

## INFORMATION TO USERS

The most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this manuscript from the microfilm master. UMI films the original text directly from the copy submitted. Thus, some dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from a computer printer.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyrighted material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each oversize page is available as one exposure on a standard 35 mm slide or as a 17" x 23" black and white photographic print for an additional charge.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. 35 mm slides or 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.



300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA



Order Number 8821068

**Cultural impact on self-concept and ethnic identity of Puerto Ricans**

Benitez, Veronica, Ph.D.

City University of New York, 1988

Copyright ©1988 by Benitez, Veronica. All rights reserved.

**U·M·I**  
300 N. Zeeb Rd.  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

...

CULTURAL IMPACT ON SELF-CONCEPT  
AND ETHNIC IDENTITY OF PUERTO RICANS

by

VERONICA BENITEZ

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in  
Psychology in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, The City  
University of New York.

1988

© 1988

VERONICA BENITEZ

All Rights Reserved

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in Psychology in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

5/2/88  
Date

Anderson J. Frankel  
Chair of Examining Committee

May 2 1988  
Date

Herbert S. Salzman  
Executive Officer

Laurence Gould

Harold Wilensky

Louis Gerstman

Sandra Samaniego  
Supervisory Committee

The City University of New York

Abstract

CULTURAL IMPACT ON SELF-CONCEPT AND  
ETHNIC IDENTITY OF PUERTO RICANS

by

VERONICA BENITEZ

Adviser: Dr. Anderson J. Franklin

This investigation was designed to examine the impact of American culture on the self-concept and ethnic identity of Puerto Ricans who come to the United States. The question of who an individual is and where he or she belongs is grounded in their culture. Researchers have found identity to be the central problem when people migrate to a new culture. Each ethnic group deals differently in adjusting to migration. Some groups try to assimilate to the dominant culture, while others try to maintain identification with their ethnicity. This knowledge was the basis for this study's main hypothesis: self-concept and ethnic identity would be significantly related to exposure of the new culture.

In conducting this investigation, 58 students attending the Exchange Program from the University of

Puerto Rico were contacted to participate in the study. They were provided with three questionnaires to identify self-acceptance attitudes, ethnic identity attitudes, and specific demographic information. From these data, relationships between self-concept and length of time in the United States, and relationships between ethnic identity and exposure to the American culture were tested.

The results of the study supported the hypothesis that exposure to the American culture was significantly related to the attitudes on ethnic identity. However, the findings showed no significant difference in relation to self-concept and length of time in the United States. Nevertheless, students who had been exposed to the American culture commented that the experience affected the way they think of themselves.

My greatest appreciation to two people I deeply love.  
Since my beginnings you have been there, helping guide  
my first steps, and then ever after, so that I may  
develop my full potential.

Today I am proud to say that my achievement is your  
achievement.

Thank you, Roberto Benitez, and you, Lourdes Borges, for  
being my parents.

## Acknowledgements

I want to express my gratitude to various people who were instrumental in the completion of this dissertation. Dr. Anderson J. Franklin, I want to thank you specially for your important guidance and assistance that allowed for the conceptualization and development of this project, as well as your warmth and confidence in me.

Dr. Richard A. Hardaway provided his statistical expertise and most importantly, his vigorous and persistent encouragement. Special credit goes to Dr. Susan L. Pazda for her valuable editorial assistance and her empathic support. Dr. Thomas Parham's cooperation and help in the use and modification of the Racial (Ethnic) Identity Scale is also greatly appreciated. I am grateful to Selma de Jesus for her technical assistance, and to Joan Olson for her responsiveness in the typing of this manuscript.

Helen Pagan and Miriam Ivey deserve special recognition for their friendship and support since this project's inception. I also want to thank Larry Elcock for being such a friend.

I am indebted to my father, Roberto Benitez, who

continually motivated me and facilitated the process in making possible the data collection.

Finally, and most importantly, my immeasurable gratitude to my husband, Samuel Ocasio, whose love and help are interwoven into the fabric of this dissertation as in my life.

Table of Contents

Abstract . . . . . iv  
Acknowledgements . . . . .vii

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Page</u>
I. Introduction . . . . .	1
II. Literature Review . . . . .	5
Concepts of the Self. . . . .	5
Relevant Empirical Studies. . . . .	11
Culture and Identity. . . . .	17
Cultural Shock. . . . .	21
Acculturation and Assimilation Factors. . . . .	25
Ethnic Identity . . . . .	30
Does ethnic identity matter?. . . . .	32
Puerto Rico and its People. . . . .	33
Who are the immigrants? . . . . .	39
Impact of migration . . . . .	40
Psychological Responses to Acculturation. . . . .	42
Hypotheses. . . . .	47
III. Method . . . . .	48
Subjects. . . . .	48
Instruments . . . . .	49
Acceptance of Self and Others. . . . .	50
Ethnic Identity Scale. . . . .	52

Procedures . . . . .	53
IV. Results . . . . .	54
Relationship Between Self-Concept and Length of Time in the United States . . . . .	54
Relationship Between Ethnic Identity and Exposure to the American Culture . . . . .	55
V. Discussion . . . . .	63
Relationship Between Self-Concept and Length of Time in the United States . . . . .	63
Relationship Between Ethnic Identity and Length of Time in the United States . . . . .	67
Limitations of the Study . . . . .	71
Implications for Future Research and Concluding Remarks . . . . .	73
<u>Appendixes</u>	
A. Acceptance of Self Scale . . . . .	79
B. Ethnic Identity Scale . . . . .	84
C. Demographic Items . . . . .	87
D. Letter to Students . . . . .	88
E. Univariate F-Tests for Ethnic Identity Subscales . . . . .	89
F. Means of the Demographic Data . . . . .	90
References . . . . .	91

List of Tables

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. Means and Standard Deviations on the Self-Concept Scores. . . . .	56
2. Multivariate Tests of Significance for Ethnic Identity. . . . .	58
3. Means and Standard Deviations for Ethnic Identity Stages. . . . .	59
4. Post-hoc Comparisons (Tukey's HSD) on the Pre-Encounter Attitudes. . . . .	61

## CHAPTER I

### Introduction

Since the 1970s, increasing numbers of Puerto Ricans who have migrated to the United States have been better educated. In contrast, in the 1950s, seventy-five percent of Puerto Rican immigrants had received eight years or less of formal education. Education has been a high priority in Puerto Rico in the last several decades. In fact, it has been of such importance that in 1975, the Puerto Rican government was spending one-third of its budget on education (Wagenheim, 1975). The flow of Puerto Rican professionals from Puerto Rico to the United States has increased dramatically since 1980, so much so that this phenomena has been termed "brain drain." Current motivation for migration appears to be similar to prior factors, such as improved employment opportunities.

Most of the island Puerto Ricans that this researcher has encountered, although proud of who they are, tend to idealize the American culture. Furthermore, there seems to be some degree of apprehension at the thought of competing with Americans. In the opinion of this researcher, Puerto Ricans tend to devalue their skills when anticipating some of the difficulties with which they will be confronted in

America, such as language difficulties. However, once in the United States, where faced with the reality of the culture, rather than an abstract concept, Puerto Ricans have the opportunity to demonstrate their competence to themselves, and thus increase their confidence.

The literature discusses that Puerto Ricans experience qualitatively new types of life events when they migrate, such as: the need to learn a new language, the effect of bilingualism, differences in values and customs, racism, discrimination due to ethnic group membership, and implications in areas such as employment and housing (Becerra, Karno, and Escobar, 1982; Longres, 1974). Island Puerto Ricans come from an environment in which their ethnicity was part of their self-identity; and therefore never in question. Thus, never before issues of ethnicity which are raised in the United States were shocking. Furthermore, the pressure to acculturate and assimilate is experienced. Rodriguez (1975) has pointed out that there has been much speculation regarding whether or not Puerto Ricans will assimilate, and that the Puerto Rican viewpoint has not been taken into consideration on this issue. Nevertheless, as Maldonado (1975) stated, some groups remain more obviously minorities than others despite the

ideology of the melting pot and pressure to assimilate and acculturate.

Furthermore, Maldonado (1975) has indicated that "studies which do not consider nonassimilation factors and theories of self-identity among minority persons are biased in favor of those who are both acculturated and assimilated" (p. 620). Thus, some minorities, despite the internal efforts to acculturate, will show a negative self-image mainly as a result of an external obstacle to assimilation, as for example, racism. Maldonado (1975) added that it is possible that a person who scores positive in a self-image test that considers his or her cultural background, could score negative on an instrument that does not take this into consideration. Maldonado (1975) concluded that due to the difficulty of developing culture-free self-identity measures, self-identity studies and theories should be developed from within a particular community and culture.

Deutsch, Katz, and Jensen (1968) have stated that self-identity does not develop in a sociocultural vacuum. Rather, it takes form in an environment that gives great importance, particularly in a pluralistic society, to one's ethnicity, race, or other characteristics that define one as different and a

minority. It is extremely difficult to develop a concept of self without considering these factors, especially if one's minority status is perceived as inferior (Mizio, 1974; Maldonado, 1975; Rigual-Lynch, 1979). It is as difficult to suddenly view your self-concept, in which your ethnicity has not been an issue, in light of your new status as a minority. Therefore, ethnicity or race is an issue that the minority person has to deal with due to the social environment.

Taking the above into consideration, this study will attempt to explore the impact of the introduction of the American culture on the self-concept and ethnic identity of island Puerto Ricans who come to the United States. Due to the nature of the study, the sample needs to be controlled in relation to their exposure to the American culture. Exchange college students provide an excellent opportunity to research the proposed study. In addition, college students are typical of a large portion of the new Puerto Rican immigrants.

...

## CHAPTER II

### Literature Review

This chapter presents an overview of the literature on the development and controversies regarding research on the concept of the self, and empirical studies that have been conducted on the effect between self-concept and ethnicity. It also provides a theoretical and empirical background on ethnicity. Furthermore, since this project deals with a particular ethnic group, Puerto Ricans, knowledge of their sociocultural background has been considered essential to the understanding of their experience; and therefore a brief historical account has been included.

#### Concepts of the Self

In reviewing the literature, there have been different opinions on what is self-concept. Burns (1979) stated three major controversies that have denied the self-concept the indispensability in the explanation of human behavior until the second half of this century. He cited as number one, the lack of agreement over definitions of the excess of self-referent terms. The other two are the encounter between rival approaches in methodology to the study of psychology, and the problems of measuring such an apparently subjective experiential element.

William James is cited (Epstein, 1973; Felker, 1974; Burns, 1979) as the first psychologist to have written elaborately on the self. He identified two fundamentally different approaches: (a) The self as a knower, the experiencing subject, which he saw as having no value for understanding behavior; and (b) the self as an object of knowledge, which consist of whatever the individual views as belonging to himself or herself, including a material self, a social self, and a spiritual self. He considered the perceptions which an individual had of himself or herself an important variable in understanding human behavior.

Cooley's (1912) original view was that individuals are prior to society, but he promptly modified his beliefs and put more emphasis on society to the degree that he viewed self and society as twin born. Cooley also introduced the concept of the "looking-glass self" which refers to one's self-concept as significantly influenced by what the person perceives others think of him or her.

Mead (1934) expanded on James' social self and Cooley's looking-glass self and, like the latter, he saw society as the origin for the self. He explained that the self-concept arises in social interaction as an outgrowth of the individual's concern about how others

react to him or her. The individual learns to interpret the environment as the others do, in order to anticipate other people's reactions so that he or she can behave accordingly.

Sullivan (1953) defined the self system as arising out of social interaction, but he emphasized the interaction of the child with significant others, particularly the mother figure. According to Sullivan, each of us internalizes "good-me, bad-me" evaluations which explain the way in which people develop positive or negative self-appraisals.

Thus far, it is interesting to note the importance these psychologists have given to the social aspect in the development of one's self-concept.

Besides the self-concept term, other investigators have employed self-referent terms with conflicting definitions. These various terms have been used interchangeably and synonymously by some writers, while others employed them to distinguish aspects of self conception. Hence, it is appropriate to present at this point a brief discussion on some of those self-referent terms which will be used in the present study.

