WHAT ACTUALLY HAPPENS TO *JOSÉ:*
CHICANO FRESHMEN IN
A PREDOMINANTLY ANGLO UNIVERSITY

Joseph C. Silva

ABSTRACT

Many theories of behavior literally bypass the area of cultural characteristics and differences. One notable exception is a model, used extensively in the social sciences, which has been termed "cultural determinism." The model focuses on cultural values, or value orientations, as a way of understanding cultural influences of behavior. Since application of the cultural determinism model has produced real-world failures in seeking to understand behavior and persons cross-culturally, a new approach is wanting. Using some major logical elements from Descriptive Psychology, a concept of culture is presented that makes explicit the relationships among culture, values, persons, and behavior. The research derived from the conceptualization examines the effects of cultural displacement on the participation and success of Chicano freshmen at a predominantly white, middle-class university.

There are currently many theories of human behavior in the field of psychology. They differ from one another in some important and characteristic ways. One feature most of them share is a level of generalization that allows for application across time, place, and person. This sort of explanatory power gives the appearance of having achieved a culture-free, or universal, formulation of human behavior. It can be more accurately said, however, that theories of this sort simply do not provide a way of *directly explicating* the relationships among the concepts of person, behavior, and culture.

It seems to be a widely accepted notion that theories of human behavior are culture-free to the extent that they have been general enough to avoid including a concept of culture. Yet, one can easily observe systematic differences in behavior between groups of people as a function of their cultural background. Since every person has been socialized into some culture, these systematic differences are literally an intrinsic part of everyone's behavior where cultural differences exist and are being expressed. This consideration alone would seem to indicate that theories of human behavior which fail to *include* a well-developed and integrated concept of culture, then, would appear to be overly general.

Historically, the concept of culture has been central to, and developed within, the discipline of anthropology. It has been adopted and applied extensively in social psychology and is an essential concept in the comparatively new field of cross-cultural psychology (Segall, 1979). Over time numerous definitions of culture have been presented.

Milton M. Gordon (1964), in a study of assimilation, begins with a definition of culture by the early anthropologist, E. B. Tylor. In sharp contrast to this usual method of calling upon a familiar definition, Marsella and Pederson, editors of the excellent book *Cross-cultural Counseling and Psychotherapy* (1981), provide neither a definition nor a discussion of culture as an introduction. They seem to rely instead on a "common understanding" of the concept.

Wallace (1970), in relating culture to personality, maps out a detailed *formulation* of culture and rejects the common definitional approach:

> We do not propose to list a set of definitions of the words 'culture' and 'personality' and then, by some suitable criteria, to select the best. Nor shall we offer new definitions. The student should realize that dozens, if not hundreds, of respectable definitions exist (p. 8).

Wallace is to be credited for his work in that it expresses an appreciation of the range of facts to be accounted for by a concept of culture. His nonfundamental approach, however, leads him away from an explication of the concept of *culture* and results instead in a tabular catagorization of "empirical operations." One of the intended and unique contributions of the present study, then, is to present a direct descriptive explication of the concept.

It is worth examining briefly, on the most basic level, the necessity of considering some of the cultural factors that give coherence and meaning to individual

behaviors and behavior patterns. These are most clearly seen from a cross-cultural perspective. Without knowledge of the cultural basis of behavior, it is possible that some behavior would not even be recognized as such. For example, the simple shrugging of one's shoulders clearly indicates a lack of knowledge among members of one cultural tradition but to persons outside that cultural group it may be indistinguishable from a reflexive movement. The same is true of subtle hand gestures used in many cultures to communicate what may be a complex state of affairs.

Even where a given movement is recognized as behavior, the differing significance from one culture to another can be a source of confusion. An illustrative, if somewhat exceptional, example is provided by the East Indian custom of indicating approval or appreciation by moving one's head from side to side. The behavior duplicates in movement the customary Western expression of disapproval. Here, although the movement may be recognized as behavior, the significance is likely to be lost to someone unfamiliar with the custom.

To a person observing behavior cross-culturally, some actions can seem obvious and unmistakable. For members of a given cultural community, however, slight intentional variations in the customary way of doing things can literally make the difference between one behavior and another. These differences can be easily missed by an outsider. A person knowledgeable and competent in the traditional Japanese form of greeting another person can, with subtle variation in movement, show either a great deal or a minimum of respect. Being able to distinguish which behavior it was on a given occasion would almost certainly require knowledge and experience acquired within the Japanese culture, or prior knowledge of the relationship.

Just from these few examples alone it is easy to see the necessity of (accurately) taking the cultural context into account when observing and describing behavior. There are, of course, more subtle effects of failing to do so that are just beginning to be fully appreciated. In a provocative and insightful statement, Segall (1979) captures the principal pitfalls of behavior observation and description *within* one's home culture in the absence of a cross-cultural perspective. In noting the "culture-bound" nature of (social) psychology he warns:

> There is a very real danger that psychologists, by limiting their attention to the behaviors of individuals in a single culture (however complex that culture might be), lose sight altogether of culture itself. The scientist, no less than the most unsophisticated layperson who knows only his or her own society becomes prey to ethnocentric judgments. Behaviors that may in fact be heavily influenced by cultural forces may appear to the psychologist to be manifestations of 'Human Nature' (pp. 22–23).

Achieving a good understanding of another culture's behavior patterns is seldom possible through observation alone. Sufficient participation is required so that one can understand the perspective of that culture. Social scientists whose activities *primarily* involve cross-cultural observation and description, and not

extensive socialization experiences, are no exception. Their perspective remains essentially that of a "foreigner".

The limitations of a monocultural perspective are nowhere better illustrated than in the social science research, conducted primarily by Anglos, on Mexican American culture. As Moore (1976) has noted, only with the advent of a growing body of research and critical evaluation by Chicano scholars (e.g., Montiel, 1970; Padilla, 1970; Romano-V, 1968; & Vaca, 1970) have the limitations of this literature become apparent.

After an extensive review of the literature across the social sciences on Mexican Americans, Vaca (1970) identified and traced the development of a model he termed "cultural determinism". In attempting to account for cross-cultural differences in behavior between Mexican Americans and Anglos, social scientists utilizing the model had focused on the values unique to each culture and shared by its members. The supposition was that behavior is best understood by reference to the value system of a particular culture. Unlike many theories of human behavior, then, this one dealt *directly* with cultural characteristics and differences.

