

A COMPARISON BETWEEN MEXICAN-AMERICAN AND SOUTH
AMERICAN STUDENTS: A CROSS-CULTURAL STUDY*

Miguel A. Escotet
Associate Professor of Psychology
School of Education
Fort Lewis College

INTRODUCTION

This research addressed itself to two major questions:

- 1) How many problem areas do Mexican-American students identify as the most important?
- 2) What are the differences between South American student problems and those of the Mexican-American student?

The theory guiding this study stems from earlier work on the cross-cultural method and student problems. The general implications of this work for the cross-cultural method have been formulated primarily by Whiting (1956, 1970)¹, Campbell (1967)², Holtzman (1968)³, and Escotet (1973)⁴, and for student problems by Baquero

* Presented to the Comparative and International Education Society, 1973 National Convention, San Antonio, March 25-27.

¹John Whiting, "Methods and Problems in Cross-Cultural Research, Handbook of Social Psychology, ed. G. Lindzey and Aroonson (Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley), 1970, pp. 693-728.

²Donald T. Campbell, "A Cooperative Multinational Opinion Sample Exchange." Unpublished paper, The University of Texas at Au

³W.H. Holtzman. Cross-Cultural Research on Personality Development: Austin: ILAS, Offprint Series, 25, 1968.

⁴Miguel A. Escotet. "Cross-Cultural Research Methodology: An Outline." Cross-Cultural Research Methodology, ed. Escotet and E. Nemeth, (In press).

(1965)⁵, Havighurst (1965)⁶ and Escotet (1969, 1972)⁷. For our purposes there are two central themes:

(A) The cross-cultural method as a tool of educational planning.

The Cross-cultural methodology conceived by contemporary psychology and education provides the conceptual framework for the present research. The cross-cultural, comparative approaches are particularly appealing for the study of cultural factors in any aspect of human development.

The comparison of people from different nations or different cultural groups has become an important part of behavioral science in recent years. The goal of these comparative studies is to discover and explain differences of behavior and development between human beings of different nations or cultural groups.⁸

The advantage of a cross-cultural approach as compared with single-cultural research approach is that the possibilities for misinterpretation are less with the former. An intensive study of a single nation or culture provides rich insight into the society or culture as a functioning organism, but hardly permits any generalization to other societies or cultures of the same

⁵Godeardo Baquero. La Problematica de la Adolescencia. Bogota: Editorial Pax, 1965.

⁶R. Havighurst, M. Dubois, M. Csikszentmihalyi and R. Doll, A Cross-National Study of Buenos Aires and Chicago Adolescents (Basel: Bibliotheca Vita Humana), 1965.

⁷Miguel A. Escotet. Venezuelan Student Problems. Cumana: Centro de Investigaciones Educativas, 1969. See also by the same author, The Measurement of Student Problems: A Cross-Cultural Study in Five Nations. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, The University of Nebraska, 1972.

⁸R. Havighurst et al. Op. cit., p. 3.

nation without duplication of experiments. Whiting states that:

The advantage of the cross-cultural method are twofold. First it insures that one's findings relate to human behavior in general rather than being bound to a single culture; and second it increases the range of variation of many variables.⁹

The main purpose of cross-cultural research in psychology is the elaboration of general behavior laws. Generalizations very common in psychology and education must be supported empirically to satisfy the external validity of the conclusion.

However, it is appropriate to point out that frequently studies that have been labeled "cross-cultural", are studies which refer to investigations conducted in a single foreign country or society. But true cross-cultural research entails much more. At least four stages are required. They are:

- 1) Establishing the purpose of the research delineating the cultural variation with respect to their cross-societal, cross-national, cross-communicational and subcultural characteristics. This design needs to include at least two cultures, societies, nations or languages to be labeled cross-cultural.
- 2) A pilot study to test ideas in a preliminary fashion. Such a study would cover the definition of the subcultural frame, measurement of meaning, translation and back-translation of

⁹John Whiting, op. cit., p. 694.

instruments, preliminary studies on small samples and scoring and coding data.

3) Carrying out the main study as a replication of the pilot study after elimination of major sources of internal and external invalidity.

