

PATTERNS OF MIGRATION TO THE UNITED STATES FROM TWO MEXICAN COMMUNITIES

Richard Mines, Berkeley, California

Douglas S. Massey, University of Pennsylvania

Economists have long recognized the importance of migration between less developed and more developed countries, and they have devoted considerable attention to analyzing it within the framework of traditional economic theory (Thomas 1954; Kindleberger 1967; Tapinos 1974; Greenwood 1979; Chiswick 1980; Wachter 1980; Stark 1983). But international migration entails not only an economic exchange of work for wages, it is also fundamentally a social process. Repeated human contact inevitably produces ties between persons in sending and receiving societies. Social networks are created that connect individuals in disparate cultural settings, and these ties ultimately change the context within which economic processes are played out. Understanding how such ties develop and change over time is therefore crucial to understanding the phenomenon of international migration.

Over the years, a large body of empirical literature on international migration has accumulated, and recently scholars from a variety of disciplines have drawn upon it to formulate theories of international migration that focus more on the social aspects than on the economic aspects of the process (Rose 1969; Bohning 1972, 1981; Piore 1979; Swanson 1979; Petras 1981; Mines 1981; Pressar 1982). One line of thinking (for example, that of Bohning, Piore, and Mines) posits a social process of international migration that unfolds according to a distinct internal logic that varies little across cultural settings. It proceeds in a series of well-defined stages associated with predictable changes in specific variables.

Piore (1979) has provided the most complete theoretical explication of the migration process. According to his view, the social process is first sparked when labor is recruited from poor countries for work in wealthier industrial nations. During the 1940s, for example, U.S. agricultural interests actively recruited Mexican farm workers for seasonal labor in the United States under the aegis of the *bracero* program. Once the social process of migration has begun, however, it tends to acquire a

self-feeding character. Social and economic changes in sending and receiving societies brought about by migration make further migration very likely. By the 1950s, Mexican migration to the United States had acquired this self-perpetuating character, and recruitment was no longer necessary.

The first migrants are typically young males of modest means. They are neither so poor that they lack the money for the trip nor so rich that a trip involving unknown costs and risks is unattractive to them. After several of these "pioneer" migrants have returned home, the relative costs and benefits of migration become clearer, and others are induced to move. Over time, the costs drop, slowly at first and then dramatically, as friends and relatives acquire contacts and knowledge in the receiving society. Some may even settle there, providing a ready-made support network for further migration. As time goes on, men from a widening array of class backgrounds enter the migrant workforce.

Most men begin migrating as target earners, that is, they go to earn a set amount of money, intending then to return home. Typically, these individuals have a specific goal in mind, such as buying a new house or perhaps some land. They may migrate in this manner several times—repeatedly over a short period or intermittently over the long run. But as the number of trips grows, these migrants' aspirations change. Satisfaction of early targets creates new ones. They and their families become accustomed to the steady cash income and to the higher level of living it provides, a level of living that is difficult to sustain from local labor alone. Eventually they become "professional" migrants, shuttling back and forth regularly between sending and receiving societies or spending longer periods of time in the host country.

At about this point in the social process, two tendencies emerge. First, as migrants spend more time abroad, they inevitably develop personal ties with people in the receiving society. These ties may be those of friendship or marriage, contacts with employers, or relations with institutions in the country of destination. All tend to draw migrants toward settlement abroad and promote the emergence of daughter communities in the receiving society. Second, the original male migrants increasingly bring other family members along. In Mexico, for example, fathers tend to be joined first by working-age sons in order to maximize family income. Eventually wives and daughters are included as well, and over time the pattern of male migration gives way to one of growing family participation.

By the time the migration process has reached the stage of family migration, a variety of social and economic changes have occurred in the sending community. Migrant earnings have sharply increased the disparity in incomes and standards of living and have driven up the

price of local land. Land and capital become disproportionately concentrated in the hands of migrants who do not use either resource very productively because it has become more lucrative and secure to migrate abroad for wage labor. The regular absence of a large share of the labor force further decreases local economic production. The demonstration effect of economically successful migrants combined with the limitation of local opportunity makes out-migration increasingly attractive. As interpersonal networks expand between sending and receiving societies, migration becomes institutionalized and routine. The town becomes a migrant community.

Thus processes intrinsic to international labor migration lead to its growing prevalence over time. These social processes unfold in a predictable developmental sequence characterized by several salient elements: an initial period during which males predominate among migrants, followed by a progressive incorporation of women and children; a steady accumulation of property and resources in the hands of migrants; and a growing probability of out-migration and settlement abroad.

The present study examines the social process of migration as exemplified in two Mexican migrant communities. We show how despite outward differences between the two towns, similar social processes can be discerned and traced to outcomes predicted by the developmental model of migration just described.

The Two Communities

Because much Mexican migration to the United States is clandestine, representative samples of the migrant population cannot be drawn (Cornelius 1982). In general, researchers have had to rely on other strategies for gathering information. One approach has been to collect data from returned migrants located in their Mexican source communities (Wiest 1973; Cornelius 1978; Reichert 1979; Shadow 1979; Diez-Canedo 1979; Mines 1981; Pressar 1982). Using a combination of ethnographic and survey methods, investigators have succeeded in compiling detailed data on patterns of migration from migrant towns. But no single community can serve to represent Mexico as a whole. A basis for generalization must be built up slowly through a comparison of data gathered in different communities, within different regions, at different points in time. This study is part of that larger effort. It compares data from two Mexican migrant communities: Las Animas, Zacatecas, and Guadalupe, Michoacán, towns located respectively on the northern and western edges of Mexico's central highlands.