Vaca and others cited above have shown that what has emerged from application of the model is the identification of cultural values that bring into sharp relief the *differences* between Mexican American and Anglo culture in a manner that could only be described as ethnocentric and stereotypic. There is general agreement that the following studies exemplify the development and application of the cultural determinism model (Saunders, 1954; Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck, 1961; Madsen, 1964; Heller, 1966).

The need of calling attention to and critically reviewing these early studies was clearly described by Romano-V (1968):

> The historically distorted studies of Tuck, Saunders, Edmonson, and Kluckhohn-Strodtbeck have been widely accepted in departments of anthropology and sociology throughout the United States. These books have become *the* [italics his] authoritative sources of information about Mexican-Americans for a wide variety of institutional agencies, from schools of medicine, departments of social welfare, to departments of employment and other governmental agencies (p. 47).

Readers unfamiliar with this body of literature are strongly encouraged to review both the original works and the critical reviews cited earlier.

For the most part, criticism of the cultural determinism model has been content-bound. That is, it has taken the form of a complete repudiation of the model and the collective descriptions of Mexican American culture that have resulted from its application. Murillo (1976) went a step further and redescribed, in a nonpejorative manner, the cultural values as they have appeared in this literature. His descriptions reflect the Chicano perspective of Mexican American culture (i.e., an insider's view). The *conceptual* shortcomings of the model have been detailed by Silva (1980). Some of the points brought out in that analysis were:

1. The model is reductionistic in that it would lead to a description of culture solely by reference to cultural values.

2. The formulation of values as utilized in the model gives values an inordinate status within the larger concept of behavior.

3. There is not a place within the model for important aspects of human behavior other than values.

4. Because of the emphasis on cultural differences, no allowance is made for cross-cultural commonalities in values. The logical extension is that non-conflictual biculturality is negated.

These deficiencies alone are enough to suggest that a new approach is wanting. Just as important, however, is the fact that cultural determinists conceive of cultural values and individual behavior as being causally connected. In addition to providing a direct explication of the concept of culture, then, the formulation to be presented will show the *logical* links between culture and behavior and not just the contingent connections.

A DESCRIPTIVE PSYCHOLOGY APPROACH TO THE CONCEPT OF CULTURE

The phenomena of persons, values, behavior, and culture are all related conceptually. To understand any one of them, therefore, one needs to understand the others and how they fit together. What follows, accordingly, is a development of these concepts and the relationships which hold among them.

Personal Characteristics, Circumstances, and Behavior

Among the resources for describing and explaining behavior that are systematically developed within Descriptive Psychology, the one most relevant to our needs at this point is the Developmental Schemata (Ossorio, 1970/1981). It has two components, a formula for constructing causal (but nondeterministic) accounts of the acquisition of Personal Characteristics, and a formula expressing the logical interconnections among Personal Characteristics, Behavior, and Circumstances. Briefly, we express these connections as follows:

1. To behave at all requires a real world within which certain states of affairs exist and others are possible. We may refer to these states of affairs as the circumstances which the person encounters. That a person appraises the circumstances as being of one sort rather than another (e.g., a danger to him vs. an opportunity to get something wanted) provides the basis for doing one thing rather than another.

2.   Because two persons reared in the same culture may well appraise the "same" circumstances differently as a function of their differences in ability, knowledge, dispositions, or current conditions, one needs to take explicit account of such Personal Characteristics. Ossorio has provided an explicit recognition of the logical point that any behavior is an expression of some Personal Characteristics of the actor by building the Personal Characteristics parameter into the parametric analysis of behavior as Intentional Action (1970/1981).

3.   Thus, the formula: Behavior is a function of Personal Characteristics and Circumstances.

A second resource of the Descriptive Psychology formulation is an explicit codification of the major logical types of Personal Characteristics under the threefold heading of Dispositions, Powers, and Conditions. Each of these general categories is in turn subdivided into important distinctions (in the case of Powers, the distinction among Knowledge, Values, and Abilities), each of which may be exemplified in a great variety of specific instances. While the Personal Characteristics codified within the system include both those that refer to relatively stable characteristics such as Dispositions (Traits, Attitudes, Styles, Interests) and to temporary conditions such as specific psychological states, moods, etc.), the primary interest for this discussion is the relatively enduring characteristics.

The Developmental Schemata is also relevant to the acquisition and change of Personal Characteristics. That persons have specific characteristics at one time depends upon their having had a limited set of others earlier and having certain life histories. To a considerable extent the relevant life history may be conceived as a history of participation in existing social practices of his or her community. In the course of such participation, a person typically, but not necessarily, becomes capable of entering into and participating successfully in the practices of his or her community. Because Personal Characteristics are acquired rather than chosen, persons cannot guarantee that they will develop the characteristics that they want. Such an outcome depends both upon having a relevant and effective personal history and also upon having already acquired other characteristics that make successful participation in the relevant social practices possible. Furthermore, the social practices that a person chooses to engage in and the way they participate already reflect the Personal Characteristics that the person has.

Group characteristics are a logical extension of Personal Characteristics. They correspond to the modal characteristics of a group. Given the relevant competence, people from different families, regions, or cultures can be identified to the extent their Personal Characteristics fit the known characteristics of a particular group. On the other hand, one can have knowledge of the modal characteristics of a group without being able to detect basic individual differences among the group's members. The common statement, "they all look alike to me," is a sure indication of limited experience with individual members of a group.

When attempting to understand or explain a person's behavior, one can make reference to his or her Personal Characteristics. The same principle holds for groups (i.e., the behavior of an individual or group of individuals is observed, circumstances are taken into account, and the individual or modal group Personal Characteristics are ascribed accordingly). For the most part, cultural determinism studies of behavior have relied on reference to only one Personal Characteristic concept-Values. The modal values that characterize a particular cultural group have been termed cultural values or value orientations.

In the present formulation of personal and group characteristics, Values are but one type of Personal Characteristics. As with other Personal Characteristics, Values are logically related to both circumstances and behavior in the manner described earlier (i.e., in any given set of circumstances the observed behavior will be an expression of some of the Values a person has). The information contained in the pattern of observed behavior allows for Personal Characteristic descriptions which include Values. Codifying a person's pattern of behavior as an expression of his or her Values gives it a particular status within their life history as distinct from other Personal Characteristics (e.g., attitude, style, trait). One needs to bear in mind in the following section that circumstances *include* the social practices being engaged in. As such, participation in a social practice constitutes an expression of an individual's Personal Characteristics and circumstances.

