%), have lived here for many years (11 years average), and have plans of staying (51%). As one interviewee, tong-in-cheek said ‘you are from where you pay your taxes; this is my home.’ They have indeed made London their home, and the place where they can get, thanks to the industriousness of transnational entrepreneurs,
Ecuadorians and from other Latin American countries, Ecuadorian delicatessens, almost as easily as they can get their fish and chips.
APPENDIX A

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION OF RESPONDENTS
## Demographic Information of Respondents
### Valid Percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td>106 (60.9%)</td>
<td>68 (39.1%)</td>
<td>174 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Province of birth</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pichincha</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>39.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loja</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tungurahua</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorados</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guayas</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Highland/Orient</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Coast</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational training</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>33.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College degree or beyond</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnered relationship</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced/separated/widow</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spouse/Partner nationality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>58.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other countries</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has partner/did not answer</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spouse/partner living place</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>2 (3.3)</td>
<td>6 (11.8)</td>
<td>8 (7.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>48 (80.0)</td>
<td>41 (80.4)</td>
<td>89 (80.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other countries</td>
<td>2 (3.3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (1.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has partner/did not answer</td>
<td>8 (13.3)</td>
<td>4 (7.8)</td>
<td>12 (10.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Have children</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>72 (79.1)</td>
<td>46 (74.2)</td>
<td>118 (77.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>19 (20.9)</td>
<td>16 (25.8)</td>
<td>35 (22.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Where children live</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>20 (27.8)</td>
<td>15 (32.6)</td>
<td>35 (29.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>48 (66.7)</td>
<td>33 (71.7)</td>
<td>81 (68.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other countries</td>
<td>12 (16.9)</td>
<td>2 (4.3)</td>
<td>14 (12.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Have any family in Ecuador</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>78 (75)</td>
<td>59 (88.1)</td>
<td>137 (80.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Respondents Immigration and Work-related Information

### Valid Percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Currently working</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>91.4</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>82.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service and Manual</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-skilled, administrative</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Managerial &amp; Entrepreneurial</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student/homemaker/retired</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of work unknown</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yearly Salary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;10,000</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,001-20,000</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>38.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,001-40,000</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,001+</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Currently studying</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>62.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Immigration Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Resident/Citizen</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>62.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>37.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Borough of residency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambeth</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwark</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewisham</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hackney</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammersmith &amp; Fulham</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B:

CONSENT FORM
CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

Project Title: Transnationalism, Immigration Stress and Subjective Well-being among Ecuadorian Immigrants in London.

Researcher(s): Lucia Orellana-Damacela

Faculty Sponsor: Dr. R. Scott Tindale

Introduction:
You are being asked to take part in a research study being conducted by Lucia Orellana-Damacela for a dissertation under the supervision of Dr. R. Scott Tindale in the Department of Psychology at Loyola University of Chicago.

You are being asked to participate because you are an adult Ecuadorian who lives in the London area.

Please read this form carefully and ask any questions you may have before deciding whether to participate in the study.

Purpose:
The purpose of this study is to learn about the Ecuadorians’ experiences as immigrants in London, their emotional well-being and the challenges they have to overcome. This study also includes information about the type and frequency of contacts that they maintain with Ecuador.

Procedures:
If you agree to participate, you will be asked to fill out a 5-page questionnaire with questions about the type and frequency of contacts that you maintain with your family and friends in Ecuador. You will be also asked about whether or not you have felt stressed due to your circumstances as an immigrant. You will also respond to questions about how much support that you receive from your family and friends, how do you see yourself and how do you feel emotionally. Finally, there will be some questions about personal information such as gender, age, etc. For most of the questions, you do not have to write anything, just to check a number for each question. Completing the questionnaire will take between fifteen minutes and half an hour at the most.

Risks/Benefits:
There are no foreseeable risks involved in participating in this research beyond those experienced in everyday life.

There are no direct benefits to you from participation, but your collaboration will help better understand the Ecuadorian immigrant community in London.
Confidentiality:
The information you provide will be anonymous and confidential. I am not asking your name or any other information that will make possible identify who you are. The questionnaires are numbered to keep them organized; in no way it is possible to identify the respondent based on these numbers. In addition, the individual responses will be aggregated to generate a general report, and that is the only information that will be used.

