

**Chicano Studies, 1970-1984**

Renato Rosaldo

*Annual Review of Anthropology*, Vol. 14 (1985), 405-427.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0084-6570%281985%292%3A14%3C405%3ACS1%3E2.0.CO%3B2-6>

*Annual Review of Anthropology* is currently published by Annual Reviews.

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/annrevs.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

---

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to creating and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).



## CHICANO STUDIES, 1970–1984

*Renato Rosaldo*

Department of Anthropology, Stanford University, Stanford, California 94305

When asked, in the spring of 1981, to review anthropological writings on Chicanos for a conference at the University of California, Santa Barbara, I did some preliminary research, hoping to discover the magnitude of the job ahead of me. *Books in Print* yielded only two ethnographies (1, 35) and a few dissertations that had been printed (by Arno Press and R & E Research Associated) to meet the demand for Chicano studies course materials. A computer search with the keywords Chicano(s), Chicana(s), and Mexican American(s) provided, with duplication, exactly 710 titles, but anthropologists virtually never appeared on the printout, which was dominated by people from other disciplines writing on the topics of health care and bilingual education. So little appeared to have been published by anthropologists writing on Chicanos that I readily accepted the invitation and confidently took on what seemed a simple task.

Then I decided to write the few anthropologists known to me who did research on Chicanos. My letter requested lists of their writings, bibliographies on the subject, and the names of other researchers. Nobody sent a review article or bibliography of the field, but virtually everybody sent their own writings and the names of other people to contact. When my “chain letter” reached four removes (contacts of contacts of contacts of people initially contacted), diminishing returns set in. At last most of the people to contact were already known to me.

To make a long story short, thanks to the generous responses of the authors cited in this review, as well as the exceptionally able research assistance of Janice Stockard, I have now compiled a virtually exhaustive (as contrasted with the more selective list of works cited below) “Working Bibliography of Anthropological Writings on Chicanos, 1970–1983,” which lists 321 books and articles (available, on request, from Stanford Center for Chicano Research, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305). During the period 1970–1983, the productivity in Chicano studies has followed a steadily rising curve from 1970 to 1981, when it has dropped off, perhaps reflecting the fate of affirmative

action in the Reagan era. The exact numbers are: 31 entries for 1970–72, 36 for 1973–75, 77 for 1976–78, 101 for 1979–81, and 60 for 1982–84. Despite the field's productivity (and in marked contrast with such other Chicano studies disciplines as history, political science, sociology, and psychology), anthropological writings on Chicanos have never been reviewed [except in a working paper of mine (142)], and have proved difficult even to identify. Only nine anthropology books on Chicanos appeared during the period under review. The major anthropology journals have printed but four papers on Chicanos (68, 110, 211, 219), though *Human Organization*, the journal of applied anthropology, has 12 entries. Less visible journals in anthropology, Chicano studies, and other disciplines carried a certain number of other articles, but the majority were published in collections, conference proceedings, or as working papers with narrow distribution.

Evidently, as it now appears in retrospect, only my ignorance of its magnitude allowed me to embark on this project. Indeed, my ignorance was shared by the anthropologists studying Chicanos, who, in the absence of discipline-based review essays and conferences, have known themselves only partially, more as segments of networks than as a group. They have succeeded in being prolific without engaging in ongoing exchange with their fellow anthropologists, either in Chicano studies or in other areas of their discipline. This review essay attempts, as one step in a longer process, to make Chicano studies more visible, both to itself and to other anthropologists.

## AN INITIAL ASSAULT

The characteristics of Chicano studies since the late 1960s in large measure date back to a series of papers by an anthropologist, Romano (137–141), and a sociologist, Vaca (173, 174), published at the beginning of the period under review. Publishing in *El Grito*, the Chicano journal they founded, Romano and Vaca set an agenda for the future and stridently attacked previous writings by Anglo anthropologists. Though they spoke of the social sciences in general, the writers most vilified for negative stereotyping prominently included such anthropologists as William Madsen, Arthur Rubel, Munro Edmonson, and Margaret Clark. Graduate students who read Romano and Vaca learned a litany of infamous names and were taught to protest against cultural determinism. They learned to recognize that anthropologists who assert that Chicanos suffer from their own alleged cultural values, such as passivity, fatalism, and *envidia*, have simply adopted the timeworn tactic of blaming the victim. The critique had the unintended consequence of so stigmatizing anthropology that one Chicano, who began his career in the early 1970s, called himself a behavioral scientist rather than acknowledge his anthropological identity.

