

Stress internalization associated with cognitive decline among older U.S. Chinese

Michelle H Chen<sup>1,2</sup>; Yiming Ma<sup>1,3</sup>; Charu Verma<sup>1</sup>; Stephanie Bergren<sup>1</sup>; XinQi Dong<sup>4</sup>; William T Hu<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Institute for Health, Health Care Policy and Aging Research, Rutgers University, 112 Paterson St., New Brunswick, New Jersey, USA

<sup>2</sup> Department of Neurology, Robert Wood Johnson Medical School, Rutgers University, 125 Paterson St., New Brunswick, New Jersey, USA

<sup>3</sup> Children's Hospital of Philadelphia, 3401 Civic Center Blvd., Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA

<sup>4</sup> Institute for Population Health Sciences, Chicago, Illinois, USA

**Co-Corresponding authors:**

Michelle H Chen; Rutgers University; [michelle.chen2@rutgers.edu](mailto:michelle.chen2@rutgers.edu); 112 Paterson St., New Brunswick, NJ 08901

William T Hu; Rutgers University; [william.hu@rutgers.edu](mailto:william.hu@rutgers.edu); 125 Paterson St., New Brunswick, NJ 08901

## **Abstract**

**INTRODUCTION:** Behavioral and sociocultural factors in minority populations in the U.S. are commonly examined as independent contributors or buffers to health disparities in cognitive decline, but can demonstrate significant inter-relatedness due to broader contextual factors (e.g., acculturation). Analyzing influence of correlated behavioral and sociocultural traits can better identify targets for future intervention. The current study aimed to account for interdependent risk and resilience factors associated with cognitive decline in non-demented older U.S.-dwelling Chinese adults.

**METHODS:** The sample consisted of 1,528 older U.S. Chinese (60 and older) with normal cognition and function at baseline who attended three waves of the Population Study of ChINEse Elderly (PINE). We used principal component analysis to generate memory and executive functioning outcomes; factor analysis to reduce behavioral and sociocultural variables into latent constructs; and linear mixed-effects models to evaluate the impact of these constructs, as well as of demographic and medical factors (e.g., cardiovascular disease), on longitudinal rates of cognitive decline.

**RESULTS:** Factor analysis identified three main behavioral/sociocultural constructs: stress internalization, neighborhood/community cohesion, and external social support. Among these, only stress internalization – consisting of greater perceived stress, greater hopelessness, and lower conscientiousness – was associated with longitudinal decline in memory, while none with decline in executive functioning. Neither acculturation nor social engagement was related to decline in memory or executive function, even though participants with greater acculturation or social engagement had better baseline cognitive performance.

**DISCUSSION:** Using a psychometrically and statistically robust model, we found that only the factor underlying stress processing, hopelessness, and conscientiousness was associated with rates of memory decline in this older non-demented U.S. Chinese cohort. These maladaptive traits have been linked to the Asian model minority stereotype but all the same potentially modifiable. Future studies examining disparate health outcomes must account for inter-relatedness among behavioral and sociocultural factors to identify root causes.

## 1. Introduction

The number of older Asian Americans is expected to grow 93% by 2040.<sup>1</sup> Among ethnic Asian groups, U.S. Chinese (individuals of Chinese descent living in the U.S.) represent the largest subgroup and constitute 24% of all Asian Americans.<sup>2</sup> Older U.S. Chinese – similar to other older racial/ethnic minority populations – are consistently underrepresented in memory and aging studies,<sup>3</sup> yet available studies suggest older U.S. Chinese face increased risk of delayed diagnosis and treatment of dementia.<sup>4</sup> This can result from reduced knowledge of dementia as an illness rather than an inevitable aspect of aging,<sup>5,6</sup> cultural stigma associated dementia and other mental illnesses,<sup>7,8</sup> and stronger dyadic or family interdependence which can mask functional decline.<sup>9,10</sup> The largely immigrant (69%)<sup>11</sup> U.S. Chinese population may also have health-related knowledge which has remained stagnant from their time of immigration, and their access to lay<sup>12</sup> or professional<sup>13,14</sup> sources of information could be made worse by 67% of older U.S. Chinese speaking English very poorly or not at all.<sup>11</sup> Even though common health prevention approaches may provide cognitive benefits across racial/ethnic groups, there is a paucity of direct evidence linking factors targeted by these approaches to rates of cognitive decline among U.S. Chinese.

The Chicago-based **P**opulation Study of **Ch**INese **E**lderly (PINE) is the largest community-based cohort study on older U.S. Chinese. Unlike earlier studies on cognition among Asian Americans such as the Honolulu-Asia Aging Study (HAAS)<sup>15</sup> and the Multi-Ethnic Study of Atherosclerosis (MESA),<sup>16</sup> PINE participants represented a smaller ethnic group (Chinese Americans in the PINE vs. Japanese Americans in the HAAS who represent 25-45% of the Hawaii population throughout the 20<sup>th</sup> Century<sup>17</sup>), were more likely to live in an ethnic enclave (1/3 of Chicago's Chinese population live in or near its Chinatown), and had lower socioeconomic status (23% of PINE participants vs. 64% of Chinese MESA participants had at

least some college education). These distinctions make PINE a unique resource to examine the impact of sociobehavioral factors on cognition.

