



# Changing Patterns of Family and Ideology among Latino Cultures in the United States

*Robert R. Alvarez, Jr.*

## A General Overview and Introduction to the Family

The United States harbors one of the most diverse Hispanic populations in the world. A drive across the nation would find large urban populations on both Pacific and Atlantic coasts, rural pockets dotted in every state of the Union and large expanses of a Spanish speaking, Latino culture in the major states from California to New York. The first impressions a person gets of this population are the basic similarities that are expressed in social and cultural behavior regardless of their urban or rural settings. The entire population is Spanish-language oriented, and indeed many newcomers and settlers speak nothing but Spanish.

Cultural manifestations expressed in dance, music, fiestas as well as in neighborhood and community settlement type, help paint a picture of similarity. The broad similarities in culture and language, however, mask a diverse people that represent every Hispanic-Latino country and group of people in the world. This diversity is a product of Hispanic immigration and the subsequent adaptation of Hispanics to the United States. These are complex processes in which Hispanics, like other immigrant and settler groups, have relied on both traditional and hybrid cultural institutions in relating, adapting and surviving in the new cultural milieu that is the United States.

Fundamental to this process is the institution of the family. The family is considered the single most important institution in the social organization of Hispanics. It is through the family and its activities that all people relate to significant others in their lives, and it is through the family that people articulate with society.

Although these primary functions of the family are evident among all peoples, the family among Hispanics

has been a central thread that connects a multitude of strands that make up their social world. The central importance in social-cultural functions and the values of cultural life expressed through the family, is emphasized in all studies focussing on Hispanics both in the United States and throughout the Hispanic world. There is no argument that when compared to the United States' population in general, Hispanics place special emphasis, sentiment and value on the family.

The Hispanic family is organized around a group of primary institutions that are common to all Hispanic groups in the United States but the family is expressed in a number of ways. What we find is diversity and variation. The literature refers to an Hispanic family structure that is composed of elements (here called institutions) that provide important social and cultural meaning and to one degree or another are identifiable in all groups. But this hides the specific and rich cultural diversity and the complex cultural adaptations of Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, Cubans, Dominicans and Central and South Americans within the United States. Each of these cultural groups exhibit a broadly identifiable "Hispanic family" that is organized around a number of supportive institutions. The variations, however, of the Hispanic family are seen both within and across all groups.

Understanding the diversity of the family among Hispanics requires a fundamental understanding of the different Hispanic groups in the United States. Each group has a particular history within the United States that has affected the manner in which the family and its supportive institutions have been expressed. Only one group, Mexican Americans/Chicanos, in part, originates in the area that is the continental United States, but the bulk of the Mexican origin population, like Puerto Ricans, Cubans, Dominicans, Central and South Americans have immigrated to this country. Puerto

Ricans on the other hand are the only "colonized" group who have migrated and settled in the United States in mass. Significantly, Puerto Ricans are United States citizens and move freely between the Island of Puerto Rico and the mainland. The adaptation of the Hispanic population in both urban and rural settings stems from the socio-economic and historical relations of home countries with the United States, a continuing migration based primarily on labor needs and, to varying degrees, a continued relationship with home regions. Hispanics have used and generated new social processes based on the traditional family patterns in the migration process and in adapting to life in the United States.

In essence, then, understanding the family as it has evolved among Hispanics in the United States requires a consideration of the societal contexts that influence and condition Hispanic socialization in the United States. The settlement of Puerto Ricans in New York and the creation of urban barrios in Spanish Harlem, Brooklyn and Manhattan have been conditioned by a continuous high unemployment, lack of housing and poverty which is exacerbated by the dense population in the city. This is very different from the Cuban settlement in Miami where strong economic enclaves of primarily middle-class entrepreneurs are thriving in what is now known as Little Havana. The traditional family has been instrumental in helping Hispanics adapt to differing social situations and conditions.

In addition, a number of other social factors must be considered when discussing the Hispanic family which include race and class. Although Hispanics stem from a similar origin the ethnic/racial make-up differs because of the historical patterns in countries of origin. Among those groups from the Caribbean (Dominicans, Puerto Ricans, Cubans), for example, a rich Black element exists in the population that stems from the importation of Africans as labor in early colonial periods. Mexicans, on the other hand, are primarily mestizo, rich in Indian (Native American) background mixed with descendants from Spain. And Hispanics represent every socio-economic class that is represented in the United States. The majority of Hispanics, however, are to be found in the lower economic strata of society, a great percentage of whom continue to remain below the poverty line of all United States families. Racial attitudes towards people of color in the United States have had a great influence on their adaptation. Discrimination towards Blacks and Hispanics and others has restricted access to employment, education and housing, and, in turn, has influenced patterns of family and household development.

Although Hispanics are among the newest groups of immigrants to the United States, they are also some of the first settlers. Indeed the antecedents of the populations in the Southwestern United States (California, Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado and Texas) settled in these states long before the United States colonies severed their ties from England. There have also been successive waves of immigrants that have been coming to the United States for many generations. The Puerto Rican migration began at the turn of this century, after the United States took that island from Spain, and Mexican immigration began in great earnest early in the century and escalated after the Mexican Revolution of 1911. The long time residence and established settlements means that many generations of Hispanics can be counted in the United States. The family must be viewed across these generations as well as within the generations to fully appreciate its role among the present Hispanic population. For example, early settlers and migrants have created and utilized social networks that are based on family relations while later generations illustrate a more nuclear family preference while maintaining family values and kin extensions in different ways.

The focus here is not just the different elements but the primary processes that together make up the family. The idea of a static and unchanging family, although once a major depiction in the scholarly literature, is not accepted by current scholars and practitioners. This is due, in part, to the emergence of critical research that has re-analyzed and often interpreted social science from an Hispanic perspective, by Chicano, Puerto Rican, Cuban and other Hispanic scholars who are focusing on their own communities and people. The family was described as an archaic vestige of past societies to which men, women and children were tied. The sense of a "traditional family" among Hispanics emphasized a non-changing and out-of-date institution that kept Hispanics from becoming productive and contributing within the larger United States society. The contrary, however, is in fact the rule. The Hispanic family is an institution that provided the social mechanisms which helped people, at least initially, in the processes of migration and settlement. It is the one institution, in varying forms, that provided the initial contacts and ties to employment, friends, kin and new settlements in the United States. There are, to be sure, elements that have not fit certain aspects of the larger United States society, but these elements appear generally after initial settlement in first-, second- and later-generation children. A high rate of divorce, for example is found among the second-generation population compared to first pioneers.

## The Institutions of the Hispanic Family

What then, are the primary elements that make up the social-cultural “machinery” of the Hispanic family in the United States? The concept of “family” among all Hispanics refers to more than just the nuclear family that consists of a household of man and wife with their children. The family incorporates the idea of *la familia* (the greater family) which includes, in addition to the immediate nuclear household, relatives that are traced on both the female and male sides including parents, grandparents, brothers and sisters, cousins and, to a certain extent, any blood relatives that can be identified through the hierarchy of family surnames. *La familia* incorporates the nuclear household and the range of relationships that are connected through both sides of the male and female. This broad ranging concept has important consequences for actual social and cultural behavior. It places individuals as well as nuclear families into a recognizable network of social relations within which mutual support and reciprocity occur.

Before describing the particular aspects of each of the major groups of Hispanics in the United States, the distinction between household and family needs to be made. Household has been a focus of anthropological inquiry because households are the entities in which people actually live. Families are groups of persons bound together by ties of kinship both real and fictive as we have seen, and households are groups of persons bound to place (Baca-Zinn 1983). Households are the units within which people pool resources and perform specific tasks. They are units of production, reproduction and consumption. They are residential units where persons and resources are connected and distributed (Baca-Zinn 1983).

Important supportive institutions of *la familia* include: the extended family, the concept of familism, *parentesco*, *compadrazgo* (godparenthood) *confianza* (trust) and family ideology.

Family ideology is more than just the way people think about family. Family ideology among Hispanics sets the ideal and standards to which individuals aim; it is the guiding light to which all look and attempt to shape their behavior for themselves as well as for the perception others have of them. Family ideology consists of the conceptual rules that people try to maintain, the values that are expressed about what the family should be and how it is maintained. For Hispanics the ideal of family is that it is the central and most important institution in life. It holds all individuals together and all individuals should put family before their own concerns. It is the means of social and cul-

tural existence. Ideology also defines the ideal roles and behaviors of family members. Although there is truth to family ideology in that it influences actual behavior, this ideology is never totally realized among Hispanics. Like all ideology, the ideology of *la familia* is a guide for behavior, a basis from which to act.

Family ideology also defines the ideal roles and behaviors of family members. The ideal family is a patriarchy that revolves around a strong male figure who is ultimately responsible for the well-being of all individuals “under his roof.” The concept of “machismo” is imbedded in this ideal, in which men are viewed as virile, aggressive and answerable only to themselves. In real life, however, this is rarely realized. There are degrees of male authoritarianism that vary both within and across groups but, for the most part, women are strong contributors to decision making and often the internal authority figures in the family. In both subtle and direct ways, women, not only contribute to decision making but often have the authority in the family. This is contrary to the stereotype in which the woman is viewed as subservient and deferent to “her man” and that child rearing and household chores should be her main concern. In fact, one of the greatest of changes in the Hispanic family in the United States is in the woman’s role. There is a very high degree of woman-headed households, especially among Puerto Ricans in New York. A high percentage of women in all Hispanic groups are employed and are the primary household wage earners. This, as might be expected, has caused tremendous changes in family structure and role behavior. However, family ideology continues to be verbally expressed as a value and cultural norm, often in contradiction to actual family behavior.

The role of children in the family ideology is one in which children, as stated in the age old dictum “are to be seen but not heard.” Children should be subservient and show respect to all elders, *respeto* (respect) being a concept held by all individuals. In a variety of studies on education, Hispanic children, especially of new migrants do behave in a “culturally prescribed manner” (Suárez-Orozco 1989) that is congruent with family ideology. However, as in all other aspects of family ideology among Hispanics, children’s roles have experienced drastic changes. Education in the American system and exposure to people outside of the immediate family and network of relatives has affected children in many ways. Children often become the social brokers between their parents and the outside world. They are the best speakers of English and know the outside more thoroughly than parents.

