

CULTURAL AND LINGUISTIC CHARACTERISTICS OF MEXICAN-AMERICANS:
A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE FOR COUNSELORS

by

JANET KAY ASHER

M.A., New York University, 1969

5248

A MASTER'S REPORT

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Education

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1971

Approved by:


Major Professor

**THIS BOOK
CONTAINS
NUMEROUS PAGES
WITH THE
ORIGINAL
PRINTING ON THE
PAGE CROOKED
THIS IS THE BEST
IMAGE
AVAILABLE**

LD
2668
R4
1971
A8
C.2

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	5
CULTURAL CHARACTERISTICS OF SIGNIFICANCE TO THE COUNSELOR.....	5
The Family and Personalism.....	5
<u>Machismo</u> and Honor.....	17
Fatalism and Time.....	21
Religion.....	27
<u>Curanderismo</u> and Ethnopsychiatry.....	32
<u>La Raza</u> and Acculturation.....	37
LINGUISTIC FACTORS OF SIGNIFICANCE TO THE COUNSELOR.....	46
The Spanish Language and Bilingualism.....	46
The Spanish Language and Testing.....	53
The Spanish Language and School Problems.....	62
3. CONCLUSIONS FOR COUNSELING.....	79
Self-Referral.....	79
The Dyadic Encounter.....	83
Unconditional Positive Regard.....	87
Values.....	89
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	94

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Over the past decade a mounting body of evidence has raised issues questioning the appropriateness of traditional counseling methods for this nation's cultural minorities. In the case of the Mexican-American, cultural and linguistic differences between himself and the Anglo counselor have virtually precluded an effective counselor-client relationship. The counselor's special responsibility to attempt to overcome these barriers becomes clear in light of the fact that it is precisely these cultural and linguistic differences which underlie most of the Mexican-American's adjustment problems: educational, vocational, and social. This review of the literature of cultural and linguistic characteristics of Mexican-Americans provides the counselor with the necessary background information in order that he might better understand and communicate with his client.

The report presents an overview of general findings from the literature written since 1950. However, a few references are made to works of ourstanding historical value written in the 1940s.

It is important to emphasize that while this report focuses on broad cultural trends, the characteristics of any

individual Mexican-American cannot necessarily be inferred on the basis of such generalizations. As the Mexican-Americans become increasingly acculturated into American society, the archetypes presented here may be of less value in understanding a given individual.

The 1960 United States Census revealed that there are approximately five-and-one-half million Mexican-Americans in the United States. The majority of whom live in five South-western States: Texas, Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico and California. Only about 10 percent live outside these States.

The ancestors of present-day Mexican-Americans came voluntarily to the United States, some as long as three-hundred years ago. No restriction was placed on immigration from Mexico to the United States until 1968. A sizable number emigrated to the United States during the period between World War I and the Great Depression. The Depression stopped immigration until World War II created an intense need for field workers and cheap labor. Mexican nationals, called braceros supplied this cheap labor during and after the war. Eventually, native-born Mexican-Americans complained that the Mexican braceros (field laborers) were stealing their jobs and forcing wages down by creating an oversupply of cheap labor. The present immigration law passed in 1968 admits up to 120,000 Mexican immigrants a year, plus the wives and children of those who become citizens.

On the basis of 1960 Census data, Burma (1970) ranked most Mexican-Americans among the lower socio-economic strata of American society. Saunders (1966) held that many of the

differences between Mexican-Americans and Anglos are due more to the culture of poverty than to Spanish cultural heritage per se. In a stereotyped view, he suggested, lower class Anglos resemble Mexican-Americans. Saunders (1966) also indicated that emphasis should be placed on social class differences rather than on ethnic differences.

Most researchers might agree in part with Saunders, but some still maintain that there are valid differences existing between Anglos and Mexican-Americans due to an Hispanic cultural orientation rather than exclusively to poverty.

These researchers argue that the unique characteristics of Mexican-American culture cause Mexican-Americans to view life differently than do Anglo-Americans. Luna (1966) for example, found that differences in world views between Mexican-Americans and Anglo-Americans may be seen in divergent concepts of: time, change, success, efficiency, education, and modes of communication. Simmons (1952) contrasted Mexican-American values with Anglo values in regard to such matters as the status of women, child training, male-female relationships, honor, masculinity, dependence, and conception of time and language as a means of categorizing experience for its users. Edmondson (1957) cited six salient value orientations peculiar to Mexican-American culture: traditionalism, "familism," paternalism, personalism, dramatism, and fatalism.

This study reviewed the literature relating to Mexican-American concepts of the family and personalism, machismo and honor, fatalism and time, curanderismo and ethnopsychiatry,

religion, and La Raza and acculturation. It also explored issues of interest to the counselor related to bilingualism, language, testing and education.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

CULTURAL CHARACTERISTICS OF SIGNIFICANCE TO THE COUNSELOR

The Family and Personalism

Definition. The basic unit of family organization is the conjugal family of husband, wife, and unmarried children, although intimate bonds are maintained with the extended family.

According to Madsen (1964), the family is the main focus of social identification in all classes of Mexican-American society. A person is first a member of a particular family and second an individual with his unique characteristics.

Sheldon (1966) defined personalism as loyalty to persons rather than to ideas. Individual achievement is devalued because it may bring on envy or resentment from one's peers. Personalism places emphasis on concrete personal relations as the delineating factor in determining an individual's loyalties and obligations. To define personalism, Simmons (1952:109) pointed out that in the development of "self-hood:"

...the process of assimilation of love objects to the identification of self does not usually go beyond the inclusion of those who are most intimately linked to the individual, i.e., family and friends.

The Mexican-American identifies so possessively with his

loved ones that they become an integral component of the "front" he presents to the world. The consequence of this strong identification is that the welfare of loved ones is bound up with that of the self. Any attempt by an "outsider" to share in or possess love objects thus assimilated is interpreted as an attack upon the self.

The concepts of the traditional family and personalism are closely related in their influence upon interpersonal relations.

Explanation. The family is viewed as a haven from the hostility of the outside world. The family protects its members in return for their impeccable conduct. Each member represents his family. To disgrace oneself is to disgrace not only the nuclear family, but the extended family comprised of grandparents, aunts, uncles, cousins, etc., as well.

Family members tend toward strict observance of traditional family roles. Woods (1956:232) described the role of the Mexican-American father as authoritarian and patriarchal. Traditionally he remains aloof from the petty details of the household, "...and does not wish to be bothered with complaints or requests." He receives obedience and respect from his wife and children, and is never questioned as to his activities outside the home.

Madsen (1964) explained the father's role as one of policing the family to preserve its public image of an honorable unit. He mediates between the family and society holding himself responsible for each member's behavior. He

judges and punishes transgressions of family members. Children are not encouraged to confide in their father. He discourages any show of affection by his aloofness, demanding instead service and obedience.

The Mexican-American mother, according to Woods (1956) is subordinate to her husband in every way. She is expected to respect and obey him without question. Indeed, questioning her husband's authority is an unpardonable sin meriting a beating. Even when beaten, she must accept it as punishment deserved, and a sign of love from her husband. Woods (1956) suggested Mexican-American women have martyr complexes in that they believe it is a women's lot to suffer in silence at the hands of men.

Madsen (1964) wrote that the Latin wife must never express sadness or anger over her husband's extramarital affairs. The community does not censure a man for indulging in such relationships as long as he continues to fulfill his other familial obligations. The wife is to view these escapades as a natural need of men to express their virility. Simmons (1952) postulated that, traditionally, fear of loss of financial support has had much to do with the tendency of women to tolerate these extra-marital amours.

The Mexican-American wife sets the tone of the home atmosphere as comfortable and protective:

In her role as wife and mother, she is frequently compared with the Virgin of Guadalupe. This holy model for female behavior possesses all the most prized values of womanhood: Purity, sanctity, tolerance, love, and sympathy. By extension, but rarely by direct comparison, the

husband and father is seen as a human image of God. He is aloof, absolute, and forceful in administering justice. (Madsen, 1964:48)

Further insight may be obtained into the husband and wife roles through examination of parent-child relationships and child training patterns. Census figures suggest that Mexican-Americans place a high premium on children. Simmons (1952) explained that the tendency to control the number of children in proportion to the ability to provide for them, or because income could be used to raise the family's standard of living, has been foreign to the majority of Mexican-American parents. They believe children are a blessing from God, and that somehow they will always be able to provide for another child.

In Tuck's (1946) view, early childhood in a Mexican-American home is a time in which both parents are extremely permissive with their siblings. Madsen (1964) told us they are called angelitos (little angels, cheribs) and are believed to be wholly untouched by sin. Young children receive vast amounts of attention from parents and other relatives who delight in observing the antics of their children and recounting their past exploits. Young children are also held and fondled a good deal by all adults and other siblings. With the arrival of a younger brother or sister, said Madsen (1964), the child is expected to share in the responsibility of caring for him and is often expected to fend for himself while his parents devote all their time to the new arrival. If older siblings are not available to assume the parental role, explained

Simmons (1952), mothers will carry the infant about with them everywhere, putting the child down only to do housework. Even when financially able to afford a baby-sitter, Mexican-American parents have not usually been inclined to do so. Children of all ages accompany their parents almost everywhere. Parents do not restrain children in public places. They are usually allowed to run about; shout to each other, and so on.

No feeding schedule is imposed on the Mexican-American baby, and he is even breast fed in public if the need arises. Older children, likewise, are not forced to eat at mealtime if they do not wish to do so. Children are weaned between the ages of one and a half and two, and toilet trained at about the age of two.

Despite the prevalence of permissiveness and indulgence, obedience and respect toward parents and other elders are instilled at an early age. There is little evidence of ordering and forbidding, but failure to obey the rarely-issued orders usually meets with swift and often severe punishment. Simmons (1952) stated that instances of the use of physical punishment, usually spanking, are almost always the consequence of disobeying the parent. On the other hand, parents tend to believe that young children are not truly responsible for their actions and therefore should be allowed to do pretty much as they please, thus making the number of disobedient acts small, and punishment rare.

Simmons (1952) observed that "bogeyman" devices have commonly been used to control children. These include warnings

that el diablo (the devil), or la llorona (the wailing spirit of a dead mother who returns to earth seeking to be reunited with her children) may appear, to seize them, or eat them. Physical punishment is usually imposed by the mother. The father may intervene if the transgression is extremely serious.

The father's aloofness and lack of camaraderie with his children instills respect and obedience in them. Said Simmons (1952:68) of children:

...they never smoked, drank, or cursed in the presence of their fathers, even at an advanced age, and were expected to kiss their father's hand on occasion.

Older children obey their father's orders out of fear. Mexican-Americans see no virtue in their child's going out on his own in order to develop a sense of independence, although he may often be sent out to work at an early age to supplement the family income. Usually all earnings are turned over to the father as long as the children live under his roof.

Vogt and Albert (1966) found that at the onset of puberty, parents expect their children to begin acting like adults. During her teenage years the daughter is expected to learn all the duties of the home from her mother. She is usually not allowed to date until she is around fifteen or sixteen years old and is often accompanied by a chaperone or dates only in a group situation. The teenage boy on the other hand, is unrestrained. The transition from boyhood to manhood is expected to take place outside the home with his male friends.

Madsen (1964) studied the formation of loosely knit groups called palomillas among Mexican-American teenage boys.

These groups are not "gangs" in the Anglo sense of the word, for they do not claim a certain territory, nor do they have a specified leader or structural organization. Their purpose is one of group activity and comradeship. They usually are formed when a few teenage boys are merely strolling in the evening to see "what's happening," and they meet with a few more friends intent upon the same pursuit. They may go together to movies, drive-ins, bars, or other recreational places. The palomilla (group) is not to be confused with the pachuco (slang term for Mexican-Americans) gangs found in some American urban areas. Madsen (1964:58) pointed out that the "true pachuco gang is an in-group seeking identity and community through revolt against society." The male teenagers' closest relationship with a group outside the family is with the palomilla (group).

The tenets of personalism prohibit the traditional Mexican-American teenager from granting more loyalty to the palomilla than to any one of its individual members, according to Edmonson (1957). It is taken for granted that one's basic allegiances and obligations should be to those social entities which are personalized by assimilating them to the self, by making them part and parcel of the honor which one has to protect. Toward the person, group, or things which have not been personalized, the Mexican-American feels no sense of obligation, nor does he feel he can claim any rights from these in the same sense that he conceives of rights and obligations with respect to the members of the inner circle. Under these

conditions, Simmons (1952) wrote that the Mexican-American expects everyone to take care of his "own," and that receiving such benefits as jobs, gifts, praise, and so on, will be denied the individual if he has no personal claim on the person conferring.

When an individual receives a favor or benefit from an "outsider," then he is indebted to reciprocate. The giver must not be made to feel that his generosity has been taken for granted, therefore the receiver is obligated to repay, value for value, whatever benefit he received.

It is common for a Mexican-American to judge the character of another person on the basis of how well he receives a favor. Simmons (1952) observed that if the receiver is not sufficiently agradecido (grateful) and does not reciprocate the gift, then the giver will neither send another, nor have anything to do with that person again -- tal persona no es digna del favor (such a person is not worthy of the gift).

Finally, personalism enables the Mexican-American to evaluate a person in terms of what he is, rather than in terms of what he can do. Is a man really macho (virile), is a woman the epitome of purity and submissiveness? These personal qualities are more important than what their occupations are or what they have achieved in life.

Psychological and Sociological Implications. Madsen (1964) has observed that Anglicized Mexican-Americans often look upon the conservative Latin family as the main obstacle

to achievement. Economically, many young couples cannot advance because they must give money to their respective families and relatives. Still, the Latin family is a great source of security and comfort for its members.

The warm, protective atmosphere of the home reinforces dependency and obedience. Latin children, even grown adults, are never encouraged to leave their homes until they marry. If they do not marry, or even in some cases if they do, they are still encouraged to remain with their parents.

Dependency and the lack of interest Mexican-American parents have in formal education can cause profound conflicts in the child who is raised in an Anglo culture that places a premium on education and independence.

The concept of personalism makes it impossible for the individual to tolerate the idea that any part of the positive affect of a love object may be diverted to others. This is reflected, said Simmons (1952) in the uncompromising demand made by Mexican-American men that their wives be "untouched." They not only demand virgins, but also prefer that their wives have no history of previous loves. Mexican-Americans take great pains to preserve their wives fidelity after marriage by confining them to the home whenever possible.

The concept of personalism also prohibits competition among Mexican-Americans. One Mexican-American quoted by Madsen (1964:22) expressed the consequences of this concept with regard to competition:

My people cannot stand to see another rise

above them. When I rented my own little store, my best friends became jealous. When I painted my house, my neighbors thought I was trying to shame them. And after I purchased my new car several people stopped speaking to me. Every one tries to pull the one above him down to his own level, if you don't try to get ahead you are criticized for laziness or stupidity. My people are hard to live with.

Cross-Cultural Impact. The traditional Mexican-American family is bound to be affected by living in an Anglo culture. Family roles are threatened, especially the dominant masculine role. The Mexican-American father's role is changing precisely because his wife has come to identify with Anglo women and is no longer satisfied to remain in a submissive role. Women are seeking more voice in decision-making. But, if their husbands compromise their authoritative positions, they will then be subject to ridicule from the rest of the Mexican-American community. Sutherland (1970) explained that the Mexican-American woman is often in a dominant position for she can obtain work, especially domestic labor, more readily than can her husband. Many sensitive women realize the damage to their husband's machismo (male pride, virility) by taking work, but their livelihood often depends on it. Montiel (1970) agreed with Sutherland, and indicated that Mexican-American men lose self-respect when they are unemployed while their wives work.

Female children are also demanding the right to date unchaperoned, and to go to parties with girlfriends as they observe their Anglo friends doing. These younger generation Mexican-Americans are faced with the dilemma of population control. Often, their elders believe that the "Pill" is a

sinful thing, and are horrified at the mere thought of their children offending God by limiting their families in this way. The greatest fear of older Mexican-Americans is that of loosening the restraints on their daughters. Madsen (1964:53) said they abhor the lack of protection of daughters in Anglo homes and fear that: "Soon virginity will be as unknown among our unmarried girls as it is among the Anglos." This, indeed, is considered catastrophic as girls are not considered eligible marriage partners if they are not virgins, and they risk being thrown out of their homes to fend for themselves if they lose their virginity.

Ideas change slowly, but through the efforts of one man, Cesar Chavez, Mexican-Americans have been made aware that upward social mobility may be obtained through education. More Mexican-Americans are trying to stay in school despite lack of encouragement from their parents. The excessive permissiveness they experienced in childhood is not conducive to the development of that discipline they need to succeed; thus making young Mexican-American's efforts all the more laudable.

The younger generation of Mexican-Americans is also beginning to disregard the concept of personalism. They do not want their identity to be tightly bound up with that of their family; they prefer to be individuals -- Anglo style. Being an individual means acceptance on one's own merits. Therefore the Mexican-American is learning to receive benefits, i.e. gifts, a job, not because he knows the person doing the

hiring, but simply because he has the necessary skills to do the job.

There is a great need for Mexican-Americans to become less personalistic, especially in the realm of politics. Sheldon (1966) explained that personalism has prohibited the Mexican-American from uniting with his fellows and becoming a political power. Martinez (1966) postulated that even though Mexican-Americans benefited from the actions of Negroes to gain their political and economic rights, still they were not able to unite with other minorities and take part in civil rights demonstrations. Rubel (1966) also blamed personalism for the lack of political unity among Mexican-Americans. The Mexican-American is likely to vote for the candidate who seems to possess those qualities he would choose in a friend rather than for the political issues involved in his campaign.

Finally, Mexican-Americans are becoming aware of the importance of occupational choice. Since many crops are now harvested by machine, Mexican-Americans are increasingly leaving farm labor for more skilled jobs. Whereas previously great importance was placed on how well a person worked, now emphasis is also placed on what type of work a person does.

In summary, one is justified in stating that many Mexican-American ideas connected with the institutions of family and the concept of personalism are slowly changing due to Anglo influence. This phenomenon of change is extremely recent, starting with Cesar Chavez. It has turned youth against their elders and is destroying many traditional values.

These changes and their consequences will be more fully discussed in the section entitled La Raza and Acculturation of this study.

Machismo and Honor

Definition. Machismo is the quality of being extremely manly and virile. Heller (1966:35-6) found the concept of machismo embodied: "...sexual prowess, physical strength, adventurousness and courage, male dominance, self-confidence, and verbal articulation." In addition to the dominant theme of sexual virility, machismo is also intertwined with the traditional patriarchy. The male dominates the affairs of the family and especially his wife. The submissive female role complements this notion of the strong Mexican-American husband.

Explanation. According to Madsen (1964:28): "...ideally the Latin male acknowledges only the authority of his father and God. In case of conflict between these two sources of authority he should side with his father." Ramos (1962) suggested that when a Mexican-American compares his own characteristics with those of a more civilized foreigner, he is likely to console himself by asserting that even though Anglos have more technical or scientific knowledge, the Mexican-American is more macho (manly). Kiev (1968:72) stressed those qualities valued by the macho as being, "...self-restraint, self-reliance and silent suffering."

