

FAMILY, KINSHIP STRUCTURE, AND MODERNIZATION IN LATIN AMERICA

Manuel L. Carlos and Lois Sellers, University of California, Santa Barbara

THIS PAPER ANALYZES FAMILY AND KINSHIP PATTERNS IN LATIN AMERICA AMONG distinct socio-economic groups in urban and rural settings. The literature on which the analysis rests is also critically examined. Much of the focus is on those aspects of the material which deal with extended family (*parentesco*) relations and with fictive kinship (*compadrazgo*) ties; less attention is given to studies and components of the nuclear family. The central theme developed in the essay is that familial ties and the institution of fictive kinship are not breaking down under the impact of modernization, despite theories and interpretations of urbanization and industrialization which maintain that the opposite is true. Our position and findings on this matter are summarized in the conclusion.

The importance of familial networks of nuclear and extended kin in providing support to the individual's adaptation to socio-economic and cultural environments, regardless of his community of residence or his class standing, has long been recognized. Perhaps the classic statement of this point of view was made by Gillin concerning the Latin American family: "A man without a family of this sort (i.e., extensive and functioning as a unit) is almost helpless in Mestizo America" (Gillin, 1949: 171).

Almost without exception, studies of Latin American society include some general remarks concerning the nature and importance of the family. Thus, we can find reference to the family, its role and structure in the works of anthropologists, economists, psychologists, sociologists, political scientists, and historians. Edelman, a political scientist, in his study of the dynamics of modernization, states:

The family is easily one of the most important institutions in Latin America. As the primary group in society it exerts a greater influence on the individual than does any other group. . . . The family and its role is of interest to us not only as a key social unit but also as one of the major influences shaping the nation's political and economic development (Edelman, 1965: 85).

Yet, in line with the Park-Wirth-Redfield hypothesis and the early Chicago School of Sociology (Faris, 1967), Edelman, like other authors (Micklin, 1969; Kahl, 1968; Germani, 1963), sees family influence waning because of the process of secularization (Edelman, 1965: 104). According to this information, its decline is due to the influences of factors inherent in urbanization, industrialization, the expansion of government, the rise of political parties and voluntary associations, and to the increasing emancipation of women in urban society.

Latin American Research Review

This view of the disintegrative effect of modernization on social structure and, consequently, on the family, is currently being reinforced by studies of urbanization that treat populations as statistical aggregates or unintegrated classes, i.e., "masses." Examples of the problems inherent in this approach and interpretation are present in the review of the material in Cornelius' article on political sociology of cityward migration in Latin America (Cornelius, 1970). The authors surveyed by Cornelius base their assessment of the urban migrant population as a psychologically alienated and behaviorally unintegrated *lumpenproletariat* on the behaviorist assumption that psychological factors and environment alone produce an individual's behavioral and attitudinal patterns. Thus, their analyses fail to factor in the production of new socio-psychological behavior patterns and bonds in new contexts through the adaptation or synthesis of older behavioral norms and transferable social networks (i.e., *compadrazgo* and extended family) that continue to link the individual to society.

If they, and Cornelius in his own research on urbanization on Mexico (Cornelius, 1969), had done so, they would not have been as seemingly puzzled about why the aggregate socio-psychological data they have used in their analyses, although revealing a high level of psychological alienation from government and its policies, does not in fact correspond to a high degree of social isolation and political unrest.¹

The difficulties of the purely statistical approach to Latin American social structure were first pointed out long ago by Oscar Lewis, who also realized that aggregate data used in this type of analysis concealed the importance of the family as a building unit between the individual and society. Moreover, his interest in the strength of the Mexican family under conditions of change also marks the beginnings of scientific study of this phenomenon in Latin America (Lewis, 1952; 1950).

Without explicitly building on the implications of Lewis' work, various contemporary Latin American studies have through their data shown that political instability produced by unintegrated masses cannot be taken as an operative model. Rather, if one examines the studies closely, it is easy to come to the conclusion that so called "marginal populations" are in reality integrated into society through basic fictive and real kinship networks, and by voluntary associations which actually reinforce these ties (Roberts, 1970; Peattie, 1968; Kaufman, 1966).

Wagley is one of the few who has explicitly accepted Lewis' insights and not subscribed to the model of family breakdown with modernization. Mainly on the basis of his observations in Brazil, he states:

There is a growing body of evidence that kinship relations and awareness of kinship need not disappear with industrialization and urbanization . . . there is every reason to believe that, especially in those cultures where the tradition of familism has been strong, such as Brazil and other countries of Latin America, kinship will continue to play an important role in ordering social relations (Wagley, 1964: 188, 189).

Though sufficient evidence indeed exists, as to the unusual strength and adaptability of familism in various Latin American contexts (countries, communities and classes), this information has not been systematically surveyed and analyzed. At

FAMILY AND KINSHIP STRUCTURE IN LATIN AMERICA

most, authors who wish to emphasize the importance of family and kinship in modern Latin America repeatedly quote insightful statements such as Willems' startling conclusion regarding the lack of a Brazilian stock market:

It is probably less known that such a typically modern institution as the stock market in large metropolitan centers failed to develop because the most important joint-stock companies are owned by kin groups which handle transfer stock as a *purely domestic matter* (emphasis our's) (Willems, 1953: 343).

Additional information on the ways in which familial ties operate within upper-class business interests, replacing the need for a stock market or other impersonal means of business management and property exchange, is given by Bourricaud (1966), Lauterbach (1966), and Cochran and Reina (1962). Bourricaud has demonstrated that in Peru the oligarchy is "above all a network of families controlling wealth" (Bourricaud, 1966: 22). In his monograph on the structure and function of the Peruvian oligarchy, Bourricaud outlines the patriarchal aspects of the business world where family ties link the most powerful industrial and agrarian interests to the deposit resources of the large banks. Here, also, is a description of the *compadre* system, always an adjunct to other kinship systems, that is the avenue of power flow from central urban areas to rural cliques and patronage complexes.

Successful native and foreign entrepreneurs in Latin America have turned to familism to staff their industrial complexes. For example, a team of anthropologists and historians studying an Italian industrialist, Torcuato Di Tella, and his company, S.I.A.M., in Argentina, concluded that his combination of family and company interests had provided several factors toward survival and growth of S.I.A.M. (Sociedad Industrial Americana de Maquinarias). They were: 1) creation of a continuous pool of company personnel (family members) from which managerial labor could be drawn—managerial material being a scarce and valuable commodity; 2) provision of a strong core of loyal individuals, identifying with the company in the context of the family and a *gemeinschaft* tradition; and these two resulting in 3) continuity and stability over time, during economic crisis, war, and political strife (Cochran and Reina, 1962).

In his investigation of upper and middle class business managers in Latin America, Lauterbach notes the pervasiveness of familism in the fabric of business and industrial life (Lauterbach, 1966). Managerial interests and attitudes reflect the constant interaction of business, family, and politics. In many cases, managers have been reared in the family business from early childhood, and take their places in management as an unquestioned matter-of-course. In fact, it is usual to resort to the hiring of "outsiders" only after the supply of managerial material within the family has been exhausted.²

Even within areas that have a long-established middle class, such as in Uruguay and Argentina, it appears that family ties are important for the economic advancement of individuals and so continue to serve an adaptive function in the urban milieu (Lipset and Solari, 1967: 7). In areas where the emergence of the middle class is

Latin American Research Review

more recent, such as in Mexico, individuals depend on family ties for jobs in private and public bureaucracies.³

An example of the lingering strength of the family in the urban lower class is a recent study done among rural migrants to the city of São Paulo (Lopes, 1961). Lopes found that geographical mobility does not seem to affect the attachments that migrants have to their family networks in their communities of origin. Whether they migrate alone or with their family, they continue to see themselves as belonging to a *family*, and interpret all other associations as less important to them as individuals. For example, they speak of their fellow factory workers and employers alike as "they," resisting identification with the union.

Visiting patterns and close physical living arrangements maintained by migrant families of *all* classes are outlined in recent Brazilian studies (Rosen and Berlinck, 1968; Wilkening, Pinto and Pastore, 1968). These indicators of strong familial ties exist in both intra-rural and rural-urban migration.

Therefore, despite expectation of family and kinship breakdown with pressures of industrialization and urbanization, we propose that a systematic examination of published data, categorized along a rural-urban continuum and analyzed by socio-economic class groupings will reveal that in Latin America, family and kinship influence as such do not generally break down. Instead, modernization processes adjust to the various institutionalized functions of the extended and nuclear family.