4) Refining the analysis, interpreting the results and publishing them. Researchers from different cultures need full involvement in the analysis and interpretation of the findings in order to eliminate possible cultural bias.

A study designed for a single culture does not imply necessarily the use of the cross-cultural method. For example, the study of Mexican-Americans in isolation from other groups of United States or Latin-American groups or other national groups is not by any meaning cross-cultural research. Consequently, studies made on minorities without comparing them with other groups to which they are intrinsically related is a dangerous practice. Making abstractions necessarily requires the overlooking of fundamental relationships and characteristics of the observations on which abstractions are based. For this reason, using the abstract definition of minorities without looking at their relationships with the society at large is methodologically wrong.

On way to improve educational planning in a pluralistic society

such as the U.S. - is to obtain empirical data from the existing educational system. Such data (e.g. student problems, aspirations, expectations, social values, intellectual development language structure, community design, teacher attitudes, physical plant, etc.) only can be meaningfully interpreted if they have been extracted from a cross-cultural design. Looking at similarities and differences between the different groups that define a society or national culture, permits educational planners to redesign the goals of education in order to find general objectives for all members of the society and specific objectives for each group without distorting an articulated and interacting change of experiences.

(B) Identifying student problems as a factor in educational planning

A matter of crucial national concern is how to improve the quality of education in minority groups. Looking at students behavior as an input and output of the educational system provides to the planner important empirical data which can be used to evaluate the process of education. For instance, personal problems of Mexican-American¹⁰ students are little understood on empirical basis by American educators, psychologists and counselors. There are suspicions about which problems

¹⁰This writer is reluctant to use the term Mexican-American since it has been so poorly defined. We use the term only to describe the descendents of Mexicans born in the United States.

confront students, but there is no scientific evidence to confirm these suspicions. Problems of minority students must be analyzed in terms of their behavioral components, such as ancestry cultural ties, the student-dominant culture and other minority students. In this way, we can explain their behavior as an interacting relationship with all parts of the environment in which they function.

This study attempts to accomplish the following objectives:

1) To identify selected personal problems affecting Mexican-American students who were in their last year of high school or first year of university; and 2) differences of student problem areas between Mexican-Americans and Venezuelan, Colombian, Ecuadorian, and Chilean students, respectively. These objectives were designed in order to analyze student problems of the Mexican-American group with no reference to other minority or national groups; and to reject the hypothesis that Mexican-American and Latin American students express similar problems.

Definition of terms appearing in data and discussion within the study are given below:

Small Intensity Problem (SI), refer to minor problems identified by students as such on the Mooney Problem Check List -Spanish-English version. Big Intensity Problem (BI), refer to major or very significant problems identified by students as such on the Mooney Problem Check List-Spanish-English version.

METHOD

The study involved 1,189 high school and university students from Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Venezuela, Colorado and Nebraska (U.S. sample comprised solely of Mexican-American). These students ranged in ages from 16 to 22 years. Institutions involved were public and private. Schools and universities were chosen on the basis of geographical location such that they represented the urban areas of the countries and states studied. The students in the research were selected at random from the last year of high school and first year of university.

The instrument used to measure student problems was the Spanish version of the Mooney Problem Check List. The English version, retaining the semantic equivalence from the Spanish, was administered to Mexican-Americans. In both versions, the procedures for test construction cross-culturally were applied. The content and face validity of the Mooney Problem Check List - Spanish and English - was tested by student responses. More than 80% of students responded that the items on the list gave a well-rounded picture of their problems. This conclusion supports the validity data presented in the Manual of the M.P.C.L.

The purpose of administering the M.P.C.L. is to discover specific areas, curricular and extra-curricular, which are factors in student adjustment and achievement between the last year of high school and first year of university. Areas of M.P.C.L. are described in Table I.

