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ABSTRACT

Foreign Domestic Workers in Hong Kong: Identifying Risk Factors, Resilience, and Psychological Well-Being

Ka Yan Danise Mok
Department of Counseling Psychology and Special Education, BYU
Doctor of Philosophy

Domestic workers, also known as house maids or handmaids, are a predominately female workforce that traditionally provides labor in upper-class households. With the increase of dual income families and the global expansion of the middle class, the demand for domestic workers increased, which facilitated the practice of importing lower-cost foreign domestic workers (FDWs) from developing areas. Hong Kong has the highest concentration of FDWs when compared to other metropolitan areas, such as Taiwan, Singapore, or New York. Since the trade began in the 1970s, qualitative research and journalistic investigations have reported that FDWs frequently encounter exploitation, including emotional, physical, and sexual abuse; being underpaid and overworked; and racial discrimination. With sparse quantitative research identifying risk factors that predict psychological well-being, this study hypothesized two models: (a) racial and ethnic microaggressions, job satisfaction, and family concern predict psychological distress and (b) resilience mediates the association in the first model. We surveyed 478 female FDWs in Hong Kong, and the results suggested that racial and ethnic microaggressions, job satisfaction, and family concerns were significant predictors of psychological distress, supporting the first hypothesis. The women demonstrated very high levels of psychological resilience; however, due to a ceiling effect in the measure of resilience, the data collected on resilience were unrelated to job satisfaction and family concerns. Thus, the second model was not supported, apparently due to a problem in the measurement of the construct of resilience in this sample of FWDs. Overall, FDWs’ working conditions and their level of resilience to those conditions did significantly influence their levels of psychological distress. These findings serve as pilot data for future quantitative research that investigates female FDWs’ employment experience.
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DESCRIPTION OF DISSERTATION STRUCTURE AND CONTENT

This dissertation, *Foreign Domestic Workers in Hong Kong: Identifying Risk Factors, Resilience, and Psychological Well-Being*, is written in a hybrid format. The hybrid format fulfills the traditional dissertation requirements and provides a publish-ready manuscript. The preliminary pages of the thesis reflect requirements for submission to the university. The thesis report is presented as a journal article and conforms to length and style requirements for submitting research reports to psychology journals. The literature review is included in Appendix A, which is followed by consent forms in Appendix B. Appendix C contains the study’s instruments.
Introduction

Domestic workers, also known as house maids, handmaids, or maidservants, are a predominantly female dominant workforce that has provided manual labor services to middle and upper-class households over the past several centuries. This predominately female industry has been shaped by historical factors in which men work for pay outside of homes and women remain homemakers (Sayer, Casper, & Cohen, 2004). Although increasing gender equity has improved women’s educational attainment and workforce contributions, gender roles have yet to change in household labor (Fuwa, 2004; Fuwa & Cohen, 2007; Gershuny, 2003; Knudsen & Wænness, 2008; Lincoln, 2008).

Employment of domestic workers flourishes in major metropolitan cities. This phenomenon is particularly distinct in Hong Kong, a major international metropolis with a long precedent and an official temporary labor migration scheme of hiring foreign domestic employment. In fact, Hong Kong has one of the highest foreign domestic worker (FDW) populations in the world, with 336,600 FDWs residing there in 2015, comprising 4.4% of the total population (Justice Centre Hong Kong [JCHK], 2016). The majority of the FDW population in Hong Kong is comprised with workers who identify as cisgender female (JCHK, 2016) and come from the Philippines and Indonesia due to those countries’ close proximity to Hong Kong and to historical trade agreements exporting migrant workers to boost their local economies. With such a high concentration of FDWs in a confined urban area, the vulnerability to exploitation of foreign domestic employment are magnified and easily observed, making Hong Kong a suitable case to study FDWs’ experience with employment exploitation.

International media has portrayed FDWs in Hong Kong as “commodities who are inspected, bought, traded, owned, and generally objectified” and “captive laborers abroad” due to
the decades-long documented hardships (Constable, 2007, p. 51). The Justice Centre Hong Kong conducted the first research assessing FDW population exploitation in Hong Kong and found similarly alarming results (JCHK, 2016). In their study, they adapted their theoretical basis from the International Labor Organization (ILO) guideline to define two important distinctions in FDW exploitation, which are forced labor and human trafficking for the purpose of forced labor (JCHK, 2016). To meet the criteria for forced labor, participants had to indicate positive in at least one of the three dimensions, including unfree recruitment, work and life under duress, and impossibility of leaving. When participants indicated positive in unfree recruitment in addition to work and life under duress or/and impossibility of leaving, they met the criteria for having been trafficked for the purpose of forced labor. The result showed that only 5.4% of the participants \( n = 54 \) did not indicate any signs of exploitation or forced labor. Meanwhile, 11.3% \( n=113 \) of the participants indicated moderate level of signs of exploitation. Furthermore, 66.3% \( n=665 \) of participants indicated strong signs of exploitation, 14% of the participants \( n=140 \) were trafficked into forced labor, and 17% of the participants \( n=171 \) endorsed all the indicators for forced labor.

Such results highlighted the vulnerability and commonality of FDW exploitation in Hong Kong. Nevertheless, Hong Kong is ironically perceived as one of the best places for FDWs due to its unlimited FDW visa quota and most liberal visa requirements.

Such dramatic journalism has shed light on the adverse circumstances faced by FDWs, but to date, a limited amount of academic research has evaluated the experiences and psychological well-being of this marginalized population (Bagley, Madrid, & Bolitho, 1997; Lau, Cheng, Chow, Ungvari, & Leung, 2009). Academic research will be necessary to properly
understand FDWs’ employment experiences, including exploitation, racial discrimination, family disturbance, and psychological distress.

Encountering racial discrimination and segregation has made work overseas difficult for FDWs. FDWs tend to have darker skin color because of their South Asia heritage, and in Hong Kong, individuals with darker complexion are perceived to have lower status, less prestige, less beauty, and other negative social stigmas, such as being unrefined, poor, and old (Leong, 2006). Racial discrimination is pervasive in Hong Kong and employers often prefer hiring FDWs with fairer skin color for social reasons (Leong, 2006). The racial discrimination faced by FDWs is often subtle and follows a systemized method (Law, 2001). For example, while FDWs are required by law to reside in employers’ residences, they can be restricted from accessing elevators, swimming pools, amenities or clubhouses of employers’ residences, and bathrooms in office buildings (Sautman, 2004). Racial discrimination and segregation often create hostile environments for FDWs.

Given power differentials between employers and FDWs, as well as a lack of employment regulatory oversight, incidences of exploitation, abuse, and even wrongful deaths have been reported (Chang & Groves, 2000; Constable, 2007). Abusive treatment includes, but is not limited to, the deprivation of food or mandatory days off, inadequate living quarters to rest (e.g., having to sleep on the kitchen floor, in the closet, in a bathtub), wrongful dismissal, sexual abuse, and physical assault (Law, 2001).

Other hardships identified by female FDWs include loneliness and homesickness (Nakonz & Shik, 2009), limited communication with their family members, and major family concerns (Nakonz & Shik, 2009). Taken together, these factors likely result in elevated levels of psychological distress.
FDWs can demonstrate resilience despite the adverse factors of exploitative working conditions, racial discrimination, and family problems. Coping strategies used by FDWs to increase their resilience include religious devotion, social activities, entertainment, and other emotional distractions. The extent to which such coping methods actually buffer distress arising from their harmful circumstances has yet to be investigated (Nakonz & Shik, 2009).

Past research has suggested that FDWs are clearly a vulnerable population facing racial discrimination, negative job environments, and family problems, the next step in academic research is to investigate how are FDWs are affected by exploitations and identified protective factors. Understanding which of those adverse circumstances most predict psychological distress among FDWs and the degree to which those negative factors can be mediated by psychological resilience and effective emotional coping is particularly important at this time. The present study was designed to meet that gap in the professional literature and to focus attention on the condition of FDWs in Hong Kong.

**Statement of the Problem**

After almost four decades of burgeoning FDW employment in Hong Kong, little has been done to improve FDWs’ working conditions or psychological well-being (Bagley et al., 1997; JCHK, 2016; Lau, Cheng, Chow, Ungvari, & Leung, 2009). Public apathy continues to enable oppression and exploitation of FDWs (Ho, 2013). With limited rights and power, it is extremely difficult for FDWs to advocate for needed changes. Academic research focusing on the consequence of FDWs oppression can help to shed light on the pervasive individual and systemic nature of that oppression. It can also shed light on how potential protective factors, such as resilience, predicts psychological distress.
Literature regarding the experiences of female FDWs in Hong Kong is very sparse (JCHK, 2016). The majority of published studies regarding this particular population have examined FDWs’ experiences through the use of qualitative methods (e.g., Chang & Groves, 2000; Constable, 2017). These qualitative studies have provided complex information regarding the emotions, behaviors, values, and insights of FDWs and have shed light on factors that contribute to FDW’s psychological distress (Constable, 2007; Nakonz & Shik, 2009).

However, to date, the Coming Clean report published by the Justice Centre Hong Kong is the first quantitative research studying foreign domestic workers’ employment condition in Hong Kong (JCHK, 2016). While qualitative research provides rich and compelling narratives of FDW’s lived experience, quantitative research on FDW’s employment experience can provide the magnitude and commonality of their experience.

Furthermore, published literature often focused on risk factors and rarely identified protective factors, such as resilience. The benefits of quantitative studies can collect numerical data by sampling the FDWs population, illuminating the commonality of their experience while maximizing objectivity (Ladegaard, 2017; Steckler, McLeroy, Goodman, Bird, & McComick, 1992).

Statement of Purpose

In recent qualitative studies, researchers have suggested that racial discrimination, low job satisfaction, and family concerns are all common sources of FDWs’ psychological distress (Cohen, 2000; Ladegaard, 2012; Leong, 2006). These researchers have further suggested that resilience and coping strategies can help mitigate risk factors and have a positive influence on psychological distress among FDWs in Hong Kong. The purpose of the current study is to design a model to better understand how racial and ethnic microaggression, job satisfaction, and family
concerns predict psychological distress. The results can help us to gain a greater awareness and understanding of FDWs’ employment experiences in Hong Kong by assessing their psychological distress, risk factors, and resilience through reliable and valid psychometric measurements. Furthermore, unions and non-profit organizations serving foreign domestic workers can use the model to identify at-risk FDWs. The results of this study will be crucial in identifying ways to better understand and subsequently provide data to illustrate current foreign domestic workers employment policy. We hope that this research will help FDWs in other countries as well.

**Research Questions**

This study addresses the following research questions:

1. What are the experiences of FDWs in Hong Kong in terms of job satisfaction, racial microaggressions, family distress, resilience, and psychological distress?
2. To what extent do racial discrimination, family concerns, and job satisfaction predict foreign domestic workers’ psychological distress in the presence of one another (see Figure 1)?

![Diagram](image)

*Figure 1.* First hypothesized model predicting relationship between family concerns, experience with racial microaggressions, job satisfaction, and psychological distress.
3. Does resilience mediate the relationship between FDWs' racial discrimination, family concerns, job satisfaction, and psychological distress in the proposed model (see Figure 2)?

Figure 2. Second hypothesized model for relationship between family concerns, experience with racial microaggressions, job satisfaction, and psychological distress while accounting for the mediating effect of resilience.

**Method**

This study was based on a questionnaire assessing FDWs' employment experiences in Hong Kong. The questionnaire and data collection procedures were reviewed and approved by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (IRB) of Brigham Young University in May 2016.

To protect female FDWs’ identities, this study originally utilized an online survey method to snowball sample anonymously without any incentives. The online link to the survey was posted on various social media platforms for FDWs. However, the researcher was notified
that many participants reported difficulties gaining access to stable internet to complete their survey on their mobile electronic devices, such that the participation rate was low.

An in-person recruitment method was eventually adopted in order to increase participation. Since FDWs are not allowed to stay in the employers' residencies during their time off (1 day a week for 8 hours), they generally congregate in public areas, such as parks or other open spaces to rest and socialize. FDWs were contacted by the primary investigator in these public locations, in the absence of employers, and were provided hard copies of the questionnaire. Because fluency in English is a required qualification for FDWs, each question in the questionnaires was presented bilingually in English and Indonesian (for Indonesian workers) or Tagalog (for Filipino workers). For both the paper and online copy, participants were provided with an informed consent form explaining the purpose and risks of the study.

Participants

We invited individuals who self-identified their employment status as FDW to participate in the study. We only included female or transgender FDWs who identified as female since the trend in the literature suggests that FDWs are predominately cisgender female (JCHK, 2016). Cis-females have been employed in the vast majority of cases as FDWS in Hong Kong due to the nature of household responsibilities which are traditionally viewed to be women’s work. In total, 478 female-identified FDWs participated in the study.

Measures

**Family Concerns Survey (FCS).** This survey measures an individual’s difficult family hardships that may potentially impact psychological well-being. This survey contains 18 questions geared to examine such hardships and includes questions related to having trouble with the law, mental health or health struggles, financial stress, disability, abuse, and relationship
concerns. For the item inquiring about unemployment, it originally only asked regarding parents’ unemployment and we included spouse and children to include different family compositions of FDWs. Participants were invited to identify “Yes,” “Unsure,” or “No” on the survey and higher scores on this measure indicate having more family concerns. The Cronbach alpha of this scale has been measured to be .78 (Kearney, Draper, & Barón, 2005).

**Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale (CD-RISC).** The CD-RISC measures an individual’s ability to "bounce-back" or the ability to adapt by asking participants to rate how they self-identified with the statement by using a 5-point Likert scale (from “not true at all” to “true nearly all the time”). A higher total score suggests a higher level of resilience. Sample statements were “I am able to adapt when changes occur” or “I tend to bounce back after illness, injury, or other hardships.” This scale has been tested for internal consistency (Cronbach’s alpha = 0.89) and test-retest reliability (intraclass correlation coefficient: 0.87) and has shown significant validity in terms of correlation with other acceptable scales such as the Kobsa Hardness Measure (Group 3, n = 30; Pearson r = 0.83 p < .0001), the Perceived Stress Scale, (Group 3, n = 24, Pearson r = -0.76, p < .0001) the Seehan Stress Vulnerability Scale (Spearman r = -0.32, p < .0001), and others (Connor & Davidson, 2003).

**Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS).** The JSS is a short questionnaire that measures job satisfaction pertaining to occupation pertaining to human service occupations (Spector, 1985). It contains 36 statements, and participants rate their response with a 6-point Likert-like scale, from “disagree very much” to “agree very much.” Higher scores on the JSS suggest higher satisfaction in ones’ current employment. We only used 8 of the 9 subscales, measuring participants’ satisfaction with their job, including pay, promotion, supervision, benefits, continued rewards, operating procedures, co-workers, nature of work, and communication. Five items were omitted
(including the promotion subscale) due to irrelevance to the FDWs’ work experience and we also changed wordings of six items to adapt to FDW employment (e.g., item 12 “My supervisor is unfair to me” changed to “My employer is unfair to me”). Previous research has found that 71.8% of the participants (FDWs) earn less that the Minimum Allowable Wage (MAW) and only 6.1% of FDWs earned more than the MAW. Instead of being the minimal floor to protect FDWs’ salary, the MAW becomes the norms that majority of employers abide by, indicating a stagnant pay scheme.

Support for this scale includes testing for internal consistency (total scale coefficient alpha of .91) test-retest reliability (correlation coefficient of .71) and an adequate correlation between similar subscales of the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) measure (ranging from .61 to .80) (Spector, 1985).

Racial and Ethnic Microaggressions Scale (REMS). The REMS has 45 items, measuring 6 areas of microaggressions, including assumptions of inferiority, second-class citizen and assumptions of criminality, microinvalidations, eroticization and assumptions of similarity, environmental microaggressions, and workplace microaggressions. Participants were asked to identify if they had experienced a form of the microaggressions mentioned in the statement in the past six months. The more items endorsed, the more frequently the individual had encountered various forms of microaggressions. Three items were omitted as they were unrelated to FDWs’ context. Analyses of this scale indicate an adequate internal consistency (Cronbach’s alpha of .912) and validity in measuring racial microaggressions, as supported by a strong correlation ($r = .464, p < .001$) between a similar measure, the RALES-B (Nadal, 2011, p. 473).

Outcome Measure 45 (OQ-45). The OQ-45 is a self-report measure of global mental health distress. The 45 items measure three areas: symptom distress (depression and anxiety),
interpersonal relationship (loneliness, interpersonal conflict, and family difficulties), and social role (difficulties at work or home). Participants were invited to rate their response by using a 5-point scale (never to almost always). The clinical cutoff for significant distress is 63 and higher total scores suggest more psychological distress. Scores above 63 suggest a level of distress that warrants attention. High intercorrelation between the OQ-45’s three subscales (highest being $r = .93$) and high correlations ($r = .72$) with similar measures like the Behavior and Symptom Identification Scale (BASIS-32) provide support for this scale in terms of convergent validity (Lambert, Gregersen, & Burlingame, 2004).

**Demographic survey.** We created this demographic survey in order to obtain demographic information about participants including nation of origin, relationship status, level of education, religious affiliation, sexual orientation, and debt ownership status (and the amount participant owned).

The demographic survey was the last section of the survey. Many FDWs have expressed fear of repercussion in previous studies which might potentially negatively affect participation rate (JCHK, 2016). By putting the demographic survey towards the last section, participants could complete the scales before considering their continual participation in disclosing demographic information.