Social Practices

A social practice is an intelligible, recognizable and learnable pattern of behavior. It is generated from a formal schema for a Process Description (Table 1), where the Process is specified as a behavioral process and the Individuals are people (Ossorio, 1978). The notion of a social practice is that of a sequence of behavior exemplifying a pattern having sequential stages. Of particular importance is the fact that the same social practice can be done a number of different ways on different occasions and still be the same social practice. Getting married is a social practice for which most people could readily generate a number of different versions.

Every individual behavior is a behavior within some social practice, and at some level of description, an intrinsic social practice. That is, as one goes from individual behavior through the descriptive levels of social practices that constitute the more extensive behaviors being engaged in, the boundary condition will be an intrinsic social practice. Intervening social practices, where they can be identified, will be of the nonintrinsic variety. Each level of significance of a behavior, similarly, will paradigmatically be a social practice, the participation in which is achieved by engaging in that individual behavior.

A nonintrinsic social practice is one which a person engages in as part of doing something else (i.e., participation in another, more extensive social practice,

Table 1
Basic Process Unit
(Ossorio, 1978)

P-Name^A: The process "Name" of process A.

P-Description^A: The "Description" of A. It specifies:

I.   P-Paradigms: The major varieties of P-Name^A. This is a technical option. If only one paradigm exists, it will be the same as P-Name^A. For each paradigm, the following is specified:

(a)   Stages 1-K: These are "Names" of sub-processes within A. They are systematically specified, e.g., as P-Name^{A11}, P-Name^{A12}, . . . P-Name^{A1K} for Paradigm 1. For each stage specify:

(1)   Options 1-N: These are the various exemplars of the process (stage) in question. That is, these are the various ways in which that process could happen. Each Option is systematically indexed as P-Name^{A111}, P-Name^{A112}, . . . P-Name^{A11N}. Each of these can now be expanded (decomposed) on the model of P-Name^A.

(b)   Individuals
(c)   Elements
(d)   Eligibilities
(e)   Contingencies
(f)   Versions

---

either nonintrinsic or intrinsic). An intrinsic social practice is one which is understandable as being done for its own sake. An example is provided by the game of tennis. Playing tennis is an intrinsic social practice and some people participate in it in that way. Others participate in it as a means to an end (e.g., making business contacts). For those individuals, playing tennis constitutes participation in an intrinsic social practice, but having an ulterior motive for doing so.

In a given culture customary versions of a social practice may become established in time as *the* way something is done (e.g., baptism by total immersion). The development of a particular version of a social practice is generally an historical accident, yet doing something in the customary or established manner is sometimes confused with the doing of it at all. Following the example, a person stuck at the conceptual level of custom might consider any other form of baptism not *really* being baptized. It is the customary versions of social practices, along with modal Personal Characteristics, which contributes to the regularity of behavior one observes among the members of a cultural group.

Both the significance and the intelligibility of any individual behavior derive from the larger pattern of behavior of which it is a part. Understanding someone's behavior requires knowledge of what social practice was being engaged in at the time, as well as competence to recognize it as such on a particular occasion. This is so because the social practice is *what* the person was doing by engaging in that behavior (e.g., moving a pawn in a game of chess). The fact that

a social practice may be done in different ways at different times allows for the expression of individuality. But even creative participation necessarily conforms to the requirements of the social practice being engaged in at the time.

Socialization

A person needs to have certain Personal Characteristics, including Values, to function successfully in a given context, whether it be a family, profession, or culture. This requires being socialized into having, or acquiring, the relevant Personal Characteristics. They cannot simply be passed on as information (as many a frustrated parent has come to find). Successful socialization occurs by virtue of the acquisition of certain Personal Characteristics that facilitate acceptance and allow a person to appreciate and participate in social practices. This has classically been called ''internalization'' in the literature on socialization. The mark of successful socialization is having good independent judgement and being able to make choices appropriate to the context one is operating within. By virtue of having the relevant Personal Characteristics, one will be able to make choices that satisfy one's basic needs which at the same time are well fitted to the operative cultural context. In order to exercise good independent judgement in the course of living and encountering novel situations, one has to be doing the right things for the right reasons.

Simply conforming to the behavior of others in the situation or doing what one has always done before in a similar situation will not generally result in an appropriate response in a social practice. Imagine a game of chess in which a person made either all the same moves the other person made, or the same moves made the last time he or she played. Just engaging in ordinary conversation involves the creation of novel, but fitting responses (that reflect one's socialization). Carrying the analogy of the chess game just described to conversing with someone generates some humorous possibilities. It is the sort of participation that could only work for a fictional person.

There are numerous social institutions that are involved in and directed toward, socialization (e.g., family, school, church). They are part of the totality of social forms, social practices, and institutions that make up a culture. In any given culture, then, some complementarity among them can be expected. The cumulative effect of participating in the social practices and institutions of a culture is, paradigmatically, the development of a person who is well adapted to that culture.

There are some individuals, however, who may not reach the point of being well adapted to their culture. This is understandable, as socialization is not foolproof. These individuals will range from creative to pathological in their manner of participation. Failures of socialization of this sort are many and varied, and it is difficult to make any general statements about them as a group.

Cultural Displacement

There are some mismatches of person and culture that are not merely accidental. They result when a person who has been primarily socialized into one culture has to operate within the context of another culture. These individuals can be systematically described as *culturally displaced persons.*

If people are culturally displaced, their Values and other Personal Characteristics still play a selective function in their new cultural context, but their life is likely to be unsatisfying to the extent that their Personal Characteristics are a poor fit. Culturally displaced persons lack the required Personal Characteristics and skills that would lead them to choose the forms of social participation that would satisfy their basic needs and allow them to participate successfully. The same set of Personal Characteristics that may have been well adapted to their home culture often leads them to make choices that may be problematic in the host culture.

It is also the case that some number of the choices made by a culturally displaced person would be all right if other persons in the host culture were not functioning as gatekeepers by equating *valid* participation in the social practices of their culture with the *customary* way of doing something. Institutions, in particular, with their tightly organized sets of social practices, can present a formidable barrier for the culturally displaced person. Yet, it is only through successful participation in the social practices and institutions of the new culture that a culturally displaced person can acquire the necessary Personal Characteristics required by that culture. The person cannot simply *choose* the necessary Personal Characteristics and then act accordingly, thereby fitting into the new cultural context, however high the motivation may be.

