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A HISTORY OF LATINO PSYCHOLOGY

The origins of Latino psychology can be traced to pre-Columbian times as well as to developments in Europe that were transported to Latin America (Padilla, 1980a, 1984, 2000; Padilla & Salgado de Snyder, 1988). Our purpose here is not to review the earliest developments in Latino psychology but to provide an overview of contemporary developments in the field between 1930 and 2000. We begin by briefly defining Latino psychology and placing it within the context of psychology in general and then present the careers of six pioneer Latino psychologists who contributed in significant ways to psychology in general and to Latino psychology in particular. These psychologists are deceased now, but all of them left a lasting imprint on Latino scholarship because of their research, their commitment to their cultural roots, and their advocacy on behalf of future generations of Latinos who walk in their footsteps as psychologists. In discussing each of these individuals, we place them in the context of their time and the struggles they overcame as Latino psychologists when there were no ethnic role models to emulate and when culture was not valued in the discourse of psychological inquiry.

In addition, we highlight several major developments that also contributed in unique ways to Latino psychology. The events in particular have to do with the creation of professional associations that focus on professional training of Latinos in psychology. Our historical account is intended to be not comprehensive but rather heuristic; its goal is to encourage others to take up the study of the history of Latino psychology. Our perspective, too, is personal, since we knew most of the individuals whose names we give in this history.

WHAT IS LATINO PSYCHOLOGY?

A definition of Latino psychology is important because it sets the stage for the theoretical paradigms, research methodologies, and instruments used in our inquiry of Latinos and in the interpretations we give to our findings. We take the position that Latino psychology is a branch of ethnic psychology in which the population of interest is people of Latin American heritage who reside within the continental United States and Puerto Rico. Ethnic psychology, as we use the term, has as one of its focal points the study of Latinos within the context of majority-minority-group relations. Latinos are an ethnic group who historically have been oppressed and who can point to individual and group experiences of prejudice and discrimination in education, employment, and their communities of residence. Bernal, Trimble, Burlew, and Leong (2003),
in the *Handbook of Racial and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, make the point in the foreword to their book that until the 1970s American psychology was the study of the behavior of White persons. Thus, Latino psychologists, along with other ethnic psychologists, have worked to make psychology more inclusive of the multicultural context that is America.

Latino psychology also has a connection to cross-cultural psychology, but it is distinct in that it concentrates less on intercultural group differences and more on intracultural group variation. In other words, cross-cultural psychology is usually concerned with the systematic study of experience and behavior as they occur across cultures in different nation-states (e.g., Japan and the United States). Exceptions to this pattern often occur, of course, because the research approaches found in cross-cultural psychology can be used both within and across cultures.

In contrast, Latino psychology seeks to understand the influence of culture, language, and majority-minority-group status on people of Latin American origin who reside in the United States. The intracultural comparison enters because Latinos, as mentioned above, maintain aspects of their culture of origin while also manifesting American cultural patterns of behavior. Latino psychology, then, seeks to learn how adaptation to the U.S. mainstream and acculturation influence a wide variety of behaviors, such as child-rearing practices, educational attainment of students, gender differences, and coping responses to stressful environments.

Also, Latino psychologists have had greater affinity for the applied areas, such as clinical, health, educational, and community psychology. This is due to social problems within the Latino community that call out for intervention and prevention programs of various types.

**Early Contributors**

**George I. Sanchez**

The first Latino psychologist was George I. Sanchez (1906–1972). Nathan Murillo wrote an excellent biography of Sanchez for the first volume of *Chicano Psychology* (Martinez, 1977). At the conclusion of editing *Chicano Psychology*, Joe Martinez dedicated the volume to George Sanchez and called him the father of Chicano psychology. Sanchez was born in New Mexico and spent most of his professional career in his home state and in Texas. Thus, he was intimately familiar with the way of life of Latinos in the Southwest and with the social and educational exclusion they experienced because of their minority status. Throughout his life, Sanchez was an advocate of social justice and an activist for the rights of Chicanos. Sanchez received his doctorate from the University of California at Berkeley; for a time, he was on the faculty in education at the University of New Mexico and then became professor of Latin American education at the University of Texas at Austin. During his long career, Sanchez played a number of important professional roles—university professor, educational psychologist, social scientist, and frequent consultant to different Latin American countries on educational planning and policy.

The earliest contributions to Latino psychology are found in four articles Sanchez authored between 1932 and 1934 on the topic of intelligence testing of Mexican American children. In these four articles, Sanchez (1932a, b; 1934a, b) presented a series of cogent arguments for why standard intelligence tests lacked validity when used to assess Mexican American children. Considering the era in which he wrote, Sanchez provided exceptional insights into why IQ testing of Chicano children was inappropriate when these children did not have the same life experiences or level of English-language proficiency that majority-group children had and on whom the tests had been standardized. The four articles are as appropriate today as they were nearly 80 years ago. Importantly, mainstream psychologists at the time ignored Sanchez's call for caution in testing Mexican American children. Even today, there are concerns about high-stakes educational testing of Latino children on tests similar to those discussed by George Sanchez some 7 decades earlier.