Let us start with "identity," which is probably the most widely used concept to describe the individual's sense of who he or she is. Dashefsky (1972) stated that

identity may be best understood if it is viewed first as a higher-order concept, i.e., a general organizing referent which includes a number of subsidiary facets. Parsons (1968) has referred to it as "the pattern-maintenance code system of the individual personality" (p. 20). Identity is the sector of the personal system that maintains personal continuity through the coherent organization of information about the person. For Erikson (1968), what he called ego identity arises out of a gradual integration of all identifications (which will be discussed later). He defined it as "the ability to experience one's self as something that has continuity and sameness" (1980, p. 94). Erikson was somewhat reluctant to provide a succinct definition of identity which is not only the sum of roles assumed by the person, but also includes emerging configurations of identifications and capacities, a function of direct experience of self and world, and perceptions of the reactions of others to self. He explained (1965) how cultures elaborate out of a biologically given basis an identity which is appropriate to the culture in question and manageable by the individual. For Erikson, identity was obtained from achievement that has significance in the culture. In his work, Child and Society (1950), he stated that:

only a gradually accruing sense of identity, based on the experience of social health and cultural solidarity at the end of each major childhood crisis, promises that periodical balance in human life which--in integration of the ego stages--makes for a sense of humanity. But wherever this sense is lost,...an array of infantile fears are apt to become mobilized: for only an identity safely anchored in the "patrimony" of a cultural identity can produce a workable psychosocial equilibrium. (p. 412)

Identification was viewed by Foote (1951) and Lindersmith and Strauss (1968) as involving connecting oneself to others in an organizational sense or in a symbolic sense. Rosen (1965) argued that an individual may identify himself or herself with others on three levels: 1. with some important person in one's life, 2. with a group from which one draws one's values, and 3. with a broad category of persons, e.g., an ethnic group. Ethnic group identification happens on this last level. Dashefsky (1976) stated that "ethnic group identification occurs when the group in question is one with whom the person believes he has a common ancestry based on shared individual characteristics and/or shared sociocultural experiences" (p. 8).

Glazer and Moynihan (1975) went a step further and discussed a "basic group identity," derived from belonging to what is generally called "ethnic group," that includes identifications and a ready-made set of endowments which every individual has in common with

others from birth by the chance of the family into which he or she is born at that time and place. The new member not only shares the past, but also the particular circumstances that impact on the family and the group and with it all its effects on the development of the individual's personality and the shaping of his or her life. They saw the function of basic group identity as having two essential ingredients in every individual's personality and life experience, the sense of belongingness and the quality of self-esteem. They added that "an individual belongs to his basic group in the deepest and most literal sense...It is an identity he might want to abandon, but it is the identity that no one can take away from him" (p. 35).

Kurt Lewin has called "the uncertainty of belongingness" the challenge to self-esteem which needs to be faced in mixed societies when dealing with members of other groups (Glazer and Moynihan, 1975). Glazer and Moynihan (1975) felt that with belongingness goes, inseparably, the matter of self-esteem, the supporting measure of self-acceptance, or self-respect, that every individual must have in order to live satisfactorily. There are individuals that derive enough self-esteem from their personalities alone. Others need their group associations to provide them with what their

personalities lack. Most people seem to depend on both sources.

Most writers use "self-esteem" to designate the value which the individual attributes to particular descriptions. Coopersmith (1967) saw self-esteem as:

the evaluation that the individual makes and customarily maintains with regard to himself: it expresses an attitude of approval or disapproval, and indicates the extent to which the individual believes himself to be capable, significant, successful, and worthy. In short, self esteem is a personal judgement of worthiness that is expressed in the attitudes the individual holds toward himself. (p. 4-5)

Rosenberg (1965) defined it in a similar way as an attitude, positive or negative, towards the Self. As Burns (1979) cited Brisset (1972), self-esteem included two basic psychological processes, the process of self evaluation, and the process of self worth.

#### Relevant Empirical Studies

Most researchers have used the component of self-esteem as the measurement of self-concept. There has also been an assumption that minority group members' self-esteem is lower than that of whites. In the various doll studies done (Horowitz, 1939; Clark and Clark, 1947; Helgerson, 1943; Goodman, 1946; Seeman, 1946; Radke et al, 1949), which were used to measure racial awareness and self evaluation, the researchers

found that black children selected or identified with white dolls, and that black and white children assigned negative roles to black dolls (Gordon, 1974). Burns (1979) noted that disadvantaged children are regarded as likely victims of low self-concepts because of discrimination, poverty, and majority group expectations, which supposedly lead to denigration of self worth (e.g. Tannenbaum, 1967).

Zirkel (1971) also found low self-concept to be one of the main characteristics of the "disadvantaged" cited by different researchers. He also quoted from the Educational Policies Commission in 1962 that:

The disadvantaged are the main victims of practices that frustrate the development of self respect...The resulting sense of inferiority and exclusion is most severe among Blacks, but is seriously felt among Puerto Ricans and Mexican-Americans; whom other whites commonly regard as nonwhite. (p. 211)

Rice, Ruiz and Padilla (1974) examined the relationship between ethnic and racial awareness, self-identity and ethnic preference in Anglo, black and Chicano preschool and third-grade children. They presented their subjects with a set of three photographs of the three ethnic groups and read them a list of phrases. The subject would indicate his or her choice of photograph for each phrase, to which the experimenter determined how well the subject could discriminate the

various ethnic groups from each other, as well as the subject's preferences. They found that all the children were able to discriminate among the photographs except for the preschoolers who could not make the distinction between Anglo and Chicano. Although all children matched themselves with the appropriate photos, not all preferred the representatives of their group. Among the preschoolers, Anglos preferred their group, but blacks and Chicanos did not. Among the third-graders, only the Chicanos preferred their ethnic group. The researchers suggested that some aspects in the rearing environment of the Chicano foster a strong sense of self-esteem and ethnic group pride.

Their study implied that the low self-concept found among blacks in earlier studies was still evident. However, as they acknowledged, other studies have shown contradictory results. Some have shown that disadvantaged children possess positive self-concepts even higher than advantaged groups (e.g. Hunt and Hardt, 1969; Bachman, 1970). In a study of Mexican-Americans, Carter (1968) showed that those who had positive self-concepts related themselves to their own cultural group and not to the Anglo society. Solely because the majority group looks on the minority groups in a negative way, there is no reason to assume the latter

look at themselves in the same fashion. Heiss and Owens (1972) observed that it is a mistake to assume that all blacks use whites as significant others. The evaluations of other blacks are more relevant, demonstrating that self-esteem is determined by the population defined as the significant other. Ziller and others (1968) in a study of Indians found that Indians in the lowest castes produced significantly higher self-esteem scores than members of higher castes. They suggested that low-caste children were comparing themselves with children of their own caste.

Louden (1977) compared groups of Asian, West Indian and English adolescents on their self-esteem and found no statistically significant differences between any of the groups. Verma and Bogley (1975) had collected data on Asian, West Indian and white children attending British multi-racial secondary school and had obtained the same findings as Loudon. An explanation offered for the absence of statistically significant differences was that significant others are highly likely to support and provide standards, attitudes and perceptions in agreement with those held by the individual.

Parham and Helms (1981) studied the influence of black students' racial identity attitudes on preferences

for a counselor's race. They used Cross' racial identity model which involves four stages: Pre-encounter--the person views and thinks of the world as being non-black; Encounter--the person experiences a startling personal or social event that motivates him or her to challenge his or her old frame of reference, and causes him or her to be receptive to a new interpretation of his or her identity; Immersion-Emersion--the person begins to develop a sense of "Black pride," still the degree of internalization of positive attitudes about his or her blackness is minimal; Internalization--the person achieves a feeling of inner security with his or her blackness, and tends to feel more satisfied with it (Parham and Helms, 1985). They found that having certain racial identity attitudes will influence blacks' acceptance of black and white counselors. As expected, pre-encounter attitudes were related with pro-white, anti-black counselor preferences. Encounter and immersion-emersion attitudes tended to be associated with pro-black, anti-white counselor preferences. However, there were no significant differences in preference for a counselor of either race with the internalization attitudes. They proposed that the counselor's race as such becomes a less crucial variable as the black person becomes more

comfortable with his or her racial identity and that a personal counselor's characteristics such as his or her racial attitudes and skill level may become more important (Parham and Helms, 1981).

In their study of the relationship between racial identity attitudes and self-esteem, Parham and Helms (1985) found that pre-encounter and immersion attitudes were related to poor self-esteem, while encounter attitudes tended to be associated with positive self-esteem. Internalization attitudes were related positively, although not significantly with self-esteem. These findings imply that depending on where the person is regarding his or her attitude on his or her racial identity will affect feeling positive or negative about themselves. Also, they can probably explain in part the contradictory results among different studies.

Gordon (1980) in her literature review on blacks' self-concept cited McDill (1966), who studied academic self-concepts among high-school and college age black and white students. He found higher academic self-concept among black students, pointing out the positive value of higher education for disadvantaged students. Bartee (1967) found an increase in the self-esteem of a sample of black students in freshman to senior years of college. Hodgkins and Stakenas (1969) reported positive

self-concept for blacks with no difference between the levels of self-concepts for blacks and whites when socioeconomic status is controlled.

### Culture and Identity

Next, some studies on the impact of cultural shock and the assimilation process on the migrant's identity will be examined. On a study of cross-cultural students, Miller et al (1971) examined the question "What does it feel like to study, work and live in another culture?" (p. 128). They wanted to look at how often an international student successfully bridges cultural barriers. They reported that the student "usually had great hopes of being warmly received by [the] host nationals" (p. 129). However, differences in values were found to be the primary barriers to friendships between the students of different cultures. "The problem...goes beyond culturally-conditioned misunderstandings between host and guest, for inevitably the visitor's identity, pride and national loyalties become involved" (p. 131). They concluded that although uncertain, their experience with international students makes them look "to the notion of 'national melting pots' with suspicion" (p. 131).

Sue (1973) has also cited cultural values as having a significant impact on the psychological

characteristics of Asians in America. Traditional Asian values emphasize, among other things, formality and reservation in interpersonal relations, restraint and inhibition of strong feelings, and use of shame and guilt to control behavior. However, "as they become Westernized, many Asian-Americans come to view Western personality characteristics as more admirable qualities than Asian characteristics" (p. 87). These cultural conflicts may cause hostility to be turned inward. Due to the contrast of the Asian cultural values with the Western emphasis on spontaneity, assertiveness, and informality, Asian-American students appeared more socially introverted and tended to withdraw from social contacts outside their ethnic group. Sue stated that in an attempt to raise group esteem and pride, Asian-Americans are "exploring and challenging the forces in white society which have served to unfairly shape and define their identity" (p. 87). The mode of adjustment that has been advocated by ethnically conscious Asians is one that allows the individuals to integrate aspects of both cultures which they believe are functional to their own self-esteem and identity (Sue, 1973).

Clark (1967), in discussing problems in identification among Jews, noted that assimilation and identification with the dominant society can be

considered an effective way to reduce the overt burdens of prejudice and discrimination. He pointed out that generally it is an option more easily available to Jews than to blacks in terms of the visible factor of skin color. However, he believed that maintaining one's identity as a Jew or rejecting such identity through assimilation was the basic conflict that an individual Jew must resolve for himself or herself. Among those who opt for maintaining their identity as Jews, he informed that they could encounter "overt burdens of defending the ego and protecting their self-esteem in the face of the threat of personal humiliation associated with anti-Semitism" (p. 120). Furthermore, considerations have to be given to how one determines who is Jewish. Taking into consideration the heterogeneity of the group in terms of religious orthodoxy and observance, nationality, social, economic, and political status, what gives them unity and cohesion is:

the subjective factors of the willingness of the individuals in the group to accept a common heritage, to express a desire for the maintenance of in-group cohesion, and to share a common future based upon these subjective feelings of belongingness. (Clark, 1967, p. 121)

He identified hostility as one of the responses of their cultural conflict. At times, this hostility is directed

toward other Jews as self-depreciation and, therefore, this self-hatred is an attempt to resolve the conflict between Jewish identification and assimilation in the direction of the latter. He quoted Radke's study of children which highlights that children at an early age are conscious about their Jewishness. He considered that it can be viewed as the first sign of increased sensitivity among those who identify themselves as Jews. Besides, Clark argued that it is self-evident that the children of more assimilationist Jewish parents are not going to be conscious of their Jewishness as early as those who psychologically identify themselves as Jews. Moreover, he noted that those who reject their Jewishness (ethnicity), and do it successfully, could be expected to raise children who will not identify with and be sensitive about Jewishness (their ethnicity), and could even develop anti-Semitic attitudes (attitudes against their ethnic group) to the same degree as the rest of the population.

