Introduction

On a weekday evening in November 1986, I attended a public forum held at a community center where I'd once worked. Over three hundred people, adults and children, had crammed into the multipurpose room to learn about the then–recently passed Immigration Reform and Control Act. The audience sat on folding chairs or stood in the aisles and back corridors, listening attentively and murmuring among themselves the questions for which they had come seeking answers. Would they qualify for *la amnistía,* the much-publicized but as yet poorly understood amnesty-legalization program, and could they confidently expect to get their "papers" through this program? What types of documents would they need to prove their history of undocumented residence and work in the United States, and how should they go about gathering them? What were the consequences if they did not meet the criteria for legalization? Or worse, what if submitted applications were rejected by the Immigration and Naturalization Service? Would they or their family members then face deportation? Would employer sanctions leave them jobless and without an income?

On that evening I accepted an invitation to join a small, grass-roots community group that was forming to deal with these questions, and during the next year and a half I immersed myself, as an activist and as a researcher, into family and community life in this barrio. The women, men, and children who came to the multipurpose room that November evening expressed the aspirations and anxieties shared by many other Mexican immigrants who, without the benefit of legal status, had set down roots in other communities in California and elsewhere in the United States. I conducted this study because I wanted to find out why

more women and entire families were participating in undocumented migration and settlement, and because I wanted to understand the relationship between gender relations and these processes. So I too entered the picture with a series of questions. How does gender organize and shape this migration? What are the implications for gender relations among these newcomers to U.S. society? And finally, what are the defining features of settlement, and how do women help to establish family and community life in the United States? To answer these questions, I spent a year and a half conducting semistructured interviews, observing and participating with Mexican immigrants in many social settings. The majority of these people were undocumented at the time of the study, although many of them did eventually obtain legal status.

The Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 (IRCA) had a more profound impact on undocumented immigrants than any other piece of legislation ever passed in the United States. For those who qualified for legalization, it presented the overwhelming "paper chase" task of securing obscure pieces of evidence (receipts of utilities and rent payment from years before, notarized letters, etc.), and then the risk of presenting these documents to the authorities, from whom the immigrants had always had to hide all indicators of "illegal" status. For those ineligible for legalization, it required the development of innovative responses to new employment and survival problems. I assisted in both endeavors, and my field research dovetailed with community work, political activism, and personal assistance. IRCA, then, affected both undocumented immigrants and the way I conducted the study. Furthermore, I believe this legislation represented a direct reaction to the phenomenon this study focuses on—undocumented immigrant settlement.

While the media portrayed IRCA as a liberal and generous immigration law because of legalization provisions, the primary impulse behind it was immigration restriction.[1] Each of the various bills leading to IRCA featured as the centerpiece employer sanctions—that is, penalties for employers who knowingly hire unauthorized immigrant workers—and as such, these legislative initiatives reflected the xenophobia of the 1970s and the 1980s. During the recession of the early 1980s, politicians and newspaper editorials commonly scapegoated immigrants for causing a lagging economy. Restrictionist lobby groups achieved national prominence, while their leaders warned that the new immigrants and refugees were causing a host of domestic social problems ranging from high taxes and crime to California's traffic jams and air-pollution problems. Even language became a tar-

get of attack, as the well-funded national organization U.S. English campaigned against the implementation of bilingual education programs and election ballots. Outside the law, the new nativism assumed more violent, vitriolic, and blatantly racist manifestations.

IRCA codified this xenophobia. The xenophobia of this period, however, represented less a response to undocumented migration per se than to undocumented immigrant settlement. While many U.S. citizens welcomed the labor services performed by immigrants, they remained more apprehensive about the permanent incorporation of Asian and Latin American immigrants and refugees in the United States. Claims of an impending white baby "birth dearth," of the "minoritization," "Mexicanization," or *reconquista* (reconquest) of California, sometimes animated this discourse. Meanwhile, in an attempt to quell this resurgent xenophobia, liberal scholars and journalists concentrating on the subject of immigration often underlined the large proportion of sojourners among the Mexican immigrant population. "They aren't really staying," they seemed to argue, but in fact, many indicators pointed to the contrary.

