The changing of cultural identity: a psychocultural approach

Marcolino Saraiva Mota
San Jose State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_projects

Recommended Citation
DOI: https://doi.org/10.31979/etd.4pyr-g3fp
https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_projects/1165

This Master's Project is brought to you for free and open access by the Master's Theses and Graduate Research at SJSU ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Projects by an authorized administrator of SJSU ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@sjsu.edu.
THE CHANGING OF CULTURAL IDENTITY: A PSYCHOCULTURAL APPROACH

A Special Study
presented to
the Faculty of the School of Social Work
San Jose State University

JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY
School of Social Work
APPROVED
EXAMINING BOARD:

in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Social Work

by
Marcolino Saraiva Mota
December 1980

LIBRARY, SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY
# CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREFACE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. INTRODUCTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation/Assimilation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Shock/Alienation/Marginality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. METHODOLOGY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical Construct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrument and Procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limitations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Shock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assimilation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alienation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Split of Cultural Identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer acknowledges the cooperation of all those, including the respondents, who generously and graciously contributed to the elaboration of this study. Special appreciation is expressed to:

Antonio Soto, who shared with the writer, as his advisor, his broad knowledge in matters of psychology, sociology and philosophy.

Ruben Zamorano, whose perceptive critiques motivated the writer to polish concepts and approaches.

Ernestine V. Borba, whose personal and theoretical knowledge of matters related to the process of changing cultural identity was a constant element of inspiration and challenge during the elaboration of this study.

Finally, a special thanks to my wife, Ruth, whose understanding and support in correcting and typing made it possible for the writer to actually enjoy the hectic fifteen months spent at San Jose State in this M.S.W. Program.
PREFACE

The readers are cautioned about the limitations of this study as well as the meaning of the topics treated herein. The writer maintains that:

- The process of changing one's cultural identity is analogous to the process of personality development; it passes through differentiated stages culminating in either success or failure.

- Failures, or maladjustments, which occur during the process of cultural identity change are not necessarily pathological. This study does not deal directly with "pathology" as this term is understood in ego psychology.

- A great number of immigrants and ethnic minority individuals have found, in bi-culturalism, the answer to their quest for cultural identity. The success stories of these immigrants who through acculturation, assimilation and at least partial internalization found in bi-culturalism a new cultural synthesis, are not accounted for in this study. This is due to the writer's methodological bias in dealing mostly with the failures of those who did not find their cultural selves. This bias is probably authenticated by the author's overemphasis in equipping himself and other helping professionals with tools for direct practice with those for whom the American dream never became a reality.
Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

The United States of America is a nation of immigrants. Millions of them have been anchoring at American shores for centuries magnetized by dreams of wealth and freedom. Unfortunately, for many of them the quest for the American dream turned out to be a tragic misfortune. Social scientists of all schools and loyalties have been trying unsuccessfully to shed some light onto the nightmare of those who were unable to adjust to America.

Teresa Ramirez Boulette in an unpublished study entitled "The Spanish Speaking Surname Poor" makes a very comprehensive survey of the different perspectives which have been developed to explain the problems afflicting the Spanish speaking people in America. Even though her emphasis is placed on the study of a specific ethnic group, her perceptive conclusions can be extrapolated with modifications and applied to other immigrants and ethnic minority individuals.

Due to the facility for explaining the social ills of immigrants and other minority individuals without indicting oppressive and neglectful institutional policies and practices, social scientists developed the so-called
"cultural determinism" perspective. According to this paradigm, the individual's inability to adjust to American society is blamed on his distinctive culture. Thus, prejudice, alcoholism, crime, marital disharmony, family disintegration, depression, psychosis, malnutrition, learning disabilities, prejudicial teaching styles and pervasive poverty are all attributed to immigrants' and ethnic minorities' cultural baggage. The causal force which produces the social ills afflicting these groups is something from within their psychological selves.

This reference to the immigrants' and ethnic minorities' psychological selves brings us to the second perspective which, based on unsound psycho-analytical methodology, emphasizes a pathological approach.

Armand Sanchez (1971), in his article "The Definers and the Defined" criticized Drs. Karno and Edgerton who assume that culture itself causes mental illness among some ethnic minorities. According to those authors, the factors which significantly contribute to the therapeutic failure with ethnic patients are: the avoidance of the ethnicity issue by clinic personnel; secondly, the apparatus used to gather information about the patient, systematically ignores the cultural tradition and the socio-cultural context of the patient's life.

In his criticism of Drs. Karno and Edgerton, Sanchez, as an advocate of the Chicano community, states:
In the final analysis, the Chicano predicament is a problem caused by social, political and economic conditions; to force these conditions into the inner psyche of the Chicano is detrimental to and destructive to a distinctive way of life. The result, obviously is an intensification of social problems and "mental" problems - stress and strains in the life style of the Chicano community. It makes little sense to talk about mental health without social health. To treat the problems and neglect the issues is a disservice to the Chicano community and to society. "The concepts of mental health and mental illness are increasingly used ambiguously to include a wide range of social problems. These psychiatric definitions implicitly suggest that the individual is at fault..." (Sanchez, 1971:8)

The statement by Sanchez associating the Chicano predicament with social, political and economic conditions shows quite clearly that he sponsors another theoretical perspective which has been very popular for many years: the "structural-environmental determinist" theory. This perspective postulates that the causes of social ills that plague ethnic minorities could be directly traced to the door of the economic and social structure of American society. The emphasis is on the oppressive structure of American capitalism.

According to Nick Vaca (1971) there is a two-fold concern in this structural-environmental approach to the Mexican-American people:

On the one hand they were concerned with the deleterious effects that industry, and in particular agricultural industry, had upon the existence of the Mexican-American. The pejorative characteristics attributed to the Mexican-American, argued the structural-environmental determinists, were the natural result of the conditions imposed by the type of employment into which the Mexican-Americans were forced. Secondly, other members of the structural-environmental determinist school were concerned with the more social aspects of American society as they
related to the Mexican-American; focusing their attention on the need for restructuring community resources such as churches, schools, public service agencies and health services in order to eliminate the negative effect they otherwise had on the Mexican-American. (Vaca, 1971:28)

Cultural determinism, psychoanalytical and structural environmental determinism paradigms are just some of the many approaches developed by social scientists concerned with explaining the causes of social ills that afflict immigrants and ethnic minorities. To mention all the remaining perspectives would probably be an endless task. There is one, however, that cannot be omitted: the "culture of poverty" approach.

Based on the excellent work by Oscar Lewis The Culture of Poverty, some social scientists popularized the "culture of poverty" version by which maladjustment to American society is resultant of the characteristics of the poor themselves. Poverty in this paradigm is understood as a "way of life;" it is visualized in terms of a "lower class culture," as a product of a deviant value system. This deviant value system would be responsible for deviant social behaviors.

It is true that Oscar Lewis made statements such as:

Once the culture of poverty has come into existence it tends to perpetuate itself. By the time slum children are six or seven they have usually absorbed the basic attitudes and values of their subculture. Thereafter they are unready to take full advantage of changing conditions or improving opportunities that may develop in their lifetime. (Lewis, 1966:7)

An injustice is done, however, to the author of Five Families by taking a quote out of the context of his
valuable work in order to build upon it a simplistic paradigm which postulates blaming the poor for his/her poverty. William Ryan, the controversial author of *Blaming the Victim* (1972:115) acknowledges this inconsistency when he stated that those who quote Lewis so freely and simplify his ideas very often don't share his genuine empathy for the poor nor his conviction that social changes of a structural nature are necessary to deal with the problem of poverty.

Those four paradigms were mentioned in this introduction in order to give an idea of the trend of thought followed by social scientists in their endeavor to explain the causes of ethnic maladjustment to American society. It seems that when scrutinized very closely, all the variables involved in building those theoretical perspectives are reduced to three major ones: the clash of cultures, the structure of American society, and the psychoanalytical baggage.

The theoretical approach developed for this study is likewise based on the three main variables mentioned above. It deals with the personality's reactions to cultural change, by delineating how internal and/or external factors can halt the process of cultural identity change bringing along all kinds of personality maladjustments. It also considers the structure of American society with its racial biases and prejudices as causative of personality maladjustment during the process of change of cultural identity. It is also psychoanalytical, since it uses abundantly
terminology and techniques largely borrowed from psycho-
analysis as a body of knowledge. It is not geared towards
ego pathology, however, since it doesn't deal directly with
the ego's pathological structures.

This theoretical framework, which henceforth will
be called psychocultural, considers the process of change
of cultural identity as composed of three basic stages:
acculturation, assimilation, and internalization. These
three concepts should not be understood from the static
sociological point of view as ends of specific paradigms.
They should be understood from a dynamic, individual and
subjective perspective of a psychological process. It is
an individualized process in the sense that the individual
is considered as a person, not as a member of a specific
anthropological or sociological group. It is dynamic in
the sense that the person's struggle in dealing with cul-
tural change is perceived in the flux of its happening.
Finally, it is a subjective process in the sense that the
focus is on "how" the individual person perceives, accepts
or rejects the mutations which occur in his/her personality
during the process of changes in cultural identity.

It is stated here that a halt in the process of
acculturation can produce individuals in a state of cul-
tural shock; a halt in the process of assimilation can pro-
duce alienated people; a halt in the process of internaliza-
tion can produce marginal human beings. How to deal with
the phenomenons of cultural shock, alienation and
marginality is an issue of paramount importance for those who either engage in the field of therapy or in the field of social action.

This study, despite its abstract character, addresses the practicality issue by setting three main objectives:

1. To shed some light onto the plight of those for whom the contact with American society has been a disenchanting experience. Their failure is the result of a combination of different factors which make the process of cultural change itself a very powerful and painful endeavor.

2. To equip clinical social workers with diagnostic tools for dealing with immigrants and ethnic minority individuals in need of therapy. Maladjustments resulting from the struggle to change cultural identities do not necessarily mean ego pathology.

4. To equip social workers with tools for social action. Fostering conscientization of the process of change of cultural identity can be more powerful and more compassionate than fostering the halt of the process altogether as it has been advocated by some community leaders.
Chapter 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The literature review will focus on the clarification of the concepts of acculturation, assimilation, cultural shock, alienation, marginality and emotional detachment. Since most of these concepts have a sociological origin, emphasis will be given to the review of sociological publications.