The differential impact, if any, of modernization on kinship and family structure will be examined by separate analysis of data on socio-economic groups and communities that have achieved various levels of national socio-cultural integration. More than any other factor, examination of the material on Brazil and Mexico (see Tables III & IV in the appendix), two of the most socially mobilized and industrialized nations, has convinced us that systematic breakdown of family and kinship patterns is not occurring in Latin America.

SOME DEFINITIONS AND THE FIELD OF FAMILY AND KINSHIP STUDIES

For purposes of this paper, two concepts of the family need to be separated and clarified. First is the commonly acknowledged unit of the intimate "nuclear family," i.e., Mother, Father, and Child(ren). Murdock sees this unit as a basic one in all societies (Murdock, 1960).

The second concept to be defined here is that of the "extended family." This is the network of kin, both cognatic and affinal, described by various writers as critical to an understanding of Latin American society, economics, urbanization, etc. These kinsmen comprise an individual's *parentesco*. The extended family understood in this sense is not necessarily part of the same residential unit. In technical terms, because the matter of residence is open ended, *parentesco* is what Nutini would describe as a "non-residential extended family" (Nutini, 1968; 1967).

Most studies of the "family" make little or no attempt to describe the relation-

ship between actual kinship and "fictive" kinship (*compadrazgo*) in their analyses. A concurrent analysis of *compadrazgo* ties will be attempted in this paper.⁴

We treat *compadrazgo* and its social significance by emphasizing the relation between god-parent and parent rather than god-parent and child, since the former is the most important aspect of this kinship system. This is because those who contract a *compadre* relationship generally place their own social interactions and future expectations ahead of the purely religious aspects. This has been pointed out in numerous studies (Foster, 1969; Osborn, 1968; Diaz, 1966; Whitten, 1965; Tumin, 1952).

Our intent in dealing with all three dimensions of family and kinship is to reveal the integrated socio-economic dimensions of what we call "the nuclear family-extended family-*compadrazgo* kinship network," heretofore obscured by generalized statements about each dimension without reference to the other.

We believe that the three must be considered as an individual's total kinship network. We have found, for example, that nuclear and extended family ties, as well as *compadrazgo* ties, help migrants and other members of urban society to adopt to the economic systems of cities by finding employment and housing for newcomers (see Roberts, 1970; Peattie, 1968; Whitten, 1965; Butterworth, 1962). This same combination of kinship ties in small towns and peasant communities provides individuals with various alternatives in adapting to new situations and maintaining statuses and economic roles they have attained (Buechler and Buechler, 1971; Richardson, 1970; Foster, 1967; Kottak, 1967).

The field of family and kinship studies is very understudied. Thus, we would warn those who would follow in our footsteps that in our search for material on family and kinship we found very few studies that dealt exclusively, or even primarily, with these topics. Most of the studies we had to rely on examine the family only in a very restricted set of circumstances or in very limited aspects. Most had significant data, yet the authors did not seem to be aware of the importance or the potential utility of their information in reconstructing a complete description of the role and structure of family and kinship in Latin American society as a whole.

THE RURAL-URBAN CONTINUUM, LEVELS OF STRATIFICATION, AND MODERNIZATION

Our comparative analysis of general literature is by socio-economic segments and community types regardless of country. This is a standard sociological model of the continuum of traditional (rural) to modern (urban) society, used by Wagley and others (Wagley, 1968; Wolf, 1955; Mintz, 1953; Redfield, 1941).

The community type categories we have used to analyze and categorize the studies of family and kinship are (1) Rural Peasant (Indian); (2) Mestizo Peasant Village; (3) Town Lower Class; (4) Town Upper Class (see Table I). In the case of urban socio-cultural segments, the studies are grouped and examined by the following levels of stratification: Lower Segment "Class" (with sub-divisions Fringe

and Core Slums), Middle Segment "Class," and Upper Segment "Class" (see Table II). The first group of categories are indicators of degrees of socio-economic complexity along the rural-urban continuum model (Wagley, 1968). The word segment is used in the second group of categories since the term "Class" implies exact boundaries. The data in the studies surveyed do not permit a more refined classification. The two "town" categories (Table I) include studies of communities considered by authors to be "villages," but which, due to the size of population and proximity to cities are more urban than our Village category.

Several community types have been omitted from our survey. Aboriginal Indian populations have been omitted because of their diversity and their rapid rate of absorption into Mestizo populations.⁵ Plantation types have been grouped with corresponding socio-economic classes, with a parenthetical notation. Hutchinson (1957), for example, clearly states that his plantation "Upper-Class" maintains dual residence in countryside and city.

We have taken this dualistic residence model to classify the truly urban upper-class in Latin American cities. If upper-class families are rural in location, they are so strongly tied to city elements by education, vocation and attendant values as to make them "urban" in our sense.⁶ This pattern of dual residence and its implications for kinship and family networks have been observed by one of the authors of this paper among wealthy private farmers in northwestern Mexico.⁹ These individuals maintain their family and permanent residence in the city and are part of the urban upper class. Their second "residence" is on their private farmlands and is used only by day when they are engaged in supervising their permanent work force.

Among the wealthy farmers of Sinaloa and Sonora, Mexico, *compadrazgo* and extended family ties are maintained within the urban upper class in their city of residence as well as with members of the upper class in other cities and towns. Selection of marriage mates is within these upper class groups, thus consolidating many members of the upper class into a close social network. Although the area being described is one of highly mechanized agriculture and rapid social change (Carlos and Brokensha, 1973), *compadrazgo* ties are also established by wealthy farmers with members of their work force. This reveals the adaptation of the old patron-client relationship pattern found in more traditional agricultural societies elsewhere in Mexico and Latin America (Colby and Van den Berghe, 1969; Osborn, 1968).

Also, in assigning studies to our categories, we have acknowledged differences which have become apparent in recent studies; the urban lower segment has been separated, whenever feasible, into core slums and fringe slums (see Table II). Core slum populations represent long-term residence or city birth; fringe slums are populated by recent migrants from rural areas. This distinction is necessary because family and kinship patterns differ between *vecindad* or core slum populations and those of the fringe slums or *barriadas*.

The most prevalent assumptions and generalizations made by most authors about family structure and the relationship between family structure and family social change may be summarized thusly:

FAMILY AND KINSHIP STRUCTURE IN LATIN AMERICA

- 1) The Latin American family is usually patriarchal (male dominated).
- 2) The Latin American family is occasionally matriarchal, at least in the lowest classes (female dominated).
- 3) Modernization limits residence groups to members of the nuclear family.
- 4) Modernization and social distance produced by geographic mobility weaken extended family ties.
- 5) Modernization substitutes other associations for the reciprocal exchanges of *compadrazgo*, weakening importance of *compadrazgo* ties and sense of mutual obligation between individuals.

These five attributes or dimensions of family research compose the horizontal categories of Tables I and II. If the authors of the studies included in the table have made statements regarding any of the five specific attributes, they have been noted according to the formulas indicated on the tables themselves. Blank spaces indicate that the authors have not mentioned a particular dimension. Each of the above dimensions will be examined and its validity assessed in the following section of this paper.

In explaining social mobility, viewed here as a component of the modernization process, it is supposed by Parsons and others that he who rises does so alone, or at-most with the assistance of his nuclear family.¹⁰ Contrary to those who have studied modernization and mobility in Latin America and are of the Parsonian persuasion (Kahl, 1968), we propose that he who rises or maintains power and status in Latin America, regardless of his class or community of residence, does so with the help of the several types of family available to him: nuclear, extended, and fictive relatives (Berlinck, 1969; Peattie, 1968; Wagley, 1968; Hopkins, 1967; Bourricaud, 1966; Friedrich, 1965; Srickon, 1965; Goldkind, 1964; Leeds, 1964; Butterworth, 1962). Although the data in the studies on Tables I and II are incomplete, they reveal that the structural components of this kinship network are present in most contexts, modern and traditional.

DIMENSIONS OF FAMILY AND KINSHIP STRUCTURE

This section discusses the dimensions of family and kinship structure graphically presented in Tables I and II:

- 1) Male dominance
- 2) Female dominance
- 3) Assumed trend toward nuclear family households¹¹
- 4) Extended family
- 5) *Compadrazgo* (fictive kinship)

The most unequivocal statements regarding patriarchal power have been made by Freyre and authors influenced by him. These writers have used an historical perspective to explain the strong *em familia* pattern of the Brazilian upper-class, assuming from this basis that deviations from this pattern are lower class aberrancies.

Our research shows (see Tables I and II) that male dominance is directly re-

Latin American Research Review

lated to a specific set of socioeconomic factors, and not particularly to status or class identities. It is true, as Oscar Lewis has shown in studies of the lower classes in core slums (Lewis, 1959) that when the father-authority is absent, due to abandonment of the family by him or to his roaming in search of employment, his authority is replaced by the senior female of the household who is also the mainstay and provider. Yet it is also true that outside core slums, where the lower class is not part of the "culture of poverty," male dominance is operative in family relations.