The xenophobic scapegoating which ushered in the new immigration legislation targeted settled immigrants and centered around three claims. First, immigrants were blamed for stealing the jobs of U.S. citizens and depressing wage levels. These allegations of job competition intensified during the recession of the early 1980s, when plant closures, unemployment, and the declining number of manufacturing jobs were foremost in the public's eye, and they again surfaced with the severe recession and economic restructuring processes of the early 1990s. Second, immigrants were accused of draining the U.S. economy through their consumption of social services. The accusations included claims that immigrants come to the United States to obtain welfare payments, that they do not pay taxes, and that their children and families constitute a growing underclass, as they drain medical and educational resources in the United States. Finally, immigration restrictionists mimicked the allegations voiced by their predecessors about Southern and Eastern European immigrants in the early twentieth century, arguing that the new immigrants from Asia and Latin America were after all "too different," that they were ultimately unassimilable. Accordingly, further immigration signaled, as Senator Alan K. Simpson put it, the cultural and linguistic "Quebec-ization" of the United States. This investigation examines the group most visibly singled out by these attacks: Mexican undocumented immigrants.

THE SETTING

I conducted this study in an unincorporated area of what I shall call Oakview, a city that lies along a metropolitan corridor in the San Francisco Bay area, and when I began my fieldwork, I returned to a place that was at once familiar and new to me. I grew up ten minutes from the Oakview barrio, and as a child I regularly visited family friends there with my parents—who are immigrants from, respectively, Chile and France—and my brother. After graduating from college I worked in a nonprofit immigration legal-services agency and then in a bilingual-education program in the Oakview barrio.

Since the mid-1960s, this area, like others in California, has become transformed into what is primarily a Mexican immigrant barrio. The most graphic indicator of the recency with which Mexican immigrant families have settled in Oakview comes from surveys conducted in the three area elementary schools. As recently as 1964, Spanish-surnamed students accounted for only 15 percent of the student body, but by 1987 they made up 81 percent of local public elementary school children.[2]

Central Avenue, a half-mile strip lined with commercial establishments, serves as the barrio's main artery. It is filled with grocery stores stocked with tortillas and various Mexican products, as well as *carnicerías* (butcher shops), *panaderías* (Mexican bakeries), "Mexicatessens," jewelry and bridal-gown shops, bars, barber shops, beauty salons, record and tape stores, repair shops, and notary-public offices. In most of these establishments, transactions regularly occur in Spanish. As in many poor neighborhoods, banks and major supermarket chains are conspicuously absent along the avenue. A community center well decorated with graffiti, a nonprofit medical clinic and senior center, an elementary school, check-cashing centers, taco-vending trucks, and a Catholic church also populate the avenue, and by day, women, men, and children walk along the sidewalks that flank the four-lane thoroughfare. At night the sidewalks are vacant, except for a three-block stretch of bars where mostly men, occasionally accompanied by strolling mariachis, congregate.

The Oakview barrio remains one of the poorest areas in an otherwise affluent county, posing a stark contrast to surrounding municipalities. Well-established physical boundaries once outlined the barrio, but by the late 1980s, the perimeters around the Mexican immigrant neighborhood had become increasingly elastic as residents stretched outward to nearby areas, renting homes and apartments along the highway off-ramps and

across the railroad tracks and wide avenues that had once served as de facto residential enclosures. High rents, crowding, and problems associated with drugs and crime encouraged some Mexican immigrant families to move away from the barrio to nearby neighborhoods. While nearly all of the people in this study lived within the barrio, four families had moved from these confines to nearby neighborhoods: one couple and their child lived rent free in a garage of an estate home; another family rented a house from kin in a predominantly African American neighborhood; and two families had managed to purchase homes in predominantly Anglo neighborhoods. These families still came to the barrio to worship, shop, cash checks, and visit kin. (In Chapter 3, I present a more extensive description of the Oakview barrio and its evolution.)