Octavio Romano's voice, empowered as it was by the larger political movement in which he participated, has to be heard in all its late sixties flamboyance in order to appreciate its impact. He began with a telling critique of members of minority groups who exploit their own, such as "Mexican-American labor contractors who delivered and still deliver cheap Mexican labor (137, p. 7)." His tract claimed that such people not only exploit, but also stereotype their own by heaping upon them denigrating epithet after denigrating epithet, in the following manner:

That is to say, once they [members of minority groups] occupy some position or role in society that is above abject poverty they all too often speak of those who remain in such straits as people who are fatalistic, resigned, apathetic, tradition oriented, tradition bound, emotional, impetuous, volatile, affected, non-goal-oriented, uncivilized, unacculturated, non-rational, primitive, irrational, unorganized, uncompetitive, retarded, slow learners, underachieving, underdeveloped, or just plain lazy (137, p.7).

The jist of his objection to this demeaning rhetoric comes in his next sentence:

In using such words as these to describe other people they thereby place the reasons or causes of "inferior" status *somewhere within the minds, within the personalities, or within the culture* of those who are economically, politically, or educationally out of power (137, p. 7).

Romano, in other words, called for ex-victims to stop blaming present victims. He went on to assert that members of all American groups, whether ethnic, subcultural, or religious, have perpetuated the same mystique about the cultural reasons for their personal success versus the failure of others in their own group.

Romano extended his argument further and asserted that social scientists were not immune from the general American pattern of blaming the victim. In his words:

This peculiar rationale has remained with us to this day, as witness the ubiquitous terminology of contemporary American social science that repeatedly describes people in the lower rungs of society as underachievers, retarded, fatalistic, tradition bound, emotional, etc., etc., etc. Good examples of this can be found in the Parsonian universal dichotomy which divides social systems into the instrumental-rational social systems (us, of course) *versus* the affective-emotional social systems (they, naturally) (137, pp. 8-9).

Here he touched a nerve. Social scientists thought they were too objective to participate in such shabby, even if culturally prevalent, rhetorical practices. Nor were they prepared for the onslaught that awaited them in future issues of the appropriately named *El Grito*.

The Romano-Vaca critique, if that is not too polite a term for so rude an assault, affirmed that social scientific notions about Chicanos developed during the 1950s and early 1960s simply reflected institutional racism and forms of domination prevailing in the society at large. Unwittingly laced with ideology, the anthropological writings attacked by Romano in retrospect do appear to be

as often objectifying as objective. In any case, most researchers entering the field in the 1970s came with critique in hand, fully prepared to slay the by then doddering dragon who went by the name of passive-fatalistic-present-oriented-static-homogeneous-traditional culture.

## A MORE DEVASTATING CRITIQUE

Writing about a decade after the Romano-Vaca onslaught, Paredes (129) revisited the terrain earlier so utterly demolished (see also 88, 154). He begins his essay with a tone of moderation, by stating the distressing facts in a matter-of-fact manner, as follows:

We are well aware of the current quarrel in this country between minority groups and the social sciences. Nowhere has this quarrel reached greater proportions than between Chicanos and anthropology, with Chicanos bitterly attacking ethnographies made of their people by Anglo anthropologists. Octavio Romano, who himself received his doctorate in anthropology and did his fieldwork in a Chicano community, is perhaps the best known and most persuasive of these critics (129, p. 1).