Data from Guadalupe were gathered using a combination of ethnographic and survey methods that covered all 2,621 of the town's in-

habitants. Fieldwork was conducted over a twelve-month period ending in July 1978. Previous research has established the internal consistency and accuracy of these data (Reichert and Massey 1979, 1980; Reichert 1979, 1981, 1982). The Las Animas data were gathered during a two-year field investigation conducted within the town and its daughter communities. Ten men were interviewed in Tijuana and sixty-five were surveyed in California. In January 1979, this information was supplemented with a random sample of sixty-seven male household heads in Las Animas itself. In all of these interviews, information was sought not only on household members, but on other members of the extended family. When two respondents provided information on the same person, the information was cross-checked and verified; the data were also checked by a paid informant. In all, information was gathered on some 1,454 unique individuals. This sample represents about half the estimated total universe of Animeños (about 3,000 persons in 1979) and contains about half (715) of all of village residents (1,333). Throughout this report, persons from Las Animas are called Animeños and those from Guadalupe, Guadalupeños.

Migrants from these towns generally fall into one of four basic categories. Legal shuttles are individuals with "green cards," or legal resident papers, who return yearly to their hometowns in Mexico. Undocumented shuttles are those without legal papers who also return home annually. Long-term settlers have moved themselves and their families to live permanently in the United States. Finally, beginner permanents are undocumented migrants who have only recently settled within a U.S. urban area. This last type occurs only where colonies of settler migrants have been established that form the U.S. anchor of a larger migrant network.

Las Animas and Guadalupe are good choices for comparative analysis because both are located in the central plateau, Mexico's core sending region. The northern and western states of the central highlands provide about 70 percent of Mexico's migrants to the United States, and 80 percent are from rural areas (Zazueta 1982). The two towns therefore represent points of origin similar to those of most Mexican migrants. Both also have similar resource endowments. They are located in poor areas of dry-land farming characterized by an acute land shortage. Moreover, regular out-migration from each town began in the early part of the century, so that both communities now have mature migrant networks reflecting four generations of U.S. migrant experience.

Yet the two towns differ from one another in important ways. In Las Animas, the migrant network is dominated by long-term permanent and beginner permanent settlers living in U.S. daughter communities (Mines 1981). Las Animas is therefore a permanent settler core

community. Although half of its migrants are still undocumented shuttles, these individuals utilize the communities of legal settlers as places to arrive and to become oriented in the United States. Guadalupe, on the other hand, has never formed any permanent daughter communities outside of its home village, despite eighty years of experience. The vast majority of its U.S. migrants are legal shuttles, with a smaller number of undocumented shuttles (Reichert and Massey 1979, 1980). It is therefore a legal shuttle community.

How did two communities with such similar original endowments of resources and similar lengths of time in the migrant stream develop such apparently dissimilar patterns? So far we have not been able to uncover any preexisting differences that might explain their divergent migrant experiences. Respondents indicate that both communities have always been agrarian pueblos characterized by a shortage of arable land (although in Guadalupe this shortage was apparently more severe) and that prior to the advent of U.S. migration, neither town had any significant employment outside of agriculture. It is our opinion that early U.S. job contacts explain the different kinds of network migration. During the 1920s, migrants from both Guadalupe and Las Animas worked in agricultural jobs. But while almost all Guadalupeños worked in the fields, many Animeños found employment in steel mills near San Francisco, California. This difference in early migrant experience is the crucial factor accounting for the towns' later divergence in migration patterns.

After low rates of migration in both places during the depression years of the 1930s, migration resumed with the coming of the bracero program in 1942, a kind of guestworker program set up jointly by the governments of Mexico and the United States. Until 1964 Mexican workers were imported for temporary agricultural labor in the southwestern United States. But because of their prior contacts, Animeños were able to flee their bracero contracts for better-paid work in urban areas. Soon many obtained their legal residence papers and began to form settler colonies in several urban areas within California. These colonies served as havens for beginner permanent migrants who were newly arrived from Las Animas. These colonies also provided starting points from which the newer migrants could work their way into secure jobs without obtaining legal status.

Lacking these prior urban contacts, bracero program migrants from Guadalupe stayed in agriculture. They worked mostly for citrus growers' associations in Ventura County, areas that were particularly dependent on bracero labor. As the end of the program approached in the early 1960s, these growers became concerned about losing their labor force and began to sponsor the legalization of their employees (Mines and Anzaldúa 1982). Many Guadalupeños benefitted from this

labor scarcity in Ventura County. Although some migrants from Las Animas were also legalized by their bosses, the numbers were far fewer. Unlike Guadalupeños, Animeños were hired primarily by labor contractors rather than by the growers themselves. These intermediaries had little reason to secure the legalization of their crews. By the late 1960s, Guadalupeño networks were primarily legal ones leading to fruit-picking employment in the United States, while Animeño networks were undocumented ones leading to core settler communities in urban areas of California.