**Translation versions.** The CD-RISC was the only scale that had authorized translation versions by the authors of the scale. For that instrument, the translation process included scale creators working closely with translator under the assumption that the translation would be “sufficiently close to the original so as to give the same performance, but not accounting for local or population effects” (“The Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale,” n.d.). Laksmita, Chang, Chung, and Liao (2018) conducted a study providing psychometric evaluation of the Indonesian
translation of the CF-RISC. They surveyed 599 adolescents in Indonesia and found good internal consistency (Cronbach’s alpha of .91).

The overall lack of empirically verified translations in measures reflects the current language gap in mental health (Aguilar-Gaxiola et al., 2012; Dingfelder, 2005). Previous studies document that language barriers remained as a major challenge in providing cross-cultural mental health services. While employing interpreters have been the most prominent attempt to close the language gap, it has not addressed the demand of providing mental health information in languages other than English (Aboul-Enein & Ahmed, 2006; Garcia & Duckett, 2009).

Since alternative measures relevant to the study were unavailable, we used a bilingual committee approach (Brislin, Lonner, & Thorndike 1973; Wang, Lee, & Fetzer, 2006) with two translators producing independent forward translations. However, we encountered unforeseen challenges as one of two Indonesians translator dropped out during the forward translation process and all of the translators (one Indonesian and two Tagalog) were unable to provide back-translation due to time constraints. This limited our ability to assess the fidelity and quality of the translated scales.

We include Indonesian and Tagalog translations of scales to supplement the original English version. On the survey, the instructions, items, and response options were printed first in English and then followed by either Indonesian or Tagalog translations, providing two bilingual copies of the survey.

As English language proficiency is a requirement for FDW employment in Hong Kong, a bilingual survey would allow participants to complete the survey in English, which is a language FDWs are proficient in while supplementing translations in their native languages (Indonesian
and Tagalog). This bilingual format provides additional clarification of the meaning of each item in FDWs’ native languages without relying exclusive on the translated versions.

**Procedures**

We initiated the study by sharing the link with the aforementioned measures and informed consent on social media sites, including FDW Facebook groups, virtual swap meets, and resource websites. However, due to low participation rates and participant feedback about lack of access to stable internet connections, we adjusted the recruitment method and provided paper copies of the measures and informed consent documents directly to participants. The primary author distributed paper copies in different public locations where FDWs congregated, such as outside of the Wan Chai Immigration Office, non-profit organization social activities, and public parks during their time off on Sundays. The copies were collected shortly after participants’ completion. Participants were not compensated with any incentives for their participation.

**Data Analysis**

Data management and analyses were conducted using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). Before statistical analyses were conducted, data were examined for outliers, missing information, and alignment with the inclusion criteria. Five participants were excluded as they identified as male-identified.

After data cleaning, descriptive analyses and differences across demographic characteristics were examined for all variables (REMS, JSS, FCS, OQ, and CD-RISC). We also examined for potential significant differences in survey language and format (online or paper). Furthermore, we ran correlation analyses among all variables to confirm that all variables that
were to be included in the path analyses were statistically significantly associated with one another.

**Results**

**Preliminary Analyses**

Mean scores, standard deviations, skewness, kurtosis, and correlation coefficients for all variables in the study are reported in Table 1. Participants’ scores on the Outcome Questionnaire (OQ) ranged from 9 to 131 ($M = 52.81, SD = 17.21$), and the data were normally distributed. The average score of the OQ divided by the total number of items was 1.17, which corresponds with the indication of *rarely* experiencing the symptom listed on the OQ. Twenty-three percent of the sample ($n = 110$) reported score at or above the clinical cut-off of 63, indicating experience clinical level of psychological distress. Participants’ number of encounters of racial and ethnic microaggressions in the past six months (REMS) ranged from 0 to 42 ($M = 13.59, SD = 8.96$), and the data were also normally distributed. The average item-level response of the REMS was 0.32 with the bottom 20% reporting an average of 5 encounters of microaggressions in the past 6 months and the top 20% reporting an average of 22 encounters. Participants’ responses on the Job Satisfaction Scale (JSS) ranged from 63 to 165 ($M = 117.74, SD = 14.35$), with a normal distribution. The bottom 25% reporting an average of 108 on the JSS and the top 25% reporting an average of 126. The average score of the JSS divided by the total number of items provided an indication to the extent of participants’ agreement regarding job satisfaction; the average item rating was 3.77 which correspondent with a neutral endorsement of job satisfaction midway slightly disagree and slightly agree.

Resilience scores (CD-RISC) ranged from 2 to 100 ($M = 80.44, SD = 14.81$). CD-RISC data were non-normally distributed, with skewness of -2.14 ($SE = .11$) and kurtosis of 6.71 ($SE = $.
This distribution indicated a ceiling effect, with many participants indicating high levels of resilience. The average item-level response for the CD-RISC was 3.21, suggesting participants endorsed *often True* to resilience statements on the CD-RISC. The bottom 20% of participants reported scores up to 74 on the CD-RISC and the top 20% reported scores of greater than 91. The average of the bottom 20% of divided by the total number of items on the CD-RISC provided an indication of participants’ agreement regarding resilience; the average item rate was 2.96 which corresponded with an *often true* response, suggesting high agreement in resilience.

Lastly, participants’ family concerns (FCS) ranged from 0 to 32 (*M* = 5.39, *SD* = 5.83), with most participants reporting very few family problems in a non-normal distribution (skewness = 1.70; kurtosis = 3.60). The average item rating crossed participants was only 0.3 indicating there were hardly any family concerns across participants. Twenty percent of the participants indicated no family problems and only the top 20% of all participants endorsed an average of 5 family concerns out of 18 in total.

Table 1

*Descriptive Statistics and Correlations of Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. OQ-45</td>
<td>52.81</td>
<td>17.21</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. REMS</td>
<td>13.59</td>
<td>8.96</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. JSS</td>
<td>117.74</td>
<td>14.35</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>-.40**</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. CD-RISC</td>
<td>80.44</td>
<td>14.81</td>
<td>-2.14</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td>-.13**</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. FCS</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01 ***p < .001.**
In addition to descriptive data, we also ran scale reliability analyses for all instruments across the two different survey forms that differed by language. For the OQ, the English-Tagalog version’s Cronbach’s Alpha was .79 and the English-Indonesian version was .96. For the REMS, the English-Tagalog version’s Cronbach’s Alpha was .94 and the English-Indonesian version was .96. For the FCS, the English-Tagalog version’s Cronbach’s Alpha was .82 and the Indonesia version was .95. For the English-Tagalog version of JSS, the Cronbach’s Alpha was .80 while the Indonesian version was .91. For the CD-RISC, both English-Tagalog and English-Indonesian versions yielded a Cronbach’s alpha of .95.

Remarkably, 175 participants (37% of the total sample) did not report to one or more question inquiring demographic information, perhaps due to the sensitive nature of the topic or to fear of retribution. In spite of not providing specific demographic information, many participants chose to report on several other items of the survey. Rather than disregard the experiences of the individuals surveyed, we decided to add a “did not report (DNR)” category for the purpose of our analyses. Descriptive information of demographic variables is listed in Table 2.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>(%)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not disclose</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 *(continued)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>(%)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sexual orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equally attracted to females and males</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly attracted to females</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly attracted to males</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only attracted to females</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only attracted to males</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not disclose</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other areas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not disclose</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responded</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>22-63</td>
<td>8.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not disclose</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Status</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single (never married)</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single (separated/divorced)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windowed</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not disclose</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of children</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0-20</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest level of education</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary School</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary School</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Degree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. Degree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not disclose</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Affiliation</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehovah Witnesses</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latter-day Saints (Mormon)</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not disclose</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Debt in Hong Kong Dollars</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1HKD=0.13USD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>8070.22</td>
<td>616-20000</td>
<td>6076.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not disclose</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Correlation Analysis

Table 1 indicated bivariate correlations between the independent variables (REMS, JSS, FCS, and REMS) and the dependent variable, the OQ. The OQ was correlated with REMS ($r = .24, p < .01$), JSS ($r = -.40, p < .01$), FCS ($r = .33, p < .01$), and CD-RISC ($r = -.13, p < .01$). REMS also was corrected with all variables, including JSS ($r = -.29, p < .01$), FCS ($r = .27, p < .01$), and CD-RISC ($r = .15, p < .01$). The JSS, however, was not corrected with CD-RISC ($r = .06, p = .18$) and FC ($r = -.11, p = .06$). In addition, the correlation between FCS and CD-RISC was not significant ($r = .03, p = .62$).

We also correlated average participants’ age, number of children, and the amount of debt incurred with the other variables. The only three correlation coefficients that reached significance were age and resilience ($r = .19, p < .001$), number of children ($r = -.13, p < .01$) and amount of debt with experience of racial and ethnic microaggressions ($r = .29, p < .001$). We did not find any curvilinear patterns in any correlation coefficients between demographic categories and scales (CD-RISC, FCS, JSS, RESM, and OQ-45).

Demographic Differences

We performed a series of analyses to ascertain differences among participants regarding their level of distress (OQ), experience of racial and ethnic microaggressions (REMS), job satisfaction (JSS), resilience (CD-RISC), and family concerns (FCS) on the following variables: nation of origin, relationship status, level of education, religious affiliation, sexual orientation, and debt ownership.

Relationship status. We found significant group differences on the REMS when accounting for relationship status of our participants ($p < .001$; see Table 3). Those who did not report their relationship status reported the highest REMS score ($M = 15.53, SD = 6.92, n = 204$).
Among those who did report their relationship status, single (never married) participants had the highest REMS score ($M = 14.63, SD = 11.47, n = 85$), followed by widowed participants ($M = 14.55, SD = 10.50, n = 15$), followed by single (separated/divorced; $M = 12.51, SD = 9.01, n = 41$), and finally married participants ($M = 10.19, SD = 8.82, n = 133$).

We further found significant group differences on the CD-RISC ($p < .019$). The highest level of resilience was found among widowed participants ($M = 84.43, SD = 15.81, n = 14$). Similar levels of resilience were found among participants who did not report their relationship status ($M = 81.97, SD = 9.63, n = 204$), identified as married ($M = 80.50, SD = 17.26, n = 133$), and single (separated/divorced) ($M = 80.89, SD = 17.73, n = 41$). Single (never married) participants reported the lowest level of resilience ($M = 75.76, SD = 18.21, n = 85$). There were no significant relationship status group differences for the OQ ($p = .74$), FC ($p = .25$), or the JSS ($p = .05$).

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Between Relationship Status Groups Differences in Variables</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OQ-45</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.496</td>
<td>.739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.144</td>
<td>.001***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.373</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD-RISC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.976</td>
<td>.019**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.351</td>
<td>.251</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$. 
**Level of education.** We excluded participants who reported having attained a Master’s degree, a Ph.D., or Primary education since each of these groups had less than ten members, an insufficient number for group comparisons. We found significant differences on the REMS \( p < .001 \); see Table 4) and CD-RISC \( p < .004 \) when grouping participants by different levels of education. The group that did not report their level of education had the highest score on the REMS \( M = 15.38, SD = 7.14, n = 212 \), followed by participants with a bachelor’s degree \( M = 12.72, SD = 10.00, n = 135 \), and finally by those with secondary/high school education \( M = 11.41, SD = 9.73, n = 120 \).

Similar levels of resilience were found in participants who did not report \( M = 81.52, SD = 10.41, n = 212 \) and those who attained bachelor’s degrees \( M = 81.51, SD = 15.02, n = 135 \). Participants who identified having secondary education had lower resiliency scores \( M = 77.67, SD = 19.47, n = 119 \). There were no significant group differences related to level of education on the OQ \( p = .91 \), JSS \( p = .50 \), or the FC \( p = .12 \).

Table 4

*Between Level of Education Group Differences in Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>( P )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OQ-45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.313</td>
<td>.905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.142</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.883</td>
<td>.492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD-RISC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.566</td>
<td>.004**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.839</td>
<td>.106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* \( *p < .05, **p < .01, p < .001* \).
**Religious affiliation.** We found significant group differences on the OQ when examining various religious orientations ($p < .002$; see Table 5). Participants who identified as Christians scored highest on their OQ ($M = 55.04$, $SD = 195.98$, $n = 67$), followed by Catholics ($M = 54.29$, $SD = 21.13$, $n = 85$), followed by those who did not report their religious orientation ($M = 52.05$, $SD = 15.34$, $n = 204$), followed by participants who identified as Muslim ($M = 52.10$, $SD = 19.63$, $n = 13$). Participants who identified as members of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (widely known as Mormons or LDS) had the lowest OQ scores ($M = 49.99$, $SD = 15.63$, $n = 102$).

We also found significant group differences on the REMS ($p < .001$; see Table 5). Those who did not report had the highest scores on the REMS ($M = 15.50$, $SD = 6.92$, $n = 204$). Participants who identified as Catholic scored the second highest ($M = 13.23$, $SD = 11.74$, $n = 85$), followed by Muslim ($M = 12.67$, $SD = 11.94$, $n = 13$). The two groups with the lowest scores on the REMS were members of The Church of Jesus Christ ($M = 11.82$, $SD = 8.22$, $n = 102$) and Protestant Christian denominations ($M = 10.57$, $SD = 9.43$, $n = 67$).

We further found significant group differences on the JSS ($p < .013$). Members of the Church of Jesus Christ participants reported the highest levels of job satisfaction ($M = 121.68$, $SD = 17.90$, $n = 102$), followed by Catholic ($M = 118.59$, $SD = 16.71$, $n = 85$), Muslim ($M = 117.36$, $SD = 18.23$, $n = 13$), those who did not report ($M = 116.48$, $SD = 10.50$, $n = 204$), and finally Protestant Christian participants, who reported the lowest job satisfaction ($M = 115.63$, $SD = 13.77$, $n = 67$).

Finally, we found significant group differences on the CD-RISC ($p < .001$). Members of the Church of Jesus Christ had the highest levels of resilience ($M = 82.18$, $SD = 15.19$, $n = 102$), followed by participants who did not report ($M = 82.03$, $SD = 9.20$, $n = 204$), followed by
Protestant Christians ($M = 81.34$, $SD = 13.69$, $n = 67$), followed by Catholic participants ($M = 77.26$, $SD = 18.48$, $n = 85$), and finally participants who identified as Muslim ($M = 62.02$, $SD = 35.38$, $n = 13$).

**Table 5**

*Between Religious Affiliation Group Differences in Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OQ-45</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>.002**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.287</td>
<td>.001***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.728</td>
<td>.013*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD-RISC</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.532</td>
<td>.001***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.066</td>
<td>.058</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* *p* < .05, **p** < .01, ***p*** < .001.

**Sexual orientation.** In our analyses of differences across reported sexual orientation, we excluded the group only attracted to females since the group only had 9 members. We found significant group differences across sexual orientation on the REMS ($p < .001$; see Table 6) and CD-RISC ($p < .001$). Participants who did not report their sexual orientation scored highest on the REMS ($M = 15.30$, $SD = 7.07$, $n = 227$). The second highest group mean was reported by participants who indicated being only attracted to males ($M = 13.17$, $SD = 8.79$, $n = 90$). This was followed by participants who reported being *unsure* about their sexuality ($M = 12.58$, $SD = 7.12$, $n = 19$), followed by those who reported being mostly attracted to males ($M = 11.90$, $SD = 10.09$, $n = 49$), followed by those who reported being equally attracted to females and males ($M = 11.63$, $SD = 12.13$, $n = 77$).
Although significant mean differences in CD-RISC \( p < .001 \); see Table 7) was found comparing to participants’ who were only attracted to females with other sexual orientation groups, only nine participants endorsed being attracted to females which did not meet the required number of participants \( n > 9 \) to be included in mean comparison.

We also found significant mean differences in resilience comparing the rest of the groups, including participants who reported being unsure about their sexual orientation \( M = 81.37, SD = 13.39, n = 19 \), only attracted to male \( M = 81.31, SD = 16.55, n = 90 \), did not report \( M = 81.15, SD = 10.99, n = 226 \), equally attracted to males and females \( M = 80.65, SD = 16.6, n = 77 \), and mostly attracted to males \( M = 80.05, SD = 18.45, n = 49 \). There were no significant group differences related to sexual orientation on the OQ \( p = .47 \), JSS \( p = .06 \), or the FC \( p = .10 \).

Table 6

\[ \begin{array}{lcccc}
\text{Between Sexual Orientation Group Differences in Variables} \\
\hline
& \text{df} & F & P \\
\text{OQ-45} & 6 & .934 & .47 \\
\text{REMS} & 6 & 3.952 & .001** \\
\text{JSS} & 6 & 2.057 & .057 \\
\text{CD-RISC} & 6 & 4.683 & .001*** \\
\text{FCS} & 6 & 1.786 & .102 \\
\hline
\end{array} \]

\textit{Note.} * \( p < .05 \), ** \( p < .01 \), \( p < .001 \).

\textbf{Debt free or ownership.} We found significant group differences on the OQ \( p < .009 \); see Table 7), REMS \( p < .002 \), JSS \( p < .003 \), and FCS \( p < .047 \). There was no significant between-group difference on the CD-RISC \( p = .14 \).
Participants who did not report \((M = 52.48, SD = 16.01, n = 224)\) and those who reported debt ownership \((M = 56.51, SD = 18.74, n = 122)\) had higher scores on the OQ than those identified as debt free \((M = 49.95, SD = 17.20, n = 132)\). On the REMS, participants who did not report had higher scores \((M = 15.10, SD = 7.39, n = 224)\) than those with no debt \((M = 12.71, SD = 10.53, n = 132)\) and with debt \((M = 11.79, SD = 9.35, n = 122)\). Participants with no debt had higher scores on the JSS \((M=121.45, SD = 6.95, n = 132)\) than those who did not report \((M = 116.54, SD = 10.62, n = 224)\) and those who own debt \((M = 116.05, SD = 16.54, n = 122)\).