In his next sentence, however, the tone shifts, becoming both more humorous and more pointed:

The main target of Chicano wrath has been anthropologist William Madsen, Romano's erstwhile colleague, who has become a sort of *bête blanche* of the *movimiento*. Madsen's little book *Mexican-Americans of South Texas* is Exhibit A, to which all Chicanos point with disgust (129, p. 1).

This shift from Romano's relentless strident assault to Paredes's more modulated posture, now the voice of reason, now gentle humor, now irony with an edge, reflects a decade of changes in the broader political climate and in Chicano studies as a discipline.

In Paredes's hands, the critique of anthropology becomes both more devastating and more constructive. Paredes showed that the ethnographies of Madsen and Rubel erred less in overt prejudice than in the more subtle (and therefore more pernicious) unconscious perpetuation of stereotypes. In his words:

[A]ttempting to be as objective as possible—and that is as much as one may expect either of anthropologists or the subjects of anthropologists—I must say that I find the Mexicans and Chicanos pictured in the usual ethnographies somewhat unreal (129, p. 2).

He further asserts, in the following passage, that his perceptions are shared by members of the communities under study:

I am thinking especially of the reaction to studies such as those by Madsen, Arthur Rubel, and others on the part of the average Chicano student, especially those students coming from the communities studied by the Hogg Foundation Hidalgo County Project in 1957–1962. It is not so much a sense of outrage, that would betray wounded egos, as a feeling of puzzlement, that

*this* is given as a picture of the communities they have grown up in. Many of them are more likely to laugh at it all than feel indignant (129, p. 2).

His positive critique succeeds in being both more devastating and more constructive than his predecessors' because he elegantly dismantles specific analyses and builds convincing alternative interpretations. In one case, for example, he discusses how the anthropological folklorist, Munro Edmunson, has in part derived his analysis of Mexican fatalism from a mistranslation of the following stanza of a song:

*Guadalajara en un llano,  
México en una laguna;  
me he de comer esa tuna  
aunque me espine la mano.*

In justifying his analysis of fatalism as a key Mexican cultural value, Edmunson renders these lines as follows:

Guadalajara on a plain;  
Mexico on a lake.  
I have to eat this *tuna*  
even if it pricks me.

Paredes, however, suggests the following alternative translation:

In these last two lines the first thing worth noting is the presence of *he*, a form of the helper verb *haber*. Bilingual dictionaries usually translate *haber de* as "ought to" or "must." But any Spanish speaker knows that *he de* denotes a strong determination to do something. What the singer is saying is, "No matter what, I *will* eat that prickly pear, even if I get my hand full of thorns." And the pear in question is not an actual fruit, of course, but a woman's favors (129, p. 7).

By comparing the lines with a speech by Shakespeare's Hotspur, Paredes suggests the following less literal, yet more telling translation:

"Out of this thorny cactus, danger, I will pluck this *tuna*, beauty." Fatalism, indeed! (129, p. 7).

Suffice it to say that further examples in Paredes's essay are circumstantial, abundant, and convincing. Ethnographic errors in Madsen and Rubel include, among others, mistranslations, failing to see double meanings in speech, taking literally what people meant figuratively, and taking seriously what people meant as a joke. If ethnographers wish to move beyond stereotypes, Paredes suggests, they must acquire a deep grasp of the language, a fine understanding of social relations, and a rich sense of social context that minimally includes the ability to distinguish joking banter from deadly earnest.

Embodied in performance and embedded in social context, the concept of culture in Paredes's analysis no longer refers to that timeless, homogeneous essence: the monolithic Chicano. Paredes further enriches the notion of culture

when he discusses how researchers can misinterpret what they hear if they fail to take into account their own positions in a field of interethnic and class conflict where certain people are dominant and others subordinate. Chicanos who in seeming earnest say, for example, that all Mexicans are stupid, lazy, and backward expect not agreement, but a response indicating that their friend, the researcher, differs from other Anglos who simply accept the dominant culture's racist stereotypes. How surprised they would be to learn that their remarks, meant to test the waters, have made their way into ethnographies as earnest self-descriptions, understood to be expressions of a cultural inferiority complex (129, pp. 20–21)! The meaning of people's words cannot be separated, in other words, from who is speaking to whom in what context. Paredes thus links cultural performance and power relations.

