

UC Irvine

UC Irvine Previously Published Works

Title

Settlers and Sojourners: The Case of Mexicans in the United States

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2186b46w>

Journal

Human Organization, 47(2)

Author

Chavez, L

Publication Date

1988-09-25

Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Peer reviewed

Settlers and Sojourners: The Case of Mexicans in the United States

LEO R. CHAVEZ

This work attempts to contribute to our understanding of the process of settlement by undocumented Mexican immigrants. The behavior of single migrants (including individuals who migrated without spouse or children) is compared to that of migrants accompanied by spouse and/or children in relation to a number of factors, including the outcome of migration experiences, variation in household composition over time, attitudes concerning residence preferences, and labor market participation.

The examination reveals observable differences in migration patterns and residence intentions. Single migrants are likely to be temporary workers in the U.S. labor market. They view their jobs as temporary and are likely to return to Mexico after a brief stay in the United States. They maintain strong social and economic relationships to their place of origin.

In contrast, undocumented immigrants living with their families in the U.S. are likely to view their job as relatively secure and desire to continue residing in the United States. For many undocumented, the formation of a family in the United States begins a process that leads to eventual settlement.

This work then focuses on the implications of undocumented immigrants residing on a long-term basis in the U.S. for public policy. Of special consideration are families which include both undocumented members and U.S. citizens, referred to here as "binational families." The presence of binational families complicates the issue of access to social services and society's definition of a "resident."

Key words: immigration, Mexican-Americans, undocumented immigrants, public policy

THIS PAPER EXAMINES recent empirical data collected from undocumented immigrants in San Diego, California. Its purpose is to: (a) explore the complexity of the undocumented population; (b) introduce the concept of the "binational family"; and (c) examine the implications of the long-term residence of undocumented immigrants in the United States.

There are two reasons for this examination. The first reason derives from a recognition of two competing views of Mexican undocumented migration to the United States. The "traditional view," that the vast majority of undocumented Mexicans are temporary migrants, has developed out of what has, until recently, been the typical pattern of undocumented migration: Mexicans migrating to work on farms and ranches in the United States and then returning to Mexico after a brief stay (Cardoso 1980). The prevalence of this pattern was substantiated by a study conducted in the late 1970s that found that for every 100 entries of undocumented Mexicans to the U.S. there were 92 "exits," either voluntary or at the hands of the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS)

(Garcia y Griego 1980). Such migrants are referred to as "cyclical migrants," "temporary migrants," and "target earners" (Portes and Bach 1985; Garcia y Griego 1980).

The "emerging view" recognizes that a small, but growing, proportion of undocumented Mexicans are residing on a more or less permanent basis in the United States; they are becoming "settlers" despite their immigration status (Massey 1985; Browning and Rodriguez 1982).

A number of recent trends in both Mexico and the U.S. influence whether a migrant decides to extend his or her stay in the United States or return to Mexico. Since its economic crisis became public knowledge in 1982, Mexico has experienced continued devaluation of the peso, high interest rates, decreasing oil prices and little economic growth (Wyman 1983). Given that economic situation, migrants may find returning to Mexico less attractive than continued residence in the United States. Not only would migrants returning to Mexico find it more difficult to subsist in their places of origin, but the economic climate inhibits investment of whatever savings they may have gathered during their sojourn in the United States. Moreover, gathering the necessary resources to return to the United States is now more difficult than before the devaluation; in short, it takes more pesos to make the trip.

Events in the United States also influence migratory patterns for Mexicans. A general trend among women born in the U.S. is that they are having fewer children (Cornelius et al. 1982:23). This demographic trend has occurred during a period of change ("restructuring") in the U.S. economy (Sas-

Leo R. Chavez is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Anthropology, School of Social Sciences, University of California, Irvine, CA 92717. This paper is based on data developed under the National Science Foundation Grant No. RLL83-10453. The author wishes to thank Ina Rosenthal-Urey, Robert Alvarez, Susan Drake and Cathy Ota for their helpful suggestions. The author, of course, assumes full responsibility for any factual errors.

sen-Koob 1982). The rapid growth of service industries and light manufacturing (e.g., electronics) is making new demands for immigrant labor (Fernandez-Kelley and Garcia 1988; Cornelius 1984; Morales 1983). In contrast to agricultural employers, urban-based employers generally do not operate on a seasonal basis. Service sector and other urban-based employers offer, and to a degree *expect*, year-round employment.

As a consequence, some undocumented Mexicans are staying in the U.S. on a long-term basis. Evidence of this was provided by the 1980 U.S. Census, which counted 2.06 million undocumented immigrants, most of whom were not considered to be temporary migrant workers (Warren and Passel 1983). Of these, about 55% were estimated to be from Mexico.¹ Moreover, Passel and Woodrow (1984:665) suggested that:

Large proportions of intact undocumented families have entered [the U.S.] in recent years and settled in the southwestern states, mainly California . . . If this trend persists, undocumented immigration from Mexico to the U.S. by younger persons and families seems likely to continue.

Because past research has focused on the temporary migration of single, undocumented workers, we know less about the behavior of undocumented families who fall out of the migrant stream. As Ina Rosenthal-Urey (1984:768) has pointed out, this gap in our knowledge exists because:

It is generally conceded that [circulating or return] migrants comprise up to 90 percent of those who come to the United States; yet this focus leaves unexamined another important component of the migration stream, namely family migrants who become long-term U.S. residents and who often "escape" aggregate sampling. Family migrants . . . are a key element of the migration process which has remained largely unstudied and whose importance is obscured in the aggregate data.

The data presented here attempt to fill in part of this gap. By focusing on the differences between single migrants and those who live with their families in the United States, we can begin to suggest the factors influencing undocumented migrants to abandon a pattern of return migration and to become long-term residents of the United States. As we shall observe, once a family is formed in the United States, undocumented migrants appear to be on a course which leads to long-term residence.

The second reason for this examination is a concern for the implications of settlement by undocumented immigrants. Once again, we find two competing views. On the one hand, the "assimilationist" view asserts that over time immigrants take their place in American society. The road to integration may be rocky, with immigrants taking available low-skilled and unskilled jobs, but eventually they will experience both economic and social mobility. This model has been based largely upon the experiences of European immigrants (Portes and Bach 1985; Sowell 1981; Gordon 1964; Handlin 1941; see Portes et al. 1980 for a review of this extensive literature).

The counter view is one of conflict and non-assimilation. It asserts that immigrants who are racially and/or culturally distinct—specifically Asians, Blacks and Latin Americans—will face obstacles to their integration into American society. Instead of eventual social and economic mobility, such immigrants and their offspring will be relegated to a second-class status characterized by poverty and social problems, in

particular juvenile delinquency and other criminal activities (Portes and Bach 1985:24–26; Piore 1979; Hechter 1977; Blauner 1972; Glazer and Moynihan 1970; Cox 1948).

The data examined here suggest that policies which fail to consider the complexity of the undocumented population may unintentionally contribute to undocumented settlers and their families falling into the less desirable conflict/non-assimilation scenario presented above. It is at this juncture that an assessment of empirical data on undocumented families becomes imperative for two reasons. First, undocumented immigrants often form families and households which also include U.S. citizens (i.e., children born in the U.S.). This complex family and household composition (referred to here as "binational families") has implications for policies designed to restrict undocumented immigrants from using government-sponsored social services. Second, the data on undocumented immigrants who have formed a family in the United States suggest a need to reconceptualize the notion of what constitutes a "resident" of a community. This is not merely an academic question, but one with implications for policy-makers who must determine who is to be allowed access to the benefits society has to offer, such as education, health care, or even employment.

The first section of this paper examines recent attempts to delineate the undocumented population. It is proposed that we must consider the behavior and perceptions of single undocumented migrants independently from that of undocumented migrants who form families in the United States. Such an approach contributes to our understanding of changes in migration and residency patterns as well as labor market participation. The next section presents the methodology used in the gathering of the data, followed by an examination of the data. The final section clarifies the policy-related issues addressed by the data.