Way of Life

Way of Life notions are ways of distinguishing how people live (e.g., hunting, seafaring, nomadic). Different cultures will correspond to different modal ways of life. Formally, Way of Life is a framework, based on the structure of a Process Description, for conceptualizing a biographical historical process that is instantiated by individual persons living their lives. The specific process is a social practice, which serves as a building block. The descriptive hierarchy of social practices is such that each social practice constitutes a unit in a more extensive social practice, which in turn has Stages with various other social practices, as Options. At the lower limit of this descriptive hierarchy the most basic unit is a single behavior. The upper limit of description provides the representation or identification of a culture. At this level the units of each Stage are complex sets of social practices—some of which may be social institutions—the participation in which over a lifetime constitutes a Version of a Way of Life for any particular person.

On an individual level, a way of life involves all the basic aspects of behavior

(e.g., Values, Judgments, Choice, etc.). A way of life itself, however, is not chosen by a person. The logic here is the same as it was for Personal Characteristics. Individuals do not choose to become the persons they are, nor do they choose their way of life. Yet, one's behavioral choices reflect and are an expression of both simultaneously. Individuals are born and socialized into a way of life and in the process of living they become the persons they are at any given point in their life.

Participation in a way of life is always at the intrinsic level and involves a person's competence—as contrasted to information or knowledge only. The boundary condition of the descriptive hierarchy of social practices, as mentioned earlier, will always be an intrinsic social practice. Going to the dentist may be done "only" because it is time for a check-up, but at the intrinsic level a person is going as an instantiation of living a healthful way of life. The expression of competence is in knowing how to take care of one's teeth (i.e., by getting regular check-ups).

The development of competence requires (successful) participation in some of the relevant social practices, as opposed to just information or knowledge of the social practices. People, in addition to having the required competence, have a sense of which choices fit their particular way of life and which do not (i.e., can make those kinds of judgments). Their values allow them to make choices that are in accordance with their way of life. The significance those behaviors have for them will, in turn, be expressive of their way of life. The ultimate significance, of course, will be that they are living that way of life.

Culture

The present formulation rests on the concept of a social practice as a way of relating persons, behavior, and culture. This contrasts with the traditional accounts of person and culture, which generally make a conceptual leap from one to the other. Here, the relationship between person and culture is through behavior as participation and choice in social practices, as an expression of a person's Personal Characteristics within the behavioral opportunities provided by the culture.

By using the concept of a social practice as a link between persons, behavior, and culture, one can address both the individual and the universal aspects of behavior. In addition, the concept of a social practice allows one to relativize behavior to a cultural context without limiting it to that context. As such, it is possible to talk about cultural differences in a content-free manner without reference to any particular culture.

In essence, culture consists of the historical patterns of behavior required by the various social institutions as they exemplify certain principles in the form of organized social practices. It can be thought of as the set of societal parameters for behavior that place certain constraints on a person's behavior and thereby

provide opportunities to participate in the social institutions of that culture. To participate in a culture is to follow the requirements of whichever social practice one is engaging in at the time. One's participation (i.e., pattern of participation) in the social practices of a culture has a necessary relationship to the Significance those behaviors have for the person. That someone would want to ride a motorcycle around a twisting, paved, closed course at speeds exceeding 150 miles per hour, considering the dangers involved, would seem to require some deterministic causal explanation (e.g., a death wish). That a person does so, for example, is to be understood as participation in the social practice of road racing, which in turn is one of the practices involved in the social institution of organized motor vehicle racing. It is part of the way of life of motorcycle racing. To be sure, motorcycle racing is a sport for some and a way of life for others. Clearly only some cultures include this way of life and, accordingly, its instantiations. To explain someone's participation in the practices of their culture, then, is to explain the Significance of those behaviors and not to imply, or give, a deterministic cause.

Different cultures correspond to different modal ways of life. Each way of life in turn will involve participation in different sets of organized social practices, social institutions, and other forms of social participation. These organized sets of social practices provide the behavioral requirements that result in patterns of behavior, some of which are unique to given cultures. It is the social practices being engaged in that give coherence and meaning to the individual behaviors within those Social practices. A person, through participation in the various social practices of a culture   which fit his or her way of life—becomes socialized into his or her culture. Successful socialization occurs by virtue of the acquisition of certain Personal Characteristics that provide a good "fit" to the culture when implemented as behavioral choices. That is, people are able to make choices from among the options open to them that meet their basic needs and allow them to express themselves in a satisfying manner.

A RESEARCH APPLICATION

The general hypothesis to be pursued here is that Chicano students in an American university setting will qualify as culturally-displaced persons and that their behavior and achievements will reflect this. By virtue of their socialization into Hispanic culture and the contrasts to mainstream American culture, when a Chicano comes to the university as a freshmen he or she is operating within a substantially "foreign" culture.

The difficulties encountered by Chicanos in educational institutions are often attributed to deficits in their prior academic preparation. There is evidence, however, that other factors, cultural and personal, are as important as academic factors (Ramirez, et al., 1971).

One of the major ways in which socialization is manifest is that nonnormative

behaviors will tend to not merely be rejected in fact, but to be literally unthinkable. If suggested, the general response is ''I couldn't do that (and still be me)''. Thus, they do not even come up for decision. Correspondingly, one would expect that a manner in which culture conflict will be expressed for Chicano students is that some university activities and practices essential for academic success will be seriously inhibited or ruled out altogether. As such, Chicano identity and general Chicano values that conflict with institutionalized Anglo values appear to be among the most likely extra-academic factors that make it difficult for Chicano students to function successfully.

In principle, in a culture conflict situation, the required forms of participation to a large extent are incompatible only with the concrete, customary performances rather than with central cultural values and styles. The life-sustaining interdependence of the early Native Americans, who had a tribal way of life, fostered a strong cultural value of maintaining interpersonal harmony among group members. The expression of that value in one culture may have required the individualistic gathering and storing of food, whereas in another all food may have been gathered and stored as community property. The social practices that developed in each culture would reflect the differing circumstances and other cultural values held by the respective cultural group. One would want to consider, for example, the type of food available and the tasks faced in gathering it. Did it require group effort? Also, the cultural values around division of labor would have their interactive effect. The differing social practices around something as basic as food gathering and storing would no doubt have an influence on less central social practices, creating a pattern of practices quite distinct cross-culturally. On the concrete level of custom, it is easy to see the potential for culture conflict. One group could see the others as engaging in *individualistic hoarding*. From the other side, it would seem unthinkable, or at least an imposition, to be so *dependent* on one's neighbors for food.

An individual who identifies primarily with the concrete customs and performances of his culture (i.e., a Performative person) can be expected to experience serious difficulty when faced with the necessity for participating in the host culture practices, since these appear to be literally incompatible. In contrast, an individual who identifies primarily with his culture's central values and styles at the level of significance will be capable of engaging in the host culture activities without serious conflicts.