The Mexican-American macho must always be on guard against insult, for even a seemingly harmless insult in jest

will evoke an exaggerated emotional reaction from him. A macho takes himself extremely seriously. In order to safeguard himself against insult he has evolved elaborate patterns of ceremonial politeness. These patterns govern his behavior even among close friends. For example, a common reply after a person says "Glad to meet you," is "My house is your house." There are at least seven different idioms for saying "thank you" in Spanish. Such expressions enable social relations to flow smoothly with few incidents of an insulting nature. Heller (1966) observed that the Mexican-American overreaction to words is viewed as "touchiness" by most Anglos.

Psychological and Sociological Implications. The noted authority on Mexican character, Octavio Paz (1961:129-30) explained the psychological aspects of machismo:

The idea of manliness is never to 'crack,' never to break down. Those who 'open themselves up' are cowards....The Mexican can bend, can bow humbly, can even stoop, but he cannot back down, that is, he cannot allow the outside world to penetrate his privacy. ...The Mexican macho -- the male -- is a hermetic being, closed up in himself.... Stoicism is the most exalted of...attributes.

Madsen (1964) observed that the Mexican-American who is muuy macho (very manly) must prove to his friends that his sexual desires are virtually overwhelming for his wife and therefore he must have extramarital affairs. For those Mexican-Americans who are financially able, the custom of a casa chica (a mistress in a second household) gives them enormous status among male friends.

The macho defends himself by learning to duel verbally,

he never backs down in the face of a challenge, nor does he ever get close to a person emotionally. Close friendships may be limited to a single confidant, a male peer, never his wife. Women, because they are more open and vulnerable emotionally, are considered untrustworthy and inferior.

Another issue related to machismo is birth control. Grebler, Moore and Guzman (1970) conducted a study in a small California community among lower-class Mexican-Americans. The results indicated that it was more often the husband than the wife who objected to the use of contraceptives. Occasional interviewees had gone to the extreme of taking away or hiding birth-control pills prescribed for the wife. Two pharmacists in the community stated that some Mexican-American women would not permit pill purchases to be put on the family charge account. They insisted on paying cash to conceal their purchases from their husbands. Grebler, Moore and Guzman (1970) concluded that masculine potency and dominance are symbolized by the fact that men can get women pregnant, and that demonstrating one's virility and potency is especially significant to Anglos and Mexican-Americans alike during adolescence; it continues its significance for Mexican-American machos (virile men) after adolescence.

Cross-Cultural Impact. The concept of the macho, the sexually virile male, is not unique to Mexican-Americans. Anglos, especially during adolescence, are keenly aware of their need to prove themselves manly. Traditionally Anglo adolescent boys have gathered in groups to brag of their sexual exploits

(real and imagined) and virility. They bought sports cars and expensive clothes, classifying themselves as "cool," "groovy," and "doing their thing." Peer approval and status came not from the related quality of their sexual exploits but rather from the quantity. The difference between Anglos and Mexican-Americans has been the duration of this need to prove virility. Usually the Anglo adolescent outgrew this phase and began to seek status via his occupation. A Mexican-American's bragging of sexual prowess would seem immature and distasteful to the adult Anglo.

The quantity of alcohol a man is able to drink and still remain sober has been a major symbol of machismo (virility). It has been customary for Mexican-American men to gather at the cantina (local bar), in the evenings and drink large quantities of beer. Mexican-Americans almost always drink only among male peers while Anglos drink with both males and females. Mexican-Americans, perhaps because of machismo, do not approve of their wives drinking outside (or inside) the home.

That aspect of machismo which values stoicism and an hermetic personality is perhaps the aspect least understood by the Anglo. Twentieth century psychology has impressed upon Anglo culture the importance of emotional expression and openness with others. The Anglo struggles to get his feelings "off his chest." The encounter group is a direct result and manifestation of the Anglo's new-found need to interact closely with others; to be sincere and open. The Anglo's willingness to open up has been taken by the Mexican-American as a sign of

weakness.

In short, the values of machismo (male pride, virility) have probably been those which have separated Anglos and Mexican-Americans more than any others until now, and will be the hardest (Simmons, 1952) for Mexican-Americans to overcome in the assimilation process, for machismo is more than sexual prowess, hermetism and drinking, it is a way of seeing a man; it is the manly role for the Mexican-American. There is no other role except the Anglo role and this is diametrically opposed to machismo. As acculturation proceeds and Mexican-Americans are brought more into the mainstream of Anglo life economically and socially, perhaps a new role for the Mexican-American male will evolve.

Fatalism and Time

Definition. Martinez (1966) defined the Mexican-American attitude toward fatalism as one of complete submission. Everything which happens to man was fated to happen. God controlled all. The Mexican-American is a person who is resigned to his fate and would not dream of trying to alter it.

The Mexican-American's attitude toward fatalism is the antithesis of the Anglo's determination to "do something about things." The fate of a person is decided before birth by God. Although, according to Madsen's observations (1964), the belief prevails that a person can sometimes change his fate through prayer and sacrifice.

As mentioned previously in the section on The Family and Personalism, from childhood the Mexican-American has been

taught obedience. Since obedience is the price of rewards, and since the Mexican-American automatically expects rewards if he is obedient, he does not develop a sense of responsibility for his own fate, nor a belief in the efficacy of action by the self. Several Spanish expressions refer to this fatalistic point of view. Woods (1956) quoted: Al cabo Dios es muy grande, (God will provide), or Haga uno lo que haga, todo es lo que Dios quiere (Do what you will, everything is as God wishes), finally, the most common, Sea por Dios (It is the will of God).

These expressions and others have been in common usage to explain and justify the current state of affairs even by Mexican-Americans who are not religiously oriented. Consistent with this, said Simmons (1952), the Mexican-American has had a tendency to explain and justify the borracho (drunkard) with the phrase, asi lo hizo Dios (God made him this way). Faults or weaknesses are not controlled by the individual's will, but are determined by the world of uncontrollable forces symbolized by the word Dios (God). This explains the parental belief that little children are not really responsible for their actions, and also why Mexican-Americans display such a high tolerance of variation in individual behavior.

The Spanish expressions referred to, express a fatalism and resignation with profound implications. They exemplify how the Mexican-American may have tended to ignore his own manipulative powers and waited for whatever developments that uncontrollable force Dios (God) would bring. The Mexican-American often said, A ver que sale (Let's see what comes of it),

and since the unknown and unexpected may alter life for the better as well as for the worse, there was not much point in worrying about the future.

Explanation. Madsen (1964) linked the concept of fatalism with the Mexican-American's concept of time. Since God, not man, controls events, the Mexican-American is not at all future-oriented. The present fully occupies him for he believes God will plan for tomorrow (to wit, the song Que será será -- "what will be, will be").

Since it is useless to plan for the future, the Mexican-American acts in accordance with his "primacy of mood" said Simmons (1952). This refers to the tendency of the Mexican-American to be oriented toward immediate situational realities, to react to the first flush of their effect upon him without much regard for the ultimate consequences of these actions. This is not to say that the Mexican-American is opportunistic or unprincipled, rather he has often tended to spontaneously respond to stimuli of the immediate situation in such a way as to fully exploit its dramatic and affective potentialities.

Anglos are often amazed at how Mexican-Americans act at such events as a fiesta; a sports event, or an organizational meeting. The Mexican-American responds enthusiastically and excitedly to a speaker who plays upon highly emotionally charged symbols such as La Patria (the fatherland), La raza (the chosen), Yo soy Mexicano (I am a Mexican), La familia (the family), and so on. It has not been uncommon for Mexican-Americans to become highly emotionally charged at meetings and

pledge money, or time, etc., without following through. Simmons (1952:121) explained that this discrepancy between word and deed was not an indication of insincerity since there is no general expectation that the performer in such situations will carry out the promises he made at the time:

The opportunity to make a grand gesture, to strike a lofty pose, to perform for the group, to show oneself to advantage, is always exploited by one or many of the individuals present, and often one will try to outdo the other, but the failure of the performer to consistently follow through what he has begun is seldom ever condemned. Rather, it is taken for granted that he will not do so.

Simmons (1952) has further explained that the performance is for the enjoyment of all present and is believed sincerely at the time, but it is not a commitment for future action. It is merely oratory for its own sake. The able speaker, who can draw out emotions, is greatly admired even though the content of his speech is insignificant.

Psychological and Sociological Implications. Fatalism and an accute time orientation to the immediate present, influence the Mexican-American to take advantage of impulse. Life is to be lived now while the opportunity to do so is present, for mañana es hoy o nunca (tomorrow is today or never). There is no reason to depend on possible future gratifications because they cannot be known. The present is the only reality, and mañana (tomorrow) is remote and may never materialize.

An understandable consequence of this is the vagueness of the Mexican-American chronology, his consistent disregard

of the clock. For the Anglo, "time is money," high value is placed on punctuality and speed. Calendars and clocks are ubiquitous. The Mexican-American, on the other hand, never expects a scheduled event to start on time, nor anyone to keep an appointment on time. The event will eventually take place and so will the appointment, just as long as one waits patiently. This phenomena is jokingly referred to as la hora mexicana (Mexican Standard Time).

The very structure of the Spanish language, said Edmundson (1957) manifests fatalism. Edmundson referred specifically to the use of the impersonal, passive reflexive form of verbs in situations where English would use the active voice with a definite agent. The speaker of Spanish will say se cayó (it dropped itself); se perdió (it lost itself) instead of "I dropped it" or "I lost it." The Spanish speaker, then by implication, is one to whom things happen, not one who causes things to happen.

Cross-Cultural Impact. The Mexican-American's present time orientation and fatalism are the antithesis of Anglo values as defined by the Protestant ethic. The poet William E. Henly describes the Anglo's point of view toward determinism in these words:

I am the master of my fate;
I am the captain of my soul.

The Anglo-American believes he can shape nature and control events. "Anyone can do or be anything they want," is in essence what Horacio Alger told Anglos, and his words are still believed. Anglo's look with pride on leaders who had

humble beginnings. Lincoln was born in a log cabin; Nixon's father is a store keeper. Each and every Anglo believes that he too, or his son could potentially be President.

Although Anglo's might attribute their status to "bad luck," or never getting "an even break," still there exists that underlying belief that if they would work harder and sacrifice more, in other words, defer gratification, then they could "make it."

Why haven't Mexican-Americans achieved material success like other immigrant groups? Blauner (1970) feels most Anglos believe that it's really because they haven't worked hard enough at it. "After all, the Irish; the Jews; the Italians have done it, so why can't the Mexicans?"

The Mexican-American's belief that it is useless to plan for the future because "God will provide," is foreign to the Anglo sensibility. It is not because the Anglo does not believe that "God will provide," for he does. "God will provide" for the Anglo if he gets into a "jam," like a bad illness, and so on, but he certainly will not pay the grocery bill. Anglo's have been taught that "God helps those who help themselves," and that "the Devil makes work for idle hands." For the pious Anglo, God is around if he needs Him, and he will be punished if he does not develop the potentialities God has endowed him with. The two concepts of God's control, then, are diametrically opposed.

The Anglo plans for the future. He considers it a sign of profound love for his family to have maximum insurance

for protection against unexpected events. He does not promise what he cannot deliver for that would make him a liar. If he pledges to support a cause, it may be in a moment of emotion, but often he has already calculated just how much he will donate beforehand, and therefore is prepared to follow through.

The American male ideal, the rugged cowboy Anglos are so fond of admiring on television is a silent hero; a man of few words. He shoots first and asks questions later. Anglo's believe actions are much more noble than words and often act after much mental but not verbal deliberation. For this reason, the Mexican-American's love of oratory for its own sake, without the expectation of following through has the effect of making the Anglo call the Mexican-American untrustworthy.

In the Section on The Spanish Language and School Problems, we will discuss how fatalism and immediate time orientation drastically effect the school child. He is not encouraged to stay in school because "he will end up working anyway," and what type of job he gets depends on "what type of job God wants him to get."

Religion

Definition. The majority of Mexican-Americans are Catholics, but according to Madsen (1964) their interpretations of Catholicism vary greatly with class and education.

Simmons (1952) viewed Mexican religion as a mixture of Catholicism supplimented with indigenous folk beliefs. On the

village level, the Mexican's religion is meaningful especially with reference to his village's Patron Saint. The Mexican's agrarian life rotates around the Church's festal calendar integrated with the seasonal cycle. This type of folk religion could be carried on without a priest. In fact, the priest, as a teacher of doctrine is seen as distant and incomprehensible by the Mexican peon (agricultural worker) whose folk religion centers on feeling and emotion.

Explanation. The social significance of the Catholic church for the agrarian Mexican is lost when he migrates to the United States, suggested Simmons (1952). Religion loses its vitality and importance in a country where the land the Mexican-American works does not belong to him. In order to participate in Catholicism in the United States the Mexican-American would be required to learn church doctrine which would seem irrelevant to his folkways.

Latin women, Madsen (1964) pointed out, attend Mass regularly, but Latin men do not. A Mexican-American interviewed by Simmons (1952:84) had this to say of male church attendance:

...The undercurrent is too strong against the man who is very church-going. They look on him with distrust -- people wonder why he is going to church. He must have done something, his conscience must be bothering him.

On the other hand, a Mexican-American male churchgoer interviewed by Madsen (1964:59) gave his reasons for attendance at mass:

I've got a good little business and it is important for me to be respected in the town. Some people lie and say I'm not always fair. I go to church regularly so God will help me

put down this gossip. Who could conceive of my going to church on Sunday and cheating somebody on Monday?

In addition to church attendance many Mexican-Americans have altars in their homes. Their attitudes toward the images, observed Madsen (1964), range from idolatry to mere appreciation of their beauty.

Psychological and Sociological Implications. There are many superstitions connected with the folk Catholicism many Mexican-Americans practice. These superstitions are usually centered around devotion to the saints, and the Virgin of Guadalupe -- Mexico's Patron Saint. It is believed that certain saints have special powers to insure success in various ventures. Often Mexican-Americans make a promesa (vow) to a saint or the virgin to perform a certain action if, as Vogt and Albert (1966) observed, the saint procures the desired outcome for the supplicant. Simmons (1952) noted that many Mexican-Americans believe such a promise may not be broken without disastrous results. Belief in the promesa (vow) is so strong, that many Mexican-Americans believe spirits of the dead return to fulfill a promise made before they died.

Madsen (1964) explained that the custom of punishing images of the saints if a suplication is denied is slowly dying out. Nevertheless a Mexican-American interviewed by Madsen (1964:60-61) recalled the following behaviors:

Her grandfather's farm was dry and brown from drought. Appeals to the saint went unanswered. Thinking that the saint failed to comprehend the gravity of the situation, the grandfather took the image on a tour to view the desolation of the land. When there

was no rain several days later, the image was left to bake in the sun. 'Soon it became too uncomfortable for him,' Garcia related, 'and he convinced God to send the rain. We took San Isidro back indoors and gave him candles as a thanks offering to avert his anger.'

Simmons (1952) told of one Mexican-American informant who explained that the special significance of the Virgin of Guadalupe was that she deigned to honor Mexicans with her presence. She appeared to a Mexican peon (agricultural worker), thereby giving divine recognition to La Raza (her chosen ones). Especially endearing to Mexican-Americans is the legend that she appeared as a morena (dark skinned women) with Mexican characteristics and dress.

Cross-Cultural Impact. Some Mexican-Americans leave Catholicism and convert to Protestantism. Wagner (1966) has attributed such switches to the fact that some Protestant churches provide economic aid for their members if they are in need. Also, Protestant ministers have held funeral services for any deceased person while a Catholic priest would not, if he knew the person died without asking forgiveness before death.

Burma (1970) observed that Mexican-Americans who convert to Protestantism have done as much as they can do to isolate themselves from La Raza (the chosen). They have rejected their heritage.

Simmons (1952:91) found that most Mexican-Americans interviewed viewed those who had converted to Protestantism as "renegades" who had converted only because there was

something in it for them. Simmons (1952:91) also interviewed several Catholic priests who explained conversions to Protestantism in this manner:

There are a lot of Protestant churches which have sprung up around here, but the people go to them because they give away food and money. Their belly becomes their God.

They have a lot of money and the people of little faith run to them for bread and candy and whatever else they will give them. But if one of them gets sick, they call for the Priest right away.

Peñalosa (1966) disagreed with the commonly expressed belief that Mexican-Americans convert to Protestantism because of higher chances for upward mobility (Simmons, 1952; Madsen, 1964). He found Catholics to be more upwardly mobile than Protestants and he hypothesized that strong Catholic religious ties strengthen rather than weaken the individual's chances of upward mobility.

Burma (1970) explained that while Mexican-Americans who have converted to Protestantism separate themselves from the life of the colonia (Mexican-American neighborhood), they do not integrate with Anglo Protestants. This phenomenon occurred because of social class stratification among Protestant congregations.

Tuck (1946) observed the same phenomenon, pointing out that Catholic churches for Mexican-Americans have traditionally been staffed with Mexican-born priests, and the majority of Protestant churches serving Mexican-Americans have Mexican-American ministers. Burma (1970) noticed that rarely do Mexican-Americans join English-speaking congregations. Parsons

(1966) discovered that many Catholic and Protestant congregations do not accept Mexican-Americans as members. Catholic Mexican-Americans usually attend a mass at mid-morning when Anglos are least likely to go, and the priests' sermon differed from that which Anglos heard. Parsons (1966) also observed that when both Anglos and Mexican-Americans were in church at the same time, the Mexican-Americans sat in the back. An Anglo woman interviewed by Simmons (1952:458) had this to say of Mexican-American attendance at her predominantly Anglo Catholic church:

Most of the Mexicans know better than to come to Anglo churches. They know the people wouldn't put up with them....(they) wouldn't be turned out but would get such a chilly reception they would never come back.

Curanderismo and Ethnopsychiatry

Definition. A curandero is a Mexican-American folk healer whose powers of healing are believed to have been bestowed by God. The curandero treats all types of illness: physical, mental and that connected with witchcraft.

Ethnopsychiatry is defined by Kiev (1968:176) "...as the culture specific methods of anxiety reduction using universally valid strategies and techniques for the treatment of what appear to be culture specific psychiatric disorders."

Explanation. Clark (1959) observed that the curandero (healer), believed to be chosen by God, has great prestige in the Mexican-American community. Most curanderos (healers) do not recognize their divine powers until they are middle-aged, but some sense them in early childhood. Madsen (1964) was told

by curanderos (healers) that their gift of healing was revealed through a dream, a vision, a voice, or merely through a deep understanding of the sick. Their revelation was usually accompanied by a dramatic experience in which a seemingly incurable illness was suffered by the future curandero (healer) or a member of his family.

True folk-healers firmly believe they have been chosen by God to their calling, and many do not make a profit from curing. Often they have a regular job during the day and see patients in the evening. Madsen (1964) explained that many curers feel God would take away their divine gifts of healing if they were to charge a large fee for their services.

