P 322

NOV 10 1967

DEC 9 1967 R17

JAN 12 1968 SWAG 8-14-69

AUG 28 1970

Aug 14, 1970

JUL 25 1973 203

PW-282

SS-092

FEB 27 1974 245

MAR 4 1974

A 324

ABSTRACT

BINATIONAL SCHOOLS IN LATIN AMERICA

by Paul G. Orr

An estimated three hundred and fifty private, binational, U. S. related schools operate in Latin America. These schools provide an opportunity to foster international relations and to find in cross-cultural settings better answers to basic educational problems.

Although several U.S. agencies and institutions, at one time or another, have manifested interest in and concern for binational schools in Latin America, to date no concerted effort has been made to understand these schools nor to formulate a definable policy and program of assistance with respect to them.

While no U. S. group or agency is legally responsible for the performance or welfare of these schools, there seems to be a professional obligation on the part of the education profession in the U. S. to provide such guidance and assistance as may be practical.

Because these schools are usually perceived by Latin American nationals to be authentic representatives of U. S. culture in general and of U. S. education in

particular, the United States has a vested interest in their welfare and, whenever possible, should seek means for their improvement.

This is particularly appropriate in the case of the 53 "binational, non-profit, non-sectarian, community-type schools" identified and supported in part by the U. S. State Department.

The study was organized around basic questions concerning the schools: (1) origin, (2) chief characteristics, (3) objectives, (4) chief problems, (5) pursuance of stated objectives, (6) adaptations and contributions to national systems, (7) potential for future growth, and (8) necessary changes.

The methods employed in the study included:

1. A search of the literature and the selection of 53 schools for study. Those selected were the "U. S. sponsored, binational, bicultural community schools."
2. A questionnaire designed and sent to the 53 schools' directors, requesting recent information concerning administration, organization, curricula, personnel, financing and facilities.
3. An intensive case study of six U. S. related schools in Mexico.

4. An assessment of the Mexican-American schools against the historical background of education in Mexico.

The schools were found to be inadequate representatives of U. S. education: few were conducted as laboratories for cross-cultural research and/or experimentation; few were well conceived in relation to their bicultural setting, and all had continuing problems of organization, administration, finance, curriculum, teaching methodology and personnel.

Specifically, the study demonstrated that:

1. The schools came into being principally to serve United States children; more as a matter of circumstance than of design, they now also serve Latin American children.
2. A distinction between "American" and "Binational" schools is warranted.
3. The schools are urban, somewhat new and have small enrollments.
4. Curricular patterns vary widely.
5. The objectives subscribed to by the schools are imprecise and tend to idealize if not romanticize intercultural relations.
6. Instructional programs are not generally related to the stated objectives.

7. Stated objectives are historically irrelevant to the schools themselves, low motivators of actual school behavior, and possibly irrelevant in the culture in which the schools operate.
8. The basic and imperative needs of the schools would seem best to be met through the work of the several binational school associations.
9. To fulfill the impressive potential of these schools, new models of organization and new approaches to teaching are required.

Perhaps U. S. and Latin American universities jointly should develop these. In this effort, there would be both a substantive challenge to the education profession and a real justification for its direct involvement with the binational schools.

BINATIONAL SCHOOLS IN LATIN AMERICA

By

Paul G. Orr

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

College of Education

1964

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to acknowledge the guidance extended to me by the members of my doctoral advisory committee: Dr. Karl T. Hereford, committee chairman, whose advice, interest and talent were invaluable; Dr. Charles C. Cumberland, whose intimate knowledge of Latin American history and political affairs was of great aid; Dr. Donald J. Leu and Dr. Louise Sause who gave general assistance; and Dr. Fred Vescolani whose friendship, instruction and encouragement is greatly appreciated.

A particular debt is due to Dr. Burton D. Friedman, who gave generously of his time and talent and whose professional exactness is evidenced in this thesis.

A debt is also due to the several members of the College of Education of Michigan State University who have provided and caused professional improvement to occur in the binational schools of Latin America.

Finally, a debt of gratitude is due to my wife, Edwina Elrod Orr, who has shared with me the work as well as the satisfaction of three academic degrees.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

THE AMERICAN SCHOOL IN LATIN AMERICA

Background and Literature

There are approximately three hundred and fifty "American Schools" in Latin America,[1] at least one in each of the twenty republics. Despite the appelation, "American School," some of these schools enroll no children from the United States, and most schools enroll a small minority of them. It is thought that 60,000 of their estimated total enrollment of 63,000 consists of Latin American children and adolescents.

In terms of the sources of their support and nature of their control, the "American Schools" may be divided into four basic groups as follows:

1. Church-related schools: This largest basic group is composed of approximately 250 schools, founded by churches or church-related organizations, that continue

---

[1] Inter American Schools Service, "A List of United States Sponsored Schools in Latin America," (Washington, D. C., 1960).

to be either supported by or affiliated with their parent organizations. Many of these institutions are small mission schools situated in remote areas, but some are large urban schools. Indeed, it is not uncommon for an urban school, on the strength of high tuition fees and other charges, to support one or more smaller, tuition-free mission schools.

2. Family or individual enterprises: A second basic group of schools is comprised of a relatively small number of institutions wholly owned and operated by individuals or by families. In some cases, these are operated for profit. In other cases, although privately owned, they are conducted as non-profit public services.

3. Company-owned schools: The third basic group includes approximately thirty schools established by companies in the United States and operated on behalf of the children of their foreign-based employees in order to provide a type of education not otherwise available.

4. Binational, non-profit, non-sectarian schools: The fourth basic group of "American Schools" in Latin America consists of 53 institutions that allegedly are not operated either for profit or for religious purposes. They are "community-owned" private schools which, in most cases, came into being to provide, for children from the United States, a type of education that was otherwise

unavailable. Several such schools originally were essentially "company schools," but so organized and financed as to accommodate the requirements of all the U. S. corporations operating in a single locale. In other cases, the increasing costs of operation, the need for expansion, an increase in the number and size of U. S. corporations' activities, or a change in the nature of the school "clientele" caused a company-owned, a church-related, a profit-oriented or other privately-owned school to evolve into an institution of this type.

This study is addressed essentially to a consideration of the fourth basic group of "American Schools," namely: those the American Council on Education has called "binational, non-profit, non-sectarian community type schools."[2] As suggested above, quite a few schools of this category evolved from institutions of other types in response to a variety of pressures. For example, if a church-related or company-owned school represented the sole opportunity within a community for "U. S. type education," parents not affiliated with the sponsoring agency sought to enroll their children in the school. Once the school was opened to such children and their parents began to contribute to the school's financial

---

[2]"A Brief Statement of the History and Activities of the History and Activities of the American Council on Education 1918-1961," (Washington, D. C., 1961), p. 17.

support, the parents sought to have a larger voice in the conduct of the institution. The parents involved included citizens of the United States as well as local citizens and other residents.

In some cases, a "splinter group" broke away from the parent school to establish a new enterprise; in other cases, the original sponsors sold or surrendered control to a community of interested parents.

The multi-company school, for example, was usually organized as a "bond-holding" association; its costs were pro-rated among the participating corporations on a cost-per-student basis, each company purchasing a number of bonds equal to the number of students it enrolled. The issuance of bonds provided capital for school construction and operation, and the ownership of a bond assured the right to enroll a student. Tuition fees were adjusted each year in accordance with the budgeted operating expenditures per pupil; unusual expenses, if any, were met by assessments against the bond-holders, who thereby eliminated deficits. As non-company parents gained entree to the school for their children, they too became bond-holders and sought a share in control of the school. From the point of view of the sponsoring corporations, the school was perceived as a necessary service, but its actual operation was not deemed an appropriate corporation activity; hence the

corporations were entirely willing to be relieved of management responsibilities.

In short, by virtue of a combination of circumstances and pressures, 53 "American Schools" of the binational, non-profit and non-sectarian type have developed. Only one of these schools originated as such, as a matter of fact; the remainder have evolved from other origins.

A. EMERGENCE OF THE BINATIONAL SCHOOL

The decade of the 1940's was the period in which the binational school[3] became a definable and recognizable type of instruction.

During this decade, first of all, there was a marked increase in the number of U. S. State Department personnel assigned to Latin American posts, this increase being a result of World War II and of aid programs, civil and military, as well as of increasing commerce within the hemisphere. The U. S. government did not then and still does not operate any schools in Latin America open to the children of non-military personnel.

Government employees on Latin American assignments therefore sought and gained admission of their children in the "U. S. type" schools conducted by single corporations or by the "bond associations" that accommodated

---

[3]The phrase "Binational School" is used hereafter to denote the community-held, binational, non-profit, non-sectarian private "American School."

combinations of corporations.

A second influence that fostered the emergence of the binational school, paradoxically, was the popularity that pro-Nazi schools in Latin America enjoyed prior to World War II. Galo Plaza (former president of Ecuador, who founded and continues to serve as a member of the governing board of the American School in Quito, Ecuador) has described the activity and success of these schools and has related how their presence induced the creation of one of the present American Schools.

He wrote:

> The German school in my community became the best school in town. It had modern buildings on a beautiful wooded campus; it was run by a young and energetic faculty brought over from Germany, and, as a new feature, there was a clubhouse on the campus where parents could meet, obtain information on Germany's industrial development, see moving pictures of Nazi accomplishments and what Nazi Germany had to offer to the world, of her growing military strength and of the new happiness that Nazism was bringing to the people. Even business connections could be arranged through the club and trips to Germany were planned with the help of the unusually capable and accommodating professor in charge of the club.
>
> Tuitions were low and scholarships were available for outstanding pupils of public schools from the poorer classes. It was natural that the community was happy to have such an institution. The plan was a success. It was incredible how completely the Nazis won over the children in the school and the parents in the club.
>
> Then it was that I hit upon the idea of setting up an institution fitting into the educational

> laws of Ecuador but following the American School system, which I had come to admire during my college days in the United States. These (the schools) I considered the cornerstone of the American way of life, wherein is seen the fundamental manifestation of democracy.[4]

In 1943 the office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, U. S. Department of State, requested the American Council on Education (ACE) to cooperate in organizing and administering a grant-in-aid program to assist American-sponsored schools in Latin America, and made a grant to ACE for this purpose.[5] The program was initiated and the ACE created the Inter-American Schools Service (IASS) as the agency through which to administer grants-in-aid; these were limited by law for use in the improvement of instructional salaries and the purchase of instructional materials. This program encouraged the emergence of binational schools in a most compelling fashion, for in order to become eligible for grants-in-aid, schools had to meet the following criteria:

a. the schools' boards should be binational;

b. the non-profit schools must be conducted as a non-sectarian organization;

---

[4]Galo Plaza, "Experiment in International Education," The Nations Schools, Vol. 37, (1946), p. 24.

[5]Roy T. Davis, "American School Programs in Latin America," The Educational Record, Vol. 33, (1952), p. 319.

c. enrollment in the schools must include a significant number of national students;

d. the curriculum must include both national and U. S. history and culture.

During the 1940's, moreover, because of increasing demands for "American Schools," additional privately-owned schools began to be established. These offered education that purported to be more "American," or be more "National." Some of them were designed to make profit. They were able to absorb the overflow of students which existing schools could not accommodate, and the factors previously enumerated caused them to develop into binational schools.

Finally, new schools were created which, from their inception, intended to be agents for improving national education through U. S. type organization and methods.

B. OBJECTIVES OF THE BINATIONAL SCHOOLS

In 1961, the IASS and the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (a regional accrediting agency for eleven southern states) sponsored a conference which enjoyed the participation of the directors of binational schools throughout Latin America. A publication of that conference justifies the maintenance and support of the binational schools in these terms:

> The 20,000 children in these schools, about 60% of whom are nationals of the host country, are given an education as nearly comparable as possible to that of the best schools in the United States and at the same time become perfectly bilingual. The influence of close association and emphasis upon two cultures cannot but bring a depth of mutual understanding that can never be achieved by any other means.

According to the schools' directors, the great majority of binational schools subscribe in whole or part to nine major objectives. These are reported by Young to be:

I. To promote friendship between the people of the United States and the Latin American peoples.

II. To help interpret one culture to the other--North American to Latin American and vice versa.

III. To develop a comprehension of and respect for the ways of life of others.

IV. To help provide leaders of intelligence and character for the countries in which the schools are located.

V. To foster self-development, self-realization, and self-improvement among the students.

VI. To teach English to Latin American children and Spanish (or Portugese) to North American children.

VII. To offer an academic program acceptable to both the North Americans and nationals using the schools.

VIII. To utilize and demonstrate United States methods of instruction.

---

[6]Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, "Improving International Understanding through Binational Education," (American School Foundation of Monterrey, Mexico, 1962), p. 1.

IX. To provide leadership in developing improved practices in education in the countries in which the schools are located.[7]

Young's report of the extent to which the school directors themselves subscribe to these objectives is presented in Table 1.1.

Young concluded that the binational schools have a potential role in meeting all of these objectives and that financing should be forthcoming from the U. S. Government.

From this evidence, it is obvious that the directors of binational schools in Latin America perceive it to be their role to be involved in the education of national children and to give leadership to educational development in the countries.

It perhaps may be assumed that the school directors not only express their own personal views, but to some considerable extent, also speak for their school boards.

C. RELATIONS WITH NATIONAL GOVERNMENTS

1. Legal Relationships

One stated objective of the schools--to improve binational relations and to foster mutual respect and understanding among the peoples of the Americas--requires that the binational schools establish working relationships

---

[7]George Patrick Young, Jr., "A Study of the Potential for the Achievement of Better Inter-American Relationship through North American Schools in Latin America." (Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, University of Illinois, 1960), pp. 9-11.

TABLE 1.1

Agreement Among School Directors On The Objectives
Of Binational Schools in Latin America

Objectives	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Feeling	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Practical	Impractical
I	91	9				100%	
II	73	27				100%	
III	73	27				100%	
IV	73	13				90%	10%
V	82	18				100%	
VI	82	18				100%	
VII	73	18				80%	20%
VIII	64	36				90%	10%
IX	46	36				40%	60%

with national governments of the countries in which they operate. On a purely practical level, "good" relationships are needed simply as a matter of school survival, as the governments are under no obligation to tolerate the schools' existence. In more intellectual terms, there is the basic fact that a social institution cannot separate itself from its total community and the government is a primary expression of that community.

Irrespective of additional relationships which may be established, the binational school must satisfy governmental requirements regarding these matters: (1) authorization to operate, (2) immigration and labor laws for U. S. and national personnel, and (3) requirements and restrictions concerning content of the educational program.

Charles J. Patterson, in a study of the American School Foundation of Mexico, identified as basic problems the following:

1. In order to exist legally, the Mexican Government requires the school to provide a bi-curriculum in English and Spanish.
2. The school must satisfy labor laws which favor the host country.[8]

---

[8]Charles J. Patterson, "A Comparison of Performance of Mexican and American Children in a Bi-cultural Setting on Measures of Ability Achievement and Adjustment," (Mexico City: American School Foundation of Mexico, 1960), p. 2.

In interviews with school directors, no evidence was forthcoming to indicate that any of the schools in Latin America had any difficulty in obtaining authorization to operate. In fact, all evidence suggests that the mere permission to establish a private school is somewhat simple to obtain. Even though initial authorization to operate is easily obtained, other pertinent laws and regulations cause difficulty for the binational schools. This appears to be the case because no special legal provisions have been made for the operation of a binational school; hence it is subject, for example, to the general labor laws and is not treated as a special case. Latin American labor laws characteristically include provisions requiring that a foreign technical employee train a national to replace him. Such laws therefore generate constant pressure against the employment of U. S. personnel in the "American Schools." The degrees of enforcement of this legal provision varies, and its effect ranges from constant irritation and delay in immigration procedures to automatic approval of proposed "importation" and retention of U. S. personnel.

Government control is not limited to matters of immigration or labor law. Controls extend to educational matters as well. For example, the government of each republic exercises certain control over school curricula.

Specifically, as will be noted hereafter, the social science in most cases must be taught by a national teacher using the approved national textbook.

The binational school often is affected by legislation adopted for other purposes. An excellent example may be noted in Mexico where the legislative outcome of the historic struggle between Church and State has had a direct effect upon the binational schools, although such schools are non-combatants, as it were, in that struggle. The background is this:

Although the 1917 Mexican Constitution forbade the operation of Church-related schools, operation of such schools was tacitly permitted. In 1932, however, the Church forbade all Roman Catholic parents to send their children to public schools and required all such children to be enrolled in Catholic schools.[9] This open defiance of the government prompted retaliation. The government adopted the posture that the "economic liberation" of the worker--a prime objective of the 1917 Constitution--was of greater concern to the Mexican worker than the Church-State struggle over education. It used this concern to gain popular support for a strict interpretation of the Constitution of 1917. The result was that the federal government of Mexico regained

---

[9]The background of this event is treated extensively in Chapter II.

complete control of education. It "eliminated" church schools through their confiscation and subsequent transformation into public schools. This type of Church-State encounter is cyclic--or chronic--in Mexico: as soon as church schools become prominent, the government intensifies its enforcement of regulatory devices, or creates new devices, for their control. Since church schools legally do not exist, legislation refers to "private schools" rather than specifically to "church-operated" schools. Hence binational schools in Mexico feel the results of pressures generated by Church-State antagonists.

A recent problem involving textbooks in Mexico specifically illustrates the nature of this difficulty. Church-operated schools were importing Spanish textbooks which incorporated a Roman Catholic viewpoint into the treatment of each academic subject. The government, in a direct effort to discourage the practice, significantly increased customs duties assessed for the importation of school textbooks. Whatever the impact upon church schools, the effect of this measure was felt directly by the binational schools that had occasion to import books from the United States.

As a result of the Church-State problem controls are exercised over the binational schools in Mexico although they were not designed for this purpose.

Secondary education is under particularly strict control. In many cases, accommodation to government regulations is made informally. Personal relationships between a school officer and responsible officials of government are often more important in this respect than are express provisions of national policy.

2. Services from National Governments

Virtually no services are received by the binational schools from national governments.

National governments normally do not provide services to or for private schools but do reserve the right of inspection and regulation of such schools.

3. Services of Binational Schools to National Government

There are several evidences that the binational schools do provide service to or conduct service activities useful to the national governments. Horn, for example, opined that the best of the binational schools are actively engaged in activities which contribute to the improvement of national education in the Central American countries. He wrote:

> 1. They serve as preparatory schools for children of nationals who plan to attend colleges and universities in the United States and other countries.
>
> 2. They serve as models for providing democratically administered and operated schools.
>
> 3. They are doing research, developing instructional materials and providing services that are being made available to the educational institutions

of the countries in which they are located.

4. They provide a desired opportunity for children of nationals to learn to read, write and speak the English language.[10]

Perhaps the most direct contribution being made in Latin America by a binational school is that of the American School of Guatemala. This school, since 1948, has been designated a "Laboratory School" by the Guatemalan Ministry of Education. In this capacity, it has developed standardized tests, workbooks and textbooks, not only for its own use but available through the Ministry of Education to all public schools in Guatemala.

For several years, the school has conducted longitudinal studies of child and adolescent growth and development, and it has cooperated in the development of instructional materials for teaching concepts and practices of nutrition.

In the field of in-service education, the school organized a program for national teachers of industrial arts, and for principals of other government "Laboratory Schools."

Such extensive involvement, however, is not characteristic of even a minority of the binational schools. Most of the services provided by the binational

---

[10] Carl M. Horn. "The American Schools of Central America," (Michigan State University, East Lansing, 1963), p. 4.

schools are in the area of community service and cooperation rather than in programs actually designed directly to improve national education. Most schools provide a limited number of scholarships for local children. Many schools have offered one or more types of community service, such as helping a smaller school or teaching illiterates in the area to read.

Isaac Kandel pinpoints one basic decision which each of the binational schools that attempts to serve the needs of a Latin American country must make: Shall it (1) seek to transplant and assimilate into the educational system of one country the unmodified content of an educational system from another country, or (2) seek to adapt the desired aspects of one program to the other? Professor Kandel believed it to be possible and desirable to transplant and to assimilate into the educational system of one country certain techniques or skills developed elsewhere, and he deemed such assimilation beneficial to improvement. However, he identified manifestations of unrest--which led to failure--caused by attempts to transplant the unmodified content of an educational system from one country to another.[11]

---

[11] Isaac L. Kandel, "Introduction," Educational Yearbook of the International Institute of Teachers College, Columbia University 1931. (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1932), p. 9.

If Professor Kandel's point is valid, a binational school that intends to be of real service to the national system of education would have to emphasize adaptation--rather than attempt to transplant and achieve assimilation into the national school programs--of desired aspects of "U. S. type" educational content or practice. Put another way, if the school intends to be of service in this sense, its own programs really cannot be "U. S. type," but must be local adaptations or modifications thereof.

D. OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY

It is estimated that three hundred and fifty non-public binational U. S. related schools are operating in Latin America. In addition to transmission of knowledge, these schools also provide a means (1) to foster international relations and in the cross-cultural setting (2) to conduct research on basic educational problems.

Unfortunately, most of the schools inadequately represent U. S. education. Few are conducted as laboratories for cross-cultural research and/or experimentation.[12] All have continuing problems of organization, administration, finance, personnel, curriculum and teaching methodology.[13]

The U. S. related schools in Latin America, however, are usually perceived by Latin Americans to be authentic

---

[12]Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, op. cit., p. 1.

[13]Ibid.

representatives of U. S. culture in general and of U. S. education in particular. This seems most clear in the case of the 53 institutions that have been identified as binational non-profit, non-sectarian, community-type schools, and which are, in part, supported by the U. S. Department of State. Accordingly, the United States has a vested interest in the welfare of these schools. There also may be an obligation on the part of the educational profession in the United States to provide these schools such guidance and assistance as may be practicable.

Several U. S. agencies and institutions have, at one time or another, shown an interest in and concern for binational schools in Latin America.[14] However, no concerted effort has yet been made either (1) to understand these schools or (2) to formulate a defensible policy and program for their assistance.

A study was undertaken, therefore, which had as its purposes:

1. The review of the scant literature describing the binational schools;
2. The development of statistics descriptive of their present status;
3. The evaluation in detail of the work and role of a select number of these schools, and

---

[14]See Chapter V.

4. The presentation of conclusions that may be useful to the government and to the educational profession of the United States in determining a defensible posture toward these schools and a suitable program of action regarding them.

The study was organized to treat nine basic questions:

1. Why, how and when did these schools come into being?
2. To what objectives do they subscribe?
3. How effective are the schools in the light of their professed objectives?
4. How have they related themselves to educational systems in Latin America and the United States?
5. What have they contributed to the improvement of education in Latin America?
6. What are their chief problems and needs?
7. What potential, if any, do they have for the future improvement of education overseas?
8. What steps have been taken to improve these schools?
9. What additional steps, if any, should be taken and what outcomes can reasonably be anticipated therefrom?

The methods of study were simple and straightforward. They included:

1. The literature which treats of the schools was reviewed and summarized. Of approximately three hundred and fifty "American Schools" reported in the literature, 53 are identified as U. S. sponsored, binational bicultural community schools, hereinafter referred to as "binational" schools. The study was delimited to the binational schools.
2. In order to place the binational schools in a representative cultural context, a review was made of the development of public education in Mexico. This development is traced in Chapter II.
3. A questionnaire was designed and sent to the director of each binational school in order to obtain basic information regarding the schools' organization, curricula, personnel, financing and facilities. Twenty-three directors responded. This information is reported in Chapter III.
4. A binational school in the Republic of Mexico was selected as a special case for intensive study of parental attitudes toward

binational education. Information descriptive of this is presented in Chapter IV.

5. The improvement projects in the several binational schools were reviewed, and these are presented in Chapter V.

In a final chapter, the questions initially raised are examined in the light of available information and conclusions and interpretations developed.

CHAPTER II

EDUCATION IN MEXICO

In order to place the binational schools in a representative cultural context, it is necessary to develop an understanding of the social, moral, legal and national setting within which the binational schools are operated. This is important and significant for these reasons:

1. Binational schools enroll Latin American children--they purport to meet their needs and allegedly adapt their programs accordingly--hence the binational school is intimately related to the total national educational setting within which it operates.
2. All binational schools in Latin America are reported to be engaged in the bicultural aspects of international education.
3. In the conduct of programs of international education errors can arise or be compounded by ignorance of national educational systems.
4. The role of the binational school in Latin America is relatively unimportant to the

> total problem of education; hence organic laws and statutory regulations affect the binational school incidentally rather than intentionally; thus an understanding of national education alleviates the persistent problems encountered by the binational schools in their relations with national governments.

The device selected to develop an understanding of the setting within which a binational school operates is a review of the principal stages of development of Mexican education. Mexico is the Latin American country which is most representative of the different types of binational schools and offers the most diverse and well developed aspects for study.

The characteristics of the six schools studied in Mexico are presented in Chapter III, as are data for binational schools throughout Latin America, insofar as necessary to establish similarities with those in Mexico.

Thus, this chapter presents the development of education in Mexico to lend understanding to the role of the binational schools--schools which purport to influence and improve national education and enhance binational and bicultural relations among the peoples of the Americas.

As David G. Scanlon has noted, "For several generations attempts at international education have been suffused with a warm humanitarianism that has been idealistic at best, but on occasion sentimental and politically unrealistic."[1] It is politically unrealistic to attempt to operate a binational school without reference to the national system, as the failure of various projects in international education attests. Additional failures can be anticipated if those who operate binational schools lack knowledge of the local national system of education or if they are not alert to the significance of emerging trends. The educational system of Mexico is especially worthy of study because its history is sufficiently long to warrant analysis and sufficiently stable--a stability gained through political compromise--to permit fruitful analysis. Education in modern Mexico has several principal characteristics that can be appreciated only if the history of Mexico and its educational system is understood. Several of these characteristics are currently being modified or eliminated, albeit not without strong protest.