Delineating the Undocumented Population

A number of researchers have attempted to understand the incorporation of immigrants, especially the undocumented, into American society through development of classification schemes which distinguish various subgroups within an overall population. A brief review of their work suggests lingering problems or questions that can be addressed by comparing the behavior of single migrants with the behavior of migrants living in the U.S. with their families.

Richard Mines and Michael Kearney (1982:8–14) have argued that the important distinguishing feature of the undocumented population is not immigration status but length of residence in the United States. Consequently, they develop a classification which includes: (a) "lone male circular migrants"; (b) "newcomer families"; and (c) settled Mexican immigrant families in the U.S. eight years or more.

Mines and Kearney describe the social networks typical of each type of Mexican migrant worker. Lone males and newcomer families "are essentially rural Mexican country people who still have strong social, economic, and emotional links with the peasant villages from which most of them come and frequently visit" (Mines and Kearney 1982:9). Settler families, on the other hand, "are inserted in extensive, well-established kinship and friendship networks in the local [U.S.]

community which provide valuable survival functions such as loaning money, childcare, and assistance during life crises” (Mines and Kearney 1982:11). Furthermore, each type of migrant has characteristic social, educational and health needs.

Mines and Kearney’s classification has both merits and shortcomings. Although they distinguish between single migrants and migrants who have formed families in the U.S., disregarding legal/immigration status, and the political and economic factors associated with that status, may be misleading. The undocumented population is integrated into society and participates in the economy in a way that leaves them disadvantaged when compared to legally-immigrated Mexicans and the general population regardless of the length of time they have been in the United States. To take but one example, long-term undocumented residents often do not receive private medical insurance as a benefit at their place of work. In a recent study, only 35.4% of undocumented interviewees who had lived in San Diego, California over ten years had private medical insurance, compared to 70.3% of the legal Mexican immigrants with similar length of residence (Cornelius et al. 1984:147–148). Thus, aggregating the undocumented and legal population may result in less accurate analysis of migrant behavior and needs.

Other classification schemes also distinguish between recent arrivals in the U.S. and long-term residents, but include immigration status as an important factor (Cornelius et al. 1982:17–22; Chavez et al. 1985).² Such schemes classify migrants as: (a) recent undocumented migrants; (b) recent legal migrants; (c) long-term undocumented migrants; (d) long-term legal migrants; and (e) border commuters. Each type of migrant has characteristic migration and residence patterns, and participates in the U.S. labor market in different ways. In addition, each subgroup exhibited distinctive patterns in its use of hospitals, clinics and private doctors. Moreover, the authors concluded that although the overwhelming majority of undocumented migrants who come to the U.S. in any given year return to Mexico after a brief stay, “substantial proportions of the undocumented workers [have] established permanent or semi-permanent residence [in the United States]” (Cornelius et al. 1982:21). Although insightful, the *process* of undocumented workers establishing long-term settlement patterns in the U.S. is not addressed by the above classification scheme, which takes residence as a given factor.

Another way of understanding the complexity both within and between immigrant populations is to consider patterns of labor market participation (Portes and Stepick 1985). Building on the segmented labor market concept (Portes and Bach 1985; Baron and Bielby 1984; Piore 1979), Portes and Stepick distinguish among *legal* immigrants who participate in the primary labor market, the secondary labor market, the informal sector, and “ethnic enclave” enterprises. Participation in each of these sectors depends upon the immigrant’s personal characteristics and skills, immigration status, his or her ethnic group’s history of migration, and how the initial migrants participated in the labor market.

Portes and Stepick show that participation in the labor market is important for understanding questions of an immigrant group’s economic mobility and social integration. Yet questions about the consequences of differential labor market participation remain unanswered. What types of migrants participate in the labor market as circular migrants

and which types become more or less permanent participants in the U.S. labor market? How does participation in the U.S. labor market influence a migrant’s relationship to his or her place of origin? In other words, which migrants maintain a strong relationship to their place of origin and which ones view themselves as permanent settlers in the United States?

An examination of such questions can be furthered by comparing the behavior and residence intentions of single migrants, including those who left spouse and/or children in Mexico, with migrants who live with their spouse and/or children in the United States. Distinguishing between undocumented immigrants residing as singles from those residing with families contributes to an understanding of labor market participation by international migrants as well as changes in the migrant’s orientation to the place of origin. It also permits questions about how the U.S. labor market encourages migrants to continue residing in the United States rather than returning to their place of origin. Examination of data on undocumented Mexican immigrants in San Diego illustrates how these issues benefit from an analysis which begins with the individual migrant’s household composition.

Methodology

Between March 1981 and February 1982, a research team for the Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies at the University of California, San Diego, gathered data on the characteristics of undocumented and legal Mexican immigrants (Cornelius et al. 1984). Personal in-home interviews were conducted with 2,103 adults (aged 17 or older) born in Mexico who were living or working in San Diego County at the time of the fieldwork.³

The sampling methodology employed was considered carefully since interviewing a “representative” sample of Mexican immigrants—in San Diego County or elsewhere in the United States—presents special difficulties of access and identification because of the large proportion of undocumented migrants in this population. To date, the most successful approach for overcoming these special problems has been a “snowball” sampling procedure, in which each successive respondent is a relative or friend of a previous interviewee who provides the interviewer with the necessary introductions and assistance in making contact with other members of his or her kinship/friendship network (Cornelius 1981; see also Baca and Bryan 1980; Mines 1981). The San Diego study utilized this methodology. Just as with other studies focusing on undocumented immigrants, the sample of interviewees in this study is not necessarily statistically representative of the total (undefined) undocumented population in San Diego or the nation.

The procedure of “snowball” sampling within kinship and friendship networks tends to bias the resulting sample of Mexican migrants toward “long-stayers” in the United States. An attempt was made to reduce this inherent bias by dispersing our initial contacts over as wide a geographic area as possible and by broadening the sources of initial contacts to include many different types of community-based organizations with diverse clientele.

The interview schedule consisted of both closed questions (in which the responses are anticipated) and open-ended

TABLE 1. AGE DISTRIBUTION BY IMMIGRANT STATUS AND SEX, SAN DIEGO IMMIGRANT SAMPLE AND MEXICAN ORIGIN POPULATION DESCRIBED IN THE 1980 U.S. CENSUS

Age group	Males						Females				
	San Diego		1980 Census*			San Diego		1980 Census*			
	Undocu- mented (N = 603)	Legal (N = 585)	I	II	III	Undocu- mented	Legal	I	II	III	
0-14	29.7	32.2	26.3	9.8	44.4	32.4	31.8	30.2	10.0	42.2	
15-19	10.4	12.8	15.8	7.9	11.4	11.3	12.7	14.7	7.7	11.4	
20-24	20.7	10.9	23.3	11.2	9.3	17.4	8.5	19.9	10.2	9.7	
25-29	17.7	8.3	14.5	15.6	8.0	12.9	8.0	13.1	13.7	8.2	
30-34	7.6	6.6	7.7	13.7	6.4	9.7	7.1	7.7	12.8	6.5	
35-39	5.1	4.8	4.6	10.2	4.3	4.6	6.6	4.7	10.1	4.6	
40-49	5.3	9.3	4.7	13.8	6.8	6.7	9.3	4.9	14.6	7.2	
50-59	2.9	9.9	2.0	8.6	5.6	3.1	9.5	2.8	9.1	5.9	
60+	0.7	5.1	1.1	9.1	3.8	1.9	6.5	2.2	11.8	4.4	
Total	100.1	99.9	100.0	99.9	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.1	
Total N	1376	1070	17470	24469	155368	1041	1140	14313	23756	157767	

* Source for the 1980 Census data: Bean et al. 1984:676.