HYPOTHESIS 1. *Performative persons will participate less in the institutions of the host culture than will less performative persons.*

HYPOTHESIS 2. *Performative persons will see more conflict between their values and host culture practices and requirements than will less performative persons.*

HYPOTHESIS 3.   *The more a person sees specific conflicts between essential host cultural institutional practices and his or her own central values or self-concept, the less he or she will participate in those institutional practices.*

HYPOTHESIS 4.   *Persons who do not identify cultural values with specific cultural practices will be better able to participate effectively in host culture institutions.*

Methods.

Sample.   Subjects for the study were 36 full-time freshmen Chicano students, 19 male and 17 female, at the University of California, Davis. They began their freshman year in the Fall quarter of the 1979–80 academic year. The sample consisted of students who were identified as ''high ethnic Chicanos'' by means of an inventory of central cultural values (Ethnicity Index). This index was included in the Chicano Cross-Cultural Research Questionnaire (CCRQ). Both the questionnaire and the index are described in the section, ''Experimental instruments''.

None of the students had completed more than 9 units of transferable credit at another educational institution prior to entering University of California, Davis as freshmen. Re-entry students (i.e., those who were re-entering the educational system after an extended absence) were excluded from the study.

The average age of the students at the time of the study was 19 years. They were U.S. citizens who had lived most of their life in California. Their parents, for the most part, had started, but not completed high school. The majority of students in the sample, then, were the first generation to graduate from high school and enter an institution of higher education. Income level of the parents ranged from $12,000 to $20,000.

Students selected for the study fell into two groups based on their university admissions status:

Group I.   *Those students who were admitted to the University by Special Action (i.e., they did not meet the established admissions criteria, but showed other evidence of academic promise). There were 14 such students in the sample.*

Group II.   *Those students who were regular admissions (i.e., did meet the established admissions criteria of the University). There were 22 such students in the sample.*

The students in both groups were in the Educational Opportunity Program (EOP) at University of California, Davis. EOP status is the combined result of a

student's request to be in the program and meeting established program guidelines. All EOP students have some structured interaction with the program's support services (e.g., counseling, peer advising, class scheduling, etc.). Because of the small number of incoming freshman Chicano students who met the selection criteria for inclusion in the study, an effort was made to contact each of them for participation in the study.

Experimental instruments.   Two separate questionnaires were devised for the study, The Participation Rating Sheet (PRS), and the Chicano Cross-Cultural Research Questionnaire (CCRQ). The PRS identified a student and the course in which he or she was enrolled. It asked either the faculty member or teaching assistant who taught the course to rate the student's overall level of participation in the course, independent of base level academic abilities. An eight-point scale was used ranging from an ''absolute minimum level of participation'' to ''absolute maximum level of participation.'' Descriptions of the sort of behaviors to consider were included for clarity. For students, this data would constitute an assessment of legitimate overall participation in essential university social practices. A copy of the PRS can be found in Appendix A.

The CCRQ contained items related to: (a) Chicano central cultural values, (b) university social practices or requirements, and (c) concrete cultural performances. Questions were rated on an eight-point scale keyed to the type of question asked. The Chicano central cultural values and potentially conflictual university practices or requirements as described for the CCRQ are listed in Appendix B. Sample descriptions of concrete cultural performances are contained in the description of the Performative and Significance Indices. The selection and description of all items as they appear on the CCRQ are an expression of the researchers knowledge about and experience within both the Chicano cultural context and the university environment.

The individual items on the CCRQ were components of indices conceptually related to a parametric analysis of Behavior as Intentional Action (Ossorio, 1981). The conceptual relationship of the indices to the Parameters of Behavior is shown in Appendix C. The various indices are described in detail below:

Ethnicity Index.   An assessment of identification with Chicano cultural values. Consists of CCRQ questions based on Research Descriptions 1 through 5 of Appendix B (e.g., ''How important is it for you to be someone who fits in well with your family?''). Each question is rated for degree of importance on an eight-point scale.

High Ethnic Chicanos.   Those Chicanos whose mean score on the Ethnicity Index is 4 or greater.

Performative Index.   An assessment of how closely cultural identity is tied to the concrete performances of one's home culture. Consists of CCRQ questions which equate being Chicano with concrete cultural practices (e.g., ''Someone

isn't a real Chicano, or Chicana, if he or she does not do these things when he or she gets a chance: Go to church at least on special occasions, attend large family gatherings, or speak some Spanish.''). Each question is rated for degree of agreement on an eight-point scale. Higher mean scores indicate Performative cultural identity.

Significance Index.   An assessment of cultural identity that is not tied to specific cultural performances. Consists of a CCRQ question, which places cultural identity on the level of significance (''Being Chicano, or Chicana, is something you carry inside you, not what you visibly do?''). Higher scores on an eight-point scale indicate Significant cultural identity.

Flexibility Index.   An assessment of flexibility in values implementation. Consists of the relative scores between the Performative Index and the Significance Index. A decision table was designed to establish the Flexibility Index Score (Appendix D).

Conflict Index.   An assessment of the degree to which Chicano cultural values (as part of one's self concept) conflict with university practices or requirements essential for continued participation and success. Consist of CCRQ questions which pair, in all combinations, Research Descriptions 1 through 5 with those numbered 7 through 12 of Appendix B (e.g., ''Does being someone who fits in well with your family conflict with spending a lot of time around white, middle-class people?''). Each paired description is rated for degree of agreement on an eight-point scale. The product of scores between a paired description and the corresponding Ethnicity Index item is used to generate a Conflict score. A weighted mean Conflict Index score is used to account for the fact that an absence of conflict in one area does not completely account for the presence of conflict in another (as would be implied by simple averaging).

Pure Ethnicity Conflict Index.   An assessment of the degree to which pure ethnic identity as a Chicano conflicts with specific university practices or requirements. Consists of CCRQ questions that pair Research Description 6 with those numbered 7 through 12 of Appendix B (e.g., ''Does being Chicano conflict with studying alone a lot of the time?''). Each paired description is rated for degree of agreement on an eight-point scale. Higher mean scores indicate pure ethnic identity conflict.

Academic Knowledge and Abilities Index.   An assessment of academic knowledge and abilities. Consists of standardized scores on established academic knowledge and ability indicators (i.e., high school grade-point averages, Scholastic Achievement Test scores, the number of university-required high school course ommissions, and university math and English placement exams). An unweighted mean composite score was used.