TABLE I

AREAS OF THE MOONEY PROBLEM CHECK
LIST - SPANISH AND ENGLISH VERSIONS

I.	Health and Physical Development.....	HDP
II.	Finances, Living Condition, and Employment....	FLE
III.	Social and Recreational Activities.....	SRA
IV.	Courtship, Sex, and Marriage.....	CSM
V.	Social-Psychological Relations.....	SPR
VI.	Personal-Psychological Relations.....	PPR
VII.	Morals and Religion.....	MR
VIII.	Home and Family.....	HF
IX.	The Future: Vocational and Educational.....	FVE
X.	Adjustment to High School or University Work..	ASW AUW
XI.	Curriculum and Teaching Procedure.....	CTP

Student responses to the Mooney Problem Check List were transferred to computer cards to facilitate data processing. The statistical procedures used in this study were:

- 1) The data were computed by percentages in order to identify the problem areas of students and to simplify comparison by cultures and sex. Chi-square procedures were also utilized in order to compare the degree of problem intensity and countries with sex.
- 2) Analysis of Variance by Ranks of Kruskal-Wallis was used in order to find the differences among sample countries for each of the eleven problem areas. Also it was applied to test the internal consistency of the questionnaire.

The study involves the tabulation of tangible variables dealing with student's perceptions and feelings in connection with educational and psychological variables. At the same time, it does not involve prior manipulation of variables. Relationship which could be found do not necessarily imply causation. Interpretations of the findings are restricted to describe the independent variables, and no explanation is possible regarding the nature and cause of the relationship among variables. Finally, the study is a cross-cultural design

involving a maximum variability in which the respondents from a variety of nations can be pooled so as to provide scientific information for educational planning on Mexican-American education.

RESULTS

An inspection of table II indicates that for Mexican - American students, problem area X seems to be the most

TABLE II
RANK ORDER AND FREQUENCY OF RESPONSE EXPRESSED
IN PERCENTAGES BY SEX AND PROBLEM INTENSITY FOR
MEXICAN-AMERICAN STUDENTS

Problem Intensity	SI-PROBLEMS					BI-PROBLEMS			
Sex	Male		Female		Male		Female		
	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	
I	10	6.76	10	12.90	6	4.26	10.5	3.12	
II	7	10.00	5	15.48	3	5.28	4	6.34	
III	9	8.33	7	15.16	7	3.70	10.5	3.12	
IV	8	8.52	11	11.72	9	2.78	5	5.91	
V	3.5	11.11	4	17.63	9	2.78	6	5.81	
VI	3.5	11.11	2	19.35	2	6.67	2.5	6.77	
VII	2	11.57	3	18.71	4	4.91	7.5	5.27	
VIII	11	6.48	9	13.01	9	2.78	1	9.03	
IX	5	10.93	7	15.16	5	4.35	7.5	5.27	
X	1	13.80	1	19.68	1	8.15	2.5	6.77	
XI	6	10.19	7	15.16	11	2.31	9	3.55	

important regardless of sex. Also areas II, VI and VII seem to be very important for Mexican-American males, while the areas II, VI and VIII are the most important for Mexican-American females.

The differences between Latin American student problems and those of Mexican-American students in regard to sex are presented in Tables III, IV, V, and VI. Inspection of these tables indicates great and significant discrepancies between Latin and Mexican-American student problems. Venezuelan and Mexican-American male students show differences in Areas V, X ($p < .05$), XI ($p < .02$), and IX ($p < .01$) while those female students seem to be different in areas II, V ($p < .05$), I, III, VI, VIII, ($p < .02$), VII, XI ($p < .01$), and IX and X ($p < .001$). Colombian and Mexican-American students show significant differences in all areas with exception of area I and VI for male students. Ecuadorian and Mexican-American students seem to be different in areas VIII, IX, and XI, while female students from the same regions show differences in all areas with exception of area IV. Finally, Chilean and Mexican-American male students express differences in areas VI and IX ($p < .05$, $< .02$). Female students of the same geographical groups express differences on all areas of M.P.C.L. With exception of area IV.