Immigrant Status:

- I. Mexican-born non-citizens who immigrated to the U.S. in 1975 or afterwards; mostly undocumented.
- II. Mexican-born non-citizens who immigrated to the U.S. prior to 1975; mostly legal immigrants.
- III. Persons born in the United States who self-identify as of Mexican origin.

questions. The latter questions allowed for in-depth probing and follow-up questioning. Responses to open-ended questions were recorded exactly as stated by the interviewees and were later classified into response categories, a method which allowed for the gathering of extensive qualitative data. Interviews averaged about two hours in duration.

Most of the undocumented interviewees stated freely that they entered this country without having first obtained proper documentation from the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service. Others claimed to be here with appropriate documents. However, follow-up questions revealed that such documents included local border crossing cards, expired tourist visas, or fake permanent residence visas, none of which allows permanent residence or the freedom to work in the United States. These latter interviewees were classified as undocumented.

The original study focused on individuals. A co-residing husband and wife were both interviewed whenever possible, as were other adult members of the household. However, the focus of the present work is on households. Household is defined in relation to residence, that is, those who co-reside in a particular place.

A subsample of discrete households was arrived at by eliminating interviews of individuals other than the head of the household, whose interview contained basic sociodemographic information on all household members. Consequently, two sets of data are used; one includes all men and women in the study, the other is limited to household units. After describing the sociocultural characteristics of the interviewees drawn from the first data set, only the second set will be used.

In order to compare the behavior and attitudes of singles to that of migrants living with their families in the United States, households will be classified on the basis of composition into three categories: (a) non-family households, or

households comprised of singles; (b) simple family households; and (c) complex family households (adapted from Hammel and Laslett 1974).⁴

Non-family households are made up of individuals ("solitaries") who are not related to one another through marriage or a parent-child bond. These individuals live either alone or with a sibling, other relatives or friends. Included in this category are individuals who live at their place of work, such as live-in maids and farmworkers who live on or near farm premises. Such individuals are single, or if married are not living with their spouse and family, who typically reside in Mexico.

Simple family households are composed of married couples without children, married couples with children, and single parents with children. *Complex family households* include both extended and multiple families. Extended families consist of relatives other than the head of the household's spouse and/or children. Additional relatives may be single or married and not living with spouse and/or children. Households with multiple families include various combinations of two or more families (that is, individuals related by marriage or a parent/child bond).

Socioeconomic characteristics

Similarities and predictable differences in the age-sex structure of household members in San Diego compared to data collected in the 1980 U.S. Census suggest that the sampling procedure employed in this study identified a population that is similar to that of undocumented immigrants in the country generally (see Table 1, with particular attention to Immigrant Status I, or the category made up primarily—perhaps two-thirds—by undocumented immigrants). Undocumented immigrants in both samples have a high frequency of individuals between 20 and 29 years of age, the age most prone to

TABLE 2. CHARACTERISTICS OF MEXICAN IMMIGRANTS, SAN DIEGO SAMPLE, BY IMMIGRATION STATUS AND SEX

Characteristics (medians or percentages)	Undocumented		Documented	
	Men (N = 588)	Women (N = 491)	Men (N = 487)	Women (N = 537)
Years in the U.S.	3	4	16	13
Age at interview	26.8	27.3	40.3	38.6
Years of education	5.6	5.6	5.6	5.8
% Illiterate	11.4	14.5	4.4	6.5
% Cannot speak English	49.6	60.0	32.9	40.3
% Cannot read English	68.0	68.8	40.8	43.9
% Homemakers	0.0	36.5	0.0	52.5
% Currently employed	92.9	63.5	90.0	47.5
Annual job income	\$7,334	\$6,243	\$9,099	\$7,026
Data by household	Undocumented head		Documented head	
Total annual family income	\$9,359		\$13,281	
% Owns house	3.8		29.8	
Household size	4.1		3.9	

migration. Sex ratios are also highest for these age-groups: 157.5 men for each 100 women in the 20–24 age group in San Diego, compared to 143.0 in Immigrant Status I; and 181.3 in the 25–29 age category for San Diego, 135.6 in Immigrant Status I.⁵

In general, undocumented interviewees can be characterized as relatively recent arrivals (although 9.6% had been in the U.S. ten years or longer) who lack English language skills, received a limited education, and have low incomes (see Table 2). Their legal counterparts had been in the U.S. for a much longer period, have received about the same level of education, have greater English language skills, and earn slightly more money.

Migration Patterns: Singles Compared to Families

Table 3 presents information on age, marital status, whether spouse and/or children accompanied the migrant, and outcome of each migration to the United States for undocumented heads of household (which includes 95 female heads of household). The median age for the interviewees on their first migration was 22 years and the median length of residence in the U.S. was one year. About a third were married (35.6%) and almost as many had children (31.9%). Over half (57.0%) brought their spouse or child(ren) with them, which indicates that some individuals migrated with children but not necessarily with spouses.

As for the outcome of the first migratory experience, 38.1% returned to Mexico voluntarily, 11% were returned to Mexico by the INS, and 50.8% were still on their first migration. Importantly, almost four times as many undocumented migrants returned to Mexico voluntarily than at the hands of the authorities. Interestingly, the proportion of migrants still in the U.S. is similar to the proportion who brought their spouse or children to the United States.

With each succeeding migration, migrants are more likely

to be married and have children. However, migrants with multiple migrations are increasingly less likely to migrate with their spouses and children and are more likely to return to Mexico. Importantly, the proportion of those who brought their spouse or children at each succeeding migration continues to be similar to the proportion of migrants who were still in the United States.

These data indicate that two significant patterns are occurring. On the one hand, there are the migrants with multiple migrations who maintain their family and household in Mexico: the traditional return migrant. On the other hand, there are the migrants who bring their families with them and who are more likely to continue their residence in the United States. This latter pattern is examined further after first noting the behavior of female interviewees.

Focusing only on the migratory patterns of female heads of households reveals some important differences with the general pattern (Table 3). Focusing on their first migratory experience, women were generally older than the general undocumented population when they migrated, were less likely to be married, but more likely to have children. About the same proportion of women as men migrated with spouse or child(ren), but women interviewees stayed in the U.S. longer and were much more likely to still be in the United States. Women with two or more migrations exhibited patterns similar to their male counterparts.

Table 4 compares the outcome of migrations for interviewees who migrated with spouse and/or child(ren) with interviewees who left their spouse and/or child(ren) in Mexico. The association between the two variables is highly significant. Examining the first migration, migrants with families were much more likely to still be residing in the United States compared to those who migrated alone (63.8% to 39.5%). On the other hand, those who migrated alone were much more likely to have returned to Mexico after their first migration (60.5% to 36.3%). This pattern continues in succeeding migrations. In short, migrating with a family appears

TABLE 3. MIGRATION HISTORIES FOR UNDOCUMENTED HEADS OF HOUSEHOLDS

	Median age	Median stay (years)	% Married at time of migration	% With children at time of migration	% Brought spouse and/or children	% Returned to Mexico under own volition	% Returned by INS	% Still in U.S.
M1.*								
N = 503	22	1.08	35.6	31.9	57.0	38.1	11.0	50.8
M2.								
N = 245	25	1.25	49.8	46.5	53.2	38.1	17.4	44.4
M3.								
N = 137	27	1.00	56.9	59.3	46.7	48.6	14.4	37.1
M4.								
N = 81	28	1.00	66.7	61.7	47.1	41.8	11.4	46.8
M5.								
N = 44	29	.67	75.0	75.0	45.0	46.5	14.0	39.5
M6.								
N = 27	30	.50	74.1	77.8	29.2	53.8	15.4	30.8
M7-10								
N = 57	31	—	77.2	80.7	37.5	47.1	25.5	27.5
Migration histories for undocumented female heads of households								
M1.								
N = 91	24	2.00	27.4	41.5	55.9	33.3	4.6	62.1
M2.								
N = 32	25	2.00	22.6	37.5	64.7	50.0	15.6	34.4
M3.								
N = 15	27	2.00	20.0	53.3	44.4	46.7	20.0	33.3
M4-6								
N = 13	33	1.50	30.8	76.9	50.0	30.8	15.4	53.8

* M = Migration; M1 = First migration experience.

to influence continued residence rather than returning to Mexico.