Harriet Bartlett (1970) in her book The Common Base of Social Work Practice states that:

Social work, like all other professions, derives knowledge from a variety of sources. The practice of social work is typically guided by knowledge of human development and behavior characterized by emphasis on the wholeness of the individual and the reciprocal influences of man and his total environment - human, social, economic, and cultural. (Bartlett, 1970:222)

In this special study I will be using generously concepts borrowed from sociology and psychology. By doing that I will be in keeping with the integrative thinking tradition which characterizes social work as a discipline since its dawn. I will be facing, however, a formidable obstacle. To my knowledge, no major work has ever been published which attempts to integrate ego psychology with changes in cultural identity. Under the influence of Freud,
ego psychology focused mainly on the intrapsychic aspects of personality. Since Freud, psychological knowledge has expanded to define the individual within his culture and his society. This was Erickson's great contribution. No addition, however, has been made regarding the human conflicts of identity and other psychosocial crises undergone by a human being in the process of cultural change.

It is not my claim that this study is the first one of its kind. As the reader will soon learn, there are scattered articles dealing with different symptoms of personality maladjustment which are a consequence of cultural change. None of these articles, however, is as comprehensive as this study proposes to be.

Acculturation/Assimilation

Originally, the sociological use of the term "assimilation" was based on an analogy with the physiological process of nutrition. Stanley Lieberson (1963) called attention to this fact when he reprinted a quote from Robert Park, who wrote in his book *Race and Culture* (1950):

Assimilation, as the word is here used, brings with it a certain borrowed significance which it carried over from physiology where it is employed to describe the process of nutrition. By a process of nutrition, somewhat similar to the physiological one, we may conceive alien peoples to be incorporated with, and made part of, the community or state. Ordinarily assimilation goes on silently and unconsciously, and only forces itself into popular conscience when there is some interruption or disturbance of the process. (Park, 1950:209)
This approach to assimilation is by all means a very primitive one and served its purpose as a foundation for discussion and clarification of a concept which is difficult to grasp. In this literature review we will follow sociologists in their efforts to overcome a purely physiological definition of assimilation by reaching for more sophisticated psychological approaches.

American Minorities: A Textbook of Readings in Intergroup Relations edited by Milton Barron (1958) is a classic anthology of literature on the relations between different groups in the United States. In this book of readings, William C. Smith describes the process and concept of assimilation in a variety of ways according to different theories (Barron:429).

1) The "melting pot" theory. Zangwill's parable of the melting pot symbolizes the popular concept of assimilation. In this grand American cauldron we crystallize millions of aliens from all nations into a new homogeneous race, better and finer than the world has ever known. According to this theory, assimilation means the creation of the "real American...who will be the fusion of all races, the coming superman" (Cole, 1954:142).

2) The "Americanization theory." This theory originated after World War I. According to this position, the millions of immigrants who had not been fused in the melting pot should divest themselves of their heritage immediately and adopt standardized American patterns of behavior.
This theory views assimilation largely as a negative process of denationalization. According to Constantine Panunzio,

Assimilation aims to make the foreign born similar to Americans in language, dress, customs, religion, and what not. It lays stress upon formal Americanization through naturalization. It insists that all immigrants must at all times use English and must put away their native customs, ideas and ideals as soon as possible. In other words, assimilation tends to be a standardization. (Barron, 1958:430)

3) The "Ethnic Federation Theory." This theory, developed by social workers, stresses the perpetuation of the cultural heritages of different groups. The American culture, once assimilated, is the symbiotic relationship of the immigrants' culture and of the dominant culture, with the immigrants' culture continuing to exist as a distinct entity.

4) The "sociological theory." In this theory, assimilation is defined as an interactional process. The immigrants would not have to divest themselves all at once of their heritage and be recharged completely with Americanism. On the contrary, by sharing their experiences, they would become incorporated with the rest of the population in a common cultural life.

According to this theory, assimilation is not a static condition; nor can it be measured by a rigidly objective standard. Immigrants become assimilated when they acquire the sentiments, attitudes, viewpoints and behavior patterns of the Americans and feel at home in the United States. According to Robert E. Park:
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. The common-sense view of the matter is that an immigrant is assimilated as soon as he has shown that he can get on in the country. This implies among other things that in all the ordinary affairs of life he is able to find merits without invidious and qualifying reference to his racial origin or to his cultural inheritance. Assimilation may in some senses and to a certain degree be described as a function of visibility. As soon as an immigrant no longer exhibits the marks which identify him as a member of an alien group, he acquires by that fact the actual if not legal status of a native. (R.E. Park, "Assimilation," Encyclopedia of the Sciences, New York, 1930, Vol. II, p. 281)

In accordance with the above mentioned theories, assimilation is:

1) Inevitable. No matter what the situation may be, assimilation takes place in any immigrant who spends some time in America. They cannot withstand American influence.

2) A slow process. Assimilation is not merely a process of acquiring a new culture, but it also involves a discarding of the old one. The immigrant slowly gives up his traditional ideas, standards, and practices while adopting those of the new country.

3) An unconscious process. Assimilation is a process by which the person is incorporated into the life of the new group without being aware of it.

4) Different from amalgamation. Amalgamation is a biological process, like the mingling of blood, while assimilation is a social, cultural, and psychological process.
Milton Gordon (1964) in his valuable work *Assimilation in American Life* goes into the very meticulous process of analyzing most of the traditional definitions of acculturation and assimilation. He points out that acculturation and assimilation have been used to mean the same thing; that sociologists are more likely to use assimilation while anthropologists would favor acculturation.

After reviewing the definitions of acculturation and assimilation by anthropologists such as Robert Redfield, Ralph Linton and by sociologists such as Robert Park, Ernest Burgess, Brewton Berry, Joseph Fichter, Arnold Rose, Arnold Green, William Bernard and others, Gordon derives his own definitions which encompass all the relevant factors and variables already covered by previous definitions. He distinguishes between two kinds of assimilation. The first one is behavioral or cultural assimilation, or simply, acculturation, which is the process of learning the manners and the styles of the new society. The second kind is structural assimilation or more simply assimilation which involves large-scale entrance into cliques, clubs, and institutions of the host society, and the dissolution of group differences even at the most intimate primary levels of friendship and family. Gordon divides the assimilation process into seven subprocesses:

1) cultural or behavioral assimilation - characterized by change of cultural patterns to those of the host society
2) structural assimilation - characterized by large-scale entrance into cliques, clubs, and institutions of the host society on a primary group level (where contact is personal, informal, intimate, usually face to face, and involving the entire personality)

3) marital assimilation - characterized by large scale intermarriage

4) identificational assimilation - characterized by development of the sense of peoplehood based exclusively on the host society

5) attitude receptional assimilation - characterized by absence of prejudice

6) behavior receptional assimilation - characterized by absence of discrimination

7) civic assimilation - characterized by absence of value and power conflict

According to Gordon (1964:71), structural assimilation, rather than acculturation, is seen to be the keystone of assimilation. Once this has occurred, either simultaneously with or subsequent to acculturation, all of the other types of assimilation will follow naturally.

Comparing Gordon's approach to the above theories discussed by Barron we see some striking differences:

1) For Gordon assimilation is not an inevitable process. Acculturation of the minority group may take place even when none of the other types of assimilation occur simultaneously or later, and this condition of "acculturation only" may continue indefinitely. Confirming this assertion, Gordon states that:

While behavior assimilation or acculturation has taken place in America to a considerable degree, structural assimilation with some important exceptions has not been extensive. (Gordon, 1967:412)
2) Gordon introduces two subjective elements of "attitude receptional" or prejudice and "behavior receptional" or discrimination in his definition of assimilation. In this context he states that:

Unusually marked discrimination, such as that which has been faced by the American Negro, if it succeeds in keeping vast numbers of the minority group deprived of educational and occupational opportunities and thus predestined to remain in a lower-class setting, may indefinitely retard the acculturation process for the group. (Gordon, 1964:78)

According to this quote, discrimination can be an obstacle even to the most basic process of acculturation.

Tamotsu Shibutani's and Kian Kwan's book Ethnic Stratification: A Comparative Study (1965) is a very enlightening work on the process of transformation of minority groups. According to these authors:

The concept of acculturation refers to the process of acquiring the culture of another ethnic group. This is the initial step in the breakdown of ethnocentrism, and when it occurs there are many changes in behavior patterns. (Shibutani:470)

The acquisition of language is an important component of this process of acculturation:

Soon after the establishment of inter-ethnic contacts a universe of discourse begins to develop. A common language is needed for trade and to deal with authorities. (Shibutani:471)

The last step in the process of acculturation is the appreciation of values of the dominant society. An immigrant may have a solid knowledge of American values but still be miles away from being acquainted with them. According to these authors, acculturation requires more than descriptive knowledge of the American way of life.
It requires intuitive knowledge as well.

Shibutani and Kwan (1965) state that the process of acculturation is by no means an inevitable one, as had been suggested by the "melting pot" and "Americanization" paradigms.

In many cases organized resistance develops within the minority group against the acceptance of alien ways. Those who adopt the customs of the dominant group are condemned as wicked "radicals," horrible examples of what can come of friendly association with foreigners. (Shibutani:475)

These authors are also very emphatic in establishing that acculturation and assimilation are not interdependent.

Acculturation may take place without assimilation; minority groups may alter their culture but still retain consciousness of kind. Assimilation refers to both the acquisition of the perspective of the dominant group and the attempt to identify with it. A person who is assimilating develops a new reference group; he performs for an audience who transcends the minority group. Many members of American minorities speak English and are otherwise acculturated but they continue to conceive of themselves as a people apart and act only for others like themselves. (Shibutani:479)

By stating that assimilation refers to the acquisition of the perspective of the dominant group as well as the attempt to identify with it, the authors are sanctioning the psychological element of the assimilative process. Shibutani and Kwan are definitely dissociating themselves from the physiological concept of assimilation when they state:

Assimilation is basically a psychological transformation. When a person of Irish ancestry no longer conceives of himself as an Irishman but as an American, he is well on his way. He sees himself, his parents and other people from the same perspective as other Americans. (Shibutani:121)
Franklin Frazier (1957) in his book *Race and Cultural Contacts in the Modern World* provides a definition of assimilation similar to that of Shibutani and Kwan. Talking about the marginal man, that culturally hybrid or "divided man" who doesn't belong anywhere, Frazier states that he "becomes a new person" when he assimilates.