TABLE III

CHI-SQUARE ANALYSIS OF SMALL AND BIG INTENSITY PROBLEMS
FOR VENEZUELAN AND MEXICAN-AMERICAN (U.S.) STUDENTS,
BY PROBLEM AREA AND STUDENT GROUP, AS WELL AS SEX AND STUDENT GROUP

		Problem Area x Student Group ¹				Student Group x Sex ²			
		Male		Female		SI-Areas		BI-Areas	
		χ^2	P	χ^2	P	χ^2	P	χ^2	P
A R E A S O F M O O N E Y	I	1.3709	<.30	6.4458	<.02	.9624	N.S.	.1570	N.S.
	II	1.7935	<.20	4.7733	<.05	.9673	N.S.	.0358	N.S.
	III	1.2957	<.30	5.6178	<.02	1.6388	<.30	.0215	N.S.
	IV	2.8551	<.10	2.5864	<.20	.5141	N.S.	.7973	N.S.
	V	4.4662	<.05	5.3791	<.05	1.0591	N.S.	.8283	N.S.
	VI	1.1252	<.30	5.6735	<.02	1.2612	<.30	.0233	N.S.
	VII	2.6947	<.20	7.3704	<.01	1.2187	<.30	.0006	N.S.
	VIII	4.5126	<.05	6.6173	<.02	2.1521	<.20	2.4249	<.20
	IX	7.7416	<.01	11.1490	<.001	.5392	N.S.	.9460	N.S.
	X	5.3906	<.05	12.4226	<.001	.5955	N.S.	.1497	N.S.
	XI	5.8544	<.02	8.7098	<.01	.7532	N.S.	.1897	N.S.

¹The chi-square procedures were utilized in order to compare the degree of problem intensity (SI and BI) with student groups (Venezuelan and Mexican-American) in both sex and in each area of the Mooney Problem Check List.

²The chi-square procedures were utilized in order to compare student groups (Venezuelan and Mexican-American) with sex in the two degrees of problem intensity (SI and BI) in each area of the Mooney Problem Check List.

TABLE IV

CHI-SQUARE ANALYSIS OF SMALL AND BIG INTENSITY PROBLEMS
FOR COLOMBIAN AND MEXICAN-AMERICAN (U.S.) STUDENTS,
BY PROBLEM AREA AND STUDENT GROUP, AS WELL AS SEX AND STUDENT GROUP

		Problem Area x Student Group ¹				Student Group x Sex ²			
		Male		Female		SI-Areas		BI-Areas	
		χ^2	P	χ^2	P	χ^2	P	χ^2	P
A R E A S O F M O N E Y	I	1.5622	<.30	8.1710	<.01	1.3742	<.30	.1878	N.S.
	II	4.9838	<.05	8.5430	<.01	.9253	N.S.	.1592	N.S.
	III	2.8149	<.10	8.3548	<.01	.7127	N.S.	.0231	N.S.
	IV	3.1709	<.10	3.9157	<.05	.6767	N.S.	.6213	N.S.
	V	5.2499	<.05	8.9634	<.01	1.4449	<.30	.5431	N.S.
	VI	2.3124	<.20	10.5338	<.01	1.8675	<.20	.0482	N.S.
	VII	3.5516	<.10	10.7146	<.01	1.1740	<.30	.0284	N.S.
	VIII	5.6494	<.02	7.7285	<.01	2.2024	<.20	2.8016	<.10
	IX	12.9582	<.001	19.9509	<.001	1.0164	N.S.	.1144	N.S.
	X	5.8394	<.02	16.9332	<.001	1.1554	<.30	.2807	N.S.
	XI	8.1089	<.01	9.8735	<.01	.7126	N.S.	.3623	N.S.

¹The chi-square procedures were utilized in order to compare the degree of problem intensity (SI and BI) with student groups (Colombian and Mexican-American) in both sex and in each area of the Mooney Problem Check List.

²The chi-square procedures were utilized in order to compare student groups (Colombian and Mexican-American) with sex in the two degrees of problem intensity (SI and BI) in each area of the Mooney Problem Check List.

TABLE V

CHI-SQUARE ANALYSIS OF SMALL AND BIG INTENSITY PROBLEMS
FOR ECUADORIAN AND MEXICAN-AMERICAN STUDENTS,
BY PROBLEM AREA AND STUDENT GROUP, AS WELL AS SEX AND STUDENT GROUP