Voluntary Participation:
Participation in this study is voluntary. If you do not want to be in this study, you do not have to participate. Even if you decide to participate, you are free not to answer any question or to withdraw from participation at any time without penalty.

Contacts and Questions:
If you have questions about this research study, please feel free to contact Lucia Orellana-Damacela at or to the faculty sponsor, Dr. R. Scott Tindale at .

If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Compliance Manager in Loyola’s Office of Research Services at 001-773-508-2689.

Statement of Consent:
Completing the following survey indicates that you have read and understood the information provided above, have had an opportunity to ask questions, and agree to participate in this research study. You will be given a copy of this form to keep for your records.
CONSENTIMIENTO PARA PARTICIPAR EN EL ESTUDIO

Título del Proyecto: Transnacionalismo, estrés de migración y bienestar subjetivo de los inmigrantes Ecuatorianos en Londres.

Investigadora: Lucía Orellana-Damacela

Profesor Auspiciante: Dr. R. Scott Tindale

Introducción:
Usted está siendo invitado/a a participar en un estudio conducido por Lucía Orellana-Damacela para su disertación doctoral, llevada a cabo bajo la supervisión del Dr. R. Scott Tindale en el Departamento de Psicología de Loyola University en Chicago.

Usted es invitado/a a participar porque es una persona adulta de origen Ecuatoriano que vive en el área de Londres y sus alrededores.

Por favor, lea esta forma cuidadosamente y haga cualquier pregunta que usted tenga antes de decidir si va a participar en este estudio.

Propósito:
El propósito de este estudio es aprender acerca de las experiencias de los inmigrantes ecuatorianos en Londres, su bienestar emocional y las dificultades que sobrellevan. Este estudio también incluye información sobre el tipo y frecuencia de los contactos que los Ecuatorianos mantienen con el Ecuador.

Procedimientos:
Si usted acepta participar, se le pedirá que llene una encuesta de 5 páginas con preguntas acerca del tipo y la frecuencia de los contactos que usted mantiene con su familia y amigos en Ecuador. Usted también responderá a preguntas sobre el nivel de estrés que usted ha experimentado o no como inmigrante. También responderá a preguntas acerca de cuánto apoyo ha recibido de su familia y amigos, cómo se aprecia usted a sí mismo/a, y cómo se siente emocionalmente. Finalmente, usted responderá preguntas de información general como sexo, edad, lugar de nacimiento, etc. Para responder a las preguntas tiene que escribir muy poco; para la mayoría de las preguntas simplemente tiene que marcar las respuestas. Completar el cuestionario le tomará entre 15 minutos y media hora como máximo.

Riesgos/Beneficios:
No se prevé ningún riesgo para usted por participar en este estudio, más allá de los riesgos propios de la vida diaria.

No se prevé ningún beneficio directo para usted por participar en este estudio. Sin embargo, su colaboración ayudará a conocer mejor la situación de la comunidad Ecuatoriana en Londres.
Confidencialidad:
La información provista por usted será confidencial y anónima. No estoy preguntando su nombre o ninguna información que pueda identificar quién es usted. Los cuestionarios están numerados para mantenerlos organizados, pero no hay manera de identificar a los respondentes basados en esos números. Además, este estudio agrega las respuestas de cada persona en un reporte general, que es un resumen estadístico de las respuestas. Esa es la única manera en que la información será usada.

Participación Voluntaria:
La participación en este estudio es voluntaria. Usted no tiene que participar si no desea tomar parte en este estudio. Incluso si decide participar, es libre de no contestar cualquier pregunta o de terminar su participación en cualquier momento sin ninguna consecuencia.

Contactos y Preguntas:
Si usted tiene alguna pregunta acerca de este estudio, por favor no dude en contactar a Lucia Orellana-Damacela al e-mail o a mi profesor auspiciante, Dr. R. Scott Tindale al e-mail .

Si usted tiene alguna pregunta acerca de sus derechos como participante en esta investigación, puede contactar al Compliance Manager en la oficina de Research Services de Loyola University al teléfono 001-773-508-2689.