Academic Achievement Index.   A scale corresponding to a university Grade Point Average (GPA), but which takes into account pass/no pass and other courses that do not contribute to a GPA. Results in an adjusted Grade Point Average (AGPA).

Academic Success.   An AGPA of 2.00 (equivalent to a C average), or great-
er, for the last complete quarter of full-time attendance.

Participation Index.   An assessment of a student's overall course participa-
tion independent of exam scores. Consists of the Participation Rating Sheet
(PRS), Appendix A, which asks faculty and teaching assistants to rate the stu-
dent's participation level on an eight-point scale. Higher mean scores indicate
greater participation.

Procedure.   The EOP program at the University of California, Davis is de-
centralized, which means that its functions as a support program are performed
by established university services. EOP Counseling, a program component, is
performed within the University Counseling Center by professional staff mem-
bers. Data gathering for the study took place in the Center where the researcher
works as a staff psychologist.

Because of the structured interaction with the EOP program, it was possible
through posted notices, referral from other staff members, and direct contact, to
communicate with incoming Chicano students and request their participation in
the study. Those students indicating a willingness to take part in the study were
given an appointment with the researcher. When the students came for the
appointment, they were given a copy of the CCRQ with an Informed Consent
Form. They were given instructions for filling out the CCRQ and allowed about
forty-five minutes to complete the questionnaire. About fifteen minutes were
provided at the end for any questions they had.

At the end of the time period, subjects were requested not to discuss any aspect
of the study with other students. The one exception to this was that they could
encourage other Chicano freshmen to take part in the study.

Data gathering with the CCRQ took place the last half of the Winter quarter
during the 1979–80 academic year. PRS forms were sent through campus mail to
faculty members of all classes the subjects were currently enrolled in, with the
exception of physical education courses (where participation is mandatory). PRS
forms were sent out in a like manner the last half of the Spring quarter for each
person in the sample group.

Demographic data on each subject were obtained from student records on file
with the Counseling Center, Admissions Office, and Registrar's Office of the
University. Earned grades and grade points for each class completed during the
academic year were obtained from official transcript data on file at the Center for
EOP students.

Results

The first hypothesis was that Performative persons would participate less in
the institutions of the host culture than would less performative persons. The
prediction stated that the scores on the Performative Index would correlate nega-
tively with scores on the Participation Index. One-tailed Pearson correlations

were used to analyze the data relative to this and other predictions. The predic-
tion did not hold up for the total sample group ($r = .09$, $p = .29$). There were no
appreciable differences between the two subgroups used in the study.

The second hypothesis was that Performative persons would see more conflict
between their values and host culture practices and requirements than less Per-
formative persons. The prediction stated that there will be a positive correlation
between scores on the Performative Index and scores on the Conflict Index.
There was a moderate positive correlation for the total sample group substantiat-
ing the hypothesis ($r = .44$, $p = .004$). Looking at each of the subgroups
separately reveals some sharp differences. Group II had a moderately strong
correlation ($r = .66$, $p = .001$), while Group I was near zero ($r = -.07$, $p = .41$).

The third hypothesis was that the more a person sees specific conflicts between
essential host culture institutional practices and his or her own central cultural
values, the less he or she will participate in those institutional practices (since
participation would violate his or her self-concept).

The first prediction for this hypothesis was that scores on the Conflict Index
will correlate negatively with scores on the Participation Index. For the total
sample group, the correlation was in the predicted direction, but not statistically
significant ($r = -.11$, $p = .27$). There were no appreciable differences in the
subgroups. The second prediction was that scores on the Pure Ethnicity Conflict
Index will correlate negatively with scores on the Participation Index. The cor-
relation was moderate and negative, substantiating the hypothesis ($r = -.34$, $p = .02$).

For the second prediction of hypothesis 3, there were subgroup differences.
Consideration of Group I only reveals a low negative correlation ($r = -.27$, $p = .18$). Group II, by contrast, shows a stronger negative relationship between
the two indices ($r = -.44$, $p = .02$).

The fourth hypothesis was that persons who do not identify cultural values
with specific cultural practices will be better able to participate effectively in host
culture institutions. The first prediction for this hypothesis was that scores on the
Flexibility Index will correlate positively with scores on the Participation Index.
The correlation was low and negative ($r = -.20$, $p = .12$). There were no
subgroup differences. The second prediction for hypothesis 4 was that scores on
the Flexibility Index will correlate positively with scores on the Academic
Achievement Index, allowing for academic knowledge and ability.

Making allowance for academic knowledge and ability was done by taking
into account the Academic Knowledge and Abilities (AKA) Index. The Index
provided a way of predicting which individuals in Group I could be expected to
succeed academically even though they had not met the regular university en-
trance requirements. Group II, by contrast, was described as having the relevant
academic knowledge and abilities by virtue of having met the regular admissions
requirements of the university. Thus, the prediction was considered to apply to
only the subgroups. The prediction did not hold up for Group I ($r = -.14$, p

= .05). For Group II, the correlation was in the predicted direction, but not statistically significant ($r = .20, p = .18$).

Discussion and Implications

The principal findings of the study were substantially different for the two subgroups. This calls for some description of their relative characteristics and circumstances beyond mere identification.

Group II consisted of students who had met the regular admissions standard of the university. This means that not only had they participated in high school, they had done so successfully. Group I students, for a number of reasons, seem not to have participated to the same degree in that they have not been as successful academically. It is reasonable to expect, then, that students from each group would continue to participate on a level in keeping with their established patterns. This is substantiated by the fact that Group II had a higher mean on the Participation Index than Group I.

The high schools the students in both groups attended tend to reflect the ethnic composition of the surrounding community—at least within the student body if not among the faculty and staff. In addition, the students generally lived at home with their families. Thus participation in high school could be carried out from a cultural "home-base" as it were. In contrast, the University of California, Davis remains a predominantly white, middle-class, educational institution in terms of its student body, faculty, and staff. Furthermore, it is situated on the edge of a small university town that mirrors the university in this respect. Because of the distance involved, many Chicano students have to relocate to Davis and do not commute from their home communities. The sum effect is that the cultural "home-base" has been lost for most Chicano students.

With these factors in mind it can be understood that a Chicano student could have been participating successfully throughout high school with a minimum of cultural conflict. The same level of participation at the university, however, may generate previously unexperienced and unexpected cultural conflict. This would be more pronounced for Group II given their higher overall level of participation at both high school and the university.