Always embedded in the analysis of particulars, Paredes's (121–133) theory of culture and power deserves a more general statement, even at the risk of excessive schematization. His view allows for a certain autonomy in people's patterned lifeways, suggesting that culture can both shape and reflect the larger political economy. His approach can be exemplified here in relation to the term "interests." Can one determine group interests simply by looking at their economic conditions? Or must one also discover how interests are culturally mediated, both reflected and created, through what people value and find worth struggling for? Crude idealist theories of culture, on the one hand, remove interests from factors that condition them. Such views ignore the practices through which interests achieve objective expression and undergo continual revision. Vulgar materialist theories of culture, on the other hand, reduce interests to socioeconomic formations. They fail to see how such conditions both enable and constrain the emergence of cultural conceptions. In Paredes's analysis, culture neither determines all human behavior nor dissolves into the economic base.

In this revised form the concept of culture allows for historical change and variation by region, class, city versus country, and time of immigration. It also permits one to stress tensions within and between cultures and classes, such as Mexican nationals, Chicanos, other American minorities, and Anglos. Analyses need not, in other words, generalize to Chicano culture as an eternal totality in a manner comparable to how scholars, according to Edward Said, have characterized the Orient.

## THE POLITICS OF RESEARCH

The critical stance that has become prevalent in recent anthropological works on Chicanos faces in two directions. Looking inward toward the academic discipline itself, as Arvizu has said, "Chicanos continue to critique anthropology as a discipline which has developed through colonizing traditions (8, p.

119).” Looking outward toward Anglo American society, as Cuéllar asserts, insider studies stress “a critical dimension that centers on the rigorous analysis and critique of dominant perspectives and institutions (30, p. 70).” Anglo researchers in the field, to varying degrees, have adopted similar positions. Kutsche, for example, accounts for the reported factionalism of Hispano villages of northern New Mexico by affirming, “The simple and in my view adequate explanation [of factionalism] is oppression (84, p. 10).” Whether they take on their discipline or the dominant society, this shared critical posture both unifies researchers and enables them to ride off in widely divergent empirical and theoretical directions.

These writings have also explored what happens when so-called natives, the subjects of anthropological investigation, talk back, question research findings, and produce findings of their own. More often than not, the Chicanos talking back are also anthropologists with university teaching positions. This dual position, as Chicano and as anthropologist, particularly complicates the general debate about whether anthropologists and their subjects can engage in analytically productive exchange. In many, but not all cases Chicano anthropologists are not members of the particular communities for which they speak. Indeed, anthropologists who call themselves Chicanos on campus often do research among people of Mexican ancestry who call themselves, depending on context and region, Mexicanos, Mexicans, Mexican-Americans, and so on.

Let me hasten to say that in this essay Chicano (as is common in the literature) refers broadly to people of Mexican descent residing in the United States, rather than more narrowly to the urban (often university-based) political movement that emerged in the late 1960s. Readers who wish to learn about the etymology, political performance, and limits of the term Chicano should consult Limón (96). Paredes (130) has also insightfully explored contextual parameters of the enormously varied ethnic names in use among Americans of Mexican ancestry. His analysis stands as a cautionary tale against reifying a single term as an ethnic community’s one and only self-designation.

Chicano anthropologists’ identification with their subjects, whether or not they happen to have grown up in the community under study, includes a perception that ethnographer and informant share a common heritage. Thus the gap otherwise separating the pragmatic everyday uses of language among “natives” and the analytical projects of academic “anthropologists” seem less likely to confound matters when “native anthropologists” critique their own discipline on behalf of their subjects. Chicanos not trained as anthropologists have also commented on academic writings, and they have done so with insight (42, pp. 242–60; 176).

Both the engaged stance and Chicano responses to research have raised issues about the connections between power and knowledge. Who decides whether or not an ethnographic report is significant or accurate? Should the



dialogue and debate about the validity of particular interpretations include only trained anthropologists, community members, or both? The anthropological discipline at large clearly should be (though it has not been) concerned with how vexing problems in the politics of research have been played out in the field of Chicano studies.