#### Cultural Shock

Ticho (1971) described "culture shock" as:

a reaction that commonly results from the impact of the new culture upon those who come to work and live in it...is the result of a sudden change from the 'average expectable environment' to a strange and unpredictable one. (p. 324)

She added that there is an ever-recurring pressure for a reevaluation of the previous values and the previous identity.

Garza-Guerrero (1974) provided a more elaborated definition adding three elements which he considered were common denominators of this phenomenon. "Culture shock profoundly tests the over-all adequacy of personality functioning, is accompanied by mourning for the abandoned culture, and severely threatens the newcomer's identity" (p. 410). He also presented a sequential schema of the process of cultural shock which will be reviewed later.

Richardson (1967) found the initial period of adjustment crucial to his theory of assimilation. He brought forth the notion, citing previous research, that the individual experiences a great deal of anxiety after making the decision to emigrate, but prior to actual departure. Denying negative characteristics of the new culture and building up positive features are typical ways of reducing the anxiety.

Once the individual arrives in the host country, Richardson called attention to two patterns of reaction, "elation" and a "depression" pattern. Three factors contribute to the elation pattern: (a) The novelty of the situation itself--the newcomer's status is

announced through the clothes and speech as well as the inquiring manner. (b) The social freedom of the newcomer's role--usually not having yet the time or opportunity to become involved with those whom he or she meets, there are few feelings of obligation to behave in a certain required way. (c) The need for self-justification--"I am where I wanted to be so that I must, consequently, be satisfied" (p. 8), which is supported by the cognitive dissonance theory.

The depression pattern occurs when the satisfaction level decreases typically after six or seven months of residence. Richardson believed culture shock was one of the most common factors contributing to this pattern. He stated that the novelty wears off and the immigrant starts to realize more fully the difference between the old and new culture, and it becomes somewhat threatening. The other two factors are nostalgia, an increased awareness of the environment from which one came; and reactive non-acceptance, which occurs when an immigrant reports not being accepted by the host group members even where little or no traditional prejudice or discrimination exists.

At this point, let us return to Garza-Guerrero's process of cultural shock. It consists of three phases. Cultural encounter, phase one, merits the name "culture

shock." It is a stage of exploring cultural differences and similarities. "The newcomer tests the accuracy of his--realistic or unrealistic--preconceived anticipations regarding the new culture" (1974, p. 418). Disillusionment results when the discrepancy is too great.

Discrepancies between this new world of external objects and his endopsychic representations of the abandoned culture become apparent (Miller et al, 1971). Subjectively, the experience is one of puzzlement....Exposed to his new culture, the newcomer's interaction with it fails relatively and temporarily to provide the basic elements upon which his own identity is solidly maintained. (p. 418)

He indicated that in this phase "a sense of continuity, consistency, and confirmation" (p.418) are threatened. The role of the ego is to master the painful experience of mourning and the unpleasant feelings of a loose identity. To accomplish this, the individual usually relies on the "goodness" of his or her prior internalized and integrated object relationships, and identifies with the previous culture.

In the second phase, reorganization, the person begins to accept the new culture. This subtle attempt to merge with the new culture can be followed by two routes: (a) Disappointment, which will make the individual devotedly cling to the previous culture; or

(b) successful interactions, which will reinforce disengagement with the prior culture. Garza-Guerrero described the subjective experience in this stage generally as one of depression, discouragement, and dejection, although feelings of resignation and encouragement begin to emerge.

He considered mourning for the previous culture "a prerequisite for an adequate solution of culture shock" (p. 422). Furthermore, the process of working through it is necessary for the prior identity to be reaffirmed as well as reintegrated under the influence of the new culture. He states:

Reaffirmation and reintegration of one's own identity in interaction with the new culture, a more realistic concept of the post culture's endowment and, hence, enhanced capacity for a realistic impression of the new culture, are all reflections of an enrichment of the self. They constitute fundamental presteps for a successful reorganization of the personality to take place. (p. 423)

New identity is the third and final phase and "denotes continually re-edited process (Erikson, 1950)" (p. 425). It is a consolidation of the identification acquired from the new culture integrated with the prior cultural heritage into the organization of ego identity. The self becomes enriched. Garza-Guerrero described the subjective experience of this stage "as a gradual feeling of 'belonging' to the new culture" (p. 425).

Relevant to the present study is the point that Garza-Guerrero offered in the first phase of his cultural shock process. It is that the individual, in order to deal with the sense of unbelongingness, will recur to prior internalized object relationships as well as identifying with his or her own culture. This form of adjustment to the situation does not necessarily indicate that the person thinks of himself or herself negatively, or devalues self.

#### Acculturation and Assimilation Factors

Acculturation, as other terms utilized in the social sciences, has been used without formal definitions, as well as interchangeably with other terms such as "assimilation" (Linton, 1963; Gordon, 1964). In 1935, the Subcommittee on Acculturation appointed by the Social Science Research Council sought defining the term as its first task. They reported that "acculturation comprehends those phenomena which result when groups of individuals having different cultures come into continuous first hand contact, with subsequent changes in the original cultural patterns of either or both groups" (Linton, 1963, pp. 463-464). A note was affixed to this definition by the committee which read:

Under this definition acculturation is to be distinguished from "culture change," of which it is but one aspect, and "assimilation,"

which is at times a phase of acculturation. It is also to be differentiated from "diffusion," which, while occurring in all instances of acculturation, is not only a phenomena which frequently takes place without the occurrence of the types of contact between people specified in the definition above, but also constitutes only one aspect of the process of acculturation. (p. 464)

Some have considered assimilation as the most desired goal for ethnic groups, viewing acculturation as the stepping stone to get there (Broom and Kitsuse, 1955). Nevertheless, as Maldonado (1975) stated, in spite of the melting pot ideology and efforts to acculturate and assimilate, some groups remain more obviously minorities than others.

Assimilation has been defined by Park (1930) as:

the process or processes by which peoples of diverse racial origins and different cultural heritages, occupying a common territory, achieve a cultural solidarity sufficient at least to sustain a national existence....In the United States an immigrant is ordinarily considered assimilated as soon as he has acquired the language and the social ritual of the native community and can participate, without encountering prejudice, in the common life, economic and political....This implies among other things that in all the ordinary affairs of life he is able to find a place in the community on the basis of his individual merits without invidious or qualifying reference to his racial origin or to his cultural inheritance. (p. 281)

Prejudice and discrimination are highlighted by Gordon

(1964) as two variables that the immigrant should not encounter for assimilation to take place.

Gordon (1964) made a distinction between two kinds of assimilation: cultural or behavioral assimilation and structural assimilation. The former, which he also called acculturation, is the process of learning the manners and style of a new society. The latter involves "large scale entrance into cliques, clubs and institutions of [the] host society" (p. 71) and the dissolution of group differences even at the primary levels of family and friendship. He added that an individual can acculturate but not be assimilated into the host society.

Rose (1956) defined assimilation as:

the adoption by a person or group of the culture of another social group to such a complete extent that the person or group no longer has any characteristics identifying him with his former culture and no longer has any particular loyalties to his former culture. Or the process leading to this adoption. (pp. 557-558)

Greeley (1969) has proposed a six-step paradigm for the American acculturation and assimilation process which is as follows: cultural shock, organization and self-consciousness, assimilation of the elite, militancy, self-hatred and anti-militancy, and emerging

adjustment--signifying an acceptance of both the ethnic and "American" identities as compatible.

Padilla (1980) proposed a multidimensional model of acculturation. This model considers cultural awareness and ethnic loyalty as essential elements. He defined cultural awareness as "an individual's knowledge of specific cultural material....of the cultural group of origin and/or the host culture"; and loyalty as "the individual's preference of one cultural orientation over the other" (p. 48). These preferences are translated into behavioral indices of both elements which will provide the information about the degree of an individual's acculturation. The more an individual prefers "ethnic" related activities and relationships, the lesser acculturated he is.

For Berry (1980), assimilation, which he described as relinquishing one's own cultural identity to move into the larger society, should be but one of the options among the varieties of possible adaptations. Integration is another form of adaptation that he mentioned, defining it as "the maintenance of cultural integrity as well as the movement to become an integral part of a larger societal framework" (p. 13). This can lead to a plural society, a society having many cultural groups present, or even to a multicultural society,

which is when the diversity of those cultural groups is also valued.

Biculturation, as the ability of an individual to function in two or more cultures, has been another alternative to assimilation. Rodriguez (1975) on a study about factors affecting Puerto Rican assimilation found that in her sample there was a high degree of pro-Puerto Rican sentiment, if not anti-assimilationist views. She believed biculturation to be the option, particularly due to the constant back and forth migration between the continental United States and the island.

A discussion on acculturation will not be complete without mentioning marginality. "The marginal man is the person who stands on the borders or margins of two cultural worlds but is fully a member of neither" (Gordon, 1964, p. 56). Stonequist (1937) referred to the marginal man as being psychologically uncertain as to which social world he belongs, which can result in inner strain and feelings of isolation and alienation.

Handlin (1973), in his book, The Uprooted, on the topic of alienation, writes:

The old folk knew then they would not come to belong, not through their own experience nor through their off-spring. The only adjustment they had been able to make to life in the United States had been one that involved the

separateness of their group; one that increased their awareness of the differences between themselves and the rest of the society. In the adjustment they had always suffered from the consciousness they were strangers. The demand that they assimilate, that they surrender their separateness, condemned them always to be outsiders. In practice, the free structure of American life permitted them with few restraints to go their own way, but under the shadow of a consciousness that they would never belong. They had thus completed their alienation from the culture to which they had come, as from that which they had left. (p. 254)

### Ethnic Identity

Giordano (1971) indicated that ethnicity is a powerful influence in determining identity. McGoldrick (1982) added that a sense of belonging and of historical continuity is a basic psychological need. Furthermore, by ignoring it or cutting it off, as for example, changing their names, rejecting their families and social backgrounds, it is done to the detriment of the individual's well-being.

Maldonado (1975) proposed the term "ethnic self-identity" which he considered central to the development of the personal self-identity of minority group members. He stated that:

ethnic self-identity refers to the integration of ethnicity or race into the self-concept or self image. It is the full recognition of one's ethnicity and the subsequent self-identity that flows from the values, ways, and styles of that ethnic background, instead of from a self-concept

based upon the opinions and prejudices of the larger society toward that ethnic group. Ethnic self-identity is identity that develops from within the experience of the ethnic life instead of an image that is imposed from without. (p. 621)

He concluded that the development of ethnic and racial self-identity is vital to personal identity.

On this issue, Lewin had previously proposed, similarly, that individuals need a firm clear sense of identification with the heritage and culture of their ingroup in order to find a secure basis for a sense of well-being, a "ground on which to stand" (Driedger, 1976). A similar statement was also made by Erikson in his book, Childhood and Society.

In Beyond the Melting Pot (1970), Glazer and Moynihan observed a "resurgence of ethnicity." They suggested three hypotheses for this situation. First, that ethnic identities have increased the role it plays in the self-concept of the individual, where occupational identities used to do that. Second, while international events involving the homelands are not as likely to mobilize a source of feelings of ethnic identity, domestic events have become more important. In other words, that the ethnic feelings have been evoked primarily by domestic developments and not foreign affairs. Third, that religion has decreased its

role in establishing one's identity and ethnicity has taken it on. In a study of ethnicity versus religion, Greeley (1974) concluded that under some circumstances cultural heritage is a more important predictor of attitudes and behavior than is religion.

Summarizing, Giordano (1971) stated:

Ethnicity from a clinical point of view is more than a distinctiveness defined by race, religion, national origin, or geography. It involves conscious and unconscious processes that fulfill a deep psychological need for security, identity, and a sense of historical continuity. It is transmitted in an emotional language within the family and is reinforced by similar units in the community. (p. 11)

Does ethnic identity matter?