Participants who were in debt also reported higher scores on the FCS \((M = 6.52, SD = 6.84, n = 113)\) when compared to those who did not report \((M = 4.74, SD = 4.69, n = 38)\) and compared to those without debt \((M = 4.62, SD = 4.94, n = 120)\). In addition to debt ownership, we found a small positive correlation between amount of debt owned and microaggression \((r = .29, p < .01)\).

### Table 7

**Between Debt Ownership Group Differences in Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>(p)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OQ-45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.761</td>
<td>.009**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.421</td>
<td>.002**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>.003**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD-RISC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.004</td>
<td>.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.092</td>
<td>.047*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. * \(p < .05, ** p < .01, p < .001\).*

**Missing data.** About 39% of the participants \((n = 292)\) reported all of the demographic information, with 61% participants missing at least 1 or more questions in the demographic survey \((n = 186)\). We therefore examined the influence of missing data on variables through a
series of correlational analyses. The only significant correlation coefficient we found was a small positive correlation between missing data and family concerns ($r = .13, p < .05$). Thus, the overall results did not differ as a function of participants’ disclosure of demographic information.

Potential Confounding Variables

We identified two potential confounding variables that could potentially impact the proposed models. The first potential confounding variable was the format of how participants received the survey: 279 participants received a paper copy, and 199 responded to the survey online. Significant group differences were found in racial and ethnic microaggressions ($t_{(476)} = 5.24, p < .001$), resilience ($t_{(475)} = 2.70, p < .007$), and family concerns ($t_{(269)} = 3.39, p < .001$). We found that participants who completed the survey online reported more encounters of racial and ethnic microaggressions ($M = 16.07, SD = 7.29, n = 199$), more resilience ($M = 82.60, SD = 7.26, n = 198$), and more family concerns ($M = 8.17, SD = 8.34, n = 41$). Participants who completed the survey on paper copies reported fewer encounters of racial and ethnic microaggressions ($M = 11.83, SD = 9.60, n = 279$), less resilience ($M = 78.90, SD = 18.23, n = 279$), and fewer family concerns ($M = 4.89, SD = 5.13, n = 271$).

The potential confounding variable was the language of the survey that participants completed. We administered the survey in both (a) English and Tagalog and (b) English and Indonesian. Hence, we conducted an independent $t$-test to analyse group differences. The only variable that reflected a significant difference between survey languages was resilience ($p < .015$). We found that FDWs who received a Tagalog version ($M = 79.91, SD = 16.54, n = 267$) reported more resilience than FDWs who received an Indonesian version ($M = 71.34, SD = 27.40, n = 29$). No significant between-group differences were found in OQ ($p = .56$), REMS ($p = .95$), JSS ($p = .86$), and FC ($p = .97$).
We wanted to further examine language differences and therefore conducted another \( t \)-test analysis by language groups. We grouped FDWs who received copies of the surveys in their native language in Tagalog and Indonesian and FDWs who did not receive a copy of the survey in their native language. With the new language grouping, we found significant group differences in encounters of racial and ethnic microaggressions \( (t_{476} = 5.084, p < .001) \), job satisfaction \( (t_{476} = 3.478, p < .001) \), and resilience \( (t_{475} = 2.591, p < .01) \). There were no between-group differences in OQ \( (p = .43) \) and family concerns \( (p = .13) \).

Participants who received the survey in their native languages \( (M = 12.00, SD = 9.74, n = 296) \) reported fewer encounters of racial and ethnic microaggressions than participants who filled out the survey in their second language \( (M = 16.18, SD = 6.76, n = 182) \). Participants who received the survey in their native languages \( (M = 118.73, SD = 16.51, n = 296) \) reported more job satisfaction than those who received the survey in their second language \( (M = 116.13, SD = 9.72, n = 182) \). In addition, participants who completed the survey in their native languages \( (M = 79.07, SD = 18.01, n = 296) \) also reported less resilience than their counterparts \( (M = 82.67, SD = 6.34, n = 181) \).

Survey format (paper/electronic) and survey language were highly correlated \( (r_{476} = .80, p < .001) \) suggesting that participants who took the paper copy of the survey were very likely from the Philippines and Indonesia. The paper copy of the survey also represented an in-person recruitment method, as copies of surveys were directly distributed to participants. Since these two variables were highly correlated, accounting for both variables in the path analyses would have created problems due to multicollinearity. Analyses showed that accounting for either variable yielded similar results, so subsequent analyses controlled for language, which was
deemed to be more conceptually relevant to participants’ responses than the method of survey completion (paper versus online).

**Evaluating the Initial Path Analytic Model**

Based on risk factors suggested in the literatures, which were racial and ethnic microaggressions, job satisfaction, and family concerns, we hypothesized that these risk factors would predict psychological well-being. Additionally, we also predicted that job satisfaction would also be correlated with racial and ethnic microaggressions. These variables were entered into a path analysis. This first model examined the extent to which the variables of family concerns, racial and ethnic microaggressions, and job satisfaction predicted psychological distress while controlling for language. All hypothesized paths were found to be significant in the model \(F(4,266) = 24.11, p < .001\) (see Table 8). Family concerns \((\beta = .25, p < .001)\), experience of racial and ethnic microaggressions \((\beta = .14, p < .05)\), and job satisfaction \((\beta = .35, p < .001)\) all significantly predicted psychological distress. In addition, experience of racial and ethnic microaggressions \((\beta = .29, p < .001)\) predicted job satisfaction \([F(2,475) = 22.47, p < .001]\) (Figure 3).

![Image of a diagram](https://example.com/diagram.png)

**Figure 3.** Result of the first path model of racial and ethnic microaggression, job satisfaction, and family concerns predicted psychological distress.
Evaluating the Mediation Model

The third research question of the study proposed that resilience mediated the association between racial and ethnic microaggressions, family concerns, job satisfaction, and psychological distress. However, the data on the measure of resilience exhibited a ceiling effect, such that racial and ethnic microaggressions, family concerns, and job satisfaction were not significantly associated with resilience \[F(4,265) = 2.01, p > .09\]; thus mediation did not occur.

Since resilience was not a significant mediator, we created a subsequent model that included resilience as a direct predictor of psychological distress. We found that this model, which included resilience as a predictor, was significant \(F(5,264) = 22.67, p < .001, \beta = .25, p < .001\). In addition to the previously reported statistically significant paths, the path in this model between resilience and racial and ethnic microaggressions also reached statistical significance \(F(2,474) = 16.63, p < .001, \beta = .25, p < .001\). Resilience was a significant predictor of psychological distress in the presence of the other variables (Figure 4).

![Figure 4](image)

*Figure 4.* Result of the second path model of resilience, racial and ethnic microaggression, job satisfaction, and family concerns predicted psychological distress.
Table 8

Result of Hypothesized Models Predicting Psychological Distress (Model 1 & 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model 1:</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>R2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1: REMS→ JSS</td>
<td>-.462</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>-.288***</td>
<td>.86***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2: REMS, JSS, FC</td>
<td>.258</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.140*</td>
<td>.252***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.389</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>-.352***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1: CD-RISC→REMS</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.125***</td>
<td>.066***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2: REMS→ JSS</td>
<td>-.462</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>-.288**</td>
<td>.86***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3: REMS, JSS, FC</td>
<td>.300</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.165**</td>
<td>.236***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.364</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>-.337***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD-RISC</td>
<td>-.202</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>-.202***</td>
<td>.300***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001.

Discussion

Reports of exploitation of FDWs in Hong Kong have appeared in popular media and in the research literature. FDWs have provided rich and complex narratives, which include common themes explaining the exploitation pertaining to their employment experience. However, little was known about the extent to which FDWs experience psychological distress and the association of that distress with their experiences of workplace exploitation and public cultural biases (Bagley et al, 1997; JCHK, 2016; Lau, Cheng, Chow, Ungvari, & Leung, 2009). The
purpose of the present study was to identify common risk factors for psychological distress among FDWs in Hong Kong.

Based on previous journalistic investigation and research on migrant workers, this study focused on three specific risk factors: racial and ethnic microaggressions, family concerns, and job satisfaction as well as the potential mediating effect of resilience. Survey data collected from 478 women were analyzed to test hypothesized models predicting FDWs’ psychological well-being. The key findings of the study are explained in this discussion section, followed by a list of study limitations and implications for future research.

Overview of Findings

According to the OQ, the average level of psychological distress FDWs reported was somewhat elevated but within the subclinical range ($M = 52.81$). This finding suggested that the majority of FDWs in this sample were not experiencing clinical levels of distress. Our analyses sought to ascertain the extent to which other factors accounted for the distress reported by participants. Correlation analyses suggested that the three variables of racial and ethnic microaggressions, job satisfaction, and family concerns were significantly and independently associated with psychological distress. The women also reported very high levels of resilience. We discuss each of these variables separately before interpreting the results of a path analysis conducted with all variables simultaneously.

Racial and ethnic microaggressions. Correlation analysis revealed a significant positive small correlation ($r = .24, p < .01$) between racial and ethnic microaggressions and psychological distress. We found that, on average, FDWs experienced 14 encounters of racial and ethnic microaggressions over the course of the previous six months from when they filled out the REMS. This result was comparable to a study on perceived discrimination of recent immigrants
from Mainland China to Hong Kong (Chou, 2012) and presented the pervasiveness of racial and ethnic discrimination. In Chou’s (2012) study, almost two-thirds (65.1%) of participants found that people made jokes about them based on their migrant status. Over half of the participants in their study (55.9%) experienced discrimination with only 11% of participants reporting that they did not feel any discrimination.

The mean of racial and ethnic microaggressions in this current study is consistent with research on the concurrent and cumulative experiences of microaggressions. Results from studies focused on the effects of racial discrimination and microaggressions have shown that individuals who experienced more racial microaggressions also reported poorer psychological adjustment (Mercer, Zeigler-Hill, Wallace, & Hayes, 2011; Torres, Driscoll, & Burrow, 2010). Furthermore, Ong, Burrow, Fuller-Rowell, Ja, and Sue (2013) found what they termed a lagged-day association of microaggressions. The lagged-day association shows that yesterday’s experience of microaggressions has a compounding effect and is correlated with higher negative affect and somatic symptoms. The average item-level response reveals that the bottom 20% of participants experience an average of 5 encounters of microaggression suggesting racial and ethnic microaggressions is common among FDWS. While on average 14 encounters of microaggressions over the course of six months may not seem excessive, we have no information on the severity of each encounter. Psychologically, it is possible that each new encounter could have exacerbated the perceived intensity of previous encounters. Thus, the exposure to microaggressions experienced by FDWs likely impacted their psychological well-being in negative ways.

In our study FDWs who experienced racial and ethnic microaggressions were somewhat more likely to report higher levels of psychological distress. The strength of the correlation was
similar to previous literature reporting FDWs frequent encounters of discrimination in Hong Kong, including treatment of second-class citizenship, assumed criminality, and environmental discrimination (Hovey & Magaña, 2002; Yeoh, Huang, & Gonzales, 1999). However, the strength of the correlation coefficient was weak and did not reflect similar magnitude comparing to narratives presented in the previous literature.

**Job satisfaction.** Correlation analysis of job satisfaction and psychological distress also indicated a significant negative moderate correlation ($r = - .35, p < .001$). This suggests that FDWs who have lower scores on the JSS were more likely to report a higher level of psychological distress on the OQ. FDWs in our study scored an average of 117.74 on the JSS, which indicated greater satisfaction than the average score of 109 on the JSS. In Spector’s (1985) original scale validation study, 3,067 human service employees scored an average of 122.6. The human service employees in Spector’s (1985) study were individuals employed as nurses, teachers, social workers and caregivers. FDWs in our study had slightly lower job satisfaction than others in different fields of work. This level of satisfaction warrants further investigation, given the likely adverse influence of work exploitation that surprisingly did not result in very low levels of work satisfaction. The average item rating of a neutral endorsement of job satisfaction may also suggest that the participants felt commonplace regarding their job satisfaction, meaning that many have resigned themselves to their situations.

Furthermore, we found that those who did not own any debt reported significantly higher job satisfaction than participants who owned debt or did not disclose debt. It is possible that debt ownership created additional psychological strains and influenced FDWs’ perception of their employment experience. This finding is consistent with similar studies among medical doctors that student debt at the time of graduation was the only significant predictor of lower job
satisfaction (Xu & Veloski, 1998). It is noteworthy that job satisfaction did not correlate with other factors, such as age, gender, minority identities, socioeconomic status during upbringing, physician parents, financial support from federal or state levels, and gender.

The mean score for the promotion subscale on the JSS was much smaller than the other subscales (see Table 8). There were two possible interpretations of promotion; promotion of position and increase of pay. When FDWs are hired, they receive a foreign domestic worker visa, which limits their employment status to the domestic worker industry with no exceptions (Ku & Pun, 2011). Policies on such visas restrict FDWs to work with the contracted employer for two years. The low mean score in promotion might reflect dissatisfaction of stifled promotion opportunities or a sense of “dead end” as the hope of switching to a different job is impossible.

The low mean on promotion could also reflect FDWs’ dissatisfaction of their wages. As it is impossible for FDWs to promote to different roles or positions based on their visas, the wage increase is stifled as well. FDWs’ wages are regulated by the Hong Kong government and the FDWs’ minimum allowable wage only had a 3.9% increase from 1998 to 2012 (Kuo, 2014). This wage increase is relatively small when compared to the average median monthly income (15%) in Hong Kong. The slow and small increase of minimum allowable wage has often been criticized by unions and human rights organizations as it resembles second-class citizen compensation.

Taken together, it may be that FDWs may not feel that they can progress in this line of work. Both findings mentioned above seem to illustrate how a lack of financial security and doubts about obtaining such financial security impact FDWs overall job satisfaction and overall mental well-being.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Promotion</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Supervision</td>
<td>16.79</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Continue rewards</td>
<td>14.33</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Operating procedures</td>
<td>10.38</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Co-workers</td>
<td>11.42</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Nature of Work</td>
<td>17.55</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Communication</td>
<td>15.59</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Family concerns.** The correlation between family concerns and psychological distress was found to be significantly moderately positive ($r = .33, p < .01$). This is consistent with previous research indicating that individuals who have more family concerns are more likely to have higher levels of psychological distress (Nakonz & Shik, 2009). The mean number on the FCS for participants in our study was 5.38, which suggested that FDWs endorsed nearly one third of the items related to familial concerns that we measured. The correlation between family concerns and psychological distress was significant and the two most commonly reported family concerns endorsed by FDWs are worth noting.

The most endorsed family concerns were “parents or spouse or children unemployed for an extended period of time.” Taking the endorsement of this statement by FDWs at face value, one interpretation could be that FDWs are concerned about the financial struggles at home. This seems likely given that we found that FDWs who reported debt ownership also reported
significantly more family concerns than their counterparts who reported being debt free or did not disclose. This is consistent with previous studies with FDWs that they face with financial struggles at home that include medical expenses, educational tuition, and family debt (Nakonz & Shik, 2009). The magnitude of family concerns was possibly increased due to collective cultural values and expectations. “Utang na loob” which is a Filipino cultural value, means “an abiding and eternal debt of gratitude for favors extended to a member of the family” (Sustento-Seneriches, 1997, p. 107). If an immediate or extended family member is in financial crisis, FDWs are likely to offer or feel obligated to financially assist given this view of forever being indebted to their family. In 2016, approximately 26.9 billion US dollars remittances were sent back to the Philippines, which demonstrates how common it is for FDWs to contribute to their (Rowley, 2017). When female FDWs sacrifice to financial assist their family due to extrinsic demands, they reported feeling a lack of power in their decision-making process (Ronquillo, Boschma, Wong, & Quiney, 2011). It seems likely that this sense of pressure and helplessness possibly explain the connection between family financial concern and psychological distress.

The second most commonly endorsed family concern among FDWs in this study was “frequent, hostile arguing among family members.” This is consistent with research with FDWs in Hong Kong suggesting that individual value changes or adaptation to Hong Kong culture might be one cause for these exchanges (Constable, 1999). Despite the potential of being exposed to exploitation, FDWs may have developed a new sense of individuality when they were able to increase distance from and provide momentary help to their family. It is possible that such changes may create conflict when families at home disapprove or discourage their new choices.
One example of this is found in the story of Delores, a FDW, who encountered troubles during one of her visits home (Constable, 1999). Delores was aware that her husband was engaged in an ongoing affair. When she arrived home, she shared being angry and bitter about the affair but also appreciative of her husband taking care of their children. She decided to stay with her parents for a week to evaluate her relationship and he disapproved of her desire and grew furious toward her newfound autonomy. She recounted the violence that followed:

“I was like a punching bag. I was blue and black all over my face. I was bloating because of hits. And how would I take this? And he would say I am so proud to have so much money. And I said, ‘No, I am not. If I had a lot of money I would not go back and clean other people’s toilets. If I have lots of money I would not go back.’” (Constable, 1999, p. 213)

While we do not have direct accounts of the experiences of FDWs in this study, participants’ job satisfaction results appear to be consistent with these narratives of low job satisfaction.