Examining the types of households formed by undocumented migrants approaches the question of settlement from a different perspective. When we correlate household composition with the length of time the migrant has been in the United States, a definite pattern emerges. As the data presented in Table 5 indicate, households composed of single migrants tend to be associated with interviewees who have been in the U.S. for a relatively short period of time. The first year of residence in the United States is clearly a "fishing expedition." The undocumented migrant either resides at work, alone or with other single individuals in non-family households. Or, the migrant might live with relatives in an extended or multiple family household. Less than a quarter of the undocumented migrants who have been in the U.S. a year or less live in simple family households.

Over time, undocumented immigrants tend to reside less in households which appear to be transitory, that is, made up of single migrants. Households composed of simple families, particularly those comprised solely of parents and children, appear to be formed only after an initial period of time has been spent in the United States. Family formation can occur either through a single person marrying while in the United States or through an already existing family being brought from Mexico.

The most significant change in household composition and structure appears to occur after one year of residence in the United States, when the proportion of simple family households rises from 22% to 42.4% and a corresponding decrease occurs in households comprised of singles. This change in household structure is related to a process of selection which occurs during migration (as discussed above), resulting in most undocumented migrants (singles) returning to Mexico after about a year of residence in the United States. As a consequence, for those migrants who remain, the temporary nature of the residence begins to dissolve into a more long-term settlement, as reflected in the composition of their households. Simple family households increase in importance the longer the migrants reside in the United States.

Migrant Views of Continued U.S. Residence

Differences in migratory and household patterns exhibited by single migrants and migrants with families are also reflected in responses to a series of questions concerning the migrants' ties to Mexico and their future residence intentions. Asked if they had a house in Mexico where they could live permanently, almost all (90.3%) of the 148 singles responded affirmatively, compared to only about half (56.0%) of the 233 interviewees living in simple family households. Of the 155

TABLE 4. OUTCOME OF MIGRATION EXPERIENCES BY WHETHER OR NOT FAMILY ALSO MIGRATED, FOR UNDOCUMENTED HEADS OF HOUSEHOLDS

Migration number:	Back to Mexico own volition %	Sent back by INS %	Still in U.S. %
1. Spouse and/or children accompanied migrant (N = 160)	24.4	11.9	63.8
Spouse and/or children left in Mexico (N = 119)	52.1	8.4	39.5
$\chi^2 = 22.80; df = 2; p < .0001$			
2. Spouse and/or children accompanied migrant (N = 87)	24.1	17.2	58.6
Spouse and/or children left in Mexico (N = 75)	56.0	17.3	26.7
$\chi^2 = 19.90; df = 2; p < .0001$			
3. Spouse and/or children accompanied migrant (N = 45)	44.4	11.5	44.4
Spouse and/or children left in Mexico (N = 33)	52.8	15.1	32.1
$\chi^2 = 1.63; df = 2; p = .443$ N.S.			
4. Spouse and/or children accompanied migrant (N = 32)	28.1	9.4	62.5
Spouse and/or children left in Mexico (N = 33)	66.7	15.2	18.2
$\chi^2 = 13.48; df = 2; p < .002$			
5-10. Spouse and/or children accompanied migrant (N = 45)	35.6	13.3	51.1
Spouse and/or children left in Mexico (N = 66)	56.1	24.2	19.7
$\chi^2 = 12.12; df = 2; p < .01$			

interviewees living in complex family households, 68.8% indicated that they had a house in Mexico where they could live permanently.

Those interviewees who indicated they had a house in Mexico were then asked, "Is your principal place of residence your house in Mexico or your house in the United States?" Singles overwhelmingly (80.8%) responded "Mexico," while a majority of interviewees living in single family households (68.5%) and complex family households (68.7%) considered their principal house to be in the United States.

This difference in residence preference between households comprised of singles and those comprised of families is underscored in responses to the question, "Do you intend to live permanently in the United States?" Most of the informants living in family households (simple = 71.2%; complex = 61.9%) desired to live permanently in the United States, a commitment few of the interviewees living as singles (25.4%) were willing to make (a pattern also found by Cardenas and Flores 1980). Chi-square significance tests ($p <$

TABLE 5. HOUSEHOLD VARIATION OVER TIME IN THE UNITED STATES AMONG UNDOCUMENTED IMMIGRANTS IN SAN DIEGO, INDEPENDENT HOUSEHOLDS (HEADS) ONLY

Household type	1 year or less (N = 123) %	2-5 Years (N = 217) %	6-8 Years (N = 87) %	9+ Years (N = 112) %
Non-family (singles) households	47.2	28.1	17.2	12.5
Simple family households	22.0	42.4	48.3	65.2
Complex family households	30.9	29.5	34.5	22.3
Total	100.1*	100.0	100.0	100.0

$\chi^2 = 58.42; df = 6; p < .0001.$

* Error due to rounding off.

.01 for all comparisons) indicate that there is very little probability that these patterns of responses would occur if the migrants' views on residency and the migrants' family situation were not highly associated.

As these data make clear, individuals living as singles and migrants living in households composed of families exhibit distinctive views on their residence preferences. Undocumented singles remain committed to their household and residence in the place of origin. In contrast, migrants with families in the U.S. express a commitment to continue residing in the United States.

Whether or not a migrant remits money also indicates the strength of his or her ties to a household in Mexico. Singles (81.1%) were much more likely to send money to Mexico than interviewees living in complex family households (70.6%) or in simple family households (63.0%). Such complex family households are often a combination of recent arrivals and longer-term residents, which is reflected in the responses. In all three types of households, the majority indicated they remitted money to family in Mexico, which indicates both the continued commitment to assisting economically needy relatives and the pragmatic strategy of maintaining a link (as "social insurance") to family whose assistance may be required should the migrant be apprehended and deported back to Mexico.

The reasons given by interviewees for coming to the U.S. shed some light on residence preferences and patterns. Similar proportions of interviewees living as singles (55.2%), in simple family households (50.9%) and in complex family households (54.7) stated they migrated for economic reasons, such as not enough work in Mexico, low wages in Mexico, higher wages in the U.S. or they were unemployed. However, a clear difference emerges in the proportions of interviewees who cited the need to assist their parents economically as their motivation for migrating (singles = 21.0%, in simple family households = 3.1%, complex family households = 5.4%). Either interviewees living in family households migrated initially for other reasons, or, with their families now in the United States, they no longer believed their purpose for being in the U.S. was to support a family in Mexico.

The data suggest strongly that undocumented migrants liv-

TABLE 6. EMPLOYMENT OF UNDOCUMENTED HOUSEHOLD HEADS BY HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION

Job category	Non-family households (N = 145) %	Simple family households (N = 206) %	Complex family households (N = 146) %
Agriculture	23.4%	10.7%	11.0%
Fieldworker*	(91.2)	(45.5)	(68.8)
Foreman	(0.0)	(22.7)	(0.0)
Other	(8.8)	(31.8)	(31.3)
Construction	4.1%	5.3%	4.1%
Unskilled/semi-skilled	(100.0)	(100.0)	(100.0)
Manufacturing	4.8%	4.4%	4.1%
Food, textile electronics	(57.1)	(66.7)	(83.3)
Machine operator	(42.9)	(22.2)	(16.7)
Supervisor	(0.0)	(11.1)	(0.0)
Commerce	21.4%	27.2%	26.0%
Waiter/waitress	(6.5)	(7.1)	(5.3)
Cook	(25.8)	(14.3)	(13.2)
Cook's helper	(0.0)	(10.7)	(13.2)
Dishwasher	(25.8)	(30.4)	(44.7)
Busboy	(19.4)	(12.5)	(10.5)
Auto service (gas station, car wash)	(16.1)	(5.4)	(2.6)
Other	(6.5)	(19.6)	(10.5)
Services	41.4%	44.7%	48.6%
Gardener	(13.3)	(22.8)	(26.8)
Gardener, self-employed	(15.0)	(6.5)	(18.3)
Nursery worker	(8.3)	(13.0)	(9.9)
Maid/housekeeper	(46.7)	(28.3)	(31.0)
Janitor/bldg. maintenance	(1.7)	(10.7)	(4.2)
Driver of vehicle (delivery, truck)	(1.7)	(4.3)	(2.8)
Other	(13.3)	(14.1)	(7.0)
Other	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%
Economically inactive	4.8%	6.8%	6.2%
Unemployed	(28.6)	(42.9)	(22.2)
Looking for first job	(57.1)	(14.3)	(44.4)
Other	(14.3)	(42.9)	(33.3)