Although the answer seems obvious, various researchers have looked into this question (Dashefsky, 1976; Greeley, 1974). Dashefsky (1976) rephrased the question to: "What are the attitudinal and behavioral consequences of ethnic identity in terms of the importance attached to it by others (the objective effects), and by the individual (the subjective effects)?" (p. 161). It should be noted that other writers (De Vos, 1975; Royce, 1982) found the objective-subjective variables also essential in the definition of ethnic identity. In a study done by Rosen (1959) he found ethnic differences important in explaining

achievement values among East Coast Americans. Greeley (1974) compared three samples of American ethnic groups (Irish, Italians and British) along four categories of variables: certain personality characteristics, political participation, attitudes and behavior about alcohol and sex, and respect for the democratic process. He concluded that there were important differences among the three groups. He added that although these differences cannot be explained only in terms of cultural heritages, the ethnic component is extremely important. Furthermore, some of those differences, as with political participation, persisted even after controlling for variables such as religion, education and generation.

#### Puerto Rico and its People

In order to obtain a better understanding of the Puerto Rican experience, let's briefly review their historical and sociocultural account.

Puerto Ricans are a product of the merging of different cultures: Taino Indian, European, African and American. The Spanish culture has been the predominant one as is reflected in the language, family patterns, religion, and institutions. A number of natural and political factors contributed to the homogenization of the various cultural influences into a unique Puerto

Rican culture, different from all its components (Rivera, 1974).

The United States obtained Puerto Rico as a result of the Spanish-American War in 1898. Under the Treaty of Paris of 1899, Spain ceded the island of Puerto Rico to the United States with the disposition that the civil rights and political condition of the territories be determined by the Congress of the United States. These negotiations were effectuated by representatives of Spain and United States governments without any Puerto Rican being consulted or included in them. The political expectations in the island varied from becoming a state, to having a free association with the United States, or to becoming independent. The political status became an important issue in Puerto Rico, and it still is.

The first two years the island was governed by the militia of the United States. The Foraker Act of 1900 established a civil government, but the governor was an American named by the President of the United States. English was imposed as the language to be taught in the schools on an island where few people, including the teachers, knew the language. This situation was vehemently criticized on the island.

In 1917, under the Jones Act, Puerto Ricans were conferred United States citizenship with the accompanied requirement of obligatory military service. The granting of the citizenship was taken by several groups in the United States as "war strategy" since it happened shortly before the United States began to take part in World War I, and German ships were getting closer in the Atlantic. It was also believed by some that the granting of the citizenship implied the incorporation of Puerto Rico in the Union as a territory. However, the Supreme Court eventually decided that was not the case. Longres (1974), discussing this situation, states "...the issue here is the rationale behind the decisions of the Supreme Court that forced the creation of an unincorporated territorial status and relegated Puerto Rico to that status. The rationale used throughout was cultural and, primarily, racial 'inferiority.'" [Documents on the Constitutional History of Puerto Rico (Washington, D.C.: Office of Puerto Rico, n.d.) pp. 117-51].

The relationship between Puerto Rico and the United States continued unaltered for the next 30 years. In 1948, Puerto Rico was permitted to elect for the first time its own governor. In 1950, the Congress approved Law #600 which authorized Puerto Rico to write

up its own Constitution. On July 25, 1952, the Free Associated State of Puerto Rico (Estado Libre Asociado de Puerto Rico), commonly known as the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, was inaugurated. It was described as a permanent union between the United States and Puerto Rico on the basis of the same citizenship, same defense, same currency, a free market and loyalty in common to the value of democracy, and the federal government retaining powers specifically defined as "essential to the Union." This political arrangement has continued without much change since then.

At the time of the United States takeover, Puerto Rico was an agricultural society whose economy was based on sugar, tobacco and coffee exports. Around 1940, the economic character of the island began to change. The formula for economic development called for a switch from agricultural production to an economy based on manufacturing. In order to attract United States firms, policies were instituted that would give tax-free incentives to corporations ("Operation Bootstrap") and the assurance of low wage labor. The shift in the economy caused large numbers of agricultural workers to be displaced. In 1940, 44 percent of the labor force was involved in the agricultural sector; by 1975, the proportion had dropped to 4.7 percent. The new

industries that had been attracted to the island could not produce enough jobs for those persons displaced from the agricultural sector. Even large scale efforts by the Puerto Rican government to create public service positions were not sufficient to incorporate those persons who had been employed in agriculture. The demise of the agricultural sector produced massive shifts of the population from rural areas to urban areas. The resulting number of unemployed persons became what has been referred to as a "surplus population." In order to reduce the growing number of unemployed persons, the Puerto Rican government, along with the United States authorities, pressed for large scale emigration of Puerto Ricans to the continental United States and to other countries in the Caribbean and South America. Along with inexpensive air fares between the United States and Puerto Rico, high rates of unemployment on the island and the "pull" of perceived economic opportunity on the U.S. continent, thousands of Puerto Ricans started migrating to the industrial centers of the United States. Between 1940 and 1970, three-fourths of a million Puerto Ricans left the island in search of those better opportunities. According to the 1980 Census Bureau figures, about two million Puerto

Ricans now make their homes on the continental United States.

The major reason for emigration among Puerto Ricans is economic. Joseph Monserrat (1968), ex-director of the Division of Emigration of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, has said that the volume of Puerto Rican emigration varies parallel with the employment opportunities in the United States, that is, when the employment opportunities increase, emigration increases, and when the employment opportunities decrease, emigration decreases.

Unlike other immigrants, Puerto Ricans are not politically or religiously persecuted, and are American citizens. Because of the nearness of the island and their citizenship status, there was and is a great deal of turnover in population. There is a constant movement back and forth between the island and the United States, often caused by economic pressure. An increasing number of Puerto Ricans spend part of their lives in both places. This has been referred to as the Puerto Rican diaspora. Puerto Rico itself has felt the impact of this phenomenon, which unavoidably increases the Americanization process of the island (Wagenheim, 1970).

This back and forth movement contributes to preserve the Puerto Rican culture in the United States,

but also may cause instability in assimilation. According to Rodriguez (1975), the synthesis of this continuing dialectic between cultures appears to be biculturation.

Who are the immigrants?

As a rule, Puerto Rican emigrants were young people of working age with their childbearing years ahead of them. In a survey conducted between 1951 and 1961, educationally, about three-fourths had finished eight years or less of school, approximately one-third had attended high school, but few had college experience. However, since the 1970s there has been a flow of Puerto Rican professionals between Puerto Rico and the United States. This has been increasing since 1980, a phenomenon which has been called Puerto Rican "brain drain." Education has been a high priority in Puerto Rico in the last several decades. In 1975, Puerto Rico's government was spending one-third of its budget on education (Wagenheim, 1975). In recent years, dramatic improvements in college and university faculties and curriculums have resulted in Puerto Ricans moving up. "But now the island's new, expensively trained elite is running out of maneuvering room" (The San Juan Star, 12-1-1982). As a consequence, they are migrating to the continental United States. Nearly 42

percent of those who took their degrees in electrical engineering in 1981 headed north for their first job. A survey of the college's 1982 mechanical engineering graduates found 22 percent working in the United States. At least 25 percent of the architecture school's graduates also leave the island. These groups have also been joined by social workers, school teachers, young doctors, nurses and other skilled professionals. The Planning Commission (Junta de Planificacion) in Puerto Rico estimates that of the 61,640 that migrated in 1983-84, 13,577 had one year or more of college education, and 10,709 were students in universities in the United States (El Mundo, 11-3-86). Therefore, the immigrants have become more educated; still, the main reason for emigration among Puerto Ricans seems to be economic.

#### Impact of migration

According to Fitzpatrick (1971):

When a group of people migrate from one area to another, they are usually leaving what they have traditionally recognized as their way of life, their culture. This culture has expressed itself in a definite geographical area, in activities which enabled the people to gather their food, provide their clothing and shelter, protect themselves, marry and raise children, and cope with the meaning and mystery of existence. This human interaction which constitutes the daily life of men is their society. In the framework of culture and society, as a member of a social group

interacting with others according to commonly accepted norms, man finds his identity, knows who he is, where he belongs, and what his life and actions mean. (p. 22)

Therefore, it seems not surprising that from several studies (Herberg, 1955; Glazer and Moynihan, 1970; Gordon, 1964) of a social group migrating to a new culture area, the problem of identity emerges as the central problem. Gordon (1964) stated that when members of an ethnic group move into a society dominated by another ethnic group, and the contact raises a challenge as to whether the newcomers will continue to live according to their culture or be absorbed into the new culture, the problem of identity becomes acute. Fitzpatrick (1971) commented that "the problem faced by people migrating from their home and moving into a different society with a different way of life is to find a new identity, to adjust themselves to new forms of social interactions, and assimilate a new way of life" (p. 22). However, Howard (1970), discussing Puerto Ricans, stated that "as late as the 1950's Puerto Ricans faced a problem of shifting identities with regard to both ethnicity and race" (p. 129). Concerning the latter, he stated that color is probably the key factor inhibiting Puerto Rican assimilation. Longres (1974) agreed and stated that psychologically, the most

damaging experience encountered by a Puerto Rican is racism. "It is part of the initial shock of arriving on the continent, and its result persists as a psychological dilemma even among the seemingly assimilated" (p. 67).

A great deal of racial mixing and intermarriage has taken place on the island, having as a result of this racial mixture, a general tolerance about color. It will be unrealistic to assume that racism does not exist in Puerto Rico or among Puerto Ricans. However, if it can be considered in terms of degrees, there is much less racism in Puerto Rico than in the United States. This is observed in the Puerto Rican lexicon on color which is much broader than that found in the United States. For example, darker Puerto Ricans are "morenos," less dark are "trigueños," while still lighter Puerto Ricans can be described as "grifo" (light-skinned with kinky hair) or "indio" (having native Indian characteristics). Therefore, the simple racial dichotomy of black-white which is commonly used in the continent, is inadequate when applied to the Puerto Rican multiracial society.

#### Psychological Responses to Acculturation

In a review of the literature, Berry (1979) very appropriately points out six areas of psychological

functioning involved in the process of acculturation. They are: language, cognitive style, personality, identity, attitudes, and acculturative stress.

Language has been identified by some writers as one of the three major barriers in counseling minority groups (Padilla, Ruiz and Alvarez, 1975; Sue and Sue, 1977; Atkinson, Morten and Sue, 1979) and a barrier to assimilation and a cause of discrimination (Howard, 1970). It is recognized that after contact with a new society, some language shift will occur, usually in the immigrant group. Other options are sometimes taken, such as bilingualism or linguistic merging into a creole (Berry, 1979) or even maintaining their traditional language. Therefore, language can be an obvious problem of acculturation (Marden and Meyer, 1973; Longres, 1974; Handlin, 1962). Among Puerto Ricans, it has been an impediment especially in the employment arena as well as in the schools. However, many Puerto Ricans understand more English than it is realized, but they prevent themselves from speaking it if they cannot do it well. In the island, due to the "americanization" going on which includes English being taught in schools, most of the population understands the language.

In the cognitive style area, Berry (1980) included all the perceptual and cognitive behaviors besides the

work done on the field dependent-independent cognitive style. Cognitive theories explain that individuals strive for meaningful organization of their perceptions, beliefs and attitudes to reduce inconsistencies created by contrasting beliefs or attitudes associated with culture change. Berry reported that shifts toward the norms found in the dominant group are shown by most perceptual, cognitive and cognitive style test performance. Nevertheless, he added that there is also evidence of a "switching" between styles, or a "bicultural" style, depending upon which group the individual is operating at the time, the traditional or the dominant group.

Cohen and Fernandez (1974), from a study in Washington, D.C., expressed concern about the ways young Spanish immigrants reject their cultural heritage and rapidly adapt to the city. They added that "through rejection of the old and adoption of new belief systems, children try to reestablish cognitive control" (p. 417). However, Buriel (1975), in his study on "Cognitive styles among three generations of Mexican-American children," suggested that there could be a returning to traditional style by Mexican-Americans acculturating more to the "barrio" lifestyle than to the Anglo American culture.