When comparing the manner in which racial and ethnic microaggressions, family concerns, and job satisfaction correlated with psychological distress, racial and ethnic microaggressions had the weakest correlation coefficient. One possible explanation for the higher correlation of job satisfaction and family concerns to psychological well-being is that FDWs are more concerned about job-related stressors that potentially include sexual abuse, physical assault by employers, inadequate living quarters to rest, and deprivation of food or time off. These concerns likely pose a more urgent physiological need that directly impacts their likelihood to survive, than their experience of racism and microaggressions. Another possible explanation is that this underreporting tendency may reflect an unequal power relationship in foreign domestic work employment (Massao & Fasting, 2010). Institutional power is given to
employers as the Hong Kong FDW employment system favoring employers without etiquette protection for FDWs. Underreporting racial microaggression can be an illustration of FDWs’ racially subordinate position as their racial and ethnic identities are not reflected in majority of the employers.

**Resilience.** We found that FDWs who participated in this study reported an astoundingly high level of resilience (M = 80.44, SD=14.81), with 100 being the highest score. In addition to high level of resilience, correlation analysis revealed that resilience is positively correlated with racial and ethnic microaggression ($r = .15, p < .01$). This positive correlation indicates that FDWs who encounter more racial and ethnic microaggressions will likely report higher level of resilience. Combing the two findings, it suggests that despite reporting adversity such as frequent encounters of racial and ethnic microaggressions and family concerns, FDWs are resilient and strong.

**Missing data.** Participants who did not disclose any information in all of the demographic categories scored slightly higher on racial and ethnic microaggressions. Previous research has suggested that FDWs’ fear negative repercussions from a variety of sources including their employers, domestic workers agencies, and the Hong Kong Immigration Department (Chin, 1997). Although participants in this research were reminded in the consent form that no identifiable information would be collected, close to half of the participants did not disclose any demographic information. The decision was made to respect participants’ autonomy on demographic information disclosure by making all questions optional – and placing the demographic questions at the end of the survey. This practice allowed participants to consider their fear of repercussion and decided how to respond to the survey. Nevertheless, the lack of
Path analyses. The first hypothesized model predicted psychological distress from the measures of racial and ethnic microaggressions, job satisfaction, and family concerns. The model was found to be a good fit, providing support that all three variables are associated with psychological distress, as had been anticipated by relevant theory (see Table 9).

Additionally, racial and ethnic microaggressions was a significant predictor of lower job satisfaction. This result aligns with previous research findings that suggest that employees’ lower job satisfaction is correlated with experiences of ethnic harassment (Low, Radhakrishnan, Schneider, & Rounds, 2007). However, some previous literature had anticipated findings in the opposite direction: Adaptation Theory indicated that the effect of racial discrimination in the workplace would affect minority employees less because they would have already adjusted and adapted to living in a racist community (Helson, 1964). Nevertheless, theories studying racial battle fatigue and social identity disputed the possibility of the desensitization effect (Smith, Hung, & Franklin, 2011). Rather than desensitization, chronic exposure to racial microaggressions could lead to post-traumatic stress disorder, anxiety, frustration, shock, and depression.

Second, the data failed to support the second hypothesized model as resilience was not a significant mediator for psychological well-being. This result contradicted previous findings on resilience, which has been found to regular emotion moderate negative effects of stressors and facilitate positive adaption (Beasley, Thompson, & Davidson, 2003).

What this result suggests could be a reflection of the distribution of resilience rather than resilience. We found that the resilience distribution was non-symmetrical with a strong peak,
more rapid decay, and heavier tail skewing towards higher scores (skewness of -2.14 and kurtosis of 6.71). This suggests a clear ceiling effect, as most scores were very high. With limited variance, the correlations between resilience and other variables were attenuated. This ceiling effect impeded this study from examining resilience as a mediator because the CD-RISC was unrelated to other measures. That was, although the construct of resilience may indeed mediate distress, the measure used in this study yielded problematic data that precluded conducting the relevant statistical analysis.

Another possible explanation for high resilience among FDWs is that their connections with their cultures become a protective factor (Hill, 1998). Commonly shared cultural traits, such as religiosity, self-confidence, a strong positive identity, are valuable assets for people of color overcoming social and economic barriers. These strong interpersonal relationships provide psychological and enhance adaptation. A resilience study researching African American women who worked as maids in the deep south found that domestic reporting workers reported high resilience. Although the domestic workers were poor and legally powerless, they learned and found ways to resist oppression without jeopardizing their employment (Van Wormer, Sudduth, & Jackson, 2011). One domestic worker shared her strategy of fantasizing a successful and rewarding future which provided fulfillment of a dream and comfort. Another domestic worker, Mrs. Byrd shared her experience of her employer forbidding her from washing her hands in the same wash pan that the family used due to his fear of her germs. After the discriminatory encounter, Mrs. Byrd started cooking without washing her hands, per her employer’s instruction.

Third, when including resilience as a predictor of psychological well-being in the second hypothesized model, the strength of the correlation between racial and ethnic microaggressions and psychological distress increased. One interpretation of this phenomenon is the suppressor
effect, which is described as a variable that has a weak correlation with the dependent variable but accounts for irrelevant variance; therefore, increasing other independent variables’ correlations. When resilience was added to the second model as another independent variable, it accounted for the residuals, which were left by the model without resilience. As a result, the observed R-square increased from Model 1 \( (R^2 = .27) \) to Model 2 \( (R^2 = .30) \). Although resilience itself was a weak predictor, it seemed to suppress the error of the reduced model.

Besides the suppressor effect, another possible explanation was that individuals with lower psychological well-being were more likely to be aware of the experience of racial and ethnic microaggressions. Unlike blatant racism, racial and ethnic microaggressions are common and “innocuous” exchanges or behaviors that can easily be overlooked and unacknowledged by people of color due to their pervasive and automatic nature (Sue et al., 2007; Solorzano, Ceja, & Yosso, 2000).

**Limitations and Implication for Future Research**

The study has a number of limitations. First, the issue of linguistic equivalence needs to be considered. Surveys were administered in English, Tagalog, and Indonesian. Wordings of survey items could possibly have slightly different meaning across languages. Of the several instruments used in this study, the CD-RISC was the only one that had empirically validated translations. The other measures used in this study were not professionally translated into either Indonesian or Tagalog. We asked volunteers who were native Tagalog or Indonesian speakers to translate the surveys and the translation of these measures were reviewed twice by the volunteers, but these translations were not conducted by professionals and were not validated prior to administration. While the measures demonstrated adequate reliability across all versions
administered, future research will be needed to refine the translations for these surveys and to verify the reliability and validity of translated versions.

Second, many survey responses were incomplete. Close to half of the participants did not disclose any demographic information. This is a major limitation of this study. It is possible that FDWs were fearful about potential negative repercussions of being identified. A factor that might have increased the level of non-disclosure was that the primary researcher’s racial and ethnic identity is the same as the majority of the local Hong Kong residents who employ FDWs. In the current study, one female FDW volunteered to recruit participants. Unfortunately, no procedure was completed to keep track of the source of the participant's referral when completing the paper survey or the online link to the survey. Future research will need to account for the race and ethnicity of the individuals soliciting data to determine if that factor affects participation and disclosure of demographic information.

Third, data collection procedures resulted in a restricted sample. A major obstacle to data collection was that many participants did not have internet connection or access to computers. Since data analysis identified significant differences between responses provided via paper copy and internet survey, those differences were statistically controlled in the analysis. Future research could either eliminate online surveys entirely (by only providing paper copies to standardize administration) or provide participants with access to a tablet to complete the survey, although the latter method would require additional resources and may perhaps involve other confounds (such as participants mistrusting survey confidentiality while the researcher remains nearby or when the electronic technology has the capability to capture the image of the participant).

A final limitation is that the participants completed the survey under different circumstances in different locations. Participants were approached at various locations, including
outside of the Wan Chai Immigration Office, non-profit organization social activities, and in
different public locations during their time off. One possibility is that the location where
participants were approached might affect the response. For example, FDWs suggested the Wan
Chai Immigration Office location as an optimal location for data collection because it reflected
their horrendous work conditions. During the summer, a peak season of contract renewal, FDWs
will stay on the street outside the immigration office in order to obtain a next day walk-in spot.
In very hot and humid weather with the closest public bathroom 15 minutes away, FDWs spend
close to twelve hours on the street. It is therefore possible that being approached while suffering
from poor physical accommodations might provoke more negative feelings on the survey. Public
locations also might invoke more negative feelings for FDWs. During their weekly time off of
approximately twelve hours, FDWs can reclaim their freedom of socializing with friends,
running errands, and worship. However, they have little time to rest and cannot bring friends to
their employers’ homes. As a result, FDWs often resort to spending their time congregating in
public parks regardless of the weather. People on the street outside of the immigration office or
at a public park are under very different circumstances compared to FDWs who might be
socializing in a non-profit organization in the company of their peers. Future research should
analyze the locations where the participants are contacted to ascertain the extent to which survey
responses differed.

Conclusion

This study sought to examine the extent to which aspects of FDWs’ employment
predicted their level of psychological distress. Participants reported elevated but sub-clinical
levels of psychological distress. FDWs also reported an average of 14 encounters of racial and
ethnic microaggressions over the course of the six months prior to completing the measures,
which to some extent corroborates qualitative narratives of FDWs experiencing racial discrimination in Hong Kong. The average number of family concerns reported was five and the most endorsed item was spouse or child unemployment, which seemed to suggest financial stress at home. These results reflected that FDWs were impacted by multiple risk factors as predicted, but they also demonstrated very high levels of psychological resilience.

We tested two hypothesized models incorporating literature-commended common risk factors, including racial and ethnic microaggressions, family concern, job satisfaction, and resilience to predict the level of psychological distress. Results only partially supported the hypotheses, as only the first model was a good fit. Due to the high overall levels of resilience reported by the women, a ceiling effect characterized the data that precluded an accurate evaluation of possible mediation. Nevertheless, resilience remained a significant predictor of psychological distress in the presence of the other variables evaluated. Thus FDWs’ working conditions and their level of resilience to those conditions do influence their overall levels of psychological distress.
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For several centuries, domestic workers have provided manual labor services to middle and upper-class households in societies around the globe. Though the responsibilities of such workers vary, the general nature of the work done by domestic workers often requires physical labor that may include, but is not limited to performing various household chores, child and elderly care, cleaning, cooking, purchasing food and household items, laundry, maintenance, and any other tasks designated by employers (Anderson, 2010; Clark, 1937). Compensation for these services also varies and may include, stipends, wages, and/or shelter.

This industry has been shaped by historical, social, and economic factors. The predominantly female population in this industry is partly due to the historical gender allocation of labor (Lanchance-Grzela & Bouchard, 2010), which has traditionally been that men worked for pay outside of homes and that women were homemakers (Sayer, Casper, & Cohen, 2004). Although women’s commitment to education and placement in the workforce has increased due to increasing equal rights, it has yet to translate into the delegation of household labor (Fuwa, 2004; Fuwa & Cohen, 2007; Gershuny, 2003; Knudsen & Wærness, 2008; Lincoln, 2008;). Following the tradition that men work outside of the home and that women work as homemakers, those who employ domestic workers have typically preferred female domestic workers to males. As more women enter the workforce, upper-class households have increasingly delegated domestic work to girls and women from lower socioeconomic backgrounds. For girls and women from lower socioeconomic backgrounds, domestic work has become an increasingly stable and predictable form of employment with the promise of increased pay and perhaps an escape from poverty (Black, 2002).
In order to better understand this line of work, why such work is appealing to women from lower socioeconomic status, as well as ways that domestic workers are at risk for potential exploitation, it is important to have a basic understanding of the origins of domestic workers and ways in which this line of work has changed over time. Domestic work can be dated across history and time (Musson, 2009; Turner-Bisset, 2001). For instance, during the Victorian era of the late 1800s, domestic work was the second most common occupation in England and Wales. During that time, domestic employment conditions and regulations were governed by the Master and Servants Act in the United Kingdom and other British Colonies, in countries such as Australia, Canada, New Zealand, and South Africa (Deakin & Wilkinson, 2005). The act aimed to regulate servants and laborers’ performance, which required complete obedience and loyalty from domestic workers to employers. Failure to comply with this regulation, even when employers’ requests violated domestic workers’ rights, was punishable by law. About 10,000 workers were prosecuted per year between 1858 and 1875 in Britain while zero employers were prosecuted (Jones, 1867). The nature of the legislation in the Master and Servants Act planted the historical biases of favoring employers as the details of this Act aimed to discipline and repress domestic workers.

The oppression of domestic workers has firmly taken root, even as the formalities associated with domestic work have evolved with time. After other World War II, the world saw an economic expansion in which there was a marked increase in employment among women worldwide (Murray, 2000; Hartmann, 1987;). The increasing need of human resources, coupled with the progression of equal rights for women, led to the steady rise of women of all ages obtaining higher education in surging number of countries around the world (Moore, 1987). Industrialization and opportunities for women to be employed in lucrative work opportunities
created the need for increased numbers of domestic workers to fill the vacancy in households where women, who had traditionally done household chores, were now involved in the workforce (Sakhrani, 2002). To solve the domestic worker shortage, a modern form of domestic work was implemented by importing lower-cost domestic workers from less developed countries. These groups of domestic workers have come to be known as Foreign Domestic Workers (FDWs).

**Foreign Domestic Workers Worldwide**

Foreign domestic employment involves the recruitment, training, and placement of international migrants into households seeking help in completing many of the traditional household chores mentioned above. The process of hiring and placing FDWs includes the following steps: 1) establishing recruiting agencies in developing countries, 2) advertising financial advancement opportunities and potential benefits of being involved in domestic work to attract potential candidates, 3) selecting qualified candidates, 4) providing training for qualified candidates regarding domestic skills needed for this line of work, 5) sending qualified candidates’ profiles to prospective employers, 6) arranging employment contracts and obtaining the necessary documentation for such employment (e.g., visas and other supporting documents), 7) providing the transportation needed to get the worker to the designated country, and finally, 8) meeting the employers at the agency and following up with employers regarding necessary home conditions prior to having FDWs begin work (Constable, 1997).

The services that FDWs provide have made it easier for women, who would have traditionally stayed at home, to participate in the workforce while delegating various domestic chores as well as child and elder care responsibilities to a stay-at-home caregiver (Groves & Lui, 2012). Unlike typical caregivers, most FDWs’ visas are specifically sponsored by their
employers and expire as soon as the contract finishes or as soon as the FDWs employment is terminated. This gives employers more power and protection in the employment relationship. In addition to these unequal power dynamics, legal supervision of the contract that FDWs enter into is nearly nonexistent.

Without proper legal protection, employment exploitation among FDWs has burgeoned. Some examples of the exploitation faced by FDWs include labor law bias, limited social mobility, a high risk of becoming victims of human trafficking, and other forms of general exploitation (Kuo, 2014). These exploitations have received greater attention recently as they have been reported globally by investigative journalism in the last decade (Bell & Piper, 2005; Constable, 1997; Constable, 2007). While exploitation of FDWs has occurred over the course of decades, one case of FDW exploitation gained international attention when Shanit Gurung, a FDW in the United States from India, was awarded $15.6 million in damages by a New York district judge in 2012 (Vora, 2012). During her three years of employment, Shanit was financially compensated by her employer in the total amount of one hundred and twenty US dollars and while working she was required to sleep on the living room floor and eat leftovers. Such conditions were far below the minimum wage and compensation requirements regulated by the Fair Labor Standards Act and the New York Labor Law. While Shanit’s experience garnered international attention, her case was only one of many of FDWs who have been mistreated and unfairly compensated for the services they provided.

Human Rights organizations around the world are beginning to better document the systemic exploitation faced by FDWs. For example, FDWs in Bahrain, Iran, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, and the United Arab Emirates are supposed to receive certain protections through the Kafala sponsorship system (Selk, 2017; Pande, 2013). Under the
Kafala system, employers sponsor FDWs’ visas. If FDWs disobey their employers’ instructions, even when basic human rights are exploited or violated, employers can threaten them into submission by revoking their FDWs’ visa which would essentially cause them to lose their legal migrant worker status (Gardner, 2010). The Kafala system resembles the historical Master and Servant Acts mentioned previously in that employers are given far more power than FDWs as the visa status of FDWs under this system are constantly in jeopardy. Similar visas system are employed in the most developed areas of Asia, including Hong Kong, Singapore, and Taiwan, creating systemic oppression that leaves FDWs powerless. One female FDW described her experience of working for her employer as follows:

“Mama would close the fridge; we were not allowed to take any food…… She also beat me if there was anything wrong, like a tiny speck of dust. I worked from 6 a.m. until 1 a.m.” (Selk, 2017, p.1).

Some may wonder why FDWs would stay and continue to work when even basic human rights such as clean water and physical safety are violated. Research suggests that FDWs are legally and socially dependent on their employers, and, as such, are increasingly vulnerable to such exploitation (Chuang, 2010; Gibson, Law, & McKay, 2001). The examples shared above illustrate the concerns that FDWs face in regard to the exploitation of their basic human rights and the subsequent negative impact on their psychological well-being. FDW exploitation has spread worldwide. However major metropolitan cities seem to be hotbeds for both FDWs and exploitation of FDWs. This phenomenon is particularly apparent in colonial Hong Kong, an industrialized city with geographic advantages for import and export businesses which have blossomed economically over the past several decades. In addition to its historically established foreign domestic employment precedence, Hong Kong also has one of the highest FDW
populations in the world. Over the past four decades, FDWs have come to represent about five percent of the city of Hong Kong’s overall population (Constable, 1997). With such a high concentration of FDWs in a relatively confined demographic area, Hong Kong appears to be an excellent location to study and better understand the experiences of and issues related to FDWs.