The traditional curandero (healer) has been joined by a new breed of healer: the spiritualist. Spiritualists often have diplomas from spirit healing schools in Mexico or by correspondence with these schools. Their healing art lies in the act of conjuring up spirits of the dead who diagnose the patient's illness and prescribe treatment. Many times they charge higher fees than do physicians.

Curanderos (healers) are not wholly ignorant of modern medical practices. Some obtain antibiotics in drug stores in Mexico, where they may be purchased without a prescription, and inject patients. Others construct imitation diagnosis rooms resembling those in doctors offices.

According to Madsen (1964) a curanderos (healer's) reputation is completely ruined if a patient dies while in his care. For this reason many curers refuse cases they know

are terminal. If a curandero (healer) fails to cure all his patients, or heals only infrequently, the Mexican-American community is likely to report him to the police as a "fake" curer.

Psychological and Sociological Implications. Kiev (1968:124) described what went on when a patient visited a curandero (healer):

The family and the curandero will try to determine whether a sick individual has violated the commands of God, incurred the wrath of an enemy, or simply come into contact with a witch or an evil person. In evaluating the history of the patient's illness, the curandero considers his behavior in relationship to his family, his habits and his temperament. When this information reveals no obvious reasons for the patient's difficulties, more supernatural explanations are invoked.

The relationship between the curandero (healer) and the patient is warm and friendly. The patient's family is always encouraged to accompany him. Contrary to the Anglo point of view, the Mexican-American views illness as a family affair. It would be inhuman to leave a patient alone while he was suffering. The curer identifies and sympathizes with the patient. He is never too busy to sit down and discuss his illness with him.

Kiev (1968:152) felt that the situation of illness served certain social purposes. The curandero used illness to reintegrate a person into the traditional Mexican-American cultural pattern of life. Hence ethnopsychiatry has a dual function: first to maintain the continuity of society and second to reintegrate individuals into the community.

The curandero plays upon that guilt that all people suffer and may attribute illness to the fact that the individual is becoming too much like an Anglo. Kiev (1968) felt that curanderismo (folk healing) developed to deal specifically with the types of illnesses and problems (especially mental) faced by the Mexican-American in his dual cultural role.

Cross-Cultural Impact. Why would Mexican-Americans rather go to a curandero (healer) than to a doctor? Rubel (1966) believed there is a communication gap between Mexican-Americans and Anglo physicians. He postulated that the Mexican-American resents the doctor's practice for profit when a curer practices only to help others.

Clark (1959) felt Mexican-Americans resented the authoritativeness and noninvolvement of the Anglo physician. Madsen (1964) brought to attention the fact that many psychiatric and physical disorders were cured by curanderos (healers) after an Anglo physician failed to cure them. What are some of these typical "Mexican-American ailments?"

Mal ojo is "evil eye" sickness. It is caused by a person with strong vision on a person with weak vision. Its symptoms are headache, fever and crying. Madsen (1964) found that the "evil eye" was a reflection of envy. Rubel (1966) attributed mal ojo to loss of equilibrium in social relationships. Madsen (1964) observed that the treatment for mal ojo consists of the curandero (healer) rubbing an unbroken raw egg over the patient's body to draw out evil spirits.

Empacho is a form of indigestion believed (Rubel, 1966;

Madsen, 1964) to be caused by emotional distress while a patient is eating. To cure it, a patient's back is rubbed.

Asustado is an illness caused by fright in which the spirit allegedly leaves the body. Symptoms are lack of appetite, exhaustion, fear and listlessness. In treating asustado the curandero tries to force the soul to re-enter the body by making sweeping motions with a broom or a stick.

Paredes (1968) pointed out that acculturated Mexican-Americans feel traditional Mexican-Americans must reject such things as curanderismo in order to compete successfully in the Anglo world. In order to jest and at the same time express exasperation toward their less-acculturated brethren, Mexican-Americans hold sessions called Tallas (verbal dueling) in which humorous stories are told of curanderos (healers). Reprinted here is a tale recorded and presented by the American Ethnological society at their annual meeting in 1966:

TEXT VI

There was a veterinary out there with the Aftosa, a bolillo* from around here. And then this little old man was very sick; he had indigestion or I don't know what. So they went. "Here's a doctor from the other side of the border. What more do you want!" So they went to see him.

He said, "Oh, no! Me doctor by the cow. But not by the man. NO GOTTA PERMIT."

Said, "No matter, doctor. What do you give cows when they are sick in the stomach?"

"Well, hombre," he says, "me give a little Epsom salts."

Said, "How much Epsom salts do you give the cow?"

He says, "Oh, by one big cow me give her a

*Bolillo - One of the many derogatory names for the Anglo.

pound of salts in one gallon of water."

So then they said, "Now we can figure the dose ourselves." They went home and measured half a gallon of water and half a pound of Epsom salts. And they made the old man drink it.

Well, so next morning they came. Said, "Oh, doctor, we came to see you."

"How is sick man doing? Is he better?"

"Oh, no, he's dead."

He said, "But how could he be dead!"

"Yes, we came to invite you to the funeral, this afternoon. But don't feel guilty about it, doctor." Said, "It isn't your fault."

He said, "Why you say not my fault?"

Says, "We gave him the salts and the salts worked. He must have died of something else, because even after he was dead he still moved his bowels three times."

La Raza and Acculturation

Definition. La Raza is a spiritual and cultural concept, uniting all people who speak Spanish. Rubel (1966:7) explained that "...La Raza implied both a mystical bond uniting Spanish-speaking people and a separation of them from all others." The term La Raza is a highly charged symbol of the Mexican-Americans' group identity and traditions. Simmons (1952) believed that in the case of the immigrant generation, experience in the United States awakened an ardent patriotism for Mexico, a national consciousness that did not exist before emigration. Soy Mexicano (I am a Mexican), is a common expression of identification with La Raza and its traditions. Group pressure maintains individual identification with La Raza.

When the term "latin American" began to be used to eliminate the pejorative connotation of the term "Mexican," the euphemism was received among Mexican-Americans as an attempt

to sever their identification with Mexicanismo (Mexicanness). As a Mexican-American quoted in Simmons (1952:522) expressed it:

...My father and mother came from Mexico, they're Mexican, and that's good enough for me. Anybody who calls himself a Latin American is just ashamed of being a Mexican and is trying to hide it. I'll be damned if I want anyone to call me a Latin American.

The theme of La Raza (the chosen) and of being un buen y digno Mexicano (a good and worthy Mexican), is frequently played upon by Mexican leaders, particularly political leaders to manipulate enthusiasm.

The term acculturation, in this study, refers to that process of assimilation in which a Mexican-American's values become supplanted by Anglo-American values. It implies a conscious attempt by the Mexican-American to orient himself to Anglo social and cultural traditions in order to cope with the problems of his subordinate status. The Mexican-American has substituted American for Mexican culture elements insofar as they have demonstrated greater utility or attractiveness in relation to his changed needs and desires in the United States. With regard to material culture, Mexican-Americans can hardly be distinguished from Anglo-Americans. There have also been basic changes in religion, magical and medical beliefs and the traditional family system. On the other hand, the Mexican diet still survives to a great degree and also the Spanish language, which though anglicized, remains the primary language.

It should be understood that these changes have been

ones of adaptation to the immediate needs and demands of the Anglo culture. They do not represent a cultural and social fusion with Anglos. Rather, they represent what could be a departure point for assimilation in that ideas and action patterns have been shared and understood.

Explanation. According to Marden (1968:134) La Raza implied that "God has planned a great destiny for his people, though it never may be obtained because of the individual sins of its members."

This concept of peoplehood and destiny is very like that of the Jewish people. It reflects the long Spanish occupation the Mexicans endured, and the discrimination which Mexican-Americans now endure in the United States. This is not to say that Mexican-Americans accuse Anglos of holding them back from achieving their God-given destiny. Madsen (1964:15) quoted one informant's explanation of La Raza: "If we lived by God's commands we would be so strong that no one could block us. Of course, the Anglos take advantage of our weaknesses but it is we who make ourselves weak, not the Anglos."

Sin, suffering and pain are common aspects of La Raza. Vogt and Albert (1966) pointed out that Mexican-Americans tried to see a balance of opposites in their lives. Life is balanced by death, illness by health, desire by denial, and so on.

La Raza is a unique concept among American immigrants. Tuck (1946:134) observed that such a "self-respecting pride in one's background and origin strikes a rather new note in

American immigrant histories." The traditional American immigrant changed his name, denied his background and ignored his parents with their old-fashioned ideas and accents. Martinez (1967) found that Mexican-Americans were not assimilated because of their proximity to Mexico which enables frequent visits and close links with the Mexican culture, and because of the failure of Anglos to accept them on an equal basis, regarding them instead with discrimination and mistrust. Saunders (1954) found other reasons for lack of assimilation of Mexican-Americans. These were: A lack of leaders among Mexican-Americans to serve as models of success, and geographic separation -- Mexican-Americans tend to live apart from Anglos. Tuck (1946:104-5) found that few attempts had been made to bridge the social isolation in which most Mexican-Americans live. Mexican-Americans clung to their traditional manners of conduct and values partly because they seemed stable and comforting, but chiefly because they did not know any others. Tuck (1946:104-5) noted that Anglos did nothing to educate the Mexican-American:

...No such push arose from social institutions. No salesman appeared...to introduce the Perez family to the laws of the nation; they had to learn these by trial and error. The radio took no time off from purgatives and furniture on easy payments to talk about the constitution, history and traditions of this country.

Psychological and Sociological Implications. The arousal of feelings of nationalism and the concept of La Raza (the chosen) has caused a widespread reluctance to seek naturalization, as this was seen as a betrayal of the fatherland:

Mexico. The point must be made, though, that naturalization conferred no new status, nor did it benefit the Mexican in any way. One Mexican-American interviewed by Simmons (1952:521) explained his father's refusal to become naturalized:

My father is a man that has clung to his love for his native land....He has maintained a dignity and a certain culture that a lot of other people wish they had because he stuck to his so-called Mexicanismo. In a way, it was a refuge, I guess, for the preservation of his dignity. Otherwise what would he have been here to these Texans, just another damn Mexican who didn't know English, and who should either go back to Mexico or become Americanized. To trade his heritage for a mess of pottage, to become an American when he knew that he wasn't accepted as an American, he regarded as a bad bargain.

Simmons (1952) found that Mexican-Americans who strongly identify with La Raza renew their ties with Mexico by celebrating Mexican national holidays. These celebrations on the fifth of May and the sixteenth of September, are fostered by Mexican consuls, but the actual organization of the fiestas (celebrations) is accomplished by a "patriotic committee" composed almost entirely of American (Anglo) citizens. Mexican-Americans who are more assimilated celebrate the fiestas merely as a ceremonial means of paying their respects to their Mexican background and tradition.

Many Mexican-Americans who acculturate, do not wish to assimilate. They are not willing to concede sweeping superiority to Anglo ways. Naegele (1967) speculated that one reason for the retarded acculturation of Mexican-Americans was that they had maintained a rural, folk culture while living in a middle-class urban culture of the United States. Campa

(1966) observed that Mexican-American folk culture had not yet evolved to the status of a complete society and hence there is no approximation of cultural level between the two groups. The term folk culture used in this context defines a culture in which tradition is handed down orally from generation to generation and serves as a model for the pattern of lives.

It is of primary importance to the counselor not only to understand possible reasons why Mexican-Americans have not been assimilated into Anglo society, but also to be aware of the Mexican-American's personal feelings toward assimilation.

Does the Mexican-American want to become like the Anglo? Sommers (1964:340), a psychiatrist who works with Mexican-American mental health problems, stressed the phenomena of the new ego-image many Mexican-Americans acquired when they assimilate: "Several changed their names, refused to speak their parental tongue, or rejected their parent's religion, etc." Octavio Paz (1961:14) described the Mexican-American's bicultural dilemma:

...The Pachuco does not want to become a Mexican again; at the same time he does not want to blend into the life of North America. His whole being is sheer negative impulse, a tangle of contradictions, and enigma....Since the pachuco cannot adapt himself to a civilization which, for its part, rejects him, he finds no answer to the hostility surrounding him except his angry affirmation of his personality.... the pachuco actually flaunts his differences. The purpose of his grotesque dandyism and anarchic behavior is not so much to point out the injustice and incapacity of a society that has failed to assimilate him as it is to demonstrate his personal will to remain different.

Both Tuck (1946) and Simmons (1961) indicated that

many Mexican-Americans do not want to be assimilated into an Anglo culture. They emphasized what most Mexican-Americans refer to as the "best of both ways," rather than a one-sided exchange in which all that is distinctively Mexican is lost completely. The meaning of the point of view expressed in the phrase "best of both ways" will be briefly explained. With regard to language, a premium is placed on speaking "good," unaccented English, but the retention of Spanish is valued just as highly as a mark of culture and tradition. Most Mexican-Americans who wish to assimilate tend to disregard the use of Spanish and only speak English to their children. This practice is highly condemned by those advocating the "best of both ways." Mexican-Americans who favor assimilation also favor adopting Anglo values which promote "getting ahead." Those who do not advocate full assimilation favor incorporating these patterns into their own life but not to the point where the drive for power and wealth would dominate their lives, as they believe it dominates the Anglos.

Simmons (1952) found that although there was a lack of agreement as to what the nature of the end product should be, most Mexican-Americans with assimilationist tendencies favor adopting Anglo patterns they regard as most essential in gaining such acceptance. Nevertheless, such Mexican traits as the highly sensitive pride, the vulnerability to ridicule and insult, the fostered dependency of children, machismo (male pride, virility), and sex roles, usually may be found in even the most assimilated Mexican-American.

Naegele (1967) felt that rather than combining the "best of both ways," the possibility of the existence of a dual culture, in which both Mexican-Americans and Anglos could conduct themselves according to their respective patterns, should be considered.

Cross-Cultural Impact. Navarro (1952) noted that Anglos had contradictory viewpoints on how they viewed La Raza (the chosen) and Mexican-Americans. On the one hand Anglos believe that all men are created equal and subsequently Mexican-Americans are the equals of Anglos. On the other hand a belief that Mexican-Americans are inferior is widely held. The typical Mexican-American, continued Navarro (1952), is pictured as indolent, improvident and unclean.

Anglo-Americans are suspicious of ethnic groups that won't assimilate. Tuck (1946:93) quoted Anglos in the Southwest describing Mexican-Americans: "The Mexicans just won't assimilate, that's the trouble. They stick together and won't make outside friendships. The old people won't learn English and the young ones won't speak it half the time." Tuck (1946:74) related an experiment in which she asked several Anglos how and if they would be different from Mexican-Americans had they been left as babies in small towns in Mexico, raised by a Mexican family and later immigrated to the United States. All Anglo participants in the study answered "yes," stating that they would speak Spanish and be Catholics, but they would differ from true Mexican-Americans in that they would be "more ambitious." "Quite a few insisted that their ideas of morals

and family life would be different from the Mexican pattern... and gave the reason of 'blood awareness' for this difference."

Simmons (1961) described Anglo images of Mexican-Americans as: unclean, dangerous, mysterious, unpredictable, drunkards, and deceitful. Such things as: Romanticism, musical ability and always ready for a fiesta are favorable qualities Anglos believe Mexican-Americans possess. Simmons (1961) viewed these "favorable" qualities as tending to reinforce the Anglo's image of Mexican-Americans as child-like and irresponsible, therefore inferior.

Kibbe (1949) distinguished three areas in which the Anglo has discriminated against the Mexican-American: economic, education and social. Economically, Anglo agriculture has exploited Mexican-Americans and until the 1968 emigration law, braceros were imported from Mexico for cheap labor at the expense of Mexican-Americans. In the realm of education, Mexican-Americans have been segregated in public schools or forced to use improperly trained teachers and inferior buildings. School administrators have demonstrated a marked lack of interest in enrolling migrant children. Socially, many Mexican-Americans have been denied the right to vote or serve on a jury. They have also been denied service in various establishments and have been subjected to harrassment from law-enforcement officers.

The main consideration is, will the Anglo culture fully accept the Mexican-American if he does not assimilate? If not, then acceptance does not seem foreseeable in the near

future; for Mexican-Americans, like Afro-Americans wish to be accepted on their own terms, and their growing militancy is proof of their determination to retain their identity at all costs.

LINGUISTIC FACTORS OF SIGNIFICANCE TO THE COUNSELOR

The Spanish Language and Bilingualism

Definition. Spanish is the principle language used by Mexican-Americans. Spoken Spanish, said Madsen (1964) is the primary symbol of loyalty to La Raza (the chosen), and any Mexican-American who tries to converse in English with his fellow Mexican-Americans is mocked and regarded as a traitor to La Raza (the chosen).

Tuck (1946) explained that public use of Spanish by Mexican-Americans did not imply anti-American protest nor discourtesy, it simply expressed the natural tendency of a people to express themselves in the language in which they first learned to speak.

The Spanish spoken by most Mexican-Americans is often a local dialect intermixed with "hispanicized" English words. For example, the following words have been formed by "hispanicizing" English words. The result is a Spanish word which does not look like the original English but sounds like it when pronounced by a Mexican. (Gamio, 1931)

<u>Standard Spanish</u>	<u>Dialect Mexican-American Spanish</u>	<u>English</u>
Diez Centavos	Daime	Dime
Cinco Centavos	Nicle	Nickle
Camionetta	Traque	Truck

<u>Standard Spanish</u>	<u>Dialect Mexican-American Spanish</u>	<u>English</u>
Jefe	Bos	Boss
Helado	Aiscriñ	Ice-cream
Sudante	Suera	Sweater
Oficial de Justicia	Chirife	Sheriff
Agua	Guore	Water
Comeda campestre	Piquiniqui	Picnic
Estacionar el coche	Parquear el carro	Park the car
Qué pasa	Guasamara	What's the matter
Mirando	Guachando	Watching
Estación	Dipo	Depot
Oportunidad	Chansa	Chance

These are examples of words in common use among the various Mexican-American dialects which include, according to Marden (1968) the "Tex-Mex" of Texas; the "Pachuco" of Los Angeles and the many dialects of the Hispanos of New Mexico.

This is not to say that the various dialects spoken by Mexican-Americans are comparable to speaking a whole new language. By way of comparison it may be said that the difference between Spanish spoken in Spain and that spoken in Mexico is similar to the difference between the English spoken in England and the English spoken in the United States. Following the same line of comparison, the difference between the Spanish spoken in Los Angeles and the Spanish spoken in Mexico is comparable to the difference between the English spoken in the deep South and the English spoken in Australia. In other words, the basic language remains the same -- grammar, syntex, morphology -- but various areas salt and pepper the basic language with new words and expressions. But for scattered words and expressions, a native Mexican-American can go to Spain, make himself understood, and understand Spaniards with little difficulty.

Explanation. The Spanish-speaking Mexican-American faces many obstacles in trying to learn English. Levine (1968) pointed out, for example, that a Mexican-American child may say "siwa" and his Anglo teacher may congratulate him on having learned the word "sidewalk." The Mexican-American child's pronunciation sounds correct to his Anglo teacher because what she hears is governed by what she expects to hear -- she may believe that Mexican-Americans just speak that way. In California, Leonard Olquin, a State Education Department Consultant, told Levine (1968) that he distinguished thirty-two distinct problems with English sounds among Spanish-speaking children.