Consentimiento:
Llenar la encuesta indica que usted ha leído y entendido la información provista, ha tenido la oportunidad de hacer preguntas, y ha consentido en participar en este estudio de investigación. Se le entregará a usted una copia de esta forma para sus archivos.
APPENDIX C

QUESTIONNAIRE
QUESTIONNAIRE FOR ECUADORIANS LIVING IN ENGLAND

1. Are you an Ecuadorian living in England? Yes ____ No ______

If your answer is YES, please complete this questionnaire. If your answer is NO, please return the questionnaire and do not answer it.

TRANSNATIONAL PRACTICES QUESTIONNAIRE

2. The following are questions about your contacts with Ecuador. Please answer each question by checking the cell that corresponds to your answer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Never</th>
<th>2 Very occasionally (less than once in two years)</th>
<th>3 Occasionally (about once a year)</th>
<th>4 Somewhat often (every 6 months)</th>
<th>5 Often (between three and four times a year)</th>
<th>6 Very often (more than four times a year)</th>
<th>7 All the time (once a month or more)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Participated in social or cultural organizations in Ecuador</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Contributed to community projects in Ecuador</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Participated in charity organizations active in Ecuador</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Participated in sporting, social, cultural or religious events of the Ecuadorian community in England</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Traveled to Ecuador to visit family and friend or attend events</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Made investments or conducted business in Ecuador</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Conducted businesses in England that are geared towards the Ecuadorian community (e.g. food, services, etc.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Contributed to or participated in the activities of an Ecuadorian political party or movement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Taken part in Ecuador-related political rallies and campaigns in England</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Registered to vote/voted in Ecuadorian elections</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Read, listen to or watch news from Ecuador</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Been in contact with your family and friends in Ecuador</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Sent remittances and/or goods to your family in Ecuador</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the last two years, how often have you…
ENGLISH MASTERY
3. Please check the number that better corresponds to your answer for each of the following statements.
   **How well do you**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Very poorly</th>
<th>Poorly</th>
<th>Fairly Well</th>
<th>Very well</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
   a. Speak English? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
   b. Read in English? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
   c. Write in English? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
   d. Understand radio/tv programs in English? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

DEMANDS OF IMMIGRATION SCALE*
4. Below are a number of demands that immigrants might face. Think about how each of these statements fits into your personal experiences as an immigrant within the last three months. For each statement listed, circle the number that better represents how much have you been distressed by each of the problems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all distressed</td>
<td>A little distressed</td>
<td>Somewhat distressed</td>
<td>Moderately distressed</td>
<td>Very distressed</td>
<td>Extremely distressed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**How distressed are you for this …**
   a. I have difficulties doing everyday things because of the language barrier | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
   b. I have fewer career opportunities than British people | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
   c. I feel like an outsider in this country | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
   d. Even though I live here, it does not feel like my country | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
   e. When I think of my past life, I feel emotional and sentimental | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
   f. I have to depend on other people to show or teach me how things are done here in England | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
   g. It is very difficult to obtain a permanent permit to stay and work in this country | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
   h. It is hard for me to adjust here due to the cultural differences between Ecuador and England | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

* Items g and h do not belong to the original scale; they were added by the author (L. O.) for the present study.

Do not use items A to F of the Demands of Immigration Scale without the permission of the author, Karen Aroian. If you want to obtain the complete version of the instrument, contact the author, Karen Aroian at karoian@mail.ucf.edu
ROSENBERG SELF-ESTEEM SCALE

5. Below is a list of statements dealing with your general feelings about how people perceive you. If you strongly agree, check the column 1 and so forth. Please use the scale provided below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>1 Strongly agree</th>
<th>2 Agree</th>
<th>3 Somewhat agree</th>
<th>4 Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>5 Disagree</th>
<th>6 Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. At times, I think I am no good at all</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. I feel that I have a number of good qualities</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. I am able to do things as well as most other people</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. I feel I do not have much to be proud of</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. I certainly feel useless at times</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. I feel that I’m a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. I wish I could have more respect for myself</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. I take a positive attitude toward myself</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NETWORK COMPOSITION

6. Approximately how many of your friends and people with whom you interact socially here in England regularly are from the following places

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Origin</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Place of Origin</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Latin American countries</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>Other countries</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. These questions are about how you feel and how things have been with you during the past month. For each question, please circle a number for the one answer that comes closest to the way you have been feeling.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All of the time</td>
<td>Most of the time</td>
<td>A good bit of the time</td>
<td>Some of the time</td>
<td>A little of the time</td>
<td>None of the time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**How much of the time during the past month…**

a. Were you a happy person? 1 2 3 4 5 6
b. Have you felt calm and peaceful? 1 2 3 4 5 6
c. Have you been a very nervous person? 1 2 3 4 5 6
d. Have you felt downhearted and blue? 1 2 3 4 5 6
e. Did you feel so down in the dumps that nothing could cheer you up?