Among all Hispanics some form of the extended family is present. The extended family is an important

part of *la familia* concept, because it includes more than one generation of individuals that are related, and who express immediate support to one another as a primary value. The ideal extended family includes a husband and wife, their children, children's children, mother and father of either husband or wife, and siblings of either husband or wife. Parts of this ideal type live together under one roof and share economic and social activities. Although a number of variants to the ideal type do exist, Hispanic groups in the United States do not generally live in an extended family household. The reality is that Hispanics tend to favor the nuclear family and a separate household. This is especially true of later settlers and individuals born in the United States. The extended family living in single households is generally a transitory stage in family and household development. It is seen primarily during the migrant stages of first arrival when newcomers need support and help in adjusting and finding their way in a new environment. The reality of the extended Hispanic family is that it transcends geographical barriers and has functioning units in both country of origin as well as in the United States. It is in this sense that the institution of the family has taken on a hybrid form through the strategic expression of migrants adapting to a new environment.

Hispanics have used the extended family in conjunction with other kinship institutions that form part of the greater *familia*, and family ideology. As in the family in general, the Catholic religion has had a very strong influence in *familia* institutions. Religious rites of baptism and marriage take on special meaning that have evolved into socio-cultural expressions important among Hispanics in the United States. *Compadrazgo* (godparenthood), marriage and *parentesco* (kinship sentiment) are primary institutions that need to be understood in relation to the family. These are multidimensional elements that together help maintain the *familia*. *Compadrazgo* is formed usually through the baptism of a child, with parents choosing *padrinos* (godparents) from close friends or relatives. *Compadrazgo* is the extension of kinship to non-relatives and the strengthening of responsibilities between kin. *Padrinos* also sponsor the child in baptism and confirmation ceremonies. *Padrinos* are also chosen at weddings and are the best man and bridesmaids. *Compadres* (co-parents) ideally have special responsibilities towards the godchild and in the past have been expected to take the parental role if parents were to pass away, except in the case of marriage sponsorship. This special parental relationship is maintained throughout life. In addition, although not recognized in much of the literature, the *ahijado* (godchild) has a special responsibility towards the *padrino/madrina*. This is

manifested in varying degrees, but can be seen when the *padrino/madrina* is elderly; *ahijados* may pay special attention almost as if the *padrino/madrina* were a grandparent. However, the strongest relationship in *compadrazgo* is that between the child's parents and godparents, who call each other *compadres* (literally co-parents). Godparents often address each other as *comadre* (co-mother) or *compadre* (co-father), illustrating the special relationship they have towards one another. *Compadrazgo* forms an intimate relationship in which those sharing the role have specific expectations of each other. Much of the literature focuses on the reciprocal nature of the relationship between *compadres* especially in the early period of adaptation to the United States. *Compadres* are expected to provide each other with mutual help, to care for one another in time of need and to be readily available in times of crisis. *Compadrazgo* has been, as might be expected, a key institution expressed by migrants from all the Hispanic origin countries. *Compadres*, as kin, have provided shelter for newcomers, access to jobs and a base from which people can become acclimatized to the new environment. *Compadrazgo* is a means to further "extend" the family by adding new members and assuring support in times of need.

In addition to *compadrazgo* that extends reciprocity among Hispanics, *parentesco* (kinship sentiment) has been an important institution that has taken on new meaning in the early periods of migration and settlement. *Parentesco* has been especially utilized by Mexican immigrants. As used in the border area, it became a broader concept than that understood in the home region where *parentesco* was reserved for kin. In the United States it was expressed on the basis of regional affiliation, the migration experience, or the mutual settlement in a foreign environment. Families did not just extend *parentesco* to other migrants; they were extending *parentesco* to families and individuals who shared a specific history in the country of origin. *Parentesco* is not familism which is the recognition of the importance of family, family ties, family honor and the ideal of respect. Familism incorporates the altruistic value that the family is more important than any of its members. This recognition carries a responsibility to kin in general. *Parentesco* is a kinship sentiment used by Hispanics to incorporate kin as well as non-kin into family networks. It is an extension of family sentiment to kin and non-kin.

*Parientes* (blood relatives), because of their natural relation as blood-kin, are automatically a part of a family network. Similarly *compadres*, if not already kin, are brought into the network as well. However, among Hispanics in the United States, the sentiment of *parentesco* is extended to individuals who share regional

or specific geographic origins, especially a town, or township in the country of origin. This was especially evident among early migrants to the United States who came from primarily rural backgrounds, and often similar origins in towns did indicate kinship even if distant. The new environment in the United States utilized the sentiment towards kin and friends from home regions to build the support and reciprocity networks needed in the new settlements. Kin terms are used to express this relationship—*primo/a* (cousin), *tío/a* (uncle/aunt), for example.

*Confianza* (trust) is of particular importance to both the institutions of *compadrazgo* and *parentesco* among Hispanics in the United States, and is the basis of the relationships between individuals in many spheres of social activity. It is evident in business relations among entrepreneurs who work on the basis of trust and among friendships in which trust is fundamental (Alvarez 1990). But *confianza* goes beyond relationships between individuals and forms the underlying base of reciprocity of all types. *Confianza* is the underlying factor that builds relationships and forms the basis for trust in the institutions of *parentesco* and *compadrazgo*. In a sense, the combined expression and practice of *compadrazgo* and *parentesco* produce the continued trust that is expressed as *confianza*. To have *confianza* with an individual is not just to regard that person with trust, but it signifies a relationship of special sentiment and importance involving respect and intimacy. *Confianza* developed in friendship can, for example, lead to a relationship of *compadrazgo* and in expressing *parentesco* to individuals who are not kin, as for example, an individual who is from a home region and is a friend or *compadre* of kin.

A unique characteristic of the extended family among Hispanics in the United States is regionalism. Due to the migration over time of different generations from specific home regions, the family has been extended to include both United States and home country components. The family has become in many instances a binational or transnational institution even after several generations of time. Among Dominicans and Mexicans, this is especially evident, but it is true to varying degrees among all Hispanics in the United States (Chávez 1988; Vélez-Ibáñez 1990). Extensions of the family in the United States form part of a social network that includes not just regions but actual ties to specific home towns (Alvarez 1987a, 1984; Hendricks 1974; Mines 1981; Whiteford 1979). Among early pioneers and first migrants, kinship forms the basis for help in settling and finding jobs in the United States, later as settlements became more established, these early migrants host and assist both relatives and friends from their home areas. And migrants themselves return

to home countries and regions, setting up a back and forth flow that is dependent on the support of family members in both areas. This actually extends the family across geographic space creating the reciprocity, mutual help and *parentesco* in country of origin as well as in the United States. Hence the extended-regional family becomes a basis of reciprocity between families in home and country of origin, as well as a potential basis for continuing migration to and from the United States.

The institution of marriage varies tremendously among Hispanics in the United States, and like the family in general has been adapted to a number of different socio-economic conditions. The value of a religious wedding is not, nor has it been, the sole means for recognizing unions between men and women. Among Dominicans, for example, marital unions consist of *matrimonio por la iglesia* (church wedding), *matrimonio por ley* (civil marriage) and *union libre* (free union). Church weddings carry higher prestige and are more prevalent among persons of higher socio-economic status, but free unions allow for early cohabitation in the migrant settlement. Marriage, however, has been an institution that strengthens extended family ties and incorporates individuals and their kin into network alliances under *parentesco*. Marriage, in addition to its important function of uniting conjugal pairs and their critical household formation and procreation of children, needs to be seen as an institution that is used in primary adaptive processes to the United States. Marriage among Hispanics continues to be within their own group (endogamous), that is Mexicans marrying Mexicans, Puerto Ricans marrying Puerto Ricans, etc. There is some intermarriage between groups but this is infrequent, and there is a growing rate of intermarriage with Anglo Americans, especially among second-generation Hispanics. This is especially true of Mexican Americans.

*La familia*, then, incorporates the institutions of ideology, *parentesco*, *compadrazgo*, marriage and *confianza* that together have formed the basis of migration and settlement in the United States. Through the variant forms of the extended family, Hispanics have adjusted and adapted to a new environment. The family, however, continues changing as seen in the change of the extended to a nuclear family preference in later generations and with United States born persons. This however is not an indication of abandoning extended family ties as indicated in the literature, but a change in the manner in which extended ties and relations are expressed that are congruent with life in the United States. Although these institutions can be viewed as separate strands in the thread of life, each strand helps form the social fabric in unique products of expression.

Social networks composed of extended families are the basis of communities in urban and rural barrios of Chicanos, Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, Cubans and the other Latinos in the United States.

Because families live in households, they are often taken as one and the same thing. Hispanics make the differentiation clearly, as they refer to the nuclear family living under one roof as *la casa* as opposed to the greater institution *la familia* to which we have been referring. Households, however, are a good indication of the changing nature of adaptation and settlement of Hispanics in the United States. Households include the extended family as people first migrate and begin to settle in the United States. It is the first step in becoming permanent settlers (Chávez 1988; Alvarez 1987a, 1987b).

Let us turn now to the description of the family among the major Hispanic groups in the United States. This includes Mexican Americans and Chicanos, Puerto Ricans, Cubans and Dominicans. The discussion will focus on these groups, only because there is very little information available on Central and South Americans. Some generalizations can be drawn for the latter.

## Puerto Ricans: Born in the U. S. A.

Puerto Ricans are the second largest Hispanic group in the United States and have been migrating to the mainland United States since the turn of the century. In 1917 the Jones Act granted all Puerto Ricans born on the Island United States citizenship. This is a striking difference to all other Hispanic immigrants to the country, as Puerto Ricans can move freely between their place of origin without legal restrictions and entanglements of United States immigration law.

Migration to the continental United States became a viable alternative to the deteriorating economic and social situation on the island. Economic changes on the island brought about by foreign control of land for sugar and coffee plantations and tobacco created high unemployment and a steady stream of migrants to the United States that has continued to the present. One of the first casualties of this economic change was the incremental decline of family patterns that were based on subsistence. High unemployment coupled with a gradual industrialization caused both increased unemployment and dependence on outside commodities. This imbalance created surplus labor at a time when jobs in New York City on the mainland needed to be filled. Puerto Ricans began migrating to the United States, and in particular to New York City. Initially as is the case with the majority of Hispanics in the United States, the early migration was intended to be only temporary. Puerto Ricans did not want to leave the

island, but the high unemployment and the draw of jobs in New York created the flow of people between the mainland and the island.