In terms of history, these major points may be noted:

---

[1]David G. Scanlon, (ed.), International Education, (Columbia University, New York, 1960), p. 31.

1. Recurrent political changes have had direct and immediate effects upon education, thereby limiting the stability and continuity of educational endeavor.
2. Educational opportunity has had a very marked socio-economic class bias, the lower classes having access basically to public elementary education only and not on a universal or obligatory basis--and the upper classes having access to public and private elementary, college preparatory, secondary and higher and/or professional education.
3. Private education and major segments of public education have been managed by the Roman Catholic Church and, although the elimination of religion from education is a basic tenet of the continuing (1910-present) Mexican Revolution, the Church-State struggle is still undecided despite major gains by the government.
4. Public education is oriented so as to make education very explicitly an instrument for the achievement of national goals, the creation of a Mexican nationality (and nationalism) being one goal that now has thereby been achieved to a great extent.

5. Private education--including parochial--is subject to government control with respect to crucial elements of operations, hence is also an instrument for achievement of national goals.
6. Mexican education has maintained a distinction between that which is appropriate to the governed and that (much more extensive) which is required for the governors, with the result that, despite counter-measures now being taken, the socio-economic distinctions have determined both the extent and the content of educational opportunities available.
7. Governmental control of education means, basically, control of the Mexican federal system by the strong central government rather than by the comparatively weak and less active state and local units.

Reforms are currently under way in Mexican education. They affect public and private institutions, hence are relevant to a study of binational private schools. They are results of historic trends and pressures. Therefore, they can best be examined in the context of the historical development of education in Mexico. The following discussion of that development should make clear the significance of three perennial cultural problems:

(1) recurrent political changes;

(2) the marked stratification of society, and

(3) continued church-state difficulties.

Pre-Columbian Times

Before recorded history, the indigenous peoples of what is now Mexico began forming communities in the sheltered valleys of the Sierra Madre mountains. These communities eventually formed tribal and national alliances which became the early Tolteca and Chichimecs and the later Aztecs and Mayas.

Aztec civilization was widespread during the Fifteenth Century. From their capital at Tenochtitlan, in the valley of Mexico, they dominated an empire embracing a territory extending to Veracruz in the East and to Oaxaco in the South.[2] The Aztec nation itself contained over 300,000 people, with a population of over a million among subject and/or allied tribes.[3] The nation was dependent upon the effectiveness of a small religious and military class called Cacique to govern and dominate the empire. To assure the continued development of this class, the Aztecs evolved an elaborate educational program.

Children of both sexes and all classes were educated at home for the first 14 years of their lives. A boy

---

[2]Charles E. Chapman, Colonial Hispanic America: A History, (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1933), p. 38.

[3]Elsa von Dorman and Henry L. Cain, A Short History of Mexico, (Mexico: El Modelo, 1932), p. 89.

learned his father's occupation; the girls became homemakers. They were also inculcated with the mores of their particular community. Children were given a definite part in the periodic rituals and social events.[4] From birth to death Caciques were obligated to follow a well defined tradition of lifetime obligations. To celebrate the birth of a male child in a special religious ceremony, the family and leaders of the community dedicated the child to a life of service.[5]

Sons of the Cacique class entered school at age 14 to receive their formal education. The Calmécac, as the school was called, was a three-level school in which young men were taught religious and military leadership; each level of training was designed to prepare them for a certain level of leadership within the community. After five years of training a novice was designated a tlamacazto; at the end of the tenth year, he became a tlamecaztli, or deacon; and after completing fifteen years of training a student was graduated as a tlanamacac or priest.[6] Novices served as priest's assistants on festive occasions and as junior officers during times of

---

[4]Francisco Larroya, Historia comparada de la Educación en México, (Mexico, D.F.: Editorial Pourra, S.A., 1959), p. 42.

[5]Ibid., p. 42.

[6]Ibid., p. 42.

war. The deacons were lesser priests and intermediate officers. The priests were the religious and military leaders of the nation. Within the hierarchy of priests there was considerable specialization, as well as closely guarded family and tenure rights.[7]

In addition to the Calmécac school, the Aztecs maintained a system of community schools designed to train the rest of the free people of the nation in the art of welfare. The Telpochcalli, as the military schools were called, instilled concepts of loyalty and obedience to the ruling class as well as military techniques.[8] In return for this loyalty, the Aztec nation expected the ruling Cacique class to guide skillfully the destiny of the people. Unable by education or tradition to govern themselves, when the effectiveness of the small leadership group later disintegrated, the entire civilization collapsed.

The Colony of Nueva España

On April 22, 1519, an expedition of Spaniards, under the leadership of Hernán Cortés, landed at Chalchiuhcuecan, later Veracruz. Cortes planted the Cross of Jesus and the flag of Spain on the high ground overlooking the beach, while his 900 soldiers and sailors celebrated mass. In this act of loyalty to both Church and State, Cortés

---

[7] Ibid., p. 36.

[8] Ibid., p. 37.

instituted in Mexico an arrangement which had earlier proved effective in Spain.

The Aztecs were defeated by the year 1521, and their former empire became the nucleus of New Spain. Expeditions expanded the empire north and south during succeeding years until the Viceregency of New Spain included territory as far north as San Francisco, California, and as far south as the Isthmus of Panama.

One significant reason for the facility of conquest of the Aztecs was that the million subjugated people within the nation, as well as the Aztecs themselves, had become "educated" to a system in which a small ruling class would exploit and dominate the majority. Except to those Indians who had been Caciques, it probably mattered little who ruled them.

The only real resistance to Spanish conquest came from the Maya civilization. Although many of their magnificent temple cities were reduced to insignificant communities, and Christian Churches were established throughout the area, the Mayas steadfastly refused to become absorbed into Spanish colonial life.

The Royal Court of Spain ruled New Spain from 1521 to 1821. Sixty-four different Viceroys[9] guided the

---

[9] Ibid., p. 38.

colony in the development of a strong agricultural economy. In addition to the widespread haciendas (large agricultural enterprises), there were numerous mining and commercial enterprises.

The strength of the colonial system was based upon three factors: (1) a system of land-holding by loyal Spaniards; (2) the diffusion of Christianity to all levels of society and (3) a stratification of that society. The original land grants were given to soldiers in recognition of the services they rendered in securing the new colony. Later generations of creoles, (persons of Spanish blood born in the new world) and well-born mestizos (those of mixed parentage) were expected to continue the tradition by rendering either military or civil service to the colonial government. The Christian Church brought not only a new religion to the "infidels" but also new cultural concepts, and these permeated the colonial society. Indians and Spaniards alike were obligated to turn to the Christian Church for intellectual and moral guidance throughout the colonial period. The third ingredient of the colonial system was the rigidly stratified society in which the Indian was subjugated to a level of serf-like peonage.

During the three hundred years of colonial domination, the Church and the Spanish colonial government were virtually

one and the same. Commencing with the Papal Bulls of Alexander IV and ending with the Inquisition's trial of Morelos and Hidalgo (early Mexican leaders), the Church supported the colonial government.[10] This support was given to temporal authorities in exchange for their concession of leadership in all things spiritual to the Church. The Church, therefore, was given a free hand in establishing educational institutions for the colony.

Christianization of the Indian population was considered synonymous to education of the Indian. The first permanent building in each new community was the chapel which in a very real sense was the school. In addition to teaching Christian doctrine, the friars also undertook to teach the Spanish language, morals, law, agriculture, and even craft technology.[11]

There were many outstanding friars during the early years of colonial domination. Bartolomé de las Casas led the work for the betterment of the indigenous population.[12] As an educator, Fray Pedro Gante will be recognized as the man who established the first elementary school in the New World; a Franciscan Father, he was responsible for the small school at Texcoco, opened in 1523, and the

---

[10] Ibid., p. 107.
[11] Ibid., p. 108.
[12] Ibid., p. 111.

Escuela de San Francisco, opened in the capital city in 1525. The latter school was also called the Colegio de San José de los Naturales because its objective was to educate the Indians.[13]

Charles V planned to educate the Caciques and their children to continue to lead their communities, but the plan fell into disuse due to a limited number of students and to the excessive demands of the task of Christianization,[14] a task in which the Caciques could not provide leadership.

It was Vasco de Quiroga who set the pattern for the early religious educational institutions to be established in Mexico. As Bishop, he travelled the breadth of his Episcopate of Micheacan establishing hospitales, as he called them, for his young Indian charges. These institutions were basically resident agricultural schools which emphasized the study of language and religion. The Ordenanzas authorizing such schools throughout the colony were decreed by the Royal Audiencia while Vasco de Quiroga was serving as its president. The escuelas de gran, as they were called in the Ordenanza, were to instill within the students the will to work and an obedience to spiritual and temporal authorities.[15] The work and enthusiasm

---

[13] Ibid., p. 3.

[14] Ibid.

[15] Ibid., p. 66.

exhibited by Vasco de Quiroga served as an ideal and stimulus to the other prelates of Mexico.

The hospitales were successful as far as they went; unfortunately, they were designed primarily to make better workmen out of homeless, landless Indian children. No attempt was made to upgrade them socially or economically.

Education for the mestizo children during the early colonial period took two forms: institutional programs of orphanages and private tutoring. The first boarding school for orphan mestizo boys, established under Viceroy Mendoza, was called the Colegio de San Juan de Letrán. In addition to teaching the rudiments of language and religion, it taught the boys an occupation or prepared them for further education in a professional field. At the same time, the Colegio de Niñas was formed for orphan girls. It taught home management.[16] The majority of well-born mestizo boys as well as their creole counter-parts enrolled in one of the many small private tutorial elementary schools which came to exist in virtually every community. As the school age population grew, the colonial government began regulating elementary education.

Viceroy don Gaspar de Zúñiga y Acevedo, Count of Monterrey, issued an Ordenanza, in 1600, establishing certain minimum standards to be required of a teacher.

---

[16] Ibid., p. 70.

The ten clauses of the Ordenanza were:

1. The colonial government would designate two experts to examine existing schools and to certify those that met the requirements of the Ordenanza.
2. No Negro, Mulatto or Indian could be a teacher. Only Spaniards could teach. Teachers were required to give proof of morality.
3. Teachers were expected to know how to read the classics and to write formal and informal script.
4. Teachers were expected to know how to add, subtract, multiply and divide.
5. If a school was established without authorization, its owner would be fined twenty gold pesos.
6. No school could be established within a two block radius of an existing school.
7. Co-education was prohibited.
8. Only certified teachers could teach. Teaching assistants were not permitted.
9. Storekeepers could not supplement their income with a school in the "back room."
10. All schools were required to teach Christian doctrine, morals and the catechism.[17]

---

[17] Ibid., p. 72.

The Ordenanzas continued in force for two centuries with only slight modification. In 1709, an effort to permit Negroes and Indians to be certified to teach in official schools was blocked vigorously on the grounds that it would destroy the class system.[18]

Although the rules governing educators and their institutions were not radically changed during this period, the composition of the teaching profession did change. During the early years, any unemployed man who could read and write could establish a school. Later the Dominicans, the Franciscans and the Jesuits came to dominate colonial education. Although the principal function of the religious schools was to provide education for the ministry, many students of the upper classes were accepted for general education.[19]

Education of women was placed in the hands of elderly Christian ladies called amigas, who taught etiquette, the catechism and household management. The requirements to be an amiga were:

1. A letter from the parish priest stating that the amiga had been instructed in Christian doctrine.
2. A letter from the confessional indicating a "good moral life."

---

[18] Ibid., p. 74.

[19] Ibid., p. 76.

3. A baptismal certificate proving purity of blood.[20]

For many creole and mestizo girls, education also included a period of one more year in convents before entering the adult world.

It is evident that a wide social gulf divided the creole and mestizo from the Indian. The well-born child was afforded an opportunity for professional education, whereas his Indian counterpart was expected to enter the colonial society only as an unskilled or semi-skilled laborer. Within this social structure, only the Church urged some opportunity through higher education for outstanding Indian students. This led to the establishment, in 1533, of the Colegio de Santa Cruz de Tlaltelolco, as part of the Colegio de San José de los Naturales. Under the leadership of the Dominican, Bernardino de Sahagún, higher education for Indians became reality.[21] Unfortunately, only a few of the most promising Indians were afforded this opportunity; the vast majority remained illiterate and in a state of peonage.

Perhaps the most significant step in the development of higher education in the colony was the establishment, on September 21, 1551, of the Royal University of Mexico. The Apostolic Seat confirmed its establishment in 1555,

---

[20] Ibid., p. 83.

[21] Ibid.

and it then became known as La Real y Pontifical Universidad de México.[22]

There were three major fields of study at the University: theology, medicine and law. The new University was patterned after the University of Salamanca, Spain, and drew many of its teachers from the mother school.[23]

Education remained the prerogative of the aforesaid institutions until the latter part of the Eighteenth Century. During this long period, every sizeable town had an elementary and a secondary school operated by a religious order. Those schools were primarily for those people who could afford to pay educational fees, i. e., the wealthy. The Church continued to provide the Indian laborers with the rudiments of language, law and religion. Outside the towns, education of the well-born was accomplished through tutors, while the Indian continued to be dependent upon the priest.

In the Eighteenth Century, three schools were established which broke from the tradition of Church-oriented schools. El Colegio de las Vizcaínas, la Academia de las Nobles Artes de San Carlos de la Nueva España and la Escuela de Minería were chartered as lay-directed institutions. El Colegio de las Vizcaínas was a private

---

[22] Ibid.

[23] Ibid., p. 87.

school for girls, situated in the capital of the colony and dedicated to girls' intellectual and vocational training.[24] La Academia de las Nobles Artes de San Carlos de la Nueva España was created to encourage the expression of Mexican art. The sponsor of this institution was Viceroy Mayorga who formally chartered the school in 1781 as an academy of painting, sculpture, and architecture.[25] La Escuela de Minería (or school of mines) was originally started as an adjunct to the church of San Nicolás and was called El Real Seminario Metálico. In the closing years of the colonial period its curriculum was expanded, and its faculty and administration were placed in the hands of laymen. Thereafter, it was called la Escuela de Minería.[26]

Changes were also evident in the Royal and Pontifical University of México. Prominent Jesuit philosophers, such as José Rafael Campoy, Andrés de Guevara, Diego Abad, Francisco Alegre and, above all, Francisco Javier Clavijero, led a movement for independent philosophic thought at the university level. During the latter half of the Eighteenth Century, such courses as mathematics, geography, world history, Greek, modern languages and philosophy were taught by the university faculty.[27]

---

[24] Ibid., p. 126.
[25] Ibid., p. 128.
[26] Ibid., p. 129.
[27] Ibid., p. 131.

Uncertain Independence: 1810-1857

Although Locke, Montesquieu, Voltaire, Rousseau and Jefferson were studied by the intellectuals of New Spain, the movement for independence in Mexico was more a rebellion of the peonage against the landed gentry than a revolt of the elite. Fathers Hidalgo and Morelos led the peons of rural Mexico against local oppressors. The fighters for independence fought with clubs, spears, and machetes against the well-equipped Spanish army.[28]

Hidalgo called for independence by ringing the bell at Dolores on September 15, 1810; ten months later he was captured by the Spanish army, turned over to the Inquisition for trial and subsequently shot and be-headed by the army. His head was staked as a warning to other fighters for independence. Undaunted, Morelos carried on for another year before he too was captured and killed. The band of rebels struggled to keep the fire of liberty burning despite their inability to defeat the Spaniards. A young Spaniard by the name of Mina inspired many to fight but he too was captured and killed in 1815.[29] Then Vicente Guerrero fought from the hills (in the state now called Guerrero) until victory was won at the conference table.[30]

---

[28] J. Fred Rippy, Historical Evolution of Hispanic America, (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 2 c., 1945), p. 150.

[29] Ibid., p. 152.

[30] Ibid., p. 159.

The Plan de Iguala, in 1821, was drawn up between Vicente Guerrero and General Iturbide of the Spanish army. When the Spanish army sided with the revolution the Viceroy, Juan O'Donojú, acceded to demands for independence.[31]

The plight of the Church was not a happy one during the ten years of insurrection. On the one hand, a sizeable minority of its rural priests aided and abetted the revolutionists; on the other hand, the hierarchy and the institution itself were part of the colonial government. As a part of the colonial government, the Church was formally committed to maintenance of the status quo. Ultimately, the Church, by supporting Iturbide, was able to maintain its position as spiritual leader of Mexico. One of the conditions of independence, as set down in both the Plan de Iguala and the Treaty of Córdoba, was that the Roman Catholic Church would continue to be the national church.

Although the Treaty of Córdoba (1822) recognized the independence of Mexico, few of the ills that had precipitated the insurrection were resolved. In fact, the few controls imposed upon the landed gentry were indifferently enforced, as the central government was not able to maintain effective control of the nation.

After Emperor Iturbide's short reign, there was a rapid succession of presidents, each with little or no

---

[31] Ibid., p. 160.

no power. The army, the landed gentry, the Christian Church, the Scottish and York Rite Masons[32] and seemingly anyone else who cared, competed for control of the government with the net result that confusion reigned in the Republic.

The political climate between the time of Independence and the Constitution of 1857 was characterized by a contest between a conservative and a liberal movement. The Christian Church, the landed gentry, the _creoles_ and many well-to-do _mestizos_ were loosely aligned as a political party dedicated to maintaining the _status quo_ in religion, property holdings and social position. Their political club was the Scottish Rite Masonic Lodge. This group was originally known as the Monarchist, then as the Centralist, and ultimately as the Conservative party.

Opposition to the alliance of conservatives came from a group roughly comprised of the intelligentsia, middle class businessmen and poor _mestizos_. This group was originally called the Republican party (as opposed to Monarchist), then Federalist and ultimately the Liberal party. Their unity stemmed from a common desire to reform the economic and social structure of the nation. The Liberals were generally known as York Rite Masons.[33]

---

[32] _Ibid._, p. 165.

[33] _Ibid._, p. 87.

The Indian population continued to remain outside the stream of national affairs.

Between 1822 and 1857 the conservatives and liberals fought a continuing battle for control of the national government. Each had its own army, and the presidency exchanged hands frequently, going to the leader of the army which proved to be the stronger at any moment in time.

The first president to acquire and consolidate military and political power sufficient to form an effective national government was Antonio López de Santa Ana. This dynamic but conservative leader was in and out of office over a period of two decades, during which time half the territory claimed by the Republic of Mexico was lost.[34]

During this period, church officials were encouraged to return to Spain. In their absence, many of the church schools either closed their doors or limited their enrollment to candidates for the clergy.[35] Many turned to the Lancasterian system of education, which was then in vogue in both Britain and the United States of America.

La compañía Lancasteriana was founded in 1822 under the sponsorship of the Scottish Rite Masons. Their first

---

[34]Rippy, op. cit., p. 230.

[35]Larrayo, op. cit., p. 150.

school was set up in the Secret Chamber of the building belonging to the Inquisition. As more school buildings were needed, the national government turned over various vacant convents in both the capital and the states.[36] Although the Lancasterian schools were organized and operated under private charter, their success was, to a very large extent, due to the broad support of the national government. By 1833, the schools were operating in all the major towns of the Republic.

In that year, a liberal, don Valentin Gómez Farías, President of the Republic, nationalized both Lancasterian and parochial schools in an attempt to standardize curriculum and to suppress the political factions that were exploiting the schools.[37] However, Gómez Farías was overthrown by López de Santa Ana and the schools were returned to private sponsors.[38]

The issue of state versus private control of education became another battlefield for the antagonists who were trying to influence the national government. Without the security of continuity, the Lancasterian and clerical schools suffered.

Although there are no accurate statistics relating to school population during this period, the few facts that

---

[36] Ibid., p. 152.
[37] Ibid., p. 155.
[38] Ibid., p. 157.

are known indicate that only a very small per cent of the children of school age were afforded the opportunity of an education. Most of these were, of course, in the capital and outlying towns.[39]

A prominent example of political influence upon educational institutes was that of the Royal and Pontifical University of Mexico. As could have been expected, it was a hotbed of political activity during the early independence period. Because of its conservative tradition and faculty, the university was aligned with the politically conservative. Therefore, it became a prime target for liberal attacks, and every time the liberals gained power it was suppressed. In 1833, 1857, 1861 and 1865, the university charter was withdrawn. It is noteworthy that in 1865 emperor Maximilian suppressed the "republican" university, having re-established it only four years earlier.[40]

Between 1867 and 1876 the national government was firmly in the hands of the liberal party. Juárez and Lerdo de Tejada served as presidents, and under their signatures numerous laws were passed to solidify liberal gains.

In the field of education, another attempt to reduce the influence of the Church was made with the passage of the Ley Orgánica de Instrucción Pública in 1867. The law

---

[39] Ibid., p. 179.

[40] Ibid., p. 179.

declared that all education was to be obligatory, free from personal expense, and under public control.[41] As the nation was a Federal Republic, implementation became the responsibility of the state and local governments.

The Federal District received most of the benefits from the new law, and it came to serve as an example for the states to follow. Between 1867 and 1870, the number of elementary schools in the Republic increased from a few hundred to more than four thousand, enrolling an approximate 300,000 pupils.[42]

Doctor Gabino Barreda, Minister of Education and a former student of Comte's in Paris, introduced the philosophy of positivism in the public schools with the official endorsement of the liberal government.[43] Barreda proposed that education be used to develop a national and scientific man, in his own words:

> An education in which none of the important branches of natural sciences is absent; within every nature's phenomena, from the simplest to the most complicated are studied and analyzed theoretically and practically, at the same time, in what they have in common; an education that will improve the mind and the sense, in which not this or that view, this or that political or religious dogma will be stressed or enforced, an education that will not fear to be contradicted by facts, such and such authority; an education, I repeat, developed on such basis

---

[41] Larroya, op. cit., p. 186.

[42] Ibid., p. 193.

[43] Ibid., p. 201.

> and with the only desire to find the truth, that is to say, not what according to our terms should be but what really is in the phenomena of nature. And this cannot be but an endless spring of satisfactions or the best advanced line of peace and social order; because it will enable every citizen to appreciate every fact in a similar way, and by means of this, it will cause uniform views of what's possible. And the opinions of men are and ever will be the source of their acts. This means surely is slow, but, does it matter if we are sure of its importance? What are ten, fifteen or twenty years in the life of a nation when what matters is to develop the only way to conciliate freedom with harmony and progress with order! The intellectual order that this education tends to establish is the key to social and moral order--that's our main concern...[44]

Barreda's influence among educators was widespread, and it stimulated and molded Mexican education to a considerable degree. One of the early effects was to stimulate an interest in the "science" of teaching *per se*, as well as in subject matter content.

Doctor Manuel Flores, a student of Barreda, described the principal tenets of positivism in his book on education, *Tratado Elemental de Pedagogía*. According to Flores, "the true education should be concrete and objective."[45] Flores' book found broad acceptance among Mexican educators at a time in which similar views were gaining acceptance among educational circles in Europe and the United States.

A study of Mexican education published in 1875 under the title, "*Estudio sobre la instrucción Pública en México*,"

---

[44] *Ibid.*, p. 200.

[45] *Ibid.*, p. 209.

indicated that in 1874 school population was nearing 400,000 with 8,000 schools.[46] The study emphasized the fact that only one in five of the nation's school age children was actively enrolled in a school program.[47] The majority of the uneducated lived in rural areas. Many were members of Indian communities that traditionally resisted assimilation by the Spanish culture, while the others were peones of the vast haciendas.

Educational improvements during the liberal Reform Period were limited; nevertheless, a broad base was established upon which later improvements could be and were developed.

La Epoca Porfiriana: 1876-1911

General Porfirio Díaz entered the political scene as a candidate for the presidency on a platform of "peace, order and progress." He also pledged himself against the re-election of the president. The policy of "no re-election" had powerful appeal and the incumbent, Lerdo de Tejada who was then standing for re-election, was defeated. As both men were members of the official party, the continuity of liberal programs was not at issue and therefore momentarily secured.

Despite his professed belief in "no re-election," Díaz ruled Mexico for thirty-five years. In order to

---

[46] Ibid., p. 213.

[47] Ibid., p. 213.

establish political stability, Díaz pursued a policy of reconciliation between the liberal and conservative factions. He stopped the liberal-sponsored attacks upon the Roman Catholic Church and the landed gentry while, at the same time, giving encouragement to the merchants and industrialist through tax incentives.[48]

Education was stimulated by the establishment of the Escuela Modelo de Orizaba, in 1883, under the leadership of Enrique Laubscher. The school was intended to be an experimental elementary school in which educational materials were developed for use in the school system. Laubscher argued that the learning of the language was the core of education. He believed that the various subjects presented in the school were dependent upon reading and writing. Therefore, the model school devoted itself to the task of developing reading and writing materials in the various disciplines.

Mexican education was considerably enriched by the influx of European educators who brought with them the pedadogy of Pestalozzi, Froebel and Herbart. Under their tutelage, a teacher preparation was introduced in the experimental school. Rébsamen, a prominent European, taught a Herbartian philosophy of education while Laubscher taught the methods for implementing the philosophy.[49]

---

[48]Rippy, op. cit., p. 232.

[49]Herbartian Plutos.