On the third area, personality, and connecting it with culture, Opler (1956) stated that "ordinarily, a person's experiences are in the normal course interpreted along lines laid down by his culture" which provides the features that "are the coin of the realm of personality formation...They vary with culture, and with degree and pace of acculturation or culture change" (p. 6). Hallowell (1955) has stated the importance of studying the relationship of psychological processes such as perceiving and thinking to the "differential conditions (cultural, situational) of man's existence in particular time and places, considered with reference to the psychological organization and integration of individuals (personality structure) and personality dynamics" (p. 36). In his study he found a linear gradient pattern in the shift of personality change. However, that gradient has not always been found. Berry proposed three responses of personality to the acculturation processes, more like dominant culture, synthesis, or quasi-traditional.

The responses he provided for identity, the fourth area, are dominant culture identity, ethnic identity, or return to traditional identity. The attitudes that will accompany these responses are assimilation, integration, or rejection.

Acculturative stress included "those behaviors and experiences which are generated during acculturation and which are mildly pathological and disruptive to the individual and his group (e.g., deviant behavior, psychosomatic symptoms, and feelings of marginality)" (Berry, 1980, p. 21). He added that adaptations of migrants and of native people, two main areas of research, present evidence that "such stress is common, but not inevitable" (p. 21). From these studies, he proposed that "acculturative stress will be highest when the cultural distance is greatest and when the insistence that the journey be taken is strongest" (p. 22). In accordance with Berry's statement of the stress being common, but not inevitable, this writer undertook the present study to further the understanding of the impact of the American culture on the island Puerto Ricans to be able to use it to at least minimize, if not prevent, psychopathological responses to acculturative stress.

As stated previously, the purpose of this study is to investigate how island Puerto Ricans think of themselves as individuals and as Puerto Ricans, how their self-concepts and ethnic identities are affected when impacted by a new culture, in this case, American culture.

### Hypotheses

In general, self-concept and ethnic identity will be significantly related to exposure to the new culture. Specifically, the following results are hypothesized.

1. Students in Puerto Rico before coming to the continental United States (Group 1) will have positive self-concepts.

2. Exchange students who have been in the continental United States at least nine months (Group 2) will have higher self-concepts than students who have not been to the United States.

3. Students who have returned to Puerto Rico after the year of exchange (Group 3) will have the highest self-concept level of all the three groups.

4. Students in Puerto Rico before coming to the continental United States (Group 1) are expected to be positive about their ethnic identities.

5. Exchange students (Group 2) will show stronger identification with their ethnic group than the students in Puerto Rico (Group 1).

6. Students who have returned to Puerto Rico after the year of exchange (Group 3) are expected to score higher than Group 1 and equal to or higher than Group 2 on ethnic identity.

## CHAPTER III

### Method

This study investigated the impact of the introduction of the American culture on the self-concept and ethnic identity of island Puerto Ricans who come to the United States. Towards this purpose, an analysis of variance was used with the self-concept scale. Due to the nature of the ethnic identity scale, which consisted of four stages, multivariate analyses of variance were performed.

### Subjects

The subjects used in this study were 58 Puerto Rican college students from the University of Puerto Rico. They had been or would be part of an exchange student program, consisting of one year, with several universities in the United States. They ranged in age from 18 to 29 years, and were mainly from the middle socioeconomic class. These students were raised in Puerto Rico and had not been in the United States prior to their exchange year. As part of the requirement of their program, they had some proficiency with English.

Group 1 consisted of 25 freshmen and sophomores, 20 females and 5 males, with an average age of almost 20 (M=19.92), who had applied to the Exchange Program.

They were in Puerto Rico in the process of coming to the United States.

Group 2 consisted of 16 sophomores and juniors, 9 females and 7 males, with an average age of slightly above 20 ( $M=20.40$ ), already in the program, and therefore residing in the United States. They had spent at least nine months in America.

Group 3 consisted of 17 students, 15 females and 2 males with an age mean of 21.35, who went through the program and had returned to Puerto Rico where they had been for at least one year.

#### Instruments

Two scales were used in this study, one to measure the self-concept, and the other to measure ethnic identity. They were "Acceptance of Self and Others" and "Ethnic (Racial) Identity Scale." Both instruments were given in English since this language is a requirement to participate in the Exchange Program. Each scale was preceded by self-explanatory written instructions concerning the use of the instrument.

A demographic questionnaire was also included to determine data such as age, sex, place of birth, and socioeconomic status (see Appendixes C and F). Besides the descriptive data, this questionnaire was especially useful in assessing if there had been a significant

amount of exposure to the American culture prior to their exchange year.

Acceptance of Self and Others (Berger, 1952).

This instrument was really two scales, one to measure attitude toward self and one to measure attitude toward others, but it is administered as a single test.

Subjects were instructed as follows:

This is a questionnaire of some of your attitudes. Of course, there is no right answer for any statement. The best answer is what you feel is true of yourself. For each of the following statements, please indicate by marking your choice (X) how true or not is each statement of yourself. [See Appendix A]

It was developed by Berger (1952) using the Likert procedure. The self-acceptance scale is made up of 36 items and the acceptance-of-others scale of 28 items. These items were selected from an initial pool of 47 statements on self-acceptance and 40 statements on acceptance of others on the basis of an item analysis. The top and bottom 25 percent of a sample of 200 were selected, and the difference between the mean scores of these criterion groups was used as an index of the discriminating power of the item. The standard error of the difference between means did not exceed .30 for any item, and all items in the final scales had critical ratios of 3.0 or more, except three which had critical ratios close to 2.0 (Shaw and Wright, 1967).

Each item is answered on a five-point scale, running from "not at all true of myself" to "true of myself." The score for any item ranges from 1 to 5. The direction of the scoring is reversed for negatively worded items. After this adjustment has been made, the acceptance-of-self score is computed by summing the item scores for all items on that scale. Similarly, the acceptance-of-others score is obtained by summing item scores for that scale. A high score indicates a favorable attitude toward self and other. Administration takes less than twenty minutes.

Split-half reliabilities were obtained for five groups ranging in size from 18 to 183. These were reported to be .894 or better for the self-acceptance scale for all but one group, which was .746. Similar reliabilities for the acceptance-of-others scale ranged from .776 to .884. All estimates were corrected by the Spearman-Brown formula.

On concurrent validity, one group (N=20) was asked to write freely about their attitudes toward themselves, and another group (N=20) was asked to write about their attitudes toward others. These essays were then rated by four judges and the mean ratings correlated with the corresponding scale scores. The

correlation was .897 for self-acceptance and .727 for acceptance-of-others.

On convergent validity, Omwake (1954) found that the Berger and Phillips scales correlated .73. Eagly (in Robinson and Shaver, 1973) found a correlation of .84 with the Janis-Field Scale for 32 of the Berger items with an experiment intervening.

Shaw and Wright (1967) stated that the scales appear to have been carefully developed and that Berger provided more than the usual amount of evidence of validity.

Ethnic Identity Scale. Since there had been no scale used to measure ethnic identity on Puerto Ricans, any instrument used had to be adjusted to this group. Therefore, the statements on Parham and Helms' (1981) Racial Identity Scale were reworded to fit the Puerto Rican culture, and in this study the scale was called "Ethnic Identity Scale" (see Appendix B). It consists of 30 items that measure attitudes associated in this case with Puerto Rican identity. The original scale was used to measure attitudes associated with the various stages of black identity development as described in the Cross (1971) model of psychological nigrescence. Each item is answered using a five-point scale ranging from

strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5) to indicate their extent of agreement with each statement.

Parham and Helms (1981) reported internal consistency reliability coefficients ranging from .72 to .66 among the four stages. Their study in 1981 in which the scale scores were used to predict preferences for sex and socioeconomic status of counselors provided evidence of construct validity.

#### Procedures

A list of the students and their addresses for all groups were obtained from the Director of the Exchange Program at the University of Puerto Rico. They were contacted by letter (Appendix D) with the request to take part in the study, which involved filling out questionnaires on how they perceive themselves and others, and on attitudes about their ethnicity. Each student was provided with a return envelope, and a follow-up letter or phone call was made to enhance participation.

Each scale had self-explanatory instructions. Completion time was estimated to be forty minutes.

## CHAPTER IV

### Results

This chapter will present the hypotheses and the findings of the statistical analysis performed on the relevant data. Two objectives of this study have been to examine: (a) the relationship between self-concept and length of time in the United States, and (b) the relationship between ethnic identity and exposure to the new culture.

#### Relationship Between Self-Concept and Length of Time in the United States

The hypotheses predicted that those subjects who have been exposed to the new culture will score higher on the self-concept scale than those who have not been in the U.S.A. yet. The hypotheses stated that:

1. Students in Puerto Rico before coming to the continental United States (Pre-U.S. or Group 1) would have positive self-concepts.
2. Exchange students who had been in the continental United States at least nine months (In-U.S. or Group 2) would have higher self-concepts than students who had not been to the United States (Pre-U.S.).
3. Students who had returned to Puerto Rico after

the year of exchange (Post-U.S. or Group 3) would have the highest self-concept level of all the three groups.

These hypotheses were tested through an analysis of variance. The results show no significant differences among the three groups on self-concept ( $F=.0226$ ,  $df=2,55$ ). Table 1 shows the mean scale scores and the standard deviations for each group. Although the difference is towards the direction predicted, it is too small to be significant.

#### Relationship Between Ethnic Identity and Exposure to the American Culture

The hypotheses predicted that:

4. Students in Puerto Rico before coming to the continental United States (Pre-U.S. or Group 1) were expected to be positive about their ethnic identities.

5. Exchange students (In-U.S. or Group 2) would show stronger identification with their ethnic group than the students in Puerto Rico (Pre-U.S.).

6. Students who had returned to Puerto Rico after the year of exchange (Post-U.S. or Group 3) were expected to score higher than Pre-U.S. (Group 1) and equal to or higher than In-U.S. (Group 2) on ethnic identity.

Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations on the Self-Concept Scores

Variable	Group	M*	SD
Self-Concept	Pre-U.S.	143.48	16.46
	In-U.S.	151.31	13.42
	Post-U.S.	151.00	17.52

Note. The higher the score, the higher the self-concept.

The instrument (Ethnic Identity Scale) utilized to measure the ethnic identity variable is composed of four stages, which are Pre-Encounter, Encounter, Immersion/Emersion and Internalization. The original designers of the scale from which the one in this study was derived, Parham and Helms (1985), recommended using "patterns of scale elevations and/or weighted linear combinations of the attitudes for interpretive purposes," rather than assigning subjects to a single stage by using their highest scale score. They reasoned that the former procedures permit one to use the measure even with subjects who have attitudes that are represented in more than one stage. Therefore, taking this into consideration, the hypotheses were tested through a multiple analysis of variance. Three multivariate tests of significance were done and all were significant at the .05 level (see Table 2).

Univariate F tests for each subscale are shown in Appendix E. As predicted, all three groups were positive about their ethnic identities, even Group 1 (Pre-U.S.) as expected on hypothesis #4 (see Table 3). Notwithstanding, a highly significant F ratio was found for the Pre-Encounter variable ( $p < .005$ ). As a priori differences were predicted, t-tests were used to determine exactly where significant differences lay. As

Table 2

Multivariate Tests of Significance for Ethnic Identity

Test Name	Value	F	df	Error df	p
Pillais	.2638	2.013	8	106	.05
Hotellings	.3179	2.027	8	102	.05
Wilks	.7491	2.020	8	104	.05

Table 3

Means and Standard Deviations for Ethnic Identity Stages

	Groups		
	Pre-U.S.	In-U.S.	Post-U.S.
Pre-Encounter	$\bar{X}=2.138$ SD= .548	$\bar{X}=1.644$ SD= .549	$\bar{X}=1.679$ SD= .459
Encounter	$\bar{X}=2.960$ SD= .709	$\bar{X}=2.547$ SD= .600	$\bar{X}=3.009$ SD= .599
Immersion	$\bar{X}=2.595$ SD= .504	$\bar{X}=2.388$ SD= .628	$\bar{X}=2.604$ SD= .542
Internalization	$\bar{X}=3.832$ SD= .439	$\bar{X}=4.056$ SD= .363	$\bar{X}=4.035$ SD= .659

anticipated on hypothesis #5, Group 2 (In-U.S.) reported lower Pre-Encounter attitudes than Group 1,  $t(39)=2.960$ ,  $p<.005$ . Also, as expected on hypothesis #6, Group 3 (Post-U.S.) scored lower in their Pre-Encounter attitudes than Group 1,  $t(40)=2.782$ ,  $p<.005$ . Subjects in Groups 2 and 3 showed no significant difference in their Pre-Encounter attitudes,  $t(31)=.192$ .