In the late 1890s, during the Spanish-American War a small group of Puerto Ricans fled the island and sought refuge in New York City while they worked for independence. Most of these people returned, after the United States obtained the Island from Spain, feeling betrayed when the United States maintained jurisdiction over the Island and did not support the liberation movement. However, the early colony helped establish New York as a receiving area which grew geometrically in the following years. In the early part of the century, migration to the United States continued and New York became the preferred area for the majority of migrant Puerto Ricans, establishing one of the largest concentrations of Hispanics in the United States. The early migration was composed of people moving from rural to urban areas in Puerto Rico as well as people who had come to New York directly from rural areas of the Island. Of importance here is that these people maintained what might be called the traditional family as it was known in Puerto Rico. Some of these people joined the migrant labor circuits on the mainland doing agricultural work, but the majority went to the city of New York (Rodriguez 1989; Lopez 1980; Rogler and Cooney 1984; Fitzpatrick 1987; History Task Force 1979). The early conditions of this migration created a relationship that was to have enduring consequences for settlement and adaptation of Puerto Ricans and their families as well as for the subsequent forms the family would take in the United States.

In the 1940s, airline flights between the island and New York became regular, were relatively inexpensive and travel time was short. Air travel became the common means of leaving and returning to the Island and paved the way for what was to become the "Great Migration" from the mid 1940s to the 1970s. The decades before 1945 are considered the period of pioneer migration. Many of the people coming from Puerto Rico were contracted laborers who came to work in industry and agriculture. These individuals were the basis for many of the Puerto Rican communities that currently exist outside of New York City. However, the majority of migrants continued to pour into New York City. By 1940 there was a total of almost 70,000 Puerto Ricans in the United States, over 87%, or almost 65,000, were living in New York City (United States Bureau of the Census 1970).

During the war years, there were not many migrants who crossed from the island because of the danger in the Atlantic. But when the war ended, there was a sizeable unemployed population looking to leave for jobs

in the United States. It was at this time that the "Great Migration" began. The economic situation in Puerto Rico had worsened before this period and the Island fell further under the domination of a market economy controlled by United States interests (History Task Force 1979). By 1960 a total of 887,662 Puerto Ricans had migrated to the United States; 69% of these people, or 612,574, resided in New York City. By the end of the next decade, a total of 1,391,463 people had left the Island and had become residents of the United States with 817,712 of these folk residing in the city of New York.

Similarly to other Hispanic immigrants, Puerto Ricans did not travel together in family groups at the beginning of the migration. Usually young men came to find work then began sending for spouses and families. But the social conditions in the United States, especially in New York where new communities were established, set parameters that changed family patterns and conditioned the adaptation of Puerto Ricans to the city. Much of the literature on Puerto Ricans focuses on New York City, but there is relatively little on the family and its adaptations to the United States (Rogler and Cooney 1984 is an exception).

In Puerto Rico, unemployment in these later years continued to worsen, and the educational system was not meeting the needs of the population. The majority of people worked *la zafra* (the sugar harvest), but this work lasted only five months of the year. Workers were idle for the remaining seven months. During the years after the 1940s, unemployment was heightened by a growing working-age population. A rising population coupled with a drop in the death rate created a large, young, unemployed working class.

Poverty became a significant factor in the lives of families in both Puerto Rico and the United States. It is impossible to discuss the Puerto Rican family in the United States without discussing the extreme conditions that have pervaded the Puerto Rican community here. From a historical perspective, Puerto Ricans have never recovered from the early colonial period when United States capital interests took over the ownership of the majority of land on the island and created a labor force that was dependent on cash crops. Puerto Rico had one of the highest infant mortality rates in the world and one of the lowest rates of average income per worker during the early years of the United States jurisdiction over the Island. Consider, for example, that in 1899 Puerto Ricans maintained ownership of 93% of all farms (Morales 1987), but by 1930 foreign (United States) interests controlled 60% of sugar cultivation, 80% of tobacco lands, 60% of all banks and 100% of maritime lines that controlled commodities coming and going from the island. Prior to the capital-

ist sugar economy, the family was very important in the subsistence economy (Steward 1956). The diminished importance of the family in agriculture, continued unemployment and poor education in Puerto Rico resulted in poverty on the Island. Similar factors account for its existence in the United States. People arrived to the States with low skills due to both a rural background and little or no schooling. The jobs they worked at were poor paying. Of the distinguishing factors of all Hispanic groups in the United States Puerto Ricans continue to be the most socio-economically disadvantaged group in the country, especially in New York City. In 1980 the median family annual income for Puerto Ricans was \$9,900 compared to \$15,000 for all Hispanics and \$19,500 for all United States families. Forty-five percent of Puerto Ricans in New York City live below the poverty level. Much of this poverty is found among female-headed households, an adaptation of the family that is increasing among Puerto Ricans, Dominicans and other Hispanics in the United States. Poverty, then, is a consistent factor and an underlying force among the Puerto Rican family in the United States. It has conditioned change and the adaptation of families to the social and cultural environment that is the United States.

At the end of the 1960s and into the earlier 1970s, what has become known as "revolving door" migration began. This is a back and forth stream of people moving between the United States and the Island. It is no longer focused in New York, although a majority of Puerto Ricans continue to migrate and settle in the Northeast, and it incorporates a dispersion of people to other areas throughout the continental United States.

This back and forth movement has encouraged the unification and extension of families on the mainland with those in Puerto Rico. Travel of family members to and from households on the Island and on the mainland is now a natural part of the migration cycle. Even "Newyoricans," Puerto Ricans born in New York, have migrated to the Island and have begun to adapt to life there.

A significant problem in New York and in other urban areas that has greatly influenced Puerto Rican families and individuals is access to housing. Housing in New York has always been a problem, but among Puerto Ricans who earn low wages and are often unemployed in the city, housing is poor, crowded and a major adaptational factor for those Puerto Ricans who are on the lowest rung of the socio-economic ladder.

An example of the seriousness of the housing conditions for inner city, Puerto Rican families is that of Hartford, Connecticut (Pelto, Roman and Liriano 1982). Here housing conditions have become desperate as apartments are converted to more expensive condo-

miniums and residential space is taken over by offices and businesses. Housing is influencing household fragmentation and unemployment is contributing to serious problems in family life. Two of every three households were reported to lack employment, even of a part-time nature for their members. This has contributed to a number of household types. This includes dual parent households where at least one of the two parents of the house is employed; households where there are two parents but neither is employed and single family households where the parent is not employed. These variations, however, illustrate the workings of the extended family in that the houses with two unemployed parents are often helped by other relatives living in the Hartford area. Similarly among single parent households, there are relatives in the city who appear to be providing help and support. Here again the range of assistance received from others outside of the household demonstrates the general patterns of exchange and reciprocity. It is clear, then, that the urban milieu in the United States has influenced Puerto Rican family patterns and households in the cities.

Although poverty among Puerto Ricans is a significant factor, not all Puerto Ricans are suffering from unemployment and poverty. Although the majority of early migrants were unskilled, Puerto Ricans have slowly penetrated the white collar world associated with the middle class in the United States. Even with great poverty, the children of migrants, the second generation, are improving their socio-economic position. Less unemployment, higher educational achievement and higher incomes are not the rule, but are evident in the population as a whole (Rogler and Cooney 1984).

The ideal of the family as a cultural expression is still adhered to and the institutions of *parentesco*, *compadrazgo*, *confianza* and varying degrees of patriarchy are expressed among Puerto Ricans in the United States. One significant change among the general population is the increasing influence of the role of women. This has been a direct result of women working, often when the male in the house is unemployed. Women in many cases have become the "bread winners" of the household. This has led to an increasing trend toward stronger egalitarian relations among spouses, but this generally means that the wife has taken on "traditional" male tasks, not that men have taken on wife's roles and tasks in the household. Marriage preference continues to be a religious ceremony in the Catholic Church, and there is a low rate of Puerto Ricans marrying outside of the community, although this has increased in second-generation, United States born.

Puerto Ricans continue to identify strongly with their cultural and ethnic past. A study of 100 families of par-

ents and their married children (a total of 200 married couples) in New York, reported that not one member of the children's generation, almost all born in the United States, reported feeling closer to Americans than to Puerto Ricans, nor did anyone in their generation consider Americans to be his or her real people (Rogler and Cooney 1984).

What we see in the family among Puerto Ricans in the United States is a great variation in form, but still based in part on the ideal type of Hispanic family. Major institutions appear to be alive and well, but the dearth of research in this area of family life does not allow any assured conclusions. As illustrated above, the research and documentation of the Puerto Rican family revolves around the continuing migration between the Island and the mainland United States and focuses on New York City. However, the extreme socio-economic conditions in which Puerto Ricans have lived are significant factors in the formation of variant types of households. The extended family is an important institution that has been utilized in situations of mutual help and reciprocity but the preferred family living pattern is the nuclear family with a woman, man and children living in one household. The variety of family types include variations of the extended family and the nuclear family. There are intergenerational forms where the nuclear family enjoys considerable autonomy from kin, but where frequent visits, exchanges of gifts and help, especially in ceremonial occasions keep the extended nature of the family alive. Also there are families in which married children are completely dependent on their parents and where the younger generation is almost totally absorbed and nurtured by the parents, and ranging to situations where strong mothers have created matriarchal patterns of organization in which they control and bind the family together. Although there is variation among households and family in general, there are strong underlying bonds that maintain the norms which bind the family together allowing a flexibility that has provided for successful adaptation in numerous areas of the United States.

## Dominicans

The Dominican population in the United States, like Puerto Ricans and Mexicans, began arriving at the turn of the twentieth century, but the political and economic conditions in the Dominican Republic fostered a pattern of migration to and settlement in the United States that affected the formation and structure of families differently than other groups. The Dominican Republic has had a history of strong economic and political dependency on the United States, that like other Caribbean nations began around 1900. How-

ever, unlike Puerto Rico the Dominicans experienced an internal domination during the "Trujillato," the reign of dictator Trujillo from 1930 to 1960 that created a constriction of the migrant flow from the Republic. After the death of Trujillo in 1960, a surge of Dominicans began leaving for the United States. Throughout this period and into the present, the family and its constituent institutions have been a major factor for Dominicans in both initiating migration to the United States and, in the initial settlement and adaptation to the United States. Dominicans through the institution of the family have maintained a continuous chain of movement between the Republic and the mainland United States (Hendricks 1974; Georges 1990). Understanding the basic causes of the migration helps comprehend the development of the Dominican family as an institution responding to socio-economic circumstances in both the United States and the Republic.