Two factors are therefore of key importance in understanding the contrasting development of Guadalupe and Las Animas as migrant communities. First is the occupational status of the earliest migrants. The fortuitous entry into urban jobs by pioneer Animeños provided the basis for the later emergence of a permanent settler core community. Second is the legal status of the later migrants. Because legal documents facilitate the movement of migrants back and forth across the border, the extensive legalization of Guadalupeños during the 1960s made possible the development of Guadalupe as a legal shuttle community. By 1978 the contrasting migrant networks had produced very different populations, both in the United States and in the source communities.

Characteristics of the Population

Table 1 summarizes the current migrant status of persons from Las Animas and Guadalupe and reveals important differences in migration patterns. First, the percentage of migrants among Animeños is considerably higher than among Guadalupeños. In the total binational Las Animas sample, about half (52 percent) are U.S. migrants, compared to 35 percent in the Guadalupe sample. If the comparison is restricted to adult males, the figures rise to 90 percent migrants in Las Animas and 75 percent in Guadalupe (data not shown). Comparisons are complicated, however, by the binational structure of the Animeño community. In Guadalupe, migrants who were away in the United States were included in the local sample if they maintained a home in the community; but in Las Animas, out-migrants were interviewed directly in the United States. If only the Las Animas village sample is compared with the Guadalupe sample, the relative share of migrants is quite similar.

A second difference is that legal migration is obviously much less important among Animeños. Of the 193 shuttle migrants based in Las Animas, only about 3 percent were legal, while fully 79 percent of Guadalupe's 919 shuttle migrants had legal documents. Although the percentage of legals is much higher among Animeños in the United

TABLE 1 Migrant Status of Persons from Las Animas, Zacatecas, and Guadalupe, Michoacán

| Migrant Status | Las Animas Sample | | | | Guadalupe Sample* |
|----------------|-------------------|------------------|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| | Las Animas (%) | Other Mexico (%) | United States (%) | Total (%) | |
| Migrants | 27.0 (193) | 26.3 (63) | 100.0 (499) | 51.9 (755) | 35.1 (919) |
| Legal | 2.7 (19) | 2.5 (6) | 70.1 (350) | 25.8 (375) | 27.6 (723) |
| Un-documented | 24.3 (174) | 23.8 (57) | 29.9 (149) | 26.1 (380) | 7.5 (196) |
| Non-migrants | 73.0 (522) | 73.8 (177) | 0.0 (0) | 48.1 (699) | 64.9 (1698) |
| Total | 100.0 (715) | 100.0 (240) | 100.0 (499) | 100.0 (1454) | 100.0 (2617)* |

Note: Figures in parentheses are base Ns for the adjacent percentages.

*Excludes four U.S. citizens married to Guadalupe residents.

States (70 percent), even when their number is added to the rest of the binational sample, the total percentage does not approach the high figure observed in Guadalupe. Only about half of all 755 Animeño migrants possessed legal documents, as compared with nearly 80 percent of Guadalupe’s migrants.

Compared to Guadalupeños, migrants from Las Animas clearly have weaker ties to their home village. Whereas 90 percent of Guadalupe’s migrants returned home each year (Reichert and Massey 1979), table 2 shows that this kind of shuttle migration was much less prevalent among Animeños. Thirty-one percent of the men interviewed did not work even once in Las Animas during the five years prior to the interview, and 39 percent worked two years or less. Legal migrants were generally less likely to have returned home to work than were the undocumented migrants. While 54 percent of legal migrants had not worked in Las Animas during the previous five years, only 13 percent of the undocumented migrants stayed away that long. Because of the Animeños’ early experience and contacts in urban areas, the green card facilitated their long-term settlement in U.S. cities; among migrants from Guadalupe, who lacked these contacts, it promoted more seasonal movement back and forth.

These contrasting patterns of out-migration have produced divergent rates of population growth in the two communities. In Guadalupe the population of those who consider the village their home has

TABLE 2 *Number of Years Worked in Village in Last Five by Migrant Status for Working-Age Males from Las Animas, Zacatecas*

| <i>Number of Years Worked</i> | <i>Legal (%)</i> | <i>Undocumented (%)</i> | <i>All Migrants (%)</i> |
|-------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| 0 | 53.6 (143) | 12.9 (44) | 30.8 (187) |
| 1-2 | 4.9 (13) | 11.1 (38) | 8.4 (51) |
| 3-4 | 0.7 (2) | 17.3 (59) | 10.0 (61) |
| 5 | 40.8 (109) | 58.7 (200) | 50.8 (309) |
| Total | 100.0 (267) | 100.0 (341) | 100.0 (608) |

doubled over the last two decades (Reichert 1979) while the number of Las Animas residents has remained almost constant. Permanent settler core communities, such as Las Animas, are associated with a greater outflow of migrants than are legal shuttle communities such as Guadalupe.

Another contrast between the two communities concerns the amount of migration by women. Although table 3 shows that the incidence of male migration is about the same in both communities (about 75 percent of village-based males), large differences are found in the frequency of migration among village-based women. While 40 percent of women based in Guadalupe migrate to the United States (usually with their husbands), only 10 percent of the women based in Las Animas do so. Most women migrants from Las Animas, however, are not legal shuttles based in the home community but permanent settlers in U.S. urban areas. When the total binational sample is considered, about 40 percent of Animeño women are migrants, as in Guadalupe.