When the marginal man becomes the leader of a nationalistic movement, he turns his back on the dominant group and becomes assimilated in the subordinated group. Whereas he once was a divided man with ambivalent feelings toward the subordinate group with which he is biologically identified, he becomes a new person completely identified psychologically with his group. (Frazier, 1957:316)

For Frazier, assimilation means psychological identification with the assimilated culture. The notion of assimilation is no longer associated with the physiological process of nutrition but with the psychological process of identification and belonging. Frazier's view of assimilation as a subjective process can be clearly seen in the following excerpt from his book.

Assimilation involves something more than acculturation or the acquisition of the language, moral and religious ideas and patterns of behavior of the dominant group. Assimilation includes a subjective element - identification with the members of the society. When this occurs, physical or racial characteristics cease to be marks of identification, and people who are assimilated not only share in the traditions of the society but identify themselves with these traditions.... In Brazil people of Negro ancestry generally think of themselves as Brazilian or Latin. On the other hand, in the United States, practically all persons with a Negro ancestor, however remote, think of themselves as Negroes first and only secondly as Americans. Therefore one can say that colored people in Brazil are not only acculturated but are assimilated Brazilians whereas the Negroes of the United States are acculturated but not assimilated. (Frazier, 1957:316)
As will be illustrated in the next chapter, this study will dwell heavily upon the psychological aspect of the assimilative process developed by the above reviewed literature.

Cultural Shock/Alienation/Marginality

Alvin Tofler (1972) in his book *Future Shock* defines culture shock as a "form of personality maladjustment which is a reaction to a temporarily unsuccessful attempt to adjust to new surroundings and people" (Tofler:347). Quoting Sven Sundstaedt, the author of *Future Shock* states that "cultural shock can be viewed as a response to stress by emotional and intellectual withdrawal" (Tofler:347).

Stressful and disorienting aspects of a rapidly changing society have created a kind of cultural shock among national Americans themselves which has been labeled "future shock:"

We have in our time released a totally new social force - a stream of change so accelerated that it influences our sense of time, revolutionizes the tempo of daily life, and affects the very way we "feel" the world around us. We no longer "feel" life as men did in the past. And this is the ultimate difference, the distinction that separates the truly contemporary man from all others. For this acceleration lies behind the impermanence - the transience - that penetrates and tinctures our consciousness, radically affecting the way we relate to other people, to things, to the entire universe of ideas, arts and values. (Tofler, 1970:17)

The contact with a society in which future shock is a way-of-life is apt to produce physical as well as psychological imbalances. Jack Levin (1975) in his book
The Functions of Prejudice describes the attempts made by social scientists to measure the adverse physiological and psychological impact of the occurrence of rapid change in an individual's life. Using Social Readjustment Rating Scales, it has been determined that rapid and drastic changes in an individual's life frequently precedes the onset of physiological malfunctioning:

Individuals who achieve high life-change scores during a short period of time, are especially likely to experience an illness and to experience it in a severe form. (Levin:114)

The impact of rapid and drastic changes extends beyond physiology; it can also have an adverse psychological effect. Levin (1975:114) mentions that studies produced to assess psychological reaction to demands for readjustment to changes found that those reactions were associated to tension, depression, anger and fatigue.

At the basis of the psychological stresses resulting from cultural shock, and/or future shock, may be the individual's need for structure amid disorder and uncertainty. Human beings who developed their value system in a relatively well-structured parental environment will find themselves struggling to make sense out of disorder, to structure their world in a meaningful way and to find a place for themselves in society. The failure to make sense out of the disorganization and disorientation gives origin to what Durkheim called "anomie," which is:

a form of social pathology in which guidelines for behavior are missing and the individual is, in a sociological sense, very much alone. (Levin:115)
Eric Josephson (1966) in his book *Man Alone: Alienations in Modern Society* defines alienation as an indefinable sense of loss; a sense that life has become impoverished, that men are somehow deracinated and disinherited, that society and human nature alike have been atomized and hence mutilated, above all that men have been separated from whatever might give meaning to their work and to their lives. (Josephson:11)

M.L. Kovacks and A.J. Cropley (1975) in their article "Alienation and Assimilation of Immigrants" claim that in most of the literature the successful adjustment of immigrants is usually considered only in terms of their cultural, sociological and psychological fitting into the receiving society. However, they say, this attachment process is accompanied by estrangement from the old society—a process of alienation.

Kovacs and Cropley present the notions of assimilation and alienation in three separate senses:

1) Cultural assimilation (acculturation) refers to the adoption of broad cultural traits such as the public use of a particular local language, locally acceptable styles of dress, knowledge of local conventions for conducting oneself in public, and so on.

2) Social assimilation involves admission to key ingroups. A well-assimilated immigrant in this sense would be one who was, for example, accepted by workmates as "one of the boys" and freely admitted into peer group relations.

3) The third sense in which an immigrant may be assimilated is called psychological assimilation. It refers
to the internalization of beliefs and attitudes which are consistent with those of the receiving society.

These authors also describe different forms of alienation:

1) Occupational alienation. Typically, regardless of former occupational status or training, immigrants are often expected to occupy all the kinds and levels of jobs least desired by members of the receiving society.

2) Residential alienation. Very often immigrants are expected to live in the meanest accommodations. This probably accounts for the tendency of certain immigrant groups to cluster in the inner suburbs of large cities.

3) Social alienation. In his former homeland the immigrant shared a set of values, beliefs and feelings with his fellow countrymen. He understood cultural and social practices in areas like language, living habits, dress, leisure activities, artistic expression and so on. In the receiving society he is likely to find that he is subtly snubbed by those he regards as his peers, and that social relations are based on what are for him a new set of rules to which he cannot be privy.

4) Cultural alienation. It follows from the futile attempts to substitute another culture and language for the native one. For the average adult immigrant, who is expected to earn his and his family's living and in addition, to catch up economically and socially, it is almost impossible ever to duplicate this cultural feat.
5) Personal alienation. This level of alienation is accurately described by Kovacs and Cropley this way:

In the homeland he had acquired an image of himself as a certain kind of person, beliefs about his own rights, privileges and responsibilities, attitudes towards his own and other ethnic groups, and so forth. In the new society, however, this image and its constituent traits may be very largely irrelevant, incorrect, or even actually harmful. If he is to adjust, the immigrant must modify a very substantial portion of the complex network of beliefs, attitudes and emotions which have permitted him, in the past to interpret his own existence. In order to endorse the ways of the receiving society, he must detach himself from this pattern of psychological signposts. He is 'uprooted' emotionally as well. (Kovacs, 1975:225)

Finally, the authors discuss the notion of marginality, which is described as "a position of cultural uncertainty" in which the immigrant is not yet integrated into the receiving society but is already significantly estranged from the old. Some degree of marginality is almost inevitable for all immigrants. At this point, marginality may involve a kind of dissatisfaction with himself, a degree of frustration and a loss of self respect arising from the conflict within him, between new values and old. "He may despise himself for his duplicity, and display symptoms of personal disorganization" (Kovacs, 1975:226).

For Kovacs and Cropley the phenomenon of marginality originates at the very end of the process of assimilation. At this stage, the immigrant or ethnic minority individual becomes a very paradoxical person. "In the process of endorsing the observable behaviors of the receiving society, he may begin to express prejudice against immigrants less assimilated, at a time when he himself is still visibly
a stranger. He may display surface rejection of values and attitudes that he still endorses deep down" (Kovacs, 1975: 226). These authors conclude their discussion of marginality reassuring us of the prospects of bountiful supply of marginal men and women since

In any case, it is most difficult to achieve internal assimilation - internalization of the receiving society's basic values and attitudes which constitutes the final stage in the assimilation process. (Kovacs:226)

Shibutani and Kwan (1965) in Ethnic Stratification: A Comparative Approach provide a very enlightening description of that cultural hybrid who has emerged as a result of cultural maladjustment at a very high stage of assimilation:

At first there are only a small number who escape their traditional lot, and individuals in this vanguard occupy marginal status, a position dangling between two social worlds. They develop new interests and tastes and no longer feel at ease in the company of those among whom they grew up. At the same time they are not able to participate in the society of people who think and behave as they do. (Shibutani:352)

The marginal men are highly acculturated and highly assimilated people who by altering their cultural characteristics have acquired new competitive advantages. As their capacity to make their way in the existing social order is enhanced there is a discrepancy between power and status. When made conscious of that discrepancy, marginal men can become powerful leaders of social reforms, especially if they are identified with the subordinate group after being rejected by the dominant one.

They may become leaders of minority movements.... As increasing numbers in minority groups develop
new self-conceptions, they reinforce one another's discontent. Agitation gives direction to their unrest, and in time dissatisfaction centers upon a few selected objects that are held responsible for their discomforts. It is at this point that demands are made for social reform. (Shibutani:370)

**Emotional Detachment/Psychocultural Adaptation**

Luis R. Marcos (1976) in his article "Bilinguals in Psychotherapy: Language as an Emotional Barrier" focuses on the aspect that the information-processing mechanisms involved in the speaking of a second language may function as an impediment to the emotional expression and affective involvement of the person. This phenomenon is explained as "the result of the second language words carrying less emotional components since the experiences during which these words were acquired were of more "peripheric" nature than the experiences concomitant with the learning of mother-tongue words" (Marcos:553). This explanation is related to the psychoanalytical hypothesis which considers that experiences, as well as unconscious impulses, are cathected by words in the process of verbalization. In other words, experiences of feelings and ideas are encoded, mostly during childhood, into sounds or words which carry emotional load that no second language word could carry.

The encoding process, i.e., "the mechanisms whereby a speaker's ideas, feelings, images and so forth, become coded into intelligible sounds in a given language" (Marcos: 553) is presented by the author in a schematic way in relation to first and second languages: First Language:
caused by either internal and/or external factors can throw the whole process out of balance. Changing culture is a process analogous to the one undergone by the human body when it comes in contact with an inhospitable environment. All the body's senses are urgently called into a state of alert. Similarly, or rather analogously, when a person gets in touch with another culture for any length of time, there is an unconscious reawakening and retesting of all the personality components in search of balance. At that moment, a regression occurs not in the subject itself but in the subject's action. It is a kind of regression that is termed here "a regression in the object." The personality's three main psychological components (id, ego, superego) will be testing the new situation not in the way a child would do (regression in the subject), but the way an adult would do reenacting the testing process done during the early stages of development (regression in the object). The sudden increase in id impulses as well as in ego and superego activities coupled with the nature of the object to be tested (the new culture with its idiosyncracies) make very problematic the outcome of the process of cultural change.