**SOCIAL SUPPORT (ADAPTED FROM MSPSS)**

8. Read carefully each of the following statements. Please select the number from the scale below that better corresponds to your answer for each of the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very strongly disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Very strongly agree</td>
<td>Does not apply</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**To what extent do you agree with these statements…**

a. My family and/or friends in Ecuador really try to help me 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 9
b. I get the emotional help and support I need from my family and/or friends in Ecuador 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 9
c. I can talk about my problems with my family and/or friends in Ecuador 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 9
d. My family and/or friends in Ecuador are willing to help me make decisions 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 9
e. I can count on my family and friends to keep me informed about the things that affect me back in Ecuador 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 9
f. I can count on my family and/or friends to help me with my personal and business matters back in Ecuador 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 9
g. My family and friends in Ecuador truly appreciate my efforts to help them and my community as much as I can 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 9
h. I can count on my family and friends in England to help me with my personal and business matters 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 9
DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

9. Are you:  Male ☐  Female ☐

10. What year were you born?_______

11. What is your place of birth? __________  Year when you arrived in England_______

12. Are you currently studying?  Yes ☐  No ☐

13. Highest Education level you have reached so far

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary school</th>
<th>High school</th>
<th>Vocational training</th>
<th>Some college</th>
<th>College degree or above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Are you currently working?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes ☐</th>
<th>No ☐</th>
<th>Number of full time jobs</th>
<th>Number of part-time jobs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. What is your yearly income, approximately?  SP 10,000 or less  10,001 to 20,000  20,001 to 30,000  30,001 to 40,000  40,001 or more

16. What is your occupation?  ______________

17. Are you, at the present moment, a British citizen or a permanent resident?  Yes ☐  No ☐

18. Are you currently (please check):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Single</th>
<th>Living with a partner</th>
<th>Married</th>
<th>Divorced</th>
<th>Widowed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. What is your husband or wife (or partner)’s nationality?

Ecuadorian ☐  British ☐  Other countries ☐  Does not have ☐

20. Where do the following members of your family live? (mark all boxes that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Members</th>
<th>Ecuador</th>
<th>England</th>
<th>Other country</th>
<th>Does not have</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents/siblings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
21. In the last year, how often have you been in contact with your family or friends back in Ecuador by any means of communication? Please circle the number that better corresponds to your answer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Less than once a year</th>
<th>1 to 4 times a year</th>
<th>5 to 11 times a year</th>
<th>Monthly/every two weeks</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Daily or more</th>
<th>Does not have</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. In the last year, how often have you used the following media to stay in touch with your family and friends in Ecuador? Write 1 next to the media most often used by you, 2 next to the second most used, and 3 next to the third most used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Media</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Regular mail</td>
<td></td>
<td>d. e-mail, chat, instant messages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Land phone/phone cabins</td>
<td></td>
<td>e. Web sites, blogs, social networks</td>
<td>such as Hi5, Facebook etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Mobile phone/Mobile text messages</td>
<td></td>
<td>f. Other (computer phone calls, web cam, etc)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. If you and your family and friends in Ecuador or elsewhere communicate by internet using a computer, where do you and your family have access to the computer? (mark all the boxes that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persons</th>
<th>Home Computer</th>
<th>Cyber cafes/community centers/other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. You</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Your family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. If you visit web sites to stay informed about Ecuador, to get news about the country, and to be in contact with people, which web sites do you visit more often? (write the name of the sites)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Web Sites</th>
<th>Web Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. How sure are you about you eventually going back to Ecuador?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. I’m sure I will return</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. It is very likely that I will return</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. It is very likely that I will not return</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. I am sure I will NOT return</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. I do not know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
26. City where you live ____________ Borough ______________

27. Do you want to write a comment about your experience as an immigrant in this country?

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

MANY THANKS FOR ANSWERING THESE QUESTIONS!!!