Chavez (1957) mentioned some of these differences in sounds and in concepts between the two languages. The short "i" in miss, for example, may be pronounced by the Spanish-speaker as the "ee" in meet, since "i" carries the sound of "ee" in Spanish. Similarly, the "sh" of the English word show may be pronounced by the native Spanish-speaker as the "ch" in the English word church. In addition, a difference in concepts between the two languages may cause the listener to note a difference even when none is present. In Spanish, some words are plural, but their English counterparts are singular, such as the word "nose." Therefore, when speaking English, the Spanish-speaker may say, "I hit them against the door." Instead of "I hit it (nose) against the door."

Such things as the English lazy "L" continued Levine (1968) in "apple" or "ball" are lost on the Spanish ear. "I'll

call you" comes over as "Ow cow you" and is repeated that way by a Mexican-American. Many problems stem from rules of Spanish. A Spanish "d" is governed by vowels and position. If it comes between two vowels it is pronounced as "th", therefore a Mexican-American might pronounce the English word "wedding" as wething."

Beberfall (1958) cited hypercorrection, omission of the final consonant, and use of the future tense as common language problems Mexican-Americans experience. Hypercorrection occurs when the Spanish-speaking person makes a correction that extends into other areas where it is not needed. In correcting the "sh" of show, the individual may extend his correction to such words as "church," pronouncing instead "shursh."

Perales (1965) noted that besides giving English words a Spanish pronunciation and meaning (as illustrated on the previous table), Mexican-Americans' limited Spanish vocabulary require that they borrow from their English vocabulary to complete expressions. For example, the Mexican-American may use such expressions as "yo le dije que I wouldn't do it," (I said to him that I wouldn't do it), and "El fue, but I stayed in la casa," (He want, but I stayed in the house). Holland (1960) found that this language borrowing occurred because the environment of Mexican-Americans permitted their learning only a small basic vocabulary of Spanish words and concepts related directly to restrictive, in-group experiences.

Psychological and Sociological Implications. Previously

scientists believed that all people experienced the world in the same way. The different languages they spoke were merely different manners of expressing the one reality.

The famous psycholinguist Whorf (1956) proposed a theory which postulated just the opposite of the traditional theory. Whorf's thesis is that the world is differently experienced and conceived in different linguistic communities. In other words, each language embodies and perpetuates a particular world-view. Those who speak a particular language have agreed to see and think of the world in a common way. Whorf (1956) believed that the world can be structured in many ways and it is the language we learn as children which directs the formation of our particular structure. Brown and Lenneberg (1961) pointed out that the Whorf hypothesis deviates from the common sense view formerly held, first by maintaining that the world is differently experienced and conceived in different linguistic communities, and second by suggesting that language is causally related to those psychological differences.

Other writers also believed that the relationship between language and thought is somewhat as proposed by Whorf. The philosopher Cassirer (1953), conceptualized language as the direct manifestation of knowledge. Orwell (1949), in 1984 described a totalitarian England of the future. The complete efficiency of the dictatorship of the time lies in their having invented a language -- Newspeak -- in which it is impossible not only to express, but even to think, a

rebellious thought.

Massad (1970) conducted an experiment with Mexican-Americans to test this Whorfian hypothesis that language molds thinking. He flashed cards with pictures on them to the experimental subjects who were to describe the pictures in both Spanish and English. When speaking Spanish all the Mexican-American subjects used words with more sensory and emotional connotations than when speaking English. Massad (1970) suggested that bilinguals have sets of thinking patterns. Woods (1958) concurred:

Language gives clues to the understanding of behavior. While the English clock 'runs,' it 'walks' in Spanish; hence, the English-speaking person must hurry to make use of the time before it runs away, but the Spanish-speaking person may take a more leisurely attitude....Language then, is a good guide to the way a person perceives events and objects in the world about him.

Cross-Cultural Implications. In summary, there are numerous hypothesis which attempt to explain why Mexican-Americans have continued to speak Spanish: Loyalty to La Raza (the chosen); the proximity of Mexico; preference for the first language learned; world view particular to the Spanish-speaking, and so on.

The tenacity with which Mexican-Americans have preserved their language may seem offensive to the Anglo-American who may believe it unamerican not to speak English. Could there be another reason Mexican-Americans cling to Spanish? Could it be that the Anglo has not taught him English?

Spanish is so widespread among Mexican-Americans that

Clark (1959) in a large survey in Los Angeles found that only sixty-five percent of Mexican-Americans over five years of age or older speak some English, but most of these are children. However, not all Mexican-Americans who speak and understand some English can read or write it. Clark (1959) further found that the average number of years of school completed for Mexican-Americans over seventeen years of age was 4.8. Gray (1956) found that those Mexican-Americans who left school before reaching the fifth grade tended to read below the expected level. It is important, if somewhat discouraging, to remember that Clark's (1959) survey was taken in California which is the most progressive state of the five states in which the majority of Mexican-Americans live. If only approximately sixty-five percent of the Mexican-Americans who live in California speak some English, then the number of Mexican-Americans who speak some English in the other South-western states is most likely to be considerably lower.

Carp (1970), also in a survey in Los Angeles, found that all the Mexican-Americans he interviewed preferred to listen to the radio and watch television programs broadcast in Spanish rather than English. In fact, two-thirds of those surveyed watched television programs only if they were in Spanish. Carp (1970:127) also found that many Mexican-Americans are distrustful of or do not even have a telephone:

...They do not want to appear incompetent and feel embarrassed by dialing a number or answering a ring only to be confronted with a voice speaking a 'foreign language.'

It is possible to conclude that many Mexican-Americans

speak Spanish not only because it signifies loyalty to La Raza (the chosen), or because it is their first language, but simply because it is the only language they know, even if they are third generation Mexican-Americans and attended the primary grades in school in the United States.

Thus, the distaste (previously referred to) Anglos have felt when they hear a Mexican-American speaking Spanish instead of English may be their own fault. Until now, the Anglo has not made any educational provisions for the Mexican-American which would facilitate the learning of English.

Mexican-Americans have repeatedly expressed their desire to learn English -- but not at the expense of losing their mother tongue, Spanish. They feel Anglos should learn Spanish also, especially since the United States borders with Mexico, a Spanish-speaking country. Mexican-Americans also want more professionals to speak Spanish. Teachers, psychologists and doctors are those who can help Mexican-Americans the most. Slowly the Anglo community is responding. In California especially, Spanish-speaking professional personnel are sought, and Anglos who work with Mexican-Americans are learning Spanish.

The Spanish Language and Testing

Definition. Over the past few decades, IQ and Achievement tests have risen to decisive importance in determining a child's future in American society. Both Thorndike (1969) and Anastasi (1970) have demonstrated that the typical intelligence or achievement test is based on an urban, middle-class culture.

It is highly verbal, emphasizing speed, competition and excellence. Tests measure samples of present behavior which is composed not only of innate potential but also of life experiences. Those who make tests try to base them on experiences which are common to all children in our society. Unfortunately for the psychological testing movement, no experiences are universally common to all children. In fact, many key experiences taken for granted in middle-class homes may be absent in the home of a poor or culturally-different child.

Thorndike (1969:327) indicated some deficits found in impoverished environments as : "Generally restricted language patterns by those with whom he comes in contact....Lack of toys, games and other stimulus materials found in more favored homes." Whatever the original causes, the fact remains that by the time the child comes to school, as in the case of Mexican-American children, noticeable differences exist on test scores.

Many researchers have suggested that Mexican-Americans have low innate intellectual ability. According to Carter (1968:49) the proponents of this theory cite three types of evidence to support their hypothesis: "(1) The results of widespread testing...(2) The disproportionate percentage of Mexican-Americans in "slow" and mentally retarded classes. (3) The obvious failure of Mexican-Americans to achieve in school." Glick (1970) suggested that Mexican-Americans have been tested and classified using procedures and scales designed for another culture. The Mexican-American child is expected to excel on an

instrument of measurement given to him in what is to him a foreign language.

Explanation. Burma (1970) hypothesized that Mexican-American children were given intelligence tests in which the important factors were linguistic, cultural, and socioeconomic background. Hence, although the Mexican-American child may have as much (or more) intellectual potential as the Anglo, he inevitably shows up as a "low achiever" on the test due to bilingualism and his unique cultural-economic background.

Carlson and Henderson (1950) tested 115 children of Mexican parentage and found their IQs were lower than the mean IQ of Anglo children. Cook (1951) gave the Stanford-Binet and the Form I of the Point Scale of Performance Test, which is a nonverbal intelligence test, to children with a mean age of 12 years and seven months. On the Binet, the mean IQ of the Mexican-American children was 83.77, while on the PSPT it was 101.06. Cook concluded that a nonverbal IQ test was more culturally fair to Mexican-Americans than the Stanford-Binet.

Altus (1953) observed that the IQs of Mexican-American children were usually ten to fifteen points below those of their Anglo peers. He hypothesized that the difference was attributable to lack of language ability due to bilingualism. To test his hypothesis he gave the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC) to groups of bilingual Spanish-speaking children and unilingual Anglo children. He choose the WISC, as it has both a Verbal scale and a Performance scale, believing that there would be no significant differences

between Anglos and Mexican-Americans on the Performance scale. Altus' hypothesis proved correct. The unilingual Anglos scored an average of seventeen points higher than did the Mexican-Americans on the Verbal scale, and no significant differences were found between the two groups on the Performance scale.

Johnson (1953) found an inverse relationship between performance on the Otis and knowledge of Spanish relative to English. The higher the Otis IQ, the less knowledge the child had of Spanish in comparison to English. On the other hand, a greater knowledge of Spanish was associated with superior performance on the Goodenough Draw a Man Test (nonverbal).

Keston and Jimenez (1954) found that fifty Mexican-American children received higher scores on the Stanford Binet given in English than when given in Spanish. They concluded that the children had a higher level of development in English than in Spanish because school was taught in English. Their Spanish was equal to that of preschool children, probably due to the fact that its development stopped upon entering school.

Jensen (1961) conceptualized the problem this way: The environment in which Mexican-American children grow up does not foster development of the kinds of knowledge, habits, and skills that are measured by IQ tests. Johnson (1953) agreed and postulated that the measurement of intelligence of bilingual children is too complex; that present tests, both performance and linguistic, are not valid. Sanchez (1966:24) said:

"...investigators, proud of their recognition of the 'language handicap' of Spanish-speaking children have chosen to test these children with 'non-verbal' tests, overlooking completely that the nonverbal tests are as culturally-based as the verbal tests and that neither can test what is not there." Jensen (1961) also had suspected that non-verbal tests most likely discriminate just as much against Mexican-Americans as verbal tests since nonverbal tasks do require verbal mediation.

Roca (1955) found innumerable problems in translating an intelligence test from English to Spanish. When the Division of Research and Statistics of the Department of Education of Puerto Rico attempted to translate the WISC, the Stanford-Binet and the Goodenough Intelligence Test they not only had to change the wording, but also the cultural context of some of the questions, thus changing their order of difficulty. For example, "Who wrote Romeo and Juliet?" became "Who wrote Don Quixote?", and so forth.

Jimenez (1954) did not believe that testing in Spanish was a fair measure of intellectual ability since most children of Mexican-American parentage speak Spanish spattered with many Anglicisms. Perales (1965) explained that the difficulties Spanish-speaking students encounter when speaking Spanish are these: They borrow words from English to complete expressions begun in Spanish; they pronounce English words as if they were Spanish and literally translate their meanings; they have difficulties in pronunciation and enunciation. If any one of these difficulties is present in the child's speech then it

would be unfair to test him in Spanish, Perales (1965) concluded.

Gamio (1931:72) offered an interesting hypothesis as to why Mexican-Americans did not develop the analytical skills necessary for successful performance on psychological tests:

An American child as a rule develops in a relatively scientific atmosphere. The child interprets the phenomena around him according to tendencies already fixed for him in the standard American home. His mind works on lines more or less scientific or pragmatic, rarely supernatural or magical. In school he enters a world of ideas with which he is already familiar. He responds normally to mental tests, not only because he is used to rational thinking, but also because these tests are similar to elements in his experience previous to entering school....The son of a Mexican immigrant of mixed or indigenous culture, however, develops in an environment of personal attitude based on tradition, convention, and supernatural belief. He sees problems met sometimes by will and effort, and sometimes by the intervention of mysterious, vague, inexplicable and unexplained beings, without whose aid personal effort may not alone be sufficient for success.

Psychological and Sociological Implications. Because the Mexican-American child does poorly on intelligence tests, no one, (perhaps not even his parents) expects him to excel in achievement situations, and he, according to the self-fulfilling prophecy, usually measures up (or down as the case may be) to their expectations. Rosenthal and Jacobsen (1968) conducted a unique experiment on the effect of teachers' high expectations on childrens' academic performance. A random sample of children from a low socio-economic background in an

elementary school in San Francisco were falsely predicted to make dramatic gains in IQ and general classwork. The parents were not informed of the predicted dramatic gain in IQ, only the teachers were told. The false predictions were self-fulfilling in that the experimental groups of children did indeed make substantial gains in IQ as measured by standardized instruments. One of the observations Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968:177) made is of special interest here:

...After the first year of the experiment and also after the second year, the Mexican children showed greater expectancy advantages than did the non-Mexican children, though the difference was not significant statistically. One interesting minority-group effect did reach significance, however, even with just a small sample size. For each of the Mexican children, magnitude of expectancy advantage was computed by subtracting from his or her gain in IQ from pretest to retest, the IQ gain made by the children of the control group in his or her classroom. These magnitudes of expectancy advantage were then correlated with the 'Mexican-ness' of the children's faces. After one year and after two years, those boys who looked more Mexican benefited more from their teachers' pre-experimental expectancies, for these boys' intellectual performance were probably the lowest of all. Their turning up on a list of probable bloomers must have surprised their teachers. Interest may have followed surprise and, in some way, increased watching for signs of increased brightness may have led to increased brightness.

Countless numbers of Mexican-American children have been placed into groups for low achievers (tracked) and into classes for the educable mentally retarded merely because counselors and educators have accepted test scores at face value. Burma (1970) felt that tracking and stereotyping were direct results of low intelligence test scores. Tracking Mexican-Americans has encouraged academic failure because of teachers'

low expectations. Clark (1965:28) described the frustration caused by tracking:

...Tracking encourages a sense of personal humiliation and unworthiness. Students react negatively and hostilely and aggressively to the educational process. They hate teachers, they hate schools, they hate anything that seems to impose upon them this denigration, because they are not being respected as human beings, because they are sacrificed in a machinery of efficiency and expendability.

Tracking encourages Mexican-Americans to drop out of school as soon as possible. Their hate and rejection of school has often been rationalized by educators as the failure of the home and culture, instead of the direct effect of a bad system.

In an effort to make more accurate evaluations of the mental capacity of Mexican-American children, Palomares and Johnson (1966) conducted an experiment in which each author tested and interviewed a group of Mexican-American children who had been recommended for Educable Mentally Retarded (EMR) placement. Johnson, the non-Spanish-speaking psychologist found 24 of his 33 pupils (73%) eligible for EMR classes. The Spanish-speaking psychologist, Palomares, on the other hand, recommended that only 9 of his 35 pupils (26%) be placed in EMR classes. Both psychologists agreed that while many investigators had questioned the validity of the psychometric instruments, little attention has been given to the psychologist or counselor as a variable in the evaluation process.

Clark (1970) asked several teachers of special education classes and administrators in charge of such programs to estimate the number of Mexican-Americans in their classes who

were truly mentally deficient. All but one replied that from 50% to 80% should be in regular classes. Ironically, these same special education teachers justified the presence of Mexican-Americans with normal intelligence in their classes on the grounds that they receive more individual attention and psychological support than in regular classes.

Cross-Cultural Implications. In summary, tests written for middle-class Anglo-Americans should be used as evaluating instruments only for middle-class Anglo-Americans. The results of such standard tests are invalid when administered to a culturally different or socially and economically deprived child. There is no such thing as a "culturally fair" test.

If these conclusions are valid, then why are Mexican-Americans still being tested with standard IQ and achievement tests in English? Why are they still being placed in classes for the Educable Mentally Retarded and tracked into low ability groupings?

Several years ago New York City abandoned group IQ testing in the city's public schools because, as Yourman (1966) noted, almost half of the city's public school pupils might be called culturally deprived. Why haven't other cities followed the example set by New York City?

One possible solution suggested by many Mexican-Americans, would be to refrain from giving IQ and Achievement tests to Mexican-American children. Instead they could be evaluated by personal interviewing with counselors who speak Spanish and who have been trained in dealing with Mexican-Americans.

Another solution would be to develop special tests for bilingual Mexican-American children who come from culturally or economically deprived backgrounds. These tests would be normed on a sample of the children themselves, thus making their IQ scores relevant to their group. Another remedy might be to begin formal instruction in Spanish with English as a second language and forgo any evaluative testing until the child could perform well in both languages, as is now being done in many schools in California.

These suggestions address themselves to more than just the testing problem. They deal with major changes that should and are taking place in many schools throughout the Southwest. Better educative programs are discussed in the section dealing with the School.

The Spanish Language And School Problems

Definition. Before World War II Anglo educators viewed the Mexican-American as an outsider, a foreigner whose low IQ test scores proved his innate intellectual inferiority. Mexican-American children were not encouraged to attend school, and many were children of migrants whose constant moving caused great deficiencies in their education. Many Anglos believed, as Taylor (1934:196) put it, "The illiterates make the best farm labor..." Carter (1970) pointed out that school programs during the 1930's emphasized the learning of English, vocational and manual-arts training, and the inculcation of basic American values such as thrift and punctuality. These subjects were selected as it was believed that Mexican-Americans

were deficient in them.

Until the late forties, Mexican-American children were formally segregated in separate buildings or separate schools. Heller (1966) explained that the rationale for this practice was because Mexican-American children knew little or no English upon entering school. Little (1944:60-61) quoted several school superintendents' reasons for physical separation of Mexican-American children:

Local prejudice and inability to speak English; Latin-Americans favor the plan; children are much more at ease and they will naturally segregate anyway; public opinion; school board is antagonistic toward housing in the same building;...they are dirty, lousy, and need special teaching in health and cleanliness.

In California, in 1947, the courts decided, in the "Mendez Case" that enforced segregation violated the United States constitution. Unfortunately, de facto segregation still existed due to spacial separation. A recent Supreme court decision indicated that busing would end such de facto segregation, and busing programs are now being instituted.

In the 1950s and the 1960s, the emphasis on socioeconomic problems of minority groups coupled with the civil rights movement contributed to a growing concern for the Mexican-American and to the tendency to recognize his problems as characteristic of low socioeconomic status.