Post-hoc comparisons were also made using the Tukey Honestly Significant Difference Test (HSD), which yielded similar results as the t-tests (see Table 4).

When Encounter attitudes were used as the dependent variable, results of the analysis of variance in Appendix E show a non-statistically significant difference. However, a tendency in the opposite direction of predictions is indicated,  $F(2,55)=2.60$ ,  $p=.083$ . Although the F test was not significant, in order to further evaluate the direction of the results, t-tests were performed. Subjects in Group 1 (Pre-U.S.) reported significantly higher Encounter attitudes than subjects in Group 2 (In-U.S.),  $t(39)=1.995$ ,  $p<.05$ . Group 2 reported significantly lower Encounter attitudes than Group 3 (Post-U.S.),  $t(33)=2.044$ ,  $p<.025$ . Again, these results were contrary to expectations. Comparison between subjects in Groups 1 and 3 showed no significant difference.

Table 4  
Post-hoc Comparisons (Tukey's HSD) on the Pre-Encounter  
Attitudes

Groups	Qobt	p
Pre-U.S./In-U.S.	4.083*	.05
Pre-U.S./Post-U.S.	3.793*	.05
In-U.S./Post-U.S.	.289	NS

Note. df=(3,55).

For 40 df, Qcrit = 3.44 (.05).

For 60 df, Qcrit = 3.40 (.05).

When the Immersion attitudes or Internalization attitudes were used as the dependent variable, results on the analysis of variance show no significant difference for either variable. However, the F ratio for the Internalization variable was stronger than for the Immersion variable and t-tests were done to explore the direction of the results. Strong tendencies were shown in the predicted directions. Pre-U.S. subjects (Group 1) reported lower Internalization attitudes than In-U.S. subjects (Group 2),  $t(39)=1.41$ ,  $p<.10$ . Post-U.S. subjects (Group 3) scored higher in their Internalization attitudes than Pre-U.S. subjects,  $t(40)=1.301$ , barely missing significance at the .10 level for which a  $t$  of 1.303 was required. No significance was found between In-U.S. and Post-U.S. subjects' Internalization attitudes,  $t(31)=.121$ .

## CHAPTER V

### Discussion

This study was designed to investigate the effects of American culture on the self-concept and ethnic identity of Puerto Rican students who come to the United States. Thus, the main hypothesis was that self-concept and ethnic identity would be significantly related to the length of time of exposure to the new culture. The results of this study supported the idea that Puerto Rican students' stage of ethnic identity was related to the degree of exposure to the host culture. However, the findings did not support the same assumption regarding their self-concepts. The specific hypotheses will be examined and the results will be discussed in this chapter. In addition, limitations will be identified as well as implications for future research.

Relationship Between Self-Concept and Length of Time in the United States

The first hypothesis stated that students in Puerto Rico who were contemplating coming to the continental U.S. would score positive in the self-concept scale. Since they had not been exposed to the new culture, it was assumed they would provide a base line for the measurement of self-concept. The expected outcome was supported by the results in that these students reported

positive self-concepts. However, the findings failed to demonstrate the predicted differences between the three groups of Puerto Ricans examined.

The second hypothesis stated that exchange students who were in the continental U.S. for nine months would score higher in their self-concept scale than the students in Puerto Rico. The assumption was that prior to coming to the United States, students often idealized the new culture, and at times doubted their capabilities in dealing with the new environment. However, that once they encountered the host culture and experienced the fact that they had the ability to deal and adjust to the new demands, they would think more positively of themselves. The results show that although this second group scored higher than the first group, the difference was too small to be statistically significant.

One possible explanation for the insignificant difference in scores could be found in the literature itself. As Burns (1979) pointed out, one of the reasons self-concept research has been controversial is because of the difficulty of measuring such a concept. Therefore, scales might not be as sensitive in picking up differences. Of course, another possibility may be that the impact the new culture had on the self-concept

is not great enough to result in an internalized change by the students in such a short period of time.

The third hypothesis stated that students who had returned to Puerto Rico after the year of exchange would score the highest among the three groups. The suggestion was that these students had experienced the success and accomplishment of adapting to the new culture and therefore would think of themselves as more capable, confident, and self-assured. This hypothesis, however, was not corroborated by the findings. The mean score of Group 3 was almost the same as for Group 2. In addition to the two previous explanations, it may be possible that the level of self-concept reaches its maximum while students are in the United States.

In summary, quantitatively, the results did not support the idea that self-concept is related to the level of exposure to the American culture. However, several observations were made through the comments the students wrote in response to the questionnaires. First, it was observed that the first group of students made no comments regarding either variable, self-concept or ethnic identity. This was expected, since they did not have a base for comparison. Secondly, Group 2 commented on both, but mainly on ethnic identity issues, while Group 3 commented on both variables.

Comments on the self-concept variable by students in Group 2 denoted an immediate struggle with their insecurities vis-à-vis their abilities to cope with a different and at times adverse environment. They were also contending with their ability to make their opportunity in the United States a positive learning experience. An illustration of this is an excerpt from a speech a student sent this writer while in his exchange year. It reads:

Before I finish this speech, I would like to say that here in Oswego, the Land of Oz, I didn't find a lion, a scarecrow or a tinman, but I did find that I have the courage, brains and heart to confront all things. And I also found that people who are prejudiced have no courage, brains or heart.

Qualitatively, comments from Group 3 indicated a degree of internalization of the experience they went through. They concentrated on the importance of believing in oneself and working hard to be a better human being. Also, they commented on putting the good and the bad of an experience in perspective and assuming control over such experience. They also pointed out the need to learn to deal with all kinds of people.

In conclusion, although quantitatively the results did not support the hypotheses, qualitatively it seems that exposure to the new culture affected the way students think of themselves.

Relationship Between Ethnic Identity and Length of Time  
in the United States

The fourth hypothesis stated that students in Puerto Rico contemplating coming to the continental U.S. would score positive in the ethnic identity scale. Again, the scores for this group served as the base line, since they had not been exposed to the new culture. The fifth hypothesis stated that exchange students who had been in the continental U.S. for nine months would show stronger identification with their ethnicity than the previous group. And, the sixth hypothesis stated that students who had returned to Puerto Rico after the year of exchange would show their ethnic identity to be at the same level as Group 2 or probably higher. The results of this study show that all three groups have a positive identification with their ethnic group since all of them were at the internalization level as expected. Nevertheless, the results also support the assumption that students who had been exposed to the new culture would exhibit different levels of ethnic identity attitudes than those who had not been exposed.

It should be noted that since the ethnic identity scale consisted of four stages, the discussion will proceed explaining the findings for each one.

As expected, the results indicate that Group 1, the students who had not been exposed to the new culture, scored the highest in pre-Encounter attitudes. One of the characteristics of this subscale is that it idealizes everything that is American. Therefore, it is consistent with what has been previously discussed. These students tended to agree more often with statements such as:

I believe that American people look and express themselves better than Puerto Ricans.

I believe that Puerto Ricans should learn to think and experience life in ways which are similar to American people.

I feel that Puerto Ricans do not have as much to be proud of as Americans.

Students who were in the United States and students who had returned to Puerto Rico after their exchange year showed no significant difference among their scores on this stage as it was suggested.

However, the findings for the encounter subscale are unexpected and puzzling. It would have been predicted that the students who were in the U.S. would score higher in this scale since it describes the stage in which the individual starts questioning his or her ethnic identity because of a "startling personal or social event," and they are the ones confronting the new culture. However, those students scored

significantly lower than the other two groups in this subscale. There were no significant differences between the groups that were in Puerto Rico, implying that encounter attitudes are more prevalent while the students are on the island. It is interesting to note that Parham and Helms (1985), also contrary to their expectations, found that encounter attitudes tended to be associated with self-acceptance and low anxiety. Yet, correlations between self-acceptance scores and the encounter attitudes scores were not significant in this study. Nevertheless, in affinity with their findings about the association with low anxiety, it is logical to assume that when Puerto Ricans are on the island they feel more secure in their environment since they are more insulated from controversies coming from confronting the mainland experiences and issues; and therefore feel less anxious. Still, it may also be speculated that as Helms and Parham (1985) noted in their development of the RIAS, the transitional nature of encounter attitudes could imply that it may not be as sensitive as other subscales.

The findings regarding the immersion attitudes yielded no significant difference among the groups. The data suggest that the students did not tend to strongly idealize everything that is Puerto Rican while

denigrating everything that is American. They usually disagreed or were uncertain about statements such as:

I believe that everything Puerto Rican is good, and consequently, I limit myself to Puerto Rican activities.

I speak my mind regardless of the consequences (e.g., being kicked out of school, being exposed to danger).

Post-hoc comparisons between the groups on internalization attitudes show strong tendencies in the expected directions. As predicted, the students who had not been exposed to the new culture scored the lowest among the groups. There was no significant difference between the students residing in the United States and those who had returned to Puerto Rico. It, therefore, suggests that the latter two groups of students had further achieved and internalized their confidence and security in their identity as Puerto Ricans.

Again, comments by the students on the ethnic identity variable provided a broader understanding on what the scales were trying to measure. They reported on how the exchange program experience provided them with the opportunity to assess their ideas on being Puerto Ricans and the issues and conflicts they needed to deal with due to such identification. For example, one student reported how surprised he was when early on he was called "spic" (a pejorative name, such as

"nigger"). He was unaware of the meaning, although judging from the attitude, he deduced it had a negative connotation. He noted that he then had to examine his ethnic identity as he had never done before in view of his new status. Another of the students very eloquently wrote on the point this study tried to make regarding how Puerto Ricans think of themselves and their ethnicity. She says:

I am proud of being Puerto Rican and I don't feel inferior or superior because of my ethnic background. I do believe and understand that the situation that a lot of Puerto Ricans face in the U.S. is very difficult. But I strongly believe that the Puerto Rican image in the States can be improved, and it has to be changed by we, the students who have the opportunity to do so.

#### Limitations of this Study

Since the nature of this study was to examine the effects of the introduction of the new culture on the individual's self-concept and ethnic identity, the subjects had to be limited to Puerto Ricans who have not lived in the United States. This is a difficult population to find since most Puerto Rican adults have lived at some time in their lives in the United States. Therefore, for practical reasons, a further limitation was imposed by obtaining the subjects from the Exchange Program of the University of Puerto Rico. Positively, however, it provided a population controlling for

educational level and to some extent for socioeconomic status. The rationale was that these students would be relatively at the same level for the mentioned factors with the host population with whom they would be dealing. It is strongly felt by this researcher that what is looked at most of the time in Puerto Rican studies is the culture of poverty, which yields results that could apply to anyone living in low socioeconomic conditions. Thus the struggle for financial survival in this study is controlled.

Nevertheless, these controls could also be taken as limitations. Therefore, we should be careful in generalizing the results to other populations. Furthermore, no claim can be made that the results are descriptive of mainland Puerto Ricans.

As it is well known to self-concept researchers, and at this time to this investigator, the scales available are always open to question on their sensitivity in measuring the construct under study, and on their appropriateness, especially when researching an ethnic minority group. Hence, knowing such restrictions, the task was to identify measures that best fit the purpose of the study. It was with utmost confidence that such a decision was made when the scale used in the present study was selected. This also holds

true with the selection of the scale to measure ethnic identity.

Finally, a longitudinal design would have been preferred for the analysis of changes in their self-concept and ethnic identity, since these facets of the person evolve over time. Nonetheless, a cross-sectional approach was used because of the resources and time constraints of this study.