Two other elements in the authority-role patterning of family groups are also revealed in our analysis, however. First, strict authoritarianism of the male is but one side of the coin—the obverse of which is female authority and power within the household. As the male becomes more absolute, he necessarily withdraws from the warm inner-circle of the family, and his distance (social and physical) from day-to-day household events makes it possible—in fact necessary—for feminine power to prevail.¹²

Second, male dominance is directly involved with the degree of economic cohesion of the extended family. The greater the economic reliance on male control over resources is, the greater the likelihood of actual or symbolic male dominance over nuclear or extended family affairs will be. For example, the old patriarch of a Brazilian upper class family is powerful because he commands his sons and their families through economic controls, and because through his position as symbolic family head, he has in fact gained access to the political and economic resources of other large and influential families by marrying his daughters "well."¹³ In order to stay within the corporate structure of family wealth in industrial settings, individuals must comply with the wishes of the patriarch (Cochran and Reina, 1962).

Our survey revealed that studies which attest to female domination of the family, as opposed to egalitarian sharing of power (Rosen and Simmons, 1971), are confined to certain community types and socio-economic groups (see Tables I and II): the Mestizo peasant villages, and the urban lower class in core slums. It is now well documented by several studies (Valentine, 1968) that the reasons for urban lower class matriarchy are: 1) usually economic, i.e., the absence of a male provider as discussed above, and 2) the "family" considered is a residential unit, not a biological one.¹⁴

Those village studies citing female dominance must be considered individually. In Tonalá, Díaz notes the surreptitious power-plays of the women of the household—clever ways in which people and events can be manipulated to produce a desired end that cannot be managed openly. This is possible because the strict, authoritarian father has isolated himself from the intimate group (see note 12, above).

In discussing female dominance, Lewis attributes the growing incidence of conflict between husband and wife in the village of Tepoztlán, Mexico to the discrepancy between actual roles and ideal or symbolic roles in family organization (Lewis, 1953). Again, this discrepancy is due to the elements outlined above: 1) prolonged absence of the husband-father due to economic pressures (contract labor outside the community, etc.) and 2) his involvement in social-ties outside of the family, and

3) the husband's minimal participation in household affairs because he is accorded a symbolic "lofty" position in the family hierarchy.

He loses touch with the individual members and situations which he is endeavoring to control, and inadvertently, he gives his wife and children the freedom he does not wish them to have (Lewis, 1953).

As can be noted, the presence or significance of male or female dominance is not easy to establish. For example, the presence of both forms of family authority, male and female, is reported by Peattie for a working class barrio in Ciudad Guayana, Venezuela (Peattie, 1968). When the father-husband is the provider for the household group, he is also the *jefe de familia*. When, on the other hand, the household looks to a femal authority, it is usually because of her seniority as economic and emotional mainstay for the group.¹⁵

In summing up the presence or absence of male or female dominance, a word should be added regarding authors' statements of irregularity in authority patterns due to "individual differences" between *reporters*. Foster, for example, saw couples in Tzintzuntzan as essentially egalitarian in household decision making. In contrast, because of his anti-Durkheimian view of society, Lewis saw in all of his studies the conflict born of the struggle for dominance—male and female.

Turning now to the process of nucleation in extended families, we noted in our survey that there is an assumed trend toward nuclear family in most of the studies we surveyed. As we have pointed out, certain statements by sociologists have suggested breakdown of the "traditional family organization" with the advent of industrialization. These arguments are generally buttressed by supporting data that a) in contrast to urban practices, rural family groups are usually housed in groups of relatives larger than the nuclear family; and b) modern (urban) family groups are more usually composed of only the small, nuclear family; therefore c) with modernization the trend to nucleated family groups will be completed.

Several arguments for challenging this model become evident in our analysis of Latin American family studies. First, the census data upon which some of these conclusions are based may be skewed by misinterpretation of physical elements in the residence patterns of families. Thus, in checking on the possibility of these factors entering into the analysis of statistical data, Diaz found that in Tonalá household groups were indeed counted as forming a single dwelling unit simply because they shared a common exit to the street (Diaz, 1966).

Second, the variation over time of the nuclear-extended family composition of a household group is seldom taken into consideration in urban studies. Hammel's study of household composition (Hammel, 1961), as related to decades of a woman's lifetime, gives some indication of complexities overlooked in most synchronic studies.

Third, little or no consideration is given in most studies as to such factors as the freezing of rents in urban centers. That their impact may be of great influence in some areas is illustrated in a comparative study of two working-class neighborhoods in Buenos Aires (Germani, 1961). Germani concludes that the fixed-low

rents of long-time residents in the absence of new low-cost housing will make the "doubling-up" of families increasingly financially advantageous.

If we compare expectations with realities in the studies in two highly distinct cultural settings, Tonalá (Mestizo village) and Buenos Aires (urban lower-class), we see that in the former, the ideal patrilocal residence is possible without sacrifice of separate nuclear family household, while in the latter, the nuclear ideal may be sacrificed to financial expediency (Diaz, 1966; Germani, 1961).

Certainly, the study of the extended family is an area of research most evident in Latin American studies (see Tables I and II). Anthropological studies of rural and village groups have long emphasized the function of the kinship network in the integration of the individual in society (Stein, 1961). However, the economic and supportive aspects of the extended family are noted in descriptions of virtually every socio-economic group (in urban contexts, see Beyer, 1967: 201; and Frank, 1966: 78).

Contrary to our initial expectations that its economic functions would be most evident in the support of old and indigent family members, and in the powerful oligarchical groups, we also discovered in our research and comparative analysis of socio-cultural segments (noted earlier) that the extended family network is also prominent, indeed crucial, in such processes as urban migration and upward mobility. For example, Table I reflects this in that almost all of the urban lower-class studies (most of which included large numbers of migrants) mention the presence and functioning of strong kinship ties. One exception, Hammel's study of a Peruvian slum in a small city, purports to show the absence of extended family. We maintain that his interpretation of the absence of extended family is due to his definition, with which we disagree.

For his part Hammel believes that the extended family is comprised exclusively of kinship networks or households containing members of *several* generations. Thus, he would recognize as extended only those composed of the nuclear group plus one or more members of an ascending or descending generation related by marriage or consanguinity.

The importance of an extended family is not its composition, but rather the relationships and reciprocal obligations that it entails (Berlinck, 1969). For us, an extended family can also consist of compadres, single or married cousins, and other members of the *same* generation related through marriage or descent. This interpretation is based on our belief that an individual relies on his nuclear-extended family-compadrazgo network and that the segments in the network may vary without hampering its essential functions. Butterworth illustrates what we maintain about the importance of the function rather than the structure of family groups. He notes the complete absence of any formal or informal participation in voluntary organizations among the Mixtec migrants to Mexico City in a lower-class setting. Instead, social participation is limited to "weekend get-togethers of relatives and compadres" (Butterworth, 1962: 261-263). He also demonstrates how individuals are reliant on their compadres and extended family, as we define it, for jobs and economic as-

sistance in times of crisis. This was also observed by Ornelas in his study of lower-class fringe settlements. As many as 50% of his household head sample in one *colonia* said that they could depend on their compadres for help. They also stated they could rely on assorted relatives (Ornelas, n.d.).

Among higher-level urban classes there are, in addition to easily observable physical aid given by the extended family to its members, other more elusive factors suggested by Leeds in his study of urban *autodidacto* (self-taught individuals) and *cabide de emprego* groups (mutual aid alliances between individuals in different professions) (Leeds, 1964). Among members of these groups there is a transmission of information "cues" and of the ability to interpret them. He relates the awareness of certain individuals to advancement opportunities and openings, through cues, to their training in the "family circle" and in "non-kin contexts of like-minded families."

Lastly, in discussing the dimensions of kinship and family, we turn to an analysis of fictive kinship or *compadrazgo*. This category of kinship is usually lumped together with "extended family." Contrary to our findings, statements are usually made noting that the influence of *compadrazgo* ties are "losing importance" or that they are less traditional in form. These studies allege the breakdown in *compadrazgo* because of the demise in the number of occasions under which this relationship is contracted.

We have found that although occasions are indeed fewer, usually restricted to three (Baptism, First Communion and Confirmation), individuals still make effective use of this form of fictive kinship, relying on it in a number of ways, depending on the situation and socio-economic segment of the participants. Because these ties represent individual preferences vis-a-vis cultural norms, they present a provocative blend of "family" and "society." *Compadrazgo* is at once social, economic and religious. It makes up a fabric of relationships remarkably durable to modernization.