Sanchez continued to contribute to the educational and social science literature for many years. His last publication was a keynote address entitled "Educational Change in Historical Perspective" given at a conference in the early 1970s on bilingual education, which appeared in the volume *Mexican Americans and Educational Change*, edited by Alfredo Castaneda, Manuel Ramirez III, Carlos E. Cortes, and Mario Barrera (1971). In this paper, Sanchez expressed his anger and disappointment with the poor academic progress that Latino students had made in education. He expressed his frustration in these words:


... While I have championed the cause of educational change for American children of Mexican descent for more than forty-five years, and while I have seen some changes and improvements in this long-standing dismal picture, I cannot, in conscience or as a professional educator, take any satisfaction in those developments. The picture is a shameful and an embarrassing one. (p. 14)

Sánchez, as he had done countless times before, placed the blame on an educational system that either failed to consider or chose to neglect the impact of poverty, cultural and linguistic differences, discrimination, and educational inequity on Mexican American students in public education.

**Alfredo Castaneda**

Another major figure in the history of Latino psychology is Alfredo Castaneda (1923–1981). Manuel Ramirez III (1981) eulogized Castaneda in the *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences* with these words: "With the passing of Alfredo Castaneda, the fields of psychology and education have lost an important leader and pioneer. As a leader in psychology, Castaneda was one of the most often cited and most prolific researchers in the area of child experimental psychology from the early 1950s to the mid-1970s. He earned his bachelor's degree from San Francisco State University in 1948 and received his master's (1951) and doctorate (1952) from Ohio State University. He began his career as an assistant professor at the State University of Iowa, where he remained until 1959. Castaneda then accepted the offer of a full professorship in clinical psychology at the University of Texas at Austin, where he also served as director of child research. He remained at the University of Texas at Austin through 1962 and subsequently relocated to New York City, where he held various teaching and research positions until 1968. During the period 1968–1970, he served as professor of psychology at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE). At OISE, he was also a faculty member at the Institute for Child Study.

In 1970 Castaneda became professor of education and chairman of Mexican American studies at the University of California at Riverside. It was at this point that Castaneda broke with his earlier, more traditional experimental work and began an intense and productive period in which he concentrated his talents on bilingual and multicultural education.

Castaneda was likely the first Latino psychologist to recognize the importance of biculturalism from a psychological perspective and to call for inclusion of biculturalism in research, training, and services involving Latinos. This interest culminated in Castaneda’s study of the cultural determinants of cognitive and motivational styles of learning and teaching. In 1972, Castaneda was appointed professor of educational psychology in the School of Education at Stanford University. At Stanford, he taught two very popular graduate seminars that were the cornerstone of his research interests: Cultural Pluralism and Educational Policy, and Bicultural Processes in Education. Today, courses with similar titles would be commonplace, but in the mid-1970s this was a bold step in the direction of multicultural instruction, especially at an elite institution of higher education.

It is difficult to summarize in a few lines the impact that Castaneda’s research and writing had on psychology. For more than 2 decades, Castaneda was known for his creative laboratory experiments on such diverse topics as the development of word association norms for children, paired associate learning in children, development of the Children's Manifest Anxiety Scale, conflict behavior in children and adults, effects of anxiety on complex learning, and the relationship between anxiety and scholastic motivation. His papers were widely cited in the major research journals and handbooks of the time (see Reese & Lipset, 1970). In addition to his research and writing, he also served on the editorial board of the prestigious journal *Child Development* at a time when research on minority children was not being published in this or any other developmental journals (Padilla & Lindholm, 1992).

In addition to Castaneda's eminence as an experimental child psychologist, he also was an important contributor to the development of Chicano studies. While on the faculty at UC Riverside, Castaneda, with Manuel Ramirez, received a grant in 1973 from the National Institute of Mental Health to convene a conference that brought together Chicano psychologists for the first time. The theme of the conference was "Increasing Educational Opportunities for Chicanos in Psychology." At the conference, a series of recommendations was proposed having to do with admissions, recruitment, training, faculty and staff development, and supportive
services for undergraduate and graduate Chicano students interested in pursuing careers in psychology. These recommendations were directed at departments of psychology, the American Psychological Association (APA), and the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH).

Castaneda deserves to be recognized for his groundbreaking work in showing the need for cultural pluralism in education, for Latino biculturalism as a viable alternative to cultural assimilation, and for leading the way in advocating classroom instructional strategies that could enhance the learning potential of Latino students. His work on instructional strategies culminated in a 1974 book coauthored with Manuel Ramirez entitled *Cultural Democracy, Bicultural Development, and Education*. The book offered a vision for multiculturalism in education (which was on the threshold of emerging as a recognizable field in education) that argued that language and culture shaped cognition and needed to be cornerstones of the instructional planning of Latino children.

**Carlos Albizu Miranda**

Few psychologists have had as profound an impact on the training of Latino psychologists as Carlos Albizu Miranda (1920–1984). Carlos Albizu Miranda was born in Ponce, Puerto Rico, and lived most of his life in Puerto Rico. He completed his bachelor's degree in psychology at the University of Puerto Rico. Following World War II, he worked for the Veterans Administration in the area of vocational rehabilitation. Seeing the need to broaden his training in psychology, Albizu traveled to the U.S. mainland to do graduate work at Purdue University. He completed his master's degree in experimental psychology in 1951 and his doctorate in clinical psychology in 1953.

Albizu returned to his native Puerto Rico and took a teaching position at the University of Puerto Rico, where he quickly rose to the rank of full professor. Increasingly, he saw the need to train a larger number of Puerto Rican students in psychology than was possible at the university. In addition, he was concerned that training failed to take into account the special circumstances of Puerto Ricans as Latinos who, because of Puerto Rico's commonwealth status with the United States, were U.S. citizens and could travel freely between the island and the mainland but who were marginalized on the mainland because of their culture, language, and skin color. Thus, Albizu founded the Instituto Psicológico de Puerto Rico in 1966. The goal of the institute was to provide culturally appropriate training in clinical psychology. This bold step constituted the establishment of the first professional school of psychology. This was a remarkable feat, considering that the first freestanding school of professional psychology on the U.S. mainland was the California School of Professional Psychology, founded in 1969 by the California Psychological Association, whereas Albizu did not have the professional backing or support of an association of psychologists (Wikipedia, 2008).