Enrique Rébsamen soon became the most prominent educational leader in Mexico. He moved from state to state, under the sponsorship of the Federal Government, teaching Herbartian pedadogy and helping to improve the state systems of education. In 1901, Porfirio Díaz named Rébsamen the Director of Normal Training. Rébsamen died, however, in 1903, and his work was unrealized.[50]

Carlos A. Carrillo was another leading pedagog of the Porfirian era. He authored a book entitled, La Reforma de la Escuela Elemental, which voiced the philosophy of Rébsamen and paved the way for public acceptance of reform in the educational system. Carrillo was also editor of El Instructor, a periodical designed to heighten the interest of teachers in needed reforms. Carrillo's most notable achievement was the founding of La Sociedad Mexicana de Estudios Pedagógicos, an association that brought many of the intellectual leaders of Mexico into one educational organization.[51]

Don Joaquín Baranda became Minister of Justice and Public Instruction in 1882[52] and held the post until 1901.[53] During this time, he was instrumental in

---

[50] Larroya, op. cit., p. 232.
[51] Ibid., p. 230.
[52] Ibid., p. 238.
[53] Ibid., p. 249.

establishing a network of normal schools in the states as well as in the Federal District. The normal schools employed the same methods as those established and developed at the Escuela Modelo.[54] Baranda was also instrumental in initiating the educational congresses of 1889 and 1891, for the purpose of developing a cohesive educational system in the Republic.[55] During his tenure, improvements at all levels of education were realized. Particular attention was also paid to college preparatory education with the establishment of university controlled preparatory schools adjacent the state and national universities.[56]

Justino Fernández then succeeded Baranda as Minister of Justice and Public Instruction. In 1905, the portfolio was divided and the historian-educator, Justo Sierra, assumed the post of Minister of Public Instruction and Fine Arts and retained that position until the fall of Porfirio Díaz in 1910. Sierra was an active liberal who believed that the future of Mexico depended upon mass public education.

The educational philosopher, Torros Quintero, followed Rébsmen as the spiritual leader of Mexican education. Torres Quintero echoed the belief of democratically-oriented

---

[54] Ibid., p. 264.
[55] Ibid., p. 249.
[56] Ibid., p. 255.

philosophers in declaring that compulsory universal education--free and non-sectarian--was the obligation of the democratic state. He advocated an increase in rural schools in order to free the peones from the "bondage of ignorance." Torres Quintero's pedagogy was akin to that of Dewey; i.e., democracy through education, and "learning by doing." His liberal points of view were accepted by the revolutionaries of 1910 thus enabling him to continue in office without interruption.[57]

Although significant gains were realized in the education system during the Díaz regime, the basic economic and social position of the majority of people declined to a point of desperation. By 1910, Mexico's primarily agricultural economy still failed to produce sufficient goods and services for sustenance. Land and other capital holdings were still concentrated in the church, the owners of haciendas and the politically powerful. During the international recession of 1910, many of Mexico's wealthy exported their capital, with the result that Mexico's economy collapsed.[58]

The Revolution and Its Institutions: 1910

The armed revolt of 1910 lasted only months, but the victors were unable to form a stable government until 1917.

---

[57] Ibid., p. 280

[58] Marjorie C. Johnson, Education in Mexico, (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1956), p. 6.

The revolution of 1910 embodied Mexican ideals, embraced the sacrosanctity of Mexican education and gave rent to all institutions, cultural patterns and persons which had imposed upon the country anything which was not "Mexican for Mexicans." Agrarian reform, separation of church and state and free public education were demanded--indeed insistently demanded at the expense of lives, property and the desecration and profanation of values and beliefs which had been inculcated over several generations.

The emotional appeal of the Revolution touched people at all levels of society and provided those circumstances in which the dogma of a new "Mexico for Mexicans" was formented by popular leaders. This period, 1910-1917, was a time of recurrent crises. There was a procession of chief executives, each supported by a different faction of the population. Although many were capable men, none could peacefully bridge the chasm that divided the rich from the poor. The peones were no longer peones--they were free, albeit poor, agrarios--and they refused to be reconciled with those whom they viewed as rich oppressors. Under the leadership of such notables as Zapata and Villa, groups of agrarios terrorized the rural areas. Visible possession of wealth was in some cases sufficient evidence for being classified as an "oppressor." The period was characterized by banditry, murder and unrest--underlying

this chaos, however, was the almost visible desire for a government that would not tolerate injustices to the people--a government that would bring about the solution of the severe social problems of the people.

During this early period, there was naturally a struggle control among the revolutionary leaders. Leaders in non-federal districts strongly influenced movements for strong state governments with little federal control. The desire by individual leaders to control their own area or district contributed to the general unrest and inability to form a stable government.

An uneasy peace was finally achieved when General Alvaro Obregón unified the army, and military presidents Carranza and Zapata[59] were murdered, and Villa and numerous other "generals" were retired from active service.

Obregón's most significant act was to institute provisions for a strong federal government while retaining state governments as the instruments for carrying out national policy.

The Constitution of 1917 was the third and most radical of the liberal constitutions. Under the new constitution agrarian reform, separation of church and state, and public education were guaranteed. The landed

---

[59]Zapata's murder was a classic in intrigue and deception. See Dulles, Yesterday in Mexico, (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1961).

gentry and the Church were divested of their excessive land holdings.[60] The Church, since 1910, had suffered pillage and desecration at the hands of the revolutionists. As a principal property owner[61] and member of the ancien regime, it was directly involved in the stress between the landed gentry and the agrarians. The Constitution of 1917 reflected the sentiments of the landless when it prohibited the ownership of real property by religious institutions.[62]

Resistance by the Church to the new Constitution brought even greater retaliation from the agrarians: churches were closed, priests were expelled and religious worship was severely limited. When the Cristeros, in one last attempt to redress the balance in favor of the Church, incited rebellion in the late Twenties, all religious worship was prohibited.[63]

In the 1920's, Alvaro Obregón and Plutarco Calles established the basis for stable government by instituting a paradox of contrasting political provisions: "No re-election" for the president, but a one-party state. Lázaro Cárdenas, 1934-1940, added still another dimension

---

[60]Rippy, op. cit., p. 299.

[61]It is estimated that as much as 25 per cent of the agricultural land was owned or controlled by the Catholic Church.

[62]Rippy, op. cit., p. 299.

[63]Christeros were active political supporters of the Roman Catholic Church.

to the political scene with his socialistic ideals. In succeeding years, the liberal-socialist measures embodied in the Constitution of 1917 have been allowed to mature without dictatorship.

Since the Revolution of 1910, Mexican history has been characterized by attempts to institutionalize the ideals of the Revolutions. One of the principal instruments in this task has been the public schools. From the rudimentary schools of 1911 to the impressive university cities of the Fifties and Sixties, the Federal Government has had one clear educational objective: to uplift the people through a liberal-socialist education.[64] Because Mexico was, and is, a Federal Republic, the primary responsibility for education was vested in the states. Therefore, in the early years of the Revolución, the role of the Federal Government was limited. However, the Constitution of 1917[65] provided the framework for the development of federal leadership in education. The relevant articles are:

Article 3:

There would be freedom to teach, but education will be non-sectarian in the public schools as well as in the

---

[64]Socialist education in Mexico is not Marxist dogma and may be identified most clearly as an expression of strong federal participation and control to bring about any national goals which have been or may be developed. Mexico has long contended that it has its own revolution and has not "imported" any other.

[65]La Constitución de 1917, (Mexico, 1917).

private schools from the lowest to the highest levels. Public primary education was to be free of cost and private primary schools could be established only under official supervision.

Article 31:

For the period of time designated by each state's public education law, Mexican citizens were obligated to send their children or wards under fifteen years of age to public or private schools to get an elementary or military education.

Article 73 (X and XXV):

X: This section of Article 73 limited the right of the State governments to rule on all educational matters. The Federal Government reserved this right according to the nature of the educational matter.

XXV: This section established the right for the Federal Government to establish schools at all levels and of all types throughout the country, to support them financially and to pass legislation for their control. It also established that the titles and certificates issued by these schools will be valid and recognized throughout the Republic.

Article 123:

This article established the constitutional bases for the formation of labor laws. One integral part of this article concerns education, specifically that in any

kind of agricultural, industrial, mining or other kind of business or enterprise which employed one hundred or more workers, the owner was obliged to establish schools. These schools, however, were to be operated by the state in which they were located. This article is often considered as a mandate to companies and corporations to establish schools in isolated areas as well as in those populated areas which do not have sufficient schools.

These articles in the Constitution of 1917 established the legal framework for an ever-increasing participation of the national government in education. This participation, however, was intended to be realized through the state governments' machinery--federal control to be exercised through the appointment of state officials and in the curriculum and textbooks.

The first president to serve under the Constitution of 1917 was Venustiano Carranza. In keeping with his belief in a balance between federal and state power, he transferred responsibility for the operation of the federal schools to the several states.

Two hundred Federal Escuelas Rudimentarias, the first of which had been initiated by Madero in 1911, were so transferred to the respective States.[66] The authority

---

[66]Larrayo, op. cit., p. 304.

for Federal-sponsored education also was given to the National University and its Departamento Universitario. This Department was entrusted with the responsibility for managing education in the Federal District and Federal Territories. It was also responsible for setting the standards for the primarias and preparatorias, the escuelas normales and the universities themselves.[67] José Vasconcelos, Rector of the University, developed the Departamento Universitario as if it were in fact the Ministry of Education, and until 1921 experienced no great difficulties.[68]

When it became apparent that the University was acquiring vast power in general education, the Secretaría de Educación Pública was re-established in the government. The Departamento Universitario was absorbed by the Ministry of Education and in addition, the responsibility for rural[69] and technical education,[70] was also placed in the Ministry. Vasconcelos was named Secretary and, under his guidance, education again became one of the principal goals of the Revolution.[71] During his tenure

---

[67] Ibid., p. 333.
[68] Ibid., p. 324.
[69] Ibid., p. 332.
[70] Ibid., p. 306.
[71] Ibid., p. 324.

the Federal educational budget was increased from 15 million to 35 million pesos.[72]

In the place of the reorganized Escuelas Rudimentarias, a system Casas del Pueblo or village centers was developed and the position of "circuit teachers" (a kind of helping teacher) was created to assist the lay teachers in the centers under the tutelage of 1,000 monitors and lay teachers and 48 circuit teachers. Statistically, this figure represented only a modest attempt at rural education, for it was estimated that, of a population of 12 million, only 4 million could read and write.[73]

During this same period, 1920-1924, the Obregón government began to develop a system of Federal vocational and trade schools in the Federal District.[74]

When Vasconcelos became Minister of Public Education in 1921, Antonio Caso became Rector of the university. Caso set out to develop a high calibre university in which freedom of thought and expression would prevail. He instituted the Código Universitario and the graduate school in an effort to upgrade the University.[75]

Perhaps José Vasconcelos' most lasting educational achievement was the formal re-organization of the

---

[72] Ibid., p. 376.
[73] Ibid., p. 307.
[74] Ibid., p. 324.
[75] Ibid., p. 333.

elementary schools. The pertinent law, in 1923, was entitled "Bases for the Organization of the Elementary School Conforming to the Principle of Action." The following excerpts from the document clearly prescribes the elementary school's approach to education:

> Action must be the base and foundation of the child's life in the elementary school.
>
> A very special emphasis on physical activity in school work will provide opportune motivation for the building of social habits in the children.
>
> Manual activities would not have as their purpose the transformation of the school into a workshop or industrial center, rather they should serve as a foundation for research in order to develop an artistic culture and to provide a pre-vocational education.
>
> The work children pursue in school should not be chosen with a utilitarian aim from an economic point of view; rather children should dedicate themselves to activities that have contact with life, and in such a way that these activities are a signal to those practiced in the home or in the environment where the child lives.
>
> The school should teach the child what he needs to know as a child.
>
> The child must be oriented in the most individual way possible.[76]

The program of the primary schools was supposed to follow Decroly's "interest centered" approach to education. The teacher was to develop themes which were closely related to the child's experience, and then to build

---

[76] Ibid., p. 350.

specific tasks as the child's interest in the theme matured. In practice, however, the schools taught "reading, writing, and arithmetic" by rote. Music, art and social studies were added to the curriculum; and games and improved textbooks were introduced to the techniques of teaching.

Under the presidency of General Callos, 1926-1928, even greater efforts were made to improve Federal education.[77] Secretary José M. Puig Casauranc was responsible for administration of Federal education.[78] The number of rural Village Centers was increased to two thousand, many with full-time teachers. In 1926, there were almost 200,000 pupils, 3,000 teachers and 86 inspectors in this Federal program. To supplement the rural schools, teams called Misiones Culturales or Cultural Missions--these were composed of experts in the fields of health, education, agriculture and industry--were sent to depressed areas to help local officials cope with socio-economic problems. So successful were these Missions that eventually they were employed in every State of the Republic.[79]

Under the auspices of the Ministry of Education, the Board of Directors of Federal Education (Junta de

---

[77] Ibid., p. 350.
[78] Ibid., p. 377.
[79] Ibid., p. 377.

Directores de Educación Federal) formulated a basic policy with respect to the function and aims of Mexican rural education. The main points were:

1. The rural school was an educational institution designed to help the agrarian improve his economic well being.
2. Learning should take place in practical situations as well as in the confines of the school building.
3. The rural school should be attuned to the needs of the community and should avoid imposing a curriculum deemed to be "foreign" to the community.
4. The rural school should serve as a model in developing new methods and techniques for agriculture and for small industries.
5. The rural school should itself be operated consistently with the democratic ideal and should stand out as a symbol of the fruits of democracy.
6. The rural school should become the moral teacher of the community by discouraging fanaticism, alcoholism, and premature sexual relations.
7. The rural school should teach Spanish and make its use synonymous with nationalism.

(Source: translated by P. G. Orr.)

The objective of the new secondary education, as outlined by the Dirección de Educacion Secundaria was:

1. To enlarge and elevate the general culture of the student achieved at the primary level.
2. To enlighten the student in the physical, intellectual, moral and aesthetic aspects of life.
3. To prepare the student to meet his civic and social responsibilities as a member of our free democratic nation.

To supplement state normal schools, the Federal Government established the Escuela Nacional de Maestros (1928), a national normal school.[80] In the same year, the Reglamentos de Estabilidad del Magisterio and the Ley del Seguro del Maestro were passed into national law. In these laws, professional qualifications of teachers were prescribed, as were matters of tenure and salary in a manner designed to stabilize and to enhance the teaching profession.[81]

Meantime, toward the end of Calles' regime, political activity at the National University had become so pronounced that the new President, Portes Gil, deemed it necessary to curb the freedom of the University via the Ley Constitutiva de la Universidad Nacionnal. Thereafter, the Federal Government has maintained considerable influence and power over the appointment of the officers and the operation of the university.[82]

---

[80] Ibid., p. 377.
[81] Ibid., p. 377.
[82] Ibid., p. 336.

No detailed mention has been made in this section concerning education at state operated institutions in urban areas. Throughout the first decade of the Revolution, State sponsored education was available only to well-to-do urban dwellers, State departments of education were more like local regulating bodies than leaders of school systems.[83] Except in one or two states, there was a minimum of public education, and that was concentrated in the primary grades. Private and parochial schools regained their earlier pre-eminence in education, especially at the secondary and college preparatory levels.

The resurgence of church-related education led to a renewed enforcement of the Constitutional provisions concerning education. During the latter part of the Ortiz Rupio administration, Secretary of Education, Narciso Bassols, sought to enforce Article 3 of the Constitution of 1917; i.e., to intensify inspection of parochial schools by the Federal Government. Inspections were intended to determine that lay teachers were in fact teaching a non-sectarian curriculum along the lines specified by the Federal Government. In 1932, he ordered inspectors into each of the church-related schools, with the result that the parochial schools were reported to

---

[83] Ibid., p. 350.

be in violation of Article 3. Bassols then ordered the church-related schools to comply with the provisions of the Constitution.

The Archbishop of Mexico, don Pascual Díaz, immediately issued a pastoral letter which said in part:

> Parents have an obligation to give a true Christian education to their children and nothing should be done to keep the Church from doing so.
>
> He ordered, therefore:
>
> Parents in Mexico should abstain from sending their children to public secondary schools. Parents have an obligation to prefer Roman Catholic schools to provide a Christian education for their children.[84]

Bassols' reaction to the Bishop's order was given in a speech in the Congress. He said, in part:

> The death of religious prejudice is a consequence of education for the masses...liberation of the worker is another way to clean the conscience of man...approval of secondary education will be accomplished by the government.[85]

Although the presidency changed hands in 1933, Bassols remained Secretary of Education until 1934. During Bassols' period of office, ex-president Calles and future president Cardenas supported his efforts to enforce the Constitution and during the years 1932 and 1934, they marshalled labor union support for a

---

[84] Ibid., p. 379.

[85] Ibid., p. 381.

vigorous attack on parochial education.

Even though Lázaro Cárdenas was the presidential candidate of the governing party and subsequently assured of election, he campaigned as if he were an "underdog." He pledged the fulfillment of the Constitution of 1917. Once in office, Cárdenas launched an educational program with a two-fold orientation: (1) universality of education and (2) education for a new social order. Subsequently, more and more public schools were built in an attempt to give all children an opportunity for elementary education. In response to the growing demands of labor unions--and consistently with the growth of federal policies during the depression of the thirties--the Cárdenas government amended Article 3 of the 1917 Constitution to give Mexican education a socialist orientation. Article 3 as amended stated in part:

> Education imparted by the State will be socialistic, and furthermore will exclude religious doctrine and will combat fanaticism and prejudice. For such, the school will organize instruction and activities in a manner to form within youth a rational and exact concept of the universe and of social life.

Children in public schools were supposed to be taught that it was their responsibility to proclaim a new social order, i.e., "to build a new Mexican society, comprised of a proud, independent people." This interpretation of a "socialistic education" is as adequate as any in defining "Mexican socialism."

Although Cárdenas enthused rural Mexicans with the possibility of universal education, his efforts to achieve universality of opportunity fell short. Many new schools were built, but they were not sufficient to cope with the increase in population. At the end of his presidency it was officially estimated that more than half of Mexico's population still could not read or write,[86] even though he had successfully extended education to an increased number of Mexicans in rural areas. Lázaro Cárdenas is considered today to be one of the most popular political figures among the Mexican working population.

Cárdenas' Secretary of Education was Gonzalo Vázquez Vela. He served in the cabinet for five and one-half years. An important step toward the federalization of education took place during his tenure. The Federal Government initiated a program of Federal supervision of State education.

The Federal-State agreements provided that the Federal Government should provide materials and pedagogical supervision to State-sponsored urban schools.[87] (It will be remembered that the Federal Government was already responsible for all technical vocational and rural education.)

---

[86] Ibid., p. 360.

[87] Ibid., p. 384.

Several Federal educational institutions were established during Cárdenas' regime. These institutions continue to have a marked influence on Mexican education and culture.

They were:

Instituto Politécaico Nacional
Escuela Normal de Educación Física
Conservatorio Nacionnal: La Escuela de Danza
Escuela Superior Nocturna de Música para Obreros
Escuela de Artes Plásticas
Instituto Nacional de Pedagogía
Instituto de Antropología e Historia
Escuela Normal para Profesores no titulados[88]

The Congreso Nacional de Educación Popular, held in 1937, established a Comisión Nacional de Educación Popular. The Commission's purpose was to popularize education through state, zone, sector, municipal, and community committees and, specifically, to encourage the literate citizenry to teach the rudiments of reading and writing to the illiterate.[89]

The next president (1940-46), Manuel Avila Camacho, deemed the objective of education to be "the service of national unity." In the interest of national unity, Article 3 of the Constitution of 1917 was again amended. This time purportedly to de-emphasize its socialist

---

[88] Ibid., p. 383.
[89] Ibid., p. 385.

orientation;[90] however, it became more a change of words than of philosophy.

Secretary of Education Vázquez Vela was criticized by the socialists within the party for his attempts to change the socialistic orientation of Mexican Public education.[91] When Vázquez Vela declared, in 1943, that democracy and patriotism were not compatible with socialist education,[92] he was asked to resign. President Avila Camacho then appointed an internationally-known humanist, Jaime Torres Bodet, to succeed him.[93] A man of high repute, Torres Bodet brought new prestige to the Ministry of Public Education. His theme was that Mexican education should be dedicated to peace, to democracy and to social justice. In his own words:

> If victory is to guarantee the precepts in whose name the peoples have struggled, the first rule that the nations will apply to education will be to convert it (education) into a doctrine consistent with peace; the second, education for democracy--nation to nation and people to people within each nation; the third, an education to produce loyalty to justice. These (the three precepts) because while liberty may be written into treaties and constitutions, it is in danger of perishing unless individuals of the nations have fertile opportunities to exercise it.[94]

---

[90] Ibid., p. 392.
[91] Ibid., p. 391.
[92] Ibid., p. 393.
[93] Ibid., p. 394.
[94] Ibid., p. 398.

In 1945, Article 3 of the Constitution of 1917 was changed again to read:

> Education imparted by the State (Federal, State and Municipal) will develop harmoniously all human facilities and will, at the same time, instill within man a love of country and a conscience of international solidarity in independence and justice.[95]

Secretary Torres Bodet interpreted the amended Article 3 in a directive sent to all public schools and described how it was to be implemented.

1. Children do not learn well except when they personally observe and reflect and experiment, i.e., by a self-educating process.

2. Instruction should be individualized.

3. There should be practical education and creative education along with intellectual education.

4. Instruction should be coordinated and organized for the total formation of the child.

5. Given that education is life and that life is predominantly a human collaboration, group work should be respected and thus strengthen the individuality of each child.[96]

Also in 1945, the Ministry reorganized the Escuela Normal para Profesores de Escuela Secundaria, naming it the Escuela Normal Superior, and established it as the nation's principal center for providing advanced training to teachers and educational administrators.[97] Torres

---

[95] Ibid., p. 397.

[96] Ibid., p. 397.

[97] Ibid., p. 401.

Bodet's three years in office were highlighted by a major campaign to teach the rudiments of reading and writing to the masses of illiterates. Campaña Nacional Contra el Analfabetismo was formally launched in 1944. From August, 1944, to February, 1945, the Ministry campaigned in an attempt to popularize the program. From March, 1945, to February, 1946, a nationwide effort was made for "each one to teach one." During the remainder of 1946, results of the literacy program were evaluated. Two conclusions were drawn: (1) one and one-half million adults had learned to read and write, and (2) of equal importance, the citizenry had been made much more aware of the national problem of illiteracy.

Miguel Alemán Valdéz, president of Mexico from 1946 to 1952, chose Gual Vidal to be Minister of Education. During his tenure four important developments occurred:

1. In 1947, all the normal schools were federalized under the Direction General de Enseñanza Normal;
2. In the same year the adult literacy campaign was incorporated into a continuing program;[98]
3. Although the Bellas Artes was erected before the downfall of Porfirio Díaz,

---

[98] Ibid., p. 401.

its incorporation into the educational program of the nation was not achieved until its reorganization in 1948 as the Instituto Nacional de Bellas Artes, (National Institute of Fine Arts) at which time the Instituto was departmentalized with music, art, theatre, and dance being the principal departments; and

4. The most spectacular educational achievement during the office of Alemán Valdéz was the construction, near Mexico City, of the Ciudad Universitaria in 1953, four hundred years after the University's founding as the Royal and Pontifical University of Mexico.[99]

Despite the fact that public education was receiving over 12 per cent of the national budget, plus a large amount of state support, as late as 1958, President Adolfo Ruíz Cortínez lamented that, of seven million school age children, three million were receiving marginal education. Including adults, only one out of every two Mexicans could read or write.[100]

---

[99] Ibid., p. 413.

[100] Ibid., p. 423.

Cortinez' successor, President Adolfo López Mateos, 1958-64, undertook a major program to provide universal education. He recalled Jaime Torres Bodet from his UNESCO duties again to become Minister of Public Education. Torres Bodet conducted a survey in 1958 to determine means for improving Mexican education. The results of the survey were published in 1960.

Bodets' plan for improving education indicated that once again the Mexican school systems were to be reorganized, with increased emphasis to be placed on the development of elementary education.

Current Reforms and Roles

It is evident that many educational reforms are under consideration, however, several basic conflicts which mitigate against progress in education have yet to be resolved. There remain many evidences (1) of a popular mistrust of government and (2) of continued strife between the liberal and conservative factions within government.

Mexico is a one-party state; however, strong conservative and liberal elements compete for control of government policy within the Official Party, the P.R.I.--Partido Revolucionario Institucional. In order to maintain stability and to introduce continuing reforms, the party and the President must mediate the demands of these

competing elements. However, even within this governmental and political structure, many educational reforms have already been effected and many others are under consideration.

At the same time the economy of Mexico has been changing. In 1940, 65 per cent of the labor force was agricultural, but by 1959 the number has been reduced to 52 per cent.[101] The general opinion of Mexico's leaders is that Mexico is quickly developing to the point where industry and services are displacing agriculture as the axis of the economic structure.[102] To speed industrialization, Mexico needs a broader and more technical education program. Paradoxically, the resources needed for developing public education can be realized only after industrialization.

The problem is a large one. The 1950 census data indicated that each one hundred Mexicans had received formal education as follows:[103]

---

[101] Secretaría de Industria y Comercio, "Informe al C, Secretario de Educación Pública," (Mexico, D.F., 1959).

[102] Secretaría de Industria y Comercio, "Fundamento Estadísitco," (Mexico, D.F.), p. 316.

[103] Ibid., p. 318.

No. of Persons	No. of Grades	Type of Training
46	None	None
48	1 - 6	Primary
3	7 - 9	Secondary-Prevocational-Special
2	10 - 12	Preparatory-Vocational-Normal for Primary
1	13 - 16	Superior: University-Technical

Despite a national average of only two grades of schooling in 1950, Mexico has emerged as a semi-industrialized country. Yet even by 1956 the change in the average education level had become negligible because of rapid population growth. If the demands for trained people are considered, there was actually a retrogression.