* % in parentheses refer to proportions of specific sector.

ing as singles in the U.S. essentially remain members of their household in Mexico. Indeed, their very presence in the U.S. can be interpreted as part of a strategy of household survival that includes diversifying sources of income. Micro-level analysis of the communities which send migrants to the United States have shown that one way of adapting to economic uncertainty is to develop as many sources of income as possible, including sending a household member to work in a nearby urban center or, if family resources permit, to the United States (Dinerman 1978, 1982; Munoz et al. 1982; Selby and Murphy 1982; Mines 1981; Wiest 1973). For such households the selling of their labor resources is not restricted to national boundaries, but responds to the demands of an "international labor market" (Bustamante 1983:324).

Undocumented singles are important to the international labor market. They make up a significant part of the migrant

stream that flows from Mexico to the United States and back again. But the families headed by undocumented immigrants appear to be on a different course. They are not directed by membership in a household in Mexico. Their strategies are for survival of the household as constituted in the United States. They no longer participate in a pattern of voluntary return migration (see Alvarez 1984). Many appear to be in the process of "falling out," or have "fallen out," of the migrant stream, at least in their view of themselves and their place in the world. For many, they are no longer "birds of passage" but rather settlers who will continue to reside where their family has been relocated.

Settlement and Employment

Employment information provides a partial explanation for this pattern. The data on employment (Table 6) indicate that single undocumented interviewees and those living in households comprised of families work in similar types of jobs. Both groups are clustered in services and restaurant work.

Differences are observable, however, for interviewees living with families who were found to be employed in non-seasonal, year-round employment, such as supervisors in the agricultural and manufacturing sectors, positions rarely held by single interviewees. Interviewees with families also worked in a broader range of jobs in the commerce and service sectors.

An important difference between single and family-based migrants is the extent to which they viewed their employment as permanent. Interviewees living in households comprised of families more often viewed their employment as permanent than did their single counterparts (Table 7). Even interviewees with families who were recent arrivals (a year or less of residence) held such views, and they maintained this perception with longer residence. Singles, too, tended to view their jobs as more permanent with longer residence, but not to the degree of the family-based interviewees.

Considering oneself a permanent employee does not equate with the possibility of mobility at the workplace. Indeed, over half of the interviewees with families in the U.S. believed they had few opportunities for advancement or mobility at their current job, a view which changed only moderately with longer residence (Table 7). It is perhaps the perception of employment stability rather than the type or quality of the job itself (that is, a job with upward mobility) which influences undocumented immigrants to continue residing in the United States.

The desire to settle in the U.S. despite the economic and political constraints inherent in an undocumented immigration status is a curious paradox.⁶ That some undocumented immigrants choose to reside in the U.S. on a long-term basis has implications for the way we conceptualize this population and its composition.

The Binational Family

Based upon the above discussion, the presence of long-term undocumented residents necessitates a broader concep-

TABLE 7. PERCEPTIONS OF EMPLOYMENT STABILITY AND MOBILITY AMONG UNDOCUMENTED MEXICAN IMMIGRANTS, BY LENGTH OF U.S. RESIDENCE

	Singles		Simple family household		Complex family households	
	1 year (N = 49)	2-5 (N = 56)	1 year (N = 19)	2-5 (N = 72)	1 year (N = 31)	2-5 (N = 56)
Job stability						
Permanent	42.9	67.9	84.2	86.1	74.2	76.8
Temporary	57.1	32.1	15.8	13.9	25.8	23.2
Totals	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
$\chi^2 = 30.16; df = 5; p < .0001$						
Job mobility						
Opportunity	27.5	35.1	35.3	41.6	28.6	41.1
No opportunity	72.5	64.9	64.7	58.4	71.4	58.9
Totals	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
$\chi^2 = 3.58; df = 5; p = .612$ N.S.						

tualization of undocumented families. The term “undocumented” is inappropriate when focusing on families and households. Popular terms such as “undocumented family” and “illegal alien family” are generalities which disregard the fact that many of these families have at least one child who was born in the U.S. and is therefore a citizen. Out of 603 households headed by undocumented immigrants in the San Diego sample, 42.1% contained at least one member who was a citizen by birth in the United States. This proportion compares favorably with similar data collected in Texas (Weintraub and Cardenas 1984).⁷

A more accurate term for families comprised of members of different nationalities and mixed immigration status (some members undocumented Mexicans and others U.S. citizens) is “binational family.”⁸ Within a binational family, status differentiation among members exists on the basis of rights and privileges in the larger society accorded on the basis of political status (citizen or undocumented).⁹

The age structure of undocumented immigrants indicates that the formation of binational families is fairly predictable. Undocumented immigrants who leave the migrant stream are in the early years of family formation, with a large proportion of the adults between 20 and 29 years of age (see Table 1; for comparable data see Weintraub and Cardenas 1984; Cross and Sandos 1982; Cardenas and Flores 1980; North and Houstoun 1976). Focusing on the children (14 years old and under) in households headed by undocumented interviewees provides further evidence that undocumented settlers are in the early childbearing years: 46% of the children were five years old or younger. Consequently, the chances that a family headed by an undocumented immigrant will have a child born in the U.S. increase the longer that family resides in the United States.

The evidence also indicates another pattern that is important for considering the future of long-term undocumented residents: many eventually become legal residents. Of the 151 legal interviewees who had a previous history of migration to the U.S., 59.4% were at one time undocumented migrants (see also Portes and Bach 1985; Flores 1984; Hirschman 1978).¹⁰

A number of possibilities exist for undocumented immigrants to legalize their status. Current immigration policy has an established set of preferences under which aliens can apply to immigrate. Within this system, preference is given to the immediate relatives of U.S. citizens and legal residents who are attempting to reunite with their families. In addition, aliens with labor skills for which there is a need in the U.S. also receive preference. Within binational families, children born in the U.S. who are 21 years old can sponsor their parents' immigration. Undocumented children could also eventually legalize their status through petition by a U.S.-born sibling or through marriage to a U.S. citizen. In short, long-term undocumented residents, especially those who migrate as children, are not forever relegated to an undocumented immigration status.¹¹

Finally, both legal and undocumented immigrants often live in households which include friends or other relatives. Almost half (47.3%) of the households with families that were headed by undocumented immigrants (N = 369) included friends or relatives. Many (20.4%) of the family households headed by legal immigrants (N = 465) also contained relatives who have joined the household.

Policy-related Issues

The data on undocumented Mexicans and their families in San Diego also has implications for public policy, especially the debate over access to government-funded social services. Three issues will be highlighted.

(1) Many households headed by undocumented immigrants contain U.S. citizens.

This finding is particularly important for policies which are directed at the undocumented population in general without regard to the family and household's compositional complexity. For example, since 1981 California has required that all non-citizen applicants for Medicaid (Medi-Cal), Food Stamps and AFDC benefits complete a “CA-6” form, which is routinely sent to the Immigration and Naturalization Service for verification of the applicant's immigration status.

Illinois and Colorado, since 1982 and 1983 respectively, have used the form to screen applicants for unemployment insurance.