The Oakview barrio provides an advantageous research site for examining processes of settlement because it is a relatively nascent yet thriving Mexican immigrant community. Although crews of Mexican railroad workers and cannery workers labored in the Oakview area in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, it was not they who proved to be the pioneers of the contemporary immigrant community, but rather the Mexican immigrants who began arriving in the 1950s and who established a more forceful presence by the 1960s. As an immigrant community in formation, the Oakview barrio provides an ideal vantage point for developing an understanding of the ongoing processes of gender as they relate to migration and settlement.

THE STUDY PARTICIPANTS

Most of the families who participated in this study lived in residences near Central Avenue, renting modest-sized, unattached, single-level houses or units located in small apartment buildings. The 1990 census counted nearly four thousand household units and fourteen thousand people, the majority of them "Mexican-origin," in this one-square-mile unincorporated area of Oakview.[3] The many one-level houses and duplexes, punctuated by occasional four-story apartment buildings, together with the lack of sidewalks on some streets, contribute to the barrio's distinctively suburban and spread-out spatial quality, one very unlike the densely packed urban neighborhoods typical in eastern cities or in nearby San Francisco. The buildings are fairly new, post–World War II stucco constructions, and although residents often grow vegetables and brightly colored flowers in their yards, the structures already show signs

of deterioration, and landlords are not always quick to replace malfunctioning plumbing fixtures and heaters. Given the high monthly rents—one-bedroom apartments cost five hundred to seven hundred dollars—many of the families live in small, crowded dwellings. A family of six living in a one-bedroom apartment is not uncommon.

Still, many of these people consider themselves to be quite fortunate in their living arrangements, especially when they compare themselves with their more recently arrived, undocumented immigrant peers. While more-recent newcomers are forced to make do with sleeping niches on someone else's living-room sofa or in a garage, the people in this study had achieved a modicum of residential stability. Most of them lived in modified nuclear-family households, although it was not unusual for them to share *their* living space—generally for a fee—with kin or friends.

The achievement of residential stability reflects the fact that at the time of the study—1986 to 1988—all of the participants had lived in the U.S. for a minimum of three years. In soliciting participants for this study, I had determined three years of residence as a minimum indicating long-term settlement. Many of the respondents had been in the United States for much longer: the average number of years of U.S. settlement was nearly thirteen. All of these forty-four women and men form part of a much larger group of Mexican immigrants who are spending prolonged periods of time in the U.S., a group sometimes referred to as "permanent settlers." Table 1 lists the study participants' names (all pseudonyms), ages, current occupations, number of children, and years of residence in the U.S.

When I met them, most of these women and men were living and working in the U.S. without legal authorization. With the exception of four families who had achieved legal status after entering the country without official authorization, the respondents lacked "lawful permanent resident" status when this study was conducted.[4] These are some of the people commonly described, in popular vernacular, as "illegal aliens."

I recruited study participants by asking people I knew for names of others who might participate in the study. In spite of my use of this snowball technique, which often yields a homogenous group, the persons in this study represent a diverse group with respect to class, occupational background, and place of origin in Mexico. Their heterogeneous characteristics indicate the wide range of Mexican immigrants settling in the U.S. today, and so belie the stereotype that all undocumented immigrants from Mexico are poor, illiterate, landless peasants. Nearly two-thirds of the respondents had in fact worked as *campesinos* (peasants) in rural

places which share long traditions of U.S.-bound migration, in states such as Zacatecas, Michoacán, and Jalisco. This is no surprise; these Mexican regions are among the traditional sources for undocumented migrants bound for California (Dagodag, 1975).