The basic assumption that some individuals consciously or unconsciously fail to adjust to a new culture can be approached from three hypothetical inquiries:

1. Immigrants and ethnic minority individuals often get fixated at a state of cultural shock.

2. Immigrants and ethnic minority individuals often get fixated at a state of alienation.
The extra cognitive and attentional demands placed upon the use of a second language constitutes what is commonly called "language barrier." Focusing on the effects of language barrier on the bilinguals' behavior, Marcos mentions the splitting verbalization/affect:

When speaking across the language barrier, a primary consequence of the bilingual's deflection of both attention and the affective component of the idea in verbalization towards the more demanding second language encoding work will be the splitting or lack of integration of experience/affect. (Marcos:556)

Illustrating his conclusions about the detachment effect of the language barrier, Marcos mentions how bilinguals who are experiencing psychological crisis manifest that effect "by verbalizing emotionally charged material without displaying the expected emotion" (Marcos:556).

The lack of integration verbalization/affect plays an important role in the building of the theoretical framework this research is based on.

Lucy M. Cohen and Carmen L. Fernandez (1974) in their article "Ethnic Identity and Psychocultural Adaptation of Spanish Speaking Families" seem to address the same concerns and share the same goals which have been proposed for this study:
The social work profession has a long-standing interest in working among persons adapting to cultural change. Renewed interest in the impact of ethnicity on treatment and social action calls for the examination of the processes of cultural change. (Cohen, 1974:413)

Unfortunately these authors focus only on two rather peripheral aspects of the process of changing cultural identity: the first includes the public image of the Spanish-speakers as their spokesmen meet with counterparts of the host society; the second area highlights psychological mechanisms the Spanish-speakers use in adaptation; this set of mechanisms is what the authors call "psychocultural dimension."

It will be enlightening to review the ego-maintaining mechanisms as described by these authors. Mechanisms such as "compartmentalization" and "rejection" play key roles in the resolution of cultural conflicts among adults. These defenses "may shield immigrants from dealing directly with stresses associated with demands of two cultural systems" (Cohen:416).

"Compartmentalization" is mostly common among children who segmentalize their perceptions and feelings, separating those associated with members of the host society from those associated with their families. "They live in two worlds, cushioned from areas of conflict in values" (Cohen:417).

Processes of "accommodation" and "selection" help others to retain aspects of a cultural heritage while adapting to a new way of life. "Identification" with the host
society, according to these authors, is by far the most common mechanism used by youth in their efforts to internalize life goals and aspirations transmitted by parents and school personnel.

Finally some notes on Freud. Freud's theory of personality dynamics is not a theory of personality systems seen in abstraction from culture. As a matter of fact, the superego is the moral, religious and cultural branch of personality. The ego in itself is cultural in the sense that it originates from the transaction between the id and the outside world. The id is the only transcultural element in the Freudian system.

Freud's theory of the superego concentrates on the ways in which evaluative symbols, which express moral standards, are internalized by members of the society.

By focusing on the superego as the personality link to social-action theories, social scientists soon found out that the Freudian theory needed modification. Freudian evaluative symbols alone do not take into account all of the complexities of the moral-cultural-personality relationship. Talcott Parsons suggested modifications to Freud's theory by adding two new sets of symbols: cognitive symbols which give account of what there is in the natural world; and cathetic symbols which define appropriate feelings about objects. Another inspirational modification to Freud proposed by Parsons regards the ego. According to Parson's theory, the ego is derived from two sources - the
Freudian external world as an environment, and the common culture which is also acquired from outside (Bocock, 1976: 52).

Parsons' premise that Freud should be modified to be able to explain some socio-cultural aspects of the personality is especially relevant in the case of cultural change. When a person changes culture there occurs a breach on the well-structured socio-cultural foundations on which the superego was built. Freudian evaluative symbolism does not take into account some of the phenomena originating from cultural change such as cultural shock, alienation and the emotional detachment effect caused by language barriers.

This brief reference to Freud and to modifications proposed to his theory brings us to the conclusion of this review which, far from being complete, serves adequately its main purpose: it provides a sense of direction in the maze of concepts and theories about the subject of this study; it also provides inspiration in defining terminology as well as in ordering the theoretical construct to be presented in the next chapter.
Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

The first chapters of this study reviewed some of the theoretical perspectives which attempt to explain the maladjustment of immigrants and ethnic minority individuals to American society. Different perspectives emphasize different biases such as individual's cultural baggage, the structure of the American society, poverty, ego pathology caused by faulty cultural heritage. In this study, the issue of maladjustment to any new culture will be approached from the perspective of the process itself of changing one's cultural identity. The psychodynamics of changing one's cultural identity presents a very complex process which in many ways resembles the ego developmental phases as presented by empirical psychoanalysis. This study proposes to relate the process of changing cultural identity to the process of personality functioning.

Assumptions

The underlying assumption in this study is that "some immigrants and ethnic minority individuals, consciously or unconsciously fail to adjust to a new culture." The process of changing culture is so critical that disturbances
3. Immigrants and ethnic minority individuals often get fixated at a state of marginality.

Definitions

As a precondition for the clear exposition of the theoretical framework, the writer will define concepts such as culture, cultural identity, acculturation, assimilation, internalization, cultural shock, alienation, emotional-detachment effect, marginality, symbolism and so on.

CULTURE: "The way of life of a group of people based on patterns of learned behavior which are transferred from one generation to another through the means of language and imitation" (Borba, 1979:43).

CULTURAL IDENTITY: Is the individual self or personality as substratum of the component elements of a specific culture.

CULTURAL CHANGE: terminology exchangeable for "change in cultural identity."

ACCULTURATION: "The acquisition of the language, moral and religious ideas and patterns of behavior of the dominant group" (Frazier, 1957:316). Acculturation can also be defined as "the changes of cultural patterns to those of the host society" (Gordon, 1964:71).

ASSIMILATION: "Assimilation is basically a psychological transformation" (Shibutani, 1965:121). It is the process of subjective or psychological identification with another culture.
INTERNALIZATION: "The process of making part of oneself that which was formerly external" (Blanch, 1974:4).

CULTURAL SHOCK: "A form of personality maladjustment which is a reaction to a temporarily unsuccessful attempt to adjust to new surroundings and people" (Tofler, 1972:347).

ALIENATION: "An indefinable sense of loss; a sense that men have been separated from whatever might give meaning to their work and their lives" (Josephson, 1966:11).

MARGINALITY: State of cultural uncertainty due to the lack of internalization of the receiving society's total system of values and attitudes.

DETACHMENT EFFECT: Split or lack of internal integration due to the failure to internalize the new culture. Its main symptom is "emotional detachment" which is the lack of integration between verbalization and emotion.

MIND: I will use Cyril Burt's definition of mind as "a particular continuant which is capable of entering activity into conscious relations, namely, the various relations of cognition (I am aware of the object), affection (I am pleased with the object), and conation (I want the object)" (Shanmugam, 1972:18).

SYMBOLS: are images carrying a cultural and/or transcultural content. When exposed to a cross-cultural experience the human being gets attuned to three kinds of symbolism:

CRITICAL SYMBOLS: which originate from the individual person's perception of the existence of a different
culture as differentiated from his own. It belongs to the field of cognition.

AXIOLOGICAL SYMBOLS: which originate from the individual person's perception of the essence or value of another culture. It belongs to the field of affection.

INTEGRATIVE SYMBOLS: which originate from the individual person's perception of the incorporatedness of the elements of another culture. It belongs to the field of conation.

MALADJUSTMENT: inability of an individual to develop patterns of behavior making for success in his/her environment.

Theoretical Construct

According to this framework, during most of the period of development the ego structures, which are geared to deal with cross-cultural reality, become dormant. When suddenly faced with a broader range of cross-cultural experiences, through immigration for instance, the person's most common reaction is rejection. The rejection of the existence of another culture is often translated into cultural shock. Cultural shock becomes in some cases a positive rejection of acculturation. Fixation at the state of cultural shock can lead to a severe process of dissociation from reality.

At the first stage of cultural change, the dyad ego/mind becomes the personality's province of the critical
process; being reality oriented, the ego deals with elements of unity and diversity, since reality first strikes one as being either uniform or pluriform. The dyad ego/mind will be attuned to critical symbols such as "different people," "different ideas," "different religions," different attitudes," "different values" and so on. That dyad by accepting or rejecting the "existence" of pluralism and diversity becomes responsible for the process of either acculturation or cultural shock.

When and if cultural shock is overcome by admitting the existence of another culture with its idiosyncracies, the stage of acculturation can be successfully integrated. For practical purposes, acculturation is integrated when the individual person decides to learn the language and to accept as valid the value system of the dominant society.

Once acculturation is stratified, the person triggers the mechanism of assimilation, which constitutes the second stage of the process of cultural change. The assimilation process is mostly unconscious. It is the process of being incorporated with and made part of the dominant culture. By assimilating the elements of the new culture the person faces the unconscious dilemma of keeping or rejecting the elements of the original culture on which the superego was built.

The person will feel like belonging to the dominant society when the choice is made to assimilate. Very often, however, the person consciously or unconsciously chooses to
reject the elements of the new culture and becomes alienated. Alienation is an important piece of the person's defense mechanism against being completely stripped of the old cultural identity.

At the second stage of cultural change, the dyad superego/mind becomes the personality's province of the axiological process. The superego during the formative years used to deal with ethical questions such as "what I ought to do" under the pressure from parental mores and values. Here the dyad superego/mind will be dealing with axiological questions such as "why I ought to do." Axiology presupposes knowledge of values. At this stage therefore the dyad superego/mind will be attuned to axiological elements such as "I ought to assimilate this culture because it is as good as mine." Axiological symbols relate to the essence of a culture as being "good," "better," "unique" and so on. The dyad superego/mind by accepting or rejecting the elements of another culture based on their essential qualities of "goodness" or "uniqueness" etc., becomes responsible for the process of either assimilation or alienation.