Ortego (1971) called the educational statistics on Mexican-Americans "shocking." He pointed out that the Mexican-American dropout rate has been more than two times the national average. The estimates of the average number of school years

completed by Mexican-Americans (7.1 years) are below the figures for black children (9.0 years) or Anglo children (12.1 years). In Texas, 39 per cent of Mexican-Americans have less than a fifth grade education, and Mexican-Americans over twenty-five years of age average as little as 4.8 years of schooling. Nearly half the chicanos in Texas are functional illiterates. These statistics only cover those Mexican-Americans who attend school, but many never get to the first grade. In Texas, for example, only one-third of the five and six-year-old chicanos are enrolled in school. Clark (1970) explained that an analysis of census data revealed that the median years of schooling completed by white persons with Spanish surnames was lower than for any ethnic group in the Southwest except the American Indian.

Those Mexican-Americans who do enroll in school have failed to achieve as well as their Anglo counterparts on standard tests of achievement; their grade point average has also been lower as a group than that of Anglos in the same school district. Carter (1970) observed that Mexican-American children start out in school fairly close to Anglos in measured achievement. It is during the intermediate grades that Mexican-Americans' performance begins to drop drastically below that of Anglo children. This progressive "mental withdrawal" manifests itself in boredom, failure to work, inattentiveness and discipline problems which begin sometime during the third to sixth grades.

The Mexican-American's lack of achievement in school has

been attributed to many factors. The Los Angeles School Study (1968:134-5) conducted by Gordon and others, endeavored to ascertain what factors most influenced Mexican-American school achievement. They found four major factors:

...(1) Parental aspirations for pupils' educational attainment. (2) Pupil attitudes and values. (3) Language spoken at home. (4) Family economic level which contributes less to the performance of both ethnic groups than does family educational level.

From Gordon's study, Carter (1970) concluded that the academic success of a Mexican-American child depended on the degree to which his home has been oriented to Anglo middle-class culture.

Coleman and others, (1966) found that Mexican-American children: Strongly desired to stay in school and be good students; did not frequently plan to attend college; held high occupational aspirations; seemed to be slightly more self-depreciating than Anglos or Blacks; indicated feelings of poor ability to control their environment.

Mexican-Americans have failed to take advantage of the schools and the schools have failed to take advantage of Mexican-Americans. How can we better understand the reasons for their evident low academic achievement and poor participation in school?

Explanation. Many authors have lamented over the Mexican-American child's initial experience in school, and hypothesize that it is precisely these experiences which later cause the child to drop out. The average Mexican-American's

first contact with the Anglo culture - in school - is extremely demeaning. Immediately, the child is told he is a Mexican, therefore he is different. He may never before have realized he was different. There are many positive values in being a Mexican-American but a person's pride in his heritage is generally not instilled when he is labeled "different."

Ramirez (1970) has pictured the Mexican-American child's school experiences as being irrelevant to his home situation. He goes to a neighborhood school in which perhaps the only Anglo is the teacher. There, his daily schedule, his books, his tests, are all patterned after that of his Anglo counterparts who attend a school across town. Therefore, Ramirez (1970) continued, seventy-five percent of these children have a record of continuing school failure and drop out as soon as possible.

The NEA-Tucson Survey Group (1966) found that an enormous barrier the Mexican-American child faces when he enters school is that the school wants the child to grow up as an Anglo. He is asked to deny his family and his culture and in the process he is made shamefully aware of the disadvantages of his differences.

Nava (1970) felt the following situations were commonly experienced by all Mexican-American children in school, and contributed to their dislike of it: Bilingual children have been forced to suppress their mother tongue in favor of wholly English school learning. Speaking Spanish and being of Mexican descent is often considered a sign of

inferiority. Most Mexican-American children have poor English language skills, which hamper all academic and social endeavors. Nava (1970) indicated that initially a Mexican-American child's response to learning situations may be positive and creative, but he is frustrated because he cannot express himself well in English.

The Mexican-American child dreads, said Madsen (1964), being forced to recite in class. He knows his mistakes will be criticized and perhaps after class they will be ridiculed by Anglos. Demos (1962) has indicated that the contributing factors to school failure are: A low level of aspiration; lack of parental support; bilingualism; biculturalism; economic insecurity. Ulibarri (1966) felt that while teachers were sensitive to language deficiencies, they were unaware of cultural differences and conflicts. If a Mexican-American reaches high school, the chances are he has done so with great difficulty (Heffernan, 1955). He usually meets nothing but negative attitudes from parents, peers and the school.

Gottlieb (1967) conducted a research project to find out if perhaps the goals of Mexican-Americans were different than Anglo goals. He found that Mexican-Americans and other people of ethnic origin had middle-class goals: The attainment of the material goods which characterize the "American way of life." He found that they were unable to use education as a means to attain these goals, first because they fail to perceive a meaningful relationship between school and their future expectations, and second because there are few adults

in their lives who can help them with goal clarification and attainment.

Mexican-Americans in a mixed school have often run up against school rules which discriminate against them, though not overtly. Parsons (1965) for example mentioned such practices as school policy requiring fees or expenses to enter certain extracurricular activities such as band. In band the school provides instruction only on an advanced level, thus excluding children who do not have their own band instruments and have not had private lessons. The socioeconomic status of most Mexican-Americans prohibit such lessons and thus the school rules prohibit Mexican-Americans from participating. Mexican-Americans are also discriminated against in the question of dress. They often do not have the funds to dress like their Anglo peers.

Perhaps the most discriminatory practice of the school is ability grouping of students (tracking). This practice merely perpetuates birth status. Members of the low social class leave school prepared to enter low status social slots little different from those of their parents. In this sense school ascribes rather than proscribes status. The relationship between socio-economic class and track placement is obvious; with few exceptions, families in lower socioeconomic classes rear children who score below average on the instruments that are used to predict or measure school achievement or intelligence. According to Carter (1970:91), this tracking system isolates Mexican-American youth from equal status

interaction with others, and reinforces existing stereotypes. "Mexican-American children learn their future subordinate role in society by practicing it at school."

Mexican-American children, according to the Industrial Union Department of the AFL-CIO (1966:18-19) have regularly been suspended from school for "non-American" physical appearance. In a California Junior high school a vice-principal cut a seventh graders long black hair:

...Shame-faced and almost in tears Mexican-born Juan Garcia took his seat in class. His head was bald in spots. He tried to hide the black turfs of hair that stuck out all over. There was an awkward silence. Garcia's humiliation was to serve as a warning to the other boys. Haircutting never works (John's English teacher commented later.) All this does is force them out of school; they've had this kind of treatment since the first grade. Why should they want to stay in?

The teacher pointed out that John was wearing his hair in the same style as his father, and that Anglo children were never given such treatment.

Teachers, said Carter (1970) genuinely and willingly desire to help Mexican-Americans, but they do not necessarily like them or accept them as they are. What qualifications would a person need to be a good teacher of Spanish-speaking children? Manuel (1968) believed a good teacher needed: superior native ability, mastery of subject matter; broad general education; an understanding of human nature; dedication to the work. Manuel (1968), Noreen (1966), and the NEA Tucson Survey group (1966) strongly advocated that teachers of Mexican-Americans be bilingual. Noreen (1966), Galbraith (1965) and Chavez and

Erickson (1957) believed that being bilingual was not enough. Teachers should also understand and appreciate hispano culture.

The Office of Economic Opportunity (1967) set pupil-teacher ratio guidelines for disadvantaged children. It prescribed one teacher for each fifteen children. It also indicated that the teacher should start from where the child is.

Hunt (1966) noted that Piaget hinted that a discrepancy between central processes and a circumstance beyond the limits of an organism's capacity for accomodation resulted in distress and avoidance. In other words, as Ausubel (1966) indicated: Teaching must start where the learner is. How can one know where the learner is? Hunt (1966) suggested that since the child himself is the only one who can truly determine the appropriateness of the match between his state of readiness and the learning material, the child needs the opportunity to follow his own bent.

The views that Mexican-American's problems in school may be caused by their individual personalities, or by the failure of the culture, or by the failure of teachers, all lead to frustration. The first two views encourage intense efforts to modify the child; all encourage the development of the common teacher attitude that the Mexican-American child cannot learn.

It would appear logical to assume that Mexican-American teachers would, as a group, be accepting and understanding of their own group's children. It would also seem logical that

Mexican-American children would look up to such teachers as social role models. Not so, said Carter (1970, Mexican-American teachers usually adhere strictly and rigidly to institutional demands in order to maintain their new, higher socio-economic status as teachers. Although they may comprehend and empathize with the problems of their Mexican-American students, their precarious position prohibits them from doing anything to change the situation.

There is neither a theoretical framework nor empirical evidence that would make it possible to isolate and assess the impact of each of the numerous forces through which the school system contributes to deficient education for Mexican-Americans. Therefore the influence of the school's inadequacies may best be seen by observing the results of its work. Carter (1970) vehemently advocated objective institutional self-analysis as a step toward remedying the now present fact that the school has discouraged Mexican-American children from succeeding within it.

Psychological and Sociological Implications. The NEA-Tucson Survey Group (1970:112) suggested that the harm done the Mexican-American child linguistically was only exceeded by the harm done him psychologically:

In telling him that he must not speak his native language, we are saying to him by implication that Spanish and the culture which it represents are of no worth. Therefore (it follows again) this particular child is of no worth. It should come as no surprise to us then, that he develops a negative self-concept -- an inferiority complex.

The Mexican-American child, said the NEA-Tucson Survey group (1970), suffers irreparable psychological damage when he goes to school. He is immersed in an English-speaking environment which lacks the warmth and security of the human relationships found in his home, and at the same time he is expected to meet new work and discipline demands. "The result," continued the NEA-Tucson Survey Group, (1970:110), "may be that the Spanish language becomes a refuge into which the child retreats at every opportunity."

At school, the Mexican-American child also encounters an alien set of cultural values and a teacher who does not understand his own. Simmons (1952) believed that this first contact consists not of relationships with Anglo-American children, but with an Anglo teacher as perhaps the sole representative of an ethnic group other than his own. This relationship is a prototype of later relationships with Anglos in that the Mexican-American is subordinate while the Anglo is dominant.

Nava (1970:126) found that the Mexican-American's individual needs have been submerged in favor of a uniform curriculum established to make everyone speak and act like a typical American: "Efforts to suppress certain ethnic backgrounds cause long-lasting wounds and these result in social maladjustment and under-achievement." "No man," reported the NEA-Tucson Survey group (1970:110), "can find a true expression for living, or much less think right, who is ashamed of himself or his people."

The Mexican-American child's school experience often begins and ends in failure, and in order to avoid these failure experiences the Anglo community developed the preschool. Theoretically the preschool should, according to Olson and Larson (1966), provide for the development of language skills, self-image, social skills, and an awareness of cultural patterns of behavior. Pines (1967) envisioned the preschool as providing: Small group situations, each with its own teacher; planned sequences leading to specific educational objectives; activities selected for their contribution to learning. Finally, Sonquist and Kamii (1967) believed preschools should work along two dimensions: symbolization and the mastery of elementary types of relationships.

While preschools (e.g. Head Start) could help disadvantaged children substantially, many preschools are of short duration, usually for only the summer before the child enters the first grade. Many have speculated a three month preschool is not enough to "catch up" Mexican-American children to Anglo children. One informant interviewed by Rodriguez (1968) felt that Mexican-American children needed at least a year of preschool in order to "be even" with Anglo first graders.

Manuel (1965:191) found that a Mexican-American child may learn as many as five hundred English words while attending a summer preschool. But five hundred English words did not give Mexican-American children equal footing with Anglo children who enter the first grade knowing two or three thousand

English words. Sanchez (1966) questioned whether it was possible that a few weeks of vocabulary building could rectify the imbalance.

Amsden (1967) described a successful preschool program in the Los Angeles School system. The preschool program lasts for a year and stresses parental participation. Frank Serrano, initiator of the program, believed that the presence of parents eased the transition the Mexican-American child must make from the Spanish-speaking Mexican-American culture to the English-speaking Anglo school. Serrano reported that after a year all the children had improved and the only ones who did not improve dramatically were those whose parents did not participate regularly.

Such programs as this not only help the child form a positive concept of school, but also help parents to become aware of the child's need for their encouragement to continue in educational endeavors.

Cross-Cultural Impact. Armando Rodriguez (1968: Introduction) Chief of the United States Office of Education's Mexican-American Affairs Unit, pointed out that education is the one issue which unites all Mexican-American activists. "The Mexican-American is late getting into this battle. But he realizes that unless he gets in quickly and forcefully he will spend another half century fighting for survival from a position of linguistic and cultural isolation." Rodriguez (1968) felt that one of the reasons there are so many Mexican-American activists is because previously they were victims of

the schools. They had seen their hopes and dreams destroyed by a system which for years had been indifferent to their needs.

Ortego (1971) noted that in California the Chicano Movement advocated outright elimination of all entrance requirements for Mexican-Americans who wished to go to college, and the establishment of a Chicano studies program which would be closely attuned to the needs of the Mexican-American community. Ortego (1971), like Rodriguez (1968) mentioned that most Mexican-Americans see the need for the bilingual-bicultural school as the most pressing issue in Mexican-American education.

Are Anglos trying to right the wrongs which have been done to Mexican-Americans? The answer is "yes." In 1968 the Federal Government created three new agencies with specific responsibilities to the Mexican-American. The Inter-Agency Committee on Mexican-American Affairs assists in development of services that cover a wide range of government activities. The United States-Mexico Commission on Border Development and Friendship is charged with creating programs to improve cooperation on both sides of the border. The United States Office of Education's Mexican-American Affairs Unit seeks to bring about the creation of new educational systems tailored to meet the needs of the bilingual-bicultural citizen.

In 1968 the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was passed. This act contained provisions for funds for Mexican-Americans. Under Title I of this act funds were provided for a program called "English As A Second Language" (ESL) which is considered the first steppingstone to complete

bilingual school programs in the Southwestern schools. The "Migrant Amendment" of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act channels federal money for compensatory education into the creation and maintenance of new programs to meet the needs of migrant children. The Bilingual Education Act (Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act) authorized funds and support for schools to develop programs in which both English and the native language of the student could be used as teaching tools until a mastery of English has been achieved. Ortego (1971) pointed out that this act included pre-service training for teachers, teacher-aides, and counselors, and takes in early childhood education, adult education, reinstatement and retention programs for dropouts, and vocational training programs for people of limited English proficiency. The Bilingual Act also provided for teaching Mexican-American history and culture in order that Mexican-American children could learn about the history of Mexico and how it relates to their present situation as Mexican-Americans.

The goals are laudable, but in practice the results are discouraging. Bilingual-bicultural education exists at the moment only in a handful of programs throughout the country. Last year, EPDA (Education Professions Development Act) programs tapped teachers for training in bilingual-bicultural education, but their numbers have been extremely small. Such programs as Head Start prepare the child for the English curriculum of the Anglo school. Those few schools

which have bilingual programs are forced to use educational material relating to middle-class Anglo-American instead of to Mexican-American life. Instead of works in Spanish by and about Mexicans or Mexican-Americans, Anglo-American works in Spanish translation are used.

Rather than change programs for Mexican-Americans, many authors have suggested ways of helping the Mexican-American child within the Anglo school setting. Heffernan (1955) for example, proposed that schools initiate programs to get Mexican-American parents interested in the school and their childrens' education. This could be accomplished by conducting PTA meetings in Spanish with the use of slides and films to acquaint parents with the learning experiences the school provides. The school could disseminate information booklets in Spanish concerning courses, school requirements, health, vocational opportunities and so forth. Bilingual Mexican-American parents could be used as speakers and leaders. Finally, the school could offer evening courses in English. Heffernan (1955) reminded readers that one of the chief reasons Mexican-Americans drop out of school is that of economic insecurity. She proposed that the school take the responsibility of helping Mexican-Americans secure part-time employment. The school should also help Mexican-American families determine their eligibility for public assistance, and interest community organizations in providing scholarships for Mexican-American students.

Nova (1970) offered suggestions to teachers on how

to help Mexican-Americans stay in school. He suggested teachers learn Spanish, include Hispano-Mexican history in history classes, make it clear that all minority groups have enriched our country and help Mexican-American children feel pride in their culture and native language.

The watchword of MECHA (Movimiento Estudiantil Chicano de Aztlan), the national Chicano student organization, is the improvement of Mexican-American education from Kindergarten to college. At the University of Texas at El Paso, MECHA has created a model program for Chicano education aided by Chicano tutors and counselors. The heart of the program lies in La Mesa Directiva, an advisory board to the president of the university, composed of three factions: Chicano community, Chicano faculty, and Chicano students. Thereby, the Chicanos themselves develop their own education system.

Ortego (1971:81) summed up the consensus of opinion among Chicanos regarding education:

Chicanos insist that Mexican-Americans must, out of necessity, take the schools out of the hands of those who are academically suppressing them. The time of looking upon the Mexican-American as the poor, uneducated, tortilla-eating peon who is a victim of some fate stemming from Quetzalcoatl's disapproval is over. Montezuma's children are descendants of a proud race. The Chicanos of la raza will no longer be patient. They are insisting on action now.

Chapter 3

CONCLUSIONS FOR COUNSELING

Self-Referral

Nearly three decades have passed since Carl Rogers (1942) first promulgated the now widely adhered to dictum that counseling can be effective only when initiated by the client. The past decade has seen a re-examination of this issue in light of mounting evidence that socio-economically disadvantaged peoples, including Mexican-Americans, are disinclined to initiate counseling interviews.

Karno (1969) attributed the underrepresentation of Mexican-Americans in psychiatric treatment to the formidable language barrier, the self-esteem threatening nature of agency-client contacts, and the lack of mental health facilities in the Mexican-American community. He added that Mexican-American folk-psychiatry (curanderismo) may play a role in keeping Mexican-Americans away from counseling and mental health services in general.

Certain cultural characteristics of Mexican-Americans discussed in this study may be responsible for the Mexican-Americans' reluctance to seek aid. Machismo (male pride, virility) might be a key to understanding the Mexican-American male's distaste for professional assistance. The macho (manly male) does not ask for help. The self he presents to the world,

said Paz (1961), is one of self-sufficiency, and complete control. He resents a physical illness and often "suffers in silence" rather than go to a doctor. To admit weakness, especially in the case of an emotional problem, would shatter his image of authority and self-containment. Paz (1961) described the macho (manly male) metaphorically as one who always wears a mask covering his emotions and feelings. This mask is only removed when the macho (manly male) gets intoxicated.

The macho, as observed previously, maintains what to Anglos seem extremely formal relations with those outside his family. Dworkin (1970) observed that the Anglo's informal, to-the-point frankness in dealing with people offends the Mexican-American. Thus, fear of losing face in the eyes of his peers, together with a distaste for the Anglo counselors' informal style tend to deter the Mexican-American from approaching a counselor.

His fatalistic world-view and inadequate English language skills may also come into play. As mentioned in the section on fatalism, many Mexican-Americans accept events as being their due; as being God's will. A Mexican-American might reason that his emotional problems are merely his deserved punishment for some past sin, or simply a burden God wants him to bear to make him a better person. It would then be worthless to seek help, as man cannot change his God-given fate. For a fatalistic man, any attempt to change one's lot in life runs the risk of bringing on even worse

punishment.