Prior PINE studies – often examining a select number of risk or resilience factor and a single mean cognitive score – correlated multiple measures of healthier living (e.g., social engagement, cognitive leisure activities) with better cognition.<sup>18-22</sup> However, repeatedly examining only subsets of factors increases cohort-level Type I errors. Multiple sociobehavioral variables in immigrant populations can also be jointly influenced by internal (e.g., acculturation) or external (e.g., access to transportation) factors. This interdependence between variables is not new in biomedical research, but is better accounted in genomic, proteomic, and other big data approaches through haplotypes (e.g., genes inherited in a related fashion) and eigenvectors (e.g., proteins regulated in a related fashion). For outcomes, prior PINE studies operationalized cognitive decline as a one-way crossing beyond a threshold (Z-score of -1.5) of a participant's average performance in five short tests relative to the entire cohort.<sup>23</sup> The potential inclusion of people with mild baseline impairment during derivation of this threshold risks underestimating the proportion of people experiencing meaningful cognitive decline, and the threshold approach overlooks common fluctuations in cognitive performance in population studies. Together, conceptual and methodological shortcomings can conflate statistical anomalies with meaningful associations which in turn worsen health disparities among older U.S. Chinese.

To best prioritize actionable risk and resilience factors in age-associated cognitive decline among older U.S. Chinese, the current paper will address limitations of prior PINE studies by identifying participants with normal cognition at baseline, assessing longitudinal cognitive trajectories, and accounting for interdependence among sociobehavioral risk factors.

## **2. Methods**

### **2.1.Ethics in Human Research**

This study was approved by the Institutional Review Boards of Rush University Medical Center and Rutgers University. The study was performed in accordance with ethical standards laid down in the 1964 Declaration of Helsinki and its later amendments, and signed informed consents were obtained from all participants.

### **2.2.Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion**

The PINE investigators worked intensively with a community advisory board (CAB), consisting of diverse community stakeholders across 20 organizations in the Chicago metropolitan area, in designing the study and subject recruitment.<sup>24</sup> The measures were translated and back-translated by an experienced bilingual and bicultural research team into both simplified and traditional Chinese characters.<sup>23</sup> Since the study focused on older U.S. Chinese, participants were all of Chinese descent, although country of origin can vary across multiple countries. To ensure diversity of Chinese subcultures, study interviews were offered in both Mandarin and Cantonese, and there was a concerted effort to recruit approximately equal number of men and women as well as individuals with disabilities.

### **2.3.Participants**

Study sample was drawn from waves 1-3 of PINE. Study design and participant characteristics were previously detailed.<sup>24,25</sup> Briefly, PINE is a community-based epidemiological study of older adults of Chinese descent (aged 60 and older) living in the greater Chicago, Illinois area (midwestern U.S.). In-person interviews were conducted in 2011-2013, 2013-2015, and 2015-2017 for the three waves. 1,528 subjects who were non-demented at

baseline and attended all three waves were included in this study (see Figure 1 for participant selection).

## **2.4.Measures**

See Supplementary Table 1 for comprehensive information about all study measures.

### **2.4.1. *Cognitive functioning***

Five cognitive measures were collected in PINE: Global cognitive functioning by the Chinese version of the Mini-Mental State Examination (C-MMSE),<sup>26</sup> episodic memory by the East Boston Memory Test (EBMT immediate and delayed recall),<sup>27</sup> working memory by the Wechsler Memory Scale-Revised (WMS-R)<sup>28</sup> Digit Span Backward subtest, and processing speed by the oral version of the Symbol Digit Modalities Test (SDMT).<sup>29</sup>

### **2.4.2. *Potential predictors of cognitive functioning***

Demographic variables included age at wave 1, sex, years of formal education, marital status, and annual income. Acculturation was measured by the PINE Acculturation Scale.<sup>30</sup> Current and past health were assessed by self-reported diagnosis of a list of health conditions (Supplementary Table 1), along with a semi-quantitative sum of four cardiovascular risks (heart disease, stroke, high blood pressure, and diabetes). Symptoms related to 15 organ systems and smoking history were also assessed. Depression,<sup>31,32</sup> anxiety,<sup>33</sup> conscientiousness/neuroticism,<sup>34</sup> perceived stress,<sup>35</sup> hopelessness,<sup>36</sup> neighborhood cohesion,<sup>37</sup> sense of community,<sup>38</sup> perceived social support,<sup>39</sup> and social activity engagement<sup>40</sup> were assessed using standardized self-report inventories (Supplementary Table 1).