Our analysis of statements made in all studies supports what we have said about *compadrazgo* (see Tables I and II); it shows that the institution of *compadrazgo* changes form by socio-economic level or group, but does not disappear. Despite the paucity of definitive statements, it is our conclusion that the forms of *compadrazgo* relationships change along these dimensions

1) In rural Indian communities the choice of compadres is usually outside the family. Primary relationships are already very strong in both the nuclear and extended families (see Nader's description of Juquilan family life, 1964; also Cancian, 1965) and do not require reinforcement. *Compadrazgo* ties are outside the village, fewer in number than Mestizo villages, but ritually very meaningful, serving to enlarge the economic and social world of isolated rural groups.

2) In the nationally integrated Mestizo village, the tendency is to a proliferation of *compadrazgo* ties (Foster, 1967; Diaz, 1966; Nader, 1964) and to the retention of *compadrazgo* *within* the extended family. This is because extended families are physically close, but members are interspersed with other families in the community and face-to-face relationships between family members become diffused. Thus com-

Latin American Research Review

padrazgo ties reinforce relationships diffused by spatial and social factors.

3) In the urban lower-class, *compadrazgo* ties are used as a "help" mechanism. Choices tend to be from two areas: from the migrant community itself, and from a higher economic group. Individuals within the migrant movement buttress each other in the new precarious environment. Individuals chosen as *compadres* in a vertical relationship to the low urban group, such as factory foremen and low-ranking managers, help to integrate the individual (and through him other family members) into the more modern social milieu.

4) In urban upper-class groups, *compadrazgo* ties, as well as most social relations, tend to be within the extended family group. This is according to tradition, and again, has socio-economic implications.

As a post-script to the dimensional aspects of extended family and *compadrazgo*, we would point out an example of the sorts of conclusions which have been drawn due to the inadequate appreciation of the adaptability and strength of these forms of kinship. Our illustration is a series of contradictory statements to be found in Tumin's study of a pueblo in Guatemala, published in 1952. On the one hand, in assessing the importance of the "family" in both Indian and Ladino ethnic groups, he states:

It is most nearly accurate, therefore, to insist that the family, as an organized group of kin, with its attached functions extending beyond those of reckoning descent, is the single most pervasive and important social agency in San Luis (Tumin, 1952: 157).

Moreover, Tumin, in an earlier chapter, outlines the crucial importance of *compadrazgo* ties between the dominant and subordinate populations of land-poor Indians and the land-rich Ladinos. The two "castes" do not mix socially, but the dyadic bond between *compadres* serves the double function of 1) guaranteeing rental rights to the Indian for the extra land he needs to support his family, and 2) maintaining the social distance and subservient patron-client relationship of the Indian, giving him privileged status in the form of access to other benefits from his patron. The reciprocity is achieved in the form of labor the Indian provides to his Ladino *compadre*.

Tumin also notes the importance of the family "name" and, therefore, extended family ties in the Ladino group, and the cooperative aspects of Indian families in their work activities. And yet, he concludes that "kinship is becoming less effective and extended" (presumably because of fragmentary evidence of levirate practices now extinct) and that "kinship bonds, as formerly defined, are tending to disappear" (because the authority of the elder brother as surrogate parent is not as strong as once supposed) (Tumin, 1952).

THE THEORY OF MODERNIZATION AND FAMILY STRUCTURE

The crucial points of pressure from the impact of industrialization on traditional family structure and on reliance on familial ties are conveniently identified in a series

FAMILY AND KINSHIP STRUCTURE IN LATIN AMERICA

of propositions by Goode (Goode, 1963: 369). Goode, it should be noted, excluded Latin America from his world survey of family studies. Significantly, in the Latin American context, the same sorts of propositions are made in Kahl's study of Mexico and Brazil (Kahl, 1968).

Goode's points are:

1. The demands for physical or geographical mobility weaken intimacy of contact in the kin network.
2. The class-differential mobility rates created by new labor markets separate family members into different socio-economic groups.
3. Modern urban systems of social welfare services and extra-family organizations replace the economic and social functions of the extended family in traditional and rural groups.
4. Industrialization creates a new value structure, one that recognizes individual achievement over inherited obligations, thus weakening the basic reward-submission structure of relationships between the individual and his family.¹⁶
5. Industrialization requires occupational specialization, making it less likely that kinsmen can help each other find employment.

All of these elements are mentioned in Latin American studies, especially those influenced by Redfield's work and done before 1955. Evidence contrary to each of these central tendencies can be found in recent studies, suggesting that these statements, while based on a review of world literature, are simply a restatement and application of the basic tenets of the Chicago School to a new body of data.

Wilkening, Pinto, and Pastore (1968) found data demonstrating that Goode's first point did not hold true for Brazil. They compared families in a rural sample, migrant vs. non-migrant, with urban families (Brasilia) of all socio-economic groups. This study reveals that "the extended family is the most important source of information and assistance for migrants to both rural and urban areas of central Brazil" (Wilkening, Pinto, Pastore, 1968: 695). Ties which were disrupted during the migration process were reinforced by visiting and grew stronger with length of residence in the new area. Studies cited elsewhere show that the same patterns are present in other countries.

Goode's second point is treated in an elaborate model developed by Whitten for his analysis of kinship and class in his study of Negro families (Whitten, 1965: Chapter 7). In the first generation, lower-class families spread their resources to cover the presence of transient relatives in quest of jobs, etc. The second generation achieves upward mobility toward lower middle-class status by severing these ties that drain so heavily on individual economic resources. By this method, which is also practiced in a Brazilian village studied by Kottak (1967), enterprising nuclear groups rise in the system. By the third generation, however, these families are again involved in a complex network of marriage and compadrazgo ties that extend both to groups above and below them on the socio-economic scale. It would seem there-

Latin American Research Review

fore, that although the kinship ties are weakened by the second generation, they remain viable enough to function again for the third generation in a new context. Thus, breakdown is momentary, situational, and limited to individuals, not entire classes or groups.

Point three is challenged by data in studies by Butterworth, and by Rosen and Berlinck. Butterworth found that Mixtec migrants to Mexico City maintain a strong solidarity with their fellow Tilantongueños, using their familistic and compadre ties as avenues of employment, living together until adjacent buildings can be constructed to house families independently (Butterworth, 1962). The Rosen, Berlinck study is more far-reaching, using samples from five communities near São Paulo, Brazil (Rosen, Berlinck, 1968). These communities were selected to represent varying degrees of modernity along the rural-urban continuum. Families within each community were scaled by socio-economic class, and cross-community comparisons were made. These researchers concluded, as we have from our survey of studies, that regardless of degree of community modernity, frequent visiting patterns exist between related families. They also found that among lower socio-economic groups in the city the proximity of dwellings among blood relatives serves as an adaptive mechanism for new migrants from rural areas.

Goode's fifth point, job specialization, does not appear as a significant disruptive factor in Latin America. Leeds' illustration of the mechanisms of *autodidacto* and *cabide* help to explain this. The widely established practice of on-the-job training, plus a quick response to opportunity are complimented by a strong kin-network helping the aspirant to find an opening. This sort of mutual assistance strengthens the kin network.

TRENDS IN FAMILY AND RELATED STUDIES

Tables III, IV, and V in the appendix illustrate the wide variety of sources used for our comparative analysis. Examination of all types of family studies makes certain trends evident. Ethnographic descriptions for the sake of description alone have been replaced by a concern for problems of change, modernization. In other cases inconclusive generalizations have been confirmed or refuted by comparative studies using sophisticated sampling techniques. In spite of this, as we have illustrated, the tendency has persisted to accept certain sociological propositions even when individual data collections prove to be inconclusive or contradictory (Kahl, 1968).

The tables also demonstrate a subtle difference in content from studies done in one country to those done in another. There is no apparent reason for differences in focus except the predilection of the investigator. For example, investigators in Brazil tend to focus on migration and hence extended family networks. This appears to be an influence of Freyre's assumption that strong kin ties are a part of Brazilian culture. Researchers in Mexico, on the other hand, tend to focus on role patterns and parent-child relationships, taking almost for granted the myriad complexities of the all-

pervasive compadrazgo networks and family structure. They seem to be preoccupied with the emphasis on *machismo* in the culture.

Studies available from other Latin American countries, although fewer in number, tend to echo similar problem orientations and changes in focus over time. Perhaps they are influenced by numerous and extensive research funds available for studies of migration and attendant problems. For example, the best data on fringe slums are in the latest studies from cities in Venezuela, Argentina and Brazil (see Tables IV and V). These reflect a concern with exploding urbanization (Beyer, 1967).