A substantial concentration of the Mexican immigrants in the Oakview barrio hailed from a particular rural *municipio* (county area) in the state of Michoacán. The pioneer migrants who settled in Oakview during the 1950s and 1960s came principally from this region, and although the subsequent migration of their kin resulted in the numerical predominance of their *paisanos*, they did not dominate local social affairs when I conducted the research. In fact, people from this area sometimes lied about their place of birth, as they were harshly stigmatized by other, more recently arrived Mexican immigrants, who tended to view them as backward hillbillies prone to committing acts of violence.

During the late 1970s and the 1980s, U.S.-bound undocumented migrants came from more diverse points of origin in Mexico, increasingly from cities (Cornelius, 1992). Some of the study's participants who had migrated during the 1970s and 1980s hailed from Mexico's large urban centers—Guadalajara, Puebla, and the Federal District's sprawling megalopolis—where they had last worked as small entrepreneurs, secretaries, bus drivers, and factory workers. During the 1980s, as Mexico's economic crisis worsened, Mexican undocumented immigrants were more likely than before to come from professional middle-class sectors located in Mexico's largest cities. Since I conducted the study in the late 1980s, and because I designed it in order to examine the experiences of long-term settlers, only a few of the subjects came from middle-class backgrounds.

Most of the study participants had first migrated in their twenties and thirties, and as the chart listing the study participants shows, at the time of the research, many were middle-aged. To my knowledge, all of them were heterosexual, although several spoke of gay family members. The majority were married or living in consensual unions, and were parents of children who had attended or were attending U.S. schools. The respondents' own levels of education varied: many of them had attended three to six years of elementary school, but two men held teaching credentials in Mexico, and one man and one woman had received enough education or on-the-job training to work as accountants. Several of the respondents had received less than one year of formal schooling, but the finesse with which they maneuvered their daily activities rarely betrayed their lack of formal education.

These men and women displayed varying degrees of English proficiency, ranging from no facility to fairly sophisticated colloquial usage. They generally preferred Spanish to negotiate commercial and bureaucratic transactions and to communicate with kin, friends, and neighbors; all of my discussions and interviews with them occurred in Spanish. Most of them held jobs that required minimal English-language skills. Although four of the families had purchased homes in Oakview, many of the respondents could be accurately described as "working poor," struggling each month to scrape together enough cash to pay rent, utilities, and other bills.

METHODS

Over the course of eighteen months, forty-four women and men in twenty-six families allowed me to gather data using participant-observation methods, in-depth tape-recorded interviews, and informal conversations that occurred during my visits to their homes and other sites of shared activities. A tape-recorded group interview with Latina immigrant women participating in a co-dependency group, and my ongoing interactions with the larger immigrant community in the Oakview barrio, also inform this study. These qualitative methods allowed me to assess complex social dynamics related to migration and settlement as they occur in family and community groups.

I used chain or snowball referrals to select a nonrandom sample of forty-four study participants.[5] The majority of these people were undocumented when they entered the U.S., but many of them became successful applicants for legalization. As I was primarily interested in long-term residents, as opposed to sojourner migrants, I recruited study participants who had resided in the U.S. for a minimum of three years. Other studies of Mexican immigrants (Massey et al., 1987; Chavez et al., 1989) also use the three-year-residency criterion as an indicator of long-term settlement.

All of my field interactions and interviews occurred in Spanish. I learned Spanish from my mother, but that language was prohibited when I began first grade in Catholic school, and like many second-generation children, I rejected Spanish as a second-class language. I made subsequent efforts to improve my fluency, and although my Spanish isn't perfect, it served me well enough in the field.

In addition to the interviews, I engaged in participant observation in homes, public meetings, and offices, and at social events. Over the course

of eighteen months, I regularly visited most of the twenty-six families in their homes. With some families, this took the form of an informal afternoon or evening visit on a biweekly or, for some periods, a weekly basis, while with other families, I visited as few as three times. During these visits, I observed daily family interactions and conflicts, participating in meals and meal preparation, viewing television and videos, and talking with my informants. I was particularly interested in observing the household division of labor. While my presence in people's homes modified behavior, direct observation yields a more accurate portrayal of peoples' lives than do methods of self-report. As Hochschild (1989) found in a study of working parents, what women and men *say* about the household division of labor or decision making, for example, may be quite different from what they actually *do*.