If the person chooses to assimilate, then the attachment to the thought residuum will become the last resort of anchoring to the original cultural identity. Reflecting over the personality changes which occurred during the process of acculturation and assimilation, the human mind faces the internal image of a split reality: on one side there
are the assimilated elements of the new culture; on the other side, there is the thought content which is transcultural in the sense that it belongs to both cultures, since it has been exposed to and bears abstract elements from both, but has no loyalty to either.

At this point, the personality triggers the process of internalization - the third stage of the process of cultural change - which consists in the removal of the above mentioned dualism between the "new assimilated me" and the transcultural thought content or residuum. Through internalization, thought-content becomes second culture biased. In this state of total internalization the person would think only in terms of second culture content; daily life activities as well as world events would have second culture meaning alone; and most important, the individual at this stage of change in cultural identity would be able to use the second language verbalization as a tool to externalize deep emotions at a level equivalent to a native speaker.

Very often, however, the person chooses not to internalize by refusing intellectual approval of the internal changes which took place during the processes of acculturation and assimilation. This intellectual refusal will trigger the dissociation between emotions and verbalization. In order to keep that dissociation well alive, the individual who refuses to internalize the cultural changes will anchor himself/herself to the thought content, the last residuum of the primary culture. This attachment to thought
residuum can become a powerful defense mechanism against
total loss of the original cultural identity.

At the last stage of cultural change the dyad id/mind becomes the personality's province of the integrative
process. Integrative symbols relate to images of the new
cultural identity. The id, being an innate and transcultural element and given its instinctual bias to avoid con-

flict, should have no problem to operate within the frame-
work of the new cultural identity so long as its impulses
can be fully gratified. The mind is also transcultural but
isn't by any means a blind instinct. It has the capacity
to reflect over human events and assign to them any meaning it pleases: "this is what it is" but "this is what it ought
to be." By reflecting over the whole reality of the new
cultural identity the human mind will accept or reject the
totality or parts of the new cultural self. The acceptance
by the dyad id/mind of the totality of the integrative sym-

bols means internalization of the new cultural identity and
consequent birth of a new cultural self. The failure or
refusal to do so gives origin to the cultural hybrid or
marginal person without definite cultural identity.

My assertion is that internalization is most diffi-
cult to be achieved. The human being has a great capacity
to give up and trade in values, except for a single one:
the mind's capacity to assign to human events any cultural
meaning it pleases. The failure to internalize this single
value means failure of the total process of cultural change
itself. A human being can accept the existence of another culture by acculturating; can choose to belong to a new culture by assimilating; but can never negotiate the freedom of thinking about his thought content in a transcultural way. Man's extrospection towards the outside world is done through windows of specific cultures. Man's introspection towards his own thought content is a human prerogative which transcends all racial and cultural boundaries.

Descriptive Survey

The empirical testing of all the stated or tacit assumptions on which this theoretical construct is built would constitute a long range project in itself. Constraints of time and scope will limit this special study to a descriptive survey. Instead of an in-depth empirical research to be done among immigrants and ethnic minority individuals who are in the process of undergoing cultural change, I opted for a descriptive survey of professionals who are familiar with issues related to the process of changing cultural identity. The professionals surveyed in this study have a similar characteristic: they are all members of ethnic minority groups themselves, being consequently apt to express their experiences in the field of cultural change from the professional as well as a personal point of view.
Instrument and Procedures

A questionnaire was applied to twenty professional people in the area of San Jose including psychologists and social workers. The questionnaire was administered by the writer using a face-to-face interview format, consisting of five basic questions:

1. Is there enough evidence to back the idea that cultural change follows a developmental path?

2. Is there enough evidence to back the idea that some immigrants and ethnic minority individuals consciously or unconsciously fail to either acculturate or assimilate or internalize cultural changes?

3. What mechanisms do people use to avoid taking decisive steps towards changing their cultural identity?

4. Is there enough evidence to back the idea that immigrants and ethnic minority individuals may get fixated in maladaptive states of cultural change?

5. What behaviors do people manifest while fixated in maladaptive states of cultural change?

Limitations

As the reader has discovered, most of the questions have a psychological bias. This study is definitely looking for behaviors and psychological mechanisms instead of trying to find villains responsible for the ills that plague some immigrants and ethnic minority individuals who come in contact with American society.
There are different methodological reasons to authenticate the approach used in this study: first, this is not a sociological study which would be mostly concerned with discovering the "external" causes responsible for people's maladjustments to societies; secondly, the population selected to be surveyed, deals professionally, with mechanisms and behaviors rather than directly with causes of maladaptive states; finally, in a psychological approach, from unveiled mechanisms and behaviors, it is possible in some instances to pinpoint the causes of cultural maladjustment. The analysis of the data collected, which is the subject of the next chapter, will give us some specific examples of the various mechanisms and behaviors which are indicative of cultural maladjustment.
PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

Given the abstract character of this survey, the writer decided to interview his sample using the questionnaire found in the appendix of this study. After explaining briefly that immigrants and ethnic minority individuals, according to the paradigm presented here, pass through a series of dynamically differentiated stages in the process of changing their cultural identity, the questions were paraphrased, in order to insure full comprehension by the participants. The questions which required straight answers "yes," "no," or "not sure" were tabulated, while questions requiring description of mechanisms and behaviors were ranked from the highest to the lowest frequency.

Acculturation

Question 1: "Describing acculturation as the process of learning the language and accepting the basic ideas, values, and patterns of behavior of the dominant society, do you see any evidence among immigrants and ethnic minority individuals of a conscious or unconscious refusal to acculturate?" The same question was then repeated in a more direct way: "Are you acquainted with any immigrant or
ethnic minority individual who consciously or unconsciously refuses to learn the language and/or refuses to accept the American system of values?"

Answers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. of responses</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT SURE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The two respondents who answered "no" did so based on the opinion that acculturation is inevitable, since nobody who lives in this country for a reasonable length of time can escape American influences. Their position is in keeping with the "melting pot" and "Americanization" paradigms.

The eighteen respondents who answered "yes" were applied the next question which deals with mechanisms (means or manners) in which the avoidance of acculturation is accomplished.

Question 2: "You mentioned that you have evidence of people who consciously or unconsciously refuse to acculturate. Which mechanisms do these people use to avoid acculturation?"

Answers: (ranked according to frequency from highest to lowest).

1) Avoidance of contact with people of the dominant culture. This avoidance is mainly manifested by restricting outside contacts to people of their own culture.
2) Refusal to learn the language.

3) Denial that they are living in another country. This mechanism manifests itself mainly through denial of the norms and the values of the dominant society. This denial is described by most of the respondents as a means of protecting oneself from the unpleasant reality of change by refusing to perceive or face the new culture.

4) Formation of cultural neighborhoods.

5) Idealization of own culture. An idealized image of the "home culture," derived more from fantasy and wishes than from reality, is created in order to maintain the conviction that one's own culture is superior.

6) From the idealization of the home culture emanates what some respondents called the "superiority complex" built around the original culture and language; this complex involves exaggerated estimates of the traits and qualities of one's own cultural baggage.

7) Overemphasizing old structures which otherwise would never surface, such as going back to practice a national religion or developing for the first time a strong sense of ethnicity.

8) Denial of need to acculturate. This denial manifests itself by a simple acceptance of the conditions which follow a state of non acculturation.
9) Overcompensation, which is a process of engaging in excessive efforts to counterbalance what is perceived to be a deficiency. This mechanism is seen by some respondents as being particularly used in child-rearing. Parents over compensate the "lax mores" of the dominant society by engaging in efforts of becoming excessively strict.

10) Confusion or unclear thinking due to internal inability to cope.

11) Refusal to acculturate for personal gains. In some circles it is classy or elegant to keep alive traits of one's culture for prestige purposes.

12) Refusal of identification with the dominant group. According to the respondents, this refusal means two different things: first, it is a process of dissociating oneself physically from the dominant group; secondly, and most important, it is a process of dissociating oneself emotionally from the ideals and values the dominant group sponsors.

13) Rebellion against dominant group, mainly against its ideas and morality.

14) Projection, or the process of blaming the dominant society for blocking aspirations and dreams of success.
15) Passivity and helplessness for being unable to change things and mold them according to one's ideals.

16) Inactivity following experiences that are linked with unpleasant cross-cultural interactions.

17) Refusal to be categorized as an underclass individual. It is more suitable to be called an alien than a minority.

18) Refusal to accept what is new, what is different. The stress here is on the inability to cope with differentiation.

19) Fatalism regarding inability to acculturate, which leads to lack of acculturation efforts.

20) The world view of particular immigrants is not conducive to acculturation.

**Cultural Shock**

Before applying the third question, it was explained that according to this perspective individuals who refuse to acculturate may be able to function relatively well living in secluded ethnic neighborhoods; some other individuals, however, may feel trapped in a kind of disfunction that is termed here as "cultural shock."

**Question 3:** "If I describe cultural shock as a form of personality maladjustment which is a reaction to an unsuccessful attempt or perceived inability to adjust to new surroundings and people, do you see any evidence among
immigrants and other ethnic minority individuals of fixation at the state of cultural shock?"

**Answers:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. of responses</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT SURE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of those who answered "no" and "not sure" did so on the grounds that one can experience cultural shock without being fixated. In many instances, during the interview I was requested to define "fixation." This phenomenon was defined as being a strong and relatively persistent mode of behavior which has outlived its usefulness and has become an obstacle to performing daily activities.

Some of those who answered "yes" voluntarily provided a wide range of reasons for immigrants to feel the pang of cultural shock and in some instances to get fixated in it. Even though this survey is not looking for reasons and causes but for mechanisms and behaviors, this writer believes that two of those comments, given their originality, should be printed: "Religion is to blame for cultural shock since religion has all the answers; by conditioning people's minds, religion fosters homogeneity." A second respondent was more specific and blamed the Catholic Church instead of religion in general: "The Catholic Church is to blame. The Church has not been able to cope with differentiation. Immigrants from countries where the Church is the dominant organized religion struggle for similarity."
If anyone tries to be different, he/she is excommunicated."

The fifteen who responded "yes" were applied the next question which deals with phenomenons or behaviors associated with fixation at a state of cultural shock.

Question 4: "You mentioned that you have evidence of people whom you consider to be fixated at a state of cultural shock. What behaviors do these people manifest?"

Answers: (Listed in order of frequency of responses.)

1) Withdrawal or self isolation considered as a pattern of behavior which shields the individual from frustration during social contacts.