Refinement of research techniques may be best illustrated by taking the example of Oscar Lewis' studies. His early family studies in Mexico (Lewis, 1949, 1950, 1959), although comparative in a restricted sense, did not provide supportive data or evidence of unbiased samples. However, his recent comparative study of slum families in Puerto Rico and New York (Lewis, 1968) augments his ethnographic observations with data on socio-economic levels, populations, and realistic statements of the relationships between his samples and the communities at large (see Tables I, II, III and V).

Also, although Lewis' early sample (1949) appears as 853 families, his use of this base was very generalized. His 1968 sample, 150 families in all, while not random is at least representative, better documented, and more intensively studied.

If we compare other early works such as Whetten (Table III), Frazier (Table IV) and Tumin (Table V) with the later studies on each table, the same refinements of techniques in relationship to sample sizes become evident.

Moreover, changes are evident in content and form as well as methodology. Three fairly recent studies demonstrate these changes. The first uses detailed description augmented by a biographical format to illustrate the life patterns of *callejon* dwellers in Lima, Peru (Patch, 1961). The social "disorganization" apparent in this microcosm of society, a core slum, is probably related to the length of time the family remains in the culture of poverty, where all cultural patterns break down (Stokes, 1962).

The second study is an exercise in methodology. In it, the authors attempt to define and delineate the dimensions of modernization manifested in the role structure of individuals within the nuclear family (Young and Young, 1967). As society becomes more complex, the number of roles and types of alternatives available to individuals are multiplied. These authors suggest that the tools of measurement currently in use by researchers are inadequate both to family studies and to studies of social class based on "family units."

The third study is a research and dissertation project undertaken in Santiago, Chile, which was truncated by the exposure of Project Camelot in 1965 (Kaufman, 1966). The findings and conclusions drawn from this work raise more questions than they answer. Interviewers attempted to ascertain whether nuclear families become less dependent upon or involved in the sharing of households with their ex-

Latin American Research Review

tended families as their standard of living rises. Kaufman concludes that 1) as levels of living increase among lower-classes, families become better integrated (with the extended family network, in that they share households), and 2) at the lowest segments of the lower-class, demands are largely concerned with the goal of family independence in the form of maintaining nuclear family households because of their smaller resources. Thus he raises an important question: Which is first, improved family status or greater integration in kin networks? Whitten's four generational model of Negro families in Ecuador, discussed earlier, may have application here (Whitten, 1965).

Finally, it is clear from our survey that the following socio-cultural segments are the most studied:

1. Fringe-slum populations
2. Peasant-village areas

The most understudied groups are:

1. The heterogeneous elements that comprise the so-called Latin American "middle-class"
2. Urban-Elites (Lipset and Solari, 1967)

A number of related studies were included in our survey that are indirectly concerned with the concepts and wider field of family research. They investigate, in depth, various aspects of life dealt with in ethnographic descriptions, providing us with a broader comparative base. In the following paragraphs, each area of special focus is related to the facet of family life to which it applies.

Parent-child relationships are explored in a study by McGinn, Harburg and Ginsberg of affiliative responses of eighteen and nineteen-year-old male students in Guadalajara and Michigan (McGinn *et al.*, 1966). These researchers conclude that the Mexican youths react to conflict situations in ways that tend to maintain positive interpersonal relationships. This response is attributed to family experiences and early childhood training patterns. The authors suggest that parents in Mexico are less achievement oriented than their U.S. counterparts and tend to emphasize dependency and obedience in their demands on children.

Parent-child relationships are also explored by psychiatrists Ramirez and Parres (1957). In a study of welfare recipients, they conclude that male abandonment patterns in marriage in Mexico City reflect deep-seated insecurity produced by rejection in childhood. They give an alternative explanation to the idea that female-headed households are caused by the economic inability of males to support a family. They maintain that the extraordinarily close relationship of the Mexican mother and son is disrupted by the birth of another sibling; this trauma is repeated at the birth of his own child, producing a rejection of the wife and offspring.

The dichotomy of masculine and feminine roles in Latin America is outlined by the studies of Diaz-Guerrero (1955) and of Maccoby, Modiano, and Lander (1964). Diaz-Guerrero generalizes from his own experience plus a sample drawn from Mexico City; Maccoby *et al.* use children's game behavior as an experimental analytic device. Both investigations explore authority patterns as well as the closely

FAMILY AND KINSHIP STRUCTURE IN LATIN AMERICA

related *machismo* complex. Other recent studies have focused on masculine and feminine roles (Steinmann and Fox, 1969; Peñalosa, 1968).

Rosen has published two articles relevant to our analysis, both concerning an achievement-motivation study made in a cross-cultural comparison of boys nine to eleven years of age in Brazil and the U.S. (Rosen, 1962; 1964). He relates achievement motivation to economic growth, and states that an equally important element of the achievement syndrome, besides motivation, is "achievement orientation" developed as a result of family life experiences.

Value orientations, because of their conceptual content, are probably acquired in that stage of the child's training when verbal communication of a fairly complex nature is possible. Achievement motivation, the need to excel, on the other hand, has its origins in parent-child interaction beginning early in a child's life when many of these relations are likely to be emotional and un verbalized (Rosen, 1964: 346).

Thus, the importance of early parent-child relationships and of the enculturation process is directly related by Rosen to the crucial processes of modernization in Latin America.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This paper has attempted analysis of the family in Latin America by considering various publications impinging on questions relevant to the functions considered "traditional" to the family in its two concepts: nuclear and extended. Studies have been compared by socio-economic group regardless of specific locale, and have been analyzed according to five criteria implicit in the standard sociological model of change due to industrialization and modernization processes.

Our analysis of these studies, supplemented by special psychological data focused on specific problems, leads us to conclude that the model of waning familial influence and gradual disorganization and disintegration of large family groups is not true for Latin America. Instead, the modernization process is being molded to the existing family and kinship institutions and areas of traditional family function.¹⁷

Thus we would rephrase Goode's propositions:

1. The demands for physical mobility may or may not weaken intimacy of contact in the kin network; most studies in Latin America show that it does not.
2. The class-differential mobility created by new labor markets may or may not separate family members into different socio-economic groups; most studies show that it does not.
3. Modern urban systems of social welfare facilities and extra-family organization may or may not replace the economic and social functions of the extended family in traditional and rural groups; recent Latin American studies show that they do not.
4. Industrialization tends to create a new value structure, one that recognizes

Latin American Research Review

individual achievement over birth, which may weaken relationships between the individual and his family. Recent studies negate this proposition for Latin America.

5. Industrialization does not necessarily mean that job specialization will be rapid or disruptive of family and kinship; in Latin America kinsmen tend to help each other find employment.

We can relate practical expediency to the prevalent retention of extended family ties, an adaptation of a behavioral pattern, and couple it to Peck's findings associated with the Latin American core-value pattern of "respect" (Peck, 1967), an adaptation of a psychological pattern, to explain groups of all socio-economic levels.

When an author introduces his remarks with a general statement of the importance of the family or kinship in Latin America, we can be sure that, in most instances, it is an institution prevailing over rapid change. Admittedly, the data for supporting our contentions is still scarce. Hence, the extent to which we are right for all the situations, classes and community types we have mentioned will of course, depend on confirmation from findings or data of further systematic field research. Until such time, we stand by those hypotheses made in this paper, and the propositions stated above. We urge that what we have said about the functions and importance of the nuclear-extended family-compadrazgo network not be ignored in studies of social structure and change, as they have been in the past. Modernization will occur and affect individuals in these networks without necessarily destroying the networks themselves.