Of each 1,000 children who started to school in 1940, 471 left school during the first grade and 973 before the end of the ninth year. Of the twenty-seven who finished nine years, only nine students continued in the tenth year and of those, three left school. Finally, six arrived at the thirteenth year of school, but five of those left during the fourteenth year. A plan to bring about educational reforms was put into action with a decree in 1958[104] naming a commission to study primary education and formulate a plan to receive the problems. The Commission employed the services of the Research and

[104]Adolfo López Mateos, "Decreto de 30 de diciembre de 1958, Artículo 7," Cámara de Diputados, (Mexico, D.F.), 1958.

Sample Department of the Ministry of Industry and Commerce to conduct basic statistical studies of Mexican education. The results of the study should be forthcoming in 1964 and should provide a new and factual basis for planning primary education in Mexico.

The few schools that offer studies beyond the first six grades often employ curricula which are unrelated to the socio-economic needs of the country. Prior to 1961, the program for the seventh, eighth and ninth years of schooling generally contained an average of fourteen subjects per year and, as expressed in lesson plans, made no provision for studies other than those designed for college preparation. Program changes currently being inaugurated indicate a major change in the objectives of secondary education in Mexico.[105]

Meantime, the government of Mexico does control public education and strives to use it to accomplish national goals, goals which are not always compatible with those of the church or the economically affluent. While maintaining political stability through compromise, the Mexican government channels public funds principally to elementary education, and to the preparation of teachers and professions. In doing so, Mexico now neglects middle secondary or junior high education.

---

[105]Secretaría de Industria y Comercio, op. cit., p. 316.

Summary

For the binational school director, the study of the development of education in Mexico should hold several important implications for understanding the setting in which his school operates. Among these understandings are:

1. The Mexican government is primarily interested in public education and only secondarily in private education.

2. The Mexican government is interested in employing public education as a principal instrument of national development.

3. The Mexican government is realistic in its quest for universal education and the development of an industrialized society in that it has--and probably will continue to--incorporate elements of "foreign" educational philosophies into its own system; however, these are fully "Mexicanized" in the process.

4. The "socialist" nature of Mexican education poses little threat to guardians of U. S. political philosophy; with respect to education, "socialist" education is clearly Mexican, nationalistic and very likely essential to the continued growth of the nation. To associate this form of "socialism" with Marxist dogma is unquestionably in error.

5. With respect to private education, historically this has been associated with church-related education and with education for the privileged; hence, directors of binational schools cannot realistically expect the Mexican government to have a great reservoir of good will toward such schools, wherever the government official himself might send his own child to school.

6. The historical conflict between the state and church in Mexico permeates all aspects of education. Since church related schools are "tolerated" rather than sanctioned by law, the non-church related private schools must expect also to be restricted in their development--whatever the merits of the case--as are the church related schools.

CHAPTER III

THE STATUS OF BINATIONAL SCHOOLS IN LATIN AMERICA

Because the literature concerning the binational schools in Latin America was sparce and incomplete, a survey of these schools was conducted in 1962, in order to develop needed descriptive information. A questionnaire was designed and distributed to 46 school directors. Usable returns were received from directors of 23 schools as indicated in Table 3.1.

TABLE 3.1

Returns from Questionnaires to Directors of Binational Schools in Latin America

Item	Mexico	Central America	South America	Total
Number of Schools	9	6	31	46
Number of Questionnaires Returned	6	5	12	23
Percentage of Questionnaires Returned	67%	83%	39%	50%

Information for Mexico and Central America was obtained by professors of Michigan State University during their visits to the schools in the Spring of 1962.

The results of the Mexico survey appear in the publication, "Capabilities, Accomplishments, Possibilities of American Schools in Mexico," published by the College of Education of Michigan State University in 1962 in cooperation with the Association of American Schools in the Republic of Mexico.

Incomplete results from the Central American survey are reported in an unpublished manuscript entitled, "The American Schools in Central America," also duplicated by the College of Education of Michigan State University.

Mailed responses from the 12 South American schools were tabulated by the author and are reported for the first time in this manuscript.

The intent to study all reported binational schools was frustrated largely by: (1) the inaccessibility of the schools to direct examination, (2) an absence of adequate school records, and (3) low motivation of school directors and their governing boards to participate. Consequently, the results obtained, while enlightening of school performance, are inconclusive.

Seven dimensions of binational school performance are reported in this chapter. These are:

1. School Organization and Control
2. School Population
3. Characteristics of Academic Personnel

4. Incorporation and Accreditation of School Program
5. Curricular Organization
6. School Revenue
7. School Plant

A. SCHOOL ORGANIZATION AND CONTROL

Each school reported that it is sponsored and controlled by a local association comprised of parents and/or patrons. The associations elect an executive committee or board of school directors which, on behalf of the larger association, assumes immediate responsibility for school management.

Each school has a superintendent[1] who serves as the chief executive of the board. The authority vested in the superintendent, however, varies among the schools.

Generally, the functions of the schools' boards are assumed to be limited to (1) policy formation, (2) employment of personnel, (3) evaluation of personnel performance and (4) financial trusteeship. However, only four schools reported that board policy had been formally developed and written. Most school directors reported that the relationships and division of responsibilities and authority between the board and its administrative officer were

---

[1]The title bestowed upon the chief executive varies among the schools. The title "school director" or "school superintendent" occurs most frequently.

not clearly defined.

It was reported that some boards participate directly in school management, either by means of standing board committees or informally by actions of the board chairman or other board members.

The only intensive study of this set of relationships is reported in "The American School Looks to the Future," the published results of a self-study conducted by the American School Foundation of Mexico City, Mexico, with the assistance of Michigan State University. In that case, the study teams reported that board committees participated actively in administering the school, but the board itself denied the assertion.

As indicated in accompanying Table 3.2, the school boards vary in size from four to sixteen members with average membership being nine. Ninety-seven or 58 per cent of the board members are citizens of the United States. Thirty-seven per cent of the board members are Latin American nationals and 5 per cent of the members are citizens of countries other than the United States or the country in which the school is located.

Ten of the eighteen schools which provided information on this subject reported that U. S. citizens constituted the majority on the controlling board, eight a majority of national citizens and only one school, an equal number of each nationality. Five of the schools reported

TABLE 3.2

Boards of Control of Selected Binational Schools in Latin America
Number and Percentage of Members by Nationality

School	United States		National		Other		Total	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
1	4	50	4	50	0	0	8	100
2	9	56	7	44	0	0	16	100
3	16	100	0	0	0	0	16	100
4	6	55	3	27	2	18	11	100
5	1	25	3	75	0	0	4	100
6	2	40	3	60	0	0	5	100
7	4	80	1	20	0	0	5	100
8	11	79	3	21	0	0	14	100
9	7	70	3	30	0	0	10	100
10	2	40	1	20	2	40	5	100
11	4	57	3	43	0	0	7	100
12	6	43	8	67	0	0	14	100
13	1	17	3	50	2	33	6	100
14	4	31	9	69	0	0	13	100
15	5	83	0	0	1	17	6	100
16	1	10	9	90	0	0	10	100
17	6	86	0	0	1	14	7	100
18	8	89	1	11	0	0	9	100
Total	97	57	61	37	8	5	6	100

that citizens of other than U. S. or the country in which the schools are located sat on their governing board.

Only one school reported that its board of directors was composed entirely of citizens of the United States. It also reported that board membership is limited by policy to U. S. citizens.

One other case is worthy of note. The school is owned by an individual and operated by members of the owner's family; nevertheless it has a binational board. In this case--and in other similar situations--it is difficult to judge to what extent the board is merely advisory and to what extent it is indeed a board of directors. The matter would be of only academic interest except for the fact that the eligibility criteria, established pursuant to the U. S. Department of State grant-in-aid program, specify that: in order for a school to be classified as a binational school, it should have national representation on the board of control. If this criterion was deemed to refer to a governing board rather than to an advisory board--which may well have been the original intent--schools so managed might well be ruled ineligible. However, the criteria appear to be applied liberally for the school that has an all U. S. board was also deemed to be eligible to receive grants-in-aid.

Only four of the school directors provided information concerning the occupations of board members. All reported that the members of their boards of directors who were nationals were also employed by U. S. companies, represented U. S. company policy rather than binational policy and that a majority had children who were attending the particular school on full scholarship provided by the U. S. company employing the board member.

The information available regarding the organization and control of binational schools appears to warrant several conclusions.

It is questionable, first of all, whether the school boards are representative of their binational constituencies even though, strangely enough, the accompanying table indicated 97 U. S. and 61 Latin American citizens on the eighteen boards reported. The composition of many boards is heavily weighted in one direction or the other. It would appear that a genuinely binational board requires binational membership at more than a token level.

Second, the question of "administration by board committee" appears to require further study. Good administrative practice is usually deemed to require that a board vest authority for the operation of a school in the hands of the executive officer. This would appear to be desirable practice within the binational school, and the

formal adoption of carefully-drawn written statements of policy would help to introduce it.

The third conclusion to be noted emphasizes the obstacles in the way of "good administrative practice": in point of fact, the school directors are not well qualified professionals. Hence it is extremely unlikely that they are well equipped to administer the uniquely difficult binational schools.

These three conclusions lead to a fourth: that the entire question of representation, board composition and board-administrator relationships requires serious review and adjustment. Anticipating a general conclusion elaborated later in this study, it should be noted that a primary justification for future support, expansion and study of binational schools is the opportunity that they offer for significant research and experimentation in the problems of cross-cultural education. In order to be useful objects of study in this respect--and, in any case, in order to be successful at the task of binational education--they must be well organized, well administered, well supported and genuinely representative of the two principal nationality groups involved.

B. SCHOOL POPULATION

The 23 schools included in the study enrolled 10,740 students in 1962; 53 per cent of these were Latin American children, 40 per cent were U. S. children and 7 per cent

were of other nationalities. In four of the schools, fewer than 10 per cent of the children enrolled were of U. S. citizenship; however, in all cases, more than 10 per cent of the children enrolled were Latin American.

The largest school in the group enrolled 1,500 students and had an international student body: 40 per cent U. S., 40 per cent National and 20 per cent other nationalities.

The smallest school had only 54 pupils, of whom 96 per cent were Nationals.

It is noteworthy that only four of the 23 schools reported a majority of U. S. children, the highest percentage of U. S. children in a school being 82.

The 1962 enrollments of the 23 schools are summarized by nationality groupings in Table 3.3.

From Table 3.3, it is clear that the binational schools don't follow any pattern in regard to the distribution by nationality of their students.

The fact that 53 per cent of the children who are enrolled in these binational schools are of Latin American nationality demonstrates that--even though the schools were founded for the purpose of serving U. S. children--they now serve large numbers of Latin American children.

TABLE 3.3

Enrollment in Selected Binational Schools in Latin America by Nationality of Students: 1962

School	Enrollment			Per Cent			
	Latin America	United States	Other	Latin America	United States	Others	Total
1	189	21	0	90	10	0	210
2	369	165	16	67	30	3	550
3	600	600	300	40	40	20	1,500
4	396	264	0	60	40	0	660
5	220	0	0	100	0	0	220
6	1,008	32	10	96	3	1	1,050
7	204	108	17	62	33	5	329
8	39	34	13	45	40	15	86
9	301	151	49	60	30	10	501
10	536	95	4	84	15	1	635
11	98	49	11	62	31	7	158
12	6	37	3	13	80	7	46
13	95	450	49	16	76	8	594
14	208	170	43	50	40	10	421
15	141	113	42	48	38	14	296
16	257	40	23	80	13	7	320
17	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
18	78	47	37	48	29	23	162
19	863	73	63	86	7	7	999
20	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
21	52	2	0	96	4	0	54
22	28	150	18	14	77	9	196
23	58	332	13	14	82	4	403
Total	5,746	4,283	711	53	40	7	10,740

NR=No response

Further examination of Table 3.3 reveals that the schools vary significantly in the extent of binational distribution of students. Seven of the schools reported that 80 per cent or more of their students are Nationals while one school reported no U. S. students. Enrollments in the binational schools are increasing. Projected enrollments from several of the schools indicate that they anticipate further increases. The six schools in Mexico projected an increase of 35 per cent by the academic year 1966-67; the six schools in Central America anticipated similar increases. The schools in South America have not projected future enrollment. The schools in South America, however, have indicated that, by and large, they do expect to increase the number of classrooms they now have.

The projected increases in enrollment tend to verify the information presented in the literature in Chapter I, i.e., a minimum growth of approximately 5 per cent per year in the binational schools throughout Latin America.

These projections are considered to be minimum when contrasted to actual increases in six schools in Mexico during the 1954-1960 period. During this six-year period the enrollments in the schools increased by 50 per cent, or approximately 8½ per cent per year.

All 23 schools reported that the significant portion of their enrollments was at the elementary level, with a smaller group at the junior high level and even a smaller group at the senior high school level. Because of limited enrollments at the secondary level, it is undoubtedly difficult for the schools to offer adequate comprehensive programs and services to their students economically.

All of the 23 schools reported that they anticipate difficulty in increasing their enrollments after 1966 because of limited buildings and facilities. A detailed study of space utilization is available concerning the six schools in Mexico. The percentage of space utilization reported by these schools ranges from 80 to 166 per cent. The capacity and utilization of the binational school buildings in Mexico is presented in Table 3.4.[2]

The information presented thus far demonstrates that:

1. The enrollments in the binational schools differ widely by nationality and by size.
2. The schools no longer serve U. S. children alone but now serve a majority of National children.

---

[2]College of Education, Michigan State University, "The American School in Mexico," (1961), p. F-4.

TABLE 3.4

Capacity and Utilization of Binational School Buildings in Mexico: 1960

	Durango	Guadalajara	Mexico	Monterrey	Pachuca	Puebla
No. of Regular Classrooms	8	19	81	22	8	24
No. of Pre- and Kindergarten Rooms	1	1	2	3	2	4
Total Number of Square Feet in Classrooms	3,520	5,626	58,000	15,675	4,639	20,987
Optimal Capacity of Rooms[1]	124	180	1,600	520	186	693
Maximum Capacity of Rooms[2]	148	219	2,000	631	222	823
Enrollment	161	364	1,540	507	215	872
Per Cent Utilization	109	166	97	80	97	106

[1]Computed at 30 sq. ft. per child

[2]Computed at 25 sq. ft. per child

3. None of the schools are large enough to offer a comprehensive program from kindergarten through the senior high level at efficient cost.[3]
4. The binational schools are currently operating at or near the capacity of their facilities, yet they anticipate increases in enrollments.
5. The schools now confront the choice (a) of expanding physical facilities or (b) of limiting enrollments.

C. CHARACTERISTICS OF ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

For the artful implementation of binational schools' objectives, academic employees must necessarily fulfill several demanding professional expectations. Among these are:

1. To interpret his own culture to others and also have some understanding of intercultural relations,
2. To promote friendship between peoples of different nationalities and cultures,

---

[3]The American Association of School Administrators establishes 750 as the minimum size for a comprehensive high school; the Conant Report recommends high schools of 1,000; none of the schools reported an enrollment in the high school of more than 400.

3. To develop courses of study and instructional materials which incorporate two different curricula and two distinct cultures, and

4. To evaluate performance in such a setting.

Only competent and well trained professionals could reasonably be expected to do these tasks well. However (1) based upon the extent of their training and experience, binational school teachers are not sufficiently skilled for the tasks required by the binational school enterprise, and (2) the schools do not--or cannot--provide the incentives necessary to attract and hold career teachers of outstanding competence.

The 23 schools employ 765 academic employees, and of these 626 are full-time employees, and 139 are employed on a part-time basis. Forty-three per cent of the teachers are reported to be U. S. citizens, and 572 are full-time classroom teachers.

An examination of the distribution of the full-time classroom teachers at the various grade levels reveals that eight of the schools have thirteen or fewer teachers and only three have forty or more. There is no evidence that the schools have adequate personnel to engage in extensive improvement of education in the countries in which they are located. There are only isolated cases in

which the schools have the services of supervisors and professional employees in pupil personnel services. The schools also follow the normal pattern in Latin America of employing a large percentage of part-time personnel; 18 per cent of the total number of employees are so employed. Those schools supplying complete information indicated that the part-time employees are generally responsible for teaching the subjects required by the National government in civics, social studies and Spanish.

Thus, the binational schools have full and part-time employees; by and large they do not have the services of administrative and supervisory personnel, and most of the schools have a small number of employees. Eighteen per cent of the employees, those basically involved in areas susceptible to integration, are part-time employees.

Perhaps the most revealing analysis of the employees of the binational schools is the number of teachers at the various salary levels. As demonstrated in Section F of this chapter, the binational schools expend an average of $291.24 per pupil per year as contrasted to $547.00 in the U. S. The bulk of this difference appears to be in the payment of salaries to teachers. The average salary for teachers in the U. S. for 1962-63 as reported by the U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare was $5,940. Only 9.2 per cent of the teachers in the binational

schools receive a salary which approximates the U. S. average. The lowest average salary in a particular state in the U. S. was reported to be $3,700; and only 39.7 per cent of the binational teachers received this much.

Only one of the 23 binational schools employed full-time teachers who received as much as $6,000 per year. All teachers in that school received this amount as a minimum, and they represent 5.2 per cent of all teachers in all of the schools. Four per cent of the teachers receive salaries from $5,000 to $5,999 annually, and these teachers are distributed among five of the schools. Only seven of the 23 schools report having employees who receive salaries of $4,000 or more per year; however, all of these seven schools except one also report having teachers who receive less than $2,000 per year.

Contrasted to expectations for teachers as manifested in the objectives of the binational schools, the fact that 39 per cent of the professional, full-time academic employees of the schools receive less than $2,000 per year for their services is staggering.

Irrespective of isolated cases of "missionary spirit" and "working wives," the schools cannot attract and retain professionally trained teachers at present salary levels. Furthermore it is unlikely that the schools in the past have retained the long-range services

of such personnel as obviously required for the development and realization of the cross-cultural bilingual educational experience they purport to provide. It is also doubtful that such an experience will be provided unless sweeping changes are made in the financing of the schools. Table 3.5 presents the number of non-teaching and teaching employees in the schools, Table 3.6 presents the number of full-time teachers at various salary levels, and Table 3.7 presents the percentage of teachers at various salary levels.

In order to analyze in more detail the information concerning the characteristics of the academic employees of the binational schools, more specific information is presented for the six binational schools in Mexico. This information resulted from a study compiled by the Association of American Schools in the Republic of Mexico in cooperation with Michigan State University. The report of this survey has been presented previously as "The American School in Mexico," (College of Education, Michigan State University, 1961).

This part of this section of the study treats 230 professional employees in six binational schools in Mexico who were employed in 1960. They include 217 full-time and thirteen part-time employees. Of the full-time employees, 192 were classroom teachers and the remaining 25 are special personnel which included administrators, counselors and librarians.

TABLE 3.5

Academic Employees in Binational Schools: 1962

School	Non-Teaching	Teaching	Total
1	1	21	22
2	2	24	26
3	11	86	97
4	5	30	35
5	1	10	11
6	3	37	40
7	1	20	21
8	0	10	10
9	2	31	33
10	6	68	74
11	1	10	11
12	1	7	8
13	3	50	53
14	1	22	23
15	1	10	11
16	1	17	18
17	3	28	31
18	1	10	11
19	2	17	19
20	2	17	19
21	1	8	9
22	2	13	15
23	3	26	29
Total	54	572	626

TABLE 3.6

Number of Full-Time Teachers at Various Annual Salary Levels in Binational Schools in 1962

School	$6000 or More	$5000-$5999	$4000-$4999	$3000-$3999	$2000-$2999	$1500-$1999	$1000-$1499	Under $1000
1								11
2							10	
3			2	86				
4		1	1	19		6		
5				1				10
6							8	24
7		6						1
8		3		3	23	9	6	4
9					2	6	2	
10		9		3	25	9	6	
11	Information not supplied							
12	Information not supplied							
13					19	21		
14				13	5	4		
15				7		1		
16				9	4	2		
17					4	6	2	4
18				1	2	7		
19					20	8	4	
20				1	2	12		
21						1	5	
22		1	7		2			
23	26							
Total	26	20	10	143	108	92	43	59

TABLE 3.7

Percentage of Full-Time Teachers at Various Annual Salary Levels in Binational Schools in 1962

School	$6000 or More	$5000-$5999	$4000-$4999	$3000-$3999	$2000-$2999	$1500-$1999	$1000-$1499	Under $1000
1								100
2							66	33
3			2	88				
4		4	4	70		22		
5				10				90
6							25	75
7		83					17	
8		6		6	48	19	12	8
9					20	60	20	
10		17		6	48	17	12	
11	Information not supplied							
12	Information not supplied							
13					48	52		
14				59	23	18		
15				88		22		
16				60	27	13		
17					25	40	10	25
18				10	20	70		
19					63	25	12	
20				7	13	80		
21						17	83	
22		10	70		20			
23	100							
Percentage of All Teachers	5.2	4.0	2.0	28.5	21.6	18.4	8.6	11.7

All except one of the schools employed part-time teaching personnel, and all schools except one reported the services of at least one non-teaching professional employee. The six schools had fifteen administrators, seven librarians and three counselors.

The number of professional employees, part and full time, are summarized in Table 3.8.

The teachers in these schools work with a varying number of children. One school reported a pupil-teacher ratio of 13.4, which was the lowest of all schools, and the highest reported 25.6. The average for all schools was 19.0. The school directors attribute the low pupil-teacher ratio primarily to these factors:

1. The dual curricula required by the Mexican government.
2. The necessity to provide special classes in either Spanish or English for new students.
3. Classrooms not large enough for larger sections.

The pupil-teacher ratio accounts in part for the inability of the binational schools to pay higher teacher salaries. Pupil-teacher ratios in the schools are presented in Table 3.9.

The 192 full-time teachers who were employed in the six binational schools were asked to supply information through an individual questionnaire in order to identify

TABLE 3.8

Number of Professional Employees in Binational Schools
Mexico: 1960

	Durango		Guadalajara		Mexico		Monterrey		Pachuca		Puebla		Total	
	Ft	Pt	Ft	Pt	Ft	Pt	Ft	Pt	Ft	Pt	Ft	Pt	Ft	Pt
Administrators			1		8		2		1		3		15	
Classroom Teachers	12		21	2	87		28	2	10	3	34	5	192	12
Librarian		1	1		4		1				1		7	1
Counselors					2		1						3	0
Total	12	1	23	2	101	0	32	2	11	3	38	5	217	13

TABLE 3.9

Pupil-Teacher Ratios in Binational Schools
Mexico: 1960

	Durango	Guadalajara	Mexico	Monterrey	Pachuca	Puebla	Total
1959-60 Enrollment	161	364	1,540	507	215	872	3,659
Number Full-Time Teachers	12	21	87	28	10	34	192
Pupil-Teacher Ratio	13.4	17.3	17.7	18.1	21.5	25.6	19.0

fully their characteristics. Eighty-one per cent of the teachers supplied the information. Those who did not were by and large the National teachers; therefore, the specific characteristics probably represent a U. S. bias.

Forty-four per cent of the teachers are single, and 56 per cent married; 80 per cent of the teachers are women, and most all teachers fall within the ages of 20 and 50. Fifty-five per cent of the teachers are Mexican nationals, 42 per cent U. S. citizens and the remaining 3 per cent represent five other nationalities. Thirty per cent of the teachers are 25 years of age or less, and 26 per cent are between the ages of 26 and 35. The citizenship of the teachers is presented in Table 3.10, and a distribution of the teachers by age is presented in Table 3.11.

Language competence as reported by the teachers in the schools indicates that over 90 per cent of the teachers read, write and speak Spanish and that approximately the same percentage applies to English. In the experience and observations of the author this information is not valid for the U. S. teachers if applied to their abilities to apply usefully a knowledge of Spanish to teaching or any professional area. In fact, the author would hypothesize that a large majority of the U. S. teachers in the binational schools speak no more Spanish than that

TABLE 3.10

Citizenship of Teachers in Binational Schools in Mexico

Country	Number	Per Cent
United States	66	42.0
Mexico	85	55.0
Italy	1	.6
France	1	.6
Spain	1	.6
Canada	1	.6
Columbia	1	.6
Total	156	100.0

TABLE 3.11

Distribution of Binational School Teachers by Age

Number of Years	Number	Per Cent
20-25	47	30
26-35	41	26
36-50	47	30
Over 50	19	12
No response	2	2
Total	156	100

required for basic services. The language competency reported by the teachers is presented in Table 3.12.

TABLE 3.12

Language Competence Reported by Teachers of Binational Schools in Mexico

Language	Number of Teachers Who		
	Read	Write	Speak
Spanish	145	140	146
English	140	135	134
French	48	30	21
German	9	4	7
Italian	9	5	5
Other (10)	9	5	8

The professional characteristics of the teachers in the binational schools are of primary importance. In order to present information pertinent to the professional characteristics, these aspects are analyzed: (1) years of U. S. experience, (2) source and level of training, (3) course hours of professional study, (4) salary schedule, and (5) faculty organization and activity.

Thirty per cent of all teachers in the schools have had some experience in the U. S.; however, in two schools none of the teachers were reported to have had U. S. experience. The 47 teachers (30 per cent) with U. S. experience are found almost exclusively in two of the schools. These two schools employ 87 per cent of teachers with U. S. experience.

The majority of teachers with U. S. experience have five or fewer years of experience. Only twelve, or 26 per cent, of the teachers have had six or more years of experience in U. S. schools.

Thus, 70 per cent of the teachers have not had any experience in teaching in the U. S.; of the 192 full-time teachers in the schools, only 6 per cent have had more than five years of experience in U. S. schools; two schools have no teachers with U. S. experience and less than 20 per cent of the teachers in two other schools report any U. S. experience.