In 1971, the institute changed its name to the Caribbean Center for Advanced Studies. A sister branch, the Miami Institute of Psychology, was opened in 1980. Together, these two professional schools have played a major role in the clinical and research training of Latino psychologists not only on the island of Puerto Rico but throughout the Caribbean, Latin America, and the United States. As the founder of the Caribbean Center for Advanced Studies, Albizu's vision and enthusiasm for psychology was infectious. He communicated the firm conviction that the science and practice of psychology could contribute to the social well-being of Puerto Ricans and other Latinos both on the island and on the mainland.

Carlos Albizu Miranda was active in the American Psychological Association. He received special recognition in 1980 from the American Psychological Foundation for his work in the professional development of psychologists in the Caribbean region. In recognition of his vision and pioneering spirit, on January 1, 2000, the Board of Trustees of the Caribbean Center for Advanced Studies officially changed the name of the institution in both Puerto Rico and Miami to the Carlos Albizu University. This was a fitting tribute to a man who had worked tirelessly to create an institution dedicated to training Latino psychologists to provide culturally appropriate services to the Latino community. Finally, in 1979 Albizu was also elected the first president of the National Hispanic Psychological Association.

**Rene A. Ruiz**

Another influential psychologist was Rene A. Ruiz (1929–1982), who was instrumental in drawing attention to the underrepresentation of Latinos in psychology. Like the other early Latino psychologists, Ruiz did not begin his career with the intent to focus on Latino issues. He was born and raised in
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the Los Angeles area and graduated from the University of Southern California in 1954 with a major in psychology. He completed his graduate training in clinical psychology in 1963 at the University of Nebraska. Early in his career, he held faculty appointments in the Department of Psychiatry at the University of Kansas Medical School and then at the University of Arizona. In 1970, he coauthored a popular text, The Normal Personality, with Robert Wrenn. However, the turning point came in a 1971 article Ruiz published in the American Psychologist entitled “Relative Frequency of Americans with Spanish Surnames in Associations of Psychology, Psychiatry, and Sociology,” in which he reported that fewer than 1% of the total APA membership for the year 1970 had Spanish surnames. From that time forward, he worked in various ways and in numerous capacities to increase the number of Latino students in psychology and to show that minority-related content could be integrated into the graduate curriculum offered in departments of psychology.

Later academic appointments took Ruiz to the University of Missouri at Kansas City and to New Mexico State University, where he served as professor and chair of the Department of Counseling and Educational Psychology until he died unexpectedly from a heart attack in 1982. In addition to his academic appointments, Ruiz was also a visiting scholar (1979–1980) at the UCLA Spanish Speaking Mental Health Research Center. In conversations, Ruiz remarked that the circumstances that motivated him to advocate on behalf of Latinos in the profession was that he had spent the first 20 years of his university and postgraduate career as the only Latino psychologist on the staff, and he had no intention of allowing this to happen to other Latinos.

Like Carlos Albizu, Art Ruiz invested his time and talents in working with the American Psychological Association to bring minority issues to the attention of the membership. He was proudest of his work on the APA Committee for Equality of Opportunity in Psychology (1972–1976), of which he was a charter member and which he helped to bring to fruition through his insistence that the APA be responsive to minority concerns. He also served as an APA visiting psychologist on numerous occasions and traveled to different universities around the country, where he consulted and lectured on emerging themes in Latino psychology. In addition, he was often called on by the National Institute of Mental Health to consult on minority-group mental health. Ruiz was known among his friends for his quick wit and disarming humor, which allowed him to call attention to the plight of Latinos without seeming to also call attention to racist practices that segregated Latinos and resulted in their second-class status in schools, employment, social services, and housing.

In 1973, Ruiz collaborated with Amado Padilla on a volume titled Latino Mental Health (Padilla & Ruiz, 1973), which constituted the first state-of-the-art review of the literature on Latino mental health. The primary intent of the monograph was to serve as a catalyst for subsequent investigators interested in Latino mental health. Ruiz continued his research and writing on Latino mental health and authored many works on a variety of themes, including mental health services for Latinos, acculturation and mental health, ethnic identity among children, and issues of Latino aging and mental health.

Martha Bernal

Martha Bernal (1931–2001) was born in San Antonio, Texas. Her parents were immigrants from Mexico, and Bernal was educated in Texas, receiving her bachelor’s degree in psychology from Texas Western University in El Paso (now known as the University of Texas at El Paso). She later earned her master’s degree from Syracuse University and completed her doctorate in 1962 in clinical psychology at Indiana University. Bernal was the first Latina to receive a doctoral degree in psychology from an American university. From Indiana, she relocated to the University of Arizona, then moved to the UCLA Neuropsychiatric Institute and began work with behavior-problem children and autistic children. Her early publications were on behavioral techniques for eliminating “brat syndrome” behaviors in maladjusted children and on establishing desirable behaviors in autistic children. From UCLA, Martha Bernal moved on to academic appointments first at the University of Denver and then at Arizona State University.