		Problem Area x Student Group ¹				Student Group x Sex ²			
		Male		Female		SI-Areas		BI-Areas	
		χ^2	P	χ^2	P	χ^2	P	χ^2	P
A R E A S O F M O O N E Y	I	.0813	N.S.	3.7830	<.10	1.3657	<.30	.3344	N.S.
	II	2.2598	<.20	4.5752	<.05	1.1273	<.30	.1755	N.S.
	III	.3985	N.S.	4.2313	<.05	2.1756	<.20	.0507	N.S.
	IV	2.0596	<.20	2.0750	<.20	.5462	N.S.	.6357	N.S.
	V	2.8119	<.10	4.2566	<.05	1.3138	<.30	.5968	N.S.
	VI	.3579	N.S.	4.4060	<.05	1.5851	<.30	.0661	N.S.
	VII	1.3752	<.30	6.2281	<.02	1.1685	<.30	.0477	N.S.
	VIII	3.9574	<.05	4.5557	<.05	1.9641	<.20	2.7968	<.10
	IX	6.6976	<.01	10.9861	<.001	.7031	N.S.	.0589	N.S.
	X	1.7823	<.20	9.4120	<.01	1.5968	<.30	.2577	N.S.
	XI	5.3718	<.05	7.7370	<.01	.8007	N.S.	.2256	N.S.

¹The chi-square procedures were utilized in order to compare the degree of problem intensity (SI and BI) with student groups (Ecuadorian and Mexican-American) in both sex and each area of the Mooney Problem Check List.

²The chi-square procedures were utilized in order to compare student groups (Ecuadorian and Mexican-American) with sex in the two degrees of problem intensity (SI and BI) in each area of the Mooney Problem Check List.

TABLE VI

CHI-SQUARE ANALYSIS OF SMALL AND BIG INTENSITY PROBLEMS
FOR CHILEAN AND MEXICAN-AMERICAN STUDENTS,
BY PROBLEM AREA AND STUDENT GROUP, AS WELL AS SEX AND STUDENT GROUP

		Problem Area x Student Group ¹				Student Group x Sex ²			
		Male		Female		SI-Areas		BI-Areas	
		χ^2	P	χ^2	P	χ^2	P	χ^2	P
A R E A S O F M O O N E Y	I	.0259	N.S.	5.5782	<.02	1.5810	<.30	.8766	N.S.
	II	.4494	N.S.	3.8593	<.05	1.1550	<.30	.0315	N.S.
	III	.0202	N.S.	4.9672	<.05	2.0764	<.20	.5779	N.S.
	IV	1.1628	<.30	1.8088	<.20	.5206	N.S.	.2806	N.S.
	V	1.4751	<.30	4.8617	<.05	1.1417	<.30	.0641	N.S.
	VI	5.2009	<.05	6.2163	<.02	2.0520	<.20	.9132	N.S.
	VII	.3677	N.S.	7.3223	<.01	1.7680	<.20	.4751	N.S.
	VIII	2.5633	<.20	5.4735	<.02	2.0077	<.20	1.3406	<.30
	IX	5.9922	<.02	16.2296	<.001	1.8245	<.20	.00004	N.S.
	X	1.2921	<.30	12.7023	<.001	1.7750	<.20	1.0010	N.S.
	XI	2.5508	<.20	7.5049	<.01	1.5666	<.30	.0221	N.S.

¹The chi-square procedures were utilized in order to compare the degree of problem intensity (SI and BI) with student groups (Chilean and Mexican-American) in both sex and each area of the Mooney Problem Check List.

²The chi-square procedures were utilized in order to compare student groups (Chilean and Mexican-American) with sex in the two degrees of problem intensity (SI and BI) in each area of the Mooney Problem Check List.

TABLE VII

RANK ORDER AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF BIG INTENSITY PROBLEMS
BY SEX AS CONTRASTED BETWEEN GROUPS OF STUDENTS

		Venezuelan		Colombian		Ecuadorian		Chilean		Mexican-American	
		Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
A R R E A S O F M O O N E Y	I	28	18.5	19	8.5	6	6	12.5	10	32	1.5
	II	29	26	34	31	41	33	30	14	45	41
	III	24	7	31	11	9	5	5	4	21	1.5
	IV	17	15	10	17	26	27	23	8.5	3	37
	V	18	12	11	21	16	18.5	7	13	3	36
	VI	25	23	27	34	22	25	14	32	53	45.5
	VII	20	16	12.5	22	15	24	8	20	40	29.5
	VIII	43	48	42	42	48	47	46	44	3	55
	IX	50	49	52	53	51	52	54	54	33	29.5
	X	47	50	39	43	38	40	49	51	55	45.5
	XI	35.5	38	35.5	28	44	39	37	35	1	3

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE¹

MALES

H = .36
df = 4
p = N.S. (<.99)

FEMALES

H = .48
df = 4
p = N.S. (<.99)

¹RANKS were given from the lowest to the highest scores in order to utilize the Analysis of Variance of Kruskal-Wallis.