The teachers with U. S. experience are reported in Table 3.13.

Thirty-nine per cent of the teachers in the binational schools have attended college in the U. S., and 37 per cent attended college in Mexico. Thus, 153 persons, representing 80 per cent of the teachers, have attended some type of post-secondary education, either in Mexico or in the U. S. About half of the teachers report that they hold a teaching diploma or college degree from the U. S.

Concerning professional study by the teachers, 24 report undergraduate professional study in U. S. programs and 11 in National programs. Forty-eight teachers were engaged in graduate study in U. S. programs and 19 in Mexican programs. Approximately one-third of the

TABLE 3.13

Teachers With U. S. Experience in the Binational Schools of Mexico

Number of Years In U. S. Schools	Durango	Guadalajara	Mexico	Monterrey	Pachuca	Puebla	Total
0-5	0	3	20	11	0	4	35
6-15	0	1	6	2	0	1	10
16-25	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
Total	0	4	28	13	0	5	47
Per Cent of Total Staff	0	20	32	46	0	15	30

study, undergraduate and graduate, was made possible through the Association of American Schools in the Republic of Mexico. Since the time of this study, this program has more than quadrupled.

Considering the salary schedules in the binational schools of Mexico, they are fortunate to have the services of teachers with or without training. The extremes in levels of training for salary schedules are reported by one school as being from a normal certificate from Mexico to the Ph.D. The normal teacher receives $66 per month and the Ph.D. with ten years of experience receives from $180 to $190 per month according to his classification. The school did not report having employed anyone at the Ph.D. level. One other school reported $32 as the minimum salary and $450 as the maximum salary. The highest salary schedule reported by any school was a base salary for a trained teacher of $3,000 per year with maximums for automatic increments of $3,400 for the bachelor's degree and $4,050 for the master's degree. The maximum automatic salary for the bachelor's degree teacher was reached in four years; for the master's degree, eight years.

The actual salaries paid to the teachers in the six schools during this period approximate those reported for all 23 schools in the first section of this chapter. The

average salary in the six schools in Mexico was $2,230 and 21 per cent of the teachers received less than $1,000 per year.

It is generally accepted that faculty committees are useful devices for upgrading curriculum and instruction within the schools in the U. S. They are not only useful, but necessary to the development of integrated and correlated curricula in the binational schools, to wit, (1) all areas of study followed in the U. S. program have their counterpart in the national program, and most all children in the elementary programs which are "binational" study the same subject in two different languages with two different teachers; hence all teachers involved in teaching the same subject, irrespective of language of instruction, must work cooperatively to produce correlated programs of instruction, and (2) the very nature of a binational, bilingual and bicultural school requires that the professional staff meet together frequently to treat the normal problems which such a nature creates.

Only one school reported that it had faculty committees which dealt with the program being taught in the school. Several schools reported committees to deal with various school services such as bus, library, exhibits and assemblies. The number and types of faculty committees reported by the schools is presented in Table 3.14.

TABLE 3.14

Number and Types of School Faculty Committees in Binational Schools in Mexico

Name of Committee	Monterrey	Durango	Guadalajara	Mexico, D.F.	Puebla	Pachuca
1. Evaluation-Elementary	15	---	---	---	---	---
2. Evaluation-Secondary	8	---	---	---	---	---
3. Evaluation-Steering	4	---	---	---	---	---
4. Others Being Formed	---	---	---	---	---	---
5. Bus Committee	---	3	---	---	---	---
6. Library Committee	---	2	---	---	---	---
7. Admin. Council	---	---	---	8	---	---
8. H.S.Admin. Council	---	---	---	---	---	---
9. Elementary	---	---	---	5	---	---
10. Admin.-Teacher Student Council	---	---	---	15	---	---
11. Admin.-P.T.A.	---	---	---	6	---	---
12. Educ. (Adm.-bus. Men-Laymen)	---	---	---	5	---	---
13. Exhibit Committee	---	---	---	---	---	2
14. Program Committee	---	---	---	---	---	3
	3 comm. 27 members	2 comm. 5 members	---	5 comm. 39 members	---	2 comm. 5 members

It must be concluded, therefore, that

1. The binational schools adhere to unrealistic objectives, and
2. With present personnel, they cannot be expected to improve significantly.

D. INCORPORATION AND ACCREDITATION OF SCHOOL PROGRAMS

The binational schools in Latin America may seek and gain recognition of their programs of instruction from both National and U. S. agencies. In addition, the binational schools must have a charter to operate which is merely a legal document required in Latin America for the operation of any institution, but does not necessarily include the recognition of the program which is offered.

Generally, the binational school may apply for the incorporation of its elementary, junior and senior high programs to the National government; however, the senior high program is often under the jurisdiction of an autonomous National university.

A binational school in Latin America is also eligible to accreditate its junior high and senior high programs with the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. In 1961, this agency made provisions also for the recognition of elementary programs through its Cooperative Program for Elementary Education. In addition to the Southern Association, binational schools in Mexico may accredit

their elementary and secondary programs with the Texas Education Agency.

1. Charter to Operate and Incorporation

The literature concerning the binational schools often fails to distinguish between the terms: (1) charter to operate and (2) incorporation. These terms are different and such distinction is necessary and important to an understanding of the nature of a school's program in relation to national education.

Incorporation (incorporacion) is the legal process whereby a school program is approved by national educational officials as meeting the requirements of the national program; hence a student from a binational school with an incorporated program is assumed to be qualified and legally able to transfer to and from any other incorporated program--public or private. Incorporation, as such, is required by law as a condition of school operation in some Latin American countries.

In most cases, with the notable exception of Venezuela, the binational schools have incorporated their elementary programs because: (1) they were required to do so by the national government, (2) they chose to do so, or (3) it was politically expedient to do so.

A "charter to operate" is the legal instrument required in each country in order to establish a private school, whether or not the school's program is later

incorporated. There is no evidence that a "charter to operate" has been denied to anyone who has requested one.

Thus, a binational school in Latin America has not been known to have been refused a charter to operate; however, the incorporation of the school's program into the national program depends on the legal educational requirements of a particular country and the degree to which the requirement is enforced, and the composition of the student body, i.e., if the school admits national children.

Incorporation requirements do not appear to have been rigidly enforced. Certainly the requirements of (a) instruction in the language of the country, and (b) the use of approved textbooks have not been followed by binational schools. In only one case was it reported that a national government had formally made a concession to a binational school. This was achieved in the formal designation of the Colegio Americano de Guatemala as an official laboratory school by the Ministry of Education in Guatemala, Central America.

Available evidence indicates that Latin American educational officials are generally cooperative in approving the programs of the binational schools. They consider the best interests of the students and are willing to seriously consider proposed plans for integrating National and U. S. programs, to wit, a large number

of binational schools are incorporated which do not teach exclusively in the National language and do not use exclusively the approved textbooks of the National program.

All schools reported curricular organizations which demonstrated that these types of curricula may be found in the binational schools: (1) basically a national curriculum, (2) basically a U. S. curriculum, (3) a dual curriculum, or (4) a blended or integrated curriculum. These types of curricular organization are treated extensively in the proximate section and are designated in this section to demonstrate that different types of programs have been incorporated.

Thus, it appears that in most cases reported by the binational schools that these conclusions may be justified concerning incorporation:

1. National children attending binational schools which do not have incorporated programs cannot re-enter national schools at equivalent grade levels; hence, incorporation is the desired status in most schools.
2. Incorporation is more dependent on informal relationships established by binational school officials with National educational authorities than it is on meeting fully the legal requirements for incorporation.

3. The most common solution found by binational school officials in acquiring incorporation is a basic national curriculum or a dual curriculum which includes the basic elements of both National and U. S. curricula, i.e., the same subjects taught in both languages with different instructional materials.

4. In some cases, binational school officials have acquired incorporation of U. S. programs; in an isolated case a blended program has been accepted. The blended program is distinguished from the dual program by its practice of not repeating the same subject matter in different languages, but providing a binational, bilingual program.

2. The Nature of Accreditation of Binational Schools by U. S. Agencies

The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, a regional accrediting association for the colleges and schools of eleven Southern States in the U. S., has the exclusive right[4] to accredit all colleges and schools in Latin America except those which are operated by the U. S. Government as overseas dependent's schools.

---

[4]By agreement among the five regional private accrediting associations in the United States.

The binational schools reported that they sought accreditation for these reasons: (1) to improve the possibilities of their students' re-entrance into U. S. schools without loss of credit and their entrance without examination to U. S. universities, (2) to afford their teachers experience which could be accepted by school districts in the U. S., and (3) to maintain basic U. S. standards in the schools.

Twelve of the 23 schools reported that they offered a secondary program, and of these, 9 were accredited by the Southern Association. Only one elementary program was recognized.

The work of the SACS in Latin America has been limited by the number of schools and by inadequate financing. SACS' only source of funds for work with the binational schools has been from the schools themselves and from the IASS. Binational schools which seek accreditation are required to pay for the expenses of the visiting teams from the accreditating associations, as are cooperating schools in the United States. The binational schools usually cannot afford to pay for such services; hence the work of SACS has been limited to that which could be accomplished through an annual grant of $4,000 from IASS.

The SACS has been responsible, directly and indirectly, for influencing several schools to improve: (1) the

qualifications of their faculty, (2) faculty salaries, (3) policy statements, and (4) self-evaluation. Visiting committees from the SACS have worked with school directors and school boards in seeking to bring about improvement. This service, ironically, has led to a basic conflict--the appropriateness of an accreditating association engaging in improvement which they will ultimately evaluate.

The role of SACS, in accreditating the binational schools, may be compared to that of the National educational officials in incorporating them.

The SACS uses the principles and standards developed for schools in the U. S. and their evaluation of the binational school. To be eligible for accreditation, SACS requires that a school meet the following minimum standards:

1. A minimum teacher salary of $3,000 per year and an average salary for all teachers of not less than $3,400.
2. That each school director hold a master's degree or the equivalent, the major portion of study for the degree to be presented in the field of administration.
3. That each teacher hold a bachelor's degree and such academic and professional training as required by the state in which he teaches.

4. That each secondary school have the services of a qualified librarian and counselor, and
5. That each school have written board of education policy.

An examination of the binational schools which are accredited by the Southern Association indicates that none of the schools meet all of these requirements for accreditation. Thus, the SACS--as do their national counterparts--does not adhere to its principles and standards in the accreditation of binational schools.

The Texas Education Agency also accredits binational schools in Mexico. Its efforts have been largely parallel to those of the Southern Association because, for several years, the same individual has been the Director of School Accreditation in Texas and the Chairman of the "Committee on Latin American Relations" of the SACS, the committee responsible for the accreditation of the binational schools.

With respect to U. S. accreditation of binational schools, therefore, these conclusions seem justified:

1. The efforts of the SACS and the Texas Education Agency have been largely parallel.
2. The application of U. S. standards to binational schools is a questionable practice; hence SACS teams have "adjusted"

standards in their application to binational schools.

3. No efforts have as yet been made to establish appropriate standards for binational schools.
4. The SACS has also tried to assist schools by having its visiting teams consult with directors; however
5. It is questionable that the team responsible for evaluation can also be responsible for technical assistance.

E. CURRICULAR ORGANIZATION

The curricula of the schools can generally be classified into four distinct types: (1) a basic Latin American program, now offered in six schools; (2) a basic U. S. program, which seven schools follow; (3) dual curricula (characterized by the teaching of the same subject in two languages of which there are nine; and (4) the blended or integrated curriculum which includes requirements of Latin American and U. S. programs but does not duplicate subject matter instruction in two languages. One school can definitely be identified in this latter category. Several of the schools in the third category, i.e., dual curricula, have made some discerible progress toward integration.

Curricular organization is necessarily complicated for most of the schools because they accept mono-lingual students, Latin American and U. S.; consequently, they are required to provide special classes in Spanish and English. Some schools meet this problem by refusing admission to a mono-lingual Latin American child; however, none is known to refuse admission to a U. S. child who doesn't speak Spanish. Most schools have provided what has come to be known as "Special Spanish" and "Special English" classes. These classes are designed to teach the mono-linguist enough of the second language that he may enter the regular program. Other schools merely place the child in the regular program and hope for the best.

Within and among the several schools, many innovations have evolved in developing materials and procedures for special provisions for the English-speaking mono-linguist. There is no evidence, however, of the development of materials for teaching English as a second language, with the exception of experimental materials in one school. Several schools have fairly well developed materials for teaching Spanish as a second language, and many of these materials are in published form.

Those schools offering a secondary school program usually offer a very limited program. In all but two cases, the secondary program is offered solely for the purpose of preparing the student to enter a university. There

are evidences of limited fine arts instruction; however, no school offers practical arts for vocational exploration, and none offers vocational training other than commercial training.

The schools in Mexico devote approximately five times as much time in teaching reading in English as they do in Spanish; however, only two of the schools teach reading in Spanish. The student is reported to learn to read Spanish in regular Spanish classes in five of the six schools. Handwriting, spelling, art and music are reported to be taught in integrated programs. Two of the schools teach arithmetic in both Spanish and English, three exclusively in English and one in only Spanish. Social studies are taught in both English and Spanish in three schools, in English only in one school, and in Spanish in the other two schools.

The schools in South America follow a somewhat different pattern. Only four of the twelve schools teach any notable part of the program in Spanish (or Portuguese).

Thus, the schools in Mexico evidence a tendency to integrate their programs, i.e., not to repeat instruction in the same subject in two languages, or to operate dual curricula.

The schools in South America tend toward a program taught in English with some concession to instruction in Spanish. There are, however, exceptions in both areas.

The average numbers of hours of instruction in Spanish and English in each basic area for Mexico and South America are presented in Table 3.15.

Conclusions

A. The elementary programs in the binational schools are varied. There is no particular pattern among the schools; however, all but one elementary school program may be classified into one of three groups: (1) a basic Latin American program, (2) a basic U. S. program, or (3) a dual program which includes subjects of both languages.

B. Those elementary programs which are basically Latin American or dual have little time available for any areas other than the "three R's."

C. The secondary programs are underdeveloped and predominantly college preparatory.

D. The number of schools sufficiently large enough to justify a twelve-year program is limited. Some are attempting to provide a twelve-year program through the use of correspondence school programs, etc.; however, these are by and large inadequate and inefficient secondary programs, even though the efforts are admirable.

TABLE 3.15

Primary School Programs
Binational Schools in Latin America

School Number	1	2	3	4	5	6	12	13	14
Average Number of Hours Per Week Devoted to:									
Reading: English	5	4	4½	5	5	4	5	1 5/6	5
Spanish	--	--	--	--	3	2	--	--	--
Handwriting	--	*	*	*	*	1	--	--	--
Arithmetic: English	--	4	4	5	5	3	5	2 5/6	3 3/4
Spanish	5	3	2	--	--	--	--	--	--
Spelling	--	*	*	*	*	*	--	--	--
Language: English	5	--	2	--	--	3	5	3	3 3/4
Spanish	--	2½	3	4	3	2	--	2½*	--
Social Studies:									
English	--	3	4½	5	2	--	5	1½	3 3/4
Spanish	5	--	3½	2	1	2	--	--	½
Science: English	--	--	--	4	2	--	2½	5/6	½
Spanish	5	2	3	--	1	2	--	--	--
Art	--	1	*	¼	*	1½	½	1½	1
Music	--	1	*	¼	--	½	½	5/6	1
Physical Education	--	--	1	1½	3	--	--	--	1½

*Integrated language instruction

Table 3.15 (continued)

School Number	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23
Average Number of Hours Per Week Devoted to:									
Reading: English	--	5	5	5	--	3 3/4	5	5	5
Spanish	--	1	5	2	--	--	5	--	--
Handwriting	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Arithmetic: English	--	5	2½	5	--	3 3/4	1½	5	5
Spanish	--	--	2½	--	--	--	1½	--	--
Spelling	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Language: English	--	5-10	5	5	--	3 3/4	3½	5	5
Spanish	--	1	--	3	--	x2½	3½*	5*	5
Social Studies: English	--	5	2½	5	--	3 3/4	1½	5	3
Spanish	--	4	2½	--	--	--	1½	--	3
Science: English	--	3	2	5	--	2½	1	3	2
Spanish	--	--	2	--	--	--	1	--	--
Art	--	1	2	1	--	--	1	2	2
Music	--	1	1	2	--	--	1	2	2
Physical Education	--	1½	2	3	--	--	1	--	--

[x]French *Portuguese

F. SCHOOL REVENUE

Sixteen of the 23 schools provided complete information concerning their sources of revenue.

A review of the schools' budgets demonstrated that tuition and fees charged are the primary source of revenue, representing 90.7 per cent of the total. Only two of the schools, however, reported tuition and fees to be the sole source of income. Most schools also received U. S. government grants and private donations. These total $81,622.11, which represents 3.7 per cent of all income. The schools received $43,220 from the IASS which represented 1.9 per cent of income. This third ranked source of income is directly attributable to the contract between the American Council on Education and the U. S. Department of State (as documented in Chapter I) and can be considered as income from the U. S. government. The separation of the amounts, thus, represents that income received by the schools directly from IASS and that which they received through other U. S. government sources. The schools also report the receipt of $55,676, or 2.5 per cent of all revenue, from various kinds of donations. These are reported to be from such sources as the Parent-Teacher Associations, American Societies or from individuals and business and industry, National and U. S.

The schools received a total amount of $2,256,862 per year and enroll 7,749 students. This represents a per pupil revenue of $291.24 per year.

Total revenue, however, ranges from a low of $8,784 to a high of $453,800 per year. The low represents a per pupil revenue of $162.65 and the high $304.97. These, however, do not represent the extremes of the range in per pupil revenue. The lowest per pupil revenue is $61.12 and the high is $1,042.18. Thus, one school has revenue 17 times larger than another. It is significant that the lowest per pupil income school enrolls 100 per cent National children and the school with the highest income enrolls 82 per cent U. S. children.

Twelve of the 16 schools reported that they received revenue from the U. S. government, directly or through IASS. Only two of the schools reported receiving funds from both sources.

There seems to be no particular pattern which determines the amount of financing received by a binational school from U. S. government sources; however, it is obvious that the binational schools with a significant national enrollment receive a larger part of their income from the U. S. government than do schools without a large per cent of nationals. The total amount of funds reported to have been received from the U. S. government represents

5.6 per cent of all revenue received by all the schools; however, it represents 17.5 per cent for those schools which report a majority of National children, and 2 per cent for those with a majority of U. S. children. Two of the schools received approximately 38 per cent of their total revenue from the U. S. government. One had 50 per cent National children and the other 96 per cent.

Some of the smaller schools appear to be dependent on U. S. government support for continued operation; in most schools such U. S. government support is an insignificant part of the total revenue.

The per pupil expenditure per student in the U. S. in 1962-63 was $547, which represents about 80 per cent for operating expenses and 20 per cent for buildings, equipment and bond interest. Thus, the U. S. average for operating expenses was $437.60 per pupil per year contrasted to an average source of income--hence anticipated expenditure--of $291.24 per year in the binational schools in Latin America. If, however, one school in South America--that which reported revenue of $1,042.18--is eliminated from the average, the binational expenditure would be reduced appreciably.

U. S. education, that which the binational schools purport to demonstrate, expends an average of $547 per pupil annually; the binational schools expend an average of $291.24. There are several factors which contribute

to reducing the cost of living in Latin America, and there are other factors which increase it as compared to the U. S. A detailed study of the cost of living is not undertaken in this study; however, these facts are important: (1) U. S. business and industry pay premium salaries and benefits for overseas work, and (2) U. S. government pays housing allowances, a cost of living differential and provides other benefits to its employees outside of the U. S. It seems reasonable to assume that a binational school cannot expect to operate more economically than a U. S. school.

The fact is that the binational schools operate with 53 per cent of the per pupil income expended in the U. S. Even though significant differences exist in per pupil revenue among the binational schools, only one reports an expenditure which is as much as the U. S. average. Only three of the schools report revenues of as much as $300 per pupil per year.

An examination of the budgets presented by the several schools demonstrated that great differences existed among the several schools in the accounting procedures which they used. This, the area of financial accounting, is an area which warrants additional study, and if budget comparisons are to be made for the purpose of financing, the standardization of pertinent reporting procedures.

An analysis of the budgets demonstrated that school budgets and accounting procedures were either organized similar to a profit-making business or they were not organized in a manner to provide accurate reporting. The first case, organization similar to a business enterprise, could result from a general tendency of the schools to always show a loss for any given year. Specific methods used in accomplishing a "book" loss were (1) charges against depreciation of donated buildings and equipment, and (2) contingency reserves based on the assumption that all employees would be discharged and thus eligible for indemnification under National labor laws. The purpose of this study was not to evaluate or to judge the validity of budgetary and accounting procedures, rather to demonstrate that comparisons of budgets can be inaccurate.

Reasons for projecting a loss can be attributed to these circumstances (1) the binational schools are generally organized as non-profit associations and such organizations exempt them from payment of taxes, (2) the binational schools apparently prefer to follow procedures in accounting practices which show any surplus as a reserve for a specific purpose, and (3) the schools presumably believe that solicitation of funds is more successful when a loss rather than a reserve is evidenced in their operations.

From this section of Chapter III, these conclusions are presented:

1. The binational schools are almost exclusively supported by tuition.
2. Over 80 per cent of the schools studied receive far less revenue than the average in the U.S.; and an average of all schools demonstrates revenue of approximately one-half of that expended per pupil in the U. S.
3. Whatever and irrespective of the stated purposes of the binational schools, the amount of revenue largely predetermines the type of schools they become.
4. The revenue of the binational schools, as a whole, demonstrates that they receive less revenue than that required for a minimum program which could fulfill their stated objectives.
5. Monetary aid from the U. S. government is insignificant to all schools, on a per pupil basis, except those which enroll a majority of national children and even in these cases the total amount is insignificant.
6. Budget and accounting procedures and practices in the schools vary widely and comparisons of budgets may be inaccurate.

7. Most all schools are inclined to demonstrate that they are operating at a loss, and they may be, but their budgets do not identify nor differentiate between cash losses and book losses.

The following tables present detailed information concerning this section. Table 3.16 presents the sources of revenue reported by the 16 binational schools in 1961-62; Table 3.17 presents this same information on a per pupil basis, and Table 3.18 presents the varying sources of income by per cent.

TABLE 3.16

Sources of Revenue Reported from Selected Binational Schools in Latin America: 1961-62

School	Tuition and Fees	U.S. Government Grants	IASS Grants	Donations	Loans	Miscellaneous	Total
1	$ 17,786	---	$ 6,000	$ 1,624	$1,600	---	$ 27,010
2	48,720	---	5,920	960	---	$ 2,112	57,712
3	440,727	---	2,798	8,971	---	1,304	453,800
4	147,589	---	3,107	5,726	---	2,129	158,551
5	8,970	---	2,395	960	---	82	12,407
6	55,448	---	5,000	2,102	---	5,789	68,339
7	248,004	---	---	---	---	---	248,004
8	250,000	---	---	300	---	---	250,300
9	90,217	$58,770	---	---	---	6,528	155,515
10	25,746	5,891	---	28,704	---	1,208	61,549
11	73,680	12,000	---	4,200	---	---	89,880
12	18,000	---	6,000	1,000	---	---	25,000
13	150,750	3,750	10,000	---	---	3,511	168,011
14	52,000	---	---	---	---	---	52,000
15	3,445	2,210	2,000	1,129	---	---	8,784
16	420,000	---	---	---	---	---	420,000
Total	$2,051,082	$82,621	$43,220	$55,676	$1,600	$22,663	$2,256,862
Percentage	90.7	3.7	1.9	2.5	.2	1.0	100.00

TABLE 3.17

Source of Revenue Per Pupil in Sixteen Binational Schools: 1961-62

School	Tuition and Fees		U.S. Government		IASS Grants		All Other		Total	
	Abs.	Per Cent	Abs.	Per Cent	Abs.	Per Cent	Abs.	Per Cent	Abs.	Per Cent
1	102.21	65.9	--	--	34.48	22.2	18.52	12.0	155.21	100.
2	95.52	84.4	--	--	11.61	10.3	6.02	5.3	113.21	100.
3	296.19	97.2	--	--	1.88	.6	6.90	2.3	304.97	100.
4	234.27	93.1	--	--	4.93	2.0	12.48	5.0	251.68	100.
5	44.19	72.3	--	--	11.80	19.3	5.13	8.4	61.12	100.
6	62.23	81.1	--	--	5.61	7.3	8.86	11.6	76.70	100.
7	N.R.								N.R.	
8	387.46	100.0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	100.
9	215.24	58.1	139.59	37.7	--	--	15.51	4.2	370.34	100.
10	86.96	41.8	19.91	9.6	--	--	101.06	48.6	207.95	100.
11	230.25	82.1	37.50	13.4	--	--	13.13	4.7	280.88	100.
12	111.11	72.0	--	--	37.03	24.0	6.17	4.0	154.31	100.
13	150.80	89.7	3.75	2.2	10.01	6.0	3.50	2.1	168.06	100.
14	196.96	100.0	--	--	--	--	--	--	196.96	100.
15	63.79	39.2	40.93	25.2	37.03	22.8	20.90	12.8	162.65	100.
16	1042.18	100.0	--	--	--	--	--	--	1042.18	100.