Date ________________ Place of collection ________________
CUESTIONARIO PARA ECUATORIANOS/AS QUE VIVEN EN INGLATERRA

1. ¿Es usted un/una Ecuatoriano/a viviendo en Inglaterra?  
   Si ____     No ______  
   Si usted contestó que SI, por favor responda a este cuestionario. Si contestó que NO, por favor devuelva el cuestionario y no lo conteste.

CUESTIONARIO DE PRACTICAS TRANSNACIONALES

2. Estas son preguntas sobre sus contactos con Ecuador. Por favor, conteste cada pregunta marcando el casillero que mejor corresponde a su respuesta.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Nunca</th>
<th>2. Casi Nunca (menos de una vez al año)</th>
<th>3. De vez en cuando (como una vez al año)</th>
<th>4. Con algo de frecuencia (cada 6 meses)</th>
<th>5. Con frecuencia (entre 3 y 4 veces al año)</th>
<th>6. Con bastante frecuencia (más de 4 veces al año)</th>
<th>7. Siempre (una vez al mes o más)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>¿En los últimos dos años, con qué frecuencia usted ha...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Participado en organizaciones sociales o culturales en Ecuador?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Contribuido a proyectos para la comunidad en Ecuador?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Ayudado a organizaciones caritativas activas en Ecuador?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Participado en eventos deportivos, sociales, culturales o religiosos de la comunidad Ecuatoriana en Inglaterra?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Viajado a Ecuador a visitar familia y amigos o atender eventos?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Hecho inversiones o negocios en Ecuador?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Hecho negocios en Inglaterra para atender a la comunidad Ecuatoriana (como vender comida, prestar servicios, etc.)?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Contribuido o participado en las actividades de un partido o movimiento político Ecuatoriano?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Participado en campañas o eventos políticos en Inglaterra relacionados con Ecuador o la comunidad Ecuatoriana?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Registrado para votar o votado en las elecciones Ecuatorianas?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Leído, escuchado o visto noticias de Ecuador?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Estado en contacto con su familia y amigos en Ecuador?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Enviado remesas y/o regalos a su familia en Ecuador?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DOMINIO DEL INGLÉS

3. Por favor marque su respuesta para cada una de las siguientes preguntas:

**¿Qué tan bien...**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nada</th>
<th>Muy mal</th>
<th>No muy bien</th>
<th>Bien</th>
<th>Muy bien</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Habla usted Inglés?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Lee usted en Inglés?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Escribe usted en Inglés?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Entiende programas de radio o TV en Inglés?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ESCALA DE DEMANDAS DE INMIGRACIÓN*

4. Abajo aparece un número de problemas que los inmigrantes pueden tener. Para cada problema, piense en cómo el problema encaja en sus experiencias personales recientes (en los últimos tres meses) como inmigrante. Marque la respuesta que describe cuán afectado/a o molesto/a está Ud. por cada uno de los problemas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 No Afectado</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Casi nada</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Algo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Bastante</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Muy Afectado</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Extremadamente</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**¿Cuánto le han afectado a usted estos problemas?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Tengo dificultades para realizar cosas corrientes debido a la barrera del idioma</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Tengo menos oportunidades profesionales que los británicos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. La gente de este país me trata como un/a extraño/a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Aunque vivo aquí, no me siento como en mi país; no me siento cómodo/a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Cuando pienso en mi vida pasada, me siento emotivo/a y sentimental</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Tengo que depender de otras personas para que me muestren o me enseñen cómo se hacen las cosas aquí en Inglaterra</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Es muy complicado obtener un permiso permanente para vivir y trabajar en este país</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Es difícil para mí acostumbrarme a este país debido a las diferencias culturales con Ecuador</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Items G y H no forman parte de a escala original; fueron añadidos por la autora (L.O.) para este estudio. No use los items A a F de la escala de Demandas de Inmigración sin el permiso de la autora, Karen Aroian. Si desea la versión completa del instrumento, contacte a la autora: Karen Aroian en karoian@mail.ucf.edu.
ESCALA ROSENBERG DE AUTO-ESTIMA