In an autobiographical account, Martha Bernal describes how, after attending the 1973 Conference on Chicano Psychology organized by Castaneda and Ramirez, she turned increasingly in the direction of Latino research (Bernal, 2004). In her autobiography, she recounts her effort over a period of approximately 20 years to increase multicultural training in clinical and counseling
psychology. Bernal's work in multicultural training (Bernal & Castro, 1994; Bernal & Padilla, 1982; Quintana & Bernal, 1995) has had important policy implications for the identification, recruitment, and training of Latino psychologists. Bernal coupled this interest with her advocacy on behalf of Latinos by serving on numerous APA boards and task forces addressing ethnic minority concerns in the profession (Vasquez & Lopez, 2002).

Martha Bernal received many awards for her professional contributions, among the most prestigious of which were the Distinguished Life Achievement Award from the Society for the Psychologica Study of Ethnic Minority Issues (Division 45), the Carolyn Attneave Award for lifelong contributions to ethnic minority psychology, presented in 1999 at the first National Multicultura Conference and Summit, and in 2001 the APA Award for Distinguished Contributions to the Public Interest.

In her research, Bernal was a careful methodologist and student of child development. With her colleague George Knight, she investigated the developmental course of ethnic identity among Mexican-heritage children. In their seminal book, Ethnic Identity: Formation and Transmission Among Hispanics and Other Minorities (1993), Bernal and Knight provided a rich array of findings on the theme of ethnic socialization and the intergenerational transmission of ethnic identification. Bernal's research on ethnic identity development has been widely cited because of its groundbreaking approach to the study of how children process information about ethnicity through socialization by parents and contact with other adults and peers.

Finally, as the first Latina to receive a doctorate in psychology, Martha Bernal proved to be a shining beacon to younger Latinas in psychology. She was generous with her time, even though she was ill during most of the last 2 decades of her life. She was a role model and mentor (Vasquez & Lopez, 2002) who showed through her commitment to social issues affecting Latinos that it was possible to overcome racism and sexism and to excel in her chosen profession.

Edward Casavantes

Another early contributor to Latino psychology was Edward Casavantes (1927–1980). Casavantes was an educational psychologist who worked on Latino educational and civil rights issues. He worked for the U.S. Civil Rights Commission in Washington, D.C., for nearly a decade during the 1960s and 1970s. While with the Civil Rights Commission, Casavantes worked on its far-reaching study of the education of Mexican American students. The study resulted in the six-volume Mexican American Education Study (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1974).

Casavantes was also the founder, in 1969, of the Association of Psychologists por la Raza. As a member of APA and Division 9 (the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues), Casavantes received a grant from Division 9 that funded some of the organizational work necessary for establishing the Association of Psychologists por la Raza. Casavantes played a critical role during this period in trying to identify other Latino psychologists when there were no established Latino professional networks to call upon for assistance. This is the reason why Rene Ruiz (1971) took it upon himself to do a manual search of the APA membership directory to identify individuals with Spanish surnames, which was the only method in those days for identifying possible Latino APA members.

Casavantes was also interested in showing how social scientists were often responsible for creating cultural stereotypes about Latinos. For instance, in an article called "Pride and Prejudice: A Mexican American Dilemma," published in the Civil Rights Digest (1970), Casavantes argued that the well-known anthropologist Oscar Lewis's culture of poverty was misdirected and that the observations made by Lewis were not really depictions of Puerto Rican and Mexican culture but rather observations of poor and oppressed people irrespective of their cultures. In addition, Casavantes was the first to comment on the diversity among Chicanos; he argued that Chicanos were not a homogeneous ethnic group but diverse in a number of respects ranging from skin color and social class to professed ethnic self-identification. In El Texano: Cultural and Sociological Factors Affecting Drug Use Among Chicanos, Casavantes (1974) showed creativity and daring in his study of drug addiction among Latinos. One important theme taken up in El Texano is the necessity of culturally relevant psychotherapeutic approaches in the treatment of drug abuse in Latinos. In his discussion of drug treatment, Casavantes argued that therapists needed to extend their treatments in culturally appropriate ways to be effective with Latino addicts. While this may appear to be common sense today, it was not 30 years ago. The National Coalition of
Spanish Speaking Mental Health Organizations published Casavantes's book. The book is the first contribution to the clinical literature on substance abuse and treatment of Chicanos.

**SUMMARY**

The six individuals whose lives and careers are described here are unique because in numerous ways each gave meaning to how psychology as a science and practice needed to be open to ethnocultural diversity. The six individuals, in their own independent and initially isolated ways, without mentors or intellectual guideposts, challenged traditional assumptions about the lack of importance given to culture and ethnicity in psychology. Unlike today, where there is an established body of literature on Latino psychology and where there are Latino symposia at professional meetings, none of the six individuals whose careers are presented here had any training or experience in Latino psychology. Each of them, because of cultural experience, saw the need to advance the cause of Latinos in psychology in his or her own way. In addition, each worked to broaden the goals of American psychology without the support of peers or professional organizations, by increasing the training of Latinos in psychology and by showing that psychology could be enriched by diversity. Moreover, these six individuals created an intellectual foundation for a Latino psychology of which younger psychologists may not be aware and which is the primary reason for writing historical essays such as this. We owe a special debt of appreciation to these six individuals because they took risks in their professional careers to open doors that others might pass through.

Jones (1998), in reflecting on ethnic minority psychology in the 20th century, said it best:

> We all stand on others' shoulders to reach for new possibilities. We walk through doors that are now open where in the past no door existed at all. Our present is the cumulative consequence of our past, our collective past. Our predecessors worked in different venues in different times.