## **2.5.Statistical Analyses**

See Supplementary Table 1 for details regarding data transformations. Data analyses were conducted using IBM SPSS version 28 and plots were generated using R version 4.3.1.

### ***2.5.1. Cognitive outcomes***

To address the potential inclusion of participants with baseline cognitive impairment in the derivation of Z-scores, we established a normative subgroup within PINE. We first identified participants with C-MMSE>28 at wave 3 which excluded incident dementia while allowing for practice effects during early waves. To additionally account for the possibility that some cognitively impaired individuals had high C-MMSE, we reduced heterogeneity in this normal cohort by removing individuals who had Lawton-Brody Instrumental Activities of Daily Living (IADL)<7 (equivalent to Z-score of -1.5 as there was no difference between men and women in this cohort) during any wave. The resultant subgroup's performance at wave 1 (n=724) formed the normative curve for each cognitive measure. Raw performance also underwent linear regression analysis to adjust for age, sex, and education before Z-transformation to produce adjusted Z-scores. All participants' Z-scores across the five measures were then analyzed using principal component analysis (PCA; Varimax rotation), arriving at two principal components (PC) whose scores were used as cognitive outcomes.

### ***2.5.2. Predictors***

To test the non-independent nature of sociobehavioral risk/resilience factors, we conducted exploratory factor analyses (EFA) to identify latent constructs (principal axis factoring, Equamax rotation). Factor scores were included as sociobehavioral predictors in subsequent models. Spearman correlation was conducted to evaluate collinearity among predictors.

### ***2.5.3. Associations between predictors and cognitive outcomes***

Linear mixed-effects models (LMM) were performed to identify factors influencing baseline or longitudinal (interaction term with time) cognition. Because we were mostly



concerned with intra-individual changes over time, use of PC scores in LMM also reduces influence from one or more cognitive tests having greater fluctuation. Predictors were entered into the models as fixed factors or covariates. Time in months since the baseline visit was entered both as fixed and random effects, and subject's random intercept was included to account for within-person clustering. A first-order autoregressive covariance structure was used to model the random effects. Models were built stepwise, such that all predictors were included in the initial model but were iteratively removed for  $p > 0.15$ . The Akaike information criterion ( $\Delta AIC > 2$ ) was used to decide if a model iteration was better than the previous with a preference for simpler model for  $\Delta AIC \leq 2$ .

### **3. Results**

PINE participants had relatively low socioeconomic status (SES), with average education of 9 years and 83.73% making less than \$10,000 per year (Table 1). Most immigrated to the U.S. during middle age after 1980, and have been U.S. residents for almost two decades.

#### **3.1. PCA of cognitive outcomes**

In keeping with the need for rigorous analysis of cognition including deriving cognitive PC scores for analysis using LMM, up to 20% of participants' cognitive scores fluctuated by one standard deviation or more between time points (Supplementary Figure 1). PCA of the five adjusted cognitive Z-scores showed Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) sampling adequacy of 0.396 and Barlett's test of sphericity at  $p < 0.001$ . These modest correlations among the cognitive measures thus supported our selection of PCA over factor analysis for cognitive outcomes. Two PCs were extracted (eigenvalues  $> 1.0$ , Figure 2 Panel B): EBMT-immediate recall, EBMT-delayed recall, and EBMT-percent retention loaded onto the memory PC; digit span backward and SDMT loaded onto the executive functioning PC.

### **3.2.EFA of psychosocial constructs**

As predicted, bi-variate analysis showed multiple correlations among sociobehavioral variables (Figure 2 Panel A). EFA identified three factors (scree plot, two with eigenvalues >1.0; KMO of 0.624, Barlett's test of sphericity  $p < 0.001$ ; Figure 2 Panel C). One factor (stress internalization) loaded onto measures of hopelessness, perceived stress, and lack of conscientiousness; a second factor (neighborhood/community cohesion) loaded onto neighborhood cohesion and sense of community. The third factor (external stress alleviation) loaded onto higher perceived social support and lower levels of perceived stress. No factor loaded onto social engagement and acculturation, and they were subsequently analyzed as independent variables.

### **3.3. Identifying significant predictors of cognitive outcomes**

For memory, greater baseline PC score was associated with older age, fewer years of formal education, higher annual income, higher level of acculturation, and absence of strokes. Some of these differences dissipated over time, including effects from education and acculturation regressing towards the mean (Table 2, Figure 3, and Supplementary Table 2). Higher stress internalization and stroke were each associated with greater rates of memory decline over time. For each standard deviation increase in stress internalization, we observed a 0.024 unit greater annualized decline in memory function. History of stroke was associated with 0.084 unit greater annualized decline in memory, although the overall frequency of stroke diagnosis ( $n=50$ ) was low so interpretation may be limited.