5. A continuación se presenta una lista de afirmaciones sobre la manera en que uno puede sentirse consigo mismo. Para cada pregunta, marque el casillero que mejor corresponde a su respuesta.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cómo se siente....</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. En general, estoy satisfecho/a conmigo/a mismo/a</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. A veces pienso que no soy bueno/a en nada</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Tengo la sensación de que poseo algunas buenas cualidades</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Soy capaz de hacer las cosas tan bien como la mayoría de las personas</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Siento que no tengo demasiadas cosas de las que sentirme orgulloso/a</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. A veces me siento realmente inútil</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Tengo la sensación de que soy una persona de valía al menos igual que la mayoría de la gente</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Ojalá me respetara más a mí mismo/a</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. En definitiva, tiendo a pensar que soy un/a fracasado/a</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Tengo una actitud positiva hacia mí mismo/a</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMPOSICION DE LA RED SOCIAL

6. ¿Aproximadamente cuántos amigos y gente con quien usted socializa frecuentemente aquí en Inglaterra son de los siguientes lugares?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lugar de Origen</th>
<th>Número</th>
<th>Lugar de Origen</th>
<th>Número</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>Inglaterra</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otros países Latino</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>Otros países</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americanos</td>
<td>______</td>
<td></td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Estas preguntas son acerca de cómo se ha sentido Ud. y cómo le han ido las cosas en las últimas cuatro semanas. Para cada pregunta, por favor marque la respuesta que más se acerque al modo en que usted se ha estado sintiendo.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Todo el tiempo</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>La mayor parte del tiempo</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Gran parte del tiempo</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Parte del tiempo</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Muy poco del tiempo</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Ni una vez</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

¿Por cuánto tiempo en las últimas 4 semanas:

a. Se ha sentido feliz?

b. Se ha sentido Ud. calmado/a y en paz?

c. Se ha sentido Ud. muy nervioso/a?

d. Se ha sentido desanimado/a y triste?

e. Se ha sentido Ud tan decaído/a que nada podía alegrarlo/a?

APOYO SOCIAL TRANSNACIONAL (ADAPTADO DEL MSPSS)

8. Lea cada una de las siguientes frases cuidadosamente. Marque el casillero que mejor corresponde a su respuesta para cada una de las siguientes preguntas.

| 1 | Totalmente En desacuerdo | 2 | Bastante en desacuerdo | 3 | Más bien en desacuerdo | 4 | Ni acuerdo ni desacuerdo | 5 | Más bien de acuerdo | 6 | Bastante de acuerdo | 7 | Totalmente de acuerdo | 9 | No me aplica |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

¿Qué tanto está usted de acuerdo con lo siguiente…?

a. Mi familia y/o mis amigos en Ecuador realmente tratan de ayudarme
b. Obtengo de mi familia y/o amigos en Ecuador la ayuda y el apoyo emocional que necesito
c. Yo puedo hablar de mis problemas con mi familia y/o amigos en Ecuador
d. Mi familia y/o amigos en Ecuador se muestran dispuestos a ayudarme para tomar decisiones
e. Yo puedo contar con mi familia y/o amigos para mantenerme informado/a acerca de noticias de Ecuador que me afecten a mí
f. Yo puedo contar con mi familia y/o amigos para ayudarme con mis asuntos personales y de negocios en Ecuador si es necesario
g. Mi familia y/o amigos en Ecuador realmente aprecian mis esfuerzos para ayudarlos a ellos y a mi comunidad de acuerdo a mis posibilidades
h. Yo puedo contar con mi familia y/o amigos aquí en Inglaterra para ayudarme con mis asuntos personales y de negocios si es necesario
INFORMACION DEMOGRAFICA

9. Usted es:  Hombre □  Mujer □

10. En qué año nació? ______

11. Cual es su lugar de nacimiento? ______  12. ¿En que año llegó a Inglaterra? ______

13. Está usted estudiando?  Si □  No □

14. Nivel de educación más alto al que usted ha llegado (marque una respuesta)

| Escuela Primaria □ | Escuela secundaria □ | Entrenamiento vocacional □ | Algunos años de universidad □ | Título universitario o estudios de post grado □ |

15. Está usted trabajando en la actualidad?

| Si □ | No □ | Número de trabajos a tiempo completo | Número de trabajos a tiempo parcial |