> We now reap what they have sown. (p. 206)

**National Associations and Organizations**

We turn now to early organizational efforts to bring Latino psychologists together. All the early psychologists except George Sanchez played key roles in activities to unite Latino psychologists. As mentioned earlier, Casavantes founded the Association of Psychologists por la Raza in 1969. The first meeting of Chicano psychologists was held in 1970 at the annual meeting of the APA in Miami. A handful of Chicano psychologists attended the meeting. Casavantes was elected president; Albert Ramirez, who was then at the University of Alabama, was elected vice president, and Manuel Ramirez III was elected secretary-treasurer.

A year later, a second meeting of Chicano psychologists was held at the APA meetings, this time in Washington, D.C. Casavantes also took the initiative at this meeting to organize a symposium on Chicano psychology entitled "The Effects of Cultural Variables on Mexican Americans." The panelists for the symposium were Casavantes, Manuel Ramirez, Albert Ramirez, Rene Ruiz, Ernest Bernal, and Amado Padilla. This was a historic symposium because it was the first time that Chicano psychologists had organized a symposium on Chicano psychology at an APA meeting. Since this first symposium in 1971, it has now become commonplace for Latinos to present their research at regional and national psychological conferences.

At the 1971 meeting, Alfredo Castaneda was elected president of the Association of Psychologists por la Raza, and Casavantes was elected executive director, since he worked in Washington, D.C., and could lobby the APA and the NIMH. The officers of the association remained unchanged until 1973. In the spring of 1973, Alfredo Castaneda and Manuel Ramirez organized a conference at the University of California at Riverside themed "Increasing Educational Opportunities for Chicanos in Psychology." The NIMH funded the conference, the purpose of which was to bring Latino psychologists together to discuss training, research, and service for Chicanos. Another goal was to make recommendations for increasing the number of Latinos in psychology. This objective was achieved, and recommendations for recruiting and training undergraduate and graduate students in psychology were written and disseminated widely to psychology departments, the APA, and the NIMH.

Although it is not possible to name all the individuals who attended this first conference of Chicano psychologists, the names of some
individuals and their institutional affiliations at the time are presented for historical purposes. In attendance were Martha Bernal from the University of Denver; Ray Burie, then a graduate student at UC Riverside and now professor of psychology at Pomona College; Ed DeAvila, who was with Bilingual Children's TV in Oakland, California; John Garcia, then at the University of Utah and now professor emeritus at UCLA; Richard Lopez, a postdoctoral fellow at Notre Dame University and later with the NIMH; Joe Martinez, then at California State University, San Bernardino, and later at UC Irvine; Albert Ramirez, University of Colorado; and Rene A. Ruiz from the University of Missouri at Kansas City. At this same meeting, the Association of Psychologists por la Raza elected Floyd Martinez as its second president. Martinez, a clinical psychologist who later worked for the NIMH, was instrumental in helping Latino psychologists throughout the United States obtain support for community mental health services programs, training programs, and research projects.

From the late 1960s through the mid-1980s, the NIMH was instrumental in assisting Latino psychologists to develop capacity in a variety of ways. Early efforts to organize Latino psychologists were facilitated by Juan Ramos, who held a doctorate in social policy from Brandeis University and who became chief of the Division for Special Mental Health Programs at NIMH. Among Ramos's early activities was organizing a conference in Washington, D.C., in July 1971, which was attended by a small number of Hispanic mental health professionals from around the country, with the agenda of prioritizing the mental health needs of Latinos. The attendees concluded that a national mental health organization was needed to advocate for the mental health service needs of Latinos as well as for the training of Latino professionals in the various mental health professions. The attendees named the new organization the Coalition of Spanish Speaking Mental Health Organizations (COSSMIO) and appointed a committee to draw up bylaws for the new organization to begin the process of incorporating the organization as a legal entity with an office in Washington, D.C. COSSMHO was established in 1974 with Rodolfo Sanchez, a former social worker, as its executive director. Several years later, Sanchez broadened COSSMHO's charter to include all human services; it is now known as the National Coalition of Hispanic Health and Human Services Organizations and maintains its office in Washington, D.C. Working through COSSMHO, Sanchez played a key role in bringing together Latino psychologists from different geographic areas to work on mutual interests involving families, substance abuse (especially among Latino adolescents), and services for the elderly.

In 1975, Joe Martinez, who was then a postdoctoral fellow in the Department of Psychobiology at the University of California at Irvine, secured funds from the Ford Foundation and a number of university offices to convene the First Symposium on Chicano Psychology, which was held in May 1976. Whereas the 1973 University of California at Riverside meeting addressed the training of Chicanos and Latinos in psychology, the 1975 meeting consisted of scientific presentations on Chicano psychology delivered over 2½ days. By this time, there was a cadre of young psychologists eager to present their burgeoning research on a wide variety of topics ranging from social to clinical psychology and from issues of psychological assessment to bilingualism. The meeting also served to establish networks for future collaboration among some participants and to reinforce the need for continued interest in Chicano psychology. Martinez proved to be an extremely capable editor of the symposium papers and published them in an edited volume entitled Chicano Psychology in 1977.