Because most men in Guadalupe are legal shuttles, they have been able to take advantage of the family reunification provisions of U.S. immigration law to obtain residence documents for their wives and children. They are then free to travel back and forth accompanied by their spouses and dependents. Legal shuttle families in Las Animas behave in the same way, but they are fewer in number. Most Animeño shuttle migrants are undocumented and are reluctant to bring their families with them to the United States, just as they are in Guadalupe. But the existence of settled Animeño communities in several California cities has allowed a somewhat higher percentage of undocumented Animeño women to join their husbands. Nonetheless, in both communities, women follow the dominant migratory patterns established by their men.

TABLE 3 Migrant Status by Sex for Population Ages 15–64 in Las Animas, Zacatecas, and Guadalupe, Michoacán

| Migrant Status | Las Animas Sample | | | |
|-------------------|-------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| | Males | | Females | |
| | Village (%) | Total (%) | Village (%) | Total (%) |
| Migrants | 73.6 (78) | 87.5 (246) | 10.0 (13) | 39.0 (92) |
| Legal | 7.5 (8) | 35.6 (100) | 3.1 (4) | 25.8 (61) |
| Undocu- mented | 66.0 (70) | 51.9 (146) | 6.9 (9) | 13.1 (31) |
| Nonmigrants | 26.4 (28) | 12.5 (35) | 90.0 (118) | 61.0 (144) |
| Total | 100.0 (106) | 100.0 (281) | 100.0 (131) | 100.0 (236) |

Thus while overall patterns in Guadalupe and Las Animas are quite different, when one compares behavior for the same kind of migrant, basic similarities emerge. Community-level contrasts are due to differences in the prevalence of different kinds of migration. Another illustration of this general point concerns the age of migrants, summarized in table 4. In Guadalupe, the prevalence of migrant children is much greater than in Las Animas, 31 percent compared to 22 percent. This difference occurs because Guadalupe is dominated by legal shuttle migrants while Las Animas contains many undocumented beginner permanent migrants. When one looks at the relative share of children among legal and undocumented migrants separately, the two communities are quite similar. Children under the age of fifteen comprise about 36 percent of legals and less than 10 percent of undocumented in each case. In other words, in either town undocumented migrants are unlikely to be accompanied by minor dependents, in contrast with legal migrants. Moreover, legals from both communities prefer to legalize working-age children first and younger children later, thus giving priority to those able to supplement the family income (Reichert and Massey 1979; Mines 1981). Community-level differences arise because legal migrants are more prevalent in Guadalupe than in Las Animas.

There are certain differences, however, that are not revealed in the foregoing table. For example, undocumented beginner permanent

| <i>Total</i> | | <i>Guadalupe Sample</i> | | |
|------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|
| <i>Village (%)</i> | <i>Total (%)</i> | <i>Males (%)</i> | <i>Females (%)</i> | <i>Total (%)</i> |
| 38.4 (91) | 65.4 (338) | 75.0 (415) | 40.2 (247) | 56.7 (662) |
| 5.1 (12) | 31.1 (161) | 49.2 (272) | 34.7 (213) | 41.5 (485) |
| 33.3 (79) | 34.2 (177) | 25.9 (143) | 5.5 (34) | 15.2 (177) |
| 61.6 (146) | 34.6 (179) | 25.0 (138) | 59.8 (367) | 43.3 (505) |
| 100.0 (237) | 100.0 (517) | 100.0 (553) | 100.0 (614) | 100.0 (1167) |

are not found in Guadalupe, where documented shuttle migrants are the norm. As a result, some of the legal Animeño children were actually born in the United States to undocumented migrant parents, while almost all of Guadalupe's legal children had legal parents. Nevertheless, when comparisons are made within appropriate migrant status groups, the similarities far exceed the differences.

To this point, then, our results indicate broad similarities between migrants from Las Animas and Guadalupe. In both communities, extensive migration streams have developed to such an extent that a large part of the productive labor force is siphoned off to work in the United States. In each case, legal migrants comprise an important part of the migrant flow, and within the legal component are found a large number of women and children. Among undocumented migrants, women and children are much rarer. The primary differences between the two communities are twofold: first, that in Las Animas, the number of legal migrants is much smaller than in Guadalupe; and second, that while legals from Las Animas are primarily permanent settlers in U.S. cities, those from Guadalupe are seasonal migrants who have not yet established a tradition of urban-based employment. The smaller number of legal migrants in Las Animas means that fewer women and children appear in its migrant population; and the lack of significant urban employment in Guadalupe means that daughter communities were

TABLE 4 Age Distribution by Migrant Status of Persons from Las Animas, Zacatecas, and Guadalupe, Michoacán

| Age Interval | Migrant Status | | | | |
|-------------------|----------------|------------------|-----------|------------------|-----------|
| | Migrants | | | Non-migrants (%) | Total (%) |
| | Legal (%) | Undocumented (%) | Total (%) | | |
| Las Animas | | | | | |
| 0-14 | 35.6 | 5.1 | 22.3 | 52.8 | 36.5 |
| 15-34 | 38.7 | 62.8 | 49.2 | 30.8 | 40.6 |
| 35-64 | 24.9 | 27.6 | 26.1 | 15.1 | 21.0 |
| 65+ | 0.8 | 4.5 | 2.4 | 1.3 | 1.9 |
| (Total N) | (253) | (196) | (449) | (390) | (839) |
| Guadalupe | | | | | |
| 0-14 | 36.2 | 9.2 | 31.0 | 64.9 | 51.8 |
| 15-34 | 40.9 | 70.9 | 46.7 | 19.4 | 30.0 |
| 35-64 | 20.4 | 19.4 | 20.2 | 11.3 | 14.8 |
| 65+ | 2.5 | 0.7 | 2.1 | 4.3 | 3.4 |
| (Total N) | (814) | (196) | (1010) | (1599) | (2609) |

never established in U.S. cities. Thus Las Animas is a binational “village” centered in several cities that is linked together by diffuse interpersonal networks, while Guadalupe is a single village that annually sends its workforce northward on a seasonal trek through the United States and back again. The reasons for these divergent patterns are circumstantial, related to connections made and economic ties established years ago. The important point is that given these basic differences, the two communities have produced migrant populations with remarkably similar characteristics that vary in predictable ways according to legal status, age, and sex.