Such practices are part of the INS's Project SAVE (Systematic Alien Verification for Entitlements) and are intended to prevent undocumented aliens from receiving entitlement benefits (MALDEF 1985:4-5). Notifying INS of an undocumented immigrant's use of a service such as Medicaid could hinder that individual's attempt to legalize his or her status in the United States on the grounds that he or she is likely to become a public charge. As a result, parents often fear the use of Medicaid by their U.S.-born child, so even that child may go without necessary health care. According to a study conducted by the federal Department of Health, Education and Welfare in the late 1970s in San Diego, "99% of the undocumented parents of [U.S.] citizen children will not complete Medi-Cal applications for their children because they fear detection and deportation" (Health Research Services and Analysis 1978:399-400).¹²

The issue of U.S.-born children in households headed by undocumented immigrants has been specifically noted in the construction of some policies. The U.S. Congress has taken steps on food stamp eligibility to ensure that citizen children in families headed by undocumented immigrants qualify for aid. Amendments to the Food Stamp Act in 1980 require caseworkers to report to the INS household members who are ineligible for such benefits because of their illegal status in the United States. While intending to prevent ineligible aliens from receiving food stamps, Congress clearly stated that caseworkers are not to act as "outreach officers of the Immigration and Naturalization Service" (House Committee 1980:155-157).¹³

As a consequence, current federal regulations allow undocumented parents to apply for food stamps on behalf of citizen children but exclude themselves for consideration for aid by refusing to supply information about their immigration status. The immigration status of the parents thus becomes irrelevant and the caseworker has no legal basis to probe further into the subject. However, the Illinois Department of Public Aid continued to require information on immigration status from each household member; any "illegal" aliens were to be reported to the INS. Only after a successful lawsuit against the state of Illinois were federal regulations properly enforced (MALDEF 1985:11-12).

(2) Many households contain individuals who are not members of the head's nuclear family.

This finding has implications for policies which require information (i.e., social security numbers) on all household members applying for a government-sponsored program. For example, the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 requires that applicants to the Summer Food Program services, Child Care Food Program, and School Breakfast and Lunch Programs must include the names and social security numbers of all adult household members (National Center for Immigrant Rights, Inc. 1982). However, the law is unusual in that it lacks an explanation of what uses will be made of the social security numbers and imposes no restrictions on access to that information by state and other federal agencies. In short, there is no guidance to school districts concerning the protection of the applicant's privacy.

A survey of school districts in California found that some district administrators believed they had either the authority

or the legal obligation to report to the INS alien households whose school meal applications cited income without social security numbers (Wilkins 1983; Food Research and Action Center 1984:141-142). Nowhere in the law is this authority expressly conferred.

Consequently, the extent to which households headed by undocumented immigrants contain individuals other than the head's nuclear family is an important policy concern. Immigrant families may not allow their U.S.-born children to participate in a school nutrition program because of their fear that it could result in the detection of undocumented parents, aunts/uncles, or other relatives in the household.¹⁴

(3) Many undocumented residents living with their families in the U.S. are "immigrants" rather than "migrants," settlers rather than sojourners.

A significant factor underlying the policies regulating access to social services is the concept of "residency." How legal residency is defined is central to the determination of who is entitled to the benefits that society has to offer.

The question of what constitutes a "resident" has been answered in contradictory ways by judges ruling on similar cases in California. The two cases concern a county's responsibility for unreimbursed health care costs attributed to undocumented patients. In Fresno County, the court ruled that undocumented immigrants were found to be legal residents who had clearly established domicile in the County, which was thus responsible for the cost of their unreimbursed health care. In contrast, a judge in San Diego County ruled that an illegal immigration status precluded legal residence (Sequoia Community Health Foundation vs. Board of Supervisors of Fresno County 1981; Bauer and Schultz 1980; Clark 1980a, 1980b). It is thus up to the California Supreme Court to resolve the matter.

Being considered a resident has implications for social services other than health care. Although the U.S. Supreme Court determined that access to primary and secondary education for undocumented children was in society's long-term interests, the question of higher education still remains (Flores 1984; Alien Children Education Litigation 1980). In California, junior colleges, state universities and, more recently, the University of California have attempted to institute policies which consider immigration status as part of the criteria for determining a student's residence status and thus the amount and type of fees they should pay. As a consequence of such policies, the children of undocumented immigrants, whose U.S. residency may have extended throughout most of their lives, were subject to non-resident tuition, which is at least \$3,500 above the fees paid by other California residents. Although targeted at undocumented students, this policy has, in some cases, deterred even students who are U.S. citizens from applying to college in order not to draw attention to their parents' immigration status (see Scott-Blair 1984). The constitutionality of tuition-related, residence-related policies which target a specific group, the undocumented, has been successfully challenged in California's Superior Court (Leticia A. et al. v. The Board of Regents of the University of California et al. 1985).¹⁵

Conclusions

Contemporary trends in Mexican migration to the United States indicate that greater attention must be paid to the

complexity of the undocumented population. Consequently, researchers are increasingly distinguishing between the undocumented who continue a tradition of temporary labor migration from those who become long-term residents of the United States. This work has attempted to contribute to our understanding of the process of settlement by undocumented immigrants. The behavior of single migrants (including individuals who migrated without spouse or children) was compared to that of migrants accompanied by spouse and/or children in relation to a number of factors, including the outcome of migration experiences, variation in household composition over time, attitudes concerning residence preferences, and labor market participation.

The examination revealed observable differences in migration patterns and residence intentions. Single migrants were likely to be temporary workers in the U.S. labor market. They viewed their jobs as temporary and were likely to return to Mexico after a brief stay in the U.S., which they did not consider to be their permanent residence. They maintained a strong social and economic relationship to their place of origin.

In contrast, undocumented immigrants living with their families in the U.S. were likely to view their job as relatively secure and desired to continue residing in the United States. For many undocumented, the formation of a family in the United States begins a process which leads to eventual settlement.

A major implication of undocumented immigrants residing on a long-term basis in the U.S. is that families often include children who are U.S. citizens by birth. Families which include both undocumented members and U.S. citizens are here referred to as binational families. Given that the undocumented are a demographically young population, the formation of binational families is fairly predictable.

Managing to reside in the U.S. on a long-term basis does not imply that undocumented immigrants will experience an easy integration into American society. Many laws either explicitly or implicitly restrict undocumented immigrants from using social services. However, the presence of binational families complicates the issue of access to social benefits. For example, binational families are often caught in a dilemma created by the interplay of their social and political characteristics with policies defining access to social services and education. Such policies often do not account for the dual nationality and dual immigration status found in binational families.

The data presented here also have implications for what constitutes a "resident" of a community, a term which is legally ambiguous and yet often a part of the eligibility requirements for social services. When considering residency, policy-makers at all levels of government should take into consideration that: (a) long-term undocumented residents often intend to continue residing in the United States; (b) the formation of binational families creates strong social ties to the U.S.; (c) undocumented immigrants increasingly work in jobs which are year-round rather than seasonal in nature; (d) the lack of evidence on the voluntary return migration of long-term undocumented residents and their children; and (e) the possibility that many long-term undocumented residents will eventually legalize their status. These factors suggest that a failure to plan for the social integration of binational families is shortsighted at best, and at worst undermines

society's interest in providing the foundation for all members to make the maximum contribution to their communities.

In sum, many of the undocumented who are long-term residents of the U.S. must be considered "immigrants" rather than "migrants." This is especially true for those who have taken the crucial step of forming a family in the U.S., either by marrying here or by bringing their family from Mexico. Such families will not necessarily follow previous migration patterns based upon the mobility of a single individual. There is scant evidence that most such families would willingly return to Mexico after a brief "season" in the United States. Many will remain in the U.S. unless they are apprehended and returned to Mexico by INS authorities. Even then, these families will have incentives to return to the home, community and equity (both economic and social) they have built up, sometimes over several years, in the United States.

NOTES

¹ Another 22% of the undocumented immigrants counted in the 1980 Census were from other Latin American countries (including the Caribbean), 10% from Asia, 9% from Canada and Europe, and 4% from the rest of the world (Warren and Passel 1983).

² See McCarthy and Valdez (1985) for a similar typology of Mexican immigrants.