FAMILY AND KINSHIP STRUCTURE IN LATIN AMERICA

APPENDIX A

TABLE III

Mexican Studies Pertaining to Family and Kinship

Author of Study, date	Data Base Type	Sample Size	Orientation
Whetten, 1948	Census, Govt. Data	Country-Nation	
Lewis, 1949	Ethno-Descrip.	853 fams. 3,500 pop.	Male-Female Conflict
Hupmhrey, 1952	" "	2,592 fams.	Family role structure
Diaz-Guerrero, 1955	Survey, Questionnaire	294 inds.	Male, Female
Ramirez and Parres, 1957	Psycho-Social Research	635 fams.	Rejection, Abandonment
Lewis, 1959	Ethno-Descrip.	5 fams.	Poverty & Family Structure
Lewis, 1960	" "	83 households	Vecindad Culture
Erasmus, 1961	" "	85,000 pop. 70,000 pop.	Social Mobility
Butterworth, 1962	Partic-Obs. Interview	31 fams.	Migrants & Families
Lewis, 1963	Ethno-Descrip.	4,000 pop. 662 housesites	Community Structure & Family
Maccoby, <i>et al.</i> , 1964	Partic-Obs. Questionnaire	850 pop. 76 children	Attitudes re Authority
Nader, 1964	Ethno-Descrip.	2,000 pop. 1,700 pop.	Indian vs. Mestizo Patterns
McGinn, <i>et al.</i> , 1965	Psychological testing	184 students	Parent-child relationships
McGinn, 1966	Ethno-Descrip.	Not mentioned	Parent-child relationships
Van den Berghe and Van den Berghe, 1966	" "	30,000 pop.	Compadrazgo & Class
Diaz, 1966	Ethno-Descrip.	5,000 pop.	Peasant Culture
Foster, 1967	" "	1,877 pop. 376 fams.	Peasant Culture
Peck, 1967	" "	552 students	Value-systems
Hunt, 1968		2,500 pop.	Kinship
Nutini, 1968		Not mentioned	Marriage & Family
Ornelas, 1968	Survey, Questionnaire	500 fams.	Community Involvement
Maccoby and Fromm, 1970	Ethno-Descrip.	792 pop.	Peasant Culture
Nelson, 1971		2,111 pop.	Peasant Culture

APPENDIX B

TABLE IV
Brazilian Studies Pertaining to Family and Kinship

Author of Study, date	Data Base Type	Sample Size	Orientation
Frazier, 1942	Ethno-Survey	50 fams.	Candomble Families
Pierson, 1951	Ethno-Descrip.	2,723 pop.	Community
Willems, 1953			<i>Parentela</i> , U. & L. Class
Harris, 1956	" "	1,500 pop. 270 hshlds.	Race and Class
Hutchinson, 1957	" "	1,462 pop.	Plantation-Town Community
Lopes, 1961	" "	500 inds.	Migrants in Factory
Pearse, 1961	" "	279 fams.	Migrant-city Adaptation
Smith, 1963	Census, Gov't Data	Historical References	Social Survey
Rosen, 1962, 1964	Interview, Observation	1,140 boys	Achievement Motivation
Leeds, 1964	" "	15 inds.	"cues"; <i>Cabide</i>
Freyre, 1964		Historical References	Patriarchal, <i>Parentela</i> ties
Azevedo, 1965	Marriage statistics, Ethno. data		Marriage, divorce
Kahl, 1965	Questionnaire	1300 men	Soc. stratification & values
Kottak, 1967	Ethno-Descrip.	730 pop.	Kinship & Class
Rosen, Berlinck 1968	Questionnaire	734 fams.	Modernization, Family ties
Wilkening, Pinto and Pastore, 1968	Questionnaire	944 fams.	Soc., Econ. ties Migrant
Rosen and Simmons, 1971	Interview	726 women	Industrialization & Fertility

APPENDIX C

TABLE V

Miscellaneous Studies Pertaining to Family and Kinship

Author of Study, date	Location or Country	Data Base Type	Sample Size	Orientation
Siegel, 1942	Guatemala	Ethno-Descrip. Legal files	145 fams. 207 court cases	Marriage & Family
Tumin, 1952	Guatemala	Ethno-Descrip.	3,500 pop.	Indian vs. Ladino culture
Service, 1954	Paraguay	" "	1,400 inds. 301 hshlds.	Community
Fals-Borda, 1955	Colombia	" "	397 inds. 81 hshlds.	Peasant Village
Strickon, 1959	Argentina	" "	2,000 pop.	Class, Kinship System
Germani, 1961	Buenos Aires	Interview Observation	210 fams.	Lower-class Families
Hammel, 1961	Peru	Census, Ethno-Observation	Slum: 1,000 inds. Village: 700 inds.	Household Composition
Matos Mar, 1961	Lima	Census, Questionnaire	21,004 fams.	Barriadas
Reichel-Dormatoff, 1961	Colombia	Ethno-Descrip.	2,400 pop.	Peasant Culture
Stein, 1961	Peru	Ethno-Descrip.	740 inds. 166 hshlds.	Community
Williamson, 1963	El Salvador, Costa Rica	Interview	188 ubds (MC) 186 inds. (LC)	Middle-Class Values
Whitten, 1965	Ecuador	" "	1,700 pop.	Negroes-Mestizos Communities
Bourricaud, 1966	Peru			Oligarchy
Rogers, Neill, 1966	Colombia	Interview	23 inds.	Achievement Motivation
Arriaga, 1968	Venezuela	Census	not given	Family
Osborn, 1968	Colombia	Ethno-Descrip.	8,000 pop.	Compadrazgo
Peattie, 1968	Venezuela	" "	490 inds. 80 hshlds.	Barrio life
Lewis, 1968	San Juan New York	" " Interview, Tests	100 fams. (SJ) 50 fams. (NY)	Slum fams. Comparison
Lauterbach, 1966	Several Countries	Interview, Questionnaire	403 managers, industrialists	Management Activities
Kaufman, 1966	Santiago, Chile	Interview Questionnaire	373 hshlds.	Family & Class
Richardson, 1970	Colombia	Ethno-Descrip.	1,527 pop.	Community
Roberts, 1970	Guatemala	Interview, Observation	2 neighhds. 400 hshlds. 127 hshlds.	Social Organization

NOTES

1. It seems that some of the new methodologists, such as Cornelius, using survey data in their study of Latin American populations, have forgotten the message in the writings of anthropologists like Gillin, Lewis, and many others who pointed out, in their own ways, that individuals, for the most part, *are* integrated into society. As Gillin pointed out, and as our survey of new materials has confirmed, so long as a man has his real and fictive kin, he will never be "helpless" or powerless in adapting and surviving in his environment.
2. This familial orientation finds its ultimate expression in the goals stated by the most financially secure members of management, namely the perpetuation of family tradition and the development of an individual's "roots" in this tradition.
3. Ornelas (personal communication) reports that members of the middle-class rely on their kinsmen for job placement in such organizations as public utility companies. While this practice of reliance on family is not as common among the new middle-class as it is among the lower-class, it is very important among the established middle-class.
4. Two standard works on *compadrazgo* are Mintz and Wolf (1950), and Foster (1952).
5. For an excellent description of an aboriginal nuclear family, see Hilger, Sister M. Inez and Mondloch, Margaret. Araucanian Custom; an Afternoon with an Araucanian Family on the Coastal Range of Chile. *Journal de la Société des Americanistes*. 55: 1: 201-220.
6. See Kahl (1965), which demonstrates the close relationships between self-identification and socio-economic group.
7. a = Juquila only
b = Talea only
c = plantation (coffee), Pinhal.
d = Class "C"
e = São Luiz de Paraetinga
f = Second Class
g = Class "B"
8. a = Class "D"
b = São Paulo
c = First Class
d = Class "A"
e = Study concerns fringe settlements, lower and middle-class.
9. The senior author conducted field-work research in northwestern Mexico under a N.I.M.H. Grant, from Sept., 1966 through May, 1968.
10. Parsons, Talcott. *The Social Structure of the Family*. In: *The Family: Its Function and Destiny*. R. Ashen ed. 1949. New York. Also Wirth (1938).
11. Greenfield (1961) questions the argument that attributes nucleation to the Industrial Revolution, and suggests that the nuclear family as the predominant basic kinship unit in Europe and England *antedates* industrialization and "may have been responsible for the very forms of social organization that developed along with the machines." See Osterreich (1965) for various tangible functions of the extended family in Canada.
12. Nader (1964: 289) suggests that physical spatial relationships may have a direct bearing on the expression of authority. When the nuclear group is relatively isolated, as on the family farms around Juquila, the father does not further isolate himself socially by being extremely severe. The Juquilan male is therefore less authoritarian than his Talean counterpart who lives in a social milieu that provides him with comrades outside the immediate family.
13. See Noguera, Oracy, (1959).

FAMILY AND KINSHIP STRUCTURE IN LATIN AMERICA

14. See R. N. Adams (1960) for an analysis of the lower-class matrifocal family in Latin America and its implications in replacing the "classical" functions of the nuclear family.
15. Ornelas found few signs of overt female dominance in his study of fringe settlements of the Federal District of Mexico. Furthermore, females as heads of households represented less than ten per cent.
16. Both Kaufman (1966) and Ornelas (n.d.) note that voluntary associations also play an important role in aiding individuals under certain circumstances.
17. This parallels conclusions drawn by Aldous (1962) for West Africa. There the Extended Family substitutes for welfare programs that are non-existent, providing shelter and jobs for migrant members, educational opportunities for children of rural relatives, and care for oldsters. In Lagos, she cites a study by Peter Marris that found extended family groups had taken on the formal characteristics of voluntary associations, even to scheduled meetings.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ADAMS, RICHARD N.