Finally, Table VII, shows that there is no significant difference between the five cultures in our study and the eleven big intensity problem areas of the Spanish and English experimental versions of the Mooney Problem Check List (males: $H = .36$; $df = 4$; $p < .99$; and females: $H = .48$; $df = 4$; $p < .99$). This means that the areas are consistent and similar through the five student groups of our sample. This finding supports the validity of the instrument in the different cultures of our investigation and also, reinforces previous results indicating significant differences between Latin and Mexican-American students on the Mooney Problem Check List.

DISCUSSION

Mexican-American male and female students consider Area X, Adjustment to High School or University Work, as the most important in their total assessment of problems. The category, Home and Family, seems also to be very important for Mexican-American females. For this reason, this study supports much of the literature showing (1) that Mexican-American students confront difficulties in dealing with the non-Mexican environment and (2) that their home experiences do not prepare them for school life, and (3) the schools are not designed to receive them as they are.

The growing "Anglo acculturation" which filters into the

Mexican environment presents conflicts; for it often implies rejection of their parents' culture, and way of life. The Mexican-American youths do not have a set of values they can identify with and accept as their own, as contrasted with their counterparts in Latin America. They, therefore, vacillate between Anglo culture and Mexican culture, and often achieve only a poor amalgam of both cultures.

The other areas of importance for Mexican-American students are: Area II, Finances, Living Condition, and Employment; and Area VII, Morals and Religion. Conflict situation experienced by Mexican-Americans in Area II become obvious if we realize that this group belongs to low socio-economic levels. The category of Morals and Religion which is of secondary importance for Latin American students (Escotet, 1972), is very important for Mexican-American students. The student confronts the problem of accepting traditional religious values; which have been impressed upon him; but, at the same time, he may want to accept or to reject them through weighing them against the realities of our times or against other religious values. He may begin to manifest serious doubts, which, without satisfactory resolution, can lead to problems of greater or lesser seriousness.

Finally, Mexican-American students also consider Area VI, Personal-Psychological Relations, as a very important big intensity problem area. Discussion of this finding may be difficult and possibly unwarranted because no personality tests were given to these students. We encourage future investigators to study the cause of this particular problem area because of their implications for explaining Mexican-American behavior.

The discrepancies between Latin American student problem areas and those of Mexican-American students are found in both sexes. First, the Latin American male student group is different from Mexican-American male students in areas of "Personal-Psychological Relations, The Vocational and Educational Future, and Curriculum and Teaching Procedures." This may be attributable to the lack of Mexican-American self-identity and the low degree of vocational expectations held by students that previous investigations show about Mexican-Americans. Also, while the Latin American student is well known for his constant challenging of and participation in the administrative and academic body of the educational institutions, the Mexican-American does not have the freedom and initiative, or the opportunity to help produce reform

in the American educational system, so he can adjust better to the curriculum. Even this educational system has been not yet provided the appropriate equalized minority education; The dominant educational orientation still determines much of the curriculum. Possibly, the same type of curriculum could essentially satisfy the needs of both Mexican-American and Anglo-American students, the way in which this curriculum is presented to Mexican-American young people often leads them to a serious dissatisfaction with all schooling.

Venezuelan and Mexican-American male students show other discrepancies in areas related to "Social-Psychological Relations, Home and Family, and Adjustment to High School or University Work." About the same difficulties are found confronting Ecuadorian and Mexican-American male students. However, the problem of Colombian and Mexican-American males are different. The only similarity found in the areas related to "Health and Physical Development and Personal-Psychological Relations."

Second, Latin-American and Mexican-American female students seem to be different in all areas of the Mooney Problem Check List with the exception of Area IV which is related to "Courtship, Sex, and Marriage."