## REGIONAL VARIATIONS

In what follows the literature surveyed, first by geographical region and then by analytical topic, has been shaped, among other significant factors, by three relatively senior scholars. Paredes, just retired from the University of Texas, Austin, set a standard of creative scholarship in folklore and anthropology that has inspired younger scholars, foremost among others, his outstanding student, Limón. Kutsche, at Colorado College, has organized research projects and conferences that have shaped the regional vision that distinguishes studies of Hispanos in northern New Mexico and southern Colorado. Carlos, at the University of California, Santa Barbara, has published jointly with scholars from other disciplines, as well as with his two students, Gilbert and Keefe, in a substantial series of papers on social organization, health care delivery, and agricultural development.

Researchers have developed broad sketches of the boundaries and characteristics of regions and subregions within the area inhabited by people of Mexican ancestry. Spicer (148, 149; see also 91) provides a useful point of departure for the American southwest. His concept of plural society stands as a reminder that Chicanos cannot be understood in isolation. Although he proposes ethnic subdivisions (such as rural Norteño, urban Norteño, Hispano, and Mexican-American), Spicer notes that, unlike Native American groups, people of Mexican ancestry speak the same language and vary only by dialect and degrees of linguistic competence in Spanish (compare 135). The linguistic basis for Chicano unity probably seems so self-evident that only a comparative perspective can highlight its distinctive import. Spicer, on the other hand, speaks about the divisions separating Mexican-Americans, usually landless working class or peasant immigrants, from the Hispanos, who have resided continuously since the seventeenth century in northern New Mexico and southern Colorado. The latter identify with the land they own and inhabit, rather than with Mexican or Norteño culture. His distinction indicates the need for diverse sociohistorical accounts, rather than a single history, to explain how communities of Mexican descent in the United States have come to be as they are today.

Spicer's broad sketch of southwestern cultural types has been supplemented by Galarza's (43) more differentiated analysis of seven regional groupings: "the San Francisco Bay Basin, metropolitan Los Angeles, the Central Valley of California, the Salt River Valley of Arizona, the upper Rio Grande Valley of

New Mexico and Colorado, a less-defined area centering in Denver and Texas." He goes on to say, "There is an eighth which I will call the 'Border Belt' (43, p. 267)." Galarza's regions combine ecological, rural-urban, and cultural criteria. His classification implicitly calls for further research on the mutual influences of cultural forms and regional political economies.

The area most fully studied from a regional perspective has been the Hispano upper Río Grande Valley of northern New Mexico and Colorado. This area lends itself to anthropological study because the population, which owns the land it inhabits, resides in villages that make suitable units for community and comparative studies. Although only one ethnography of an Hispano village (88) has been published, historians, sociologists, and anthropologists have collaborated in illuminating comparative studies marked by an effort to understand the broader region (13–16, 55, 79–90, 135, 153a–157, 176–181, 222, 223). Van Ness and Kutsche (84, 88, 178, 179, 181) have together developed a broad ecological typology of three distinct subregions, including (a) a northern area of community land grants, small economic enterprises, high social solidarity, and relative social equality; (b) a southern area of individual land grants, large ranches, huge herds of sheep, and social inequality separating *patrón* [owner] and *peon* [laborer]; (c) and an eastern area settled only after 1848 and dominated by commercial cattle operations worked by cowboys.

The Hispano region has also been marked by a self-conscious pride in its own heritage. This awareness of traditional lore, which itself has a long distinguished history in the academic writings of Hispano folklorists, has been reflected in recent anthropological studies of folklore, religion, and local crafts (13–16, 207, 208). Among more recent writers, Briggs's published and forthcoming work appears especially promising. Paredes (127, 128, 133) has studied two Hispanos, one a psychologist and the other a novelist, who have written about the traditions of their homeland.