Dominicans are the fourth largest Hispanic group in the United States, but their impact, like Puerto Ricans, in New York City and the Northeastern United States make them the second largest group there. Estimates of their numbers range from 300,000 to over 500,000 but the actual figure is probably closer to 300,000 (Georges 1990). In 1981, Dominicans in the United States represented five to eight percent of the total Dominican Republic's work force. Dominicans are primarily working class. Of all the major immigrant groups (Hispanics and others) who entered the United States between 1970 and 1980, Dominicans had the lowest family income (\$9,569). Like the majority of Hispanics, they are a young population.

The presence of the United States was felt in the Republic early in the century and continues into the present. This influence helped set the economic structure that was to change the basic pattern of subsistence in the island, convert land to foreign interests and create a labor force that was initially confined to work in the Dominican Republic, but after the death of Trujillo poured into the United States.

At the turn of the present century, there was little migration to the United States from the Dominican Republic. By the second quarter of the century, sugar, as in the other Caribbean Islands became an important crop that attracted investors to the Island. North Americans, Europeans, Cubans and others looking for expanded or new areas in which to invest came to the Republic. In addition, investment in coffee, cacao and cattle ranching became popular. These investments created a demand for land, and, as in Puerto Rico, people were forced out of subsistence agriculture and into a labor force that was dependent primarily on sugar cultivation.

The early part of the century was marked by economic distress and political instability opening the way for United States intervention. The intervention took the form of an eight-year occupation which became the basis for major changes in Dominican health services, education and public works. Schools and hospitals were built under United States guidance where they had never existed; new roads and bridges connected once remote areas. One of the lasting results of the public works program was political centralization. Unification of the country neutralized the power of local political leaders (Georges 1991, 27). These processes helped form a new relationship with the United States and created a mass of people who came to rely on wage labor, first in the Republic itself, and, then as unemployment became a serious problem, in the urban Northeast of the United States.

By the end of the United States occupation in 1924, sugar companies controlled almost a quarter of all agricultural land; 80% of this control was by United States companies. During this period the Dominican National Guard was created which came to have lasting effects on the Republic. The Guard was trained by the United States, and produced a military establishment that was strongly favorable to the United States. A result of this establishment was the rise of Trujillo who worked his way from a guardsman into the presidency of the Republic.

President Trujillo instilled a strongly pro-national industry that relied on a large and stable work force. During his realm from 1930 to 1960, migration to the United States was a mere trickle; the population was restricted to the Dominican Republic. Trujillo also encouraged population growth to both counter a long-standing territorial conflict with Haiti, but also to boost the national labor force. During the period from 1930-1961, the population of the Dominican Republic doubled from 1.5 to 3 million people. Some of this growth was, to be sure, the result of improved health. The result, however, at the time of Trujillo's death, was a sizeable population that was dependent on wage labor.

In the early 1960s, constraints in the agricultural sector created a massive rural-urban migration. In 1970 over one half of the population of the capital city, Santo Domingo, was composed of migrants from the countryside. By the end of the following presidential period (of Joaquin Balaguer), a 1980 study reported that in the five poorest neighborhoods around Santo Domingo, 91% of household heads were migrants, most from rural areas (Duarte 1980 cited in Georges 1990). This migration became international as household heads and families left the Republic for Puerto Rico and the United States.

In the final years of Trujillo's dictatorship, between 1950 to 1960, 9,800 people immigrated to the United States. In the next two-year period from 1960-1962, this number increased six fold, and in almost every year after 1962 a number equal to or greater than the total for the previous decade migrated to the United States. Between 1966 and 1980, the number of legal immigrants admitted to the United States averaged about 14,000 per year (Georges 1990). It is obvious that both legal and undocumented migration became a partial solution to a growing unemployment problem in the Republic.

A significant aspect of the Dominican migration that affects the settlement of families in the United States is the influx of undocumented migrants, or migrants that enter on tourist or other types of temporary visas and remain in the United States illegally. By the mid 1960s, over 150,000 non-immigrants were being admitted annually, and between 1961 and 1978 approximately 1,800,000 entered the United States on non-immigrant visas. Although most of these people did not choose to stay in the United States, some did indeed regularize their status through marriages and other means. Estimates of the undocumented migrants are from 17% to 14% of the total Dominican-United States population (Georges 1990).

The closeness of the Republic to Puerto Rico and the mainland has made travel back and forth to the Island relatively easy. Most immigrants travel directly to the United States, others go first to Puerto Rico. Recently, undocumented Dominicans have begun to enter into the United States through Mexico, crossing into the United States as do many Mexicans and Central Americans at the United States-Mexico Border.

The importance here is that the migrant stream between the Dominican Republic and the United States has become one social field, in which family connections at both ends of the stream are important. Indeed, it is the family in its extended form that helps initiate the migration to the United States and helps in initial adaptation and settlement. Once settlement is accomplished, the connection to the Republic is maintained.

In many ways the Dominican migration illustrates in dramatic fashion how Hispanics strategically use *familia* institutions in new ways. Although all Hispanic groups utilize *parentesco*, *compadrazgo*, extended kin and *confianza*, the massive and direct migration of Dominicans from the Republic in a relatively short time period, to compacted settling areas in the United States show an intense use of these institutions.

Due to the direct contact with the home country, modern transportation and the proximity of the Republic to the United States, Dominicans have maintained a very strong ethnic identity in the United States. In addi-

tion, the recent immigration of numerous first-generation Dominicans has helped transfer social patterns from the Republic to the United States. The large, existing Hispanic population in the Northeast United States has been a further incentive to both keep cultural ties alive and to settle in Hispanic neighborhoods where identity and adaptation appear to be easier than in purely Anglo areas.

The household, based on the ideal of the nuclear family with two spouses and children, is the elementary unit of social and economic relationships in the Dominican Republic (Georges 1991; Hendricks 1974). This ideal has been carried over to the United States, but it is not realized. What has occurred is a hybrid form of the family that is begun in the Dominican Republic. The basis of this new form is reciprocal exchange and mutual help. As with other Hispanic groups, individuals in the household are connected through the extended family and network of friends traced through both spouses. *Compadrazgo*, *confianza*, *parentesco* and marriages unite and extend reciprocal relations and sentiment between individuals and groups of individuals. The principal relationships of the extended family play an important role in connecting individuals not only at local and regional levels, but also beyond national boundaries.

When migration to the United States began in earnest, individuals relied on the extended family for support in initiating the move. Branches of the (kindred) extended family were sent first to the cities of the Republic, or to the United States to secure contacts there (Georges 1990, 20). Once in the United States, family members and kindred branches utilized the institutions of *confianza* and *parentesco* with other Dominicans forming large networks of mutual support that led to the extension of kinship ties through marriage and other familial institutions. In 1974 Hendricks reported that in the village he studied in the Republic 65% of families had immediate family members living in the United States and 87% of these families were receiving money from kin in the United States (Hendricks 1974, 43). The extended family became so important that seldom do immigrants leave home without some assurance of help from contacts in the United States.

Because individuals have traveled to the United States often without spouses, household and marriage relations have been adapted to the new environment. In the Dominican Republic, and in the United States, the authority of the male is an ideal standard in which (as we have said earlier), the man of the house is the final authority and decision maker. There are few households, however, in which this form is evident. Circumstances in the United States and in the Republic are encouraging change in sex roles, especially among women.

Due to migration and settlement in the United States, the role of women is the most impacted and changed in family relationships. In the Dominican Republic, as men leave, women are left as the main authority figures in the household. Although many women were always in the position of heads of households, Georges (1990) reports that 1/3 of households in the village she studied in the Republic were female headed, and this seems to have increased because of migration. The greatest change, however, is seen in the United States. Here women have the opportunity to change the traditional roles they occupy, but also impacting the role of the male as provider and principal head of the household. Women are becoming heads of households due primarily to their financial contributions to the home which, in the absence of a male head, is often essential to maintain family needs, goals and, often, survival. Women are being exposed to the outside environment and new social situations are providing them with important social skills that many men do not have.

Not all women, however, are becoming more independent. Those women who do not work are confined to the household to care for children. This encourages the strengthening of the male's authority and isolation of women, who, unlike those in the Dominican Republic, have less freedom in general. They are confined to the household, seldom have outside contacts and are the caretakers of children.

In addition to the change in women's roles, a significant change in the Dominican family in the United States is the number of children in families. In the United States, Dominicans have less children than in the Republic primarily due to financial constraints. Economic restrictions in housing, food, clothing and child care, limit the ability of women to work (Hendricks 1974, 98). Parents are often brought from the Dominican Republic to help with children, and other kin in the United States are often caretakers of children while parents work, thus making the extended family a further support. Interestingly, migration has increased the likelihood that children will live with, or be cared for by a variety of individuals.

Heads of household are often those individuals who are the financial providers, are proficient in English and to whom the family is obligated because of financial support. This is often not the man in the household, especially if men have come to the United States as mature adults (Hendricks 1974). For many United States households, the father or elderly male is often the least able to perform this role.

The Dominican acceptance and acknowledgement of different conjugal unions has been a factor in United States settlement and continued ties to the Republic.

Three types of marriage are acknowledged by Dominicans: *matrimonio por iglesia* (church marriage), *matrimonio por ley* (civil marriage) and *union libre* (free union). All three are legitimate types of conjugal unions that cut across all classes, legitimizing the children of the unions (Hendricks 1974, 94). These three types of marital unions, in addition to accommodating United States legal requirements for securing visas, help Dominicans to adapt socio-economically to the United States. Religious marriages are often forgone because they are more expensive than civil unions. Civil unions are legal in the United States and help unite conjugal pairs. Free unions have played a significant role in maintaining family connections in the Republic because they allow individuals to cohabit, share households and expenses in the United States while maintaining legal spouses and households in the Republic. In the Dominican Republic, polygamous marriage, that is men having more than one "wife," and men supporting and having a union with more than one woman was socially and legally approved. Although not approved legally in the United States, the acceptability of these norms allow men and women to engage in relations in the United States while families are maintained in the home country.

