

Supplement. Moderating Role of Acculturation and Living Arrangement on the Relationship Between FPD and Indices of Wellbeing

Supplement 3.4.1 Psychological Wellbeing Domain

The initial four-step model (Table S1) revealed no significant three-way interaction effect, either as a step in the model ($F(1, 276) = 0.58, p = 0.45$) or independently ($\beta = 0.05, t = 0.76, p = 0.45$). Accordingly, the three-way interaction was not interpreted and was removed from subsequent analysis. Further, the two-way interactions between FPD and living arrangement, and living arrangement and acculturation were not significant in the initial four-step model, and were therefore removed from the subsequent model. A new and final three-step model was conducted, which comprised of main effects in Step 2 and a two-way interaction term for FPD \times acculturation in Step 3.

Table S1 The Four-Step Hierarchical Regression Analysis of FPD and Psychological Wellbeing.

	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4
	β	β	β	β
Age	-0.05	-0.03	-0.02	-0.02
Sex (1, female; 0, male)	0.07	0.08	0.08	0.08
Education				
Below High school	0.07	0.12	0.13	0.13
High school or equivalent	0.02	-0.03	-0.006	-0.008
University or above	0.15	0.005	0.03	0.02
Perceived SES				
Low	0.10	0.10	0.08	0.08
Medium	-0.09	-0.05	-0.07	-0.08
FPD		0.33**	-0.35	-0.52
Acculturation		-0.01	-0.02	-0.02
Living arrangement (1, live with adult children; 0, live alone or with spouse)		-0.13*	-0.07	-0.08
FPD \times acculturation			-0.68*	-0.86*
FPD \times living arrangement			0.02	0.02
Acculturation \times living arrangement			0.07	0.06
FPD \times acculturation \times living arrangement				0.05
R^2	0.06	0.19	0.20	0.20
ΔR^2		0.13 ^a	0.01 ^b	0.002 ^c

Notes. FPD = Filial piety discrepancy; SES = Socioeconomic status.

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.001$

^a. $F(3, 280) = 14.52, p < 0.001$

^b. $F(3, 277) = 1.47, p = 0.22$

^c. $F(1, 276) = 0.58, p = 0.45$

Supplement 3.4.2 Social Wellbeing Domain

The initial four-step model (Table S2) revealed no significant three-way interaction effect, either as a step in the model ($F(1, 275) = 0.02, p = 0.88$) or independently ($\beta = -0.01, t = -0.15, p = 0.88$). The three-way interaction term was not interpreted and removed from subsequent analysis. A new three-step hierarchical regression model (Table S3) with main effects in Step 2 and two-way interactions in Step 3 was conducted. Given that there was no significant R^2 change in Step 3 of the new model ($F(3, 276) = 0.39, p = 0.76$), coefficients in Step 2 of the new model were interpreted.

Table S2 The Four-Step Hierarchical Regression Analysis of FPD and Social Wellbeing.

	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4
	β	β	β	β
Age	0.04	0.06	0.06	0.06
Sex (1, female; 0, male)	-0.03	-0.02	-0.02	-0.02
Education				
Below High school	-0.12	-0.10	-0.10	-0.10
High school or equivalent	0.001	0.02	0.03	0.03
University or above	-0.05	-0.03	-0.008	-0.009
Perceived SES				
Low	-0.22	-0.20	-0.19	-0.19
Medium	-0.04	-0.03	-0.03	-0.03
FPD		-0.12*	-0.18	-0.14
Acculturation		0.10	0.13	0.13
Living arrangement (1, live with adult children; 0, live alone or with spouse)		0.09	-0.08	-0.08
FPD × acculturation			-0.03	0.007
FPD × living arrangement			0.06	0.06
Acculturation × living arrangement			-0.18	-0.17
FPD × acculturation × living arrangement				-0.01
R^2	0.05	0.08	0.09	0.09
ΔR^2		0.03 ^a	0.004 ^b	0.000 ^c

Notes. FPD = Filial piety discrepancy; SES = Socioeconomic status.

* $p < 0.05$.

^a. $F(3, 279) = 3.12, p = 0.03$

^b. $F(3, 276) = 0.39, p = 0.76$

^c. $F(1, 275) = 0.02, p = 0.88$

Table S3 The Three-Step Hierarchical Regression Analysis of FPD and Social Wellbeing.