A second symposium on Chicano psychology was held in 1982 at the University of California at Riverside. Martinez and Mendoza (1984) edited a second volume of Chicano Psychology based on papers from this symposium and a few papers from the original volume. Following in the tradition of these two symposia on Chicano psychology, a meeting themed "Innovations in Chicana/o Psychology: Looking Toward the 21st Century" was held in the spring of 1998 at Michigan State University. Approximately 400 participants attended the meeting, and the fact that this was the first such conference held outside the western United States is significant. Some of the papers presented at the conference appear in The Handbook of Chicana/o Psychology and Mental Health (Velasquez, Arellano, & McNeill, 2004).
The 1978 Dulles Conference

As can be envisioned from this chronology of historical events, there was considerable excitement among Latino psychologists for the work they were doing and for the social networking that was bringing them together to meet and share their work. Similar excitement could also be found among African American, American Indian, and Asian American psychologists. There was a feeling in the air that at long last the door had been cracked open (some might argue it had been forcibly opened) at the APA and at NIMH. Much more work needed to be done, but now, for the first time, ethnic psychologists were banging on the door with a single fist! Through the efforts of a few dedicated individuals, a joint conference of the leadership of psychologists from the different ethnic groups met with the leadership of the APA at the Washington Dulles International Airport in 1978. This historic meeting, known as the Dulles Conference (Jones, 1998), resulted in several significant outcomes that were critical for Latinos in psychology and for the development of ethnic psychology in broader terms.

The recommendations that emerged from the Dulles Conference called for the establishment of an Office of Ethnic Minority Affairs, an APA Board of Ethnic Minority Affairs, a division, and a journal. All of these recommendations, as we know, have come to fruition; but the course of their development was not always easy, nor did it take place overnight (Jones, 1998). The first recommendation to be implemented was the opening of the Office of Ethnic Minority Affairs (OEMA). Moreover, at the insistence of the Hispanic Caucus at the conference, the final recommendation provided for representation on the Board of Ethnic Minority Affairs of the full spectrum of major Latino communities in the United States: Mexican Americans, Cuban Americans, and Puerto Ricans.

Esteban Olmedo assumed the directorship of OEMA in the latter part of 1978. Up until that time, Esteban Olmedo had been the associate director of the UCLA Spanish Speaking Mental Health Research Center. Olmedo was born in the United States of Argentinean parents but was raised in Argentina. He returned to the United States for his education and received his doctorate in experimental psychology at Baylor University. After Baylor, he took a teaching position at California State University, San Bernardino, was a colleague of Joe Martinez, and developed an interest in acculturation research. Although Olmedo was more adept initially in research methodology and statistics, he proved to be a solid administrator and guided OEMA for the next 6 years.

When Olmedo decided to leave the APA and OEMA for the California School of Professional Psychology, Lillian Comas Diaz, a Puerto Rican psychologist who had received her training in clinical psychology at Yale University, replaced him. Under the stewardship of Olmedo and Comas Diaz, the Board of Ethnic Minority Affairs and Division 45, the Society for the Psychological Study of Ethnic Minority Issues, were created. Comas Diaz also served as the inaugural editor of the APA journal Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology.

The UCLA Spanish Speaking Mental Health Research Center

Another noteworthy project during this era was the Spanish Speaking Mental Health Research Center (SSMHRRC) at the University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA), funded by the NIMH Center for Minority Group Mental Health Programs. The UCLA center was the first minority research center funded by the NIMH and served as the prototype and testing ground for what became similar research centers for African Americans, American Indians, and Asian Americans, as well as the Hispanic Research Center at Fordham University. The original grant for the SSMHRRC was awarded to Rodolfo Alvarez, professor of sociology at UCLA, who served as the first director of the project until October 1975, when Armando Padilla, professor of psychology at UCLA, became the principal investigator and director of the center. The activities of the SSMHRRC continued with Padilla as director until funding ceased at the end of 1989.

Some of the Latino psychologists who began their professional careers at the SSMHRRC include Gerardo Marin, Manuel Casas, Esteban Olmedo, Nelly Salgado de Snyder, Richard Cervantes, Steven Lopez, Hortensia Aparicio, Felipe Castro, and Luis Moll. The SSMHRRC was also responsible for the training of many undergraduate and graduate students during its 15 years. In addition to the large number of students who received research training, the
SSMHRC also sponsored 23 postdoctoral fellows and scholars from various parts of the United States and Spain, Mexico, Peru, and Brazil.

Although the SSMHRC was funded as a research project, it also served as a clearinghouse for information on Latino mental health and as a training center for students in psychology. In accordance with its training mandate, the center supported the work of approximately 50 graduate students over 15 years. Of these, about half received their doctoral degrees, and 10 completed their dissertations with direct center support. In addition, the SSMHRC sponsored the work of another 25 undergraduates, many of whom went on to graduate school in psychology.

The research agenda of the SSMHRC focused on acculturative stress and coping, mental health services, substance abuse among Latino youth, and children's school achievement. Critical in much of the research were concerns of poverty, language barriers, prejudice and discrimination, and issues of gender roles in mental health. Scholarly knowledge of the mental health needs of Latinos and the delivery of services was facilitated by the research and publications produced by the SSMHRC. The early research identified system barriers related to the low use of mental health services by Latinos. These barriers to effective treatment included availability and accessibility of services, language differences, scarcity of Latino mental health providers, and social class differences between clients and therapists (Padilla, Ruiz, & Alvarez, 1975). This was followed by research aimed at making available services more culturally relevant.

The importance of acculturation as it impacts the treatment process was also an area of research that aided service providers in developing a greater sensitivity to individual client differences. Along these lines were studies aimed at making clinical assessment tools more relevant for Latino clients. Numerous translation and validation studies of existing clinical instruments were conducted and reported on. In addition, Richard Cervantes took the lead in developing a culturally specific measure of psychosocial stress and coping for both Latino adults and children (Cervantes, Pacilla, & Salgado de Snyder, 1988).