Impacts on the Village

Migration has had a profound impact on village life and rural development in both communities. U.S. earnings have raised the migrants’ standard of living far above anything that could be sustained locally, thus giving them access to goods, services, and resources that would otherwise be out of their reach. But different kinds of migration entail different earning capabilities, and to the extent that the communities differ with respect to factors such as legal status, the size and nature of the community impacts will also differ.

Legal shuttle migrants generally earn more than other migrant

groups, followed in descending order by long-term legal settlers, undocumented beginner permanent migrants, and finally undocumented shuttle migrants. Most legal shuttles from Guadalupe have steady employment at up to \$6.00 per hour working under union contract in Ventura County, California. On the other hand, long-term permanent migrants from Las Animas usually earn \$4.40 per hour in urban jobs. Beginner permanents made somewhat less per hour, but because they could stay with their settled relatives, they typically held year-round jobs. Most undocumented shuttles, like their legal counterparts, work in agriculture, but because of their precarious legal status, they generally find it difficult to secure year-round employment. Over the long run, their incomes are therefore lower than those of other migrant groups. Undocumented shuttle migrants also spend more money in getting to the United States because of transport costs and smuggler's fees. In some cases, they earn less per hour, but their main disadvantage is that they work less steadily and for shorter lengths of time in the long run (Mines 1981; Mines and Anzaldúa 1982; Reichert 1981, 1982).

In both towns, the standard of living of townspeople has been greatly elevated through wage labor in the United States because families with migrant members have been able to buy better housing, medical care, food, and more consumer goods than ever before. In addition, each community as a whole has been able to collect contributions from U.S. migrants to make improvements in local infrastructure. Electricity, in particular, has brought many changes by allowing the use of electric appliances. Yet at both the individual and community levels, the standard of living in Guadalupe is far above that in Las Animas. Larger migrant contributions have allowed village leaders to make more improvements in roads, schools, churches, water systems, and sewage than in Las Animas (Reichert 1981; Mines 1981); and families in Guadalupe own more washing machines, stoves, wells, televisions, stereos, and other electrical appliances than do the residents of Las Animas (Reichert 1982).

These differences in levels of living relate directly to the different kinds of migrancy that predominate in each community. The legal shuttle migrants prevalent in Guadalupe still view themselves as town residents. Even though they may have been working seasonally in the United States for many years, they see migration as a "temporary" necessity. Intending to return to the home community and retire on their accumulated wealth, they therefore invest their earnings in ways destined to improve living standards in their home community. They improve their houses and fill them with consumer durables, and they are willing to organize and contribute toward town capital projects designed to make the community a cleaner, more livable place.

On the other hand, the beginner and permanent settlers that

typify the Las Animas migrant pattern are less attached to the home community. They stay in their U.S. schools and are often U.S. homeowners. Their life is "in the north," and they adopt an immigrant mentality. Their money is spent on furnishing houses in California, leaving little left over to improve living conditions in the home village. In short, the prevailing pattern of migration in Las Animas results in the group with the highest earnings, the legal migrants, spending most of their time and money outside the home community.

The situation is not that Animeños are uninterested in buying property in the village. Table 5 illustrates this point by showing the distribution of property in Las Animas and Guadalupe. Over 50 percent of the legal out-migrants from Las Animas own a house there. But their houses typically stand vacant, without furniture or appliances, although they may be expensively constructed of brick and cement. A house-by-house count in two barrios of Las Animas found that over 20 percent of the houses were unoccupied the year round. Yet legal migrants have the highest rate of landownership in Las Animas. Apparently, permanent settlement in the United States does not completely preclude legal Animeño migrants from buying land back home.

Table 5 illustrates both similarities and differences between the two towns. The privileged position of migrants in both communities is apparent. In each case, a majority of migrant families are property owners, compared to a small minority of nonmigrant families. A home represents the most common capital investment by migrants in both towns, with relatively few in either community having succeeded in acquiring land, a scarce resource. Nonetheless, landownership is heavily concentrated among migrants. Of the 26 landowners in Las Animas, 25 were migrants; and of the 120 from Guadalupe, 92 were migrants. Certain differences also emerge. When compared to legal migrants, undocumented migrants generally fare somewhat better in Las Animas than in Guadalupe. Indeed, in Las Animas, homeownership is most prevalent among undocumented migrants; and although legals are considerably more likely to own land than undocumented migrants in both places, the differential is only two to one in Las Animas, as compared to almost four to one in Guadalupe.