#### Implications for Future Research and Concluding Remarks

A review of the study's findings suggests a number of implications for future research in this area. First, this study needs to be replicated utilizing a larger sample size and a broader population. Furthermore, a longitudinal design should be considered in order to better assess if the changes in ethnic identity and self-concept are due to time as well as kind of conditions.

Secondly, additional research is needed which compares the island Puerto Ricans with the mainland Puerto Ricans, in this case, on their self-concept and ethnic identity. Such studies could yield empirical data on the differences between the experiences of these groups. Consequently, observations on one group will not be generalized erroneously to the other, as it has often been done in studies about Puerto Ricans.

Moreover, if the reasons behind those differences could be understood by mental health workers, then they might be in a better position to consider and incorporate the sociocultural component into intervention strategies, and thus obtain greater therapeutic impact.

Third, additional data is needed on the instruments utilizing Puerto Ricans, in order to improve the validity and reliability with this population. This is particularly true with the ethnic identity scale since it is new for this group. It is also suggested that other studies in this area should be developed from within the particular culture.

In conclusion, the findings in this study provide some empirical evidence in support of the idea that the introduction of American culture has an impact on the Puerto Ricans' ethnic identity. Specifically, it shows that unlike the melting pot idea, Puerto Ricans identify more strongly with their ethnicity when faced with the new culture. Therefore, in future research, when studying this population, nonassimilation factors need to be considered in order not to be biased, as Maldonado (1975) noted, in favor of those who are assimilated. In other words, traditional studies usually compare the ethnic group studied with the norms of the Anglo. Those who do not fit those standards are

considered deviants or to be having problems. This approach does not consider individuals who are nonassimilated and would score positively, for example, in self-concept with instruments developed within their cultural context, while reflecting negatively with those instruments which do not consider their culture. If a desirable instrument is not available, self-identity studies need to carefully take the culture into consideration. Furthermore, it seems important that the individual has the alternative of retaining his or her cultural identity as one of the options among the various possible adaptations to a pluralistic society. To be discouraged and denied such a choice may ultimately create alienation and conflict.

Throughout the literature, it has been acknowledged that diagnosed mental health problems are not distributed randomly in the population but tend to concentrate within specific subgroups. Traditionally, the major dimensions associated with such variations are those of migration, social class, and race. Vulnerability to mental illness among Latinos has been attributed to a variety of factors, which in combination act to exacerbate stress. In addition to the ones mentioned, other stress-creating factors specific to Latino life in the United States are ethnic

discrimination, language barriers and difficulties with acculturation.

The specific stresses and idiosyncratic life events experienced by Latinos require a commitment from professionals to develop, firstly, relevant research so it could be translated into relevant treatment theories, models, and practices. At the beginning of the quest in this topic, this researcher was questioned why minorities, in this case Puerto Ricans, when conducting research, will most likely do it on their ethnic population. This is a valid question since being Puerto Rican does not give an expertise on everything there is to know about that population. However, it provides an insider's interpretation, and the experience of being Puerto Rican, if understood correctly, can enhance the research. With this in mind, this project was undertaken.

An understanding of the sociocultural aspects of the Puerto Rican life and the role they play in treatment is absolutely crucial to those who treat the Puerto Rican patient. As previously quoted from Giordano (1971), ethnicity from a clinical point of view envelops not only national origin, geographical setting, or race, but also involves conscious and unconscious processes that fulfill needs for belongingness,

identity, and historical continuity. Language, culture, and ethnicity are interrelated influences in the forging of an individual's self-concept; the understanding of which is essential to any therapeutic relationship (Becerra et al, 1982). The failure to understand the social and cultural environment of the Puerto Rican has contributed to many misdiagnoses and irrelevant treatments. Therefore, the knowledge of sociocultural factors, as well as their psychological characteristics, allows the mental health worker to better understand the patient and to incorporate those components of Puerto Rican life into the intervention strategy.

**PLEASE NOTE:**

**Copyrighted materials in this document have not been filmed at the request of the author. They are available for consultation, however, in the author's university library.**

**These consist of pages:**

Appendix A Acceptance of Self Scale Pages 78-83

---

---

---

---

---

---

**University  
Microfilms  
International**

300 N Zeeb Rd., Ann Arbor, MI 48106 (313) 761-4700

## Appendix B

Ethnic Identity Scale

For each of the following statements, please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with the statement by marking your choice (X).

- | 1                    | 2        | 3         | 4     | 5                 |
|----------------------|----------|-----------|-------|-------------------|
| Strongly<br>disagree | Disagree | Uncertain | Agree | Strongly<br>agree |
1. I believe that being Puerto Rican is a positive experience. (I)
  2. I know through experience what being Puerto Rican in America means. (I)
  3. I feel unable to involve myself in American experiences, and am increasing my involvement in Puerto Rican experiences. (E,Im)
  4. I believe that large numbers of Puerto Ricans cannot be trusted. (P-E)
  5. I feel an overwhelming attachment to Puerto Ricans. (I)
  6. I feel comfortable wherever I am.
  7. I believe that American people look and express themselves better than Puerto Ricans. (P-E)
  8. I feel good about being Puerto Rican, but do not limit myself to Puerto Ricans activities. (I)
  9. American people can't be trusted. (Im)
  10. I believe that certain aspects of the Puerto Rican experience apply to me, and others do not. (P-E)
  12. I constantly involve myself in Puerto Rican political and social activities (art shows, meetings, "Spanish" theater, etc.). (Im)

13. I believe that Puerto Ricans should learn to think and experience life in ways which are similar to American people. (P-E)
14. I feel excitement and joy in Puerto Rican surroundings. (I)
15. I find myself reading a lot of Puerto Rican literature and thinking about being Puerto Rican. (E)
16. I feel guilty and/or anxious about some of the things I believe about Puerto Ricans. (E,P-E)
17. I believe that a Puerto Rican person's most effective weapon for solving problems is to become a part of the American person's world. (P-E)
18. I speak my mind regardless of the consequences (e.g., being kicked out of school, being exposed to danger). (Im)
19. I believe that everything Puerto Rican is good, and consequently, I limit myself to Puerto Rican activities. (Im)
20. I am determined to find my Puerto Rican identity. (E)
21. I believe that Americans are intellectually superior to Puerto Ricans. (P-E)
22. I feel that Puerto Ricans do not have as much to be proud of as Americans do. (P-E)
23. Most Puerto Ricans I know are failures. (P-E)
24. I believe that because I am Puerto Rican, I have many strengths. (I)
25. The most important thing about me is that I am Puerto Rican. (Im)
26. I am satisfied with myself. (I)
27. I have a positive attitude about myself because I am Puerto Rican. (I)

28. I contribute to discussions about Puerto Ricans in class.
29. I consider the Puerto Rican culture as rich as any other culture. (I)
30. People, regardless of their culture, have strengths and limitations. (I)
- 

Note. P-E = Pre-Encounter subscale items.  
E = Encounter subscale items.  
Im = Immersion/Emersion subscale items.  
I = Internalization subscale items.

## Appendix C

Demographic Items

Instructions: Please print requested information in the space provided or place a check mark (X) where appropriate.

Age: \_\_\_\_\_

Sex: Female \_\_\_\_\_ Male \_\_\_\_\_

Place of birth: \_\_\_\_\_

Have you ever lived outside of Puerto Rico, in the continental United States (not including your year of exchange program)?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

If yes, where? \_\_\_\_\_

For how long? \_\_\_\_\_

At what age? \_\_\_\_\_

What was the nature of your stay?

Vacation \_\_\_\_\_

Education \_\_\_\_\_

Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

Year in College: \_\_\_\_\_

Major in College: \_\_\_\_\_

Please identify your socio-economic class:

Upper-class \_\_\_\_\_

Middle-class \_\_\_\_\_

Lower-class \_\_\_\_\_

Father's Occupation: \_\_\_\_\_

Mother's Occupation: \_\_\_\_\_

Estimate your parents' combined income.

Under \$7,000 \_\_\_\_\_

\$7,000 to \$13,999 \_\_\_\_\_

\$14,000 to \$20,999 \_\_\_\_\_

\$21,000 to \$27,999 \_\_\_\_\_

\$28,000 or above \_\_\_\_\_

Would you prefer living in the United States?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

## Appendix D

Letter to Students

P.O. Box 7477  
Alhambra, CA 91802  
March 31, 1987

Dear

Following you will find a set of questionnaires regarding your attitudes towards yourself and others, on your ethnicity as well as some demographic information.

This data will be used in a research study for a doctoral dissertation on the impact that the American culture has on the self-concept and ethnic identity.

Your honest response is greatly appreciated. Please fill it out and promptly return it, if possible within a week.

Again, let me thank you for your time and cooperation.

Atentamente,

Veronica Benitez

## Appendix E

Univariate F-Tests for Ethnic Identity Subscales

Vari- able	Source	Sum of Squares	df	MS	F	p
Pre-En- counter	Between- Groups	3.231	2	1.615	5.88	.005
	Within- Group	15.118	55	.275		
Encoun- ter	Between- Groups	2.195	2	1.098	2.60	.083
	Within- Group	23.224	55	.422		
Immer- sion	Between- Groups	.514	2	.257	.84	.435
	Within- Group	16.709	55	.304		
Inter- nalization	Between- Groups	.652	2	.326	1.32	.275
	Within- Group	13.573	55	.247		

## Appendix F

Summary of the Demographic Data

Groups	1	2	3
Age (mean years)	9.92	20.40	21.35
Sex:			
Female	80%	56%	88%
Male	20%	44%	12%
Year in College (mean)	2.5	3.13	4.0
Socioeconomic Status:			
Lower-class	28%	31%	6%
Middle-class	60%	56%	82%
Upper-class	12%	12%	12%
Prefer Living in U.S.A.:			
Yes	36%	31%	29%
No	64%	62%	65%
Uncertain	--	6%	6%

## References

- Atkinson, D.R., Morten, G., and Sue, D.W. Counseling American Minorities: A cross-cultural perspective. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Company Publishers, 1979.
- Bachman, J.G. Youth in Transition, Volume II: The impact of family background and intelligence on tenth-grade boys. Ann Arbor: Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, 1970.
- Bartee, G.M. The Perceptual Characteristics of Disadvantaged Negro and Caucasian College Students, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, East Texas State University, 1967.
- Becerra, R.M., Karno, M., Escobar, J.I. Mental Health and Hispanic Americans: Clinical Perspectives. New York: Grune and Stratton, Inc., 1982.
- Berger, E. The relations between expressed acceptance of self and expressed acceptance of others. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1952, 47, 778-82.
- Berry, J.W. Acculturation as varieties of adaptation. In Acculturation: Theory, Models and Some New Findings, A.M. Padilla (Ed.). Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1980.
- Berry, J.W. Social and cultural change. In H.C. Triandis and R. Brislin (Eds.) Handbook of Cross-Cultural Psychology, Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Vol. 5, 1979.
- Broom L. and Kitsuse, J.I. The validation of acculturation: A condition to ethnic assimilation. American Anthropologist, 1955, 107, 44-48.
- Buriel, R. Cognitive styles among three generations of Mexican-American children. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 1975, 6, 417-29.
- Burns, R.B. The Self-Concept: Theory, measurement, development and behaviour. New York: Longman, 1979.
- Carter, T.P. The negative self concepts of Mexican American students. School and Society, 1968, 96, 217-19.

- Clark, K.B. Jews in contemporary America: Problems in Identification. In The Psychodynamics of American Jewish Life: An Anthology, Norman Kiell (Ed.) New York: Twayne Publishers, Inc. 1967.
- Clark, K.B. and Clark M.P. Racial identification and preference in Negro children. In Readings in Social Psychology. New York: Holt and Company, 1952, 551-60.
- Cohen, L.M. and Fernandez, C.L. Ethnic identity and psychocultural adaptation of Spanish-speaking families. Child Welfare, July 1974, 53(7), 413-21.
- Cooley, C.H. Human Nature and the Social Order. New York: Scribners, 1912.
- Coopersmith, S. The Antecedents of Self Esteem. San Francisco: Freeman, 1967.
- Cross, W.E. The Negro-to-Black conversion experience: Towards a psychology of Black liberations. Black World, 1971, 20, 13-37.
- Cross, W.E. The Cross and Thomas models of psychological negrescence. Journal of Black Psychology, 1978, 5, 13-19.
- Dashefsky, A. And the search goes on: The meaning of religio-ethnic identity and identification. Sociological Analysis, 1972, 33(4), 239-45.
- Dashefsky, A. Ethnic Identity in Society. Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Co., 1976.
- De Roca, A.S. Algunos valores prevalectes en la sociedad puertorriquena. Revista de Ciencias Sociales, 1963 (Marzo-Junio), 7, 121-40.
- Deutsch, M., Katz, I., Jensen, A. Social Class, Race and Psychological Development. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.
- De Vos, G. Ethnic Pluralism: Conflict and accommodation. In Ethnic Identity: Cultural Continuities and Change, G. De Vos and L. Romanucci-Ross (Eds.). Palo Alto: Mayfield Publishing, 1975.