**Foreign Domestic Workers in Hong Kong**

The rapid growth of the FDW population in Hong Kong began in the 1970s when the shift of gender ratio in the workforce in Hong Kong prompted a chain reaction of social changes. Although colonial Hong Kong is a fusion of Asian and Western cultures, family structures and gender norms are strongly influenced by the prevalence of Confucianism. Domestic labor and responsibilities were generally divided by gender, with females typically taking the role of homemakers and males taking on the primary role of breadwinners. The emerging normality of dual-income households in Hong Kong created the need for hired help to perform household chores, child and elderly care, and other specific domestic tasks (Chen, 2005).

This increased demand for hired domestic help in Hong Kong coincided with the recession in the Philippines. In 1974, the Philippine government negotiated labor migration internationally to alleviate a falling GDP (Quizon, 2011). Privatized agencies quickly established systems to provide countries in demand of domestic workers with cheap labor from countries in need of employment opportunities. This process included recruiting potential candidates in developing areas of Asia, providing language and skills training, advertising candidate profiles for employer selection, and arranging travel documentation and itineraries for FDWs to employment destination. This business model spread across Asia and transformed domestic worker employment from a historically localized apprentice system to an international industry (Liljas, 2014).
International media has been narrating foreign domestic employment in Hong Kong as “commodities who are inspected, bought, traded, owned, and generally objectified” and “captive laborers abroad” due to the decade-long documented hardships (Lau, Cheng, Chow, Ungvari, & Leung, 2009, p. 572; Constable, 2007, p. 51). Because of the sparse amount of academic studies directly researching risk factors in this marginalized population, pairing risk factors identified by journalistic investigations with correlated academic research may possibly shed light on female FDWs’ employment experiences as well as their experiences related to racial discrimination, exploitation, risk factors, and psychological well-being.

**Racial Discrimination**

Racial discrimination towards female FDWs is often subtle and follows a systemized method (Law, 2001). The FDWs population in Hong Kong is comprised of women from South East Asia, such as the Philippines, Indonesia, and Thailand. It is common that women from this region tend to have darker skin tones, which has been associated with lower status and negative stereotypes in Hong Kong (Law, 2001).

This same bias can be found in academic research regarding racism and stereotypes regarding FDWs. For example, in a study examining the discourse of skin color, Filipinas, and Indonesian women’s relatively darker skin colors, compared to that of Hong Kong residents who are of Chinese descent, were interpreted in relation to their social status (Leong, 2006). Participants reported associating female FDWs’ darker skin to be less beautiful and less delicate than Chinese skin. Inferring from these stereotypes and biased beliefs, participants believed that these FDWs would be good at performing laborious work, implying lower social status based on appearance. FDWs’ darker skin has been associated with negative social factors, such as being poor and old. Another form of racial discrimination towards female FDWs is segregation.
Although FDWs are required by law to reside in their employers’ residence, they are restricted from accessing elevators, swimming pools, amenities, or clubhouses of their employers’ residence and bathrooms in office buildings (Sautman, 2011). Biases and discriminatory behaviors towards female FDWs targeted their occupation and believed racial identities.

Biases and stereotyping tend to cloud the perception of employers, which lead to irrational justifications of employers’ withholding rightful treatment. According to labor law, FDWs are entitled to one day off per week, in addition to all statutory holidays. In reality, the 24-hour mandatory day off often turns into eight hours of freedom without access to their employer’s residence. On Sunday and statutory holidays, female FDWs are often seen congregating in public spaces, including Victoria’s parks, roads in the downtown Central financial district, and any open space in communities (Tan, 2001; Grove & Chang, 1999). FDWs use this space and time to socialize, share food, and nap. Most of the time, FDWs meet according to their racial and ethnic identity, as many are eager to speak in their native languages. This implicit social grouping creates a mutual segregation from a macro level (between FDWs and local Hong Kong citizens) to a micro level (different racial groups among FDWs). Besides minimal contact in business contexts (e.g., selling affordable goods, food, or currency exchange shops), local Hong Kongers seldom interact with FDWs outside of employment settings (Ozeki, 1997). Cross-racial friendships, religious worship, or social interaction amongst FDWs and local Hong Kongers are rare and difficult to find.

The implicit segregation of FDWs in Hong Kong perpetuates the stereotypes that many locals from Hong Kong hold. Tensions between FDWs and locals from Hong Kong have also continued to rise as locals from Hong Kong often view FDWs gathering together in public space
as hostile and bothersome (Law, 2002). The following quote is one example of how local residences perceived FDWs public space occupation.

“But, on Sundays, Filipino FDWs disrupt the orderly visual space of Central and engage in ‘undesirable’ activities such as sitting on straw mats in public spaces, getting haircuts and manicures and hawking goods from home. This is also a site where migrant workers organizations launch protests to critique policies affecting migrant labor, indicating this space is also a ‘site of oppositional social movements’ and ‘a political site separate from, and often critical of the state and the economy.’” (Duncan, 1996, p. 130)

Law (2002) suggested that the competition of public space appropriation became the platform to communicate different political messages. FDWs’ temporary appropriation of public space during Sundays and the quick evacuation by sunset manifests the competition and power struggle between FDWs and Hong Kong residents.

**Employment Conditions and Exploitation**

As previously noted, racial discrimination has created a hostile environment for FDWs in Hong Kong. The portrayal of racial interiority reinforces FDWs’ identity as subservient servants. FDWs who are fairly treated by employers consider themselves to be lucky and fortunate (Sun, 2017). It is very common in the FDW community to avoid reporting employers’ abuse in order to secure financial income and legal status in Hong Kong. FDWs’ fear of repercussions has caused employers in the working relationship to have notably more power, such that FDWs are often silenced psychologically and emotionally and are most susceptible to abusive situations. Abusive treatment includes, but is not limited to, the deprivation of food or mandatory days off, inadequate living quarters to rest (e.g., having to sleep on the kitchen floor, in the closet, in a bathtub), wrongful dismissal, sexual abuse, and physical assault (Law, 2001). Narratives from
FDWs have depicted elements of humiliation, traumatic events, and deplorable details of living conditions (Constable, 1997).

For example, one FDW in Hong Kong described being beaten every day for four months and was required to work 18 hours daily, surviving on very little food while having to sleep in the bathroom. On occasion, she was dragged by her hair across the room and was physically assaulted. She was able to record her employer’s confrontation, illustrating the horrific abuse. Following is a transcript taken from the secret recording in which the employer confronts the FDW (Ladegaard, 2013, p. 45):

> What is missing? What is missing? Huh? Anything? What is missing? Anything? [slap]
> Anything? Huh [slap] Why can’t you [slap] take a look? [slap] Can’t you take a look first [slap] to see what is missing before you do the laundry? […] Maybe the butter is missing, then bring it out, I didn’t ask you to toast the bread, what’s wrong with you? Should I get angry again tomorrow? I have reminded you many times, you have a poor memory, then you should check, if anything is missing huh? You better die [slap] Why aren’t you dead? You better jump off the building and kill yourself, you better die. You make me so angry every day, you better die.

In most employment scenarios, employers work with foreign domestic employment agencies to select candidates with FDWs knowing little to nothing about their prospective employers. However, it is common knowledge among FDWs that some employers require FDWs to work at other places and for others than for those to whom they are contractually obligated (Mok, 2014). To avoid paying minimum wage, some employers send FDWs to work in multiple households or for commercial purposes. When suspicions arise, immigration and the labor department are more likely to prosecute FDWs than employers. The inequality of the legal
system has trapped FDWs into a dilemma in which they must either violate labor laws in order to meet employers’ unjust demands or risk termination from their employment. For many FDWs, losing this employment has significant ramifications including not being able to financially support families at home, becoming unemployable, and having to pay overcharged agency placement fees again.

Because of the required live-in employment arrangement, FDWs are more vulnerable to the risk of coercion and abuse by employers and family members (Bell & Piper, 2005). The live-in arrangement also makes it difficult to report and prosecute due to the absence of witnesses and lack of willingness to report the perpetrator, who may also be a family member. As domestic work requires physical labor, employers often want to ensure and maximize the availability of workers. Some countries, such as Singapore, explicitly contracted FDWs to forgo fertility rights and to undergo periodic mandatory pregnancy tests. Another FDW in Hong Kong described her experience with employer’s invasive behavior as follows:

When I was throwing out the food then I go to the rubbish but I talk to myself. Maybe I can eat it because I’m so hungry. There’s not enough food for me. I put it into a plastic bag then I put it in my bag but I don’t know she (employer) is there behind me. She say to me ‘what’s that?’ I say to her “the food you want me to throw away ma’am, but I’m so hungry I want to eat it. She say to me ‘you stole my things, I say you throw it. why do you eat it?. I say ‘I’m so hungry already ma’am. She say to me ‘it’s better to throw away than you eat it because you are rubbish.’ She never call me my name. She call me rubbish, foolish, crazy, germs. “You are only germs in my house.” When they go out, she always say to me ‘bye-bye rubbish’, sometimes ‘bye-bye foolish’. I say to myself ‘it’s okay, nobody heard it [cries]. (Ladegaard, 2012, p. 462)
Though abusive and inhumane treatment from employers are common experiences for FDWs, the lopsided and unequal employment contract makes it more difficult for FDWs to seek redress (Tan, 2001). Under the current Hong Kong labor laws, FDWs who report any disputes can be punished. Furthermore, as is common with FDWs in other countries, those FDWs in Hong Kong have work permits and visas that are sponsored by their employers on a two-year contract (Hong Kong Human Rights Monitor, 1996). Once their employment contract is terminated under any circumstances, including abuse, they have two weeks to secure another domestic work contract before being required to leave Hong Kong (Ozeki, 1997). If FDWs dispute the termination or report employers’ contract violation, they are required to stay in Hong Kong while being ineligible for any other forms of employment until their case has been legally resolved. As the average wait time to begin the legal process in Hong Kong is beyond months, many FDWs will forgo justice to secure financial stability.

Other Stressors

Besides racial discrimination and hostile work environment, FDWs in many countries, including Hong Kong, experience a host of other stressors. Hardships identified by female FDWs include loneliness and homesickness (Nakonz & Shik, 2009). FDWs normally have a two-week vacation period to visit their country of origin. The comfort and relief of being home are complicated by alienated relationships with family members at home. Some employers implement strict curfews, deny FDWs’ right to leave the apartment, and deny FDWs’ rights to call home which serves to isolate them even further from their support systems.

Having limited communication with their family members, FDWs experience constant worries about family concerns (Nakonz & Shik, 2009). Family members’ financial struggles, such as medical expenses, educational expenses, and family debt become a source of burden.
Since financial security is one of the most common reasons for FDWs’ migration, they contribute financially to their family back home, but their contributions to the family are rarely reciprocated.

Moreover, long-distance relationships and marriage are difficult to maintain. While FDWs are living abroad in Hong Kong, they worry about their husbands’ possible infidelity. In most countries, infidelity is a legal justification for ending a marriage. However, in the Philippines, a country that is the native land for the majority of the FDWs in Hong Kong, the strong Catholic influence from the Spanish colonial era has made it so that divorce is outlawed (Santos, 2015). The only legal option available is annulment, yet it excludes infidelity and abuse as legal grounds, making it nearly impossible and very expensive to obtain. Without a legal divorce, Filipino FDWs often compromise and remain in their marriages, essentially financially supporting their spouses’ affairs. The entrapment many FDWs feel is not only is legal, but emotional as well. “Trouble at home” is the term FDWs typically use to describe the dread of returning home and leaving behind a new found sense of “personhood,” independence, and freedom, even though this was attained in less desirable employment conditions (Constable, 1999).

Cultural homelessness, a term describing cross-cultural tension, is another stressor FDWs encounter (Vivero & Jenjins, 1999). To fulfill employment demands, FDWs quickly adapt to their host environment, in this case, Hong Kong. They acquire local languages, customs, social norms, and adapt to living abroad. When they return home for visits, they experience the brief “honeymoon period” as they distribute presents acquired in Hong Kong. The stress of maintaining that excitement, re-entering relationships or marriages, and feeling a sense of not belonging to their homeland instigates urgency and uneasiness to return to Hong Kong. An FDW
recounted her experience being home and the temporary satisfaction she experienced. If her stay was longer than the typical two weeks per contract (two years), she began to feel anxious, restless, dissatisfied, and stifled (Constable, 1999). Summarizing her experience, this FDW described the side effect of constant switching between cultures and languages (code-switching), leading to her experience of internalizing self-blame, shame, and alexithymia.

**Resilience**

Studies on migrant worker populations suggest that there are many resilience factors that can help to moderate distress, such as financial and material gains, marital status, and social support (Wong & Hong, 2008). In previous studies, researchers have found that FDW religious worship groups in Hong Kong helped mediate FDWs’ experience of exploitation and difficulties (Pargament, 1997). Religious interpretation of suffering provides two main benefits: religious reappraisal of hardships and a social support system. More specifically, when individuals believe in “a plan of God,” this provides purpose and belief in an external locus of control in which difficulties become positive tasks and spiritual opportunities. Besides providing religious beliefs and guidance, religious congregations also serve as a social support, providing a social network and support among FDWs (Holroyd, Molassiotis, & Taylor-Piliae, 2001). Social activities, entertainment, and sharing distractions help FDWs to avoid focusing on their troubles and sufferings.

Religious congregation not only serves as an emotional buffer but also a physical sanctuary. Many FDWs are not informed of their rights or are afraid of asserting their rights. Churches can often provide shelter, legal education, and advocates to assist FDWs in legal proceedings (Ladegaard, 2013). For example, the Bethune House Migrant Women’s Refuge
located in Central, Hong Kong offers temporary accommodation, housing FDWs who have been terminated or who have escaped from abusive employers.

**Psychological Distress Among FDWs in Hong Kong**

To identify at-risk migrant workers, studies have begun to investigate the connection between migrant worker stressors and psychological distress. Using multivariate analyses, researchers found that elevated psychological distress is related to migrant stress, high levels of traditional health beliefs, poor social relations with coworkers, self-perceived substance abuse, family dysfunctions, ineffective social support, low-self-esteem, lower desire in migration, higher level of education, and difficulties in acculturation (Griffin & Soskolne, 2003; Hovey & Magaña, 2002).

Although FDWs make up about 5% of Hong Kong’s population, research studying this specific migrant population’s psychological distress is sparse (McCurdy-Lightbound, 2014). Within the limited body of research, most of the studies employed various qualitative research methods, providing in-depth narratives of struggles and psychological challenges of FDWs. For example, Lau, Cheng, Chow, Ungvari, & Leung (2009) examined acute psychiatric disorders in FDWs in Hong Kong by interviewing 41 female FDWs. Among all racial and ethnic groups of FDW participants, Indonesian FDWs experienced the onset of psychological distress significantly earlier than other FDWs after beginning their employment in Hong Kong, with half of them being hospitalized within the first 2 years of employment.

Results also showed that among those interviewed, none demonstrated any help-seeking behavior and received help only after they were escorted to the emergency room by employers or employment agents after being found unwell. The most common disorder reported in this study was Acute and Transient Polymorphic Disorder (ATPD). The second most common diagnoses
were acute stress disorder among Indonesian FDWs and dissociative disorder among Filipino FDWs. Prior to developing psychiatric illnesses, 88.8% of FDWs who participated in the study also reported at least one psychological stressor, such as family problems (death or illness), marital discord, dating concerns, abuse and exploitation at work, and financial struggles.

The high report rate of mental health challenges sheds light on how common FDWs encounter stressors and suffer from elevated psychological distress. Another qualitative study analyzed the psychological distress of FDWs in Hong Kong through the framework of conceptualizing crying as a form of social communication and help-seeking behavior (Ladegaard, 2014). Through discourse analysis, seven predominant themes were identified, which are fear and anxiety, re-living traumatic experiences, family concerns, termination/financial struggle, hopelessness, religious beliefs, and being wrongly accused of crimes. These constant precautions and worries create more distress for FDWs in an already stressful occupation.

While qualitative studies provide detailed narratives and complex analyses of stressors contributing to psychological distress, quantitative studies that employ validated psychometric measures can provide useful information, such as screening level of psychological distress and comparing FDWs’ psychological distress with different populations. Despite their potential usefulness, we were only able to find one published quantitative study, conducted by McCurdy-Lightbound (2014). Results indicated that FDWs’ Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI) Positive Symptom Total and Global Severity Index scores were higher than BSI adult non-patient norms by two and a half times. Although the study was able to find a significantly higher level of psychological distress in FDWs participants, all the hypothesized risk and resilient factors, such as financial constraints and church attendance, were found to be unreliable predictors.
References


Ladegaard, H. J. (2013). Beyond the reach of ethics and equity? Depersonalisation and
dehumanisation in foreign domestic helper narratives. *Language and Intercultural
Communication, 13*(1), 44-59.

Ladegaard, H. J. (2014). Crying as communication in domestic helper narratives: Towards a
social psychology of crying in discourse. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology,
33*(6), 579-605.


Studies, 39*(9), 1625-1645.

*Ecumene, 8*(3), 264-283.

psychiatric disorders in foreign domestic workers in Hong Kong: A pilot study.

Leong, S. (2006). Who's the fairest of them all? Television ads for skin-whitening cosmetics in
Hong Kong. *Asian Ethnicity, 7*(2), 167-181.

Liljas, P. (2014, January 4). Abused Indonesian maid could sue Hong Kong government, lawyer
may-be-sued-over-maid-abuse/

and Family, 70*(3), 806-814.

workers in Hong Kong*. Los Angeles, CA: Alliant International University.

Mok, K.D. (2014). *Rediscover the voices of domestic helpers: How they balance expressing their moral voices with family and employment connections* (Unpublished master’s thesis). Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong, Hong Kong.