These findings reject the hypothesis, which is common

in the literature of American education, which states that Mexican-American student problems are similar to Latin - American student problems in many areas of concern. Our data shows that both groups have few similarities. Even if we acknowledge that they may have a common ethnic background the educational system and cultural legacy of Latin American and the United States change the intensity of problems and their degree of classification. At the same time, seem to have more problems in common than differences (Escotet, 1972) which may lead us to say that Venezuelan, Colombian, Ecuadorian, and Chilean systems of education are providing a similar experience to the student body at the levels of first year of university and last year of high school.

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

The results indicate that:

1. Mexican-American students have big intensity problem areas of concern.
2. The most frequently indicated problem areas for Mexican-American students are: Adjustment to High School or University Work, Finances, Living Conditions, and Employment, Personal-Psychological Relations, Morals and Religion, and Home and Family.

3. The picture presented by a previous study (Escotet, 1972) is that Latin American students are most concerned about their problems of personal status in their school environment. The present research shows that Mexican-American students are most concerned about their problems in human and family relationship, and with living needs.
4. Differences between the problems of Latin American students and those of Mexican-American student are significant, especially so with females and males.
5. Mexican-American students must have special academic orientation programs as well as counselors specialized in minority education.
6. Future studies referring to psychological and cultural patterns of a new generation of Mexican-Americans must be careful not to identify this group with Latin Americans.
7. The writer feels that similar studies should be conducted in comparing Mexican-Americans with Anglo-Americans and other minority groups of the United States. These studies may lead us to find the similarities and differences of students in order to provide information for elaboration of educational objectives for all groups and specific objectives for minority groups without distorting the goals of American education.
8. It is recommended that investigations oriented to the study of minority or majority groups should be designed using the

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, Don (ed.) Education in National Development. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1971.
- Al-Issa, I., and Dennis, W. (eds.) Cross-Cultural Studies of Behavior. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970.
- Anderson, A. "Methodology of Comparative Education". International Review of Education. 7, 1961, pp. 1-23.
- Arnové, Robert. "A survey of Literature and Research on Latin American Universities". Latin American Research Review, 1, 1967, pp. 45-62.
- Arnové, Robert. Student Alienation: A Venezuelan Study. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1971.
- Baquero, Godeardo. La Problemática de la Adolescencia. Bogota: Editorial Pax, 1965.
- Blaine, G., and McArthur, C. Emotional Problems of the Student. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1971.
- Bonilla, F., and Glazer, Myron. Student Politics in Chile. Basic Books, 1970.
- Brody, Eugene. Minority Group Adolescents in the United States. Baltimore: The Williams & Wilkins Company, 1968.
- Campbell, D. T. "A Cooperative Multinational Opinion Sample Exchange." Unpublished paper, The University of Texas.
- Campbell, D.T. and Stanley, J. Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research. Chicago: Rand McNally Co., 1970.
- Campos, L. "Personality Needs of Latin American and North American Students". XIth Interamerican Congress of Psychology, 1967, p. 173.
- Carter, Thomas P. Mexican-Americans in School: A History of Educational Neglect. New York: C.E.E.B., 1970.
- Dewey, J. Democracy and Education. New York: MacMillan, 1916.

- Diaz-Guerrero, R. "Sociocultural Premises, Attitudes and Cross-Cultural Research." XVII International Congress of Psychology, Washington, D.C., 1963.
- Diaz-Guerrero, R. "Socio-Cultural and Psychodynamic Processes in Adolescent Transition and Mental Health." In Sherif, and Sherif, C. (eds.) Problems of Youth. Chicago: Adline, 1965, pp. 129-152.
- Eide, Ingrid (ed.) Students as Links Between Cultures: A Cross-Cultural Survey based on UNESCO Studies. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1970.
- Emmerson, Donald K. (ed.) Students and Politics in Developing Nations. New York: Praeger, 1968.
- Escotet, Miguel. Evaluacion Academica y Estadistica. Cumana: Universidad de Oriente, 1966.
- Escotet, Miguel. Venezuelan Student Problems. Cumana: Centro de Investigaciones Educativas, 1970.
- Escotet, Miguel. The Measurement of Student Problems: A Cross-Cultural Study in Five Nations. Lincoln: The University of Nebraska, 1972 (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation).
- Escotet, Miguel. Estadística Fundamental para Psicología y Educación. Mexico: Editorial Trillas, 1973.
- Escotet, Miguel. (ed.) Primer Seminario Nacional de Orientación. Caracas: Consejo Nacional de Universidades, Editorial Arte, 1967.
- Escotet, Miguel and Kelsey, Clyde. Nuevas Dimensiones en Orientación. Cumana: Universidad de Oriente, 1967.
- Escotet, Miguel and Nemeth, Edward. Cross-Cultural Research Methodology. (In Press).
- Forbes, Jack. Mexican-Americans: A Handbook for Educators. Berkely: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1968.
- Ford, Clellan (ed.) Cross-Cultural Approaches. New Haven: HRAF, Press, 1967.
- Freire, Paulo. Pedagogy of the Oppressed. New York: Herder and Herder, 1971.