- Documents on the Constitutional History of Puerto Rico.  
Washington, D.S.: Office of Puerto Rico, n.d., pp.  
117-51.
- Driedger, L. Ethnic self-identity: A comparison of in-  
group evaluations. Sociometry, 1976, 39(2), 131-41.
- Epstein, S. The self-concept revisited: Or a theory of  
a theory? American Psychologist, May 1973, 28, 404-  
16.
- Erikson, E.H. Childhood and Society. New York:  
Norton, 1950.
- Erikson, E.H. Identity, Youth and Crisis. New York:  
Norton, 1968.
- Erikson, E.H. Psychoanalysis and on-going history  
problems of identity hatred and non-violence.  
American Journal of Psychiatry, 1965, 122, 241-50.
- Erikson, E.H. Identity and the Life Cycle. New York:  
W.W. Norton and Co., 1980.
- Felker, D.W. Building Positive Self-Concepts.  
Minneapolis: Burgess Publishing Co., 1974.
- Fitzpatrick, J.P. Puerto Rican Americans; The meaning  
of migration to the Mainland. Englewood Cliffs, NJ:  
Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1971.
- Foot, E. Identification as the basis for a theory of  
motivation. American Sociological Review, 1951, 16,  
14-21.
- Garza-Guerrero, A.C. Culture Shock: Its mourning and  
the vicissitudes of identity. Journal of the  
American Psychoanalytic Association, 1974, 22, 408-  
29.
- Giordano, J. Ethnicity and Mental Health. New York:  
Institute on Pluralism and Group Identity, 1971.
- Glazer, N. and Moynihan, D. Beyond the Melting Pot.  
Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1970.
- Glazer, N. and Moynihan, D. Ethnicity: Theory and  
Experience. Cambridge: Harvard University Press,  
1975.

- Goodman, M.E. Evidence concerning the genesis of interracial attitudes. American Anthropologist, 1946, 48, 624-30.
- Gordon, M. Assimilation in American Life, New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.
- Gordon, V.V. The Self-Concept of Black Americans. New York: Press of America, 1980.
- Greeley, A. Ethnicity in the United States: A Preliminary Reconnaissance. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1974.
- Greeley, A. Why Can't They Be Like Us? New York: Institute of Human Relations Press, 1969.
- Handlin, O. The Newcomers: Negroes and Puerto Ricans in a Changing Metropolis. Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1962.
- Handlin, O. The Uprooted. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1973.
- Hallowell, A.I. Culture and Experience. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1955.
- Hauberg, C.A. Puerto Rico and the Puerto Ricans: A Study of Puerto Rican History and Immigration to the United States. New York: Hippocrene Books, Inc., 1974.
- Heiss, J. and Owens, S. Self evaluations of Black and Whites. American Journal of Sociology, 1972, 78, 360-70.
- Helgerson, E. The relative significance of race, sex, and facial expression in choice of playmate by the preschool child. Journal of Negro Education, 1943, 12, 617-22.
- Helms, J.E. and Parham, T.A. The Racial Identity Attitude Scale. In R. Jones (Ed.) (In press) Handbook of Tests and Measurements with Black Population.
- Herberg, W. Protestant, Catholic, Jew. Garden City, NJ: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1955.

- Hodgkins, B.J. and Stakenas, R.G. A study of self-concepts of Negro and White youth in segregated environments (Institute for Social Research, Florida State University, 1968). Journal of Negro Education, 1969, 38, 370-77.
- Horowitz, R.E. Racial aspects of self-identification in nursery school children. Journal of Psychology, 1939, 7, 91-99.
- Howard, J.R. Awakening Minorities: American Indians, Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans. New Brunswick, NJ: Aldine Publishing Co., 1970.
- Hunt, D.E. and Hardt, R.H. The effects of Upward Bound programs on the attitudes, motivation, and academic achievement. Journal of Social Issues, Summer 1969, 25, 122-24.
- James, W. Principles of Psychology. New York: Holt, 1890.
- Jenkins, A.H. The Psychology of the Afro-American: A humanistic approach. New York: Pergamon Press, 1982.
- Lindesmith, A.R. and Strauss, A.L. Social Psychology. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1968.
- Linton, R. Acculturation in Seven American Indian Tribes. Gloucester, MA: Peter Smith, 1963.
- Longres, J.F. Racism and its effects on Puerto Rican continentals. Social Casework, February 1974, 67-75.
- Louden, D.M. Conflict and change among West Indian parents and adolescents in Britain. Educational Research, 1977, 20, 44-53.
- Maldonado, D. Ethnic self-identity and self-understanding. Social Casework, December 1975, 618-22.
- Marden, C.F. and Meyer, G. Minorities in American Society. New York: D. Van Nostrand Co., 1973.

- McDill, L. Sources of Educational Climate in High School, Dept. of Social Relations, Johns Hopkins University, Final Report, Project No. 1999, submitted to Bureau of Research, U.S. Office of Education, Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare, 1966.
- McGoldrick, M., Pearce, J.K., and Giordano, J. Ethnicity and Family Therapy. New York: The Guilford Press, 1982.
- Mead, G. Mind, Self, and Society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934.
- Miller, M.H., Yeh, E.K., Alexander, A.A., Klein, M.H., Tseng, K.H., Workneh, F., Chu, H.M. The cross-cultural students: Lessons in Human Nature. Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic, 1971, 35, 128-31.
- Mizio, E. Impact of external systems on the Puerto Rican family. Social Casework, February 1974, 76-83.
- Montserrat, J. Puerto Rican migration: The impact on future relations. Howard Law Journal, Fall 1968.
- Morse, W.C. and Wingo, G.M. Psychology and Teaching. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman, 1969.
- Omwake, K. The relation between acceptance of self and acceptance of others shown by three personality inventories. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1954, 18, 443-46.
- Opler, M. Culture and Social Psychiatry. Springfield, IL: C. Thomas Publishers, 1956.
- Padilla, A.M. Acculturation: Theory, Models and Some New Findings. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1980.
- Padilla, A.M., Ruiz, R.A. and Alvarez, R. Community mental health services for Spanish-speaking/surnamed population. American Psychologist, 1975, 30, 892-905.
- Parham, T.A. and Helms, J.E. Attitudes of racial identity and self-esteem: An exploratory investigation. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1985, 26(2), 143-46.

- Parham, T.A. and Helms, J.E. The influence of Black students' racial identity attitudes on preferences for counselor's race. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1981, 28(3), 250-57.
- Parham, T.A. and Helms, J.E. Relationship of racial identity attitudes to self-actualization and affective states of black students. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1985, 32(3), 431-440.
- Park, R.E. Assimilation, Social. In Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, Vol 2. E. Seligman and A. Johnson (Eds.). New York: The MacMillan Co., 1930.
- Parsons, T. The position of identity in a general theory of action. In The Self in Social Interaction. C. Gordon and K.J. Gergen (Eds.). New York: Wiley, 1968.
- Pederson, P.P., Draguns, J.G., Lonner, W.J. and Trimble, J.E. Counseling Across Cultures. Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii, 1976.
- Radke, M., Trager, H.G. and Davis, H. Social perceptions and attitudes of children. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 1949, 40, 327-447.
- Rice, A.S., Ruiz, R.A., and Padilla, A.M. Person perception, self-identity, and ethnic group preference in Anglo, Black and Chicano pre-school and third grade children. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 1974, 5, 100-8.
- Richardson, A. A theory and a method for the psychological study of assimilation. The International Migration Review, 1967, 2, 3-30.
- Rigual-Lynch, L. Self-Esteem and the Puerto Rican Migrant. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International, 1979.
- Rivera, J.J. Growth of a Puerto Rican awareness. Social Casework, February 1974, 84-89.
- Robinson, J.P. and Shaver, P.R. Measures of Social Psychological Attitudes. Ann Arbor: Survey Research Center: Institute for Social Research, 1973.

- Rodríguez, C. A cost-benefit analysis of subjective factors affecting assimilation: Puerto Ricans. Ethnicity, March 1975, 2(1), 66-80.
- Rose, A. Sociology: The Study of Human Relations. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1956.
- Rosen, B.C. Adolescence and Religion. Cambridge: Schenkman, 1965.
- Rosen, B.C. Race, Ethnicity, and the achievement syndrome. American Sociological Review, 1959 (February), 24, 47-60.
- Rosenberg, M. Society and the Adolescent Self Image. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1965.
- Rosenberg, M. and Simmons, R.G. Black and White self-esteem: The urban school child. Washington, D.C.: American Sociological Association, 1971.
- Royce, A.P. Ethnic Identity: Strategies of Diversity. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1982.
- Seeman, M. Skin color values in three all-Negro school classes. American Sociological Review, 1946, 315-21.
- Shaw, M.E. and Wright, J.M. Scales for the Measurement of Attitudes. New York: McGraw Hill, 1967.
- Stonequist, E.V. The Marginal Man: A Study in Personality and Culture Conflict. New York: Scribner, 1937.
- Sue, D.W. Counseling the Culturally Different: Theory and Practice. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1981.
- Sue, D.W. Ethnic Identity: The impact of two culture on the psychological development of Asians in America. In Asian Americans: Psychological perspectives, D.W. Sue and N.N. Wagner (Eds.). Palo Alto, CA: Science and Behavior Books, 1973.
- Sue, D.W. and Sue, D. Barriers to effective cross-cultural counseling. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1977, 24, 420-29.

- Sullivan, H.S. Interpersonal Theory of Psychiatry. New York: Norton, 1953.
- Taft, R. Adjustment and assimilation of immigrant: A problem in social psychology. Psychological Reports, 1962, 10, 90.
- Tannenbaum, A.J. Social and psychological considerations in the study of the socially disadvantaged. In The Educationally Retarded and Disadvantaged, P. Witty (Ed.). Washington, D.C.: National Society for the Study of Education, 1967.
- Ticho, G. Cultural aspects of transference and counter-transference. Bulletin Menninger Clinic, 1971, 35, 313-34.
- Torres-Matrullo, C. Acculturation and psychopathology among Puerto Rican women in mainland United States. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, October 1976, 46(4), 710-19.
- U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. Puerto Ricans in the continental United States: An uncertain future. October 1976.
- U.S. Development of Commerce. Report on the Census of Puerto Rico, 1940 and 1970.
- Verma, G.K. and Bogley, C. Race and Education Across Cultures. London: Heinemann, 1975.
- Wagenheim, K. Puerto Rico: A Profile. New York: Praeger Publishers, Inc., 1970.
- Wagenheim, K. Puerto Rico: A Profile. (2nd ed.) New York: Praeger Publishers, Inc., 1975.
- Wagner, N. and Haug, M.J. Chicanos: Social and Psychological Perspectives. St. Louis: The C.V. Mosby Co., 1971.
- Witty, P. An analysis of the personality traits of the effective teachers. Journal of Educational Research, 1947, 40, 662-71.
- Wright, M. (Ed.). Puerto Rican brain drain to mainland hitting new highs. The San Juan Star, 12-1-82, p. 20.

- Wylie, R.C. The Self-Concept: A review of methodological considerations and measuring instruments. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1974.
- Ziller, R.C., Long, B.H., Remana, K. and Reddy, V. Self-other orientations of Indian and American adolescents. Journal of Personality, 1968, 363, 315-30.
- Zirkel, P.A. Self-concept and the "disadvantage" of ethnic group membership and mixture. Review of Educational Research, 1971, 41, 211-25.