Selk, A. (2017, April 05). A maid begged for help before falling from a window in Kuwait. Her


APPENDIX B

Survey Packet in English and Indonesian

Default Question Block

Introduction
This research study is being conducted by Ka Yan Danise Mok, a doctoral student from Brigham Young University under the supervision of G. E. Kawika Allen, Ph.D. in the department of Counseling Psychology and Special Education. The survey is about female foreign domestic helpers’ work experience in Hong Kong and mental health. You are invited to participate because of your current occupation as a foreign domestic helper. All information you will provide is anonymous.

Because of the sensitive nature of the question, we encourage you to find a place and time (30 minutes) to participate where you will have the privacy, ideally without employers’ acknowledgement, to complete the survey.

If you are at a safe place to participate right now, click “proceed” to continue.
If you are not able to proceed to the study right now, you are welcome to return to this page at a convenient time and safe place.

Thank you.

The survey is available in both English/Tagslog and English/Indonesian. Please choose Indonesian from the drop down manual.

I-Risks/Discomforts_Resiko/Ketidak nyamanan
There are minimal risks for participation in this study. Your responses will remain confidential. If you feel uncomfortable answering a particular question, you may choose to not answer that question, or discontinue the study.

Ada resiko yang minimal untuk berpartisipasi dalam penelitian ini. Tanggapan Anda akan diangi kerahasiaannya. Jika Anda tidak merasa nyaman menjawab pertanyaan tertentu, Anda dapat memilih untuk tidak menjawab pertanyaan tersebut atau berhenti berpartisipasi dalam penelitian ini.

Benefits_Manfaat
There will be no direct benefits to you. It is hoped, however, that through your participation, researchers may learn about domestic helpers’ work experience.

Tidak ada manfaat langsung kepada Anda. Diharapkan, bagaimanapun, melalui partisipasi Anda, peneliti dapat belajar mengenai pengalaman kerja pembantu rumah tangga.

Confidentiality_Kerahasiaan
The research data will be kept on a password protected computer and only the researcher will have access to the data. At the conclusion of the study, the data will be kept in the researcher's locked computer device throughout data analysis.

Data penelitian akan disimpan di perangkat komputer dengan menggunakan kata kunci dan hanya peneliti yang yang dapat mengakses data tersebut. Pada akhir penelitian, data akan disimpan dalam perangkat komputer yang di kunci dalam seluruh proses analisa data.

Compensation_Kompensasi
There will be no compensation for research participant.

Tidak ada kompensasi yang diberikan untuk partisipasi dalam penelitian ini.

Participation_Partisipasi
Participation in this research study is voluntary. You have the right to withdraw at any time or refuse to participate entirely without jeopardy to your personal safety, employment, and chances of receiving services from Non-governmental organizations (NGOs).

Partisipasi dalam penelitian ini bersifat sukarela. Anda memiliki hak untuk menarik setiap saat atau menolak untuk berpartisipasi sepenuhnya tanpa bahaya untuk keselamatan Anda pribadi, pekerjaan, dan kemungkinan menerima layanan dari LSM.
Questions about the Research

If you have questions regarding this study, you may contact Ka Yan Danise Mok at kdmok_r@byu.edu or G. E. Kawikia Allen, Ph.D. at 1 (801) 422-2620 for further information.

Jika Anda mempunyai pertanyaan mengenai penelitian ini, Anda dapat menghubungi Ka Yan Danise Mok di kdmok_r@byu.edu untuk informasi lebih lanjut.

Questions about Your Rights as Research Participants

Pertanyaan mengenai Hak Anda sebagai Peserta Penelitian

If you have questions regarding your rights as a research participant, contact IRB Administrator at (801) 422-1481; A-265 ASB, Brigham Young University, Provo, UT 84602; irb@byu.edu. For Hong Kong participants, contact Dr. Staci Ford at the Women’s Studies Research Centre of The University of Hong Kong; womensrc@hku.hk.

Jika Anda mempunyai pertanyaan mengenai hak Anda sebagai peserta penelitian, hubungi Administrasi IRB di (801) 422-1481; A-265 ASB, Brigham Young University, Provo, UT 84602; irb@byu.edu. Untuk peserta dari Hong Kong, hubungi Dr. Staci Ford at the Women’s Studies Research Centre of The University of Hong Kong; womensrc@hku.hk.

Statement of Consent

I have read, understood, and received a copy of the above consent and desire of my own free will to participate in this study. (By proceeding to the next page of this survey, you will be consenting to participate in this study).

Saya telah membaca, memahami, dan menerima salinan dari persetujuan diatas dan dengan keinginan kehendak bebas saya sendiri untuk berpartisipasi dalam penelitian ini.

QoL: Looking back over the last week, including today, help us understand how you have been feeling.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never Tidak</th>
<th>Rarely Jarang</th>
<th>Sometimes Kadang Kadang</th>
<th>Frequently Sering</th>
<th>Almost Always Selalu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I get along well with others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saya bergaul dengan baik dengan orang lain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I tire quickly. Saya cepat capai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel no interest in things. Saya merasa tidak tertarik dengan barang/kegiatan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel stressed at work/school. Saya merasa stres di tempat kerja/sekolah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I blame myself for things. Saya menyalahkan diri saya sendiri untuk hal yang terjadi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel irritated. Saya cepat teranggung</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel unhappy in my marriage or significant relationship. Saya merasa tidak bahagia dalam perkawinan saya atau hubungan yang signifikan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have thoughts of ending my life. Saya pernah berfikir untuk mengakhiri hidup saya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel week. Saya merasa lemah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel fearful. Saya merasa takut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After heavy drinking. I need a drink the next morning to get going. (If you don’t drink, mark “never.”) Setelah minum berat, saya perlu minum lagi pagi nanti untuk memulai hidup (jika Anda tidak minum alkohol pihak tertentu)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find my work/school satisfying.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Saya merasa perkerjaan saya/sekolah saya memuaskan
I am a happy person. Saya
orang yang bahagia
I work/study too much. Saya
bekerja belajar terlalu banyak
I feel worthless. Saya merasa
tidak berarti
I am concerned about family
troubles. Saya khawatir dengan
masalah masalah keluarga
I have an unfulfilling sex life.
Saya mempunyai kehidupan
sex yang tidak memuaskan
I feel lonely. Saya merasa
tersedih
I have frequent arguments.
Saya sering bertengkar
I feel loved and wanted. Saya
merasa disentai dan dibutuhkan
I enjoy my spare time. Saya
menikmati waktu luang saya
I have difficulty concentrating.
Saya suka untuk
berkonsentrasi
I feel hopeless about the future.
Saya tidak mempunyai
pengharapan untuk masa
depan
I like myself. Saya benci diri
saya
Disturbing thoughts come into
my mind that I cannot get rid of.
Saya mempunyai hal yang
mengganggu pikiran saya yang
saya tidak dapat hilangkan
I feel annoyed by people who
criticize my drinking (or drug
use). (If not applicable, mark
“never.”) Saya kesal dengan
orang orang yang mengkritik
kebiasaan minum saya (atau
menyakini narkotika). (Jika tidak
berlaku, pilih tidak pernah)
I have an upset stomach. Saya
merasa sakit perut
I am not working/learning as
well as I used to. Saya tidak
bekerja belajar sebaik
biasanya
My heart pounds too much.
Jantung saya berdetak terlalu
kencang
I have trouble getting along
with friends and close
acquaintances. Saya kesulitan
bergaul dengan teman/
sahabat
I am satisfied with my life. Saya
puas dengan hidup saya
I have trouble at work/school
because of drinking or drug
use. (If not applicable, mark
“never.”) Saya mempunyai
kesulitan dalam pekerjaan
sekolah saya dikarenakan
kebiasaan minum minum atau
narkoba. (Jika tidak berlaku,
| I feel something bad is going to happen. Saya merasa sesuatu yang buruk akan terjadi | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| I have sore muscles. Saya mengalami pegal pegal otot | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| I feel afraid of open spaces, or driving, or being on public transportation. Saya merasa ketakutan akan ruangan terbuka, saat mengemudi, atau naik bis, naik kereta bawah tanah, dan sebagainya | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| I feel nervous. Saya merasa gugup | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| I feel my love relationships are full and complete. Saya merasa hubungan perintaan saya penuh dan lengkap | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| I feel that I am not doing well at work/school. Saya merasa tidak melakukan pekerjaan/ sekolah dengan baik | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| I have too many disagreements at work/school. Saya mempunyai pertikaian banyak pertentangan di tempat kerja/sekolah | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| I feel something is wrong with my mind. Saya merasa ada yang salah dengan pikiran saya | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| I have trouble falling asleep or staying asleep. Saya kesulitan untuk tidur dan tidur telapak | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| I feel blue. Saya merasa sedih | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| I am satisfied with my relationships with others. Saya puas atas hubungan saya dengan orang lain | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| I feel angry enough at work/school to do something I may regret. Saya merasa cukup marah di tempat kerja/sekolah untuk melakukan sesuatu yang mungkin saya akan sesalkan | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| I have headaches. Saya merasa sakit kepala | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

REMS-I: Think about your experiences with race. Please read each item and think of how many times this event has happened to you in the PAST SIX MONTHS.

| I did not experience this event. Saya tidak mengalami kejadian ini. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| I experienced this event at least once in the past six months. Saya mengalami kejadian ini paling tidak sekali dalam kurun waktu enam bulan terakhir. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
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I was told that I should not complain about race. Saya diberitahu untuk tidak mengeluh dikarnakan ras saya.

Someone assumed that I grew up in a particular neighborhood because of my race. Seseorang menyangka saya dibesarkan di daerah tertentu dikarnakan ras saya.

Someone avoided walking near me on the street because of my race. Seseorang menghindari berjalan dekat saya di pinggir jalan dikarnakan ras saya.

Someone told me that she or he was colorblind. Seseorang memberitahu saya bahwa dia buta warna.

Someone avoided sitting next to me in public space (e.g., restaurant, movie theaters, trains, buses) because of my race. Seseorang menghindar duduk di sebelah saya di tempat umum (misalnya restoran, bioskop, kereta api bawah tanah, bis) dikarnakan ras saya.

Someone assumed that I would not be intelligent because of my race. Seseorang mengira saya tidak pintar dikarnakan ras saya.

I was told that I complain about race too much. Saya diberitahu untuk tidak mengeluh terbahayak dikarnakan ras saya.

I received substandard service in stores compared to customers of other racial groups. Saya menerima pelayanan dibawah standard dikarnakan konsumen di kelompok ras lainnya.

I observed people of my race in prominent positions at my workplace or school. Saya melihat orang orang di ras saya di kedudukan tinggi dalam pekerjaan atau sekolah saya.

Someone wanted to date me only because of my race. Seseorang ingin mengencani saya hanya dikarnakan ras saya.

I was told that people of all racial groups experience the same obstacles. Saya diberitahu bahwa orang orang dari kelompok ras yang lain mempunyai kesulitan

My opinion was overlooked in a group discussion because of my race. Opini saya diabaikan dalam sebuah diskusi kelompok dikarnakan ras saya.

Someone assumed that my work would be inferior to people of other racial groups. Seseorang mengira pekerjaan
saye lebih rendah dibandingkan orang orang dari kelompok ras lain.

Someone acted surprised at my scholastic or professional success because of my race. Seseorang berpura-pura terkejut akan kesuksesan pendidikan atau pekerjaan saya dikarnakan ras saya.

I observed that people of my race were the CEOs of major corporations. Saya memperhatikan bahwa orang orang dari ras saya adalah pemimpin tertinggi dalam perusahaan besar.

I observed people of my race portrayed positively on television. Saya memperhatikan orang orang dari ras saya di pemberkatan dengan positif dalam televisi.

Someone assumed that I would not be educated because of my race. Seseorang mengira bahwa saya tidak mengenyam pendidikan dikarnakan ras saya.

Someone told me that I was "articulate" after she/he assumed I wouldn't be. Seseorang memberi tahu bahwa saya "tajam" setelah dia mengira sebaliknya.

Someone told me that all people in my racial group are all the same. Seseorang memberi tahu orang orang dari kelompok ras saya semua sama.

I observed people of my race portrayed positively in magazines. Saya memperhatikan orang orang dari kelompok ras saya digambarkan secara positif di majalah.

An employer or co-worker was unfriendly or unwelcoming toward me because of my race. Seseorang majikan atau teman kerja berlaku tidak ramah atau tidak menerima saya dikarnakan ras saya.

I was told that people of color do not experience racism anymore. Saya dibentahu bawa orang dengan warna kulit berbeda tidak lagi merasakan perbedaan ras.

Someone told me that they "don't see color". Seseorang memberi tahu pada saya bawa dia tidak melihat "warna kulit."

I read popular books or magazines in which a majority of contributions featured people from my racial group. Saya membaca buku populer atau majalah popular yang mayoritas kontribusinya bawa
menggambarka orang orang dari ras saya.

Someone asked me to teach them words in my "native language." Seseorang meminta saya untuk mengajari kata kata dari "bahasa asli saya."

Someone told me that they do not see race. Seseorang membedakan saya bahwa mereka tidak melihat perbedaan suku.

Someone clenched his purse or wallet upon seeing me because of my race. Seseorang mendesap tas atau dompetnya saat melihat saya karena ras saya.

Someone assumed that I would have a lower education because of my race. Seseorang menyanyikan saya mempunyai pendidikan rendah dikamakan ras saya.

Someone of a difficult racial group has stated that there is no difference between the two of us. Seseorang dari kelompok ras berbeda telah memberitahukan bahwa tidak ada berbedaan diantara kita.

Someone assumed that I would physically hurt them because of my race. Seseorang menyanyikan saya akan menyakit tubuhnya dikamakan ras saya.

Someone assumed that I ate foods associated with my race/culture every day. Seseorang menyanyikan saya akan makan makanan yang diasosiasikan dengan ras atau kebudayaan saya setiap hari.

Someone assumed that I held a lower paying job because of my race. Seseorang menyanyikan saya mempunyai pekerjaan dengan gaji rendah dikamakan ras saya.

I observed people of my race portrayed positively in movies. Saya melihat orang orang dari ras saya digambarkan secara positif dalam film film.

Someone assumed that I was poor because of my race. Seseorang mengira saya miskin dikamakan ras saya.

Someone told me that people should not think about race anymore. Seseorang membedakan saya bahwa orang orang seharusnya tidak lagi memikirkan mengenai perbedaan ras.

Someone avoided eye contact with me because of my race. Seseorang menghindari kontak mata dikamakan ras saya.

I observed that someone of my race is a government official in
FCS-I: Below is a list of experiences which may occur in families. Reach each experience carefully. Some of these may have been true at one point in your life but not true at another point. Think about your childhood and your adolescence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>No-Never happened TIDAK</th>
<th>TIDAK pernah terjadi.</th>
<th>Unsure TIDAK YAKIN</th>
<th>Yes- TIDAK YAKIN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents divorced or permanently separated before you were 18 years old.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orang tua bercerai atau berpisah sebelum Anda berusia 18 tahun.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family frequently moved. Keluarga sering berpindah tempat tinggal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent(s) or spouse or children unemployed for an extended period of time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salah satu atau kedua orang tua atau pasangan atau anak tidak bekerja untuk waktu yang lama.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequent, hostile arguing among family members. Pertengkaran yang sering dan kasar antara anggota keluarga.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death of parent(s) before you were 18 years old. Kematiin satu atau kedua orang tua sebelum Anda berusia 18 tahun.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse or children with drinking problem. Pasangan atau anak yang mempunyai kebiasaan mabuk mabukan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse or children with a drug problem. Pasangan atau anak yang mempunyai kebiasaan mabuk mabukan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse or children with a gambling problem. Pasangan atau anak yang mempunyai kebiasaan mabuk mabukan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical abuse in your family. Kekerasan fisik dalam keluarga.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual abuse in your family. Kekerasan fisik dalam keluarga.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
JST-I Please choose the most appropriate answer that reflect your opinion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Disagree very much</th>
<th>Sangat tidak setuju</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Cukup tidak setuju</th>
<th>Slightly disagree</th>
<th>Cukup setuju</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Cukup setuju</th>
<th>Agree very much</th>
<th>Cukup tidak setuju</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do. Saya merasa digaji dengan layak untuk pekerjaan yang saya lakukan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is really too little chance for promotion on my job. Sangat sedikit kesempatan untuk dipromosikan dalam pekerjaan saya.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My employer is quite competent in doing his/her job. Majikan saya cukup cakap dalam melakukan pekerjanya.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not satisfied with the benefit I receive. Saya tidak puas dengan keuntungan kerja yang saya terima.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I do a good, I receive the recognition for it that I should receive. Saat melakukan kerja yang baik, saya menerima pengakuan yang patut saya terima.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many of our rules and procedures make doing a good job difficult. Banyak aturan dan prosedur membuat pekerjaan yang baik menjadi sulit diakukan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I like the people I work with.
Saya suka dengan orang-orang yang bekerja dengan saya.

I sometimes feel my job is meaningless. Saya kadang-kadang merasa pekerjaan saya tidak berarti.

Communications seem good within this family. Komunikasi tampak baik dalam keluarga ini.

Praises are too few and far between. Kenakan gaji terlalu sedikit dan jauh jaraknya.

My employer is unfair to me. Majikan saya tidak bersikap adil pada saya.

The benefits I receive are as good as most other employers' offer. Keuntungan yang saya terima sama dengan keuntungan yang ditawarkan majikan yang lain.

I do not feel that the work I do is appreciated. Saya tidak merasa hasil kerja saya dihargai.