TABLE 3.18

Sources of Revenue by Percentage: Selected Binational Schools in Latin America: 1961-62

School	Tuition and Fees	U.S. Gov't. Grants	IASS Grants	Donations	Loans	Misc.	Nationality: Students	
							National	U. S.
1	65.9	---	22.2	6.0	5.9	---	90	10
2	84.4	---	10.3	1.7	---	3.7	67	30
3	97.1	---	.6	2.0	---	.3	40	40
4	93.1	---	2.0	3.6	---	1.3	60	40
5	72.3	---	19.3	7.7	---	.6	100	0
6	81.1	---	7.3	3.0	---	8.5	96	3
7	100.0	---	---	---	---	---	13	80
8	99.9	---	---	.1	---	---	16	76
9	58.0	37.8	---	---	---	4.2	50	40
10	41.8	9.6	---	46.6	---	2.0	48	38
11	82.0	13.4	---	4.7	---	---	80	13
12	72.0	---	24.0	4.0	---	---	48	29
13	89.7	2.2	6.0	---	---	2.1	86	7
14	100.0	---	---	---	---	---	NR	NR
15	39.2	25.2	22.8	12.9	---	---	96	4
16	100.0	--	--	--	--	--	14	82

G. SCHOOL PLANT

The quality of the school plant has a direct effect upon several of the basic questions of this study. Even though good teaching can take place in inadequate facilities, the probabilities are that the quality of instruction will not be much better or worse than the quality of the physical facilities.

Standards appropriate to binational schools have not yet been developed; however, inasmuch as the binational schools purport to demonstrate U. S. methodology and practices, it is not inappropriate to examine their facilities in terms of the U. S. standards. Criteria offered by the National Council of School House Construction were, in fact, adopted in 1961 by the Association of American Schools in Mexico as a basis for evaluating school building capacities.

These criteria specify that a classroom should provide a minimum of 2.3 square meters of usable floor space per pupil, with 2.8 square meters being preferred. Thus, to accommodate twenty-five students, a classroom should contain at least 57 and preferably 70 square meters of floor space.

This section concerning the school plant is limited to an analysis of the size of the classrooms in 18 of the binational schools. A detailed study of the size of the

classrooms in the binational schools is considered of greatest importance to the basic questions of this study because: (1) most schools report capacity enrollments; (2) pupil-teacher ratios, as related to classroom capacities, are reported to influence teacher compensation, and (3) most schools report overcrowded conditions and one reported space utilization as high as 174 per cent of capacity as determined by the adopted minimum standards.

Almost all binational school directors identify limited financial resources as the major problem confronting the schools. Because of financial limitations, the binational schools cannot recruit and retain qualified teachers, cannot develop adequate instructional materials, and in general cannot attain those objectives to which they ascribe and aspire.

An analysis of the size of the classrooms in the binational schools demonstrates that the schools which have the greatest financial limitations cannot expand their enrollments to an economical level of operation because they do not have classrooms large enough to accommodate groups large enough to generate necessary income.

Fifty-six per cent of the classrooms in the binational schools are not adequate to accommodate a section of 25

pupils. Over 90 per cent of the revenue available to the schools is received from tuition and fees charged to the students enrolled. The size and adequacy of classrooms is presented in Table 3.19.

The percentage of space utilization reported by all schools was 102 per cent allowing 2.8 square meters per child, and 84 per cent using 2.3 square meters.

Using the desirable amount of space for each child--2.8 square meters--only 30 per cent of the schools have additional space available for an expanded enrollment.

An analysis of the schools with more than 100 per cent of space utilization reveals that 30 per cent of them have fewer than 25 pupils per classroom. One school with 105 per cent utilization reports only thirteen pupils per classroom. Space utilization is presented in Table 3.20 and the number of pupils per classroom is demonstrated in Table 3.21.

From the information available in this section, these conclusions are warranted:

1. Over half of the classrooms in the binational schools are too small to accommodate an enrollment of 25 pupils.
2. Most of the schools which reported low per pupil revenue have classrooms which do not permit an expanded enrollment, even

TABLE 3.19

Number, Size and Adequacy of Classrooms in 23 Binational Schools in Latin America

School	Below Minimal Requirements Size in Square Meters				Minimal Size in Sq. Meters		Above Minimal Size in Sq. Meters			Total Classrooms
	Less 35	36-42	43-49	50-56	57-63	64-70	71-77	78-84	85 or More	
1	16									16
2	5	13	1							19
3		3	3	27	1	2	31	3	11	81
4					27		1			28
5	5	1	1		1					8
6		1	25	1	1					28
7	6									6
8	13	4	6	8	3	1	1	4	2	42
9		4	4	10		2				20
10		2	3	2		1				8
11	1	1	1		8			3		14
12	12	6			2					20
13						9			2	11
14	1	3	9	10	7	1			13	44
15			8		3					11
16	7									7
17	2					8				10
18						11	11	2	2	26
Totals	68	38	61	58	53	35	44	12	30	399
		225 = 56%			88=23%			86 = 21%		100%

TABLE 3.20

Enrollment, Available Space and Space Utilization in 18 Selected Schools

School	Maximum m^2 Available[1]	Actual Enrollment	Maximum Enrollment m^2 Per Child		Percentage Utilization[2]	
			2.8 m^2	2.3 m^2	2.8 m^2 Per Child	2.3 m^2 Per Child
1	560	210	200	243	105	86
2	770	555	275	335	202	166
3	5,562	1,500	1,986	2,418	76	62
4	1,778	660	635	773	104	85
5	329	220	117	143	188	154
6	1,386	1,050	495	603	212	174
7	210	86	75	91	115	95
8	2,207	501	788	960	64	52
9	1,064	635	380	463	167	137
10	413	158	147	180	107	88
11	882	421	315	383	134	110
12	798	320	285	347	112	92
13	800	162	286	348	57	47
14	2,778	999	992	1,208	101	83
15	581	264	207	253	128	104
16	245	54	87	107	62	50
17	630	196	225	274	87	72
18	1,955	403	698	850	58	47
Total	22,948	8,394	8,195	9,977	102	84

[1]Based on maximum of the range reported by school directors, e.g., each classroom reported in the range 36-42 square meters was calculated at 42 m^2.

[2]Based on 100 per cent utilization even though 90 per cent is considered maximum for a U. S. public school.

TABLE 3.21

Total Number of Classrooms Contrasted to Total Enrollment in Selected Binational Schools in Latin America

School	Enrollment	Number of Classrooms	Number of Pupils Per Classroom
1	210	16	13
2	550	19	29
3	1,500	81	19
4	660	28	24
5	220	8	28
6	1,050	28	38
7	86	6	14
8	501	42	12
9	635	20	32
10	158	8	20
11	421	14	30
12	320	20	16
13	162	11	15
14	999	44	23
15	264	11	24
16	54	7	8
17	196	10	20
18	403	26	16
Total	8,389	399	21

though the average number of pupils in each classroom is below 25.

3. Several of the schools' classrooms are dangerously overcrowded.
4. Over half of the classrooms in the schools cannot accommodate a number of children adequate to generate sufficient income for the improvement of the schools.

CHAPTER IV

A REVIEW OF PARENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE BINATIONAL SCHOOL AT MONTERREY, MEXICO

The review of the literature (Chapter I) regarding binational schools indicated some of the aspirations held by those who have observed or who support such schools, and also identified those objectives to which the schools subscribe in whole or in part. Similarly, the information obtained from school directors and reported in Chapter III is descriptive of objectives and aspirations attributed to the binational schools.

However, neither the literature nor the directors supply information regarding either the extent to which school aspirations are fulfilled or the degree to which parents of the children enrolled in a binational school are gratified by school performance of their children in a binational setting. Neither is there any information available which lends understanding to parental opinion concerning the bicultural and bilingual aspects of a binational school. Although there has been substantial descriptive study done of binational schools, little evaluative work has been accomplished.

Thus, this chapter treats parents' perceptions concerning a binational school--its policies, its bicultural nature and its binational objectives. Conclusions are drawn directly and indirectly from the responses of parents.

The American School Foundation of Monterrey, Mexico, was selected for study. This school conducted an extensive self-study in 1961-62, with the collaboration of the College of Education of Michigan State University. A major element of the self-study was a survey of opinion and judgment conducted among parents of the children enrolled.

The Monterrey school is a useful object of special study, as the following data indicate, both because it is genuinely binational and because its self-study has produced evaluative as well as descriptive data. Moreover, the Monterrey school is the only case in which parents' views have been carefully obtained regarding a variety of school problems.

The following data are drawn from the survey of parents' views, conducted by the American School Foundation of Monterrey during the 1961-62 academic year.

The parents of children then enrolled in the school were, for the most part, of Mexican or United States citizenship. (Parents of other nationalities comprised

only 2.8 per cent of the total and were excluded from the sample studied.) Considering all parents, the ratio of Mexican to United States citizens was in the proportion of approximately 60:40. Approximately half the parents of each of these two nationalities responded to the survey; hence the 60:40 ratio (Mexican:U.S.) is reflected in the data that follow as well as in the population sampled. The most pertinent survey data comprise the basis for the following discussion.

The student population of the American School of Monterrey during 1961-62 is indicated in Tables 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3. It will be noted that 58.5 per cent of all children enrolled were of Mexican parentage, 35 per cent of U. S. parentage and 3.7 per cent of mixed (Mexican-U. S.) parentage.

Girls outnumbered boys, 333-297, in the total enrollment of 630, of which 387 were in the "pre-school" (kindergarten) and the primary school, 147 were at the junior high school level, 70 were at the high school level and 26 were in a non-graded commercial program.

The 612 Mexican or U. S. students represented 350 families, of which 210 were Mexican and 140 were U. S., as judged by the father's citizenship in each case. Responses to the survey of parental views were obtained from 48 per cent of the Mexican and 52 per cent of the

TABLE 4.1

Enrollment by Number and Percentage for Nationality And Sex: Monterrey 1961-62

Nation	Number		Percentage		Total	Per
	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Number	Cent
Mexico	155	214	24.6	33.9	369	58.5
United States	119	102	18.8	16.2	221	35.0
Mexico-U.S.	15	7	2.4	1.3	22	3.7
Netherlands	1	2			3	
Germany	4	1			5	
Italy	0	2			2	
Chile	0	1	1.3	1.5	1	2.8
Canada	2	1			3	
Argentina	0	1			1	
Great Britain	1	1			2	
Cuba	0	1			1	
Total	297	333	47.1	52.9	630	100.0

TABLE 4.2

Division Enrollment Summary by Number and Percentage for Nationality and Sex

Division	Nationality: Mexican Boys	Mexican Girls	U. S. Boys	U. S. Girls	Mexico-U.S. Boys	Mexico-U.S. Girls	Other Boys	Other Girls	Numerical Totals Boys	Numerical Totals Girls	Numerical Totals Number	Percentage Totals Boys	Percentage Totals Girls	Percentage Totals Total
Pre-School*	19	13	14	10	2	1	1	1	36	25	61	59.0	41.0	9.7
1- 6	101	88	61	52	9	3	4	8	175	151	326	53.7	46.3	51.7
7- 9	33	68	20	19	3	3	1	0	57	90	147	38.8	61.2	23.3
10-12	2	19	24	21	1	0	2	1	29	41	70	41.4	58.6	11.15
C.C.	0	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	26	0	100.	4.15
Totals	155	214	119	102	15	7	8	10	297	333	630	47.1	52.9	100.0
Percentages	24.6	33.9	18.8	16.2	2.4	1.3	1.3	1.5	47.1	52.9	100			

*"Pre-school" is approximately equivalent to kindergarten.

TABLE 4.3

Enrollment Distribution Study by
Grade, Nationality and Sex
1961-62

Grade	Mexico		U. S.		Mex.-U.S.		Other		Total
	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	
Pre-primer	19	13	14	10	2	1	1	1	61
Grade 1	21	13	6	8	2	1	0	2	53
2	25	25	10	12	0	1	1	2	76
3	11	12	10	5	2	1	0	0	41
4	25	14	14	6	4	0	0	1	64
5	11	14	10	6	1	0	1	2	45
6	8	10	11	15	0	0	2	1	47
7	17	42	8	6	1	1	0	0	75
8	6	16	4	8	2	2	1	0	39
9	10	10	8	5	0	0	0	0	33
10	0	9	10	12	0	0	2	0	33
11	1	1	5	6	0	0	0	0	13
12	1	9	9	3	1	0	0	1	24
Commercial	0	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Total	155	214	119	102	15	7	8	10	630

U. S. families. In the following discussion the percentages cited refer to respondents and not to the total possible number of parents.

Objectives

Instructional-objectives. The views of parents regarding the extent to which the school was effective in achieving its instructional objectives are indicated in Table 4.4.

Mexican and United States parents disagreed in interesting respects concerning the degree to which the school was effective in language instruction; each group thought that its own language was being adequately taught to the other group's children as a second language, but U. S. parents were not pleased with their own children's mastery of English. For example, regarding the teaching of Spanish as a second language for United States children, 79 per cent of Mexican, but only 27 per cent of U. S., parents thought the school was doing "very well"; 99 per cent of Mexican parents, but only 59 per cent of U. S. parents, deemed the program adequate ("very well" or "fairly well"). Normally, one might expect, parents would be the best judges of their own children's success; but most United States parents did not speak Spanish as well as their children. Regarding the teaching of English as a second language for Mexican children, 82 per cent of

TABLE 4.4

Degree of Effectiveness in Meeting Instructional Objectives
(Responses in percentages)

Objectives	Mexican Parents			U. S. Parents			All Parents		
	Very Well	Fairly Well	Poorly	Very Well	Fairly Well	Poorly	Very Well	Fairly Well	Poorly
1. Teaching Spanish as a second language to U. S. children	79	20	1	27	32	41	53	26	21
2. Teaching English as a second language to Mexican children	43	39	18	54	41	5	48.5	40	11.5
3. Guaranteeing that U. S. children have a good command of English									
A. Speaking	84	14	2	51	37	12	67.5	25.5	7
B. Reading	85	13	2	39	45	16	62	29	9
C. Writing	71	29	0	32	38	30	51.5	33.5	15
4. Developing in all students the ability to think critically	72	28	0	33	59	8	52.5	43.5	4

Table 4.4 (continued)

Objectives	Mexican Parents			U. S. Parents			All Parents		
	Very Well	Fairly Well	Poorly	Very Well	Fairly Well	Poorly	Very Well	Fairly Well	Poorly
5. Developing in all students sensitivity to social, political and economic problems of:									
A. United States	37	34	29	17	45	38	27	39.5	33.5
B. Mexico	59	35	6	20	40	40	39.5	37.5	23
C. Latin America	28	38	34	14	28	58	21	33	46
D. World	33	48	19	8	42	50	20.5	45	34.5

the Mexican parents indicated satisfaction with the program ("very well" or "fairly well"), as did 95 per cent of U. S. parents.

Concerning the school's success in guaranteeing that United States children have a good command of English, 12 to 30 per cent of U. S. parents thought the school was performing poorly in teaching them to speak, read and write their first language; virtually all Mexican parents thought the school did well at this task.

All Mexican parents responded that the school was successful in developing students' ability to think critically and independently and only 8 per cent of the U. S. parents indicated poor performance in this area; whereas 72 per cent of Mexican parents thought this task was being done "very well," only 33 per cent of the U. S. parents so thought.

Of major significance was the indication by over 30 per cent of all parents that the school was performing poorly in developing the students' sensitivity to social, political and economic problems of the United States, Latin America and the World. Regarding development of the students' sensitivity to the social, political and economic problems of Mexico, however, 94 per cent of the Mexican and 60 per cent of U. S. parents felt that the school was successful. The presentation of U. S. problems was deemed successful by 66.5 per cent of all parents.

The detailed responses concerning these objectives are summarized in Table 4.4.

Relational objectives. A stated objective common to virtually all binational schools is that of improving or enlarging binational relations and understanding. The degree of success of the Monterrey school in accomplishing this objective was exceptionally high, according to the parents, whose views are summarized in Table 4.5.

Retention of students. If a child is withdrawn from a binational school because the family is moving or because he is being sent abroad for study, his withdrawal is not a matter for concern to the school. However, a perplexing problem for all school boards, administrators, faculty and parents is the withdrawal of students from the binational school for the purpose of entering national or "competing" private schools. Withdrawal suggests, at first thought, dissatisfaction with the school. The reasons advanced by parents in the Monterrey survey are noted in Tables 4.6 and 4.7. These reasons, it should be noted, are explanations they advanced for the withdrawal of any students, and do not suggest that they had ever withdrawn their own children from the school.

Given a list of nine pre-tested reasons plus an "other--please specify" option, parents were asked to

TABLE 4.5

Degree of Effectiveness in Meeting Relational Objectives
(Responses in percentages)

Objective	Mexican Parents			U. S. Parents			All Parents		
	Very Well	Fairly Well	Poorly	Very Well	Fairly Well	Poorly	Very Well	Fairly Well	Poorly
1. Teaching U. S. and Mexican children to understand each others' ways of living and to get along well together	61	32	7	38	49	13	49.5	40.5	10
2. Strengthening relationships between U. S. and Mexican citizens of the community	46	43	11	37	46	17	41.5	44.5	14
3. Create a favorable impression of the U. S. among the local Mexican community	91	9	0	91	9	0	91	9	0
4. Represents to U. S. citizens a favorable impression of Mexico and her people	89	11	0	87	13	0	88	12	0

TABLE 4.6

Parental Understanding of Four Most Important Reasons Parents Withdraw Children To Enroll Them in Other Local Schools

(Responses in percentages)

Reasons (in the order that they appeared in the questionnaire)	Mexican Parents' Ratings 1-4				U. S. Parents' Ratings 1-4				All Parents' Ratings 1-4			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
1. Parents do not wich children to attend a coeducational school	0	6	16	11	0	3	0	0	0	4.5	9.5	5.5
2. To attend a catholic rather than a secular school	2	12	19	11	7	11	13	14	35	11.5	16	12.5
3. Tuition fees are exorbitant	2	12	23	33	16	6	13	19	9	9	18	26
4. Fees not exorbitant but parents can't afford them	5	12	11	8	11	11	16	9	8	11.5	13.5	8.5
5. Bachillerato program unavailable	75	15	0	8	30	23	16	24	52.5	19	8	16
6. Parents keep children in school only until they have learned English	8	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	7.5	0	0
7. Standards are too low or work too easy	8	19	4	21	22	26	5	5	15	22	4.5	13
8. Standards are too high or work too difficult	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9. Fear of children becoming "Americanized"	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	19	0	1	0	9.5
10. Other reasons	0	0	0	0	7	3	3	5	3.5	1.5	1.5	2.5

TABLE 4.7

Rank and Equated Point Value* of Parental Understanding of Reasons Parents Withdraw Children to Enroll Them in Other Local Schools

Reason	All Parents		Mexican Parents		U. S. Parents	
	Rank	Points	Rank	Points	Rank	Points
Bachillerato program not available	1	598	1	353	1	245
Standards too low or work too easy	2	299	2	118	2	181
Tuition fees exorbitant	3	240	3	113	3	127
Fees not exorbitant but parents cannot afford them	4	204	5	86	4	118
To attend a Catholic rather than a secular school	5	194	4	93	5	101
Parents do not wish children to attend a coeducational school	6	76	6	61	9	15
Parents keep children in school only until they learn English	7	60	7	32	6.5	28
Other reasons	8	28	10	0	6.5	28
Fear of children becoming "Americanized"	9	25	8.5	6	8	19
Standards are too high or work too difficult	10	6	8.5	6	10	0

* Four points for the reason deemed most important
Three points for the reason deemed second most important
Two for the third
One for the fourth reason advanced

indicate the four reasons they deemed most important, ranking them from one to four. Table 4.6 is arranged to indicate the percentage of parents who ranked each item. It is perhaps worthy of note that no Mexican parent availed himself of the "other--please specify" option, although several U. S. parents did so. The reasons are listed in Table 4.7 in order of importance as ranked by parents.

The single most important reason, according to 75 per cent of Mexican parents and 30 per cent of U. S. parents, was the unavailability of the approved Mexican bachillerato or senior high school program; 98 per cent of the Mexican parents and 93 per cent of the U. S. parents specified this as one of the four most important reasons for withdrawal.

The second most important reason, one noted by 52 per cent of Mexican and 58 per cent of U. S. parents, was that "standards are too low or work too easy"; in this case, 19 per cent of the Mexican parents and 26 per cent of U. S. parents gave this reason their second ranking; 8 per cent of Mexican parents and 22 per cent of U. S. parents gave first ranking to this reason. Inasmuch as this reason applies almost exclusively to Mexican children (for U. S. children are rarely withdrawn from the binational school for entry into national schools), the comparison is revealing. It appears that U. S.

parents are more inclined to attribute low standards to the school than are Mexican parents, despite the popular Latin American belief that a "hard" school is a "good" school--and national schools are "hard."

Tuition fees and "exclusiveness." Binational schools in large cities of Latin America are frequently accused of being "snobbish" or "exclusive." There is reason to believe that this may be true to a certain degree. Although 62.5 per cent of the parents thought the school should not be an "exclusively upper-class institution," 31 per cent of Mexican parents and 44 per cent of U. S. parents responded that it should be. Responses to this and related economic items are summarized in Table 4.8.

Learning achieved and "work" required. Significant insights into the nature of binational schools were gained from parents' observations concerning "learning" and "work." Their responses, summarized in Table 4.9, indicate their belief that children "learn more" in a binational school than they would in ordinary schools. Mexican and U. S. parents were in remarkable agreement on this point, yet they diverged very sharply on the question whether children "work harder" or "work less" in such a school. Mexican parents, 80 per cent of them, thought the children work harder, but 71 per cent

TABLE 4.8

Parental Responses Concerning Fees and Tuition
(Responses in percentages)

Item	Mexican Parents		United States Parents		Total	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
1. Should school formally obligate parents to pay tuition for an entire school year at the time a student enrolls even if he withdraws later?	35	65	33	67	34	66
2. Should exception to above be made if family leaves Monterrey?	93	7	79	21	86	14
3. Should school be an exclusively upper-class institution?	31	69	44	56	37.5	62.5
4. Should school seek to establish additional scholarships for less privileged children?	94	6	86	14	90	10
5. Does your employer pay any part of the tuition?	13	87	43	57	28	72

TABLE 4.9

Parental Opinion Concerning Learning and Work in a Binational and Essentially Bilingual Institution

(Responses in percentages)

Area	Mexican	American	Total
1. Learning			
A. Learn more	71	72	71.5
B. Learn less	29	28	28.5
2. Work			
A. Work harder	80	29	54.5
B. Work less	20	71	45.5

of U. S. parents thought the opposite. Restated, Mexican parents thought their children work harder but learn more. U. S. parents thought the children learn more despite working less.

"Basic" educational objectives. An effort was made to learn what additional subjects parents thought to be "basic" by asking them what should be offered as a part of the "regular" program of the school and which subjects should be offered as extra-cost options. The responses are summarized in Table 4.10.

It is noteworthy that, in general, U. S. parents conceived of a more generous "basic program" than did the Mexican parents. The two groups agreed as to the inclusion of physical education, sports, developmental reading, and advanced arithmetic and science. However, although U. S. parents would include music and art as "basic," Mexican parents would not.

Summary

The school at Monterrey serves a genuinely binational "constituency" and student body. Therefore, it may be presumed to be an appropriate school in which to examine additional facets of "binationality." It is clear, of course, that the "binationality" of a school resides not only in the differing national origins of its students, but also in the composition of its professional

TABLE 4.10

Parental Identification of Subjects as a Part of the Basic Program or as Extra Cost Options in the Elementary School

(Responses in percentages)

Subject	Mexican Parents		United States Parents		Total	
	Basic Program	Extra-cost Option	Basic Program	Extra-cost Option	Basic Program	Extra-cost Option
Music	38	62	60	40	49	51
Art	39	61	56	44	47.5	52.5
French	23	77	33	67	28.3	72.7
German	28	72	26	74	27	73
Remedial Reading	48	52	66	34	57	43
Developmental Reading	54	46	65	35	59.5	40.5
Remedial Arithmetic	40	60	64	36	52	48
Advanced Arithmetic	52	48	55	45	53.5	46.5
Advanced Science	51	49	53	47	52	48
Physical Education	78	22	90	10	84	16
Sports	89	11	54	46	71.5	28.5

staff, in the content and concept of its instructional program, and in other questions of educational policy and practice.

A concern for several such matters was implicit in the choice of the questions posed to parents in the Monterrey self-study; questions which were chosen, it should be noted, after preliminary discussions within the binational parental committees responsible for the self-study.

The Monterrey school's constituency evidently holds these aspirations for the school:

1. That the school advance international understanding.
2. That the school impart a second language (Spanish and English, respectively) to the U. S. and Mexican children enrolled.
3. That the school develop within its students an appreciation for the culture and traditions of both the U. S. and Mexico.
4. That the school present to the local community a favorable representation of the U. S. and that, similarly, it develop within the local U. S. "colony" a sympathetic appreciation of the "host" nation, Mexico, and its culture.

These aspirations are held in common by both Mexican parents and U. S. parents. These aspirations, expressed as objectives of school operation, create no conflicts within the school's constituency; with respect to them, differences of nationality carry no basic differences of viewpoint. Hence these may be termed the "binational goals" of the binational school.

There are other objectives valued by Mexican and U. S. parents respectively which are not identical. Some aspirations are "domestic" rather than "binational." For example, U. S. parents, by and large, expect the binational school to equip their children for U. S. higher education. Some Mexican parents share this expectation; but many Mexican parents want the binational school to provide for their children a program of instruction that satisfies the entrance requirements of higher education in Mexico or elsewhere in Latin America, hence the importance assigned by parents to the bachillerato program.

It is clear, in short, that the two major groups within the school constituency do have different as well as common interests and objectives. Such differences do not necessarily create conflict within the constituency. However, they do underscore a major problem faced by each binational school: to the extent that the school

attempts to be a truly international school rather than an "American School" transplanted to Latin America. The problem and the challenge is to invent educational programs that blend "U. S." and "Latin American" characteristics so artfully as to reconcile potential conflict, and to satisfy the two sets of aspirations, in a single program of international education.