## Cubans

The experience of Cubans in the United States has been markedly different although there are similarities they share with other Hispanics. The Cuban immigration and settlement in the United States was primarily a politically instigated migration caused by the Cuban Revolution of 1959 headed by Fidel Castro. Prior to the revolution there had been some migration into Florida. At the turn of the century tobacco workers were relocated to work there in companies that had been moved from Cuba. There were some 18,000 to 19,000 Cubans living in the United States in 1930 (Moore and Pachon 1985). And there was a slow trickle of Cubans who entered the United States prior to the 1950s. But of the total, now nearing 1,000,000 Cubans in the United States, more than half have arrived since 1959 (Queralto 1984).

The United States played a significant role in the early history of the Republic of Cuba and established strong economic ties there early in the century. This history, like that of other countries from which Hispanics immigrated, is important in understanding the Cuban immigration to the United States, and the sentiment that Cubans hold for their home country. As in Puerto Rico and the Dominican Republic, the United States played a significant role in bringing Cuba into the new industrial epoch of the twentieth century and

a world economy (dominated by capital interests primarily from the United States).

Just before the turn of the century, Cuba had begun to resist the Spanish government and rebelled. In 1898 the United States intervened, supported the Cuban revolutionaries who were fighting Spain for independence and began the Spanish-American War. (The U. S. entrance into the war was justified by blaming Spain for the sinking of the Battleship Maine in Havana Harbor in February of 1898.) In December of 1898 the conflict ended and a treaty was signed in which Spain relinquished sovereignty over Cuba. The United States ruled until 1902 when the Cuban Republic was formally instituted. However, political unrest continued and the United States, with the rights of interventions secured in the original Cuban constitution, intervened from 1906 to 1909, and again in 1912. During this period and after World War I, United States interests dominated Cuba's economy through the control of land dedicated to the production of sugar. Through the next 30 years and into the decade of the 1950s, Cuba experienced continued economic instability and unrest.

During the Second World War, Cubans experienced continued food shortages and political instability due to fluctuations in world sugar prices, the primary export crop of the Cuban nation. High costs of living and continued inflation led to unrest and political violence in the late 1940s. In 1952, Fulgencio Bautista, the head of the Cuban Army, seized power, suspended the constitution dissolving the Cuban Congress and set up a provisional government. Bautista, running unopposed, held elections in 1954, and was inaugurated in February of 1955. The entire half of the twentieth century was marked by unrest, economic instability and a strong foreign interest that controlled sugar production and export. Bautista's strong hand in conjunction with the stabilization of world sugar prices brought initial suppression of the political unrest, and economic stability through an economic development program supported by the United States.

During the later years of Bautista's dictatorship, 10,000 to 15,000 Cubans entered the United States annually. This early migration was composed of ruling elite, and the politically and socially alienated as well as individuals who were unemployed. But it was overrepresented by the upper classes. This migration was to continue in earnest after the next Cuban Revolution that brought Fidel Castro into power in 1959.

That early period of Cuban history set up a stratified society favoring the ruling class and foreign interests in sugar, primarily from the United States. Although initially stymied by Bautista, unrest grew and erupted in the Cuban Revolution of 1959 led by Fidel Castro. It

was this revolution that initiated the first major wave of exiles into the United States. The revolution was supported by all classes and all generations in Cuba. Alejandro Portes, a well noted Cuban sociologist, states that "Seldom has history seen a more complete example of social consensus" (1969, 506). However, Castro's plan was to return Cuba to the ordinary people and he began a program of socialization in which the powerless working class became those in control. Castro initiated agrarian reform affecting plantations controlled by United States companies; the operation of plantations by non-Cuban stockholders was prohibited and Castro eventually de-emphasized sugar for food crops. Upper class Cubans, the wealthy, the educated and the powerful saw their status challenged and their influence radically curtailed. The lower strata of Cuban society was now in control and in power.

This restructuring of Cuban society resulted in the first massive immigration of Cubans to the United States in 1960. Between 1959 and 1962, more than 155,000 people left the island. This migration was slowed because of a three year suspension of airline flights from Cuba to the United States. But in 1965, when the airlift was re-established, daily flights brought some 257,000 Cubans to the United States between December of 1965 and December of 1972. These individuals were fleeing the Castro government and had felt betrayed by the revolution. They brought a fierce hostility towards the Castro regime, but also an attachment and pride to their values and style of life, a clearly defined identity as Cubans and a strong desire to return to Cuba (Portes 1969, 507).

The majority of this first wave of Cubans went to Miami, Florida. Here in Miami they were close to Cuba and were in a climate that was very much like home. In addition, the previous tobacco worker immigration to Miami and Florida had initiated communities there. This initial wave was followed by a subsequent group of people who left Cuba in the 1980s. In April of 1980, 10,000 people took refuge in the Peruvian Embassy in Havana, hoping to leave Cuba. The Castro regime allowed these people and, in addition, over 118,000 others to leave. Most of these people left from the port of Mariel, and are known as the *Marielitos*. Hence, the pre-revolution migration, the immediate post-revolution and the Marielito migrations constitute the three waves of migrations for Cubans entering the United States (Llanes 1982; Gallagher 1980; Moore and Pachon 1984).

Most Cuban immigrants settled in Miami, although there are smaller communities in Los Angeles, California and New York City. In addition to having a history of settlement in Miami, the initial immigrants who had come from the professional and entrepreneurial

classes came equipped to begin new businesses and prosper from the economy. Unlike many other Hispanic groups, the fact that most of the Cubans arrived with resources in the form of capital, education and both professional and semi-professional skills, allowed them to take advantage of their new situation in the United States. In addition, there were many political groups in the United States who provided help and resources because of the Castro sentiment. The result was a strong economic foothold in Miami. The success of early immigrants provided fertile ground for the successive immigrant waves in the form of jobs and opportunities that were not available in other sectors of the United States economy. This has been described as an ethnic economic enclave in which Cubans have provided viable alternatives to the United States labor market. The enclave is characterized by ethnic (Cuban) owned businesses that employ and do business within the ethnic community and provide upward mobility for labor. Hence the early immigrants were able to get a strong foothold, with succeeding waves providing continued input into the enclave in the form of resources and labor. The result in Miami is a strong Cuban community that has influenced not only the economy but also politics. Spanish, for example, is the primary language spoken, making it possible even for monolingual Spanish speakers to succeed. This environment has had strong binding effects on the families of Cubans in the United States.

An early study of Cubans in Milwaukee illustrates the adaptive nature of immigrants (Portes 1969). Portes noted that educational attainment, occupational skills that were in demand in the United States and a middle-class ethic and style of life combined to produce a fast process of adaptation (Portes 1969, 508). Significantly the adaptation of Cuban families in Milwaukee was generally not a problem. They had come with strong values in individualism, self-concept, personal rights and belief in the improvement of one's position in a stratified system. The satisfaction and attraction to life in the United States was almost an exclusive result of the level of socio-economic rewards these people received. These rewards were the only factors that overcame old attachments among the families studied which, according to Portes, is in "perfect agreement with the beliefs they supported and the role they played during the revolutionary process" (Portes 1969, 517).

The individuals who are now in the United States are primarily exiles, but there is a significant difference in the peoples who arrived in the United States at different times. During the first waves just before and during the Revolution in 1959, Cubans coming to the United States were primarily the more privileged classes con-

sisting of managers, entrepreneurs and landowners. Later, after a decade of socialism, immigrants of lower-middle and working class predominated. This provided the United States population with a truly historically representative strata of Cuban society, a factor that is not seen in the other Hispanic groups who have come to the United States.

Cubans in the United States are also different in other ways from Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, Dominicans and other Hispanic immigrants and settlers. Although the exiled population represents all sectors of the pre-revolutionary society it is overrepresented by professionals and semi-professionals. In general the upper occupational strata of the Cuban population are over-represented. Because the Caucasian population in Cuba was in the upper-strata, Cuban Caucasians are also over-represented in the United States. A 1953 Cuban census indicated that 72% of the population was Caucasian; in the 1970 United States census, the Cuban Caucasian population was 95% (Harvard 1980). In addition, the Cuban population is disproportionately elderly. Presently, 10% of Cubans in the United States are over 65, a proportion three times larger than for other Hispanic groups. When viewed as a whole, Cuban-Americans are also a highly educated group. Of the pre-1953 population, only 4% had completed the twelfth grade or more, but the later post-Castro group reported that 36% of the immigrant group had completed 12 or more years of schooling. These factors along with settlement patterns illustrate a highly adapted and successful population. As with Puerto Ricans, Dominicans and Mexicans however, the family played an initially important role in adjustment.

As in pre-Castro Cuba, the family and its structure varies according to class. Since the 1930s, Caucasian Cubans have been oriented towards the nuclear family, with both spouses and children living together as the norm (Queralto 1984). The immigration and consequent adaptation to the United States has encouraged this trend even more. The middle and lower classes have relied more on the extended family because of its supportive nature in initial settlement and employment. But the trend is towards a nuclear family household for all Cubans in the United States.

There is no doubt that family ideology is of central importance among Cubans in the United States. The concept of a good family, in particular in the value placed on conserving and exhibiting a strong and good family name has helped keep the traditional family ideology among Cubans. One example of this has been the re-establishment of strict chaperoning of daughters (Richmond 1974, 41). Although changes in family relationships and roles are taking place, Cubans continue to uphold the ideals of male authority and paternally

centered families. The traditional view of the role of children and adolescents, however, has begun to cause conflict between the generations. A 1968 study in West New York and Union City, New Jersey, indicated that 86% of parents interviewed reported having great difficulty accepting similar freedom and independence enjoyed by other United States teenagers for their own children. It appears that the trend and focus on the nuclear family has had influences in more traditional institutions of Hispanic family structure among Cubans. *Compadrazgo*, for instance, does not appear as strong or pervasive an institution as for other Hispanic groups (Queralt 1984). Marriages appear to have remained primarily within the Cuban community but this appears to be changing. Parental pressure, intergenerational language barriers and the tightness and completeness of the Cuban community help keep marriages within the group (Harvard 1980, 258). The immigration of more women in recent years as compared to men of marriageable age has not yet had an impact on marriage patterns. The Cuban law prohibiting the emigration of males of military service age has resulted in a uneven distribution of the sexes among United States Cubans of marital age. In 1970, in the age category of 20-29, there were 76 males for each 100 females in the United States. Although marriages continue to be within the group (called endogamy), the rate of divorce among Cubans is higher than for other Hispanic groups and in fact is higher than for the United States population in general. Between 1960 and 1970, there were 6.2 divorces per 100 marriages among Cubans, 5.3 for the general population and only 2.9 for other foreign born immigrants (Harvard 1980).