My efforts to do a good job are seldom blocked by red tape (too many rules). Kemampuan saya untuk melakukan kerja yang baik sering ditanah dengan batasan (terlalu banyak aturan).

I find I have to work harder at my job because of the incompetence of people I work with. Saya menemukan saya harus bekerja lebih keras di pekerjaan saya karena kekakuan orang yang bekerja dengan saya.

I like doing the things I do at work. Saya suka melakukan hal-hal yang saya lakukan di tempat kerja.

The responsibilities of this employment are not clear to me. Tanggung jawab pekerjaan saya tidak jelas bagi saya.

I feel unappreciated by the employer when I think about what they pay me. Saya merasa tidak dihargai oleh majikan ketika saya berpikir tentang bayaran saya.

My employer shows too little interest in the feelings of domestic helper. Majikan saya memperlihatkan terlalu sedikit minat dalam mengerti perasaan pembantu rumah tangga.

The benefit package we have is fair. Peket keuntungan pekerjaan yang kita miliki adalah cukup (sebanding).

There are few rewards for those who work here. Ada beberapa manfaat bagi mereka yang bekerja di sini.
I have too much to do at work. Saya mempunyai terlalu banyak tugas di pekerjaan saya.

I often feel that I do not know what is going on with the employer. Saya sering merasa bahwa saya tidak tahu apa yang terjadi dengan majikan.

I feel a sense of pride in doing my job. Saya merasa rasa bangga dalam melakukan pekerjaan saya.

I feel satisfied with my chances for salary increases. Saya merasa puas dengan peluang saya mendapatkan kenaikan gaji.

There are benefits we do not have which we should have. Ada manfaat kita tidak memiliki yang seharusnya kita miliki.

I like my employer. Saya suka majikan saya.

I don’t feel my efforts are rewarded the way they should be. Saya tidak merasa usaha saya dihargai seperti seharusnya.

There is too much arguing about petty and trivial matters and fighting at work. Ada terlalu banyak pertengkaran (berdebat tentang hal-hal kecil dan sepele) dan berkelah di tempat kerja.

My job is enjoyable. Pekerjaan saya menyenangkan.

Work assignments are not fully explained. Tugas kerja tidak sepenuhnya dijelaskan.

---

**CSR-I: Please choose the answer you most identify with.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not true at all</th>
<th>Rarely true</th>
<th>Sometimes true</th>
<th>Often true</th>
<th>True nearly all the time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>setuju</td>
<td>setuju</td>
<td>setuju</td>
<td>setuju</td>
<td>setuju</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

I am able to adapt when changes occur. Saya mampu beradaptasi, ketika terjadi perubahan.

I have at least one close and secure relationship that helps me when I am stressed. Saya punya setidiknya sebuah hubungan dekat dan aman yang dapat membantu saya saat saya dalam keadaan stres.

When there are no clear solutions to my problems, sometimes fate or God can help. Ketika tidak ada pemecahan masalah yang jelas, kadang kepercayaan atau keyakinan pada Tuhan bisa membantu.

I can deal with whatever comes my way. Saya dapat menghadapi apa pun yang terjadi dalam hidup saya.

Past successes give me...
confidence in dealing with new challenges and difficulties. Keberhasilan saya terdahulu memberi rasa percaya diri dalam menghadapi tantangan dan kesulitan baru.

I try to see the humorous side of things when I am faced with problems. Saya berusaha untuk memandang asli humor dari masalah-masalah yang saya hadapi.

Having to cope with stress can make me stronger. Pengalaman menangani stres dapat membuat saya semakin kuat.

I tend to bounce back after illness, injury, or other hardships. Saya memiliki kecenderungan untuk bangkit kembali setelah bersoda dalam kesulitan sekitar, luka, atau penderitaan lainnya.

Good or bad, I believe that most things happen for a reason. Baik atau buruk, saya yakin bahwa kebanyakan segala sesuatu terjadi untuk alasan tertentu.

I give my best effort no matter what the outcome may be. Saya memberikan usaha yang terbaik apapun hasil yang akan diperoleh.

I believe I can achieve my goals, even if there are obstacles. Saya yakin dapat meraih tujuan saya, meskipun ada rintangan-rintangan.

Even when things look hopeless, I don't give up. Bahkan saat tidka harapan, saya tidak putus asa.

During times of stress/crisis, I know where to turn for help. Saat terjadi stress/crisis, saya tahu kemana saya harus mencari bantuan.

Under pressure, I stayed focused and think clearly. Dalam situasi di bawah tekanan, saya dapat tetap fokus dan berpikir jernih.

I prefer to take the lead in solving problems rather than letting others make all the decision. Saya lebih suka maju dan memimpin usaha memecahkan masalah dibandingkan memberikan orang lain yang membuat semua keputusan.

I am not easily discouraged by failure. Saya tidak mudah putus asa akibat kegagalan.

I think of myself as a strong person when dealing with life's challenges and difficulties. Saya menganggap diri saya adalah orang yang kuat ketika berhadapan dengan tantangan dan kesulitan hidup.
I can make unpopular or difficult decisions that affect other people, if it is necessary. Jika memang penting, saya bisa membuat keputusan sulit atau yang tidak disukai/tidak disukai orang lain.

I am able to handle unpleasant or painful feelings like sadness, fear, and anger. Saya mampu mengatasi perasaan yang menyakitkan atau tidak menyenangkan, seperti kesedihan, ketakutan, dan kemarahan.

In dealing with life's problems, sometimes you have to act on a hunch without knowing why. Dalam menghadapi permasalahan hidup, kadang kita harus bertindak berdasarkan frasa atau naluri tanpa tahu mengapa.

I have a strong sense of purpose in life. Saya merasa yakin akan tujuan hidup saya.

I feel in control of my life. Saya merasa mampu mengendalikan hidup saya.

I like challenges. Saya menyukai tantangan.

I work to attain my goals no matter what roadblocks I encounter along the way. Saya berusaha untuk mencapai tujuan saya tidak peduli rintangan yang harus saya hadapi sepanjang jalan.

I take pride in my achievements. Saya bangga atas prestasi saya.

Please provide your demographic information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>70</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please indicate your age.

What is your nationality?

- Indonesia
- Nepal
- Philippines
- Bangladesh
- Thailand
- Hong Kong
- Mainland China
- India
What is your marital status?
- Single (never married)
- Single (separated/divorced)
- Married
- Widowed

What is the highest level of education you have attained?
- Primary Education
- Secondary Education
- Bachelor's Degree
- Master's Degree
- Ph.D Degree
- Post-doctoral Degree

How would you describe your religious belief?
- Atheist
- Buddhist
- Catholic
- Christian
- LDS (Mormon)
- Jehovah Witnesses
- Muslim
- Hinduism
- Other

Gender
- Female
- Male
- Transfemale
- Transmale

How many children do you have?
People are different in their sexual attraction to other people. Which best describes your feelings? Are you:

- Only attracted to females
- Mostly attracted to females
- Equally attracted to females and males
- Mostly attracted to males
- Only attracted to males
- Not sure

Are you currently in debt?

- No
- Yes

How much do you currently owe? (Please round it to the closet Hong Kong Dollar)

Information Page at the End of the Survey

Thank you for participating in the research. This is an information page of different organizations for helpers if you wish to talk to someone regarding your current employment situation.

Helpers for Domestic Helpers
Address: St. John's Cathedral, 4-8 Garden Road, Central, Hong Kong
Phone Number: (852) 2523-4020

Fair Employment Agency
Address: 12/F 280-282 Lockhart Road, Ping Lam Commercial Building, Wan Chai, Hong Kong
(852) 3566-6558
http://www.fairagency.org/

Bethune House Migrant Women's Refuge
Address: St. John's Cathedral, No. 4 Garden Road, Central, Hong Kong SAR
Phone Number: (852) 2522-8284
APPENDIX C

Survey Packet in English and Tagalog

Default Question Block

Introduction
This research study is being conducted by Ka Yan Danise Mok, a doctoral student from Brigham Young University under the supervision of G. E. Kawika Allen, Ph.D. in the department of Counseling Psychology and Special Education. The survey is about female foreign domestic helpers’ work experience in Hong Kong and mental health. You are invited to participate because of your current occupation as a foreign domestic helper. All information you will provide is anonymous.

Because of the sensitive nature of the question, we encourage you to find a place and time (30 minutes) to participate where you will have the privacy, ideally without employers’ acknowledgement, to complete the survey.

If you are at a safe place to participate right now, click “proceed” to continue.
If you are not able to proceed to the study right now, you are welcome to return to this page at a convenient time and safe place.

Thank you.

The survey is available in both English/Tagalog and English/Indonesian. Please choose Indonesian from the drop down manual.

Risks/Discomforts
Mga Panganib / Pagkababasa
There are minimal risks for participation in this study. Your responses will remain confidential. If you feel uncomfortable answering a particular question, you may choose to not answer that question, or discontinue the study.


Benefits Mga Pakinabang
There will be no direct benefits to you. It is hoped, however, that through your participation, researchers may learn about domestic helpers’ work experience.

Walaang direktaong benepisyosito ito sa iyo. Gayunpaman, inaasahan na sa pamamagitan ng iyong paglahok, maaaring malaman ng mga mananilahok ang tungkol sa mga karanasan sa trabaho ng mga kasambahay.

Confidentiality Pagka-kumpidensyal
The research data will be kept on a password protected computer and only the researcher will have access to the data. At the conclusion of the study, the data will be kept in the researcher’s locked computer device throughout data analysis.

Ang mga impormasyon makakalap sa pananilahok ay ititago sa isang kompyuter na protektado ng password at ang tagapagsaliksik lamang ang may karapatan (access) sa mga impormasyon. Sa pagtatapos ng pananilahok, ang mga impormasyon ay mananatili sa protektadong kompyuter ng tagapagsaliksik sa buong pagsusuri ng mga impormasyon.

Compensation Kabayaran
There will be no compensation for research participant.
Hindi ka makakatanggap ng anumang kabayaran sa paglahok sa pananilahok na ito.

Participation Paglahok
Participation in this research study is voluntary. You have the right to withdraw at any time or refuse to participate entirely without jeopardy to your personal safety, employment, and chances of receiving services from Non-governmental organizations (NGOs).

Ang paglahok sa pag-aaral na ito ay kusang-loob. May karapatan kang bawiin ang pakikilahok anumang oras o tuluyang tunggali sa paglahok na hindi manganganib ang iyong personal na kaligtasan, pagtatrabaho, at pagpakatason na tumatanggap ng mga serbisyo mula sa mga NGO.
**Questions about Your Rights as Research Participants**

**Mga Tanong tungkol sa Mga Karapatan ng Pakikilahok sa Pagsasaliksik**

If you have questions regarding your rights as a research participant, contact IRB Administrator at (801) 422-1461; A-265 ASB, Brigham Young University, Provo, UT 84602, irb@byu.edu. For Hong Kong participants, contact Dr. Staci Ford at the Women’s Studies Research Centre of The University of Hong Kong, womensrc@hku.hk.

Kung mayroon kang mga katanungan tungkol sa inyong mga karapatan bilang isang kalahok sa pananaliksik, makipag-ugnay sa IRB Administrator sa (801) 422-1461; A-265 ASB, Brigham Young University, Provo, UT 84602, irb@byu.edu Para sa mga kalahok sa Hong Kong, makipag-ugnayan kay Dr. Staci Ford sa la Women’s Studies Research Centre ng The University of Hong Kong, womensrc@hku.hk.

**Statement of Consent Pagahayag ng Pagsang-ayon**

I have read, understood, and received a copy of the above consent and desire of my own free will to participate in this study. (By proceeding to the next page of this survey, you will be consenting to participate in this study).

Aking nabasa, naunawaan, at natanggap ang isang kopya ng pahintulot na simula sa kusang-loob ang aking paglalakay sa pag-aaral na ito.

---

**Q-Q: Looking back over the last week, including today, help us understand how you have been feeling.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I get along well with others. Masaya ang aking pakikitungo sa iba.</th>
<th>Never Hindi kailanmanowaal</th>
<th>Rarely Bihira</th>
<th>Sometimes Kung Minsan</th>
<th>Frequently Madalas</th>
<th>Almost Always Halos palagi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I tire quickly. Mabilis akong mapagod.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel no interest in things. Walang interes sa mga bagay.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel stressed at work/school. Nasa-stress ako sa trabaho/kolesewahan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I blame myself for things. Sinasabi ko ang aking sarili sa mga bagay.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel irritated. Naririta ako.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel unhappy in my marriage or significant relationship. Hindi ako masaya sa aking relasyon sa asal o sa relasyong espesyal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have thoughts of ending my life. Naisip kong magpamatay.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel weak. Pakiramdam ko ay mahina ako.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel fearful. Nakakakaramdamin ako ng takot.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After heavy drinking, I need a drink the next morning to get going. (If you don’t drink, mark “never”. Pagkalatat ng maraming pag-isip ng mga akal, kilalangan kong uminom muli. Kinasabayan upang makapagpatuloy (kung hindi ka uminom, markahan na “hind kitailangan”).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I find my work/school satisfying.  
Naisisiyahan ako sa aking trabahoschool. 

I am a happy person. Ako ay isang masaying tao.  

I work/study too much.    
Masyado akong nagtrabaho.  

I feel worthless.  
Pakiramdam ko ay wala akong sili.  

I am concerned about family troubles.  
Nag-aalala ako sa mga gulo ng aking pamilya.  

I have an unfulfilling sex life.  
Hindi ako nasasayahan sa aking seksual na relasyon.  

I feel lonely.  
Nalulungkot ako.  

I have frequent arguments.  
Madalas akong nayonong pakikipaglaban.  

I feel loved and wanted.  
Pakiramdam ko ay minamahal ako at ako ay kinakalalangan.  

I enjoy my spare time.  
Naisisiyahan ako sa aking bakante oras.  

I have difficulty concentrating.  
Nahihirapan akong maging magpakain.  

I feel hopeless about the future.  
Pakiramdam ko ay walang pag-asa ang aking kinabukasan.  

I like myself. Gusto ko ang aking senti.  

Disturbing thoughts come into my mind that I cannot get rid of.  
May mga nakakabahagbag sa aking iisip ko na hindi ko maalis.  

I feel annoyed by people who criticize my drinking (or drug use). (If not applicable, mark "never.")  
Nalinsa ako sa mga taong pinapansin ang aking pag-inom o paggamit ng droga. (Kung hindi ito naaayon sa aking "hind kailanman").  

I have an upset stomach.  
Masakit ang aking tyan. 

I am not working/studying as well as I used to.  
Hindi ako nakakapagtrabaho at nakakareh batulad ng dati.  

My heart pounds too much.  
Matindi ang piling o pagbubok ng aking puso.  

I have trouble getting along with friends and close acquaintances.  
Nahihirapan akong makilunggo sa aking mga kaibigan at malapit na kaedala.  

I am satisfied with my life. Ako ay nasasayahan sa aking buhay.  

I have trouble at work/school because of drinking or drug use. (If not applicable, mark "never.")  
Nagkakaroon ng gulo sa trabaho/sekuelahan dahil sa aking pag-inom o paggamit ng
02/07/2016

I feel that something bad is going to happen. Pakiramdam ko ay may hindi maganda na mangyayari.

I have sore muscles. Masakit ang aking mga kasu-kasuan (muscles).

I feel afraid of open spaces, or driving, or being on public transportation. Kinakabahan ako sa mga espasyo, o sa paguusap sa bus, subways, at iba pa.

I feel nervous. Kinakabahan ako.

I feel my love relationships are full and complete. Pakiramdam ko na ang aking romantisong relasyon ay buo at kompleto.

I feel that I am not doing well at work/school. Pakiramdam ko na hindi ako gumagawa ng mabuti sa trabaho/eskwelahan.

I have too many disagreements at work/school. Masyado akong maraming hindi pagkaakusunod sa trabaho/eskwelahan.

I feel something is wrong with my mind. Pakiramdam ko ay may mali sa aking pag-iisip.

I have trouble falling asleep or staying asleep. Nanihirap akong matulog o manettling tulog.

I feel blue. Natulumbay ako.

I am satisfied with my relationships with others. Nasisiyahan ako sa aking relasyon sa iba.

I feel angry enough at work/school to do something I may regret. Ang galit ko ay sapat para makaagawa ako ng bagay na pag-iisip ko sa trabaho/eskwelahan.

I have headaches. Masakit ang ulo ko.

REMS-T: Think about your experiences with race. Please read each item and think of how many times this event has happened to you in the PAST SIX MONTHS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I did not experience this event. Hindi ko naranasan ang pangyayaring ito.</th>
<th>I experienced this event at least once in the past six months. Naranasan ko ito ng hindi bababa sa isang beses noong nakaraang anim na buwan.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I was ignored at school or at work because of my race. Ako ay binigyan o sa patuloy na ba sa trabaho dahil sa aking lahi. Someone's body language showed they were scared of me. Because of my race. Ang reaksiyon ng isang tao ay nagpapakita na sila ay takot sa akin, dahil sa aking lahi.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

https://3ys.x2l.qualtrics.com/ContentPanel/Ajax.php?action=GetSurveyPrintPreview
I was told that I should not complain about race. Ako ay sinabi na hindi ako dapat magreklamo tungkol sa lahi.

Someone assumed that I grew up in a particular neighborhood because of my race. Ininalagay nila na lumaki ako sa isang particular na lugar dahil sa aking lahi.

Someone avoided walking near me on the street because of my race. May isang taong umiwas sa paglalakek na kalikot malapit sa akin dahil sa aking lahi.