The most original contribution to cultural studies of the region is by Valdez (176), an Hispano intellectual who is not a university-based academic. In discussing *vergüenza* [shame], Valdez begins by contrasting the term with *sin vergüenza* [without shame, shameless], and convincingly shows that a person "with shame" has qualities of virtue and moderation. Such people are trustworthy and know how to keep a confidence. They appear more as paragons of self-control than as reflexes of social control. Valdez's analysis thus subverts the dominant view, current for the circum-Mediterranean and Spanish-speaking regions of the Americas, that "shame" is an external mechanism for doing the job that guilt, conscience, and inner control accomplish in "Western" cultures. Valdez himself stands as an exemplar of the Hispano region's remarkable cultural vitality, its capacity to produce what Antonio Gramsci called organic intellectuals.

Studies of the border region have only begun, but show considerable potential (6, 41, 130, 200–202, 225). Fernández Kelly has done pertinent research of

high quality on *maquiladoras* working on the Mexican side of the border. In a fine oral history of his own extended family, Alvarez has shown the continuity in family relations and patterns of coordinated movement over the past two centuries on both sides of the southern-Baja California border.

Though a number of significant studies have focused on south Texas (92–104, 121–133, 224–227) and the Santa Barbara area (17, 18, 20, 50, 51, 66–76, 119, 120), this confluence reflects the inspiration of effective teachers, Paredes and Carlos respectively, more than an effort to analyze the regions as spatially organized systems. In part the absence of regional studies elsewhere should be attributed to the difficulties ethnographers face in attempting to discover the contours of historically and demographically complex areas. Such work would probably require an interdisciplinary team able to mix methodologies more diverse than those so successfully deployed in the Hispano region of northern New Mexico and southern Colorado.

## TOPICS OF STUDY

*Health care* has been more extensively written about than any other topic in Chicano studies. One paper provides a profile of the health status of Chicanos in the United States (169). Another analyzes the status of Chicanas in the nursing profession (5). A number of articles offer outlines of ethnomedicine (4, 56–58, 61, 62, 115) and “traditional” curing practices (39, 45). Others study the interaction between ethnomedicine and modern medical health therapies (67, 71, 72, 116, 119, 120, 199, 204). These papers study the therapeutic effectiveness of traditional practices. They also ask about their role in supplementing, impeding, or promoting the use of other health care facilities.

The substantive issue that has received the most attention is fertility. Papers range from ethnographic descriptions of childbirth practices (60, 63), through menstruation (64) and menopause (65), to fertility rates (170) and fertility regulation (59, 168). Researchers also have treated the more politically volatile issue of involuntary sterilization (37, 186, 187). Vélez-Ibáñez effectively uses particular cases to make his analyses vivid.

Health care delivery and utilization is the explicit focus of a number of articles (21, 22, 67, 108, 116, 119, 120, 152). Much of this work, particularly that originating at the University of California, Santa Barbara, by Carlos and Keefe, uses network analysis to explore the interpersonal relations along which Chicanos seek help for their medical and mental afflictions. These researchers regard personal networks as support systems whose functions should be understood by institutions attempting to deliver mental health care (74–76, 118–120). This work’s strength has been its systematic exploration of network analysis as a conceptual tool. It has not, however, attended sufficiently to cultural conceptions that shape the quality of social relations. What, for

example, are the cultural notions of intimacy, friendship, *confianza* [trust], and helping?

*Kinship and social organization* have also been studied through network analysis, with similar strengths and weaknesses as in the health care field. Carlos (17) thus compares Mexican and Chicano *compadrazgo* [co-godparenthood, fictive kin relations]. Gilbert (50) and Keefe (68–70, 73) have used network analysis to study the extended family. The former (51) has also compared social structural variations in communities in the Santa Barbara area. In an analysis that nicely supplements studies by the Santa Barbara group, Vélez-Ibáñez (184, 189) has explored networks organized by exchange relations and the cultural conception of *confianza* [trust]. Trueba (161) uses life history materials to plead for less prejudiced accounts of Chicano and Mexican family life. Changing family relations in south Texas have been studied by Whiteford (227), and Wells (214) has perceptively characterized the rural Chicano family.