- Grebler, L., Moore, J., and Guzman, R. The Mexican-American People. New York: Free Press, 1970.
- Havighurst, R.J., Dubois, M., Csikszentmihaly, M. and Doll, R. A Cross-National Study of Buenos Aires and Chicago Adolescents. Basel: Bibliotheca Vita Humana, 1965.
- Heiskanen, V. and Heiskanen, I. "The Political Orientations of Youth: Effects of the Educational System." Youth and Society, 2, 4, 1971, pp. 459-488.
- Heller, C. Mexican-American Youth: Forgotten Youth at the Crossroads. New York: Random House, 1966.
- Hereford, C. and Natalicio, L. (eds.) Aportaciones de la Psicologia a la Investigacion Transcultural. Mexico: Editorial Trillas, 1967.
- Holtzman, W.H. Cross-Cultural Research on Personality Development. Austin: Institute of Latin American Studies, Offprint series, 25, 1968.
- Insko, Chester and Schopler, J. Experimental Social Psychology. New York: Academic Press, 1972.
- Kahl, Joseph. The Measurement of Modernism. Austin: Institute of Latin American Studies, 1968.
- Lipset, S.M. (ed.) Student Politics. New York: Basic Books, 1967
- Lipset, S.M., and Altbach, P. (eds.) Student in Revolt. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1969.
- Masserman, Jules (ed.) Youth: A Transcultural Psychiatric Approach. New York: Grune & Stratton, 1969.
- McCandless, Boyd. Adolescents: Behavior and Development. Hinsdale Ill.: Dryden Press, 1970.
- Mooney, R.L. Problem Check List: High School Form and Manual. New York: The Psychological Corporation, 1950.
- Mooney, R.L. Problem Check List: College Form and Manual. New York: The Psychological Corporation, 1950.

- Mooney, R.L. and Gordon, L.V. Manual for the Mooney Problem Check Lists. New York: The Psychological Corporation, 1950
- Moore, Joan W. and Cuellar, A. Mexican-Americans. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1970.
- Osgood, C.E. "Semantic Differential Technique in the Comparative Study of Cultures." American Antropologist, 3, 1964, pp. 171-200.
- Peck, Robert. "How students Cope with work problems in the U.S. and Abroad." American Vocational Association Annual Meeting, Cleveland, 1967.
- Peck, Robert. "A Comparison of the Value Systems of Mexican and American Youth." Interamerican Journal of Psychology, 1, 1967, pp. 41-50.
- Price-Williams, D.R. (ed.). Cross-Cultural Studies: Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1970.
- Sawyer, J. "Cross-Societal Analysis of Latin American Indian and National Cultures." XIth Interamerican Congress of Psychology, Mexico City, 1967.
- Solari, Aldo E. (ed.). Estudiantes y Politica en America Latina. Caracas: Editorial Monte Avila, 1968.
- Vogel, A., Zepper, J., and Bachelor, D. (eds.) Foundations of Education: A social view. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1970.
- Whiting, John. "Methods and Problems in Cross-Cultural Research." In Lindzey, G., and Aroonson (eds.). Handbook of Social Psychology. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1970, pp.693-728.
- Zavalloni, M. Adolescents' Values in a Changing Society: A Study of Trinidad Youth. Paris: The Hague, 1968.
- Zea, L. The Latin American Mind. Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 1963.