Someone told me that she or he was colorblind. May isang taong nagsabi sa akin na siya ay colorblind.

Someone avoided sitting next to me in public space (e.g., restaurant, movie theaters, trains, buses) because of my race. May isang taong umiwas na umupo malapit sa akin sa isang pampublikong espasyo (halimbawa: mga restaurant, sinahan, subways, mga bus) dahil sa aking lahi.

Someone assumed that I would not be intelligent because of my race. Inaalala ng isang tao na hindi ako magiging matalino dahil sa aking lahi.

I was told that I complain about race too much. Sinabi na na masyado ako nagrerelam nina mga lahi.

I received substandard service in stores compared to customers of other racial groups. Napatag na ng hindi kaledad na serbisyo sa mga tindahan ang mga kumpera sa mga customer ng iba pang mga grupo ng lahi.

I observed people of my race in prominent positions at my workplace or school. Napansin ko na ang aking mga ka-tahe ay nasa prominenteng posisyon sa aking trabaho o sa paaran.

Someone wanted to date me only because of my race. Gusto lang nilang makipag-date o lumabas kasama ako dahil sa aking lahi.

I was told that people of all racial groups experience the same obstacles. Sinabi na ang lahat ng lahi ay nakaranas ng mga parehong pagsubok.

My opinion was overlooked in a group discussion because of my race. Ang aking opinyon ay hindi pinansin sa isang diskusyon sa aking lahi.

Someone assumed that my work would be inferior to people of other racial groups. Ininalagay nila na ang aking
trabaho ay magiging trabaho
ang kaledad kumpara sa
trabaho ng iba pang mga grupo
ng lahi.

Someone acted surprised at
my scholastic or professional
success because of my race.
Nagulat sila nang malaman ang
aking tagumpay sa paaralan at
propesyong dahil sa aking lahi.

I observed that people of my
race were the CEOs of major
corporations. Napansin ko na
ang aking mga ka-lihi ay CEOS
ng mga pangunahing
korporasyon.

I observed people of my race
portrayed positively on
television. Napansin ko na ang
aking mga ka-lihi ay may
positibong papel sa telebisyun.

Someone assumed that I would
not be educated because of my
race. Ipinalago ng iba na
ako ay walang pinag-aralan
dahil sa aking lahi.

Someone told me that I was
"articulate" after she/he
assumed I wouldn't be. May
nagsabi sa akin na ako ay
"articulate" o nakapagsasalita
ng mabuti pagkatapos niyang
ipistle nang hindi ako ganon.

Someone told me that all
people in my race group are
all the same. May nagsabi sa
akin na ang lahat ng tao sa
aking grupo ng lahi ay pare-
parehong lahat.

I observed people of my race
portrayed positively in
magazines. Napansin ko na
ang aking mga ka-lihi ay may
positibong papel sa mga
magasin.

An employer or co-worker was
unfriendly or unwelcoming
toward me because of my race.
Ang isang employer (ano) o
kasamahan sa trabaho ay hindi
maglihi sa akin o inaayawan
ako dahil sa aking lahi.

I was told that people of color
do not experience racism
anymore. Sinabi naman ako ng
ang mga "people of color" o
 mga taong hind "puti" ay hindi
na nakaraan ng "racism" o
pagkapoot sa ibang lahi.

Someone told me that they
"don't see color". May nagsabi
sa akin na sila ay "hindi
nakakaitla ng kulay" o "don't
see color".

I read popular books on
magazines in which a majority
of contributions featured people
from my racial group.
Nakahasa ako ng popular na
mga libro o mga magasin na
ilinampok ang karamihan ng
mga kontribusyon ng aking
mga ka-lihi.
Someone asked me to teach them words in my "native language." May isang taong nagsabi sa akin na turaan sila ng ilang salita sa akin "native language".
Someone told me that they do not see race. May nagsabi sa akin na hindi nila maktapang ang lahi.
Someone demanded her/his purse or wallet upon seeing me because of my race. May isang taong hinigiitan ang hawak sa kanyang pitaka o wallet ngang maktapang ako dahil sa akong lahi.
Someone assumed that I would have a lower education because of my race. Inaakala nila ako ay may mababang edukasyon dahil sa akong lahi.
Someone of a difficult racial group has stated that there is no difference between the two of us. May Isa na mula sa ibang grupo ng lahi ang nagsabi na walang pagkakakita sa aming dalawa.
Someone assumed that I would physically hurt them because of my race. Inaakala nala na piskal ko silang sasaaktoh dahil sa akong lahi.
Someone assumed that I ate foods associated with my race/culture every day. Ipinalalagay nila ako ay kumain ng pagkaon na kaugnay sa akong lahi/kultura at-a-araw.
Someone assumed that I held a lower paying job because of my race. Inaakala nila ako mayroon ako ng trabaho na mababang mahusay dahil sa akong lahi.
I observed people of my race portrayed positively in movies. Napansin ko na ang akong mga ka-lahi ay may positibong papel sa mga pelikula.
Someone assumed that I was poor because of my race. Ipinalalagay nila ako ay mahirap dahil sa akong lahi.
Someone told me that people should not think about race anymore. May nagsabi sa akin na hindi na nararapat isipin ang tungkol sa lahi kahit kailan.
Someone avoided eye contact with me because of my race. May isang umaawit ng tingin sa akin dahil sa akong lahi.
I observed that someone of my race is a government official in my area. Napansin ko na isa sa akong ka-lahi ay isang opisyal ng gobyerno sa akong sate (sanggar). Someone told me that all people in my racial group look
FCS-T: Below is a list of experiences which may occur in families. Reach each experience carefully. Some of these may have been true at one point in your life but not true at another point. Think about your childhood and your adolescence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No-Never happened HINDI</th>
<th>Hindi Kailangan Nangyari</th>
<th>Unsure HINDI SIGURADO</th>
<th>Yes- This happened OO-Nangyari Ito</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents divorced or permanently separated before you were 18 years old. Ang mga magulang ay hwalay o permanenteng magkakailawa bago ka nag-18 years old.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family frequently moved. Ang pamilya ay madalas na lumipat.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent(s) or spouse or children unemployed for an extended period of time. Ang magulang o mga magulang o asawa o mga anak ay walang trabaho ng mahabang panahon.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequent hostile arguing among family members. Madaalas at malalang pagtataulao ng mga miyembro ng pamilya.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death of parent(s) before you were 18 years old. Madaalas at malalang pagtataulao ng mga miyembro ng pamilya.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse or children with drinking problem. Asawa o anak na may problema sa paggamit ng droga.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse or children with a drug problem. Asawa o anak na may problema sa paggamit ng droga.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse or children with a gambling problem. Piskal na pang-aabuso sa iyong pamilya.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical abuse in your family. Paggagahasa sa iyo o sa isang miyembro ng iyong pamilya.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual abuse in your family. Piskal na pang-aabuso sa iyong pamilya.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape/sexual assault of yourself or family member.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family member hospitalized for emotional problems. Miyembro ng pamilya na nasa ospital dahil sa problemang emosyonal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Family members diagnosed with a mental disorder. (Sakit sa kasipian)

Family member attempted suicide. (Miyembro ng pamilya na nagtagangkang magpakamatay)

Family member committed suicide. (Miyembro ng pamilya na nang nagpakamatay)

Family member with a debilitating illness, injury, or handicap. (Miyembro ng pamilya na nagpatuloy na mahalagang problema sa emosyon)

Family member prosecuted for criminal activity. (Miyembro ng pamilya na nang nagpatuloy na mahalagang problema sa emosyon)

Family member with an eating problem. (Miyembro ng pamilya na may problema sa pagkain)

### JST - Please choose the most appropriate answer that reflects your opinion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disagree very much</th>
<th>Disagree moderately</th>
<th>Disagree slightly</th>
<th>Agree slightly</th>
<th>Agree moderately</th>
<th>Agree very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matinding pagsang-ayon</td>
<td>Katantamang pagsang-ayon</td>
<td>Kaunting hindi pagsang-ayon</td>
<td>Hindi pagsang-ayon</td>
<td>Pagsang-ayon</td>
<td>Hindi pagsang-ayon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do. Pakiramdam ko, bilib ako ng salubong na halaga para sa trabaho ng asawa ko.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is really too little chance for promotion on my job. Mayroong kaunting oportunidad ng promosyon (promotion) sa aking trabaho.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My employer is quite competent in doing his/her job. Ang aking amo ay may lubos na kakayahang sa paggawa ng kanyang trabaho.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not satisfied with the benefits I receive. Hindi ako nasisiyahan sa mga benepisyong natinatanggap ko.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I do a good job, I receive the recognition for it that I should receive. Kapag mahusay ako sa kaing trabaho, nakatatanggap ako ng pagkilala para dito</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many of our rules and procedures make doing a good job difficult. Karamihan sa mga pati nagpapaharing na mahusay na trabaho.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like the people I work with. Gusto ko ng aking mga ka trabaho.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I sometimes feel my job is meaningless. Missan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
pakiramdam ko na walang sibiyang aking trabaho.

Communications seem good within this family. Mukhang mabuti ang komunikasyon sa pamilyang ito.

raises are too few and far between. Kaunti at matagal ang pagtaas ng sahod.

My employer is unfair to me. Ang amo ko ay hindi-makatarungan sa akin.

The benefits I receive are as good as most other employers' offer. Ang mga benepisyong na natatanggap ko ay ketulad ng halos halat ng ibinigay ng ibang amo.

I do not feel that the work I do is appreciated. Hindi ko naranaramdaman na pinahahalagahan ang mga ginagawa ko.

My efforts to do a good job are seldom blocked by red tape (too many rules). Ang aking mga paggagap na gewin ang isang magandang trabaho ay bihirang naheherangan ng red tape (masyadong naraming mga patakaran).

I find I have to work harder at my job because of the incompetence of people I work with. Kailangan kong magtrabaho ng mas mabuti dahil sa hindi kehuseyan ng mga kastambahay ko.

I like doing the things I do at work. Gusto ko ang ginagawa ko sa aking trabaho.

The responsibilities of this employment are not clear to me. Ang mga responsibilidad ko sa trabaho ng ito ay hindi malinaw.

I feel unappreciated by the employer when I think about what they pay me. Pakiramdam ko ay hindi ako napapahalagahan ng aking amo dahil sa sweto na ibinigay nila sa akin.

My employer shows too little interest in the feelings of domestic helper. Ang amo ko ay may kaunting pagpapahalaga sa mga naranaramdaman ng mga kasambahay.

The benefit package we have is fair. May mga kaunting gantimpala para sa mga nagtatrabaho dito.

There are few rewards for those who work here. May mga kaunting gantimpala para sa mga nagtatrabaho dito.

I have too much to do at work. Sobrang mabigat ang aking trabaho.
I often feel that I do not know what is going on with the employer. Kadalasang hindi ko alam kung ano ang nangyayari sa ako ng amo.

I feel a sense of pride in doing my job. Nasisisihan ako sa mga pagkakataon ng pagtaas ng sahod.

I feel satisfied with my chances for salary increases. Nasisisihan ako sa mga pagkakataon ng pagtaas ng sahod.

There are benefits we do not have which we should have. Mayroong mga benepisyo na dapat ay mayroon kami.

I like my employer. Gusto ko ang aking amo.

I don't feel my efforts are rewarded the way they should be. Pakiramdam ko na hindi napaparanagalan ng sapat ang aking mga pagasakap.

There is too much arguing about petty and trivial matters and fighting at work. Masayang maraming "bickering" o pagkatao-talo tungkol sa mga patibotong empleyado at bagay na walang halaga, at pag-anay sa trabaho.

My job is enjoyable. Masaya ang aking trabaho.

Work assignments are not fully explained. Ang mga gawain ko sa trabaho ay hindi lipusang napalawanag.

CSR-T: Please choose the answer you most identify with.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not true at all</th>
<th>Rarely True</th>
<th>Sometimes True</th>
<th>Often True</th>
<th>True Nearly all the time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hindi toto</td>
<td>Bihirang toto</td>
<td>Totoo minsan</td>
<td>Kadalasang toto</td>
<td>Paingalan ng toto</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I am able to adapt when changes occur. Kayang umangkop kung may pagbabayong nangyari.

I have at least one dose and secure relationship that helps me when I am stressed. Mayroon ako isang mataik na kaibigan at tiyak na koneksyon na nakakatuong sa akin kapag nasa-stress ako.

When there are no clear solutions to my problems, sometimes fate or God can help. Kung walang klaro sagot sa mga problema ko, minsan nakakatuong ang kapalaran, o ang Diyos.

I can deal with whatever comes my way. Kahit anong mangyari, nakakasyaran ko.

Past successes give me confidence in dealing with new challenges and difficulties. Ang
mga nakalipas kong tegumay
ay nagbibigay ng takas ng loob
para sa mga panibagong
paghamon at pasakit.

I try to see the humorous side
of things when I am faced with
problems. Sinusubukan kong
tignan ang nakakatawa sa halip
na pasakit.

Having to cope with stress can
make me stronger. Ang
kakayahan sa stress ang
siyang nakakatulong na
pattayin ang loob ko.

I tend to bounce back after
illness, injury, or other
hardships. Bumabangon ako
muli kahit masagat,
magkasakit, o mahirapan ako.

Good or bad, I believe that
most things happen for a
reason. Mabuti man o masama,
narininawa ako na may rason
para sa lahat ng pangyayari.

I give my best effort no matter
what the outcome may be.
Binigay ko ang aking
pinakamagaling na
pagcopuyuyagi, kahit ano ang
katalabasan nito.

I believe I can achieve my
goals, even if there are
obstacles. Narininawa ako na
kaya kong doolin ang aking
mga tunguhan, kahit may
paghihirap.

Even when things look
hopeless, I don't give up. Karit
mukhang walang pag-asa,
hindi ako sumusuko.

During times of stress/crisis, I
know where to turn for help. Sa
oras ng paghihirap at
pagsubok, alam ko kung saan
ako tutungo para sa saktoko.

Under pressure, I stayed
focused and think clearly. Karit
nagigiti, nakatutok ako sa
kailangang gawin, at kaya ang
aking isipan.

I prefer to take the lead in
solving problems rather than
letting others make all the
decision. Mas gusto ko na ako
mismo ang tanga-lutas ng mga
problema, imbes na hayaan na
ang iba ang magpasikyo.

I am not easily discouraged by
failure. Hindi ako madingaling
madismaya.

I think of myself as a strong
person when dealing with life's
challenges and difficulties.

Inisip ko na ako'y isang
malakas na tao kapag
hinaharap ang mga kahirapan
ng buhay.

I can make unpopular or
difficult decisions that affect
other people, if it is necessary.

Pwede akong magtaguyot ng
'di kanais-nais na desisyon na
makaka-apo ko ng ibang tao, kung kailangan.

I am able to handle unpleasant or painful feelings like sadness, fear, and anger. Kaya' kong mamahala ng nakayamanot o masasaktan na damdamin tulad ng lungkot, takot, at galit.

In dealing with life’s problems, sometimes you have to act on a hunch without knowing why. Sa paglubutang sa pagubok sa buhay, minsan dapat Kumilos ayon sa kuto mo, kahit hindi mo alam kung bakit.

I have a strong sense of purpose in life. Narinirwa ako na may malakas na layunin ako sa buhay.

I feel in control of my life. Nararamdaran ko na kontrolado ko ang aking buhay.

I like challenges. Kalangan ko ang mga paghamon.

I work to attain my goals no matter what roadblocks I encounter along the way. Pinipilit kong abutin ang mga pinapanganap ko, kahit anong mangyari patungo sa pag-abot nilo.

I take pride in my achievements. Tinaghaman ko ang aking mga nakamit o nakamit.

Please provide your demographic information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>70</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please indicate your age.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is your nationality?

- [ ] Indonesia
- [ ] Nepal
- [ ] Philippines
- [ ] Bangladesh
- [ ] Thailand
- [ ] Hong Kong
- [ ] Mainland China
- [ ] India
- [ ] Africa
- [ ] Other areas
What is your marital status?
- Single (never married)
- Single (separated/divorced)
- Married
- Widowed

What is the highest level of education you have attained?
- Primary Education
- Secondary Education
- Bachelor's Degree
- Master's Degree
- Ph.D Degree
- Post-doctoral Degree

How would you describe your religious belief?
- Atheist
- Buddhist
- Catholic
- Christian
- LDS (Mormon)
- Jehovah Witnesses
- Muslim
- Hinduism
- Other

Gender
- Female
- Male
- Transfemale
- Transmale

How many children do you have?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

People are different in their sexual attraction to other people. Which best describes your feelings? Are you:
- Only attracted to females
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- Mostly attracted to females
- Equally attracted to females and males
- Mostly attracted to males
- Only attracted to males
- Not sure

Are you currently in debt?
- No
- Yes

How much do you currently owe? (Please round it to the closest Hong Kong Dollar)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Debt in Hong Kong Dollar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information Page at the End of the Survey

Thank you for participating in the research. This is an information page of different organizations for helpers if you wish to talk to someone regarding your current employment situation.

Helpers for Domestic Helpers
Address: St. John’s Cathedral, 4-8 Garden Road, Central, Hong Kong
Phone Number: (852) 2523-4020

Fair Employment Agency
Address: 12/F, 280-292 Lockhart Road, Ping Lam Commercial Building, Wan Chai, Hong Kong
(852) 3566-6558
http://www.fairagency.org/

Bethune House Migrant Women’s Refuge
Address: St. John’s Cathedral, No. 4 Garden Road, Central, Hong Kong SAR
Phone Number: (852) 2522-8264