One similarity not readily apparent from table 5 is the extent to which migrants in both towns have become absentee landlords. Although U.S. migration has improved the lot of most people in the two communities, in some ways it has heightened class differences. It has especially exacerbated the distinction between landowner and tenant. Most new purchases of land are made by high-income legal migrants, and land prices around both towns have been bid up significantly in recent years. Because incomes of undocumented migrants, especially nonmigrants, are lower, they are increasingly excluded from the land-

TABLE 5 *Percentage of Families Owning Village Property by Type of Property and Migrant Status of Family Head in Las Animas, Zacatecas, and Guadalupe, Michoacán, in 1978*

| | <i>Las Animas</i> | | | | <i>Guadalupe</i> | | | |
|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|------------------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------|------------------------|------------------|
| | <i>Legal (%)</i> | <i>Illegal (%)</i> | <i>Non-Migrant (%)</i> | <i>Total (%)</i> | <i>Legal (%)</i> | <i>Illegal (%)</i> | <i>Non-Migrant (%)</i> | <i>Total (%)</i> |
| House* | 51.2 | 63.0 | 25.0 | 56.6 | 87.0 | 63.0 | 29.5 | 63.4 |
| Business | 4.9 | 8.2 | 0.0 | 6.6 | 6.8 | 5.2 | 8.6 | 6.9 |
| Land | 31.7 | 16.4 | 12.5 | 21.3 | 36.9 | 10.4 | 20.3 | 25.8 |
| Number of Families | (41) | (73) | (8) | (122) | (222) | (115) | (128) | (465) |

*In Guadalupe, the figures for housing refer only to those owning modernized houses of brick and cement because all Guadalupeños own their own dwellings.

holding class. In both communities, then, land is becoming concentrated in the hands of people who are absent for most, if not all, of the year.

These migrants do not see land as a principal source of livelihood. Rather, they use food and fodder produced on it to supplement migrant earnings, yielding income that can be spent during return visits or given to relatives in place of remittances. Working the land requires investments of time and money, but both yield a better return to legal migrants when invested in trips abroad. As a result, migrant-owned land often lies fallow, when it is not turned over to sharecroppers or used for low-productivity grazing. In both communities, migrants have become accustomed to high U.S. wages and consequently are not inclined to work on return visits home. The resulting scarcity of labor has driven up local wages and has discouraged owners and sharecroppers from planting traditional crops. Production of staples has declined considerably as migration has increased in both sending areas.

In summary, land has become increasingly concentrated in the hands of absentee landlords who use it for security, prestige, and supplemental income rather than as a primary source of livelihood. In both communities, migrants are set apart from nonmigrants by their privileged access to scarce village resources such as land and housing. Both towns have evolved a two-class society with migrants at the top and the other below. In Las Animas, however, the village class structure is not dominated by legal migrants to the same extent as occurs in Guadalupe. Successful undocumented migrants in Las Animas stand a better

chance of acquiring property and status because they constitute a larger share of the total population and because few legal migrants are in the village at any time. Undocumented and legal migrants have therefore joined together to form the propertied elite of Animeño society. In Guadalupe, on the other hand, legal migrants hold nearly total social sway. Their large numbers and frequent visits to the home community, combined with their economic power, insure their dominance in community affairs. Because Guadalupe never established daughter communities in the United States that could serve as alternative foci of settlement and investment, legal migrants return to invest their earnings year after year, making them the most powerful social group in the community.

Despite this difference, the impact of migration on rural development is quite similar in both settings. Earnings in the United States have generally been used to improve the level of consumption, rather than production, within the hometown. In each case, community property is controlled by an absentee landlord class that effectively freezes productive investment in local property. Moreover, an extreme orientation toward the United States has spread from migrants to all social groups in both communities, with the result that the young increasingly seek social mobility through migration rather than by investing their time and resources in Mexico.

Trends over Time

The two migrant communities also display similar patterns of migration over time. Table 6 presents information on cohorts of first-time migrants leaving Las Animas and Guadalupe from 1940 to 1979. The absolute number of migrants leaving both sending areas increased dramatically through the 1960s and then leveled off during the late 1970s. In addition, the average age of migrants fell steadily throughout the period, while the proportion of women rose. In both cases, however, the trends were more pronounced in Guadalupe than in Las Animas. This difference can again be attributed to the greater prevalence of legal shuttle migration in Guadalupe.

Legal shuttle migrants have a strong desire to legalize the status of their dependents in order to avoid the hardship of family separation, and the family reunification provisions of U.S. immigration law facilitate this end. In Guadalupe, legal shuttles have increasingly brought their entire families with them on their yearly moves northward for seasonal agricultural employment. By the most recent period, many Guadalupeño children were acquiring documents in this way, and the mean age of first-time migrants had dropped to 10.5 years. The much higher mean age of 19.7 in Las Animas reflects the small scale of legal