16. Cuánto gana por año, aproximadamente? SP 10,000 o menos □  10,001 a 20,000 □  20,001 a 30,000 □  30,001 a 40,000 □  40,001 o más □

17. ¿Cual es su ocupación? _______________

18. ¿Es usted un/a ciudadano/a Británico/a o residente permanente?  Si □  No □

19. Actualmente usted es (por favor marque una respuesta):

| Soltero/a □ | Conviviendo □ | Casado/a □ | Divorciado/a □ | Viudo/a □ |

20. ¿Cual es la nacionalidad de su esposo/a o pareja?  Ecuatoriano/a □  Británico/a □  Otros países □  No tiene pareja □

21. Dónde viven los siguientes miembros de su familia (marque todas las columnas que apliquen)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Familia</th>
<th>Ecuador</th>
<th>Inglaterra</th>
<th>Otros países</th>
<th>No tiene</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Esposo/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hijos/as</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padres/hermanos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
22. ¿En el último año, con qué frecuencia ha estado usted en contacto con su familia y amigos en Ecuador por cualquier medio de comunicación? Por favor marque una respuesta.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nunca</th>
<th>Menos de una vez al año</th>
<th>1 a 4 veces al año</th>
<th>5 a 11 veces al año</th>
<th>Mensualmente / cada dos semanas</th>
<th>Semanalmente</th>
<th>A diario o más</th>
<th>No tiene familia en Ecuador</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. ¿En el último año, qué medio de comunicación ha usado más para estar en contacto con su familia y amigos en el Ecuador? (Escriba 1 a lado del medio MAS usado, y marque todos los otros que usa)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Media</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
<td>d.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>e.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>f.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correo regular</td>
<td></td>
<td>e-mail, chat /mensajes instantáneos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teléfono regular/cabinas</td>
<td></td>
<td>Web sites, blogs, redes sociales (Hi5, Facebook, etc)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teléfono celular/mensajes de texto</td>
<td></td>
<td>Otros (llamadas por computadora, cámaras web, etc)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. ¿Si usted y su familia en Ecuador se comunican por Internet, dónde encuentran acceso a las computadoras? (marque todo lo que aplique)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Personas</th>
<th>Computadora en la casa</th>
<th>Cyber cafes/centros comunitarios/otros</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Usted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Su familia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. ¿Si usted visita sitios web (web sites) para estar informado de las noticias y eventos en Ecuador, o para estar en contacto con gente, qué sitios visita con más frecuencia? (escriba los nombres de los sitios)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sitios Web</th>
<th></th>
<th>Sitios Web</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
<td>c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
<td>d.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. ¿Qué tan seguro/a está usted de regresar o no a vivir al Ecuador?

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Seguro que regreso</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Es muy probable que regrese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Es muy probable que NO regrese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Seguro que NO regreso</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>No sé</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. ¿En que ciudad vive? _______________ Parroquia (Borough) _______________
28. Desea hacer algún comentario acerca de su experiencia como inmigrante en este país?

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

MUCHAS GRACIAS POR SU TIEMPO Y POR CONTESTAR ESTAS PREGUNTAS!!!

Fecha ________________ Lugar ____________________
REFERENCE LIST


VITA

Lucía Orellana-Damacela was born and raised in Guayaquil, Ecuador. She studied Psychology at the Universidad Católica de Guayaquil, where she later became a professor in the Department of Psychology. During this tenure, Lucía became involved in conducting social research and need assessments in organizational settings both at the University and as a consultant. After being granted a Fulbright-Laspau scholarship, Lucía moved to Chicago and enrolled in the Applied Social Psychology program at Loyola University. Lucía had been particularly attracted to the Loyola program because of its emphasis on applied settings and evaluation. While at Loyola, Lucía worked conducting research and evaluation at CURL, Loyola’s Center for Urban Research and Learning.

After obtaining her Master’s degree at Loyola, Lucía pursued her doctoral degree within the Applied Social Psychology program at Loyola University. During these academic years, Lucía has authored and co-authored several book chapters and articles published at refereed journals, and has participated in many conferences as panel and poster presenter.

Lucía’s doctoral training took a few detours as she and her family relocated internationally on various occasions, the last move being to Surrey, England, where she currently resides with her husband Roque, their son Roque Darío, their daughter Gabriela, and their two guinea pigs.