2) Anger, which was described by the respondents as an acute emotional reaction, elicited by individuals against their own families, schools, doctors, and the establishment as a whole.

3) Paranoid behavior. The respondents were very much aware of the fact that paranoia is a psychotic behavior, hence the connotation "paranoid behavior" which characterizes individuals whose attitudes resemble those of the paranoiac. These attitudes were described by the respondents as characterized by enviousness, suspiciousness, hostility and oversensitivity. One interviewee was very emphatic in asserting that, based on her experience, people in a state of cultural shock "present psychotic behavior without having a psychotic structure."
4) Low self-esteem, coupled with shame of one's own background.

5) Frustration, which is described as associated with feelings of helplessness. This is particularly true in cases of individuals who have been discriminated against and feel that they don't have a chance of adjusting anymore.

6) Anxiety and depression resulting from failure to cope with cultural situations. Anxiety is also perceived as due to continuous goal-directed behaviors being blocked by external forces.

7) Confusion, originating from the desire to go back to the country of origin coupled with the inability of taking on the task alone. One respondent mentioned what he called the old-age repatriation phenomenon. It refers to many cases he knows of elderly men and women who actually break away from their families to spend their remaining days in their towns of birth.

8) Psychosomatic ailments. As immigrants become powerless to control the environment, they concentrate on themselves and become obsessed with headaches, high blood pressures and nervousness. A respondent had an original approach to the psychosomatic phenomenons when he described what he termed the "four year syndrome." The immigrants arrive in this country, grab the first
job available, don't like it, plan to quit but then start feeling guilty. For some mysterious reason, three or four years later an accident happens and they get injured, usually in the lower back. That injury becomes permanent and is very often sanctioned by the families, which adapt well to the new situation.

9) Despair for the lack of options.

10) Sense of unreality. People in a state of cultural shock are seen very often behaving in a way otherwise unacceptable to themselves in other circumstances. One respondent mentioned the increase in sexual aggressivity among immigrants as a symptom of that loss of sense of reality and its limits.

11) Anti-social behavior, which is described as a consequence of the individuals being out of touch with reality. It seems as if individuals don't have much control over this kind of behavior.

12) Membership in Fraternal Organizations. People dealing with issues of cultural shock constitute the prototypical member of religious fraternities and sororities.

Assimilation

Prior to the application of the fifth question, it was explained to the interviewees that, according to this
perspective, assimilation constitutes the second step in
the process of changing cultural identity; that the process
of being assimilated to the new culture is basically an
unconscious one; that very often it follows the integration
of the process of acculturation: as one learns the language,
accepts the basic system of values and adopts the patterns
of behaviors of the dominant group, one will start feeling
like being a part of it.

**Question 5:** "If I describe assimilation as the
subjective feeling of belonging and being accepted, do you
see among immigrants and other ethnic minority individuals
a conscious or unconscious refusal to assimilate?" The
same question was then paraphrased: "Do you know any immi­
grant or ethnic minority individual who speaks English quite
fluently but who refuses to be part of this culture?"

**Answers:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. of respondents</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT SURE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents who answered "yes" to the previous
question were applied the next question which deals with
mechanisms people use to avoid assimilation.

**Question 6:** "Since you have evidence of people who
consciously or unconsciously refuse to belong to the Ameri­
can society, what mechanisms do they use to avoid belonging?"

**Answers:** (Presented from the highest to the lowest
frequency.)
1) The development and participation in informal networks composed of people of the same ethnic background and sometimes of the same towns of origin.

2) Avoiding emotional involvement outside the original culture. Cross-cultural dating and marriage is discouraged and sometimes positively forbidden by parents.

3) Fear and suspicion regarding the threat of the dominant culture. Fear of being engulfed.

4) Development of superiority complex regarding the "home culture." This mechanism is translated mainly in giving more credit than is due to the original culture.

5) Refusal to be treated as a second-rate citizen if he/she became completely assimilated.

6) The use of the original language for communication whenever there is a choice and opportunity.

7) Selection which is manifested in hanging onto some basic elements of the original culture such as food and general living patterns, while assimilating other elements.

8) Distortion or displacement of attention to insignificant details of the dominant culture as a means of avoiding a personal commitment to that culture.

9) Rationalization which is understood in this context as the process of justifying one's refusal
to assimilate by offering plausible and socially accepted reasons in place of real reasons.

10) Dedication to minority causes through militant social action.

**Alienation**

For the interviewee to gain perspective again and have a good grasp of the next question, he/she was reminded that according to this paradigm someone who refused to assimilate may hypothetically be able to function relatively well in this society. It was also explained that for some other people the refusal or failure to assimilate may plunge them into a maladaptive state which is labeled here as alienation.

**Question 7:** "If I describe alienation as a form of personality maladjustment which is a reaction to a sense of loss, to a sense that one has been separated from whatever gives meaning to one's life, do you see any evidence among immigrants and other ethnic minority individuals of fixation at a state of alienation?" This question was also paraphrased in a direct way: "Do you know any immigrant or ethnic minority individual whom you consider to be fixated at a state of alienation, meaning by that the feeling of not belonging?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>No. of respondents</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT SURE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Those who responded "Yes" were applied the next question which deals with behaviors.

**Question 8**: "Since you answered that you have knowledge of people who are fixated at a state of alienation, what kinds of behaviors do these people manifest?

**Answers:**

1) Anger and bitterness directed towards the dominant society, followed sometimes by violent outbursts.

2) Identity crisis, which is described as the questioning of the conditions of being the same person he/she used to be in all essential characteristics.

3) Anti-social behavior described as the one not sanctioned by the dominant society. Its origin was put this way: "since they don't accept me, I will do something different." This anti-social behavior is also described as a consequence of an increase in blind impulses. This behavior was also presented by respondents as the rationale behind the formation of gangs.

4) Depression and anxiety leading to non-productivity in any area of life.

5) Refusal to participate in any social activity coupled with feelings of isolation.

6) Helplessness for lack of attachment to either culture coupled with feelings of not belonging anywhere.
7) Development of "sub-cultures" as a consequence of what a respondent called "outcast behaviors."
8) Confusion due to the lack of a role model in either culture.
9) Feelings of being rejected by both worlds coupled with feeling uncomfortable with both.
10) Aggressive sexual behavior especially among men; one respondent quoted an acquaintance saying: "If they (women of the dominant group) look down at me, I will prove I am a man."
11) Psychosis. Actual cases of psychotic behaviors such as delusions were associated by some respondents to being fixated at a state of alienation.
12) Submissive attitude towards the dominant culture.
13) Acting or behaving in accordance with mode of treatment by the dominant society: "treated like trash, acting like trash."
14) Ambiguity: "the wish to have blue eyes coupled with hurt and anger." This kind of behavior is especially true among young people.
15) Suicides. Two respondents mentioned this extreme kind of behavior as linked to actual cases of alienation.
16) Feelings associated with grieving, a sense of loss of something very endearing and very personal.
17) Dressing sloppy as a means of striking back (the "cholos").

18) Constant trips abroad to the old country in search of self.

19) Bitterness for not having succeeded financially associated with low self-esteem.

20) Children of alienated parents turn to crime and drugs when there is no one to turn to.

Internalization

As we go deeper into the completion of the analysis of the process of changing cultural identity, both questions and answers require a much higher degree of abstraction. For the interviewee not to lose perspective of the whole process, it was restated that according to this framework assimilation is mostly an unconscious and emotional process; that the feeling of belonging sooner or later in life will have to have a rational sanctioning by which assimilation becomes internalized; that through internalization the birth of a new cultural identity takes place; that if internalization fails, a split in cultural identity occurs which can become for some individuals a permanent state of fixation. Once these preliminary explanations were made, the interviewee was asked the next question.

Question 9: "If I describe internalization as the intellectual acceptance by an individual of the changes in his/her cultural identity which occurred during the previous
processes of acculturation and assimilation, do you see among immigrants and other ethnic minority individuals a conscious or unconscious refusal to internalize?" The same question was paraphrased in a direct way: "Do you know any immigrant or ethnic minority individual you consider well acculturated and assimilated who, however, refuses to acknowledge being acculturated and assimilated?"

Answers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of respondents</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT SURE</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents who answered "Yes" were applied the next question which deals with mechanisms.

Question 10: "Since you answered "Yes" to the above question, which mechanisms do individuals use to avoid internalization?"

Answers:

1) Rationalization, which is understood in this context as the process of justifying one's conduct with the allegation of very noble reasons such as "I don't want to be sold-out."

2) Denial which is understood here as a mechanism to protect oneself from the perceived unpleasant reality of totally changing cultural identity. This denial is often translated by escapist activities like getting "sick" and so on.

3) The maintenance of social classes relationships. Well acculturated and well assimilated Indians,
for instance, keep participating in tribal activities such as attending pow-wows and ceremonies.

4) Highly assimilated individuals refuse to give up their citizenship.

5) Projection, or placing blame for one's difficulties at this stage of cultural change upon the members of the dominant group. One respondent emphasized that such is the case of some Black Americans she knows.

6) Refusal to perceive changes in themselves.

7) Exaggerated perception of cultural changes in others, and subsequent refusal to identify with them.

8) Minimizing the importance and relevance of changes in relation to the "home culture."

9) Idealization of own culture coupled with a critical view of the shortcomings of the dominant culture.

10) Commitment to help the people of their original culture.

Split of Cultural Identity

Reminding the interviewees that the lack of internalization, according to this paradigm, will project the unintegrated elements of both cultures into a maladaptive state of split of cultural identity, the next question was applied.
Question 11: "If I describe the split of cultural identity as a form of personality maladjustment which is a reaction to the fact that some elements of both cultures are irreducibly unintegrated at a high degree of assimilation, do you see any evidence among highly assimilated immigrants and other ethnic minority individuals of fixation at a state of split cultural identity?" Given the special difficulty related to the grasping of the meaning of this question an example was provided by the interviewer of what he considers a typical reaction emanating from a split in cultural identity: the dissociation between emotions and verbalization, especially in the second language, otherwise called "affective detachment effect."

Answers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. of respondents</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT SURE</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two of the respondents who answered "Not Sure" did so based on the opinion that internalization never takes place. The ones who answered "Yes" were applied the next question which deals with phenomenons and behaviors.

Question 12: "Since you answered "Yes" to the above question, would you mention the kinds of behaviors people manifest while fixated at the state of split cultural identity?"