The generational differences produced by the different waves of immigrants from both pre-revolutionary Cubans who adhere to traditional values and that of individuals who have been exposed to the socialist change are significant to family and sex roles in the United States. Generally speaking, Cubans in the United States continue to hold a stronger traditional value about the family when compared to Anglo-Americans. For example, emphasis on the male authority is still present. However, the Castro regime placed considerable emphasis on incorporating more women into the labor force and has questioned the norms about sex roles. Individuals who have entered the United States more recently have been exposed to these and other more liberal ideas. A consequence has been a more open attitude towards women in the work force and change in the family. Cuban women have the highest rate of participation, 54%, in the labor force among Spanish-speaking women. Cuban women actually have a higher rate of participation than do Caucasian women as a percentage of the total United States population.

Although working women appear to have more freedom and access to social relations outside of the family, work for Cuban women also has negative consequences. Work can be an increased burden as men have yet to take on any of the domestic responsibilities of women in the household. In addition, for Cuban women the lack of domestic help increases their responsibility in the home. However, there continues to be an increase in the percentage of working wives. As with many other Latino groups in the United States, those in the grandparental generation serve as baby-sitters and instillers of traditional values.

In general, it appears that, when compared to other Hispanic groups in the United States, Cubans are adapting successfully to American life. They have not exhibited the severe poverty nor severe socio-economic constraints suffered by Puerto Ricans, Mexicans and Dominicans. Their adaptive success is the result of a strong and viable economic structure that is based within the community itself and on a set of values based on individualism that parallel those of the United States generally.

The trend towards a nuclear family however does not discount the importance of the use of the extended family and its institutions in adapting to the United States. In fact when viewed from a sociological point of view, the extended family in the form of social networks is a prevailing institution that has had significant impact for Cubans. This may in fact be stronger for Cubans than for other Hispanic groups. Dense kinship networks provide the basis for a pattern of social relationships that revolve around the ethnic community. In fact, Cuban refugees in 1976, reported that 87% had received help from relatives living in the United States. The social world of Cuban immigrants is one that is full of kin and ethnic ties. In 1973, on arrival to the United States, Cuban exiles reported having an average of ten relatives and friends awaiting them. Three years later they reported an average of four relatives living in the same city and 2.5 relatives living elsewhere in the United States. This was true for both men and women. Cuban wives had numerous relatives in cities where they lived (Portes 1985, 302). Similarly, Cubans reported an average of eight close friends living in the same city, seven of which were Cuban. Of these, 93% stated they had no American friends. These figures are illustrative of the thick kinship and friendship networks to which Cuban immigrants belong and upon which they depend. Although the family has taken different forms, its role as an adaptive institution continues to be a significant factor in the United States Cuban community.

## Mexican Americans

The Mexican origin population is the largest Hispanic group in the United States numbering over 12,000,000

according to the U. S. Census in 1990. Because of its size and geographic range both in the United States and in Mexico, this population is also the most diverse. Indeed, the Mexican regions from which immigrants have come are larger than any of the other Hispanic origin countries. The United States mid-east and east coast is represented by Mexicanos from Tamaulipas, Saltillo, Torreon and the southeastern seaboard of Mexico including Vera Cruz and other Caribbean-like regions (Alvarez 1987b). The core sending area of Mexico, however, consists of the central states of Durango, Zacatecas, San Luis Potosi, Guanajuato, Jalisco and Michoacán (Cross and Sandos 1981). The majority of these people from the core sending states have come to the southwestern United States, principally to California and Texas. But people from throughout Mexico are represented in all areas of the United States. People have also migrated from the northern Mexican border states of Sonora, Chihuahua, Coahuila, Nuevo León and the states of the Pacific Coast, Sinaloa and Nayarit. Even remote Mexican areas and regional cultures are represented in the United States. In fact, Mexican colonies in the United States are often dense settlements of people from specific Mexican regions and states. Neighborhoods in Los Angeles, for example, are made up of people from Sonora, others from Michoacán and Sinaloa. Each group expresses a regional pride and specific cultural practices. Neighborhoods exhibit commercial establishments that boast native restaurants and shops specializing in regional specialties. This variety, a product of recent immigration, is complicated by the fact that Hispanics were also original populations in much of the Southwest.

The historical conditions between the United States and Mexico set the tone for current relationships. Of extreme importance in these relationships are the Southwestern borderlands which were first Spanish outposts in the New World, then Mexican territory before the United States-Mexican War of 1846. This is the area currently separated by a 2000 mile border. It consists of the United States-Mexican borderland states of Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, Colorado and California. Although indigenous Native Americans first lived in this region and continue to do so, each state is historically Spanish-Mexican. Unlike the political-economic influence and domination of the United States in other countries of Hispanic origin, the United States conquered the Southwest and took it from Mexico. This conquest was the beginning of a United States-Mexican relationship that shaped present attitudes, economic dependencies, and immigration. The Southwest borderlands, currently the area of the highest density of the Mexican origin population, stretches from the Pacific Ocean at San Diego, California, to the Gulf of

Mexico at Brownsville, Texas. This 2,000-mile zone has been a frontier since indigenous periods when trade routes between the civilizations in Mexico and the Pueblo Indians in the north traded before the arrival of the Spanish. It is an area of immense geographic variety and isolation. The history of settlement here reflects this diversity and a long-standing Mexican and Spanish heritage. The names of states, major settlements and geographic sites bear witness to this heritage: California, named after the legendary Califas (the Amazon Queen) where the early Spanish explorers hoped to find abundant sources of gold; La Sierra Madre of California, Los Angeles (the City of the Angels), New Mexico, Colorado, the Sangre de Cristo Mountains and El Paso are some examples.

However prominent the Spanish-Mexican heritage of the Southwest, the population, both native and immigrant, has been subordinate to the dominant Anglo and has lived a history of segregation and racial conflict that only recently has begun to change in meaningful ways. Before the Anglo arrived, there were only outpost settlements in the region, that had very small populations. Texas had some 5,000 Mexicans; New Mexico, the farthest outpost yet the largest, had some 60,000; California around 7,500 and Arizona perhaps 1,000 people (Moore and Pachon 1984, 18). Each of these states has a specific history of Mexican and Anglo social interaction that conditioned the modern incorporation and adaptation of Mexicans, both United States born and immigrants to the greater United States society.

The adaptive response of the family during this early period was conditioned both by the frontier nature of the Mexican settlements and the ensuing conflict of conquest and entrance of the Anglo population. The long-standing Hispanic presence in the United States is exemplified by New Mexican settlements around Albuquerque and Santa Fe. New Mexicans to this day consider themselves Hispanos, direct descendants of the original Spanish settlers who arrived in the seventeenth century. Similarly, the towns along the Texas Rio Grande frontier had been settled early in the original Mexican settlement. And in California, the Spanish-Californio families became landowners and rancheros, establishing a specific culture that was a product of their lives there.

It was the early Spanish and Mexican settlements which were the basis for the first Mexican-American and Hispanic Southwest. Mexico had lost nearly one third of its territory in the United States-Mexican War. The Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, both set the boundary for the international border separating the United States and Mexico, as well as outlined the rights of the Mexican population that remained in the territory

ceded to the United States. In each region and state, the new American presence capitalized on a variety of economic pursuits. Mexicans, once landowners and dominant entrepreneurs throughout the region, fell prey to the new economies and became wage laborers, although a few upper class families survived. The overall result was the subjugation of the Hispanic population from a dominant economic and political entity to one of a prevailing wage labor, in which Anglo economic interests controlled the regions. In Arizona mining became a major resource for American capitalists that depended on Mexican labor, both native and immigrant. Agriculture became prominent in both California and Texas establishing the migrant streams of Mexican workers.

In the late 1880s, the termination of the transcontinental railroad brought an onslaught of Americans from the eastern seaboard, who made the Southwest their home. In 1887 the railroad brought in 120,000 Anglo settlers to Southern California when the total population was only 12,000 for all Mexicans (Moore and Pachon 1984, 23). The early families of these Mexican populations slowly lost power and social status. To Anglos they became socially undistinguishable from the Mexicans who began arriving in great numbers after the turn of the century.

It is important to remember that the historic connection of the Southwest and Mexico continues to be prominent. Spanish is still spoken in much of the area, the geographic proximity makes travel back and forth to Mexico easy, and many of the border towns became truly a part of both cultures. The names for Calexico (California-Mexico) and Mexicali (Mexico-California), for example, were derivatives of the frontier and binational status along the California Mexican border.

Small Mexican settlements developed throughout the Southwest and became the basis for the onslaught of Mexican immigration that was to begin in the early 1900s. The early settlements, however, had been closely tied to specific regions in Mexico. In California, for example, the regional ties between Baja California and Alta California during Spanish and Mexican periods provided traditional patterns of movement for families migrating into the United States. These regional ties helped people maintain affiliation with hometowns and kin in the south. By the 1900s, colonies of Mexicans from specific regions of Mexico had established themselves in southwestern towns and cities, providing links to hometowns and the country of origin. Many of these settlements were agricultural camps, others the result of mining, and many Mexicans began moving to the growing cities of the West.

Mexican immigration has been the result, as in other Hispanic immigration and settlement, of the ongoing

economic and political relationship of the home country with the United States. The concurrent conditions of unemployment and poverty in Mexico coupled with the demand for wage labor in the United States and the history of the Spanish-Mexican Southwest influenced the massive and continuous movement of people between the two countries. The development of Mexican railroads, financed and controlled by American capitalists in the early 1900s, provided access to raw resources and human labor (Bernstein 1964). The railroads made labor accessible to every major economic center in the United States. Mexican labor was contracted for work in the Southwest and later in the industrial middle-eastern states.

The onslaught of the Mexican Revolution, a result of the tyrannical control of Porfirio Díaz uprooted and literally opened the doors for mass migration from the previously landlocked peasantry. Díaz, who was dictator of Mexico from 1887 to 1911, ruled Mexico with an iron hand. He took millions of acres from the Mexican campesino and fostered a laissez-faire development program that favored foreign interests in the Republic. Díaz gave up huge land grants to foreign capitalists under the rubric of development. Many of these schemes were in the mining industry. One of his most amazing land grants was to an American company that went by the name of the International Company of Mexico in Baja California that contained some 18 million acres (28,000 square miles) (Alvarez 1987a). The confinement and destitution of the major Mexican population, together with continued land take-over led to civil disorder and, finally, the Mexican Revolution of 1911. Many people fled Mexico at this time, many with hopes of returning.