	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
	β	β	β
Age	0.04	0.06	0.06
Sex (1, female; 0, male)	-0.03	-0.02	-0.02
Education			
Below High school	-0.12	-0.10	-0.10
High school or equivalent	0.001	0.02	0.03
University or above	-0.05	-0.03	-0.008
Perceived SES			
Low	-0.22	-0.20	-0.19
Medium	-0.04	-0.03	-0.03
FPD		-0.12*	-0.18
Acculturation		0.10	0.13
Living arrangement (1, live with adult children; 0, live alone or with spouse)		0.09	-0.08
FPD × acculturation			-0.03
FPD × living arrangement			0.06
Acculturation × living arrangement			-0.18
FPD × acculturation × living arrangement			
R^2	0.05	0.08	0.09
ΔR^2		0.03 ^a	0.004 ^b

Notes. FPD = Filial piety discrepancy; SES = Socioeconomic status.

* $p < 0.05$.

^a. $F(3, 279) = 3.12, p = 0.03$

^b. $F(3, 276) = 0.39, p = 0.76$

Supplement 3.4.3 Physical Wellbeing Domain

As shown in Table S4, the initial four-step model revealed no significant three-way interaction effect, either as a step in the model ($F(1, 275) = 1.37, p = 0.24$) or independently ($\beta = -0.08, t = -1.17, p = 0.24$). As such, the three-way interaction term was not interpreted and subsequently removed.

Upon removing the three-way interaction, a new three-step hierarchical regression with main effects in Step 2 and two-way interactions in Step 3 was conducted. Given that there was no significant R^2 change in Step 3 of the new model ($F(3, 275) = 0.92, p = 0.43$), coefficients in Step 2 were interpreted. Please see detailed analysis of the new three-step model in Table S5.

Table S4 The Four-Step Hierarchical Regression Analysis of FPD and SF-36 Physical Component Score.

	Step 1 β	Step 2 β	Step 3 β	Step 4 β
Age	-0.19	-0.17	-0.17	-0.17
Sex (1, female; 0, male)	-0.07	-0.06	-0.06	-0.07
Education				
Below High school	-0.13	-0.06	-0.07	-0.08
High school or equivalent	-0.22	-0.12	-0.12	-0.14
University or above	-0.25	-0.15	-0.15	-0.16
Perceived SES				
Low	-0.21	-0.24	-0.22	-0.21
Medium	0.06	0.03	0.05	0.07
FPD		-0.13*	0.29	0.55
Acculturation		0.04	0.09	0.09
Living arrangement (1, live with adult children; 0, live alone or with spouse)		0.19**	-0.14	-0.11
FPD × acculturation			0.44	0.71
FPD × living arrangement			0.02	0.02
Acculturation × living arrangement			-0.34	-0.31
FPD × acculturation × living arrangement				-0.08
R^2	0.13	0.18	0.19	0.20
ΔR^2		0.15 ^a	0.15 ^b	0.15 ^c

Notes. FPD = Filial piety discrepancy; SES = Socioeconomic status.

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$

^a. $F(3, 278) = 5.80, p = 0.001$

^b. $F(3, 276) = 0.92, p = 0.43$

^c. $F(1, 275) = 1.37, p = 0.24$

Table S5 The Three-Step Hierarchical Regression Analysis of FPD and Physical Wellbeing.

	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
	β	β	β
Age	-0.19	-0.17	-0.17
Sex (1, female; 0, male)	-0.07	-0.06	-0.06
Education			
Below High school	-0.13	-0.06	-0.07
High school or equivalent	-0.22	-0.12	-0.12
University or above	-0.25	-0.15	-0.15
Perceived SES			
Low	-0.21	-0.24	-0.22
Medium	0.06	0.03	0.05
FPD		-0.13*	0.29
Acculturation		0.04	0.09
Living arrangement (1, live with adult children; 0, live alone or with spouse)		0.19**	-0.14
FPD × acculturation			0.44
FPD × living arrangement			0.02
Acculturation × living arrangement			-0.34
FPD × acculturation × living arrangement			
R^2	0.13	0.18	0.19
ΔR^2		0.15 ^a	0.15 ^b

Notes. FPD = Filial piety discrepancy; SES = Socioeconomic status.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < 0.01$

^a. $F(3, 278) = 5.80, p = 0.001$

^b. $F(3, 276) = 0.92, p = 0.43$