Answers:

1) Compartmentalization, understood in this context as the isolation and blocking-off of the ideas,
feelings, values and attitudes. Such is the case, according to respondents, of some individuals who are highly placed in the bureaucracy and politics. They demonstrate compartmentalization when they address their own ethnic group in one way and the dominant group in a quite different way. It is like having a dual personality.

2) Playing two often contradictory roles. Some individuals, using well developed adaptive mechanisms, play the dominant culture role in public and the original culture role at home.

3) "The readiness to express things (ideas, jokes, etc.), which one would be unwilling to accept as one's own in the second language. As if somehow when one speaks in a second language one isn't expressing one's "real" self; the tendency to express very strong and deep feelings and emotions in one's primary language, almost automatically." This answer was quoted in its entirety because it reveals quite clearly the dynamics of the stage of changing cultural identity that we are analyzing at this point.

4) Guilt feelings coupled with anxiety about the prospect of losing completely the original culture.

5) Nostalgic behavior associated with constant search for identity.
6) Anger at self for feeling that he/she has betrayed the original culture.

7) Feelings of shame for being ashamed of the original culture. (It was stated earlier that individuals in state of cultural shock feel ashamed of the old culture.)

8) Fear of retaliation from own ethnic group.

9) Repression of feelings coupled with isolation from both cultures.

10) Coaching other members of the same ethnic group not to trade their cultures.

11) Feelings of mourning which lead to emotional paralysis.

12) Negative approach to life due to internal confusion.

13) Avoidance of the fact that internalization has not been accomplished because the dominant group would never sanction it.

14) Selfish behavior. By keeping the split in cultural identity well alive the chances are that one would be taken as a foreigner instead of a member of a minority group.

15) Involvement in social causes. The organizers of Centers, Clubs, Fraternities and Sororities are very often people dealing with issues of split cultural identity.
While going through this long list of mechanisms and behaviors, the reader has probably been trying to uncover the respondents' own perspectives or paradigms behind their answers. If we talk in terms of biases alone it will be safe to categorize the above mentioned behaviors and mechanisms according to their "leaning towards" either of the four main perspectives discussed in the introduction of this study.

If we sample the answers to question number 2, we will find out that mechanisms twelve through seventeen show a distinctive bias towards the "structural-environmental determinism" perspective which points out to the deleterious structure of the dominant society. Mechanisms eighteen through twenty are reminiscent of the "cultural-determinism" approach which emphasizes the antagonism of cultures as responsible for individuals' maladjustment to different people and surroundings. Finally, the eleven first mechanisms cannot be associated, at least not directly, to any of the four main paradigms that we have been discussing in this study.

The psychocultural approach that was proposed in Chapter 3 deals with the process of changing cultural identity itself. In any change, as in any motion, there are three basic elements which have to be considered: the point of departure (A); the point of arrival (B); and the element that changes from (A) to (B). In a comprehensive study of the phenomenons related to changes in cultural identity
there is also the need to consider three essential elements: the nature of the original culture (A); the nature of the dominant culture (B); and the psychology of the individual who changes from (A) to (B).

"Cultural determinism" and "structural-environmental determinism" paradigms emphasize the nature of the original culture and the nature of the dominant culture respectively. They don't go beyond that. The psychoanalytical approach tries to look at the psychology of the individual except that it plays in the wrong key of pathology. The psychocultural approach developed in this study tries to be comprehensive enough to consider all three elements. It looks at the nature of the original culture as it has affected the individual's view of the world (mechanisms eighteen through twenty); it considers the nature of the dominant culture and its decisive effects on the lives of the individuals (mechanisms twelve through seventeen); it also considers the psychology of the individual and its dynamics when faced with the dilemma of changing cultures (mechanisms one through eleven). There is no pathology directly involved but just adaptive or maladaptive states in a dynamic process in which the individual is always in search of the "real" self at each phase-specific juncture of cultural change.

The reader is encouraged to analyze the answers to questions 4, 6, 8, 10 and 12 from the point of view of the same paradigms discussed earlier in this study. It will be
found - and plainly demonstrated due to the generous contribution of the respondents - that the dynamics of the process of changing cultural identity are too complex to be stratified by simplistic paradigms; that a more complex psychocultural approach which encompasses all the constitutive elements of the process of cultural change is better equipped to take account of all the forces at work during the acculturation, assimilation and internalization stages.

Further discussion of the data presented here in this chapter will be done in the next chapter when recommendations will be made for social workers dealing in direct practice as well as in community action.
Chapter 5

RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

It was stated in the introduction that this study would address the issue of practicality by setting three main objectives: 1) to shed some light on issues of the immigrants' and ethnic minority individuals' adjustment to America; 2) to equip social work practitioners with diagnostic tools; 3) to equip social workers with tools for social action.

It would be unrealistic to believe that this paper provides the answers to so many unanswered questions regarding the plight of those who struggle to adjust to the American society. The message of this study is, however, that the process itself of changing one's cultural identity either causes or aggravates some of the phenomenons of maladjustment that immigrants and other minority individuals experience such as: the high rate of mental disfunctioning; the high rate of separations and divorces; the high rate of runaways and juvenile delinquency; alcoholism; the middle-aged men's dissociation from the labor market through alleged and undiagnosed low-back pain; and the phenomenon of the repatriation of the elderly, who return to their towns of birth to die alone (Chapter 4 provides a good overview of these and other phenomenons).
Mention was made in the exposition of the theoretical framework in Chapter 3 that once a human being enters in contact with another culture, all the personality's components (id, ego, superego) are strongly reactivated in search of the lost balance. As an interviewer, this writer was surprised to hear some respondents mention what they called "an increase in blind impulses" attributed to being fixated at the state of alienation (answer 3 to question 8). This increase in blind impulses - the id's baggage - may be responsible for many so called "antisocial" behaviors and even crimes committed by minority individuals.

In regards to the objective of providing diagnostic tools to direct practitioners, the long list of mechanisms and behaviors presented in Chapter 4 should constitute a precious source of inspiration. Unfortunately, no techniques have been presented to deal with the listed behaviors and mechanisms. The task of developing those techniques, besides being beyond the scope of this study, is an endeavor which would take years of therapeutic experience.

The most important tool, however, presented by this study to therapists is the insight into a valid alternative. The contention is that in addition to the traditional psychosocial approach in dealing with immigrants and other minority individuals, the therapist should be aware of a whole new dimension of psychic activities originating from the process of changing cultural identity. To be able to understand the personality dynamics of an immigrant the
therapist should focus on the psychological and social costs of these people's adjustment to America; on the phenomenon of cultural shock; on the phenomenon of alienation; on the phenomenon of prejudice; on the phenomenon of split cultural identity of men and women without country, attachments and loyalties. To focus on traditional psychoanalytical methods alone is definitely wrong and detrimental.

As a suggestion on how to use the material accumulated in this study for therapy, a general approach for work with families of immigrants is outlined in the next few pages.

The first step to be taken is for the therapist to find out the degree of acculturation that the individual members of a family have reached. By knowing the degree of acculturation of each member the therapist will have an idea of the degree of acculturation of the family as a whole. Families, for instance, in which some members are highly acculturated, usually the children, and some other members are low acculturated will be termed a low-acculturated family. Without pretending to establish a scientific measure of acculturation but only to provide simple tools for assessment, this study presents a twenty-indicator list. The therapist during the first interviews will have the opportunity to measure approximately the degree of acculturation of a family according to the capacity or attitude of their members towards the following elements.

1) Capacity to speak English.
2) Willingness to speak English, if capable.
3) Contacts with kin (the assumption is that low-acculturated individuals have frequent contacts with kin).

4) Where people turn for help (the assumption is that low-acculturated individuals turn for help mostly within family circles).

5) Attitudes towards socializing of children with dominant culture.

6) Attitudes towards American teenage dating patterns.

7) Attitudes towards household chores (the assumption is that for low-acculturated individuals household chores are women's business).

8) Attitudes toward child-care (the assumption is that child-care for low-acculturated individuals is to be kept inside the family).

9) Attitudes towards money matters (the assumption is that for low-acculturated individuals money matters is the man's world).

10) Attitudes towards tradition.

11) Attitudes towards dressing American way.

12) Attitudes towards American food.

13) Attitudes towards pre-marital sex.

14) Attitudes towards cross-cultural marriage.

15) Attitudes towards inter-religious marriages.

16) Attitudes towards cohabitation.

17) Attitudes towards recreation (the assumption is that for low-acculturated individuals, recreation is mostly associated with visiting extended family).

18) Attitude toward women education.

19) Attitude towards folk-medicine practice.

20) Interest in American political and social life.

Acculturation of an immigrant family will be measured by the attitudes of the members of that family towards the twenty points mentioned above. Every item will be assigned a .5 value. In a scale of 10, the therapist would be able to define the low-acculturated family as the one:

a) whose average score is < 5 or

b) whose range between the highest and the lowest score is > 5.

The highly acculturated family is defined as the one

a) whose average score is > 5 and
b) whose range between the highest and the lowest score is < 5.

A family of immigrants in need of therapy is likely to be dealing with serious problems related to acculturation and assimilation. As a tool for therapy this study will categorize three groups of families based on different degrees of cultural change. At the same time it will touch on some of the conflicts more likely to be staged in each one of these groups.

1) Low-acculturated family

A family at this stage will probably be dealing mostly with problems related to cultural shock. It may even be that some members of such a family are fixated at that state. Culture shock becomes for them a defense mechanism for dealing with the painful reality of cultural change (see Chapter Four: answers to questions two and four).

These are some of the family conflicts the therapist may encounter:

- Since children learn second language more quickly than do the parents, they are suddenly promoted to a kind of adulthood, participating in the family's decision-making process by using their language skills. Very often they are called upon by the parents to be their translators in very important matters. Sometimes they translate what they want and how they want it. The parent, as they lose control, try vainly to assert their authority with the result that the children leave home, breaking family ties.
- As a key element in this process of resistance to acculturation, parents very often become matchmakers for their children. Marriages are arranged by proxy with youngsters still living in the "Old Country" sometimes with very little participation of the bride and groom. It is no surprise that the marriage failure is so high.

- The old-age repatriation phenomenon is another feature of this stage of cultural change. This phenomenon refers to cases of elderly men and women who actually break away from their families to spend the remaining days of their lives in their towns of birth.