We next examined factors associated with change in executive functioning over time. Multiple factors affecting baseline memory PC score also influenced executive functioning PC score, including age, formal education, annual income, and acculturation. Depressive symptoms,

stroke, heart disease, and low social engagement but greater neighborhood/community cohesion factor were additionally associated with worse baseline executive function (Supplementary Tables 3 & 4). None of the clinical or sociobehavioral factors examined influenced longitudinal executive functioning, and only greater formal education was associated with greater decline in executive function (Supplementary Table 4). However, there was no difference in slope of unadjusted executive function scores over time among PINE participants (Supplementary Figure 2), and we suspect the effect of education on executive functioning to result from education-adjustment during Z-transformation. As this relationship was not observed for memory, we made the conservative conclusion that greater education in older U.S. Chinese was not protective against longitudinal decline in executive functioning.

#### **4. Discussion**

Among sociobehavioral factors examined in PINE, we identified three intrinsic constructs linking multiple survey outcomes: stress internalization, neighborhood/community cohesion, and external stress alleviation. Even when compared alongside demographic and clinical risk factors, stress internalization showed strong association with memory decline over three consecutive waves in PINE. In contrast, none influenced change in executive functioning over time.

Most studies leveraging the HAAS and the MESA have focused on biological predictors of cognitive decline. Participants in these studies either represent one of the most populous minority ethnic groups in the region (HAAS) or had high SES (MESA), and generalizability of these studies to U.S. mainland Asian Americans or Asians with lower SES is unknown. To our knowledge, only one previous PINE study examined cognitive trajectories in more than two waves.<sup>18</sup> It identified a strong relationship between baseline function and rates of decline (e.g.,

those with worst baseline function had fastest cognitive decline). As we discussed, the group with worst baseline function and fastest temporal decline likely included participants with undiagnosed cognitive impairment. Sociobehavioral factors associated with their cognitive change may have more to do with behaviors during early stages of dementia than risk-associated behaviors predisposing to dementia onset. A corollary of this is the inclusion of participants with incident cognitive impairment among those with better baseline cognition. In keeping with these concerns, cross-sectional associations with cognition identified in prior PINE studies largely failed to influence longitudinal cognition in our analysis – due to fallacy of reverse causality, regression towards the mean, or both. Our study thus underscores the importance of leveraging longitudinal cognitive and functional assessment to retrospectively identify a baseline group with normal cognition,

The identification of multiple latent sociobehavioral constructs has conceptual and practical implications. It is not known if there exists more prominent clustering of sociobehavioral factors in older immigrants or minority adults than in older White adults. The first two groups' neighborhood-level factors were best known to be more influenced by race relations (e.g., redlining) than choice.<sup>41</sup> Behavioral clustering was also identified in geographically dispersed research participants according to income and cultural factors.<sup>42</sup> The novel construct consisting of hopelessness, perceived stress, and low conscientiousness in PINE deserves follow-up investigation for its association with longitudinal memory decline. While we conceptualized this factor as stress internalization, these traits could also represent a culturally specific phenotype for depression or another mood disorder. In keeping with this, older Asian immigrants in North America – especially among those with lower levels of acculturation and English proficiency – face increased depression risks.<sup>43</sup> Higher perceived stress itself is linked to

lower baseline cognitive scores, faster cognitive, increased risk of dementia, and reduced brain volume.<sup>44-47</sup> Hopelessness<sup>48,49</sup> and low conscientiousness have also been respectively linked to cognitive impairment in the Finland-based Cardiovascular Risk Factors, Aging, and Dementia Study in Finland<sup>48</sup> and the U.S.-based Religious Order Study.<sup>50</sup> Whether these traits herald more severe depression<sup>44</sup> or pre-symptomatic neurodegeneration<sup>50</sup> remains to be determined, yet their replication across three very distinct cohorts deserves further mechanistic exploration. Because these traits correspond more to stress perception and processing than mere presence of stressors, their potentially modifiable nature can be a unique focus of future sociobehavioral intervention.

One potentially unique aspect of stress internalization among older Chinese adults involves the model minority stereotype. Asian Americans are often monolithically seen as being spared by health disparities,<sup>51</sup> and older U.S. Chinese may thus feel the need to silently endure various psychosocial stressors such as lower English proficiency and acculturation, reduced participation in mainstream American society and healthcare, and discrimination. In the context of low SES, high-effort coping have been associated with worse health outcomes – a phenomenon known as John Henryism, originally posited to explain the high prevalence of hypertension among low resourced Southern Black men.<sup>52</sup> While John Henryism has been primarily studied in Black Americans,<sup>53</sup> the notion of high effort coping beyond available resources may similarly explain a maladaptive response to the model minority stereotype among PINE participants, especially if they regularly deal with greater stress than HAAS participants and with fewer resources than Chinese MESA participants. If this relationship is validated, efforts to alleviate the model minority stress may be more fruitful in preventing longitudinal cognitive decline in older U.S. Chinese than nebulous public health efforts focused on the built environment or community dynamics.