³ Included in the original sample of 2,103 interviewees were 90 border "commuters" who are legal immigrants to the U.S. but who choose to reside in Mexico. The commuters work on the U.S. side of the border. For the purposes at hand, border commuters are not part of the analysis, unless they are explicitly mentioned.

⁴ See Chavez (1985) for a detailed analysis of variation in household composition and structure exhibited by Mexican immigrants in San Diego.

⁵ Bean et al. (1984) have analyzed the sociodemographic characteristics of the undocumented immigrants counted in the 1980 Census. Their work has faced methodological difficulties, due especially to the fact that it is impossible to delineate a discrete undocumented sample from the Census data. In addition, Immigrant Status I and the San Diego household data are not exactly similar. The San Diego data include U.S.-born children, which are not included in Immigrant Status I. Moreover, sex ratios would be expected to be skewed toward males in the adult age categories in the undocumented population. The higher male to female ratios in the San Diego sample, compared to Immigrant Status I of the Census, reflects the fact that the latter sample has legal as well as undocumented adults.

⁶ Portes and Bach (1985:267-297) uncovered a similar paradox in their longitudinal study of *legal* Mexican immigration in the 1970s. They found that a significant majority of legal Mexican immigrants desired to remain permanently in the United States despite the constraints they encountered because of their position in the U.S. labor market, which results in observable and quantifiable obstacles to economic mobility.

⁷ Other researchers have noted the pattern of undocumented headed families soon becoming "mixed" by the birth of a child in the United States (for recent examples see Flores 1984; Huddle et al. 1985; Mines and Kearney 1982).

⁸ This usage of the term binational is different from its usage by Baca and Bryan (1980), who speak of a "binational community" meaning one that is rooted (psychologically, if not in fact) on both sides of the U.S.-Mexican border.

⁹ The comments of a "busboy," now 45 years old, illustrate the problem. Some of his children are undocumented, while others are U.S. citizens by birth. He said, "I don't think about going back to Mexico. The schools are better here, there is more food, and I earn more money. But life is not perfect. Our house is run down, there's

no heat, the bath doesn't work, and when I pay rent I don't get a receipt. But what worries me the most is how I am going to explain to some of my children that they are not Americans, they weren't born here."

¹⁰ Portes and Bach (1985:92-93) found that 70% of the legal immigrants in their study had at some time in the past entered the U.S. illegally.

¹¹ To date, no study has determined the proportion of children of undocumented immigrant parentage who leave the U.S. to reside in Mexico.

¹² Juan's case (a pseudonym), exemplifies this point. Juan has been in the U.S. 21 years, his wife and daughter for 8 years. When his U.S.-born infant daughter had an operation, he said: "The hospital worker told us to apply for Medi-Cal for her. We said we were trying to legalize our status and didn't want to jeopardize our chances. The hospital worker told us there would be no problem, since my daughter was born here. But when the papers came, the worker had applied for my wife, too. We took the papers to our lawyer who told us we could be denied permission to legally stay in this country if we filed the papers." Juan closed the papers immediately. But with what he earned working on a flower farm and his wife as a maid, he candidly said he could not afford additional health care for his daughter.

¹³ In a similar case, the Superior Court of California ruled, in February of 1985, that the State could no longer require all applicants for the California Children's Services program to also apply for Medi-Cal, a practice which inhibited the children of undocumented immigrants from applying (Becklund 1985).

¹⁴ As the Food Research and Action Center (1984:142) has concluded: "Many households that are eligible to participate in the child nutrition programs are reluctant to apply. Some believe that disclosure of their participation could result in harassment and ridicule by their neighbors or co-workers. Others believe that there would be adverse consequences at work if their employers found out. Still others believe that merely providing the information will result in investigations by federal immigration authorities. As a consequence, children who urgently need the nutritional benefits of the child nutrition programs do not receive them."

¹⁵ On April 3, 1985, the Judge of the Superior Court of California ruled in favor of Leticia A., Sonia V. and other undocumented students. The policy of classifying undocumented students as non-residents for tuition purposes was found to be too broad and unconstitutional under the State's constitution. In his ruling, the judge noted that: "Even if the clear and convincing evidence of the values of post-secondary education had not been shown by plaintiffs, the public policy encouraging an improved and dynamic society is sufficient to find that higher education is an 'important' interest in California" (Leticia A. et al. v. The Board of Regents of the University of California et al. 1985:8).

REFERENCES CITED

Alien Children Education Litigation

1980 Brief for the Appellants. *In Re: Alien Children Education Litigation State of Texas and Texas Education Agency (Appellants) vs. United States (Intervenor-Appellee) and Certain Named and Unnamed Undocumented Alien Children (Appellees)*. Case Nos. 80-1538 and 80-1934. Washington, DC: Supreme Court of the United States.

Alvarez, R., Jr.

1984 The Border as Social System: The California Case. *The New Scholar* 9:119-134.

Baca, R., and D. Bryan

1980 Citizenship Aspirations and Residency Rights Preference: The Mexican Undocumented Worker in the Binational Community. Compton, CA: SEPA-OPTION, Inc.

Baron, J. N., and W. T. Bielby
1984 The Organization of Work in a Segmented Economy. *American Sociological Review* 49:454-473.

Bauer, W. J., and G. J. Schultz

1980 Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Support of Preliminary Injunction. Bay General Community Hospital, et al. (Plaintiffs) v. County of San Diego, et al. (Defendants). Case No. 451877. San Diego: Superior Court of the State of California for the County of San Diego.

Bean, F. D., H. L. Browning, and W. P. Frisbie

1984 The Sociodemographic Characteristics of Mexican Immigrant Status Groups: Implications for Studying Undocumented Mexicans. *International Migration Review* 18:672-691.

Becklund, Laurie

1985 Handicapped Children of Illegals Can Now Get Aid. *Los Angeles Times*, February 8, I-1.

Blauner, R.

1972 *Radical Oppression in America*. New York: Harper & Row.

Browning, H. L., and N. Rodriguez

1982 The Migration of Mexican Indocumentados as a Settlement Process: Implications for Work. Texas Population Research Center Papers, Series 4, Paper No. 4.008. Austin: University of Texas.

Bustamante, J. A.

1983 The Mexicans are Coming. *International Migration Review* 17:323-341.

Cardenas, G., and E. Flores

1980 Social, Economic and Demographic Characteristics of Undocumented Mexicans in the Houston Labor Market. Report to the Gulf Coast Legal Foundation, Houston, TX, March.

Cardoso, L. A.

1980 Mexican Emigration to the United States: 1897-1931. Tucson: The University of Arizona Press.

Chavez, L. R.

1985 Households, Migration and Labor Market Participation: The Adaptation of Mexicans to Life in the United States. *Urban Anthropology* 14(4):301-346.

Chavez, L. R., W. A. Cornelius, and O. W. Jones

1985 Mexican Immigrants and the Utilization of Health Services: The Case of San Diego. *Social Science and Medicine* 21: 93-102.

Clark, D. L.

1980a Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Opposition to Motion for Preliminary Injunction. Bay General Community Hospital v. County of San Diego; Case No. 451877. San Diego: The Superior Court of the State of California in and for the County of San Diego.

1980b Brief of the Appellant. County of San Diego (Plaintiff/Appellant) v. Leonel J. Castillo, Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, et al. (Defendants/Appellees). Case No. 80-5271. San Diego: United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

Cornelius, W. A.

1981 Interviewing Undocumented Immigrants: Methodological Reflections Based on fieldwork in Mexico and the United States. *International Migration Review* 16:378-411.

1984 The Role of Mexican Labor in the U.S. Economy: Two Generations of Research (mimeo). Paper presented at the Annual Director's Meeting of PROFMEX, the Consortium of U.S. Research Programs for Mexico. Cozumel, Mexico, July 27.

Cornelius, W. A., L. R. Chavez, and J. A. Castro

1982 Mexican Immigrants and Southern California: A Summary of Current Knowledge. La Jolla: Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies, University of California, San Diego, Research Report Series No. 36.