Even having surmounted the burden of humbling himself to admit he has a problem, and having overcome his fatalism and distaste for the Anglo's interpersonal style, the courageous Mexican-American must still face the problems associated with his innadequate command of the English language.

In a study of Puerto-Rican-Americans, Fitzpatrick (1970) found that during periods of emotional disturbance, many native Spanish-speakers loose command of their second language, English, and revert to exclusive use of their first-learned language, Spanish. He attributed this phenomenon to the notion that emotions are learned first in the mother tongue, and that these bilinguals thus fall back on the different world-view peculiar to Spanish-speaking persons. This directly relates to the Whorfian hypothesis (1956) discussed in the section on The Spanish Language and Bilingualism. If in times of stress a Mexican-American turns to Spanish for emotional expression, why should he then go to an English-speaking counselor who, by the very fact that the language he speaks is English, could not meet the emotional needs of his Spanish-speaking client.

Poverty, according to Riessman (1964), also militates against the seeking of counseling and mental health services by Mexican-Americans and other minority groups. To begin with, there are the more obvious reasons: The expense of consulting a professional, the difficulty of missing a day of work to do so, and the unavailability of appropriate mental health services in low-income districts. Riessman (1964) also

observed a strong dislike for talk among low-income people in general. Mexican-Americans disposed to action or action-related talk would hardly go out of their way to engage a service which may appear to have no tangible end-product.

Given all these problems for Mexican-Americans, can counseling be effective only when initiated by the client? Calia (1966) said no. He believed that present methods for initiating counseling are founded on contradictory assumptions and untested clinical hunches. They are to be given no credence until empirically verified. An inadvertent outcome of a study by Arbuckle and Boy (1961) led these researchers to conclude that client-centered counseling may be effective even when not initiated voluntarily. Other writers, including Tyler (1963), Samler (1960, and Kagan (1964) have also questioned the validity of the assumption that all counseling must be volitional.

The development of methods for motivating recalcitrant clients to seek counseling appears to be a fruitful area for future research. As Moore (1963) proposed, counselors should reach out to the socially disadvantaged. This includes home visits, evening office hours, in effect, counselor recruitment of clients. The counselor should serve as a mediator between the Mexican-American and Anglo culture. He must first convince those whom he seeks to help that he can help them, that he can make a difference in their lives. This aggressive approach is necessary because the client must be sensitized to the opportunities which are open to him before he can take advantage of them.

The Dyadic Counseling Encounter

The typical counseling encounter finds counselor and client seated opposite one another in the counselor's office. Informal talk is the medium of expression. As may be imagined, the effectiveness of talk is limited by the extent to which the participants can understand each other, hence, the need for Spanish-speaking counselors. Strangely enough, various writers have denied the necessity for Spanish-speaking counselors. Heller (1966), for example, said that Mexican-American youth were embarrassed when teachers or counselors tried to speak broken Spanish to them. They felt it an affront to their intelligence that an Anglo did not think they could speak English well. Vontress (1968) also felt it not necessary that counselors speak Spanish. Mexican-Americans, he said, must learn to function in an Anglo society and knowledge of English is part of that learning.

If Whorf's (1956) and Fitzpatrick's (1970) (See section on Self-Referral of this conclusion.) analyses are even partly correct, then a counselor who does not speak Spanish cannot adequately comprehend the subjective reality of his client because the Mexican-American client's emotional makeup and world-view are inextricably bound up with the Spanish language.

Perhaps the most compelling argument for Spanish-speaking counselors comes from the Mexican-Americans themselves. In a large federally-funded study done by Caskey (1967), almost all Mexican-Americans interviewed expressed their desire to have counselors and other professionals who spoke their

language. One of the central demands of the militant chicano movement in the United States is that they be allowed to express themselves in Spanish, and that those who work with them also speak Spanish.

The section on The Spanish Language and Bilingualism cited studies which indicate that many Mexican-Americans do not speak English, and that the great majority only watch television or listen to the radio when these media broadcast in Spanish. Perhaps counselors who do not speak Spanish can help the Mexican-American client. But how much more could they help him if they would learn even a smattering of Spanish!

Even if the counselor knows Spanish, the typical dyadic encounter may not be the best way to deal with Mexican-Americans. The counselor must find less verbal ways to communicate with his low income client who is typically more action oriented than talk oriented. If the goal of counseling is the facilitation of self-exploration, how can this be accomplished without verbal communication? This self-exploration counselors (especially "client-centered" counselors) feel is a mandatory component of counseling, is, according to Riessman (1964:10) directly contrary to the life style of the poor: "Low-income people are generally less introspective, less introverted, and less concerned with self. They respond more to the external, to the outside, to action."

Calla (1966) explained that the low-income client's resistance to the contemplation of self and his tendency to ascribe his difficulties and concerns to forces outside him-

self, poses a dilemma for the counselor. Should the counselor teach the client how to talk about his feelings, his inner workings, or should the counselor work essentially within the context of the client's life style? The latter solution assumes that the counselor would assist in the identification of external impediments and solutions to the client's progress.

Those few studies that have been done suggest that other methods, rather than the dyadic encounter, would gain better results with low-income Mexican-Americans. Gorden (1966) went so far as to say that counseling is not an effective tool or instrument for change in the life of a person from the "culture of poverty." Counseling may help a person from a low socio-economic social class gain insight into ways his own behavior helps to defeat his purposes, but unless the counselor can bring about an environmental change in the lives of his clients, then counseling may prove ineffective.

Group counseling is one alternative to the face-to-face counseling interview. Frank (1961) stated that group counseling holds great promise as a medium for communication with disadvantaged clients as intense peer interaction is natural to the low-income person. Mexican-Americans, for example, intensely interact with family members and with members of their palomilla (group). Problems are often worked out with help of others, rather than through silent reflection. Frank (1961:121) observed that:

...The 'give and take' of group membership, the sharing of experiences and the spontaneity of feelings provide the client with a context in which he can be himself while undertaking

the arduous task of uncovering concerns and exploring new directions for change.

Since machismo (male virility, pride) usually prohibits Mexican-American males from forming close friendships with women as equals, and the palomilla (group) is exclusively composed of male youths, group counseling might meet with more success if there were no women in the initial group. As understanding increased, perhaps then women could also be included in the group.

Zwetschke (1965) recommended family counseling as an alternative to the traditional method. Family counseling, he observed, enables members to reveal affection and positive regard to each other, thus fostering a greater openness in interpersonal relationships. Apparently no studies on the effectiveness of family counseling with Mexican-Americans have been conducted, but there are certain barriers which might limit its success. The absolute authoritative position maintained by the father as head of the family might be undermined if his wife and children were encouraged to express their dissatisfaction with his leadership. He, and his sons would not consider it manly to admit personal problems to female members of the family. Or perhaps the children, who are physically punished if they contradict or argue with their parents, would simply be afraid to express themselves in the presence of their parents.

Another alternative open to counselors which is remarkably suitable to the low-income client's life-style is

that of role-playing. Role-playing patterns itself after real-life situations.

Prazak (1969) has used role-playing sessions recorded on video tape successfully with clients who are not able to secure jobs. This directive technique calls for the counselor to teach the client how to conduct himself satisfactorily in a given situation to obtain the results he desires. Then the client acts out the situation following the counselor's teaching. The client's acting out is then shown to him on video tape so he can judge his own performance. Done with a group, other members can also help him see how he might have performed better, or let him know how well he did. These recorded role-playing sessions are reported to be successful in that they have generalized from the counseling session to the client's life (Beach, 1969; Prazak, 1969; Stewart, 1969). Role-playing seems to offer many possibilities to the counselor dealing with Mexican-Americans precisely because Mexican-Americans have not been socialized in the same manner as Anglo-Americans and may not have learned manners of conduct in the Anglo world. For example, the client might be taught how to conduct himself during a job interview or at a mixed social gathering.

Unconditional Positive Regard

Counselor attitudes toward the client have an important part in any counseling theory. Most counseling theories assume that positive attitudes toward the client are essential for adequate counseling. Rogers' (1964:420) "client-centered"

approach placed great emphasis on the attitude of the counselor: "...growth and change are more likely to occur the more that the counselor is experiencing a warm, positive, accepting attitude toward what 'is' in the client." In other words, the counselor must value that person no matter what his condition, his behavior or feelings. A number of studies (Rogers & Dymond, 1954; Abeles, 1964) supported this contention.

Counselor attitudes influence the client, but according to Fiedler (1951) whether or not the counselor really likes the client is influenced by how similar the client is to him. In other words, it is more difficult to establish empathy with those who are different from ourselves. A number of studies (Bender & Hastorf, 1953; Rogers, 1959; Hunt, Ewing, LaFarge, & Gilbert, 1959) suggested that assumed similarity is directly related to empathy and unconditional positive regard. Such findings indicate that a counselor communicates feelings of warmth and understanding primarily when he views the client as being much like himself.

Social class differences would decrease the likelihood that the counselor would assume these similarities between himself and the client. Hollingshead and Redlich (1958) found that most therapists felt positive regard for clients who came from the same social class as they. If social class makes such a difference in a counselor's ability to positively regard clients, how much more must race and

language.

These studies make it seem likely that the white middle-class Anglo counselor would find it difficult to empathize with the brown, lower-class Mexican-American client. Is there anything the counselor can do to remedy the situation? Tiffany (1970) believed that in-service and pre-service training should be provided to counselors so that they might look at themselves and analyze their own attitudes, prejudices and biases toward those different from themselves. Vontress (1968) agreed and suggested that perhaps group counseling with Anglos and Mexican-Americans might be the most fruitful manner to accomplish this self-knowledge. Along with group counseling, the counselor could study Mexican-American culture and language as aids to further understanding. Certainly counselors are not born with the ability to empathize with people. Empathy, like other personality characteristics, is learned. Perhaps learning empathy for those like oneself is an unconscious process, while learning to empathize with those of a different culture must be conscious. Nevertheless, whether the learning is conscious or unconscious, empathy is still learned, and not inherent. Thus Anglo counselors can conceivably learn to care and empathize with those unlike themselves.

Values

This study has shown that many authors held Mexican-American value hierarchies differed markedly from those of Anglo-Americans. These differences, they pointed out, were not due merely to cultural differences but primarily to economic

differences. Carter (1970), in a survey of Mexican-American school problems found that many were due to the "culture of poverty" rather than to a specific set of Mexican-American values.

Whatever their prime cause, value differences do exist and do cause dilemmas for both counselor and client. It is inevitable that the Mexican-American client will be able to perceive this difference in value orientation between himself and the counselor. This in itself is not harmful. What may cause harm is a counselor's effort to impose his Anglo values on the Mexican-American. Johnson & Vestermark (1970:80) stressed the client's need for the counselor "...to be with him; he needs not to be told, nor to be exhorted, but to be helped to experience his own fresh perspectives.: If the counseling experience is to be a learning process for the Mexican-American, then he must be given the latitude and the opportunity to explore, discover, choose and decide. After all, it is probable that the reasons the Mexican-American came to the interview in the first place may be due to confusions in value conflicts.

There is another school of thought which holds value imposition a necessary part of counseling. Williamson (1958) and others hypothesized that value imposition is inevitable and necessary to the counseling situation. Murphy (1955) and Samler (1960) argued that counselor intervention in the realm of values is essential to successful interaction. Instead of asking if the counselor should try to change the client's values, perhaps a more pertinent question now would be, "how much do (even if

inadvertantly) the values of the counselor influence the client?"

The vital thing for the counselor to remember is that all Mexican-Americans are caught between their own value system and the Anglo's value system. Accepting certain values of one culture while rejecting others is bound to cause great conflict. This is precisely why curanderismo (folk-healing) has been so popular. Mexican-Americans whose emotional problems are the result of trying to tread two cultures are reintegrated into the Mexican-American community by the curandero (healer). The healer, in effect tells the Mexican-American that it is those sinful Anglo ways which are causing his problems, and to be cured he must return to God. This return to God is through Mexican-American folk-Catholic channels.

If the individual who has been "cured" by a folk-healer remains within the Mexican community, then perhaps his conflicts will not return. If, on the other hand he does not, then the dilemma over values will return. Curanderismo (folk-healing) is a temporary answer. It's effects endure only as long as those it cures remain in the Mexican-American community.

With the current emphasis on training paraprofessionals in the field of mental health, now would be an excellent time to use curanderos (healers). Obviously they have the communities' trust, and are sympathetic to human needs. If the government were to single them out and train them as counselor aids, then this great Mexican-American resource could be tapped and great numbers of Mexican-Americans might then come for

counseling. On the other hand, it might be impossible for the curandero (healer) to function without reference to God, sin, punishment, and so forth. If this turns out to be the case, then paraprofessional training might prove fruitless.

The Mexican-American who wants to function within the Anglo world, while preserving his ethnic identity, will not go to a curandero (healer) with his emotional problems -- he will go to a counselor.

William Glasser (1965) suggested one way to deal with those who have value systems unlike that of the counselor. His method is to have the counselor discuss with the client the consequences of his actions within the middle-class Anglo value system, and then let the client decide for himself if he wishes to follow the dictates of his own value system.

An example of this may be found in the school setting. Suppose a Mexican-American child, who has been encouraged to drop out of school by his parents, consults a counselor. The counselor, instead of trying to discourage him (thus demeaning his parents values) might try to inform him of the consequences of not getting an education in an Anglo society, its implications for work and salary, etc. If the Mexican-American child decides that he still must drop out, then the counselor might point out alternatives such as a trade school or on-the-job training with a company. Glasser (1965) then, would permit the Mexican-American his freedom of choice and the right to maintain his own value system while gaining knowledge of other value systems and possible alternatives.

In summary, cultural and linguistic realities of Mexican-American life clash with many traditional counseling practices. Machismo (male pride, virility) and the language gap deter Chicanos from initiating counseling interviews. The conventional dyadic encounter is foreign to the life-style of Mexican-Americans and other peoples of low socio-economic status. Middle-class Anglo counselors find it difficult to empathize with Mexican-Americans due to differences in social class, color and experiential background. Value differences between the counselor and the Mexican-American create misunderstanding in the counseling relationship and pose dilemmas concerning value imposition for the counselor. Cultural biases built into psychological tests discriminate against Chicanos and make accurate assessment difficult.

To become effective with the Chicano client counselors must become familiar with his language and culture; actively seek out and offer their services to the target community; use more action-oriented techniques, e.g. group counseling, role playing or reality therapy, and account for social and cultural differences when interpreting psychological tests. These, and other practices suggested in this report would ensure a more appropriate service for this minority population.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abeles, N. 1964. Liking for Clients: Its Relationship to Therapist's Personality and Empathic Understanding. Paper read at the American Psychological Association Convention. Los Angeles.
- Abraham, W. 1956. The Bilingual Child, His Parents, and Their School. *Exceptional Children*. 23:51.
- Adair, D. 1967. Cesar Chavez's Biggest Battle. *The Nation*. 205:627.
- Allen, S. 1966. *The Ground Is Our Table*. New York: Doubleday and Co., Inc.
- Allport, G.W. and T.F. Pettigrew. 1957. Cultural Influences on the Perception of movement: The Trapezoidal Illusion Among Zulus. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*. 55:104.
- Altus, G.T. 1953. WISC Patterns of a Selective Sample of Bilingual School Children. *The Pedagogical Seminary and Journal of Genetic Psychology*. 83:241.
- Amsden, C.E. 1967. in P.L. Cahn (Ed.) *Mama goes to Nursery School*. *American Education*. 3:10-11.
- Anastasi, A. 1970. Culture Fair Testing. in N.E. Gronlund (Ed.) *Readings in Measurement and Evaluation*. New York: Macmillan.
- _____ and F.A. Cordova. 1953. Some Effects of Bilingualism upon the Intelligence Test Performance of Puerto Rican Children in New York City. *Journal of Educational Psychology*. 44:1.
- Anderson, G. and W.H. Johnson. 1968. *Sociocultural Determinants of Achievement Among Mexican-American Students*. New York: State University.
- Arbuckle, D.S. and A.V. Boy. 1961. Client-Centered Therapy in Counseling Students with Behavior Problems. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*. 8:136-9.
- Ausubel, D.F. 1965. The Effects of Cultural Deprivation on Learning Patterns. *Audiovisual Instruction*. 10:10.

1966. A Teaching Strategy for Culturally Deprived Pupils: Cognitive and Motivational Considerations. in J.L. Frost and G.R. Frost. (eds.) The Disadvantaged Child: Issues and Innovations. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- Barrett, D.N. 1966. Demographic Characteristics. in J. Samora (ed.) La Raza: Forgotten Americans. South Bend, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Barry, R. and B. Wolf. 1962. Epitaph for Vocational Guidance. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Beach, A.L. 1969. Overcoming Underachievement. in J.D. Krumboltz and C.E. Thorenson. (eds.) Behavioral Counseling. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Beberfall, L. 1958. Some Linguistic Problems of the Spanish-Speaking People of Texas. Modern Language Journal. 42:87.
- Bender, I.E. and A.H. Hastorf. 1953. On Measuring Generalized Empathic Ability (Social Sensitivity). Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology. 48:503-6.
- Bergin, A.E. 1964. Some Implications of Psychotherapy Research for Therapeutic Practice. Paper read at the American Psychological Association Convention. Los Angeles, Calif.
- Berkemeger, F. 1965. The Relationship Between the Colored Progressive Matrices and the WISC. Psychology in the Schools. 3:279.
- Bernstein, B. 1960. Language and Social Class. The British Journal of Sociology. 11:271.
- Berson, M.P. 1967. Daily Program 111 for a Child Development Center. Washington, D.C. : Project Head Start, Community Action Program, Office of Economic Opportunity.
- Birch, H.G. 1956. Sources of Order in the Maternal Behavior of Animals. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry. 26:279.
- Black, M.H. 1966. Characteristics of the Culturally Disadvantaged. in J.L. Frost and G.R. Hawkes (eds.) The Disadvantaged Child: Issues and Innovations, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Blackie, J. 1968. How Children Learn. NEA Journal. 57:40-42.
- Blauner L. 1970. in R. Morgan (ed.) Sisterhood is Powerful. New York: Random House.
- Bloom, B.S. 1964. Stability and Change in Human Characteristics. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

- Bogardus, E.S. 1930. The Mexican Immigrant and Segregation. *American Journal of Sociology*. 13:74-80.
- Bogartz, R. 1969. The Chicano Rebellion. *The Nation*. 208:271-4.
- Braddy, H. 1960. Pachucos and Their Argot. *Southern Folk-Lore Quarterly*. 24:255-271.
- Brickman, W.W. (ed.) 1966. School Bias Toward Mexican Americans. *School and Society*. 94:378.
- Broom, L. 1952. Mexicans in the U.S. : A Problem of Social Differentiation. *Sociology and Social Research*. 36:150-8.
- Brown, R.W. and E. Lenneberg. 1961. A Study in Language and Cognition. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*. 49:454.
- Browning, H.L. and S.D. McLemore. 1964. A Statistical Profile of the Spanish Surname Population of Texas, Austin: The University of Texas Press.
- Bruner, J.S. 1966. The Cognitive Consequences of Early Sensory Deprivation. in J.L. Frost and G.R. Hawkes (eds.) *The Disadvantaged Child: Issues and Innovations*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- Buhler, C. 1963. *Values in Psychotherapy*. New York: Free Press.
- Burma, J.H. 1970. *Mexican-Americans in the United States: A Reader*. San Francisco, Calif.: Canfield Press.
- _____. 1954. *Spanish-Speaking Groups in the United States*. New York: Duke University Press.
- Calia, V.F. 1966. The Culturally Deprived Client: A Re-formulation of the Counselor's Role. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*. 13: (1):100-105.
- Campa, A.L. 1966. Culture Patterns of the Spanish-Speaking Community. in J.E. Moseley (ed.) *The Spanish-Speaking People of the South West*. Indiana: Council on Spanish American Work.
- _____. 1966. Individualism in Hispanic Society. in J.E. Moseley (ed.) *The Spanish-Speaking People of the Southwest*. Indiana: Council on Spanish American Work.
- Caldwell, F. and M.D. Mowry. 1934. Teacher Grades as Criteria of Achievement of Bilingual Children. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 18:288-92.
- Caplan, G. 1964. *Principles of Preventive Psychiatry*. New York: Basic Books.