Notably, we failed to replicate in our longitudinal analysis many findings from cross-sectional analyses of the same cohort. This is not unexpected, as some factors (e.g., education, acculturation) may improve performance on baseline neuropsychological testing<sup>54,55</sup> without altering longitudinal rates of change. Parallel to our observation, this phenomenon has been observed in U.S. Latino immigrants.<sup>56,57</sup> However, limited benefits of other sociobehavioral factors may deserve a closer examination. For example, the role of social engagement on cognition is also more controversial in older Black<sup>58,59</sup> and Japanese<sup>60</sup> than White Americans.<sup>61</sup> It remains possible that existing scales to assess social engagement in mainstream U.S. society do not fully capture the spectrum of leisurely or engaging activities among Hispanic, Asian, and Black Americans. For U.S. Chinese, affirmative responses to social engagement questionnaires may be limited by feasibility and affordability of overnight trips, eating out, or attending a concert for immigrants who do not drive. Lower English proficiency and personal preferences may further distance survey responses from social fulfillment or cognitive enrichment. Until more culturally-relevant scales for social engagement or support can confirm their protective effects against cognitive decline in U.S. Chinese, these factors should be reserved more for promotion of mental well-being than evidence-based prevention of cognitive aging.

Results from this study should be interpreted with the following limitations. While this was the largest community-based study of older U.S. Chinese, participants were all recruited from the Chicago metropolitan area and nearly 1000 individuals were lost to follow-up between waves 1 and 3. Sampling bias may thus limit our findings' generalizability, but the consistency of our positive finding on stress internalization and memory with other large non-Asian cohorts was reassuring. Typical for community-based studies, our small cognitive battery may lack sufficient sensitivity for subtle cognitive decline. The brain-behavior relationships for memory

and executive function components also have not been directly validated in a Chinese-speaking population, although we were successful in deriving two distinct cognitive PCs in keeping with their English originals. While many study instruments were commonly used in China-based cohorts and others and were forward/backward translated with the input of a CAB, their cultural appropriateness may lag behind linguistic accuracy. Many sociobehavioral variables were based on self-reports which can be subject to response or recall bias. Similarly, a diagnosis-based derivation of medical co-morbidities risks reverse causality related to health care access. Nevertheless, we present a novel yet robust finding in line with other large population-based non-Asian cohorts which should broadens its generalizability and should further prioritize it in future prevention studies.

**Funding**

This study was funded by the Rutgers University Asian Resource Center for Minority Aging Research (RCMAR; P30 AG059304), Rutgers University Resource Center for Alzheimer's and Dementia Research in Asian and Pacific Americans (RCASIA; P30 AG083257), and the Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative (ADNI; U19 AG024904) Health Equity Scholar Program, which were all funded by the National Institute on Aging (NIA).

**Declaration of interest**

WTH has patents on CSF-based diagnosis of FTLTDP and prognosis of MCI-AD and SMA; licensed COVID-19 serology tests to SigmaMillipore; and consulted for Apellis, Biogen, and Fujirebio.



## References

1. Administration for Community Living. *2021 Profile of Older Americans*. 2022. November 2022.
2. Budiman A, Ruiz NG. *Key facts about Asian Americans, a diverse and growing population*. 2021. <https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2021/04/29/key-facts-about-asian-americans/>
3. Mehta KM, Yeo GW. Systematic review of dementia prevalence and incidence in United States race/ethnic populations. *Alzheimer's & Dementia*. 2017;13(1):72-83.
4. Chow T, Liu C, Fuh J, et al. Neuropsychiatric symptoms of Alzheimer's disease differ in Chinese and American patients. *International Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry*. 2002;17(1):22-28.
5. Woo BK, Mehta P. Examining the differences in the stigma of dementia and diabetes among Chinese Americans. *Geriatrics & gerontology international*. 2017;17(5):760-764.
6. Diamond AG, Woo BK. Duration of residence and dementia literacy among Chinese Americans. *International Journal of Social Psychiatry*. 2014;60(4):406-409.
7. Woo BK, Chung JO. Public stigma associated with dementia in a Chinese-American immigrant population. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*. 2013;61(10):1832-1833.
8. Liu D, Hinton L, Tran C, Hinton D, Barker JC. Reexamining the relationships among dementia, stigma, and aging in immigrant Chinese and Vietnamese family caregivers. *Journal of cross-cultural gerontology*. 2008;23(3):283-299.
9. Chang Y-P, Schneider JK, Sessanna L. Decisional conflict among Chinese family caregivers regarding nursing home placement of older adults with dementia. *Journal of Aging Studies*. 2011;25(4):436-444.
10. Sheng B, Law CB, Yeung KM. Characteristics and diagnostic profile of patients seeking dementia care in a memory clinic in Hong Kong. *International Psychogeriatrics*. 2009;21(2):392-400.
11. Tsoh JY, Sentell T, Gildengorin G, et al. Healthcare communication barriers and self-rated health in older Chinese American immigrants. *Journal of community health*. 2016;41(4):741-752.
12. Tang F, Zhang W, Chi I, Dong X. Acculturation and activity engagement among older Chinese Americans. *Gerontology and geriatric medicine*. 2018;4:2333721418778198.
13. Lum TY, Vanderaa JP. Health disparities among immigrant and non-immigrant elders: The association of acculturation and education. *Journal of immigrant and minority health*. 2010;12(5):743-753.
14. Anderson MD, Merkin SS, Everson-Rose SA, et al. Health literacy within a diverse community-based cohort: the multi-ethnic study of atherosclerosis. *Journal of immigrant and minority health*. 2021;23:659-667.
15. White L, Petrovitch H, Ross GW, et al. Prevalence of dementia in older Japanese-American men in Hawaii: the Honolulu-Asia aging study. *Jama*. 1996;276(12):955-960.
16. Fitzpatrick AL, Rapp SR, Luchsinger J, et al. Sociodemographic correlates of cognition in the Multi-Ethnic Study of Atherosclerosis (MESA). *The American Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry*. 2015;23(7):684-697.
17. Schmitt RC. *Demographic statistics of Hawaii: 1778-1965*. University of Hawaii Press; 1968.