Relating the principal findings of the study, including the subgroup differences, to the experimental hypotheses suggests the following conclusions:

1. Having a Performative cultural identity (i.e., being a Performative person) is not linearly related to one's level of participation in host culture social practices. Rather, the "cost" of a Performative cultural identity seems to be one of cultural conflict—to the extent that one has the motivation to participate and does so.

2. Cultural conflict between one's central cultural values and the social practices of the host culture has little linear relationship to one's participation in those practices.

3.   Cultural conflict between one's pure ethnic identity and the social prac-
tices of the host culture is negatively and linearly related to one's participation in
those practices.

4.   Flexibility in cultural values implementation has little linear relationship
to either participation in host culture social practices or successful participation.

One of the problems evident in the study was the failure of the Flexibility
Index to capture the relevant categories. Sixty-nine percent of the individuals
sampled were at the highest point on the Index, and 89 percent were in the upper
half. While this may be an accurate reflection of the flexibility in values imple-
mentation for this particular group, the broad category effect of the Index under-
standably affected the statistical analysis and must be taken into account when
reviewing the results.

The findings of the study suggest an expansion of the conceptualization in
terms of the possible resolutions to cultural conflict.

Engaging in host culture practices in a manner that does not violate one's
cultural values, by exploiting the options intrinsic to social practices, was consid-
ered a primary form of resolution. The potential "resolution" of choosing not to
engage in host culture practices at any more than the required minimal level was
also considered. The former represents a successful integration of one's home
culture and a host culture when both are operative for a person, whereas the latter
would represent a resolution which is less than optimal for both cultures—
although it may be necessary for self-preservation at times.

The findings of the study indicate that having a Performative cultural identity
did not lower one's level of participation in host culture practices. In addition,
conflict between one's central cultural values and essential host culture practices
had only a low negative relationship to participation in those practices. This
would seem to indicate other "resolutions" to cultural displacement than exploi-
tation of the social practice structure, particularly for Performative persons.

One possibility is that individuals who would potentially have lower participa-
tion levels related to cultural conflict could participate in host culture social
practices in a *dissociated* manner. In effect, "when in Rome, they are Romans".
Their participation in host culture practices has roughly the same significance for
them on a cultural level as it has for host culture persons. When operating within
a home culture context, their participation in home culture social practices has
the cultural significance of the home culture. Thus, two cultures are operative for
these persons which are potentially conflictual, and they are able to participate in
one or the other by keeping them well separated. One factor to consider in this
respect is that for many Chicanos, the language of choice when in the company
of friends or family is Spanish over English. In fact, the tenacity of Chicanos in
keeping alive their home culture language has been noted in the literature
(Moore, 1976). Speaking Spanish may not only be a way of keeping one's

cultural roots, it could also serve to help one live with cultural conflict in a way that allows participation in the host culture.

Another resolution to cultural conflict that would allow a person to participate in the host culture would be to participate with an *ulterior motive*. This was covered in the conceptualization within the context of intrinsic and nonintrinsic forms of participation in social practices. It may be a more common way of living with cultural conflict than its ''cost'' would suggest. Primarily, much of the satisfaction of participation in host culture social practices is almost certain to be lost and it is difficult to sustain participation under these conditions. The significance of engaging in the host culture social practices is part of the *home* culture and does not include any integration of the host culture. The ulterior motive is to pass oneself off as ''one of them'' for whatever benefit participation in the host culture may hold for a given individual. (Accordingly there is also some danger of being found out.)

Both dissociative participation and participation with an ulterior motive may be effective in circumventing the expected effects of cultural conflict. As such, they allow a culturally displaced person, who might not otherwise do so, to participate in host culture social practices. Both resolutions, however, are less than optimal for members of *both* cultures.

Participation in those options of a social practice which do not violate one's cultural values, but still constitute legitimate and potentially successful participation, is the in-principle way of achieving cultural integration. Through participation of this sort one can learn to appreciate and understand the host culture significance of a given social practice. An optimal cultural integration for a person would result in cultural enrichment for members of both cultures.

It is through successful participation in the social practices of another culture that people acquire the new values that allow them to appreciate and understand the social practices of another culture, and at the same time allow them to gain new appreciation of the social practices of their *own* culture. The acquisition of new values, concepts, perspectives, and forms of behavior through cultural integration enriches the lives and cultures of persons from both cultural groups.

Concluding Statement

This study calls attention to the liability of ''culture-free'' formulations of human behavior. The conceptual adequacy of the cultural determinism model is questioned and some of its shortcomings pointed out. More importantly, a *concept of culture* is presented which makes explicit the logical links between persons, values, behavior, and culture.

The foremost intent of the research application was the demonstration of a more conceptually adequate approach to research in the area of cultural differences and displacement than that offered by the cultural determinism model. The present study, drawing as it did on the conceptualization rather than relying

on the cultural determinism model, did not result in the time-worn cataloging of deficits attributed to Chicano cultural values, personal characteristics, or culture. Nevertheless, the study focused on cultural conflict on the level of cultural values and thereby demonstrated a *culturally relativistic approach* to research in this area. At the same time, the study contributes to our understanding of cultural displacement in general, and Chicanos in particular.

Cultural determinism studies predictably conclude with the "recommendation" that Chicanos (or other cultural groups) give up their cultural values and adopt those of the dominant Anglo culture (e.g., Keller, 1971; Schwartz 1968). This is neither an acceptable nor a plausible approach to the problems of the culturally displaced person. The conclusion here, by contrast, is that through intrinsic, successful participation in each other's social practices, persons from Chicano and Anglo cultural backgrounds can begin to recognize, appreciate, and understand what they have to offer one another—*this is education.*

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

REFERENCES

Gordon, M. M. *Assimilation in American Life.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.

Heller, C. S. *Mexican American Youth: Forgotten youth at the crossroads.* New York: Random House, 1966.

Keller, R. A. The educational aspirations and achievements of Mexican-Americans in a northern community—an historical descriptive study (Doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University, 1971). *Dissertation Abstracts International,* 1971, *32,* 2452A. (University Microfilms No. 71–29, 755), Abstract.

Kluckhohn, F. R., & Strodtbeck, F. L. *Variations in value orientations.* New York: Row, Peterson, and Company, 1961.

Madsen, W. *Mexican Americans of South Texas.* San Francisco: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964.

Marsella, A. J., & Pedersen, P. B. *Cross-Cultural counseling and psychotherapy.* New York: Pergamon Press, 1981.

Montiel, M. The social science myth of the Mexican American family. *El Grito,* 1970, *3* (4), 56–63.

Moore, J. W. with Pachon, H. *Mexican Americans* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1976.