- 1960 *An Inquiry into the Nature of the Family*. In: *Essays in the Science of Culture in Honor of Leslie White*. 30–49. New York.
- 1967 *Family, Household and Kinship*. In: *The Second Sowing, Power and Secondary Development in Latin America*. 149–160. San Francisco.

ALDOUS, JOAN

- 1962 *Urbanization, the Extended Family, and Kinship Ties in West Africa*. *Social Forces*. 41: 1: 6–11.

ARRIAGA, EDUARDO E.

- 1968 *Some Aspects of Family Composition in Venezuela*. *Eugenics Quarterly*. 15: 177–190.

AZEVEDO, THALES DE

- 1965 *Family, Marriage and Divorce in Brazil*. In: *Contemporary Cultures and Societies in Latin America*. D. Heath and R. Adams eds. 288–310. New York.

BERLINCK, MANOEL TOSTA

- 1969 *The Structure of the Brazilian Family in the City of São Paulo*. Ithaca.

BEYER, GLENN H.

- 1967 *Editor's Summary and Elaboration*. In: *The Urban Explosion in Latin America*. 189–214. Ithaca.

BOURRICAUD, FRANÇOIS

- 1966 *Structure and Function of the Peruvian Oligarchy*. *Studies in Comparative International Development*. 11: 2: 17–31.

BUECHLER, HANS C. AND BUECHLER, JUDITH-MARIA

- 1971 *The Bolivian Aymara*. New York.

BUTTERWORTH, DOUGLASS

- 1962 *A Study of the Urbanization Process Among the Mixtec Migrants from Tilantongo in Mexico City*. *América Indígena*. 22: 3: 257–274.

CANCIAN, FRANK

- 1965 *Economics and Prestige in a Maya Community*. Stanford.

CARLOS, MANUEL AND BROKENSHA, DAVID

- 1973 *Agencies, Goals, and Clients: A Cross-Cultural Analysis*. *Studies in Comparative International Development*. Vol. 7. (in press).

COCHRAN, THOMAS C. AND REINA, RUBEN E.

- 1962 *Entrepreneurship in Argentine Culture*. Philadelphia.

COLBY, BENJAMIN N. AND VAN DEN BERGHE, PIERRE L.

- 1969 *Ixil Country: A Plural Society in Highland Guatemala*. Berkeley.

Latin American Research Review

- CORNELIUS, WAYNE A.
1969 Urbanization as an Agent in Latin American Political Instability: The Case of Mexico| *The American Political Science Review*. 63: 833–857.
1971 The Political Sociology of Cityward Migration in Latin America: Towards Empirical Theory. In: *Latin American Urban Annual Vol I*. F. Ravinovitz and F. Trueblood eds. 95–150. Beverly Hills.
- DIAZ, MAY N.
1966 Tonalá. Berkeley.
- DIAZ-GUERRERO, ROGELIO
1955 Neurosis and the Mexican Family Structure. *American Journal of Psychiatry*. 6: 112: 411–417.
- EDELMANN, ALEXANDER T.
1965 The Family, a Loyalty Still Strong but Waning. In: *Latin American Government and Politics*. Homewood, Illinois.
- ERASMUS, CHARLES J.
1961 *Man Takes Control*. University of Minnesota.
- FALS-BORDA, ORLANDO
1962 *Peasant Society in the Colombian Andes: A Sociological Study of Saucio*. Gainesville, Florida.
- FARIS, ROBERT
1967 *Chicago School of Sociology, 1920–1932*. San Francisco.
- FOSTER, GEORGE M.
1953 Cofradia and Compadrazgo in Spain and Spanish America. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology*. 9: 1: 1–26.
1967 Tzintzuntzan, Mexican Peasants in a Changing World. Boston.
1969 Godparents and Social Networks in Tzintzuntzan. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology*. 25: 3: 261–278.
- FRANK, ANDREW GUNDAR
1966 Urban Poverty in Latin America. *Studies in Comparative International Development*. 2: 5: 75–84.
- FRAZIER, E. FRANKLIN
1953 The Negro Family in Bahia, Brazil. In: *Readings in Latin Ameica Social Organization and Institutions*. O Leonard and C. Loomis eds. 37–42. East Lansing.
- FREEDMAN, JOHN AND LACKINGTON, THOMAS
1967 Hyperurbanization and National Development in Chile. *Urban Affairs Quarterly*. 2: 4: 3–29.
- FREYRE, GILBERTO
1964 The Patriarchal Basis of Brazilian Society. In: *Politics of Change in Latin America*. J. Maier and R. Weatherhead eds. New York.
- FRIEDRICH, PAUL
1965 A Mexican Cacicazgo. *Ethnology*. 4: 190–209.
- FROMM, ERICH AND MACCOBY, MICHAEL
1907 *Social Character in a Mexican Village*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.
- GERMANI, GINO
1961 Inquiry into the Social Effects of Urbanization in a Working-Class Sector of Greater Buenos Aires. In: *Urbanization in Latin America*. P. Hauser ed. New York.
1963 Política y sociedad en una época de transición: de la sociedad tradicional a la sociedad de masas. Buenos Aires.
- GILLIN, JOHN
1949 Mestizo America. In: *Most of the World*. R. Linton ed. 171–172. New York.
- GOLDKIND, VICTOR
1964 Class Conflict and Cacique in Chan Kom. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology*. 22: 4: 346–358.

FAMILY AND KINSHIP STRUCTURE IN LATIN AMERICA

- GOODE, WILLIAM
1963 *World Revolution and Family Patterns*. New York.
- GREENFIELD, SIDNEY M.
1961 Industrialization and the Family in Sociological Theory. *American Journal of Sociology*. 67: 312-322.
- HAMMEL, EUGENE A.
1961 The Family Cycle in a Coastal Peruvian Slum Village. *American Anthropologist*. 63: 939-1005.
- HARRIS, MARVIN
1956 *Town and Country in Brazil*. New York.
- HOPKINS, JACK W.
1967 *The Government Executive of Modern Peru*. Gainesville.
- HUMPHREY, NORMAN
1952 Family Patterns in a Mexican Middletown. *Social Service Review*. 26: 195-201.
- HUNT, EVA
1968 The Meaning of Kinship in San Juan: Genealogical and Social Models. *Ethnology*. 8: 1: 37-53.
- HUTCHINSON, HARRY W.
1957 *Village and Plantation Life in Northeastern Brazil*. Seattle.
- KAHL, JOSEPH A.
1968 *The Measurement of Modernism, A Study of Values in Brazil and Mexico*. Austin.
- KAUFMAN, CLIFFORD LEE
1966 *Urbanization, Personal Welfare, and Politicization: The Lower Class in Santiago, Chile*. University of Oregon. (Unpublished dissertation).
- KORNHAUSER, ARTHUR
1959 *The Politics of Mass Society*. New York.
- KOTTAK, CONRAD PHILIP
1967 Kinship and Class in Brazil. *Ethnology*. 6: 4: 427-443.
- LAUTERBACH, ALBERT
1966 *Enterprise in Latin America*. New York.
- LEEDS, ANTHONY
1964 *Brazilian Careers and Social Structure: A Case History and Model*. In: *Contemporary Cultures and Societies of Latin America*. D. Heath and R. Adams eds. 379-404. New York.
- LEWIS, OSCAR
1950 *An Anthropological Approach to Family Studies*. *American Journal of Sociology*. 55: 5: 468-475.
1952 *Urbanization Without Breakdown: A Case Study*. *The Scientific Monthly*. 75: 31-41.
1953 *Husbands and Wives in a Mexican Village: A Study of Role Conflict*. In: *Readings in Latin American Social Organization and Institutions*. O. Leonard and C. Loomis eds. 23-27. East Lansing
1959 *Five Families*. New York.
1960 *The Culture of Poverty in Mexico City: Two Case Studies*. *The Economic Weekly of Bombay*. Special Number. June 965-972.
1963 *Life in a Mexican Village: Tepoztlán Restudied*. Urbana, Illinois.
1968 *A Study of Slum Culture, Backgrounds for La Vida*. New York.
- LIPSET, MARTIN S. AND SOLARI, ALDO
1967 *Elites in Latin America*. New York
- LOPES, JUAREZ RUBENS BUNDAO
1961 *Aspects of the Adjustment of Rural Migrants to Urban-Industrial Conditions in São Paulo, Brazil*. In: *Urbanization in Latin America*. P. Hauser ed. 234-248. New York.