The research agenda of the SSMHRC between 1980 and 1988 was at times constrained by the Reagan administration's mandate to cut federal research funds for social-problem-oriented research. Because so much of Latino mental health research is social-problem oriented—especially because of the focus on the effects of oppression, poverty, prejudice, and discrimination on psychological well-being—there was always some tension in justifying SSMHRC's research agenda to NIMH. Despite this obstacle, tremendous gains were made by the SSMHRC in Latino mental health scholarship.

There is no easy way to judge the overall impact of any research enterprise; however, we can point to 5 books and approximately 120 journal articles and chapters authored by SSMHRC staff and students. In addition to this, the SSMHRC clearinghouse staff managed to publish 24 research reports, 4 special project reports, and 10 monographs, all of which were widely disseminated. The clearinghouse also developed a bibliographic database of more than 6,000 titles (Cota-Robles Newton, Olmedo, & Padilla, 1982). The database could be searched electronically and was widely used between 1977 and 1989. While the bibliographic database and the search capability may seem incredibly old-fashioned today, it should be remembered that electronic databases were limited and that this was before the creation of the Internet, which students today take for granted when searching the literature. The SSMHRC clearinghouse provided professionals and students alike with considerable information about all aspects of Latino mental health. Many SSMHRC publications were used as textbooks during this period in undergraduate and graduate classes and seminars. The bibliographic service was a mainstay of the SSMHRC, and staff members were called upon daily by students and professionals alike to assist in locating relevant information for literature reviews, grant proposals, and class work. The SSMHRC documents were also in frequent use for in-service workshops in community mental health settings, graduate programs, and university extension classes. In addition, SSMHRC staff gave literally hundreds of conference and workshop presentations over the years to organizations around the country.

Another area in which the SSMHRC had a national impact was in providing leadership regarding Latino priorities for President Carter's Commission on Mental Health. Esteban Olmedo and Pedro Lecca (a New York Puerto Rican mental health professional) were cochairs of the Hispanic Subpanel of the Special Populations Panel of the commission (President's Commission on Mental Health, 1978). Their report emphasized the at-risk status of the
Hispanic population in the United States as a result of low income, unemployment or underemployment, and lower socioeconomic status. Barriers to mental health services and the relative lack of culturally sensitive programs and service providers compounded this. The work of the commission ensured that Latino issues would become part of the national debate on the mental health needs of the U.S. population.

The SSMHRC was also a pioneer in contemporary psychological research on acculturation. In the early 1970s, it became clear to the staff of the center that acculturation was not only a worthwhile topic of research on its own but also played a key role in the relationships between ethnicity and psychological assessment and the implementation of culturally sensitive mental health services for Latino populations.

In addition to the work of Padilla and Olmedo, the contributions of Susan Keefe to acculturation research were very significant (Keefe, 1980). She broadened the research by introducing her anthropological perspectives, particularly with respect to the role of the extended family among urban Mexican Americans.

Our principal objective was to advance the dialogue on acculturation from theoretical (and, some would say, political) rhetoric to one more solidly grounded in science. Research by SSMHRC staff revealed that acculturation could be scientifically measured with a reasonable degree of validity and reliability and that it was a multidimensional construct (Olmedo, 1979). Moreover, we showed that such well-known constructs as cultural awareness and ethnic loyalty could be operationally defined with rigor and their role in acculturation determined by the use of proper statistical analyses (Padilla, 1980b).

Another contributing factor to Latino psychology was the *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences* (HJBS), which started with the SSMHRC clearinghouse. The HJBS first appeared in 1979 as a quarterly peer-reviewed journal and is still published through SAGE Publications (see Padilla, 2003). Even though the HJBS has always published articles in the behavioral and social sciences, not just psychology, over the years many of the leading research articles on Latino psychology and mental health have appeared in its pages.

Finally, through research, consultation, and technical assistance, the SSMHRC influenced mental health treatment policies and practices ranging from psychological assessment and psychotherapy to social-service delivery systems. Active participation in conferences, professional associations, and symposia provided valuable linkages between researchers, policymakers, and service providers. In addition, SSMHRC staff participated in national policymaking panels organized by the National Research Council, the APA, the NIMH, the National Institute of Drug Abuse, and the National Institutes of Health. In sum, between 1973 and 1989, the SSMHRC led the way in shaping the future direction of Latino mental health research, training, and services.

**The Spanish Family Guidance Center**

Another center of major importance with a long-standing record of accomplishments in the area of Latino clinical research is the Spanish Family Guidance Center. The Spanish Family Guidance Center was established in 1972 as part of the Department of Psychiatry of the University of Miami. The center’s original purpose was to investigate family-oriented prevention and treatment programs for Latino drug-abusing adolescents in the Miami area. In 1974, after completing his doctorate in clinical psychology from the University of Miami, Jose Szapocznik was appointed director of research at the center. Today, the center is known as the Center for Family Studies and is the largest family-oriented clinical intervention center for Latinos and other minority groups in the country.

With Szapocznik as director, the center has established a long track record of producing innovative clinical programs for Cuban Americans and other Latino families. The early work focused on acculturation and adjustment in Cuban families (e.g., Szapocznik & Herrera, 1978). As the work evolved, important contributions have been made in family therapy (Szapocznik, Rios, Perez-Vidal, Kurtines, Hervis, & Santisteban, 1982; Szapocznik, Santisieban, Kurtines, Hervis, & Spencer, 1982). The early work, known as bicultural effectiveness training, incorporated elements of structural family therapy but added ways in which the family members (parents, children, and adolescents) could identify cultural conflicts resulting in maladaptive patterns in family interaction. By using culture in family therapy, family members were trained in bicultural skills to more effectively handle cultural conflicts causing difficulties between family members who varied in level of acculturation.