TABLE 6 Selected Characteristics of Migrant Cohorts Leaving Las Animas and Guadalupe for the United States, 1940–1978

| | 1940– 44 | 1945– 49 | 1950– 54 | 1955– 59 | 1960– 64 | 1965– 69 | 1970– 74 | 1975– 78 |
|-----------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Las Animas | | | | | | | | |
| Percent male | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 94.1 | 75.0 | 71.7 | 76.5 | 75.3 |
| Average age | 26.7 | 25.6 | 25.4 | 20.5 | 19.0 | 19.0 | 22.0 | 19.7 |
| Percent in | | | | | | | | |
| Agriculture | 76.9 | 50.0 | 64.3 | 31.3 | 15.4 | 16.3 | 22.2 | 25.5 |
| Low-wage urban | 15.4 | 15.0 | 14.3 | 25.0 | 30.8 | 32.6 | 29.2 | 63.6 |
| High-wage urban | 7.7 | 35.0 | 21.4 | 43.7 | 53.8 | 51.2 | 48.6 | 10.9 |
| Percent owning | | | | | | | | |
| House | 76.9 | 60.0 | 64.3 | 29.4 | 28.1 | 41.5 | 61.5 | 2.7 |
| Land | 38.5 | 30.0 | 28.6 | 11.8 | 12.5 | 9.4 | 4.7 | 0.0 |
| Cohort Size | 13 | 20 | 14 | 17 | 32 | 53 | 85 | 73 |
| Guadalupe | | | | | | | | |
| Percent male | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 77.0 | 56.0 | 47.0 |
| Average age | 29.9 | 28.6 | 24.0 | 21.4 | 22.3 | 17.6 | 16.7 | 10.5 |
| Percent in | | | | | | | | |
| Agriculture | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Cohort size | 15 | 26 | 33 | 36 | 57 | 87 | 459 | 322 |

shuttle migration. The Animeño pattern is for a man to migrate first alone and without papers, bringing his family north only if and when he becomes securely established. For much the same reason, there are fewer women in recent Animeño cohorts. In Guadalupe, many more wives and daughters had acquired papers through their husbands and fathers by the late 1970s and had begun to migrate.

Table 6 documents the steady swing away from agricultural work within successive migrant cohorts for the Animeño community. Although the data refer to migrants' "usual" occupations, and not the one at the time of their first arrival in the United States, the table strongly suggests a long-term trend away from farmwork and into urban-based occupations, a development that sets it distinctly apart from Guadalupe.

Finally, patterns of property ownership by cohort confirm our earlier interpretation of the role played by migration in creating socio-economic disparities. The longer a person has been migrating, the more property is accumulated. While 77 percent of Animeño migrants leav-

ing in the earliest cohort were homeowners and 39 percent were landowners, only 3 percent of the most recent cohorts owned homes, and none owned land in the village.

Conclusion

This comparison along with other studies of Mexican sending communities (Wiest 1973; Cornelius 1978; Shadow 1979; Diez-Canedo 1979; Alarcón 1983) suggest that Mexico–U.S. migration can be characterized by a set of endogenous characteristics consistent with the developmental theories of international migration postulated by Bohning (1972, 1981) and Piore (1979). In both Guadalupe and Las Animas, we have found an initial period of small-scale migration dominated by males of a certain social background, eventually giving way to the large-scale migration of men, women, and children of diverse social origins. Over time, property and resources gradually accumulate in the hands of migrants, producing social and economic changes within the community that make out-migration ever more likely.

In both communities, migrant streams have undergone a process of maturation over time, changing in regular and predictable ways. Although the original migrants may have been single males traveling alone, a migrant network eventually developed and reified. As time went on, the network came to be dominated by one of two more U.S.–oriented groups: legal shuttle migrants who move back and forth with their families on an annual basis, or long-term permanents who have many years of residence in the United States and are mostly legal. Legal shuttles provide a network consisting of job contacts and established relationships with employers in the United States. Long-term permanent migrants comprise the U.S. anchor of a network of kin and friendship relationships extending back into the home community.

These networks are extremely important resources for new, mostly undocumented migrants who are seeking entry into the U.S. labor market. The first migrants from a family are generally men who have few material assets. When they go to the United States in search of work, they rely heavily on their most important asset—social contacts. Beginner permanents usually commence their stays with trusted kin or friends who can provide them with temporary housing and job advice. Undocumented shuttles similarly take advantage of the job contacts and employer relationships established by the legal shuttles who preceded them. Because of the distance and danger of the trip, undocumented men usually go first, bringing their women and children later if at all. Thus the current pattern of network migration replicates the historical development of the migrant network itself, with males leading and families following.

In spite of underlying similarities in the developmental process of network migration, the two communities are quite different at the aggregate level. Guadalupe is a legal shuttle community with a rapidly growing population. It is dominated by an elite of legal migrants who annually travel back and forth between their jobs in the United States and their homes in Mexico. Las Animas is a permanent settler core community with a stagnant village population dominated by a migrant elite comprised mainly of undocumented shuttle migrants, with a growing undocumented settler population in several U.S. cities. Guadalupe is the wealthier of the two, with higher levels of individual consumption and higher rates of investment in the town's capital stock. Because of the predominance of legal shuttles, Guadalupe has far more women and children migrants based in the community.

These community-level contrasts stem from differences in two key variables that play an important role in shaping the developmental process of international migration: occupation and legal status. The early employment of Animeños in industrial jobs drew them toward long-term city residence rather than toward a pattern of seasonal movement. Subsequent acquisition of legal documents therefore led Animeños to permanent settlement within U.S. cities rather than to regular shuttle migration, as it did for Guadalupeños. Thus the interaction of occupation and legal status determines the kind of mature migrant network that eventually characterizes a migrant community.