Latin American Research Review

- MACCOBY, MICHAEL, MODIANO, NANCY AND LANCER, PATRICIA
1964 Games and Social Character in a Mexican Village. *Psychiatry*. 26: 2: 150-162.
- MANGIN, WILLIAM P.
1965 Mental Health and Migration: A Peruvian Case. In: *Contemporary Cultures and Societies of Latin America*. D. Heath and R. Adams eds. 546-555. New York.
1967 Latin American Squatter Settlements: A Problem and a Solution. *Latin American Research Review*. 2: 3: 65-98.
- MATOS MAR, JOSE
1961 The Barriadas of Lima: An Example of Integration into Urban Life. In: *Urbanization in Latin America*. P. Hauser ed. 170-190. New York.
- MCGINN, NOEL F., HARBURG, ERNEST AND GINSBERG, GERALD P.
1965 Dependency Relations with Parents and Affiliative Responses in Michigan and Guadalajara. *Sociometry*. 28: 305-321.
- MCGINN, NOEL F.
1966 Marriage and Family in Middle-Class Mexico. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 28: 3: 305-313.
- MINTZ, SIDNEY
1953 The Folk-Urban Continuum and the Rural Proletarian Community. *American Journal of Sociology*. 59: 2: 136-143.
- MINTZ, SIDNEY AND WOLF, ERIC
1950 An Analysis of Ritual Co-parenthood (*compadrazgo*). *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology*. 6: 4: 341-368.
- MURDOCK, GEORGE P.
1960 *Social Structure*. New York.
- NADER, LAURA
1964 Tala and Juquila. *University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology*. 48: 3: 195-296.
- NELSON, CYNTHIA
1971 *The Waiting Village: Social Change in Rural Mexico*. Boston.
- NOGUERIA, ORACY
1959 A organização da família no município de Itapetininga. *Educação e Ciências Sociais*. 5: 61-112.
- NUTINI, HUGO G.
1967 A Synoptic Comparison of Mesoamerican Marriage and Family Structure. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology*. 23: 383-404.
1968 San Bernardino Contla, Marriage and Family Structure in a Tlaxcalan Municipio. Pittsburgh.
- ORNELAS, CHARLES
n.d. Land Tenure, Sanctions, and Politicization in Mexico City. Fieldwork conducted under an NIMH Grant, January 1968-September 1969. (In progress).
- OSBORN, ANN
1968 *Compadrazgo and Patronage: A Colombian Case*. *Man*. 3: 4: 595-608.
- OSTERREICH, HELGI
1965 Geographical Mobility and Kinship: A Canadian Example. In: *Kinship and Geographical Mobility*. R. Piddington ed. 131-144. New York.
- PARSONS, TALCOTT
1949 The Social Structure of the Family. In: *The Family: Its Function and Destiny*. R. Ashen ed. 173-201. New York.
- PATCH, RICHARD
1961 Life in a Callejon: A Study of Urban Disorganization. *American Universities Field Staff, West Coast South America*. 8: 6.

FAMILY AND KINSHIP STRUCTURE IN LATIN AMERICA

- PAUL, LOIS AND PAUL, BENJAMIN D.
 1963 Marriage Paterns in Guatemala. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology*. 19: 2: 131-148.
- PEARSE, ANDREW
 1961 Some Characteristics of Urbanization in the City of Rio de Janeiro. In: *Urbanization in Latin America*. P. Hauser ed. 191-205. New York.
- PEATTIE, LISA REDFIELD
 1968 The Kinship Network. In: *The View From the Barrio*. 40-53. Ann Arbor.
- PECK, ROBERT F.
 1967 A Comparison of the Value Systems of Mexican and American Youth. *Revista Interamericana de Psicología*. 1: 1: 41-50.
- PEÑALOSA, FERNANDO
 1968 Mexican Family Roles. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 30: 4: 680-689.
- PIERSON, DONALD
 1951 Cruz Das Almas, A Brazilian Village. Smithsonian Institution, Institute of Social Anthropology Publication. No. 12. Washington.
- RAMIREZ, SANTIAGO AND PARRES, RAMON
 1957 Some Dynamic Patterns in the Organization of the Mexican Family. *International Journal of Social Psychiatry*. 3: 1: 18-21.
- REDFIELD, ROBERT
 1941 The Folkculture of Yucatan. Chicago.
- REICHEL-DOLMATOFF, GERARDO AND REICHEL-DOLMATOFF, ALICIA
 1961 The People of Aritama. Chicago.
- RICHARDSON, MILES
 1970 San Pedro, Colombia: Small Town in a Developing Society. New York.
- ROBERTS, BRYAN
 1970 The Social Organization of Low-Income Families. In: *Masses in Latin America*. I. Horowitz ed. New York.
- ROGERS, EVERETT M. AND NEILL, RALPH E.
 1966 Achievement Motivation Among Colombian Peasants. *Diffusion of Innovations Research Report 5*. East Lansing.
- ROSEN, BERNARD C.
 1962 Socialization and Achievement Motivation in Brazil. *American Sociological Review*. 27: 5.
 1964 The Achievement Syndrome and Economic Growth in Brazil. *Social Forces*. 42: 341-354.
- ROSEN, BERNARD C. AND BERLINCK, MANOEL T.
 1968 Modernization and Family Structure in the Region of São Paulo, Brazil. *América Latina*. 2: 3: 75-95.
- ROSEN, BERNARD C. AND SIMMONS, ALAN B.
 1971 Industrialization, Family and Fertility: A Structural-Psychological Analysis of the Brazilian Case. *Demography*. 8: 1: 49-70.
- SEIGEL, MORRIS
 1942 Effects of Culture Contact on the Form of the Family in a Guatemalan Village. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*. 72: 55-68.
- SERVICE, ELMAN R. AND SERVICE, HELEN S.
 1954 Tobati, Paraguayan Town. Chicago.
- SMITH, T. LYNN
 1963 Brazil: People and Institutions. Baton Rouge.
- STEIN, WILLIAM W.
 1961 Hualcan: Life in the Highlands of Peru. New York.
- STEINMANN, ANNE AND FOX, DAVID J.
 1969 Specific Areas of Agreement and Conflict in Women's Self-Perception and Their

Latin American Research Review

- Perception of Men's Ideal Woman in Two South American Urban Communities and an Urban Community in the United States. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 31: 2: 281-289.
- STOKES, CHARLES J.
1962 A Theory of Slums. *Land Economics*. 38: 3: 187-197.
- STRICKON, ARNOLD
1965 Class and Kinship in Argentina. In: *Contemporary Cultures and Societies of Latin America*. D. Heath and R. Adams eds. 324-341. New York.
- TUNIN, MELVIN M.
1952 Caste in a Peasant Society. Princeton.
- VALENTINE, CHARLES A.
1968 Beginnings of a Challenge to Accepted Images of the Poor. In: *Culture and Poverty*. 76-97. Chicago.
- VAN DEN BERGHE, GWENDOLINE AND VAN DEN BERGHE, PIERRE L.
1966 Compadrazgo and Class in Southeastern Mexico. *American Anthropologist*. 68: 1237-1244.
- WAGLEY, CHARLES
1964 Luzo-Brazilian Kinship Patterns: The Persistence of a Cultural Tradition. In: *Politics of Change in Latin America*. J. Maier and R. Weatherhead eds. New York.
1968 *The Latin American Tradition*. New York.
- WHETTEN, NATHAN L.
1948 *Rural Mexico*. Chicago.
- WHITEFORD, ANDREW H.
1964 *Two Cities of Latin America: A Comparative Description of Social Classes*. Garden City.
- WHITTEN, NORMAN E., JR.
1965 *Class, Kinship, and Power in an Equadorian Town*. Stanford.
- WILKENING, E. A., PINTO, JOAO BOSCO AND PASTORE, JOSE
1968 Role of the Extended Family in Migration and Adaptation in Brazil. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. November: 689-695.
- WILLEMS, EMILIO
1953 The Structure of the Brazilian Family. *Social Forces*. 31: 339-345.
- WILLIAMSON, ROBERT C.
1963 Some Variables of Middle and Lower Class in Two Central American Cities. *Social Forces*. 41: 195-207.
- WIRTH, LOUIS
1938 Urbanism as a Way of Life. *American Journal of Sociology*. 44: 1: 1-24.
- WOLF, ERIC R.
1955 Types of Latin American Peasantry. *American Anthropologist*. 57: 452-471.
- YOUNG, FRANK W. AND YOUNG, RUTH C.
1967 *The Differentiation of Family Structure in Rural Mexico*. Cornell University, Department of Anthropology. Ithaca. (Unpublished ms.).
- ZELDITCH, MORRIS, JR.
1964 Cross-Cultural Analysis of Family Structure. In: *Handbook of Marriage and the Family*. H. Christensen ed. 462-500. Chicago.