Therapists dealing with families struggling in this first stage may try reality-oriented techniques. Some of these families have never been exposed to different people and different ideas. The integration of the critical symbols is a precondition of growth. Resistance to a successful resolution of this stage may cause regression to unresolved stages of ego development. Culture shock is a sister of psychosis.

2) Highly-acculturated/low-assimilated family

Individuals and families at this stage of cultural change have successfully integrated the critical symbols. They have integrated the reality of the second culture but they are still struggling with matters of loyalty, priority and choice. There is at this stage strong resistance against integrating axiological symbols which deal with predicaments related to the essence of cultures such as
"good," "better" and "unique." The resulting ambivalence is translated into alienation, which may become a defense mechanism. It is too painful to make a decision regarding loyalty. Fixation at this state may cause alienation from both the original and the dominant cultures.

Authors mention long catalogs of severe behavioral and social symptoms of alienation including psychosis, neuroses, alcoholism, drug addiction, delinquency, prostitution and suicide (see Chapter four: answers to questions six and eight). A quote from M.L. Kovacs (1975) summarizes the seriousness of all these symptoms:

Although it is not possible to make a single generalization which applies to all immigrant groups to all countries, it is common for studies to report that the admission rate of immigrants to mental hospitals is considerably higher than for native born people. Such findings have been obtained in the United States and England. (Kovacs:227)

A therapist dealing with individuals and families at this stage of cultural change should be aware that one of the major needs of the alienated immigrant is companionship. People are basically alienated from belongingness. The therapist should, therefore, attack the problems on two fronts. In terms of structure, group therapy with elements of the immigrant's original culture may be in order. In the case of families, family groups may be a first step. In terms of technique, M.L. Kovacs (1975) suggests that emphasis should be put on the concept of multiculturalism:

In a multicultural model, groups of different ethnic backgrounds are permitted to retain a separate ethnic identity, but are encouraged at the same time to
develop a sense of national unity with other ethnic groups to form and maintain the single, united political state. (Kovacs:228)

This writer prefers to stress the use of techniques leading to insight and understanding of the process of cultural change. The conflicts at this stage may be resolved by stressing the need to understand the fact that it is possible to belong to a new culture and yet no choice regarding the original culture has to be made. By integrating the axiological symbols (both cultures are good, both cultures are unique), individuals and families have taken a giant step in solving the alienation issues.

3) Highly-acculturated/highly-assimilated families

Immigrants in this group have successfully integrated the two stages of acculturation and assimilation. They may however be dealing with feelings of cultural uncertainty (see Chapter four, answers to questions ten and twelve). In times of family conflicts or personal crises, people at this stage capitalize heavily in cognitive mechanisms. Their refusal to integrate the integrative symbolism is translated into an obsessive mechanism of intellectualization, repetition and reaction formation which determine their further evasion from emotional involvement. Marcos (1975:556) mentions that frequently bilingual people verbalize emotionally charged material without displaying the expected emotions. At this stage there is a decisive lack of integration of verbalization/affect.
Family therapists dealing with individuals/families at this stage of cultural change should be aware that one can easily misevaluate bilingual clients emotional responses and resistances. The main goal of therapeutic intervention is the integration of the integrative symbols by giving to thought content the correspondent cultural meaning. The first step to be taken in this direction is the integration of the dualism verbalization/affect. This can only be done if the therapist is aware of the encoding mechanisms of the languages involved.

Finally, regarding the third objective of this study, social workers as advocates of social change can be equipped with powerful tools for social action since the dynamics of cultural identity change can lead to the creation of marginal individuals who are described by social scientists as potential leaders of social reform.

In dealing with immigrants and ethnic minority individuals, social workers should be fostering acculturation as an essential condition to survival in this very competitive society. They also should be fostering assimilation as a minimum prerequisite to mental health; but, instead of fostering internalization, they should foster "conscientization" of the process of cultural change. By becoming conscious of the process of change and by comparing the changes which have occurred in their cultural identity to the unchangeable core of the human person, the individual can make a decisive distinction between what the reality of
the self "is" and what it "ought to be." This is an existential experience, often the first one of its kind in an individual's life. It is the primordial distinction between "state of right" and "state of justice." At this point the individual can choose to internalize or intellectually accept his/her changes as a situation "de facto" but still question the situation of justice: "I feel accepted, but I refuse to be accepted as a second rate citizen." Such is the case of the marginal individual who by accepting the new self as a condition "de facto" has built enough stamina to deal with both internal problems and external challenges.

That hybrid or marginal individual under the guidance of an advocate for social change would be able to extrapolate from his/her own cultural experience and apply this newly developed concept to a whole range of social realities and human relations.

Human relationships can be viewed from a wide range of different perspectives. One of the most commonly misunderstood is the dualism "law versus justice." The dimension of law which deals with the "de facto" situations is by definition imperfect since it embodies elements of prejudices, self-interests and capitulations. Law is a human compromise in search of justice. If Affirmative Action and the Civil Rights Bill are focused from this point of view, they are nothing but the institutionalization of human limitations and prejudices. In a situation of justice there would be no need for Civil Rights of any kind.
The last paragraph, as harsh as it may sound, is the language that marginal individuals speak and understand. Social workers committed to social action cannot overlook this tremendous potential for social change. They have to keep in mind that non-acculturated and non-assimilated individuals cannot constitute the backbone of social reforms. Marginal individuals can, if adequately trained for the task. One of the best techniques for training people for social change is the one developed by Paulo Freire in his publications (Soto:1973). It is through consciousness or "conscientization" that "men achieve a deepening awareness both of the socio-cultural reality which shapes their lives and of their capacity to transform that reality" (Freire, 1970:27).

This writer is in complete agreement with the last quotation. It is through "conscientization" that the immigrant and other ethnic minority individuals will accept the changes in their cultural selves, allowing them to function well in the dominant society as well as to strive for the kind of society which will fit their interpretation of the American dream.

The writer recognizes the numerous limitations of this study. The theoretical framework presented in Chapter three tries to shift the focus on issues of acculturation and assimilation from blaming the victims to blaming the process of changing cultural identity itself. The human mind is too complex to subject itself to any effort of systematization
such as the one presented in this study. Besides, the conflicts which rage among individuals and families in times of crises do not necessarily follow preestablished models. There are too many variables obstructing the realization of the immigrants' American dream, as was well documented in Chapter Four.

The merit of this paper resides in its honest effort to shed some light on the complex dynamics of the immigrants' and ethnic minority individuals' psyche. It also provides a direction towards the better understanding of human suffering caused by cross-cultural experiences. To readers who want to delve further into the dynamics of the process of cultural change, this writer recommends some aspects which warrant further development:

1) It is suggested that the mechanisms and behaviors listed in Chapter Four be tested by careful observation of two sample groups from the population of immigrants and other ethnic minority individuals.

2) It is further recommended that this approach, outlined in Chapter Five, be applied systematically in therapy with children.

It is the belief of this author that the insights and interventions outlined in this study will be most constructive when applied early in the process not only of acculturation and assimilation, but early in the process of growth and development as well. The belief that children may profit particularly from these interventions is a logical
conclusion of the premise of this paper: that finding a cultural identity is a psychocultural process.
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QUESTIONNAIRE

(1) If I define acculturation as "the acquisition of the language, moral, religious ideas and patterns of behavior of the dominant group," do you see among immigrants and other ethnic minority individuals a conscious or unconscious refusal to acculturate?

   YES  NO  NOT SURE

(2) If you answer YES to the above question, which mechanisms do individuals use to avoid acculturation?

(3) If I define cultural shock as "a form of personality maladjustment which is a reaction to an unsuccessful attempt or the perceived inability to adjust to new surroundings and people," do you see any evidence among immigrants and other ethnic minority individuals of fixation at the state of cultural shock?

   YES  NO  NOT SURE

(4) If you answer YES to the above question, would you mention any phenomenons resulting from fixation at the state of cultural shock?

(5) If I define assimilation as "the subjective feeling of belonging and being accepted," do you see among immigrants and other ethnic minority individuals a conscious or unconscious refusal to assimilate?

   YES  NO  NOT SURE
(6) If you answer **YES** to the above question, which mechanisms do individuals use to avoid assimilation?

(7) If I define alienation as "a form of personality maladjustment which is a reaction to a sense of loss, to a sense that one has been separated from whatever gives meaning to one's life," do you see any evidence among immigrants and other ethnic minority individuals of fixation at a state of alienation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>NOT SURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(8) If you answer **YES** to the above question, would you mention any phenomenons resulting from fixation at the state of alienation?

(9) If I define internalization as "the intellectual acceptance by an individual of the changes in his/her cultural identity which occurred during the process of cultural change," do you see among immigrants and other ethnic minority individuals a conscious or unconscious refusal to internalize?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>NOT SURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(10) If you answer **YES** to the above question, which mechanisms do individuals use to avoid internalization?

(11) If I define the split of cultural identity as a form of personality maladjustment which is a reaction to the fact that some elements of both cultures are irreductibly unIntegrated at a high degree of assimilation, do you see any evidence among highly assimilated immigrants and other ethnic minority individuals of fixation at a state of split cultural identity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>NOT SURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
(12) If you answer YES to the above question, would you mention any phenomena resulting from fixation at the state of split cultural identity?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSONALITY'S PROVINCES</th>
<th>SYMBOLISMS</th>
<th>STAGES IN THE PROCESS OF CHANGING CULTURAL IDENTITY</th>
<th>MALADAPTIVE STATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EGO/MIND</td>
<td>CRITICAL</td>
<td>ACCULTURATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IF PROCESS OF ACCULTURATION IS HALTED, THEN</td>
<td>FIXATION AT THE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>THERE IS POSSIBILITY OF:</td>
<td>STATE OF CULTURAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SHOCK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPEREGO/MIND</td>
<td>AXIOLOGICAL</td>
<td>ASSIMILATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IF PROCESS OF ASSIMILATION IS HALTED, THEN</td>
<td>FIXATION AT THE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>THERE IS POSSIBILITY OF:</td>
<td>STATE OF ALIENA-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID/MIND</td>
<td>INTEGRATIVE</td>
<td>INTERNALIZATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IF PROCESS OF INTERNALIZATION IS HALTED, THEN</td>
<td>FIXATION AT THE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>THERE IS POSSIBILITY OF:</td>
<td>STATE OF SPLIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CULTURAL IDENTITY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>