At the end of the revolution, the migration to the United States did not abate, and through 1930 continued in a steady stream, with only brief stoppage during the First World War. In 1930 the Great Depression in the United States caused economic upheaval and the Mexican became a threat to the nation's unemployed and was displaced by Anglo Dust Bowl migrants. Mexicans became the scapegoats for the economic crisis in America. Then President Hoover initiated a repatriation program aimed at returning the Mexican-origin population to Mexico (Hoffman 1974). The result was the deportation of almost one half million Mexicans and Mexican Americans to Mexico. Much of this was voluntary, but social pressures and the country's mood influenced the return of many Mexican Americans even some who had been born United States citizens. The 1940s reversed this pattern and the Second World War provided new opportunities for Mexican Americans in the United States. This period was characterized by a move out of agriculture, railroad work and

mining. Significantly, 300,000 to 500,000 Mexican American men served in the United States Armed forces during the War (Alvarez and Bean 1976). This was also a period in which the majority of Mexican people made a shift from a basic rural to an urban existence. In 1950 about 25% of Mexican Americans were rural, by 1970 this population constituted 15%. In some areas 90% of the Mexican population is urban.

What has occurred is a slow movement into the middle class for many Mexican Americans. Even though immigrant Mexicans have continued to be primarily unskilled, there has been a steady incorporation of Mexican Americans into the primary labor market of the United States (Portes 1981). Immigrants and undocumented Mexicans continue to be at the bottom strata of the labor market filling non-skilled jobs primarily in the service sectors. However, Mexican Americans now represent three and four generations in the country, many are United States born citizens. This residential longevity has provided for a basic adaptation and slow movement into the main stream of American society.

The 1950s through the present has seen the continued movement of Mexicans into the United States. Much of the migration has been the result of voluntary immigration by Mexicans who come in search of better jobs that will supplement their families and kin in home areas, others arrive with hopes of settlement (Chavez 1991). United States programs have also influenced the migration. For example, the Bracero Program, a labor contract program for agricultural workers in the United States, brought hundreds of thousands of Mexicans into the Southwest in the early 1960s (Galarza 1965). Many Mexicans returned to Mexico when the program was ended, but many "braceros" had made their home in the United States. This period (the 1960s) also saw the beginnings of real political involvement (Garcia 1989). Mexican Americans became involved in the Chicano Movement and in politics in general. Ethnic identity became an important aspect of the Mexican American/Chicano and brought visibility to the population as a national minority. It was no longer perceived as an isolated population of the Southwest but recognized as the largest growing minority in the United States.

This brief outline provides some idea of the complexity of the immigration and origin of the Mexican American population in the United States. It is important however to point out the major differences of the Mexican immigration from other Hispanic groups to help understand how these processes have influenced family patterns of socialization and change among Mexicans. In the first place it is easy for Mexicans to get to the major cities of the United States. All are

accessible by inexpensive travel (car, bus and railroad) in addition to air travel. Mexicans and Mexican Americans often return to Mexico, to visit relatives, and enjoy cultural and social events not available in the United States. These and other factors have had an impact on the development and change of the family and its institutions among Mexican Americans (Alvarez 1987a).

Mexican traditions, including the family, have survived more widely among Mexican Americans because of the historic isolation of the southwestern settlements and the geographic proximity to Mexico. The earliest of settlements as well as newcomer *colonias* (settlements) are rejuvenated by the continuing migration and the easy access to the border and the home regions of early pioneers. Furthermore the residential segregation of Mexican communities and neighborhoods has fostered strong ethnic ties and boundaries to the greater society. These factors along with racial conflict and discrimination towards Mexicans have sustained reasons for a fierce pride and commitment to socio-cultural institutions, which have in many ways become cultural symbols among Mexican Americans.

The family continues to be held as a particularly important institution among Mexican Americans. But family and familism is also a source of stress and conflict. Although the extended family is instrumental in socialization, especially in early migrant settlement, it is also seen as creating inner barriers to adaptation to the outside world. The concept that family is all important and that the individual should sacrifice for the good of the family has its costs, especially if individuals forego immediate opportunities that may aid in long term adaptation. Education is one example. Among migrant farm labor families, the economic necessity of having all family members participating and contributing to the family helped lead to one of the worst dropout rates for Hispanics in the country. Among second- and third-generation Mexican Americans, the traditional family values can be sources of stress in that they are not congruent with modern lifestyles. However, the values of *la familia* are still adhered to by many, albeit only ideologically.

However, as with other groups of Hispanics, the family has played an instrumental role in the early adaptation and settlement of Mexicans to the United States. Among Mexican and Mexican Americans, the concept of the family is rooted in Mexico's agrarian past. This concept was emphasized first by the severance of the original native Mexican population from political and economic standing, then with the continuing entrance of rural immigrants from across the border. Once pioneer migrants settled in the United States, loved ones were brought north beginning a

migration stream that included whole branches of families, representing the towns and regions to which they were connected. It is not uncommon for migrations between specific Mexican and United States regions to have three and four generations of continual back and forth flow, with established United States branches that receive and aid newcomers from Mexico (Mines 1984; Alvarez 1987a).

Familism is perhaps the single most consistent aspect of Mexican-American culture noted in the literature. The strong sentiment towards family, family cohesiveness and incorporation of the individual into family membership provided a base for settlement in the form of community for people in the United States. Migrants faced with strange and often threatening social environments naturally sought each other out, and extended the relationships used in home regions. These were the institutions of ideology, *confianza*, *compadrazgo*, *parentesco* and marriage. In some United States areas migrants maintained strong regional ties through these institutions whereas people who had migrated out of the same home regions and remained in Mexico did not maintain the regional and familial ties. These last mentioned individuals were absorbed into new Mexican regions as Mexicanos, but in the United States the socio-economic environment provided a boundary maintenance and cohesiveness. People count on personal connections in the United States for housing, help in finding jobs and in adapting.

Although the nuclear family and household is preferred to the extended family household, connections to kin and the relations of the extended family continue to play important roles in the lives of Mexicans and Mexican Americans in the United States. There is a great range here, however, especially when one considers the generational differences of family branches in the United States. Recent and early immigrants rely on kin and the extended family for the majority of their social relationships, while individuals born as United States citizens have less extended kin relations (especially after the second generation). Education in the United States, geographic and social mobility, and economic stability have all contributed to a strengthening of the nuclear family and household for Mexican Americans. The nuclear family is in fact the desired type of family for both Mexican Americans and Mexicans.

The relationships of the extended family often take different forms for more acculturated individuals. Frequent visiting between immediate kin and special celebrations such as birthdays, baptisms, marriages and funerals serve to bring kin together and rekindle family ties, whereas among newer immigrant Mexicanos the

extended family is the center of social and kin relations. Marriage has continued to be primarily within the group, but a growing number of Mexican Americans have wed non-Mexican origin individuals. This is greatest among Chicanos in California, but it is not uncommon among all the United States born Latinos especially after the first generation.

Mexicans, as with other ethnic groups, first live in segregated neighborhoods and are schooled with peers of the same ethnic background. However, as families get better jobs the first priority is to move out of the ethnic neighborhoods, thus ensuring more exposure to American society for their offspring. Schooling and the continued upward mobility of families has resulted in the economic severance from the reciprocity and mutual help among kin, so needed in early settlement and adaptation. The reciprocal duties of kinship obligations through *compadrazgo*, for example, continue to be ideological values that are not expressed or carried out as in previous periods. But it must be remembered that the migration from Mexico continues to emphasize these values and the actual expression of *compadrazgo* and other kin institutions in social behavior.

*Compadrazgo* has been a very strong institution among Mexican Americans. The *compadre/comadre* relationship often stands above even sibling relationships. The asking of individuals to be *padrinos* in baptisms or marriage is a high honor that brings with it kin-like obligations that are often considered of special importance. *Compadres* are expected to provide help and advice in time of crisis, and in the migration process the *compadre/comadre* are often the central individuals who provide mutual help in the first stages of settlement. These are life-long relationships in which *compadres* provide help such as in needed information, access to jobs and other essential social-economic aspects. As with all Latinos and other family institutions, *compadrazgo* varies within the generations. As with marriage and familism in general among second and later United States born generations, *compadrazgo* has lost much of its reciprocal obligatory and mutual help functions, and when it is still practiced this is sometimes only symbolic and expressive of ethnic pride and identity.

Although the actual role of the male in the family has changed, the ideals of the patri-centered family and father as decision maker and authoritarian in the family is still expressed. Respect and deference to the male is expected ideal behavior. Children especially are expected to regard the father as the final voice and decision maker without exception. However, in actual behavior, fathers and mothers have taken on a more dualistic role in the management of the family, with the

mother having increasingly more responsibility, especially regarding economics.

Children have been exposed to American education and have had much more exposure to the outside world than parents. The natural outcome of this exposure and education is the acceptance of mainstream values and goals for normalized American lifestyles. This, as with other Hispanic groups, has been the root cause of conflict within the home and family. Mexican Americans, like other youth, now spend most of their time being schooled in an educational system that stresses the norms and values of American society. These norms are often in conflict with the expected behavior of the family and its institutions.

Women's roles, as with other Hispanics, have changed the most dramatically among Mexican Americans. As with the other Latino groups, it is the female entrance into the work force that has initiated the major changes in sex roles and division of labor. Mexican women have a long history of working in various industries in the United States. In Southern California during the Second World War, Mexican American women worked in the aviation industry on assembly lines and afterwards in the canneries throughout the state. Their history as migrant laborers throughout the United States is also well noted. The garment industry and other industries employed Mexican women as well.

Working women have gained more access to society in general and more of an egalitarian role in the household. As with other Hispanic groups, however, Mexican American families exhibit change in women's roles but not necessarily in those of men. Men generally continue not to participate in the sharing of household duties. It is the woman who has taken on some of the male responsibilities. Although these are generalizations about the changes taken place in sex roles, it is important to remember that women, regardless of the value and ideal of the father-centered household, in the past have had a strong input into decisions and acted as the final authority within the family and household. In fact, women are often seen as central individuals who are primary catalysts and authoritarian figures in family relationships.