In addition to these many informal conversations, I tape-recorded and fully transcribed interviews with thirty-eight of the forty-four study participants. The interviews consisted of open-ended questions about life history, with specific questions regarding family and community relations in the migration and settlement process. In some instances, by the time I actually did an interview, I knew elements of the respondent's biography well enough to interject reminders about omissions, or to note discrepancies with what the respondent had previously related. Whenever possible, I interviewed husbands and wives separately. Some respondents, older women in particular, were reluctant to be tape-recorded, and in those cases, I rapidly wrote notes during the interviews, trying to capture as many verbatim quotes as possible. Although all respondents initially agreed to an interview, three men avoided the interview, stating that they were too busy with work schedules, or simply "forgetting" our appointments. Perhaps they distrusted me and my intentions, either because of their legal status or because I bonded too closely with their wives.

The ways that I went about soliciting research subjects varied, but in all cases, either I had an introduction or I waited until some relationship had been established before asking people to serve as participants in the study. I told everyone that I was a student gathering information for a research project, and through community work, I established a visible profile throughout the barrio and gained the acquaintance and, I think, the trust of a wide number of people. Although I was living apart from my husband in order to conduct the study—an arrangement viewed disapprovingly or with pity by many of the study participants—the fact that I was living with my parents minimized the gravity of this error. I sometimes brought my mother to informal gatherings in the park, baby

showers, and Mass, and I recruited her to help with child care for several public forums. People saw me, to some extent, in the context of my own family relations. Finally, the timing of my project also assisted my research, as the new immigration legislation effectively made undocumented immigrants "come out," and I became a community activist and personal helper. On a typical day, I drove people to a collections agency or a doctor appointment, visited another family in the afternoon, and attended an evening meeting. Although I explained to those who asked that I studied sociology, some people thought I was studying social work—a likely conclusion, since I seemed to be practicing it.

All of the study participants verbally consented to serve as "human subjects," but before they did so, many of them interviewed me about my background and beliefs. I recall most vividly one man, the father of several adolescent girls, asking me about my religious commitments and my premarital sexual practices. I tried to answer vaguely, but I failed that quiz miserably. Still, he and his wife allowed me to interview them and regularly visit at their household.

As I did community work and personal favors, some people thanked me for my assistance. One woman compared me with a public-health nurse she had known, and another referred to me as a "saint" for helping poor people. Although initially flattered, I grew uncomfortable with these rituals of deference. The results of my help were minimal, and although it seemed cold and calculated of me to do so, I tried to remind people that they were helping me with my project too. Some of the most revealing information I collected was disclosed to me in the context of being a friend, as people enmeshed in explosive family conflicts or problematic decisions often produced unedited but reflective outpourings of emotions and intimate details of their lives. In these instances, I generally did not remind research participants that they were producing "data," but instead reciprocated as an empathetic friend.[6]

WHY AN ETHNOGRAPHY OF SETTLEMENT?

Some readers may wonder why we need an ethnography of settlement. Settlement is not simply the result of an individual deciding to stay permanently in the United States. Even if immigrants are committed to remaining in the U.S., unanticipated events in Mexico—family illness, death of a parent, or the inheritance of property—can quickly sidetrack such plans. For this reason, a research strategy based on simply asking respondents about their settlement intentions has serious limitations.

Immigrants may live and work for many years in the United States while simultaneously keeping alive the dream to return and buy a ranch or a small business in Mexico. Many do return, but as time passes, immigrant women and men become more integrated into economic, social, and cultural life in the United States. While being undocumented may retard acquisition of these ties, undocumented immigrants also make these important connections (Massey et al., 1987). They develop ties to jobs, financial institutions, churches, schools, and to friends and neighbors, and these ties anchor many of them to the U.S.