- Caplovitz, D. 1963. *The Poor Pay More*. New York: Free Press.
- Carlson, H.B. and N. Henderson. 1950. Intelligence of American Children of Mexican Parentage. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*. 45:544.
- Carp, F.M. 1970. Communicating with Elderly Mexican-Americans. *The Gerontologist*. 10:(2):14.
- Carter, Thomas P. 1970. *Mexican-Americans in School: A History of Educational Neglect*. New York: College Entrance Examination Board.
- Carter, T.P. 1968. The Negative Self-Concept of Mexican American Students. *School and Society*. 96:217.
- _____. 1968. Preparing Teachers for Mexican American Children. Paper read at the Conference on Teacher Education for Mexican-Americans. New Mexico State University: Albuquerque.
- Caskey, O.L. 1967. *Guidance Needs of Mexican-American Youth*. Washington D.C. : Office of Education.
- Cassirer, E. 1953. *The Philosophy of Symbolic Forms*. Language New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Castaneda, C. 1968. *The Teachings of Don Juan: A Yaqui Way of Knowledge*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Chavez, S.J. 1965. Preserve Their Language Heritage. *Childhood Education*. 33:165.
- _____. and T.L. Erickson. 1957. Teaching American Children from Spanish-Speaking Homes. *Elementary School Journal*. 57:198-203.
- Cicirelli, V.G. and J.S. Cicirelli. 1970. Counselors' Creative Ability and Attitude in Relation to Counseling Behavior with Disadvantaged Counselees. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*. 17:2.
- Clark, K.B. 1965. *Dark Ghetto, Dilemmas of Social Power*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Clark, M. 1959. *Health in the Mexican American Culture*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Cook, J.M. and G. Arthur. 1951. Intelligence Ratings for 97 Mexican Children in St. Paul, Minn. *Journal of Exceptional Children*. 18:14-5.
- Cohen, J. 1959. The Factorial Structure of the WISC at ages 7-6, 10-6, and 13-6. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*. 23:285-298.

- Cole, S.G. and M.W. Cole. 1954. Minorities and the American Promise; The Conflict of Principle and Practice. New York: Harper and Brothers.
- Coleman, J.S. et al. 1966. Equality of Educational Opportunity. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Dept. of Health, Education, and Welfare.
- Conklin, H. 1955. Hanunoo Color Catagories. Southwest Journal of Anthropology. 11:339-344.
- Conway, T.F. 1942. The Bi-lingual Problem in the Schools of New Mexico. Alianza. 36:13-17.
- Crawford, F.R. 1961. The Forgotten Egg: An Exploration into Mental Health Problems Among Urban Mexican American Families and Their Children. Austin, Texas: Texas State Department of Health, Division of Mental Health.
- Cronback, L.J. 1955. Processes Affecting Scores on "Understanding of Others: and :Assumed Similarity". Psychological Bullitin. 52:177-193.
- Daniels, R. and H. Kitano. 1970. American Racism: Exploration of the Nature of Prejudice. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Demos, G.D. 1962. Attitudes of Mexican American and Anglo American Groups Toward Education. The Journal of Social Psychology. 57:249-256.
- Dennis, W. 1960. Causes of Retardation Among Institutional Children: Iran. Journal of Genetic Psychology. 96:47-59.
- Derbyshire, R.L. 1969. Adaptation of Adolescent Mexican Americans to United States Society. American Behavioral Scientist. 13:51.
- Deutsch, M. 1966. Nursery Education: The Influence of Social Programming on Early Development. in J.L. Frost and G.R. Hawkes (eds.) The Disadvantaged Child: Issues and Innovations. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- _____. 1965. The Role of Social Class in Language Development and Cognition. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry. 35:78-88.
- Diaz-Guerrero, G. 1955. Neurosis and the Mexican Family Structure. American Journal of Psychiatry. 112:411-417.
- Dolan, G.K. and C.E. Nevarez. 1967. Family Reading Circles. Clearing House. 41:500-501.

- Dworkin, A. 1970. Stereotypes and Self-Images Held by Native-Born and Foreign-Born Mexican-Americans. in J.H. Burma (ed.) Mexican-Americans in the United States: A Reader, San Francisco, California: Canfield Press.
- Edmundson, M. 1957. Los Manitos. New Orleans: Tulane University Middle American Research Institute.
- Elloitt, K. 1961. Juanito Can Read. Coronet. 50:152-156.
- Erickson, C.A. 1968. Uprising in the Barrios. American Education. 4:(10): 29-31.
- Fabrega, H. Jr. and C.A. Wallace. 1968. Value Identification and Psychiatric Disability: An Analysis Involving Americans of Mexican Descent. Behavioral Science. 13:362-371.
- Fiedler, F.E. 1951. A Method of Objective Quantification of Certain Countertransference Attitudes. Journal of Clinical Psychology. 7:101-107.
- Fitzpatrick, J.P. 1970. Mental Illness Among Puerto Ricans in New York: Cultural Condition or Intercultural Misunderstanding? Paper read at the American Orthopsychiatric Association Convention. New York.
- Flavell, J.H. 1966. The Developmental Psychology of Jean Piaget. in J.L. Frost (ed.) Early Childhood Education Rediscovered. New York: Holt Rinehart.
- Forbes, J.D. 1967. Mexican-Americans: A Handbook for Educators. Berkely: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.
- _____. 1968. Race and Color in Mexican American Problems. Journal of Human Relations. 16:55-68.
- Frake, C.O. 1964. The Diagnosis of Disease Among the Subanun of Mindanao. American Anthropologist. 63:113-132.
- Frank, J.D. 1961. Therapy in a Group Setting. in M.I. Stein (ed.) Contemporary Psychotherapies. New York: Free Press.
- Freeberg, N.E. and D.T. Payne. 1968. Parental Influence on Cognitive Development in Early Childhood: A Review. in J.L. Frost (ed.) Early Childhood Rediscovered. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Fullmer, D.W. and H.W. Bernard. 1964. Counseling and Content. Chicago: Science Research Associates.
- Galbraith, C.K. 1965. Spanish-Speaking Children Communicate. Childhood Education. 42:70-74.

- Gamio, M. 1931. *The Mexican Immigrant, His Life Story*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gardner, R.W. 1968. *A Psychologist Looks at Montessori*. in J.L. Frost (ed.) *Early Childhood Education Rediscovered*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Garth, T., W.M. Holcomb and V.I. Gosche. 1932. *Mental Fatigue of Mexican School Children*. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 15:675-80.
- _____, Elson and M.N. Morton, 1936. *The Administration of Non-Language Intelligence Tests to Mexicans*. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*. 31:53-58.
- Getzels, J.W. 1968. *Pre-school Education*. in J.L. Frost (ed.) *Early Childhood Education Rediscovered*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Glasser, W. 1965. *Reality Therapy*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Glick, L.B. 1966. *The Right to Equal Opportunity*. in J. Samora (ed.) *La Raza: Forgotten Americans*. South Bend: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Goldberg, M.L. 1966. *Adapting Teacher Style to Pupil Differences; Teachers for Disadvantaged Children*. in J.L. Frost and G.R. Hawkes (eds.) *The Disadvantaged Child: Issues and Innovations*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- Gonzales, E. 1965. *Mexican Americans in California*. *California Education*. 3:19-22.
- _____. 1965. *Mexican American Parents Respond to Bilingual Questionnaires*. *California Education*. 3:10-12.
- Gordon, C.W. et al. 1968. *Educational Achievement and Aspirations of Mexican-American youth in a Metropolitan context*. Mexican-American Study Project, Educational Sub-study, Center for the Evaluation of Instructional Programs. A Partial Report of the Los Angeles School Study, Los Angeles: University of California.
- Gottlieb, D. 1967. *Poor Youth Do Want to be Middle-Class But It's Not Easy*. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*. 46:2.
- Grande, P. 1968. *Attitudes of Counselors and Disadvantaged Students Toward School Guidance*. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*. 46:9.
- Gray, W.S. 1956. *How Well do Adults Read?* in N.B. Henry (ed.) *Adult Reading*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Grebler, L. J.W. Moore, and R.C. Guzman. 1971. The Mexican-American People: The Nation's Second Largest Minority. New York: The Free Press, MacMillan & Co.
- Greenbert, B.S. 1966. Media Use and Believability: Some multiple Correlates. *Journalism Quarterly*. 43:665-670.
- Grenfell, J.E. 1964. Family Group Consultation: A Description. Paper read at the American Personnel and Guidance Association Convention. San Francisco.
- Guernsey, B. Jr. 1964. Filial Therapy: Description and Rationale. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*. 28:304-310.
- Gurselin, O.R., R.G. Hunt, and J.L. Roach. 1964. Social Class and Mental Health Movement. in F. Riessman, J. Cohen and A. Pearl (eds.) *Mental Health of the Poor*. New York: Free Press.
- Haught, B.F. 1932. The Language Difficulty of Spanish American Children. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 15:92-95.
- Havighurst, R.J. 1966. Who Are the Socially Disadvantaged? in J.L. Frost and G. Hawkes (eds.) *The Disadvantaged Child: Issues and Innovations*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- Heffernan, H.W. 1955. Some Solutions to Problems of Students of Mexican Descent. *The Bulletin of the National Assoc. of School Principals*. 39:43-53.
- Heller, C.S. 1966. Mexican American Youth: Forgotten Youth at the Crossroads. New York: Random House.
- Helm, J. 1969. Spanish Speaking People in the United States. Seattle: University of Washington Press. 1969.
- Hernandez, L.G. 1969. A Forgotten American: A Resource Unit for Teachers on the Mexican-American. New York: Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith.
- Hess, R.D. 1966. Educability and Rehabilitation: The Future of the Welfare Class. in J.L. Frost and G.R. Hawkes (eds.) *The Disadvantaged Child: Issues and Innovations*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- Holland, W.E. 1960. Language Barrier as an Education Problem of Spanish Speaking Children. *Exceptional Children*. September.
- _____. 1963. Mexican-American Medical Beliefs: Science or Magic? *Arizona Medicine*. 20:89-102.
- Hollingshead, A.B. and F.C. Redlich. 1958. Social Class and

- Mental Illness. New York: John Wesley and Sons.
- Honstead, C. 1966. The Developmental Theory of Jean Piaget. in J.L. Frost (ed.). Early Childhood Education Rediscovered. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc.
- Hughson, A. 1966. The Case for Intelligence Testing. in J.L. Frost and G.R. Hawkes (eds.) The Disadvantaged Child: Issues and Innovations. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- Humphrey, N.D. 1944. The Changing Structure of the Detroit Mexican Family. American Sociological Review. 9:622-625.
- Hunt, J. McV. 1966. How Children Develop Intellectually. in J. L. Frost and G.R. Hawkes (eds.) The Disadvantaged Child: Issues and Innovations. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- _____. 1961. Intelligence and Experience. New York: The Ronald Press Co.
- _____. 1968. Revisiting Montessori. in J.L. Frost (ed.) Early Childhood Education Rediscovered. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- _____. 1964. The Psychological Basis for Using Pre-School Enrichment as an Antidote for Cultural Deprivation. The Merrill-Palmer Quarterly. 10:209-248.
- _____. T.N. Ewing, R.La Farge and W.N. Gilbert. 1959. An Integrated Approach to Research on Therapeutic Counseling With Samples of Results. Journal of Counseling Psychology. 6:46-54.
- Industrial Union Dept., AFL-CIO. 1966. We're Supposed to Believe We're Inferior. I.U.D. Agenda. 2:(7).
- Iuckhohn, F. and F. Strodthack. 1961. Variation in Value Orientation. Evanston: Row Peterson.
- Jackson, K.V. 1964. Minority Families and Family Group Consultation. Paper Read at the American Personnel and Guidance Association Convention. San Francisco.
- Jacobs, P. 1959. The Forgotten People. The Reporter. 20:12-20.
- Jean-Marie, Sister, I.H.M. 1965. A Summer School for Pre-first Grade for Mexican American Children. Catholic School Journal. 65:34-35.
- Jensen, A.R. 1961. Learning Abilities in Mexican American and Anglo American Children. California Journal of Educational Research. 12:4.
- Johnson, D. and M. Vestermarck. 1970. Barriers and Hazards in

- Counseling. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- Johnson, G.B., Jr. 1950. An Experimental Projective Technique for the Analysis of Racial Attitudes. *Journal of Educational Psychology*. 41:251-278.
- _____. 1953. Bilingualism as Measured by a Reaction-Time Technique and the Relationship Between a Language and a Non-Language Intelligence Quotient. *Journal of Genetic Psychology*. 82:3-9.
- _____. 1950. The Origin and Development of the Spanish Attitude Toward the Anglo and the Anglo Attitude Toward the Spanish. *Journal of Educational Psychology*. 41:428-439.
- _____. 1951. The Relationship Existing Between Bilingualism and Racial Attitude. *Journal of Educational Psychology*. 42:357-365.
- Johnson, H.S. and W.J. Hernandez. 1970. *Educating the Mexican-American*. Valley Forge, Pa: Press.
- Jones, R.C. 1948. Ethnic Family Patterns: The Mexican Family in the United States. 53:450-453.
- Kagan, N. 1964. Three Dimensions of Counselor Encapsulation. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*. 11:361-365.
- Karno, M. 1966. The Enigma of Ethnicity in a Psychiatric Clinic. *Archives of General Psychiatry*. 14:(5):516-520.
- _____. and R.B. Edgerton. 1969. Perception of Mental Illness in a Mexican-American Community. *Archives of General Psychiatry*. 20:233-238.
- Keston, M.J. and C. Jimenez. 1954. A Study of the Performance on English and Spanish Editions of the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Test by Spanish American Children. *Journal of Genetic Psychology*. 85:262-269.
- Kibbe, P.R. 1946. *Latin Americans in Texas*. Albuquerque: The University of New Mexico Press.
- _____. 1949. The American Standard -- For all Americans. *Common Ground*. 10:19-28.
- Kiev, A. 1968. *Curanderismo: Mexican-American Folk Psychiatry*. New York: The Free Press.
- King, P.E. 1966. Multisensory Teaching Tools and the Very Young Language Learner. *Audiovisual Instruction*. 11:639-641.
- Kluckhohn, F. and F. Strodtbeck. 1961. *Variations in Value*

- Orientations. New York: Row, Peterson & Co.
- Knowlton, C.S. 1962. Patron-Peon Pattern Among the Spanish Americans of New Mexico. *Social Forces*. 41:12-17.
- _____. 1969. Tijerina: Hero of the Militants. *The Texas Observer*. 4:28.
- Koenig, F.G. 1953. Improving the Language Abilities of Bilingual Children. *Exceptional Children*. 19:183-186.
- Leacock, E. 1968. The Concept of Culture and its Significance for School Counselors. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*. 46:9.
- Levine, B. and I. Iscoe. 1954. A Comparison of Raven's Progressive Matrices with a short Form of the Wechsler-Bellvue. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*. 18:1-10.
- Levine, D.U. 1962. City Schools Today: Too Late with Too Little? *Phi Delta Kappan*. 44:80-83.
- _____. 1964. Integration: Reconstructing Academic Values of Youths in Deprived Areas. *The Clearing House*. 39:3.
- Levine, R. 1964. Treatment in the Homes. *Social Work*. 9:19-28.
- Levine, R.H. 1968. Learn a Lito English. *American Education*. 3:10-11.
- Lesser, G.S., G. Fifer, and S. Clark. 1965. Mental Abilities of Children from Different Social-Class and Cultural Groups. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*. 30:4.
- Lewis, D.G. 1959. Bilingualism and Non-Verbal Intelligence: A Further Study of Test Results. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*. 29:17-22.
- Lewis, H.P. and E.R. Lewis. 1965. Written Language Performance of Sixth-grade Children of Low Socio-Economic Status from Bilingual and from Monolingual Background. *Journal of Experimental Education*. 33:237-242.
- Little, W. 1944. *Spanish-Speaking Children in Texas*. Austin: The University of Texas Press.
- Luna, E.G. 1966. Spanish-Speaking People of the Southwest. in J.E. Moseley (ed.) *The Spanish-Speaking People of the Southwest*. Indiana: Council on Spanish American Work.
- Madsen, W. 1964. The Alcoholic Agringado. *American Anthropologist*. 66:355-361.

- Madsen, W. 1964. Mexican-Americans of South Texas. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Mahikian, C. 1939. Measuring the Intelligence and Reading Capacity of Spanish-Speaking Children. Elementary School Journal. 39:760-768.
- Manning, J.C. 1966. Linguistic Approach to the Teaching of English as a Foreign Language. The Instructor. 75:81.
- Manuel, H.T. 1968. Recruiting and Training Teachers for Spanish-Speaking Children in the Southwest. School and Society. 96:211-214.
- _____. 1965. Spanish-Speaking Children of the Southwest: Their Education and the Public Welfare. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- _____. 1968. The Spanish-Speaking Child in Texas Schools. in D.M. Estes, and D.W. Darling (eds.) Improving Educational Opportunities of the Mexican American: Proceedings of the First Texas Conference for the Mexican American. San Antonio: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.
- _____. 1967. Technical Report, Tests of General Ability and Tests of Reading. Inter-American Series Forms CE, DE, CEs, DEs; Austin, Texas: Guidance Testing Associates.
- Marden, C.G. and G. Meyer. 1968. Minorities in American Society. New York: American Book Company.
- Martinez, C. and H.W. Martin. 1966. Folk Diseases Among Urban Mexican-Americans. Journal of the American Medical Assoc. 96:161-164.
- Massad, C.E. 1970. Stimulus Modes and Language Media: A Study of Bilinguals. Psychology and the School. 7:38-42.
- Mayer, A. 1961. The Grapes of Wrath, Vintage 1961. The Reporter. 24:34-37.
- McDonagh, F. and E.C. McDonagh. 1968. Education, Economic Status and Social Class Awareness of Mexican Americans. Penalosa. 29:119-126.
- McWilliams, C. 1942. Brothers Under the Skin. Boston: Little Brown and Co.
- _____. 1968. North From Mexico: The Spanish-Speaking People of the United States. New York: Greenwood Press.
- Miller, W. 1955. Developing Status for Members of a Minority Group. The National Association of Secondary School Principals. 4:27.