Ossorio, P. G. *"What actually happens"*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1978. (Originally published in an earlier version in 1971 as LRI Report No. 10a. Whittier and Boulder: Linguistic Research Institute.)

Ossorio, P. G. Outline of Descriptive Psychology for personality theory and clinical applications. In K. E. Davis (Ed.), *Advances in Descriptive Psychology* (Vol. 1). Greenwich, Conn.: JAI Press, 1981. (Originally published in 1970 as LRI Report No. 4d. Whittier and Boulder: Linguistic Research Institute.)

Padilla, A. Psychological research and the Mexican American. In J. Burma (Ed.), *Mexican Americans in the United States*. Cambridge: Schenkman Publishing Co., 1970.

Ramirez, M., Taylor, C., & Peterson, B. Mexican-American cultural membership and adjustment to school. *Developmental Psychology*, 1971, *4*(2), 141–148.

Romano-V, O. I. The anthropology and sociology of Mexican-Americans: The distortion of history. *El Grito*, 1968, *2*(1), 13–26.

Saunders, L. *Cultural differences and medical care: The case of the Spanish-speaking people of the Southwest*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1954.

Schwartz, A. J. Affectivity orientations and academic achievement of Mexican-American youth (Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1967). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1968, *28* 4732A–4733A. (University Microfilms No. 68–7483, 388), Abstract.

Segall, M. H. *Cross-Cultural Psychology*. Monterey, CA.: Brooks/Cole, 1979.

Silva, J. C. What actually happened to Jose: A Descriptive Psychology approach to cultural values implementation for a culturally displaced person (Doctoral dissertation, University of Colorado, Boulder, 1980). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1981, *42* 432B. (University Microfilms No. 8114009).

Vaca, N. C. The Mexican-American in the social sciences, 1912–1970. (Part II: 1936–1970). *El Grito*, 1970, *4*(1), 17–51.

Wallace A. *Culture and personality* (2nd ed.). New York: Random House, 1970.

APPENDIX A
PARTICIPATION RATING SHEET (PRS)

Faculty Member or T.A.

INSTRUCTIONS: _____ has been a class member in your ___ course, section ____, 19__. Please rate his/her level of overall class participation. In assigning a numerical value to his/her level of participation take account of such things as: [if applicable]

> Number of absences or late arrivals; required assignments; involvement in classroom activity; deadline dates for assignments; extra work turned in; homework; asking relevant questions in class; disruptiveness, etc. *Important: Please do not include any assessment of the student's base level of academic abilities or knowledge. This is an assessment of the level of participation only.*

* * *

MAKE YOUR RATING BY CIRCLING *ONE NUMBER ONLY* ON THE FOLLOWING SCALE

1. *Absolute minimum level of participation:* High number of unexcused absences; little or no attention in class; general noninvolvement in classroom activities; little or no homework or labwork completed, etc. Does the very least one can do.
2. *Low level of participation.*
3. *Somewhat low level of participation.*
4. *Slightly toward a lower level of participation:* Reasonable and effective participation, but not especially noteworthy in any respect.
5. *Slightly toward a higher level of participation:* Reasonable and effective participation, but not especially noteworthy in any respect.
6. *Somewhat high level of participation.*
7. *High level of participation.*
8. *Absolute maximum level of participation:* No unexcused absences; all assignments in on time; total involvement in class; complete attention in class; all lab and homework completed on time, etc. Does the very most one could do.

APPENDIX B
CENTRAL CHICANO CULTURAL VALUES AND
POTENTIALLY CONFLICTUAL UNIVERSITY PRACTICES
OR REQUIREMENTS

Cultural Value: CCRQ Description

1. *La Familia* (The extended family): Being someone who fits in well with his or her family.
2. *Communidad* (Community): Being someone who shares.
3. *Respeco* (Respect): Being someone who is informal in social situations.
4. *La Cultura* (The culture): Being someone who does not become like Anglos.
5. *Hermandad* (Brotherhood): Being someone who maintains solidarity with other Chicanos.
6. *Chicanismo* (Pure Ethnicity): Being Chicano.

The following are specific university practices or requirements essential for continued participation or success which are hypothesized to be potentially in conflict with the central cultural values listed above:

7. Learning to write and speak standard English.
8. Keeping to a schedule a lot of the time.
9. Attending a predominantly white college.
10. Trying to get a good grade in class.
11. Spending a lot of time around white, middle-class people.
12. Studying alone a lot of the time.

(e.g., "Being someone who does not become like Anglos" could potentially conflict with "attending a predominantly white college," especially for someone who was not flexible in their values implementation [a Performative person]).

APPENDIX C
CONCEPTUAL RELATIONSHIP OF INDICES TO PARAMETERS OF BEHAVIOR AS INTENTIONAL ACTION

K = The cognitive parameter

The Ethnicity, Performative, and Significance indices centered on a particular state of affairs as being distinguished (i.e., oneself in relationship to Chicano central cultural values and their expression.)

W = The motivational parameter

The Conflict and Pure Ethnicity Conflict indices centered on a state of affairs as being wanted (i.e., participation and success in essential university social practices given one's identity as a Chicano and expression of central cultural values).

KH = The competence parameter

The Academic Knowledge and Abilities Index was centered on a prior state of affairs as a relevant learning history (i.e., the level of academic knowledge and abilities previously acquired).

P = The process, or procedural, parameter

The Participation Index centered on the process of participation at the university (i.e., the level of participation in essential university social practices).

A = The result, or outcome, parameter

The Academic Achievement Index centered on the event of succeeding academically (i.e., achieving a grade point average which kept one in good academic standing).

APPENDIX D
DECISION TABLE FOR ESTABLISHING FLEXIBILITY SCORES

SIGNIFICANCE INDEX SCORE

PERFORMANCE DEX CORE	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1	OUT	OUT	OUT	2	4	4	4	4
2	OUT	OUT	OUT	2	4	4	4	4
3	OUT	OUT	OUT	2	4	4	4	4
4	2	2	2	2	4	4	4	4
5	1	1	1	1	3	3	3	3
6	1	1	1	1	3	3	3	3
7	1	1	1	1	3	3	3	3
8	1	1	1	1	3	3	3	3

The Flexibility Decision Table is designed to establish Flexibility Scores below the mid-point for any person with a Performative Index Score of 5 or greater. Thus, a Performative person is defined as having low flexibility (in values implementation) and its attendant problems, even though he or she may score high on the Significance Index. A person who scores low on both Performance and Significance Indices would seem to have a low level of ethnic identity and therefore not be suitable for the study.