The ethnographic material assembled in chapter 6, for example, illustrates features of undocumented immigrants' lives that are not easily captured through interview or survey methods. I looked at undocumented immigrants' everyday activities to see how these mundane practices actively construct settlement—an outcome that has important macro-level implications. Settlement, as observers have noted, is an ongoing process that unfolds over time, and ethnographic methods are uniquely suited to capture what people actually do and how this changes over time. Unlike large-scale surveys based on probability samples, intensive participant observation and interviews conducted in an area like Oakview enable one to gain insights into the everyday activities, meanings, and motives of immigrant women and men, so that knowledge is derived from the perspectives of the principal actors as well as established theory.

The goal of this study is not to arrive at a set of universal generalizations, predictions, or propositions regarding immigration, but rather to elucidate the dynamics of a neglected analytic category—gender—in processes of immigration and settlement. The study's findings and analyses complement and enhance those based on survey and demographic research.

ORGANIZATION OF THE BOOK

This study analyzes how the intersection of micro and macro forces shapes the migration and settlement of Mexican undocumented immigrant women and men in a northern California community. Chapter 1 begins by situating the study in the literature from various disciplines, drawing from theories about migration and adaptation, feminist scholarship on gender and inequality, and analyses of settlement.

Chapter 2 provides a brief historical overview and highlights legal and economic arrangements that have set the structural parameters and pressures for the permanent integration of Mexican immigrant families in the

United States. Transformations in political economy set the stage, but do not write the script, for U.S.-bound migration and settlement. Immigrants respond to opportunities created by macro-level forces, but they do so in a social context, and it is the explication of this social context that Chapter 4 addresses.

Chapter 3 introduces in greater depth the people involved in the study, and describes the evolution of the Oakview barrio in the San Francisco Bay area. This chapter also includes biographical sketches of people in five families, and introduces a typology I use to classify migration patterns: family stage migration, where husbands precede the migration of their wives and children; family unit migration, where intact nuclear families migrate together; and independent migration, where unmarried men and women migrate independently.

Chapter 4 focuses on how gender relations in families and social networks shape diverse migration patterns for women and men. While larger forces provide pressures, resources, and opportunities, it is patriarchal gender relations in family and community, together with generation, class, and culture, that determine how those pressures and opportunities lead to particular patterns of migration and settlement. Patriarchal gender relations mediate between broad economic and political factors and actual patterns of migration.

Chapter 5 examines how immigrant women and men in the U.S. reconstitute gender relations. Immigration and resettlement patterns tend to weaken familial patriarchy, as indicated by changes in the gender division of household labor, decision-making power within the family, and women's and men's spatial mobility. While there is a general trend toward the establishment of more gender-egalitarian familial relations, this occurs in a heterogeneous fashion that varies according to the three patterns of migration.

The new gender arrangements forged in these families motivate immigrant women to prolong settlement. Chapter 6 examines how women engage in activities—employment, securing public and private forms of assistance for their families, and building a social nexus of community—that ultimately serve to consolidate family settlement. Through participation in these activities, undocumented immigrant women strengthen their own position in the family, further deepening their commitment to settlement. While Mexican men often play an important part in initiating migration, women play an important part in solidifying settlement. The concluding chapter returns to the initial research questions and suggests the broader implications of the study.