In short, our results show how divergent migrant networks may result from common social processes operating through variables that differ because of contrasting historical experiences. In reaching this conclusion, we have broadened the base of support for existing models of international migration, and we would argue for the incorporation of two key variables—legal status and occupation—into future theoretical formulations.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ALARCON, RAFAEL

- 1983 "Las causas socioeconómicas e ideológico-culturales de la emigración a los Estados Unidos." Unpublished paper, Centro de Estudios de Antropología Social, El Colegio de Michoacán.

BOHNING, W. R.

- 1972 *The Migration of Workers in the United Kingdom and the European Community*. London: Oxford University Press.
- 1981 "Elements of a Theory of International Economic Migration to Industrial Nation States." In *Global Trends in Migration: Theory and Research on International Population Movements*, edited by M. M. Kritz, C. B. Keely, and S. M. Tomasi. Staten Island, N.Y.: Center for Migration Studies.

CHISWICK, BARRY

- 1980 "The Impact of Immigration on the Level and Distribution of Economic

- Well-Being." Paper presented at the Conference on U.S. Immigration Issues and Policies, 10–11 April, Chicago.
- CORNELIUS, WAYNE
- 1978 "Mexican Migration to the United States: Causes, Consequences, and U.S. Responses." *Migration and Development Monograph Series*. Cambridge: MIT Center for International Studies.
- 1982 "Interviewing Undocumented Migrations: Methodological Reflections Based on Fieldwork in Mexico and the U.S." *International Migration Review* 16:378–411.
- DIEZ-CANEDO, JUAN
- 1979 "Migration, Return, and Development in Mexico." Ph.D. diss., Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- GREENWOOD, MICHAEL J.
- 1979 "The Economic Consequences of Immigration for the United States: A Survey of Findings." *Interagency Task Force on Immigration Policy, Staff Report Companion Papers*. Washington, D.C.: Departments of Justice, Labor, and State.
- KINDLEBERGER, CHARLES P.
- 1967 *Europe's Postwar Growth: The Role of Labor Supply*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- MINES, RICHARD
- 1981 *Developing a Community Tradition of Migration: A Field Study in Rural Zacatecas, Mexico, and California Settlement Areas*. Monographs in U.S.–Mexican Studies No. 3. La Jolla: University of California at San Diego Press.
- MINES, RICHARD, AND R. ANZALDUA
- 1982 *New Migrants vs. Old Migrants: Alternative Labor Market Structures in the Citrus Industry*. Monographs in U.S.–Mexican Studies No. 9. La Jolla: University of California at San Diego Press.
- PETRAS, ELIZABETH M.
- 1981 "The Global Labor Market in the Modern World Economy." In *Global Trends in Migration: Theory and Research on International Population Movements*, edited by M. M. Kritz, C. B. Keely, and S. M. Tomasi. Staten Island, N.Y.: Center for Migration Studies.
- PIORE, MICHAEL J.
- 1979 *Birds of Passage: Migrant Labor in Industrial Societies*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- PRESSAR, PATRICIA R.
- 1982 "The Role of Households in International Migration and the Case of U.S.–Bound Migration from the Dominican Republic." *International Migration Review* 16:342–64.
- REICHERT, JOSHUA S.
- 1979 "The Migrant Syndrome: Analysis of U.S. Migration and Its Impact on a Rural Mexican Town." Ph.D. diss., Princeton University.
- 1981 "The Migrant Syndrome: Seasonal U.S. Wage Labor and Rural Development in Central Mexico." *Human Organization* 40:56–66.
- 1982 "Social Stratification in a Mexican Sending Community: The Effect of Migration to the United States." *Social Problems* 29:422–23.
- REICHERT, JOSHUA S., AND DOUGLAS S. MASSEY
- 1979 "Patterns of Migration from a Mexican Sending Community: A Comparison of Legal and Illegal Migrants." *International Migration Review* 13:599–623.

- 1980 "History and Trends in U.S.-Bound Migration from a Mexican Town." *International Migration Review* 14:475-91.
- ROSE, ARNOLD M.
1969 *Migrants in Europe: Problems of Acceptance and Adjustment*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- SHADOW, ROBERT D.
1979 "Differential Out-Migration: A Comparison of Internal and International Migration from Villa Guerrero, Jalisco (Mexico)." In *Migration across Frontiers: Mexico and the United States*, edited by R. Van Kemper. Albany: Institute for Mesoamerican Studies, State University of New York.
- STARK, ODED
1983 "Discontinuity and the Theory of International Migration." Paper presented at the Annual Meetings of the Population Association of America, Pittsburgh.
- SWANSON, JON
1979 "The Consequences of Emigration for Economic Development: A Review of the Literature." *Papers in Anthropology* 20: 39-56.
- TAPINOS, GEORGES P.
1974 *L'Economie des migrations internationales*. Paris: Librairie Armand Colin et Presses de la Fondation Nationale des Sciences Politiques.
- THOMAS, BRINLEY
1954 *Migration and Economic Growth: A Study of Great Britain and the Atlantic Economy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- WACHTER, MICHAEL L.
1980 "The Labor Market and Illegal Immigration: Outlook for the 1980s." *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* 33:342-54.
- WIEST, RAYMOND E.
1973 "Wage-Labor Migration and the Household in a Mexican Town." *Journal of Anthropological Research* 29:180-209.
- ZAZUETA, CESAR
1982 *Trabajadores migrantes temporales mexicanos en los Estados Unidos*. Mexico: Centro Nacional de Información y Estadísticas del Trabajo, Secretaría del Trabajo y Previsión Social.