Cornelius, W. A., L. R. Chavez, and O. W. Jones

1984 Mexican Immigration and Access to Health Services. La

- Jolla: Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies, University of California, San Diego, Monograph Series.
- Cox, O. C.
1948 *Caste, Class, and Race: A Study in Social Dynamics*. New York: Doubleday.
- Cross, H. E., and J. A. Sandos
1982 *Across the Border: Rural Development in Mexico and Migration to the United States*. Berkeley: Institute of Governmental Studies, University of California.
- Dinerman, I. R.
1978 Patterns of Adaptation among Households of U.S.-Bound Migrants from Michoacan, Mexico. *International Migration Review* 2:485-501.
1982 Migrants and Stay-at-Homes: A Comparative Study of Rural Migration from Mexico. Monograph #5. La Jolla: Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies, University of California, San Diego.
- Fernandez-Kelley, M. P., and A. Garcia
1988 Invisible Amidst the Glitter: Hispanic Women in the Southern California Electronics Industry. *In The Worth of Women's Work: A Qualitative Synthesis*. A. S. Statham, E. M. Miller and H. O. Mauksch, eds. Pp. 265-292. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Flores, E. T.
1984 Research on Undocumented Immigrants and Public Policy: A Study of the Texas School Case. *International Migration Review* 18:505-523.
- Food Research and Action Center
1984 Privacy Considerations Raised by Verification in the Child Nutrition Programs. *Clearinghouse Review* (June):140-142.
- Garcia y Griego, M.
1980 El Volumen de la Migracion de Mexicanos no Documentados a los Estados Unidos: Nuevas Hipotesis. CENIET Studies. Mexico, D.F.: Centro Nacional de Informacion y Estadisticas del Trabajo, Secretaria de Trabajo y Prevision Social.
- Glazer, N., and D. P. Moynihan
1970 *Beyond the Melting Pot: The Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Jews, Italians and Irish of New York City*. Cambridge, MA: The M.I.T. Press.
- Gordon, D. M.
1964 *Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion, and National Origins*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hammel, E. A., and P. Laslett
1974 Comparing Household Structure Over Time and Between Cultures. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 16:73-109.
- Handlin, O.
1941 *Boston's Immigrants: A Study of Acculturation*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Health Research Services and Analysis
1978 Unpaid Medical Costs/Illegal Immigrants. Final report submitted to the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (February). Los Angeles, CA (1100 Glendon Avenue): Health Research Services and Analysis, Inc.
- Hechter, M.
1977 *Internal Colonialism: The Celtic Fringe in British National Development, 1536-1966*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Hirschman, A. O.
1978 Prior U.S. Residence among Mexican Immigrants. *Social Forces* 56:1179-1202.
- House Committee (on Agriculture Food Stamp Act Amendments of 1980)
1980 House of Representatives Report No. 788, 96th Congress, 2nd Session.
- Huddle, D. L., A. F. Corwin, and G. J. MacDonald
1985 *Illegal Immigration: Job Displacement and Social Costs*. Alexandria, VA: The American Immigration Control Foundation.
- Leticia A., et al., vs. The Board of Regents of the University of California, et al.
1985 Statement of Decision (May 30). Case No. 588-982-5. Alameda: Superior Court for the State of California for the County of Alameda.
- MALDEF (Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund)
1985 INS Establishes 1985 Enforcement Priorities. Los Angeles: MALDEF (memorandum).
- Massey, D. S.
1985 The Settlement Process Among Mexican Migrants to the United States: New Methods and Findings. *In Immigration Statistics: A Story of Neglect*. D. B. Levine, K. Hill and R. Warren, eds. Pp. 255-281. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- McCarthy, K. F., and R. Burciaga Valdez
1985 Current and Future Effects of Mexican Immigration in California: Executive Summary. Santa Monica, CA: The RAND Corporation.
- Mines, R.
1981 Developing a Community Tradition of Migration: A Field Study of Rural Zacatecas. Monograph #3. Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies, University of California, San Diego.
- Mines, R., and M. Kearney
1982 The Health of Tulare County Farmworkers: Report of 1981 Survey and Ethnographic Research for the Tulare County Department of Health. Sacramento: Rural Health Division of the California Department of Health Services (mimeo).
- Morales, R.
1983 Transitional Labor: Undocumented Workers in the Los Angeles Automobile Industry. *International Migration Review* 17:570-576.
- Munoz, H., O. de Oliveira, and C. Stern
1982 Selected Studies on the Dynamics, Patterns and Consequences of Migration, I. Mexico City: Industrialization, Migration and the Labour Force, 1920-1970. Paris, France: UNESCO.
- National Center for Immigrants' Rights, Inc.
1982 Memorandum (Sept. 30): School Lunch Programs-Social Security Number Requirement. San Francisco: National Center for Immigrants' Rights, Inc.
- North, D. S., and M. Houston
1976 The Characteristics and Role of Illegal Aliens in the U.S. Labor Market: An Exploratory Study. Report prepared for the Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, Contract No. 20-11-74-21. Washington, DC: Linton & Co.
- Passel, J. S., and K. A. Woodrow
1984 Geographic Distribution of Undocumented Aliens Counted in the 1980 Census by State. *International Migration Review* 18:642-671.
- Piore, M. J.
1979 *Birds of Passage: Migrant Labor and Industrial Societies*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Portes, A., and R. L. Bach
1985 *Latin Journey: Cuban and Mexican Immigrants in the United States*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Portes, A., and A. Stepick
1985 Unwelcome Immigrants: The Labor Market Experiences of 1980 Cuban and Haitian Refugees in South Florida. The Johns Hopkins University (mimeo).
- Portes, A., J. M. Clark, and R. L. Bach
1980 Assimilation or Consciousness: Perceptions of U.S. Society Among Recent Latin American Immigrants to the United States. *Social Forces* 59:200-224.

- Rosenthal-Urey, I.
1984 Church Records as a Source of Data on Mexican Migrant Networks: A Methodological Note. *International Migration Review* 18:767-781.
- Sassen-Koob, S.
1982 Recomposition and Peripheralization at the Core. *In* *The New Nomads*. Marlene Dixon and Susanne Jonas, eds. Pp. 88-100. San Francisco: Synthesis Publications.
- Scott-Blair, Michael
1984 Tuition Controversy has Aliens in a Trap. *San Diego Union*, October 1, B-1.
- Selby, H. A., and A. D. Murphy
1982 The Mexican Urban Household and the Decision to Migrate to the United States. Philadelphia: ISHI Occasional Papers in Social Change.
- Sequoia Community Health Foundation Inc. vs. Board of Supervisors of Fresno County
1981 Memorandum of Intended Decision. Sequoia Community Health Foundation Inc. (Plaintiff) vs. Board of Supervisors of Fresno County (Defendant). Case No. 269458-6, Dept. 11. Superior Court of California, County of Fresno, July 24.
- Sowell, T.
1981 *Ethnic America: A History*. New York: Basic Books.
- Warren, R., and J. Passel
1983 Estimates of Illegal Aliens from Mexico Counted in the 1980 United States Census. Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Population Association of America, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, April 14-16. Washington, DC: U.S. Bureau of the Census.
- Weintraub, S., and G. Cardenas
1984 The Use of Public Services by Undocumented Aliens in Texas: A Study of State Costs and Revenues. Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs, Policy Research Project Report Number 60. Austin: Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs, University of Texas.
- Wiest, R. E.
1973 Wage-Labor Migration and the Household in a Mexican Town. *Journal of Anthropological Research* 29:180-209.
- Wilkins, C.
1983 Targeting Benefits to the Truly Needy? Implementation and Impact of Recent Eligibility Changes in the National School Lunch Programs. Master's Thesis, School of Public Policy, University of California, Berkeley.
- Wyman, D. (ed.)
1983 *Mexico's Economic Crisis: Challenges and Opportunities*. Monograph Series 12. La Jolla: Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies, University of California, San Diego.