18. Tang F, Li K, Rauktis ME, Buckley TD, Chi I. Immigration Experience and Cognitive Function Trajectories Among Older Chinese Immigrants. *The Journals of Gerontology: Series B*. 2023;78(1):124-135.
19. Tang F, Zhang W, Chi I, Li M, Dong XQ. Importance of activity engagement and neighborhood to cognitive function among older Chinese Americans. *Research on aging*. 2020;42(7-8):226-235.
20. Li M, Dong X. Is social network a protective factor for cognitive impairment in US Chinese older adults? Findings from the PINE study. *Gerontology*. 2018;64(3):246-256.
21. Chen Y, Liang Y, Zhang W, Crawford JC, Sakel KL, Dong X. Perceived stress and cognitive decline in Chinese-American older adults. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*. 2019;67(S3):S519-S524.
22. Zhang W, Liu S, Sun F, Dong X. Neighborhood social cohesion and cognitive function in US Chinese older adults—Findings from the PINE study. *Aging & mental health*. 2019;23(9):1113-1121.
23. Chang E-S, Dong X. A battery of tests for assessing cognitive function in US Chinese older adults—Findings from the PINE study. *Journals of Gerontology Series A: Biomedical Sciences and Medical Sciences*. 2014;69(Suppl\_2):S23-S30.
24. Dong X, Wong E, Simon MA. Study design and implementation of the PINE study. *Journal of aging and health*. 2014;26(7):1085-1099.
25. Simon MA, Chang E-S, Rajan KB, Welch MJ, Dong X. Demographic characteristics of US Chinese older adults in the greater Chicago area: Assessing the representativeness of the PINE study. *Journal of aging and health*. 2014;26(7):1100-1115.
26. Chiu H. Reliability and validity of the Cantonese version of mini-mental state examination—a preliminary study. *J Hong Kong College Psychiatrists*. 1994;4:425-428.
27. Albert M, Smith LA, Scherr PA, Taylor JO, Evans DA, Funkenstein HH. Use of brief cognitive tests to identify individuals in the community with clinically diagnosed Alzheimer's disease. *International journal of Neuroscience*. 1991;57(3-4):167-178.
28. Wechsler D. Wechsler memory scale-revised. *Psychological Corporation*. 1987;
29. Smith A. *Symbol digit modalities test*. Western Psychological Services Los Angeles, CA; 1982.
30. Dong X, Bergren SM, Chang ES. Levels of acculturation of Chinese older adults in the greater Chicago area—The Population Study of Chinese Elderly in Chicago. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*. 2015;63(9):1931-1937.
31. Kroenke K, Spitzer RL, Williams JB. The PHQ-9: validity of a brief depression severity measure. *Journal of general internal medicine*. 2001;16(9):606-613.
32. Kroenke K, Strine TW, Spitzer RL, Williams JB, Berry JT, Mokdad AH. The PHQ-8 as a measure of current depression in the general population. *Journal of affective disorders*. 2009;114(1-3):163-173.
33. Snaith RP. The hospital anxiety and depression scale. *Health and quality of life outcomes*. 2003;1(1):1-4.
34. Costa P, McCrae R. NEO five-factor inventory (NEO-FFI). *Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources*. 1989;3
35. Cohen S, Kamarck T, Mermelstein R. A global measure of perceived stress. *Journal of health and social behavior*. 1983:385-396.
36. Beck AT, Weissman A, Lester D, Trexler L. The measurement of pessimism: the hopelessness scale. *Journal of consulting and clinical psychology*. 1974;42(6):861.