As with other groups, Mexican Americans must be viewed in the range of their historical experiences and relationships in the United States. A look at any single region, town or neighborhood that is characterized as Mexican or Mexican American/Chicano will illustrate many inter- and cross-generational differences. Families of well adapted and acculturated individuals who hold strong Mexican familial patterns live side by side with families who have opted for more nuclear family patterns. In addition, bilingual families can be found in neighborhoods where monolingual Spanish and mono-

lingual English speakers are also residents. Some values are held on to more stringently than others, as for example the respect held for the elderly. This continues to be a strong value among Mexicans and Mexican Americans illustrated by the low rates of elderly in nursing or old age homes. They continue to be cared for in the homes of kin and children.

When compared to other Hispanic groups and to the United States population in general, Mexican Americans have the largest family size averaging almost 5 people per family. Puerto Ricans have almost 4 (3.67) people per family and Cubans 3.5. These averages illustrate a growing population and, when viewed in conjunction with the median age of Hispanics, indicate very high population projections for the future. It is estimated, for example, that by the turn of this century Hispanics will be the largest minority population in the United States. The Mexican origin population is currently 60% of this total.

The fact that the Mexican American and Hispanic population is growing and will have a greater impact on the United States in the future is obscured by the fact that Hispanics continue to be at the bottom rungs of the economic and social classes. Poverty among Mexican Americans, as with other groups, particularly Puerto Ricans, is a continuous problem that affects family lifestyles and well-being. A full quarter of Mexican Americans in the late 1970s were living in poverty. What is shocking is that it appears that, instead of decreasing, poverty is increasing. The Mexican American family will continue to be an important adaptive mechanism, utilizing the support institutions and evolving in ways that fit the socio-cultural milieu of the United States.

## Conclusion

There is no doubt that the Hispanic family, in the form of *la familia* and its supportive institutions of ideology, *compadrazgo*, *parentesco*, *confianza* and marriage illustrate a remarkable range of adaptive patterns in the United States. Hispanics have contoured the primary institutions of the family in providing mutual help and reciprocity especially in the first stages of immigration and settlement. As an adaptive mechanism the family is a flexible and important agent. As was seen in each of the Hispanic groups reported here, the family cannot be understood in isolation from its historic and current ties to countries of origin. In fact, the Hispanic family extends across geographic space and is an extension and connector to each country and region from which immigrants have come. It would be difficult indeed to find a Puerto Rican, Dominican, Mexican or Cuban family in the United States that did not have a counter-

part in the country of origin. The family as a social and cultural institution illustrates how people use and contour their institutions to new and changing situations. This change in the family will undoubtedly continue.

Significantly, however, the strength of family values as expressed in its supportive institutions is also a cause of stress and conflict within and between generations. Hispanics born in the United States, especially second and later generations have been raised with traditional values that often conflict with their lifestyles. The extended family, for example, as an institution of mutual help and reciprocity, is expressed as an ideal, but the nuclear family is commonly the desired type. Pressures from extended kin to conform to extended family needs, traditional sex role expectations and contradictions in the expression (perhaps as ethnic pride) of the importance of the family and its institutions among second-generation and later Hispanics are examples of potential conflict and individual stress. Similarly, patriarchy as a value and expression can be both a stressful and destructive concept when viewed in relation to the changing role of women among all the Hispanic groups and in expectations of youth. Unlike non-Hispanic groups who appear to have evolved and acculturated to the American family type, Hispanic values are continually being renewed through the contacts and communications with people from the country of origin, and, as in the case of the Mexican origin population, with the home region itself. This constant renewal strengthens cultural values and ideals and aids in the adaptive process as families begin their lives in the United States. On the other hand, the renewal can and often does create stress through the reinforcement of values that conflict with current life styles. The Hispanic family, however, is constantly changing and successive generations are slowly veering towards family types that meet the needs of urban, regional and long-term Hispanic populations in the United States. Such change is sure to find expression in the primary values of the family.



## Bibliography

Alvarez, Robert R., Jr.

- 1987a *Familia: Migration and Adaptation in Alta and Baja California 1850-1975*. Berkeley: U of California P.
- 1987b "A Profile of the Citizenship Process in the United States." *International Migration Review* 21.2:327-51.
- 1990 "Mexican Entrepreneurs and Markets in the City of Los Angeles: A Case of an Immigrant Enclave." *Urban Anthropology* 19.1-2:99-124.

- Alvarez, David, and Frank D. Bean
  - 1976 "The Mexican American Family." *Ethnic Families in America*. Eds Charles H. Mindel and Robert W. Habenstein. New York: Elsevier, pp 271-82.
- Baca-Zinn, Maxine
  - 1983 "Ongoing Questions in the Study of Chicano Families." Valdez et al, pp 135-46.
  - 1978 "Marital Roles and Ethnicity: Conceptual Revisions and New Research Dimensions." *Hispanic Report on Families and Youth. The National Coalition of Hispanic Mental Health and Human Services Organizations*. Washington, DC: Cossmho. 31-35.
- Berstein, Marvin O.
  - 1964 *The Mexican Mining Industry, 1890-1950*. New York: New York State U.
- Casal, Lourdes, and Andres R. Hernandez
  - 1980 "Cubans in the United States: A Survey of the Literature." *The Cuban Experience*. Ed Carlos E. Cortez. New York: Arno, pp 25-51.
- Chavez, Leo R.
  - 1991 "Outside the Imagined Community: Undocumented Settlers and Experiences of Incorporation." *American Ethnologist* 18.2:257-78.
  - 1988 "Settlers and Sojourners: The Case of Mexicans in the United States." *Human Organization* 47.2:95-108.
- Cross, Harry E., and James A. Sandos
  - 1981 *Across the Border. Rural Development in Mexico and Recent Migration to the United States*. Institute of Governmental Studies. Berkeley: U of California.
- Fitzpatrick, Joseph P.
  - 1987 *Puerto Rican Americans. The Meaning of Migration to the Mainland*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall. 2nd ed.
- Gallagher, P.
  - 1980 *The Cuban Exile*. New York: Academic.
- Galarza, Ernesto
  - 1965 *Merchants of Labor: The Mexican Bracero Story*. San Jose, CA: Rosicrucian.
- Garcia, Mario T.
  - 1989 *Mexican Americans*. New Haven: Yale UP.
- Georges, Eugenia
  - 1990 *The Making of a Transnational Community. Migration, Development and Cultural Change in the Dominican Republic*. New York: Columbia UP.
- Grebler, Leo, Joan Moore, and R. Guzman
  - 1970 *The Mexican American People. The Nation's Second Largest Minority*. New York: Free Press.
- Harvard University
  - 1980 *Harvard Encyclopedia of American Ethnic Groups*. Cambridge: Harvard UP.
- Hendricks, Glenn
  - 1974 *The Dominican Diaspora*. New York: Teachers College of Columbia U.
- History Task Force, Centro de Estudios Puertorriqueños
  - 1979 *Labor Migration Under Capitalism. The Puerto Rican Experience*. New York: Monthly Review.
- Hoffman, Abraham
  - 1974 *Unwanted Mexican Americans in the Great Depression*. Tucson: U of Arizona P.

- Llanes, Jose  
1982 *Cuban Americans. Masters of Survival*. Boston: Abt Books.
- Mines, Richard  
1981 *Developing a Community Tradition of Migration: A Field Study of Rural Zacatecas*. Monograph No. 3. San Diego: Center for U. S.-Mexican Studies, U of California.
- Moore, Joan, and Harry Pachon  
1985 *Hispanics in the United States*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Morales, Julio  
1986 *Puerto Rican Poverty and Migration: We Just Had To Try Elsewhere*. New York: Praeger.
- Pelto, Pertti J., Maria Roman, and Nelson Liriano  
1982 "Family Structures in an Urban Puerto Rican Community." *Urban Anthropology* 7.1:39-58.
- Portes, Alejandro  
1969 "Dilemmas of a Golden Exile: Integration of Cuban Refugee Families in Milwaukee." *American Sociological Review* 34:505-18.
- Portes, Alejandro, and Robert L. Bach  
1985 *Latin Journey. Cuban and Mexican Immigrants in the United States*. Berkeley: U of California P.
- Richmond, Marie L.  
1974 *Immigrant Adaptation and Family Structure Among Cubans in Miami*. M.A. Thesis. Florida State U.
- Queralt, Magaly  
1984 "Understanding Cuban Immigrants: A Cultural Perspective." *Social Work* 29:115-21.
- Rodriguez, Clara  
1989 *Born in the U. S. A.* Boston: Unwin Hyman.
- Rogler, Lloyd H., and Rosemary Santana Cooney  
1984 *Puerto Rican Families in New York City. Intergenerational Processes*. Maplewood, NJ: Waterfront
- Rothman, Jack Larry Gant, and Stephen A. Hnat  
1985 "Mexican American Family Culture." *Social Science Review* 59:197-215.
- Steward, Julian  
1956 *The People of Puerto Rico*. Urbana: U of Illinois P.
- Suarez-Orozco, Marcel  
1989 *Central American Refugees and U. S. High Schools*. Stanford: Stanford UP.
- Valdez, Arnando, Albert Cancillo and Tomás Almaquer  
1983 *The State of Chicano Research in Family, Labor and Migration*. Stanford: Center for Chicano Research.
- Vélez-Ibáñez, Carlos  
1990 *Plural Strategies of Survival and Cultural Formation in U. S. Mexican Households in a Region of Dynamic Transformation: The U. S. Mexico Borderlands*. Manuscript prepared for the Wenner Gren Panel on Industrial Disorders in Society, 1990.
- Wenk, Michael G.  
1968 "Adjustment and Assimilation: The Cuban Refugee Experience." *International Migration Review* 3:38-49.
- Whiteford, Linda  
1979 "The Borderland as an Extended Community." *Migration Across Frontiers: Mexico and the United States*. Eds Fernando Camara and Robert Van Kemper. Latin American Anthropology Group. Institute for Meso-American Studies. Albany: State U of New York.
- Ybarra, Lea  
1983 "Empirical and Theoretical Developments in Studies of the Chicano Family." Valdez et al. Stanford: Stanford Center for Chicano Research, pp 91-110.
- Zavella, Patricia  
1987 *Women's Work and Chicano Families. Cannery Workers of the Santa Clara Valley*. Ithaca: Cornell UP.
- Zaragoza, Alex  
1983 "The Conceptualization of the History of the Chicano Family". Valdez et al, pp 111-38.