The work of Latino psychologists at the Center for Family Studies has been widely
praised over the years by many professional groups, including the APA, the American Family Therapy Academy, and the American Association of Marriage and Family Therapy. Further, the publications and training programs offered by Latino psychologists have inspired an entire generation of clinical psychologists who work with Latino families.

The Lake Arrowhead, California, Conference

We conclude with a description of the National Conference of Hispanic Psychologists held from November 29 to December 1, 1979, at the University of California Residential Conference Center and known as the Lake Arrowhead Conference (Proceedings of the National Conference of Hispanic Psychologists, n.d.). Plans for this conference were begun in the summer of 1978 after the SSMHRC received a grant from the Division of Manpower and Training and the Center for Minority Group Mental Health Programs of the NIMH to support a major meeting of Latino psychologists from across the country for the expressed purpose of sharing information on needed training, services, and research from a Latino perspective. A second goal was to determine whether there was universal agreement on the need to establish a national Latino psychological association. Sixty-five psychologists representing diverse Latino groups and interests attended the Lake Arrowhead Conference. Martha Bernal, Carlos Albizu Miranda, and Rene Ruiz, whose careers as pioneer Latino psychologists were presented in the first section of this paper, attended this historic meeting; they provided wisdom and much practical guidance to their younger colleagues. Other participants included Horcensia Amaro, Glorisa Canino, Lillian Comas-Diaz, Israel Cuellar, Oliva Espin, Angela Ginorio, Aida Hurtado, Richard Lopez, Steven Lopez, Gerardo Marin, Ricardo Munoz, Esteban Olmedo, Amado Padilla, Manuel Ramirez, Nelly Salgado, David Santisteban, Jose Szapocznik, and Melba Vasquez.

The Lake Arrowhead Conference was a landmark event in the history of Latino psychology because it was the first time that a significant number of Latinos representing different national origins, geographic regions, and disciplinary interests had come together to forge an alliance and speak with a single voice. At this meeting, too, the foundation for the establishment of a National Hispanic Psychological Association was laid. Ricardo Munoz, from the University of California at San Francisco, served as the recorder for the conference, and the proceedings of the conference summarize the decisions made by the attendees regarding membership, governance, fiscal structure, and proportional representation of different Latino groups in leadership of the association. The detailed work of bringing to fruition a National Hispanic Psychological Association was left to a steering committee consisting of Floyd Martinez and Martha Bernal (Mexican American), Ana Alvarez and Luis Nieves (Puerto Rican), Dorita Marina and Angel Martinez (Cuban), and Jeannette Maluf and Gerardo Marin (Central and South American). The steering committee was charged with developing bylaws for the new organization. With Martha Bernal serving as the chair of the steering committee, the bylaws for the association were drafted in 1980, and the association was launched. In more recent years, the association has changed its name to the National Latino/a Psychological Association and has continued the work envisioned by the participants at the 1979 Lake Arrowhead Conference.

One of the more significant follow-up initiatives of the National Hispanic Psychological Association (NHAPA) came during the 1990s. Under the auspices of Richard M. Suinn (former chair of the Board of Ethnic Minority Affairs and later member of the APA Board of Directors and president of the APA), a tradition was initiated whereby representatives of the various national ethnic minority psychological associations would participate in a breakfast meeting with the APA president during the APA annual convention. Thus, in addition to the NHAPA, leaders of the Association of Black Psychologists, the Asian American Psychological Association, and the Society of Indian Psychologists now have the opportunity to periodically exchange ideas with the APA leadership and raise issues of concern to minority communities at large and psychologists of color in particular.

It is fair to say that a good number of minority psychologists continue to feel the need for a psychological association "of their own." Thus, although the (now) Committee on Ethnic Minority Affairs and Division 45 of the APA address many issues of import to minority communities, the independence provided by the ethnic minority associations is viewed by many as an important asset. The breakfast meetings...
In this history of Latino psychology, our goal first was to lay the intellectual foundation of Latino psychology by discussing the life and work of six Latino psychologists who, for 7 decades through their research, writings, and advocacy, sought to increase the visibility of Latinos in the profession. Often with little support from non-Latino colleagues and in the absence of other Latino psychologists, they sought through various means to encourage the leadership of the APA and the NIMH to support efforts to increase training opportunities for Latino students in psychology. In addition, we present a panoramic view of how the first Latino psychologists, in coordination with a second generation of Latino psychologists, organized conferences, associations, and research centers that shaped the contours of Latino psychology as we understand it today. In combination, the persons, events, and organizations all served to draw increased attention to the need to recruit and train undergraduate and graduate students in the discipline of psychology, and to bring people together with a common interest to advocate for broadening the base of American psychology through the recognition of a legitimate place for Latino psychology in research, training, and services.

A history can never be entirely comprehensive, because it is the story of people and events that represent the reflections and interpretations of the writer. Thus, the history of Latino psychology we offer here consists of our firsthand knowledge of many of the individuals and events mentioned; hopefully, our historical account will be of value to others who will use this work to expand on the history of Latino psychology and who will do so using different lenses and interpretations of the circumstances and developments surrounding Latino psychology.
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