37. Cagney KA, Glass TA, Skarupski KA, Barnes LL, Schwartz BS, Mendes de Leon CF. Neighborhood-level cohesion and disorder: Measurement and validation in two older adult urban populations. *Journals of Gerontology: Series B*. 2009;64(3):415-424.
38. Perkins DD, Florin P, Rich RC, Wandersman A, Chavis DM. Participation and the social and physical environment of residential blocks: Crime and community context. *American journal of community psychology*. 1990;18:83-115.
39. Chen Y, Feeley TH. Social support, social strain, loneliness, and well-being among older adults: An analysis of the Health and Retirement Study. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*. 2014;31(2):141-161.
40. Dong X, Li Y, Simon MA. Social engagement among US Chinese older adults— Findings from the PINE Study. *Journals of Gerontology Series A: Biomedical Sciences and Medical Sciences*. 2014;69(Suppl\_2):S82-S89.
41. Zeki Al Hazzouri A, Jawadekar N, Kezios K, et al. Racial residential segregation in young adulthood and brain integrity in middle age: can we learn from small samples? *American journal of epidemiology*. 2022;191(4):591-598.
42. Griffin B, Sherman KA, Jones M, Bayl-Smith P. The clustering of health behaviours in older Australians and its association with physical and psychological status, and sociodemographic indicators. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine*. 2014;48(2):205-214.
43. Kuo BC, Chong V, Joseph J. Depression and its psychosocial correlates among older Asian immigrants in North America: A critical review of two decades' research. *Journal of Aging and Health*. 2008;20(6):615-652.
44. Nabe-Nielsen K, Rod NH, Hansen ÅM, et al. Perceived stress and dementia: Results from the Copenhagen city heart study. *Aging & Mental Health*. 2020;24(11):1828-1836.
45. Turner AD, James BD, Capuano AW, Aggarwal NT, Barnes LL. Perceived stress and cognitive decline in different cognitive domains in a cohort of older African Americans. *The American Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry*. 2017;25(1):25-34.
46. Aggarwal NT, Wilson RS, Beck TL, et al. Perceived stress and change in cognitive function among adults aged 65 and older. *Psychosomatic medicine*. 2014;76(1):80.
47. McEwen BS, Bowles NP, Gray JD, et al. Mechanisms of stress in the brain. *Nature neuroscience*. 2015;18(10):1353-1363.
48. Soleimani L, Schnaider Beerli M, Grossman H, Sano M, Zhu CW. Specific depression dimensions are associated with a faster rate of cognitive decline in older adults. *Alzheimer's & Dementia: Diagnosis, Assessment & Disease Monitoring*. 2022;14(1):e12268.
49. Håkansson K, Soininen H, Winblad B, Kivipelto M. Feelings of hopelessness in midlife and cognitive health in later life: a prospective population-based cohort study. *PLoS One*. 2015;10(10):e0140261.
50. Wilson RS, Schneider JA, Arnold SE, Bienias JL, Bennett DA. Conscientiousness and the incidence of Alzheimer disease and mild cognitive impairment. *Archives of general psychiatry*. 2007;64(10):1204-1212.
51. Kim JH, Lu Q, Stanton AL. Overcoming constraints of the model minority stereotype to advance Asian American health. *American Psychologist*. 2021;76(4):611.
52. James SA. John Henryism and the health of African-Americans. 1994;
53. Bennett GG, Merritt MM, Sollers Iii JJ, et al. Stress, coping, and health outcomes among African-Americans: A review of the John Henryism hypothesis. *Psychology & Health*. 2004;19(3):369-383.

54. Manly JJ. Critical issues in cultural neuropsychology: Profit from diversity. *Neuropsychology review*. 2008;18:179-183.
55. Pedraza O, Mungas D. Measurement in cross-cultural neuropsychology. *Neuropsychology review*. 2008;18:184-193.
56. Lamar M, Barnes LL, Leurgans SE, et al. Acculturation in context: The relationship between acculturation and socioenvironmental factors with level of and change in cognition in older Latinos. *The Journals of Gerontology: Series B*. 2021;76(4):e129-e139.
57. Martinez-Miller EE, Robinson WR, Avery CL, et al. Longitudinal associations of US acculturation with cognitive performance, cognitive impairment, and dementia: the Sacramento area Latino study on aging. *American Journal of Epidemiology*. 2020;189(11):1292-1305.
58. Hamlin AM, Kraal AZ, Sol K, et al. Social engagement and its links to cognition differ across non-Hispanic Black and White older adults. *Neuropsychology*. 2022;36(7):640-650. doi:10.1037/neu0000844
59. Pugh E, De Vito A, Divers R, Robinson A, Weitzner DS, Calamia M. Social factors that predict cognitive decline in older African American adults. *International journal of geriatric psychiatry*. 2021;36(3):403-410.
60. Saczynski JS, Pfeifer LA, Masaki K, et al. The effect of social engagement on incident dementia: the Honolulu-Asia Aging Study. *Am J Epidemiol*. Mar 1 2006;163(5):433-40. doi:10.1093/aje/kwj061
61. Sommerlad A, Sabia S, Livingston G, Kivimaki M, Lewis G, Singh-Manoux A. Leisure activity participation and risk of dementia: An 18-year follow-up of the Whitehall II Study. *Neurology*. Nov 17 2020;95(20):e2803-e2815. doi:10.1212/WNL.0000000000010966
62. Benjamini Y, Hochberg Y. Controlling the false discovery rate: a practical and powerful approach to multiple testing. *Journal of the Royal statistical society: series B (Methodological)*. 1995;57(1):289-300.