CHAPTER V

THE EMERGENCE OF RELATIONS BETWEEN THE BINATIONAL SCHOOLS AND U. S. ORGANIZATIONS

The binational schools in Latin America have been related to several U. S. organizations in their history. The first formal relationship was the accreditation in 1928 of one school in Mexico by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). Since that time, sundry U. S. organizations have indicated interest and concern for the welfare of the schools.

The SACS made no significant progress in working with the schools until after the founding of the Inter-American Schools Service (IASS) in 1943.[1] Before this time, the SACS had no funds for travel expenses, and the schools could not afford to pay for the services. With the founding of the IASS, the SACS had the opportunity, under IASS sponsorship, to send representatives to the schools and to evaluate them for accreditation.

The SACS now seeks to accredit eligible schools throughout Latin America at the secondary level (Grades 7-12). It also conducts a cooperative program

---

[1]Roy T. Davis, "American Schools Programs in Latin America," The Educational Record, Vol. 33, (1952), p. 319.

designed to bring about improvement in elementary education.

The standards for accreditation of the binational schools have been somewhat modified in practice. However, the official standards are not adapted to the peculiar nature of the binational school. This is evident from a review of standards for teacher salaries, for example. SACS standards require a minimum annual salary of $3,000 for an individual teacher and a minimum average salary of $3,400 for all teachers.[2] Minimum and average salaries in several accredited binational schools are far below these standards.[3]

The binational schools themselves seek accreditation for several obvious reasons: (1) to improve the possibility of the transfer of their students into U. S. schools, (2) to assist their graduates in entering U. S. universities, and (3) to set minimum standards for themselves.

The SACS has been of great service to the schools in providing them with an effective, even though infrequent, contact with the U. S. education profession. This alone has stimulated interest among the several professionally isolated schools, as was evidenced by a meeting

---

[2]Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, "Principles and Standards," (Atlanta, 1960).

[3]Michigan State University, College of Education, "The Binational Schools in Mexico," (1960).

of directors from representative schools in New Orleans in 1962.[4]

The SACS is organized to work with the binational schools through the committee on Latin American Relations Commission on Secondary Schools.[5]

A standard accreditation requirement of the SACS is that the school must conduct a self-evaluation using the standard Evaluative Criteria.[6] Once gaining accreditation, the school periodically must re-evaluate itself using the same guide. Initial and continuing accreditation of a school is dependent also upon visitation by a member of the Commission on Secondary Schools of the Association.[7]

For several years, the accreditation process was the principal contact the schools had with the U. S. education profession. The contact was limited to those schools which were accredited, and the contact was made by the accreditation examiners. Accordingly, professional and technical service to the schools was limited since a single and infrequent "evaluator" could provide only a modicum of advice and counsel.

---

[4] Improving International Understanding Through Binational Education, SACS, (Atlanta, 1962).

[5] "Proceedings of the Annual Conference, 1961 Southern Association of Colleges and Schools," (Atlanta, 1962).

[6] "Principles and Standards," op. cit.

[7] "Principles and Standards," op. cit.

The formation of the Inter-American Schools Service helped SACS extend its work with the binational schools. The IASS itself came into being in 1943 after the U. S. government developed interest in the schools. Roy Tasco Davis, first director of the Inter-American Schools Service, wrote of its formation:

> In 1942 the office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs requested the Council (American Council on Education) to cooperate with it in setting up a program to assist American sponsored schools in Latin America, and made a grant of $27,000 to the Council for that purpose. In 1943 the sponsorship of the program was transferred to the Department of State. Since that time the Council has operated under contracts with the Department, and annual grants have been made to the Council for the purpose of carrying out the project.[8]

The IASS has actively engaged in working with the binational schools in many different ways between 1943 and 1963. Most significantly, it determined eligibility for grants-in-aid and made modest grants to the schools. In addition IASS also assisted in recruiting teachers in the U. S. for the schools. It also exercised a certain amount of influence in assisting the schools in obtaining funds from other sources. These general functions are treated in an excerpt from the "Newsletter," the quarterly publication of IASS:

> The recruiting service has been considerably expanded, and contacts established with more than 450 teacher placement offices. As a

---

[8]Roy T. Davis, "American Schools Program in Latin America," The Educational Record, Vol. 33, (1952), p. 319.

> result of continued emphasis on increased financial aid for the schools, 18 of them have obtained substantial official aid in local currency funds for building purposes under public Law 480 and six others are to receive aid in dollars under section 400 (e) of the Mutual Security Act. 5.[9]

Since its beginning, IASS has been faced with a financial problem. The number of eligible schools increased dramatically but the total amount of money available to them remained constant.[10]

The U. S. organizations working with these schools emphasized the importance of cooperation in dealing with financial and related problems. The usefulness of cooperation led to the founding in 1959 of the Association of American Schools in the Republic of Mexico, as an outcome of a conference of the schools in Mexico. Prior to this time, the binational schools had met in regional conferences in El Savador (1955), in Guatemala (1956) and in Washington (1957).[11] These conferences, however, did not result in the organization of an association for continuing and collaborative action.

The formation of the Association of the six American schools in Mexico in 1959 was preceded by a formal in-

---

[9]Inter-American Schools Service, "Newsletter," (July, 1959), Washington, D. C.

[10]Ibid.

[11]Ibid.

service training program that was developed in 1957 by the American School Foundation of Mexico in cooperation with Michigan State University. The program was extended to the Colegio Americano de Torreon in 1958. Because of its success and the interest it created, a meeting of all binational schools in Mexico was arranged for the specific purpose of founding an association for cooperative and collaborative action. The conference, sponsored by IASS, was organized by the American School Foundation of Mexico and Michigan State University.

The association was immediately successful insofar as participation was concerned. All binational schools in Mexico except the school in Tampico became members. A natural problem arose in the first year of operation--money. The association was financed by IASS using funds that would otherwise have been distributed as grants-in-aid to individual schools; individual grants thus were reduced--eliminated in some cases--to provide funds for the Association. In addition to this problem, one school expressed an "image" problem in that it did not wish to be too closely associated with "U. S. education." Nevertheless, of the eight binational schools in Mexico, six continued to remain active in the Association movement.

The success of the Association program in Mexico--and the soundness of the idea that limited funds should be invested in planned and cooperative improvement--led IASS to encourage the formation of associations in other areas of Latin America. Consequently, in 1960, four additional regional associations were founded: (1) Central America, (2) Colombia, (3) Venezuela, and (4) Brazil and Argentina.

The formation of these five regional associations--and an increasing interest among the schools to undertake joint action--led to the organization of a conference in New Orleans in 1962. This conference was organized by the SACS, sponsored by the IASS and attended by representatives from the Latin American associations, Michigan State University and the University of Alabama.

This conference resulted in a statement of the common objectives of the associations. These are:

1. To bring to the attention of the educational community in the host country and the United States the accomplishments, unrealized potential, and needs of the member schools, and of the needs of education generally.

2. To develop cooperative working relationships with key public and private educational agencies in Latin America, including institutions of higher education.

3. To provide a systematic program of in-service education to and for teachers in and allied with the association.

4. To provide educational consultation in and through member schools of the Association for the purpose of upgrading the programs of the several schools.

5. To provide means whereby teachers in and allied with member schools may earn advanced study certificates or degrees in cooperation with appropriate U. S. and Latin American universities.

6. To provide training and orientation activities for educational personnel in the United States and Latin America who desire or need cross-cultural experiences as a part of their professional growth and development.

7. To provide mutually beneficial programs of student, faculty, and administrative exchange among member schools, and also between member schools and those of other Associations or countries.

8. To identify areas of needed educational research, to promote research activities in member schools and affiliated agencies, and to establish and conduct programs of research in those areas of greatest mutual need and concern.

9. To develop professional guides, units of instruction, and publications aimed at the resolution of the compelling and persistent problems confronting member schools.

10. To bring about a cooperative effort among the member schools to resolve mutual problems.[12]

The representatives at the New Orleans conference attributed several types of improvements to the Association movement. These were:

---

[12]"Improving International Understanding Through Binational Education," op. cit., p. 3.

1. Improvements in Personnel

The quality of training and experience of United States teachers and local national teachers has dramatically increased in recent years. The quality of administrative leadership has also improved to the point that most of the schools now have the services of trained educators. With these improvements, the school boards have been able to delegate the administration of the schools to the directors and assume their proper role as the policy-making body.

2. Improvements in Program

More children, particularly those of national families, are engaged in American School programs. The total enrollment of these schools has grown from 4,000 in 1944 to approximately 20,000 in 1960. Enrollments are expanding at a rate of approximately 5 per cent per year. The demand by citizens of the host country is such that many schools have had to expand their physical facilities to accommodate those seeking admission. The scope of instructional programs has markedly increased, especially at the secondary level. Of the fifty binational, non-profit schools, half offer a twelve-grade program of education. There is also evidence of greatly improved elementary school programs.

Many of these programs have been accepted by the local governments as meeting the requirements for entrance to local universities.

There are increasing instances of the use of the schools' plants and personnel for demonstration purposes in cooperation with local authorities.

3. Improvements in International Relations

Increasingly, these schools have taken on binational and bicultural characteristics. Today most have provisions for binational boards of control, faculties and student bodies; and most have established dual or blended curricula.

Relationships with local educational agencies have been improved in many instances:

In Colombia, the American High School program in Bogota has been accredited by the National Ministry of Education, a genuine breakthrough in official relationships.

In Guatemala City, the American School is actually employed as a laboratory and teacher training institute on behalf of the National Ministry of Education and the National University. In addition, academic and psychological test materials developed by American School personnel have been adopted for use by all public schools in Guatemala.

In Mexico, D. F., key American School personnel serve as professors at the National University.

With growing improvements in personnel and programs, the popular image of the schools has improved to the point where many are accepted as a vital educational force in their community.

Increasingly, the schools are being turned to by professional persons among the National population for demonstrations of teaching methods, materials of instructions, school plant design and such specialized services as library, counseling and guidance and academic testing.

Some schools, through their recreational and cultural programs, have created an interest on the part of children, parents and professionals for the adoption of such activities into National school programs.

Increasingly, the improving quality of American Schools has commanded the respect of many Nationals, particularly among the so-called leading families, to the point that most schools enroll today children from those families holding the highest educational aspirations and standards. These National families in turn are among the strongest

advocates of continued improvements in the personnel, programs and services of the schools.

4. Improvements in Funds and Facilities

> In recent years, American Schools in Latin America have begun to come out of the basements and attics of sub-standard facilities. Since 1958, new buildings have been completed in Monterrey, Guadalajara and Torreon, Mexico; Bogota and Cali, Colombia; Santiago, Chile; Guatemala, Guatemala; Sao Paulo and Rio de Janiereo, Brazil; Tegucigalpa, Honduras; San Salvador, El Salvador; and Buenos Aires, Argentina. A large number of other schools have improved and expanded existing facilities. A variety of local and governmental sources have assisted in the improvement of facilities, among the latter including funds from the International Cooperative Agency (Agency for International Development), Public Law 480, business and industrial corporations and private individuals. Despite marked improvements, most of the schools are still poorly housed or operating with incomplete facilities. In Mexico, for example, approximately 50 per cent of the available classrooms in eight American Schools are still sub-standard.[13]

The activities of the Association in Mexico during the period 1961-62 serves is an example of the extent of Association activity. During this period, the Association arranged the following:

1. Credit courses for 180 teachers in four schools.
2. Two workshops in one school.
3. The provision of supervisors from larger schools to the smaller ones for consultations and pre-school workshops.

---

[13] Ibid., pp. 4-5.

4. The services of ten U. S. university consultants for a total of 250 days, and
5. The organization of two self-studies.[14]

These services, exclusive of the self-studies, were operated on an annual budget of $12,000. Including cost of travel, per diem allowances, publications, conference expense and credit courses for 180 teachers, the cost per consultant day was approximately $48. The courses alone on a U. S. university campus for 150 teachers (in a three-hour course at a cost of $9 per quarter hour) would average $14,580. There seems to be little doubt that the $12,000 were exceptionally productive.

The self-studies organized through the Association were paid for by the participating schools, namely, those of Mexico, D. F., and Monterrey.

The results of these studies, unique in Latin America, were published:

1. The American School Looks to the Future, Mexico, D. F., 1961, and
2. Planning for the Future, Monterrey, Mexico, 1962.

These studies are extremely helpful in gaining an understanding of the binational school. It is noteworthy that the American School Foundation of Monterrey submitted

---

[14] Ibid., pp. 6-7.

the study recommendations to its controlling body and they were accepted without dissent. The Mexico City report was reviewed and approximately 85 per cent of the recommendations for improvement implemented by the board and staff.[15]

It is pertinent to note the differences in objectives listed by the two schools:

Mexico City

"The official purpose of the school is to prepare qualified students in the English language for entrance into U. S. colleges and universities"; this applies basically to the secondary division, since half of the elementary division programs must be in Spanish, as required by the Mexican National curriculum. Having chosen to offer its programs to an international student body, the school necessarily performs four educational functions in addition to college preparation in English. These are (1) a bicultural elementary program, (2) an acceptable curriculum for students preparing to enter the National Autonomous University of Mexico, (3) terminal programs, and (4) services.[16]

---

[15]Board of Directors, "Progress Report," American School Foundation of Mexico, D. F., (October, 1962).

[16]Ibid., pp. 2-3.

Monterrey

The school in Monterrey listed the following objectives:

A. The primary purpose of the American School in Monterrey now, and in the future, should be to provide an education which will enable our students to enter and successfully complete their formal education in outstanding colleges and universities.

B. A second purpose of our school is to continue to strengthen and improve the relationships between the American School community and the Monterrey total community.

C. A third purpose of our school is to capitalize on the unique educational advantages of a binational school; advantages which are of value to both the Mexican and United States children.

D. A fourth purpose of the American School is to assist each individual student in achieving his maximum potential both as an individual and as a contributing citizen of his native country.[17]

These objectives represent two distinct points of view:

---

[17] "Planning for the Future," op. cit. p. 13.

1. U. S. type education perceived as a commodity made available to a Latin American community, and
2. A program designed for the students who live in the community.

These two points of view--and many variations of each--are replicated among the binational schools throughout Latin America.

The self-studies produced at least a clear definition of objectives. The schools can be presumed to know what their objectives are and what is involved in attaining them. These initial self-evaluations will probably result in continuing study and re-evaluation.

Perhaps one of the most significant reasons for the success of the association movement in Latin America may be attributed to the fact that institutional responsibilities for them is being assumed by U. S. universities. This fact is obvious from manifestations of continuing interest and support as demonstrated in the activities of the Association in Mexico, and in the commitment and accommodations that U. S. institutions made in order to work with schools in Latin America.

The published example of one university's commitment is demonstrated in an annual summary of Latin American activities by the College of Education of Michigan State University.[18]

---

[18]Karl T. Hereford, "Annual Summary of Latin American Activities," College of Education, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, (August, 1962).

In summary, M. S. U. was engaged in the following activities in Latin America:

1. Latin America Area Program Policy

   An ad hoc faculty committee prepared a "Charter" to guide the College's program development in Latin America. The document was reviewed in each interest area. In addition to specific position statements, the "Charter" emphasizes these basic elements:

   a. A Systematic Staff Development Program
   b. A Domestic Clientele Development Program
   c. A Program of Research and Publications
   d. An Overseas Extension of Instructional and Research Activities
   e. A New Kind of Graduate Program
   f. A Program of Intra-University Cooperative Activities.[19]

2. Staff Development

   The Mexico and Central America School Associations have now signed five-year agreements with the College which secure their cooperation in and support of the College staff annually undertaking four-one-term assignments or any reasonable subdivision thereof in Latin America.

---

[19] Ibid., p. 2.

3. Domestic Clientele Programs

In cooperation with American Schools in Mexico and Central America, M.S.U. graduate students may now obtain an exceptional international study and teaching experience.

The new graduate program allows qualified 5th or 6th year students to earn a master's or sixth year diploma upon successful completion of a calendar year program which includes the following:

a. Approximately 15 hours of General Professional Studies, normally including the Master's core courses or their advanced graduate equivalent.

b. Approximately 15 hours of Specialized Professional Studies including up to seven months of teaching, independent study and research in one or more American Schools in Mexico and/or Central America.

c. Approximately 15 hours of Hemispheric Studies including elements of the economics, politics, culture, sociology and education of Latin America.

The new program was approved formally by the Curriculum Committee of the College on January 18, 1962. Graduate students will assist normalista teachers in these tasks: (a) teaching of English as a second

language, (b) unit building, and (c) instructional materials development. In addition to their teaching and consultation duties, the graduate students will pursue independent studies and research related to education in the Mexican culture.

4. University Cooperation

Perhaps the most potentially significant development of the past year was the establishment of a center for educational research and improvement (in Spanish, intituto de Investigacion y Mejoramiento Educativos" or IIME (ee-may). A contract for $610,000 was successfully negotiated with REPAS, a division of AID, to conduct research in the broad fields of secondary and higher education. It is anticipated that the University of San Carlos will be officially designated a regional center for the five Central American Republics and that all or most Central American graduate students carrying a major in education and psychology will enroll for their graduate work in the Center. Whether the Center realizes its regional aspirations, or is delimited in scope to Guatemala, M.S.U. has now gained a valuable Latin American extension for undertaking long-range research and improvement programs.

5. School Cooperations

In addition to the new Central American Research Center, the College negotiated five-year agreements with American School associations in Mexico and Central America. M.S.U. teaching, consultation and research centers have been established.

6. A New Program for Teachers In-Service in Latin America

Because of a paucity of opportunities for teachers in-service in Latin America to acquire advanced work in professional education, the Curriculum Committee of the College approved a new program January 18, 1962, which permits qualified Latin American teachers to acquire advanced work at M.S.U. through M.S.U. school centers holding the bachelor's degree or licenciatura (a Latin American university degree variously equated with the bachelor's or master's degree of U. S. universities) may acquire a master's degree from M.S.U. through this program. Teachers holding a normalista certificate may acquire a Diploma for Advanced Study in Education through the same program. Each candidate completes an individually planned program in accordance with the following program:

a. Approximately 15 hours in the General Professional Studies taught by M.S.U.

staff in Center schools in Mexico and Central America.

b. Approximately 15 hours of Specialized Professional Studies consisting of workshops, independent study and research under the direction of M.S.U. lecturers and taught by qualified professionals in Mexico and Central America.

c. Approximately 15 hours of Hemispheric Studies including the economics, politics, culture and education of the Western Hemisphere. Each in-service teacher plans a program with a resident advisor. An on-campus committee approves the program.

d. Resident credit is awarded for independent study. Each student must also complete at least one summer session on-campus.[20]

The most recent development in the agencies involved in support of binational schools was the incorporation of IASS into the International Schools Foundation late in 1963. Both of these agencies now form the International Schools Services. Their policies concerning the binational schools in Latin America have not yet been formulated.[21]

---

[20] Ibid., pp. 4-8.

[21] "Progress Report, Fiscal Year 1963," (International Schools Services, Washington, D. C., October, 1963), p. 2.

From the information in Chapter V, these conclusions emerge:

1. The work of the SACS through accreditation processes has been notable but not significant in the direct improvement of the schools. The most significant contribution of SACS has been to establish a contact for the schools with the U. S. educational profession.
2. There is an inherent incompatibility in arrangements whereby both improvements service and accreditation review are conducted by the same individual or team, hence the role of the SACS is somewhat restricted.
3. The funds available to IASS (not more than $250,000 in any year) are inadequate for the significant improvement of the schools through grants-in-aid.
4. It can be demonstrated that the associations can be highly productive with limited financing.
5. There are outstanding examples of U. S. university participation in improving the schools, even though the results are not yet conclusive.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS AND INTERPRETATIONS

Nine basic questions were raised in Chapter I concerning the 53 U.S. sponsored binational schools in Latin America. Basic information and analyses concerning the schools were presented in subsequent chapters. The purposes of this chapter are (a) to summarize the conclusions drawn from analyses of basic information and (b) to essay to interpret them in a manner useful to the education profession in the United States.

The conclusions of the study are set forth in Sections A-G of this chapter, and each section treats of one or a combination of the nine basic questions.

Two interpretations are included in this chapter and presented in Sections H and I respectively.

First, a distinction is drawn between (1) the "American" school in Latin America and (2) the "binational" school. The distinction is warranted because the data from the study clearly indicate that there are two distinctly different types of schools, whatever their appelation, each a valid representation of different educational aims and objectives.

Second, an interpretation of the "binational" school is advanced, and certain challenges and opportunities indicated for the education profession in the United States and Latin America.

A. Origin and Status of Binational Schools

Most binational schools in Latin America came into being to provide a "U. S.-type education" for children of U. S. citizens residing in Latin America. They came into being principally to serve the needs of the increased U. S. population during and after World War II; hence only seven of the 53 schools were founded as binational schools prior to 1943. Originally, the schools enrolled children of U. S. citizens and only a few Latin American children. Subsequently, the balance of enrollments changed. Today the majority of enrollees are Latin Americans.

In most cases, a series of external factors caused the schools to evolve to their present form. Among these factors were:

1. The rapid increase of U. S. personnel in Latin America in representation of U. S. government, business and industry;
2. The dissatisfaction of U. S. parents with national education programs and the problems of language associated therewith;

3. Reaction against the growth and popularity of pro-Nazi private schools in Latin America;
4. The establishment by the U. S. Department of State of a modest program of grants-in-aid to U. S. sponsored schools;
5. The adoption of binational and bicultural criteria by which to determine eligibility for grants-in-aid; and
6. Increased financial pressures, particularly upon the small schools.

The several schools had quite different origins. Only one was established from its outset as a binational, bicultural experimental school, and it continues to operate on that basis while rendering only tacit acknowledgment of a U. S. affiliation. Others were established by Latin Americans and/or North Americans who wanted to provide a "U. S. type" college preparatory education for their children.

Binational characteristics developed in most schools in unintended and unforeseen ways; consequently, their histories did not prepare the schools to accept or to pursue consistently and thoughtfully the educational objectives later prescribed.

B. Chief School Characteristics

The 53 binational schools share the several characteristics listed below.

1. They are all urban schools; many are located in capital cities.
2. Most are new schools; only seven were founded twenty or more years ago.
3. Most are small schools: the largest enrolled 1,500 pupils in 1962, the smallest enrolled 46, and the median enrollment was 350. Only three enroll as many as 1,000 pupils.
4. All are private, non-profit, and non-church related.
5. All are financed principally from tuition and fees.

Beyond these common characteristics, the schools differ markedly. Differences may be cited in four main areas. These are:

1. Basic organization and method of governance;
2. Patterns of curricular organization;
3. Composition of the student body, and
4. Language(s) of instruction.

School Governance

With respect to method of governance, there are four discernible types.

About 40 per cent of the schools are governed by closed or selective associations. About 40 per cent are controlled by assemblies of parents whose children are

enrolled in the schools; and about one-sixth are controlled by representatives of share-holding U. S. companies. Two are owned and controlled by an individual or family.[1]

Curricular Organization

Curricular patterns also fit into four broad categories. These are:

1. In about one-fourth of the schools, the national curriculum is offered and English is taught only as a second language.
2. In about one-third of the schools, the principal program is a transplanted U. S. curriculum. Spanish language and culture (usually limited to national history) are taught as a second and minor area of study.
3. The predominant pattern of organization is the "dual curriculum" in which the same subjects are taught concurrently in Spanish and again in English with varying degrees of correlation in teaching materials within each subject.
4. Only one school provides a single "blended" curriculum in which the national and imported curricula are integrated into a single binational and bicultural curriculum.

---

[1] This despite contrary criteria for eligibility for State Department grants-in-aid.

Composition of Student Body

The distribution by nationality of students in the several schools varies from one extreme to the other.

All schools enroll some nationals; they do not necessarily enroll any U. S. children. Approximately two-thirds enroll 15 per cent or more North American children; three schools enroll fewer than 5 per cent U. S. children. Only one-fourth have what might be termed "balanced" enrollments in this respect.

Instructional Language

The incidence of language instruction correlates with curriculum organization. English is the principal instructional language in those schools which provide a transplanted U. S. curriculum. Spanish (or Portuguese) is used predominantly in those schools in which the national programs prevail. Both English and the national language are used concurrently by instructors in the dual curricula (which duplicate each subject). Both languages are also used in the "blended" program, but subjects are not duplicated.

C. School Objectives and Their Achievement

The objectives cited by Young for binational schools (see Chapter I) are worthy; however, it is doubtful whether they are related to the actual work of the schools.

As noted earlier, there is no historical basis for the objectives that are now attributed to the schools. Moreover, as the following discussion indicates there are no generally accepted program correlations--i.e. program elements calculated to achieve specific objectives--for these objectives.

The stated objectives of the binational schools are imprecise. They also tend to idealize if not romanticize intercultural relations. The programs of instruction, however, are not generally related to the objectives, and the result is generally a mediocre or even negative impact on the immediate and surrounding community. The schools subscribe in whole or part to nine major objectives. The objectives include these basic elements: (1) to promote friendship, (2) to help interpret one culture to the other, (3) to develop a comprehension of and respect for the ways of life of others, (4) to help provide leaders of intelligence and character for the countries in which the schools are located, (5) to foster self-development, etc., among the students, (6) to teach the students two languages, (7) to offer an academic program acceptable to both the North American and Nationals using the schools, (8) to utilize and demonstrate United States methods of instruction, and (9) to provide leadership in developing improved practices in education in the countries in which the schools are located.

None of the school directors disagreed that these should be objectives. Eighty to one hundred per cent thought all objectives practical except one, and 40 per cent thought it to be practical. The objectives and an analysis of them follow.