- Mitchell, A.J. 1937. The Effect of Bi-Lingualism on the Measurement of Intelligence. *Elementary School Journal*. 28:29-37.
- Mittelback, F.G., J.W. Moore, and R. McDaniel. 1966. Inter-marriage of Mexican Americans. Mexican American Study Project, Advance Report N. 6. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Montiel, M. 1970. The Social Science Myth of the Mexican American Family. *El Grito*. 3:(4): 56-63.
- Moore, J.W. 1963. New Programs and Trends in Guidance for Socially Disadvantaged Youth. Bureau of Guidance. New York: Education Department of New York.
- Mowrer, O.H. 1954. The Psychologist Looks at Language. *American Psychologist*. 9:660-694.
- Murphy, G. 1955. The Cultural Context of Guidance. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*. 34:4-9.
- Murra, E. 1954. Learning English as a Second Language. *Journal of Educational Sociology*. 28:181-192.
- Naegele, V.A. 1967. Sociology. in *Americans of Mexican Descent - An In-Depth Study*. San Antonio, Texas: Human Resources Development Institute.
- Nava, J. 1970. Cultural Backgrounds and Barriers that Affect Learning by Spanish-Speaking Children in J. Burma (ed.) *Mexican Americans in the United States*. Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman Publishing Co.
- Navarro, E.G. 1969. Annotated Bibliography of Materials on the Mexican American, Austin: Texas University.
- NEA-Tucson Survey on the Teaching of Spanish to the Spanish-Speaking. 1966. *The Invisible Minority...Pero no Vencibles*. Washington, D.C. : National Education Assoc.
- Noreen, Sister, D.C. 1966. A Bilingual Curriculum for Spanish-Americans. *Catholic School Journal*. 66:25-26.
- Office of Economic Opportunity. 1967. The Staff for a Child Development Center. Washington, D.C. : Project Head Start, Office of Economic Opportunity.
- Olson, J.L. and R.G. Larson. 1966. An Experimental Curriculum for Culturally Deprived Kindergarten Children. in J.D. Frost and G.R. Hawkes (eds.) *The Disadvantaged Child: Issues and Innovations*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- Ortego, P.D. 1971. *Schools for Mexican-Americans: Between Two*

- Cultures. Saturday Review. 104: (16): 62-81.
- Orwell, G. 1949. Nineteen eighty-four. New York: Harcourt, Brace and co.
- Palomares, Uvaldo H. 1968. Special Needs of Mexican-Americans: Project DESIGN. Washington D.C. : United States Office of Education.
- _____ and L.C. Johnson. 1966. Evaluation of Mexican-American Pupils for Educable Mentally Retarded Classes. California Education. 3:(8):27-29.
- Paredes, J. 1968. in A. Kiev (ed.) Curanderismo: Mexican-American Folk Psychiatry. New York: The Free Press.
- Parsons. E. 1966. in School bias Toward Mexican-Americans. School and Society. 94:378-380.
- Pasamanick, B. 1951. Intelligence of American Children of Mexican Parentage: A Discussion of Uncontrolled Variables. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology. 46:598-602.
- Paz, Octavio. 1961. El Laberinto de la Soledad. New York: Grove Press.
- Peak, H. 1958. Search for Identity by a Young Mexican-American. Clinical Studies in Culture Conflict. New York: Ronald Press.
- Pease, D. 1966. Family Forces Influence Child Behavior. in J. L. Frost and G.R. Hawkes (eds.) The Disadvantaged Child: Issues and Innovations. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- Penalosa, F. 1968. Mexican Family Roles. Marriage and the Family. 30:680-688.
- _____ and E.D. McDonagh. 1966. Social Mobility in a Mexican-American Community. Social Forces. 44:498-505.
- Perales, A.M. 1965. The Audio-Lingual Approach and the Spanish-Speaking Student. Hispanis. 48:99-102.
- Philippus, M.J. 1967. Test Prediction of School Success of Bilingual Hispanoamerican Children. Reno: Luke B. Hancock Foundation.
- Piaget, J. 1963. The Origins of Intelligence in Children. M. Cook (trans.) New York: W.W. Norton & Co. Inc.
- _____ 1966. The Psychology of Intelligence. M. Piercy and D.E. Berlyne (trans.). Totowas, New Jersey: Littlefield, Adams & Co.

- _____. 1962. The States of the Intellectual Development of the Child. Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic. 6:120-128.
- Pines, M. 1967. Revolution in Learning: The Years From Birth to Six. New York: Harper & Row Publishers.
- Pinkney, A. 1963. Prejudice Toward Mexican and Negro Americans: A Comparison. Penalosa. 24:353-359.
- Pinter, R.R. and S. Arsenia. 1937. The Relation of Bilingualism and Verbal Intelligence and School Adjustment. Educational Research. 31:255-263.
- Pitt, L. 1966. The Decline of the Californios. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Poulos, W.T. 1959. They Learn Basic English Before School Starts. Texas Outlook. 43:15-16.
- Prazak, J.A. 1969. Learning Job-Seeking Interview Skills. in J.D. Krumholtz and C.E. Thoresen (eds.) Behavioral Counseling: Cases and Techniques. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Purdy, B. and others. 1970. Mellaril or Medium, Stelazine or Seance? A Study of Spiritualism as it Affects Communication, Diagnosis and Treatment of Puerto Rican People. New York: American Orthopsychiatric Assoc.
- Ramirez, A.R. 1970. Adult Illiteracy. in J. Burma (ed.) Mexican-Americans in the United States. New York: Schenkman Publishing.
- Ramos, S. 1962. Profile of Man and Culture in Mexico. Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press.
- Ramsey, G.V. and B. Hodge. 1959. Anglo-Latin Problems as Perceived by Public Service Personnel. Social Forces. 37-38:339-348.
- Rapier, J.L. 1967. Effects of Verbal Mediation Upon the Learning of Mexican American Children. California Journal of Educational Research. 18:40-48.
- Rice, J.P. 1964. Education of Subcultural Groups. School and Society. 92:360-362.
- Riessman, G. 1964. Role Playing and the Lower Socio-economic Group. Group Psychotherapy. 17:36-48.
- Riessman, F. 1967. Teachers of the Poor: A Five-Point Plan. Journal of Teacher Education. 18:236-336.
- _____, Cohen, J. and A. Pearl (eds.) 1964. Mental Health of

- the Poor. New York: The Free Press.
- Roca, P. 1955. Problems of Adapting Intelligence Scales from one Culture to Another. *High School Journal*. 38:124-131.
- Rodgers, D.A. 1959. Relationships between Real Similarity and Assumed Similarity with Favorability Controlled. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*. 59:431-433.
- Rodriguez, A.M. 1968. Speak up, Chicano; Fight for Educational Equality. *American Education*. 4:25-27.
- Rogers, C. 1942. *Counseling and Psychotherapy*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- _____. 1961. *On Becoming a Person*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- _____. 1961. Therapeutic and Research Progress in a Program of Psychotherapy with Hospitalized Schizophrenics. Paper read at the American Psychological Association Convention. New York.
- _____. 1964. Toward a Modern Approach to Values: The Valuing Process in the Mature Person. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*. 68:160-167.
- _____ and R.F. Dymond. 1954. *Psychotherapy and Personality Change*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Rokeach, M. 1968. *Beliefs, Attitudes and Values: A Theory of Organization and Change*. San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass, Inc.
- Romano, O.I. 1968. The Anthropology and Sociology of the Mexican-Americans: The Distortion of Mexican-American History. *El Grito*. 2:13-26.
- Romney, A.K. and R.G. D'Andrade (eds.) 1964. *Transcultural Studies in Cognition*. *American Anthropologist*. 66:3.
- Rosenthal, R. and L. Jacobson. 1968. *Pygmalion in the Classroom: Teacher Expectations and Pupil's Intellectual Development*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Rowan, Helen. 1967. A Minority Nobody Knows. *The Atlantic Monthly*. 219:47-52.
- Rubel, A.J. 1966. *Across the Tracks: Mexican Americans in a Texas City*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- _____. 1960. Concepts of Disease in Mexican American Culture. *American Anthropologist*. 62:795-814.

- _____. 1964. The Epidemiology of a Folk Illness: Susto in Hispanic America. *Ethnology*. 3:268-283.
- Ruiz, R.E. 1968. The New Mexican-American: Another Defector From the Gringo World. *New Republic*. 159:11.
- Samler, J. 1960. Change in Values. A goal in Counseling. *The Journal of Counseling Psychology*. 7:32-39.
- Samora, J. 1963. Educational Status of a Minority. *Theory into Practice*. 2:144-150.
- _____. 1966. *La Raza: Forgotten Americans*. South Bend: University of Notre Dame Press.
- _____. and R.F. Larson. 1961. Rural Families in an Urban Setting: A Study in Persistence and Change. *Journal of Human Relations*. 9:494-503.
- Sanchez, G.I. 1934. Bilingualism and Mental Measures. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 18:765-772.
- _____. 1951. Concerning Segregation of Spanish-Speaking Children in the Public Schools. *Inter-American Education Occasional Papers*. 9:1 & appendix.
- _____. 1967. *Forgotten People: A Study of New Mexicans*. Albuquerque, New Mexico: Calvin Horn Publishers.
- _____. 1932. Group Differences and Spanish-Speaking Children - A Critical Review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 16:549-558.
- _____. 1966. History, Culture, and Education in J. Samora (ed.) *La Raza: Forgotten Americans*. South, Bend, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press.
- _____. 1953. Spanish Speaking People in the Southwest -- A Brief Historical Review. *California Journal of Elementary Education*. 22:106-111.
- _____. 1946. *The Education of Spanish-Speaking People in the Southwest*. Austin: The University of Texas Press.
- Saunders, L. 1966. Anglos and Spanish-Speaking People: Contrasts and Similarities. in J.E. Moseley (ed.) *The Spanish-Speaking Peoples of the Southwest*. Indiana: Council on Spanish-American work.
- _____. 1954. *Cultural Difference and Medical Care: The Case of the Spanish-Speaking People of the Southwest*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Schafer, W.E., C. Olexa and K. Polk. 1970. Programmed for

- Social Class: Tracking in High School. Transaction. 7:(12).
- Schramm, W. 1956. Why Adults Read. in N.B. Henry (ed.) Adult Reading. Fifty-Fifth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Part II. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Schrieke, B. 1936. Alien Americans. New York: The Viking Press.
- Scott, R. 1967. Head Start Before Home Start? Merrill-Palmer Quarterly. 13:317-321.
- Segall, M.H., D.T. Campbell and M.J. Herskovits. 1966. The Influence of Culture on Visual Perception. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Co.
- Sheldon, P.M. 1966. Community Participation and the Emerging Middle Class. In J. Samore (ed.) La Raza: Forgotten Americans. South Bend: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Simmons, O.G. 1952. Anglo-Americans and Mexican-Americans in South Texas: A Study in Dominant-Subordinant Group Relations. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Harvard University.
- _____. 1961. The Mutual Images and Expectations of Anglo-Americans and Mexican-Americans. Daedulus: Journal of American Academy of Arts and Sciences. 90:286-299.
- Skeels, H.M. 1966. Effects of Adoption on Children from Institutions. in J.L. Frost and G.R. Hawkes (eds.) The Disadvantaged Child: Issues and Innovations. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- Smith, J.E. 1969. Encouraging Constructive Use of Time. in J.D. Krumboltz and C.E. Thoresen (eds.) Behavioral Counseling: Cases and Techniques. Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Soffietti, J.P. 1955. Bilingualism and Biculturalism. Journal of Educational Psychology. 46:222-227.
- Sonquist, H.D. and C.K. Kamii. 1967. Applying Some Piagetian Concepts in the Classroom for the Disadvantaged. Young Children. 22:231-238.
- Sommers, V.S. 1964. The Impact of Dual Cultural Membership on Identity. Psychiatry. 27:332-344.
- Spanish-Speaking People in the United States. 1968. Proceedings of the 1968 Annual Spring Meeting of the American Ethnological Society. J. Helm (ed.) Seattle: University of Washington.
- Spodek, B. 1966. Poverty, Education, and the Young Child. in J.L. Frost and G.R. Hawkes (eds.) The Disadvantaged Child: Issues

and Innovations. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.

- Stablein, J.E., D.S. Willey and C.W. Thomson. 1961. An Evaluation of the Davis-Eels (Culture-Pair Test Using Spanish and Anglo American Children.). Journal of Educational Sociology. 33:33-38.
- Stanford, M.R. 1963. Don't Discard Those IQ Tests When They Fail to Work With Non-English-Speaking Children. A New Approach Can make them Meaningful. Texas Outlook. 47:31.
- Stewart, N.R. 1969. Exploring and Processing Information about Educational and Vocational Opportunities in Groups. in J.D. Krumboltz and C.E. Thoresen (eds.) Behavioral Counseling: Cases and Techniques. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Stocker, J. 1968. Help for Spanish-Speaking Youngsters. American Education. 3:17-18.
- Sutherland, E. 1970. Colonized Women: The Chicana. in R. Morgan (ed.) Sisterhood is Powerful. New York: Random House.
- Swickard, D.L. and B. Spelka. 1961. Hostility Expression in Spanish American and Non-Spanish White Delinquents. Journal of Consulting Psychology. 25:216-220.
- Taylor, P. 1934. An American-Mexican Frontier. Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press.
- Teel, D. 1954. Preventing Prejudice Against Spanish-Speaking Children. Educational Leadership. 12:94-98.
- Thorndike R. and E. Hagen. 1969. Measurement and Evaluation in Psychology and Education. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Tiffany, D.W. and others. 1970. The Unemployed. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc.
- Tireman, L.S., N. Dixon and V. Cornelius. 1935. Vocabulary Acquisition of Spanish-Speaking Children. Elementary English Review. 12:118-119.
- _____. 1948. Teaching Spanish-Speaking Children. Albuquerque. New Mexico: The University of New Mexico Press.
- _____. 1941. The Education of Minority Groups, Bilingual Children. Review of Educational Research. 11:340-352.
- Torrey, E.F. 1970. Health Services for Urban Mexican-Americans. New York: American Orthopsychiatric Association.
- _____. 1969. The Case for the Indigenous Therapist. Archives of General Psychiatry. 20:365-373.

- Traux, C. B. 1961. The Process of Group Psychotherapy: Relationships between Hypothesized Therapeutic conditions and Intrapersonal Exploration. Psychological Monographs. 75: (7).
- _____. 1963. Effective Ingredients in Psychotherapy: An Approach to Unraveling the Patient-Therapist Interaction. Journal of counseling Psychology. 10:256-263.
- _____. and R.R. Carkhuff. 1964. The Old and the New: Theory and Research in Counseling and Psychotherapy. Personnel and Guidance Journal. 43:860-866.
- Tuck, R. 1946. Not With The Fist. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.
- Tyler, L. 1963. The Problem that has no Name. Journal of Counseling Psychology (ed. Comment). 10:210.
- Tyler, R. 1951. Can Intelligence Tests be used to Predict Educability in Kenneth Eells and Others. Intelligence and Cultural Differences. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Ulibarri, H. 1966. Social and Attitudinal Characteristics of Spanish-Speaking Migrant and Ex-migrant Workers in the Southwest. Sociology and Social Research. 50:361-370.
- Valencia, A. 1970. Research and Development Needs and Priorities for the Education of the Spanish Speaking People. Albuquerque New Mexico: Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory.
- Vogt, E.Z. and E.M. Albert. 1966. People In Rimrock. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Vontress, C.E. 1968. Cultural Differences: Implications for Counseling. Paper read at the American Personnel and Guidance Association conference. Washington, D.C.
- _____. 1969. Cultural Barriers in the Counseling Relationship. Personnel and Guidance Journal. 107:(1):16.
- Wagner, Rev. J.A. 1966. The Role fo the Christian Church. in J. Samora. (ed.) La Raza: Forgotten Americans. South Bend: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Wallace, A. 1956. Bilingualism and Retardation. Elementary English. 33:303-4.
- Watson, J.B. and J. Samora. 1954. Subordinate Leadership in a Bicultural Community: An Analysis. American Sociological Review. 19:420.

- Whorf, B.L. 1956. Language, Thought and Reality: Selected Writings. Cambridge: Technology Press.
- Williamson, E.G. 1958. Value Orientation in Counseling. Personnel and Guidance Journal. 36:520-528.
- Woods, Sister F.J. 1956. Cultural Conditioning and Mental Health. 39:327-333. Social Casework.
- Yourman, J. 1966. The Case Against Group IQ Testing in School with Culturally Disadvantaged Pupils. in J.L. Frost and G. R. Hawkes. The Disadvantaged Child: Issues and Innovations. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- Zurcher, L.A. and others. 1965. Value Orientation, Role Conflict and Alienation from Work, a Cross-Cultural Study. American Sociological Review. 30:539-548.
- Zwetschke, E.T. and J.E. Grenfell. 1965. Family Group Consultation: A Description and a Rationale. The Personnel and Guidance Journal. XLIII:(10).

CULTURAL AND LINGUISTIC CHARACTERISTICS OF MEXICAN-
AMERICANS: A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE
FOR COUNSELORS

by

JANET KAY ASHER

M.A. New York University, 1969.

AN ABSTRACT OF A MASTERS REPORT

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Education

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1971

The purpose of this study was threefold:

- (1). First it was necessary to determine if significant cultural and linguistic differences did indeed exist between Mexican-Americans and Anglo-Americans.
- (2). Second, it was important to find out to what extent and how these differences were perceived by both groups.
- (3). Finally it was necessary to investigate the special counseling needs of Mexican-Americans which were due to these Cultural and linguistic differences.

The procedure employed in this study was to review the pertinent literature found in the Kansas State University library covering a 21 year period. This literature included books, journal articles, pamphlets and unpublished studies dealing with the cultural and linguistic characteristics of Mexican-Americans.

The review of the literature revealed that significant differences do exist between Mexican-Americans and Anglo-Americans. Culturally these differences are most noticeable when dealing with the concepts of: The family and personalism, machismo (male pride) and honor, fatalism and time, curanderismo (folk healing) and ethnopsychiatry, religion, La Raza (The chosen) and acculturation.

Linguistically, differences of interest were found in relation to bilingualism, language, testing and education.

The "conclusions for counseling" drawn from the review of the literature dealt with these traditional counseling practices: Self-referral, the dyadic encounter, unconditional positive regard and values.

It was found that many of the assumptions underlying the above traditional practices could not be applied to the culturally different -- in this case Mexican-Americans.

Recommendations were made as to how traditional methods could be modified or disregarded in some cases, to best meet the counseling needs of Mexican-Americans.