TABLE OF STUDY PARTICIPANTS

I. Family Stage Migration

	Year of Departure[1]	*Years in U.S.*	*Age*	*Current Occupation*	*Number of Children*
Marcelino Ávila	1957	30	40s	janitor	6
Dolores Ávila	1962	25	50s	laundry worker	
Arturo Barrios	1952	37	60	janitor	7
Isabel Barrios	1964	23	50s	apartment manager	
Raymundo Carbajal	1954	33	50s	janitor/gardener	7
Rebecca Carbajal	1970	17	50s	cafeteria cook	
Manuel Galván	1950	37	70s	retired cook	0
Sidra Galván	1957	30	70s	retired laundry worker	
Pedro Morales (ill)	1964	(23)	60	disabled cook	8
Griselia Morales	1976	11	50s	unemployed	
Rubén Sánchez	1952	35	50s	painter	15
Isa Sánchez (in Mexico)	1983	(1)	—		
Luis Bonilla	1973	14	50	gardener	7
Tola Bonilla	1975	12	40s	domestic worker	
Gerardo Duarte (in Mexico)	1977	—	—	—	4
Delia Duarte	1981	6	30s	domestic worker	
Alberto Gándara	1983	4	30s	warehouse employee	3
María Gándara	1984	3	30s	homemaker/occasional domestic worker	
Eudoro Ibarra	1980	7	40s	auto dismantler	7
Teresa Ibarra	1981	6	30s	domestic worker	
Patricio Macías	1978	9	30s	cook and janitor	3
Blanca Macías	1979	8	30s	homemaker, disabled	
Héctor Valenzuela	1966	21	40s	nursery worker, disabled	9
M. Teresa Valenzuela (deceased)	1974	—	—	—	

TABLE (continued)

II. Family Unit Migration

	Year of Departure[1]	*Years in U.S.*	*Age*	*Current Occupation*	*Number of Children*
Ignacio Cerritos	1980	7	30s	baker	6
Jovita Cerritos			30s	baker/domestic worker	
Roberto Melchor	1979	8	30s	box loader	2
Francisca Melchor			30s	plastics polisher	
Ausencio Mendoza	1982	5	40s	self-employed vendor	6
María Mendoza			30s	domestic worker	
Jesús Oseguera (deceased)	1978	9	—	—	
Filomina Oseguera			60s	in-home child care	5
Felipe Palacios	1979	8	30s	dishwasher	2
Trinidad Ochoa			30s	homemaker	(+3)
Jorge Ramírez	1976	11	30s	welder	3
Josefa Ramírez			20s	homemaker	

TABLE (continued)

III. Independent Migration (single at time of migration)

	Year of Departure[1]	*Years in U.S.*	*Age*	*Current Occupation*	*Number of Children*
María del Carmen Ochoa single	1979	8	50s	domestic worker/ factory assembler	0
Anabel Mesa Castrillo living w/R. Castrillo (R)[2]	1981	6	20s	homemaker/ occasional domestic worker	1
Marisela Ramírez de Hernández married to C. Hernández (R)	1981	6	20s	homemaker/occasional baby-sitter	3
Milagros Aguilar widowed	1978	9	70	home care for elderly	9
Mariana Viñas-Valenzuela (stepmother of 9) married to H. Valenzuela (R)	1977	10	30s	hospital cleaner	0
Margarita Cervantes married to L. Cervantes	1975	12	30s	self-employed vendor	0
Rosario Quiñones married to E. Quiñones	1976	11	30s	domestic/laundry worker	3
María Alicia Navarro living with A. Sánchez	1984	3	30s	domestic worker	3

TABLE (continued)

The Men:

	Year of Departure[1]	*Years in U.S.*	*Age*	*Current Occupation*	*Number of Children*
Gerónimo López single	1979	8	20s	factory assembly	1
Reynaldo Castrillo living with A. Mesa Castrillo (R)	1971	16	30s	gardener	1
Carlos Hernández living with M. Ramírez de Hernández (R)	1979	8	30s	cement pourer	3
Pablo García single	1980	7	20s	gardener	0
Fidencio Flores living with L. Gonzalez		5	30s	dishwasher	2

1. Year of departure refers to date when noninterrupted stay in the U.S. began (excepting vacations and visits to Mexico). In most cases, this refers to the last year of departure from Mexico. Some of the respondents had departed for and arrived in the U.S. earlier, but had remained temporarily and returned to Mexico. For example, Eudoro and Teresa Ibarra had come to Oakview in 1969 and 1970, respectively, but had returned within a year or two, and did not migrate again until 1980 and 1981, respectively.

2. (R) indicates study participant.