Table 1. Demographic characteristics of the sample.

Variable	Value
N: number	1,528
Age at wave 1: mean years (sd)	71.05 (7.44)
Education: mean years (sd)	9.10 (4.92)
Female sex: number (proportion)	881 (57.66)
Married: number (proportion)	1,155 (75.64)
Income: number (proportion)	
Low: <\$5,000/year	529 (34.71)
Medium: \$5,000-10,000/year	747 (49.02)
High: >\$10,000/year	248 (16.27)
Immigration period: number (proportion)	
1970 or before	86 (5.63)
1971 – 1980	131 (8.57)
1981 – 1990	379 (24.80)
1991 – 2000	479 (31.35)
2001 or later	453 (29.65)
Age at immigration: mean (sd)	52.19 (11.84)
Number of years in the U.S.: mean (sd)	18.94 (12.33)

Note. sd: standard deviation

Table 2. Estimates of fixed effects for the memory component.

	Estimate	T	p	CI
Months since baseline	-0.003	-0.683	0.495	-0.011 to 0.005
Age	0.012	5.081	<0.001**	0.008 to 0.017
Male vs. female	-0.045	-1.280	0.201	-0.114 to 0.024
Years of formal education	-0.027	-5.967	<0.001**	-0.036 to -0.018
Education × time since baseline	0.0004	2.808	0.005**	0.0001 to 0.001
Unmarried vs. married	0.002	0.049	0.961	-0.098 to 0.103
Marital status × time since baseline	-0.003	-1.780	0.075	-0.005 to 0.0003
Annual income: low vs. high	-0.118	-2.400	0.017**	-0.215 to -0.022
Annual income: medium vs. high	-0.094	-1.941	0.052*	-0.189 to 0.001
Low acculturation vs. some acculturation	-0.257	-5.723	<0.001**	-0.345 to -0.169
Acculturation × time since baseline	0.003	2.198	0.028*	0.0003 to 0.006
Absence vs. presence of stroke	0.190	1.662	0.097	-0.034 to 0.414
Stroke × time since baseline	-0.007	-2.104	0.036*	-0.014 to -0.0005
Absence of tinnitus vs. presence of tinnitus	0.085	1.373	0.170	-0.036 to 0.206
Tinnitus × time since baseline	0.002	1.325	0.185	-0.001 to 0.006
Stress internalization factor	0.017	0.655	0.512	-0.034 to 0.068
Stress internalization × time since baseline	-0.002	-2.447	0.015**	-0.003 to -0.0004

Note. CI: confidence interval. \* Significant at  $p \leq 0.05$ . \*\* Significant at  $p \leq 0.01$ .

Figure 1. CONSORT diagram.

Figure 2. Correlations among predictors, and loadings for principal component and factor analyses.

Note. Panel A illustrates the correlations among predictors. Panel B illustrates the strength of the component loadings for the cognitive variables from the rotated component matrix. Panel C illustrates the strength of the factor loadings for the psychosocial variables from the rotated factor matrix. EBMT: East Boston Memory Test; SDMT: Symbol Digit Modalities Test. P values are adjusted using the Benjamini-Hochberg correction, with the false discovery rate set at 0.05.<sup>62</sup>

Figure 3. Significant longitudinal predictors of memory component scores.

Note. Moderating effects of longitudinal predictors on decline on memory component score over time. Continuous moderators (education and stress internationalization) are stratified at the mean as well as one standard deviation above and below the mean.

Wave 1: n = 3,157

Lost to follow up: n = 444

Wave 2: n = 2,713


Lost to follow up: n = 413

Wave 3: n = 2,300

Excluded for significant  
cognitive or functional  
impairment ( $z = -1.5$ ) at  
baseline: n = 772

Final sample  
analyzed: n = 1,528





**A**


	Memory	Executive Functioning
EBMT-immediate recall	0.767	0.289
EBMT-delayed recall	0.962	0.209
EBMT-percent retention	0.739	-0.054
Digit span backward	0.003	0.860
SDMT	0.242	0.766

**B**


	Stress Internalization	Neighborhood/Community Cohesion	External stress alleviation
Hopelessness	0.747		-0.162
Perceived stress	0.551		-0.533
Conscientiousness	-0.409		0.184
Neighborhood cohesion		0.717	
Sense of community	-0.163	0.689	0.145
Perceived social support	-0.123	0.112	0.502

**C**

### Education



### Acculturation



### Stress Internalization