1. To promote friendship

The one study relevant to this objective[2] indicated that friendships between students of differing nationalities in the American High School of Mexico, D. F., were nor formed more frequently than mere chance expectation would predict.

2. To help interpret one culture to the other--North American to American and vice versa

There is undoubtedly a transfer of cultural information among students of differing nationality in the binational schools. That this objective is specifically sought through the school programs is problematical, however, as in most schools the teaching of one combination of culture and language is allowed to prevail over the other.

3. To develop a comprehension of and respect for the ways of life of others

---

[2]Charles J. Patterson, A Comparison of Performances of Mexican and American Children in a Bi-Cultural Setting on Measures of Ability Achievement and Adjustment, (Mexico: American School Foundation Publications, Bulletin No. 30, 1960).

That this objective is realized in some schools, or with some students in all schools, cannot be denied. However, the teaching materials and subject matter presented generally do not reflect a programmed pursuit of this objective. The degree of "respect for others" reported in the Patterson study[3] demonstrates that in the one school studied "acceptance of others" was ethnocentric in direction; hence in that binational school this objective was not being attained.

4. To help provide leaders of intelligence and character for the countries in which the schools are located

The claim is frequently advanced that the binational schools in Latin America exceed in this respect. There is no evidence, however, that binational schools produce more leaders than do other private schools in Latin America. In any case the validity of both the claim and the objective should be questioned in light of the fact that only children of upper social-economic groups--the almost exclusive source of potential national "leaders"--obtain formal education (particularly, secondary education) in Latin America.

5. To foster self-development among students

If character development of the type sought is related to quality of instruction--and it may not be--it is incon-

---

[3] Ibid., p. 94.

ceivable--in view of the preponderance of ill-trained, transient teachers--that the binational schools can attain this objective more often than might be expected by chance.

6. To teach the students two languages

To what extent this occurs--except among those students who enroll in a binational school for extended periods--has not been demonstrated. Certainly, some of the schools are programmed to achieve this objective. A surprisingly large number, however, are not. When either Spanish or English is taught as a "second language"--particularly by the techniques traditionally employed in national and U. S. school systems--the claims must be suspect. Language skill development may occur, of course, through repeated interaction with native language users, a desired but not necessarily school-related achievement.

7. To offer an academic program acceptable to both North American and National parents using the schools

As reported in Chapter III, the curriculum of the binational school must normally be accepted in the host country if it is to be offered at all. The blended program, described in Chapter IV, was clearly acceptable to both groups of parents. However, it is not certain that the objective itself is fundamental, i.e., the

objectives of any school should obviously transcend mere acceptability.

8. To utilize and demonstrate U. S. methods of instruction

If this is to be considered a worthy objective--accepting the implicit assumption that U. S. methods produce a desirable result independent of educational objectives or of the cultural factors affecting learning--it is clear that most binational schools are ill-equipped (in terms of personnel, materials of instruction and/or physical facilities) to pursue the objective.

9. To provide leadership in developing improved practices in education in the countries in which the schools are located

One experimental binational school, itself a laboratory school for a national government, has developed a demonstrable leadership relationship with the national education system worthy of emulation in any culture. However, it is clear from the analysis in Chapter II that leadership from U. S. sponsored schools is probably neither welcomed nor sought by national school systems.

There is no evidence that the binational schools are equipped, at this time, to "demonstrate" outstanding educational practices; any attempt to claim "demonstration-school" capabilities without adequate personnel could only be viewed as presumptuous.

It must be concluded, therefore, that the objectives expressed for binational schools--and endorsed by the large majority of school directors--are:

1. Historically irrelevant to the schools themselves,
2. Low motivators of actual school behavior, and
3. Possibly irrelevant in the culture in which the schools operate.

It is doubtful that the binational schools can or should attempt to progress unless and until more relevant, concrete, and precisely-stated objectives are formulated. It may also be inferred that the binational school personnel, by and large, are themselves insufficiently trained or experienced to determine and/or formulate needed new objectives.

D. Chief Problems and Needs

The schools confront many problems. The most important of these problems (listed and discussed below) are urgent matters in most binational schools. They are: (1) inadequate objectives and concept of purpose, (2) untrained and/or undertrained administrators, (3) ineffective curricular organization, (4) underfinancing, (5) inadequately prepared teachers, (6) inadequate instructional materials, and (7) inadequate facilities.

1. The schools are inadequately conceived. They were not intended originally to function as binational and

bilingual schools, but they have been encouraged and induced to subscribe to objectives (a) that are beyond their capabilities in most cases and (b) foreign to their original intent.

2. Most schools are administered by untrained or undertrained persons. Originally the school boards administered most binational schools; in many cases, the board continues to administer. The administrative problems usually encountered in school affairs are compounded by the binational, bilingual aspects of the schools. Binational schools find it difficult to employ trained professional school administrators. In the absence of trained personnel, the schools have no choice but to settle for less.

3. The schools' curricula are inefficiently organized. The most common pattern is the "dual" curriculum, which requires that each child study each subject twice, once in English and again in the national language. For most schools this requires two faculties, two sets of textbooks for each subject and a variety of incidental teaching materials in each language. Even when it is well-managed, the system is uneconomic, and in most schools the performance is mediocre.

4. The schools are underfinanced. No school is endowed. Grants-in-aid are received by some schools, but these are limited in amount and, because they are renewable

annually, they are not a dependable source of funds for regular operations. By and large, therefore, the binational schools rely upon tuition and fees as their principal source of revenue. Since some binational schools "compete" with other private schools, they must set tuition rates at current market prices, hence they can raise only limited amounts of revenue.

As a result, all professional personnel are underpaid. Salaries are far below the United States average; yet the task is more demanding than the average teaching position in the United States. More than half of the teachers receive less than $1,000 per year. Moreover, because the major proportion of the limited revenues must be invested in salaries, only scant amounts are available for related services and instructional materials; in consequence, these are also underdeveloped.

5. The teachers in the schools are inadequately prepared. By and large, teachers are recruited from among local residents who speak English and who are willing to teach for small salaries. No school has a fully qualified staff. Most lack career teachers.

6. The schools do not have adequate instructional materials. Yet they have an especially great need for both formal and incidental teaching materials in two languages. Coupled with the lack of trained personnel, this is the

most significant road-block to the development of a "blended" or integrated program.

In a few schools, materials have been developed locally; there is no evidence, however, that they are being widely used.

7. The schools have inadequate buildings and facilities. In recent years, more progress has been made in this area than in any other. Nevertheless, the schools by and large operate in converted houses or in other more-or-less adaptable non-school buildings; hence they frequently have small classrooms and poor equipment. Some of the larger schools, however, have greatly improved their facilities.

In summary, the binational schools in Latin America need comprehensive improvements, particularly in the areas of professional personnel and instructional materials. A key to their problem is improved financing. For most schools, tuition is the chief and only dependable source of revenue. Tuition in every case is set at the level of what "the market will bear." If the schools are to serve principally the emerging middle class nationals--a term which applies at a much lower economic level in Latin America than in the United States--tuition rates can quickly become prohibitive. It seems doubtful at this time that any basic improvements will be realized by the binational schools unless and until new, substantial,

reliable and continuing sources of revenue can be opened to them. To say the obvious, those new sources of revenue must be used to attract better-prepared personnel and to obtain or develop greatly improved teaching materials, if better financing is to be effective in improving educational offerings.

E. Adaptation to National Educational Systems

As described in Chapter I, the binational schools have met those legal provisions required of them by the host countries. This is the primary and prevalent accommodation or adaptation to the local system of education. When Spanish curricula are required, these are provided in addition to the "U. S. type" English language program, hence the creation of the "dual" program. Acknowledgment is made of other local government requirements covering labor laws, holidays and, in some instances, school inspection. Most schools, however, have not concerned themselves with the peculiar necessities of the children of nationals. Only three schools--the experimental school in Guatemala and the American Schools of Monterrey and of Mexico, D. F.--have seriously studied their students' programs and/or surrounding environment. It must be concluded, therefore, that the majority of binational schools are essentially indifferent to the general educational systems in which they operate;

consequently, adaptation is mechanical and legalistic at best.

F. Contributions to Latin American Education

There are few examples in which the binational schools have made direct contributions to the improvement of education in the countries in which they operate. The exceptions are noteworthy and, in some cases, they are worthy of emulation. The major contributions which have been made to the national systems are:

1. The development of standardized tests;
2. The development of "model programs" in some specialized fields of secondary education;
3. The training, on a very limited scale, of "cadet" teachers and administrators who return to national schools, and
4. The development of instructional materials for the teaching of English and of Spanish as a second language.

Despite the limitations for "leadership" by binational schools cited in Chapter IV, it would seem reasonable to expect the schools to have contributed significantly (1) to the teaching of English in Latin America and (2) to the development of instructional materials in the language arts fields. Unfortunately, this area of potential contribution has not been developed due chiefly

(1) to some indifference to the possibility for broad service and (2) to the lack of personnel trained for the task.

G. Improvement Activities

The most notable step toward improvement undertaken by the binational schools is the regional association movement. Beginning in Mexico in 1959, five associations have now been established in Mexico, Central America, Colombia, Venezuela, and Brazil and Argentina. By 1963, twenty-five of the fifty-three schools had joined the regional associations and had participated to some extent in the programs thereof.

To date, the most active association has been that of Mexico, in which these services have been provided.

1. College credit courses and workshops;
2. Technical assistance by U. S. university consultants;
3. Self-studies, and
4. Research projects.

Several tangible evidences of improvement have resulted from these activities.

In addition, the schools of Mexico, D. F., and Monterrey have developed a practice of "sharing" specialized teachers. This practice provides special consultants and supervisory or "master" teachers to the smaller schools in the Mexico association.

The associations of Mexico and Central America are now engaged in a joint fund-raising endeavor, the first results of which are now being realized.

It seems clear that the association movement holds great potential benefits for the binational schools. The results of association efforts to date have been limited to (1) the professional upgrading of existing faculties, (2) the development of instructional materials and (3) the re-examination--through "self-study"--of the basic purposes and programs of the schools. The association programs have not yet dealt with the basic problem of obtaining and holding qualified teachers, and their preliminary efforts to broaden the base of financial support for the schools are too premature to evaluate. An essential ingredient for their success would seem to be the active and continuing support of one or more U. S. universities.

H. "American Schools" and "Binational Schools": An Important Distinction

As already noted, the three hundred fifty "American Schools" in Latin America are a heterogeneous collection: large and small, urban and rural, church-related, company-owned, profit-oriented, etc. Church-related and other exceptions aside, "American Schools" in Latin America were founded in order to provide an "American" (i.e.,

U. S. type) education to children of U. S. citizens who reside, temporarily or permanently, in Latin America.

Whatever their other characteristics, the "American Schools" undertook to offer a U. S. type of instructional program. The fact of their location in Latin America was incidental. The fact that a second language could be acquired with relative ease was not only incidental, it was irrelevant, as was the similar ease with which students could be introduced to a second culture.

The purpose of creating an American School in Latin America was, so to speak, to produce in Latin America a replica of a school program that might exist in Austin, Mamaroneck or Keokuk. The purpose was not to create a new program loosely modelled after a "Middletown" system, nor to start with the "Middletown" model and embellish it with Latin American modifications: the purpose was to reproduce it, as nearly as that could be accomplished. Any "binational" attributes of the school, i.e., the attendance by Latin American children or the employment of Latin American personnel, were incidental and circumstantial.

The original motivation remains strong. By and large, the American Schools in Latin America continue to strive to offer "U. S. type" programs that are calculated fundamentally to be of service to U. S. children. By and

large, such programs are what U. S. parents seek when they bring their children to Latin America or when the children reach school age. Their reasons are clear: if the parents are transients in Latin America, the U. S.-type program promises ready transferability of credits to a school system in the United States; transient or not, the U. S.-type program also promises to satisfy entrance requirements of colleges and universities in the United States. The parents' concern about these matters is very real and entirely legitimate; hence a first concern of the school is to satisfy these basic requirements. Given the manifold problems faced by the tuition-supported American schools--problems of finance, personnel and facilities--a school does very well if it can satisfy such requirements.

"Binational schools," on the other hand, were not so much "founded" as they were "defined": they are a category that (again exceptions aside) did not exist in nature, so to speak; the category came into being when IASS--on behalf of the U. S. Department of State--announced the criteria that would be followed in the process of determining which American schools in Latin America would be deemed eligible to receive grants-in-aid. Fifty-three schools have been adjudged officially to meet the criteria. Hence, by definition, there exist fifty-three "binational" schools.

The criteria are readily satisfied: non-sectarian; non-profit; binational board (not necessarily a board of control); and some attention to local history and culture. A "binational" board can be created by granting token memberships to Latin Americans, if the school chooses not to make its binationality more than symbolic and superficial. If a school is not church-related, the remaining characteristics also are readily and, in general, naturally acquired. Under the circumstances in which American schools operate, for example, if it offers a reasonably complete U. S.-type program, a tuition-supported school is quite likely to be non-profit; similarly, in order to retain official permission to operate, a school is usually obliged to teach local history.

The mere announcement of a set of criteria by which to establish formal binationality, therefore, does not necessarily change the original motives that caused the schools to be founded; nor does it necessarily affect the concern of U. S. parents in Latin America that their children attend a school the credits from which are transferable to U. S. schools, colleges, and universities. Moreover, even though a school meets the formal criteria, it may continue to be managed as an American school despite its designation as binational.

The point of this discussion is that a U. S.-related school in Latin America may choose between at least two completely legitimate, but quite dissimilar, patterns of operation. The IASS criteria are such, at present, that a school can meet the requirements of binationality--hence become eligible for grants-in-aid--and nevertheless continue to operate as an American--not a binational--school.

Objectives attributed to the binational schools (and endorsed by school directors) do not necessarily affect the pattern of school operations. School directors and school boards may accept the truly binational objectives but be forced--or perceive themselves to be forced--by circumstances to offer only an "American School" program rather than a binational program. Alternatively, they may reject the binational objectives and choose to offer the U. S.-type program. In either of these cases, despite the appelation "binational school" and despite the nominal acceptance (as reported by Young) of binational objectives, a binational school in Latin America may continue to be exclusively an American school, with or without Latin American students.

The American School in Mexico, D. F., is forthright in its policy on this matter. It specifies that its purpose is to offer U. S.-type educational programs,

primarily of the college preparatory type and, very explicitly, for the benefit primarily of children of U. S. parents. The school board is comprised exclusively of U. S. citizens. School programs incorporate only such elements of Mexican curricula as are required by the government of Mexico. The School enrolls Mexican children but--and this too is explicit in School policy--it does so with the clear understanding that the School is an American School and offers a U. S.-type program: if Mexican parents believe that a program of that type is desirable, they are welcome to enroll their children in the School; but if they want their children to receive a Mexican education, they are advised to find it elsewhere. In this case, government requirements are such that both an "American" and a Mexican program must be offered at the elementary school level, and the school is predominantly "American" only at the secondary school level.

Clearly, there exists a great divergence between the objectives attributed by others to the binational schools and the objectives expressed in the programs adopted by many of the schools. It is completely clear that the schools do not actively pursue the "binational" objectives endorsed by the school directors, as cited by Young. It is equally clear that those schools which choose not to pursue those objectives are not "bad" schools: they simply

do not attempt to be "binational" schools; they strive instead to be what they traditionally have been "American" schools in Latin America.

It is easy to attack the "American" schools for not being more binational. It is easy to cite the wasted opportunity for an enriched education, for developing language skills and cultural understandings, for improving international relations through fuller comprehension of each other's culture, and so forth.

However, it is equally easy to defend the American schools' implicit decision to emphasize the "American" aspects of their educational programs. They are not, after all, agencies of the foreign policy of the United States, nor are they employees of the Department of State. They are U. S.-related schools but--despite the very modest grants-in-aid they may receive--they are not U. S.-supported schools in any meaningful sense. The schools are supported by the tuition-paying parents of the children they serve, and by the individual or corporate patrons that contribute to them. The parents and patrons pay to support the type of educational programs that they value, and they value the type of education offered by schools in the United States. They pay substantial tuition fees in order to provide that type of education to their own children, yet they find that the schools can

scarcely be supported. Their school imposes no demands upon the government of the host country, but that government requires them to offer "national" programs--at substantial additional cost--that their children could receive without cost by enrolling in national schools. Under these circumstances, it is difficult to fault the schools because they do not "demonstrate the best American methodology" or because they do not "contribute to the improvement of the national school system." It simply is not entirely clear to what extent private U. S. citizens who live in Latin America should be expected to fulfill at their own expense the sometimes lofty ambitions expressed by others regarding "what the American schools in Latin America ought to achieve."

This is not to suggest that they ought not achieve those ambitions. The philosophical, professional and political reasons for converting "American" schools into "binational" schools are compelling. However, the arguments that can be offered in favor of the American schools are also compelling.

If the schools are to be binational in the sense indicated by the nine "binational" objectives cited by Young, a way will have to be invented to relieve the financial strain felt by the best of the 53 schools and to improve their situation with respect to personnel, plant and materials. Such improvement would enable the

schools to undertake seriously to pursue the binational objectives. If the matter is of genuine interest to the U. S. Department of State, that Department will have to offer to the schools something more substantial than the nominal grants-in-aid that have thus far been made available.

I. The Binational School in Perspective: An Interpretation

It was suggested that, for various reasons, the binational schools may be of concern to the government of the United States--especially to the Department of State, inasmuch as the schools appear to be considerably less than ideally representative of the United States in Latin America. The schools may also be of concern to the education profession in the United States, although for different and non-political reasons. Among these reasons are the following:

1. The schools are exclusively urban phenomena; as such, they provide interesting and potentially useful examples for study of urban education.
2. In common with bicultural urban schools that are encountered in each major metropolitan area of the United States, the binational school has the difficult task of reconciling differences of language and of culture among its

students. A similar problem of reconciliation and of acculturation exists in U. S. cities engaged in the process of integrating previously segregated racial groups or of accommodating Mexican or Puerto Rican children within school programs designed for English-speaking youngsters.

3. However, the binational school in Latin America faces additional and unique problems of education that are not susceptible of study in an urban U. S. bicultural school. The task of the bicultural school in New York, for example, is one of assimilation and acculturation: the culture of the Puerto Rican child is submerged, essentially, in favor of the culture that prevails in his new environment. The binational school in Latin America, on the other hand, must reconcile basic differences of two languages and cultures without sacrificing either of them, because it must pursue the objectives both of the U. S. and of the Latin American system of education. Furthermore, the binational school in Latin America must accomplish this task within an administrative environment that is foreign to the U. S.-trained and U. S.-oriented administrator and teacher.

4. The task facing binational school educators, therefore, is infinitely more complex--and apparently more demanding and difficult--than it is in urban schools in the United States or elsewhere.

It is clear that the challenges posed by the binational schools are not now being faced by the best qualified personnel from the U. S. or Latin America. Therefore, the opportunities to develop maximum insights--hence to recognize implications for urban and intercultural education within the United States--are at the moment unexploited. In order to develop these opportunities for study, research and experimentation, numerous and basic changes must be made in the binational schools. Among these are:

1. A modification in the form of their control;
2. Dramatic improvement in the quality of their teaching and administrative personnel;
3. A broader and more reliable base of increased financial support;
4. A clearer statement of purposes, objectives and policies;
5. Adequate and more realistic teaching techniques and materials; and
6. Firmer and more productive relationships with Latin American and U. S. educational agencies, particularly research institutions.

For the immediate future, the basic and imperative needs of the schools would seem best to be met through the work of the several binational school regional associations, particularly as they involve the provision of technical services, the clarification of purposes and programs and the establishment of new sources of financing.

However, it should be recognized that the associations provide a vehicle for the improvement of school programs in the light of existing school objectives. From the perspective developed above, it should be clear that new models and approaches will be required--perhaps best developed jointly by the capable universities of Latin America and the United States--if the real potential of some of these multi-variant schools truly can be realized. This would seem to offer the substantive challenge to--and real justification for direct involvement of--the education profession in the U. S. and in Latin America to study and improve the binational schools.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Council On Education, "A Brief Statement of the History and Activities of the American Council on Education, 1918-1961." Washington: ACE, 1961.

American School Foundation, A. C., Mexico, D. F. The American School Looks to the Future Progress Report. Mexico: American School Foundation, 1962.

American School Foundation, Monterrey, N. L. Mexico. Planning for the Future. East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University Education in Latin America Series, 3, 1962.

Association of American Schools in the Republic of Mexico. Capabilities, Accomplishments, Possibilities of American Schools in Mexico. East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University Education in Latin America Series 2, 1962.

Batharst, Effie G. Inter-American Understanding and the Preparation of Teachers. Federal Security Agency, U. S. Office of Education Bulletin No. 15, 1946. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1946.

Branscomb, Harvie. "First Semiannual Report of All Educational Exchange Activities Carried on from July 1 to December 31, 1948," U. S. Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange Report on Activities, 1948-58.

Cain, Henry L. and Elsa Von Dorn Um. A Short History of Mexico. Mexico: El Modelo, 1952.

Chapman, Charles E. Colonial Hispanic America, a History. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1933.

Cleveland, Harlan, Gerard J. Mangone, and John Clarke Adams. The Overseas Americans. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc.

Coleccion Porrua. Leyes y Códigos de México, Constitución Política de los Estados Unidos Mexicanos. Mexico: Editorial Porrua, S. A., 1962.

Colegio Internacional de Carabobo. Student Handbook. Valencia, Venezuela: Tipografia El Cronista, 1962.

College of Education. The College of Education and World Affairs: A Statement of Policy and Posture (offset). East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University, 1962.

Constitution of the Republic of Nicaragua 1950. Washington: 1960.

Constitution of the Republic of Panama 1946. Washington: 1957.

Constitution of the Republic of Venezuela 1953. Washington: 1954.

Constitution of the United Mexican States 1917. Washington: 1957.

Constitution of the United States of Brazil 1946. Washington: 1958.

Davis, Roy T. "American Private Schools in Latin America," The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, Vol. XXIX, May, 1945.

_____. "American School Program in Latin America," The Educational Record, Vol. XXXIII, June, 1952.

Diffie, Bailey W. Latin American Civilization, Colonial Period. Harrisburg, Pa.: Stackpole Sons, 1947.

Duggan, Stephen. "The Future of American Schools Abroad," New Bulletin of the Institute of International Education, Vol. IX, March, 1934.

Duncan, Merlin. Report to the American School Foundation, A. C. Mexico, D. F. (Unpublished document) East Lansing, Michigan, 1962.

Dulles, John F. W. Yesterday in Mexico. Austin, Texas: The University of Texas Press, 1961.

Faust, Augustus E. Brazil--Education in an Expanding Ecomomy. Washington: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1959.

Fitzgerald, Dean T. "American Schools in Latin America," The Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. XXXVI, June, 1955.

Fitzgerald, R. H. "Twenty-first Semiannual Report to the Congress by the U. S. Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange," U. S. Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange Report on Activities, 1948-1958.

_____. "The Role of American Schools in Latin America," The School Review, Vol. LXIII, May, 1955.

Hereford, Karl T. (ed.). The American School in Mexico: A Survey for the Association of American Schools in the Republic of Mexico (offset). East Lansing, Michigan: College of Education, Michigan State University, 1961.

_____. Annual Summary of Latin American Activities (offset). East Lansing, Michigan: College of Education, Michigan State University, 1962.

Horn, Carl M. The American Schools in Central America (offset). East Lansing, Michigan: College of Education, Michigan State University, 1963.

Houle, Cyril D. "Some Significant Experiments in Latin American Education," The Elementary School Journal, Vol. XXXXIV, October, 1948.

Jenkins, Frank C. "Report of Visit to the American School, Mexico, August 5-9, 1946," The Southern Association Quarterly, Vol. XI, February, 1947.

Johnston, Marjorie. Education in Mexico. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1956.

Kandel, I. L. "United States Activities in International Cultural Relations," American Council on Education Studies, Series 1, No. 23, 1945.

Larroyo, Francisco. Historia Comparada de la Educacion en Mexico. Mexico: Editorial Porrua, S. H., 1959.

Lerner, Max. America as a Civilization. Volume I. New York: Simon and Schuster, Inc., 1957.

Melby, Ernest O. "Education and the Point IV Program," The School Executive, Vol. LXXI, November, 1951.

Pan American Union. Constitution of the Republic of Chile 1925. Washington: 1957.

_____. Constitution of the Republic of Costa Rica 1949. Washington: 1951.

_____. Constitution of the Republic of El Salvador 1950. Washington: 1953.

_____. Constitution of the Republic of Honduras 1952. Washington: 1958.

Patterson, Charles J. A Comparison of Performances of Mexican and American Children in a Bi-Cultural Setting on Measures of Ability, Achievement and Adjustment. Mexico: American School Foundation Publications, Bulletin No. 30, 1960.

Perkins, Dexter. The United States and Latin America. Baton Rouge, Louisiana: State University Press, 1961.

Plazo, Galo. "Experiment in International Education," The Nation's Schools, Vol. XXXVII, May, 1946.

Rehage, Kenneth J. "American Schools in Latin America," The Elementary School Journal, Vol. LV, November, 1954.

Rippy, J. Fred. Historical Evolution of Hispanic America. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1945.

Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. "Improving International Understanding Through Binational Education," Atlanta, S.A.C.S., 1962.

Staley, Eugene. The Future of Underdeveloped Countries, New York: Published for the Council on Foreign Relations by Frederick A. Praeger, 1961.

Young, George Patrick, Jr. A Study of the Potential for Achievement of Better Inter-American Relationship Through North American Schools in Latin America. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, University of Illinois, 1960.