The two phases of the life cycle that have received the most attention are youth and aging. Among studies of youth, Vigil and his coworkers have studied gangs, particularly the relations between life style and educational performance (105, 113, 192, 195–198). Spielberg Benítez (150) has studied humor in youth gangs. Among studies of aging, Newton (117, 118) has given an overview, and Cuellar and his coworkers (12, 26, 28–30, 33, 34, 205) have studied the elderly from a variety of theoretical and empirical perspectives, including an extended case history of a senior citizens center, dilemmas of “insider” research, attitudes toward death among the elderly, and the political power of the aged. For both youths and the aged, researchers continually ask applied questions: how can the lives of their subjects be improved?

*Feminist questions* about gender have been the focus of two collections that include essays by anthropologists (109, 114). The former collection discusses childbirth (63), abortion (171), the nursing profession (5), and women as innovators (226). The latter collection provides a broad discussion of women in organizations (36), an overview of involuntary sterilization (37) plus a case study on the same topic (187), and a theoretical statement on class, nationality, and gender (38). Similar practical and political concerns underlie the writings on fertility and its regulation, discussed above under health care. Other feminist studies include Melville (107) on women’s adaptation to migration, Geilhufe (47) on discrimination against women in San Jose jails, and Keefe (66) on gender and nationality in politics, with particular reference to Santa Barbara and Santa Paula, California.

*Educational anthropology* has been relatively well developed. Arvizu (7, 9) has discussed the creative potential in biculturalism and cross-cultural issues concerning parent participation in schools. The practical issue of bilingual education has received more attention than any other. It has been assessed both

from philosophical (77) and policy perspectives (53). Anthropologists with central interests elsewhere have discussed the role of culture in bilingual education (3, 31). Trueba and his coworkers have given this topic broad sustained attention that includes general issues (158–160), assessment of language skills (166), models (162), adjustment problems (165), and ethnographic approaches (163, 164, 167).

*Immigration* has developed in lopsided fashion, more in demographic and sociological studies than in ethnographic ones. Cornelius's UC San Diego Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies has surveyed materials on immigration in southern California (23), and in the San Francisco Bay Area (24). In this connection, Chávez (21, 22) has written well on issues of health care delivery for undocumented workers. Elsewhere writers have explored explanations and theories of migration (143) and connections between ethnicity and migration (110). More specific studies include one on women's adaptation to migration (107), and another on retrained, relocated workers (172). Wells (210–212) has published a series of sophisticated studies on immigration in relation to factory labor in a Wisconsin small town.

*Political economy* has a small number of good studies. Carlos & Brokensha (19) have compared the effectiveness of government agencies for inducing socioeconomic and cultural integration among rural agrarian populations in California's San Joaquin Valley and Sinaloa, Mexico's Fuerte Valley. Moles (112) has shown how Mexican workers are replacing small farmers in the Sacramento Valley of northern California. Patricia Zavella has a good book forthcoming on cannery workers in San Jose, and a number of papers in preparation on women in the electronics industry of northern New Mexico. Vélez-Ibáñez (188, 189) has studied how rotating credit associations in the United States and Mexico have created and reflected cultural conceptions of *confianza* [trust] and socioeconomic exchange relations. Wells (213, 215–221) has developed a series of outstanding studies on the strawberry industry in the Salinas region of coastal northern California.

*Urban life* has been handled in a dispersed fashion that perhaps reflects the nature of the phenomenon under study. Cuéllar (25) formulated an early model for urban studies that should bear fruit in his forthcoming studies of Chicano and Mexican urban youth culture. Achor (1) has done an informative ethnography of a Dallas *barrio*. Davidson's (35) study of Chicano prisoners in San Quentin opens a field for further study. Geilhufe (46–48) has also studied women in jail, Chicanos and the police in San Jose, California, and urban life. Eiselein & Marshall (40) have reported on the effectiveness of public television programs designed for Chicanos in Tucson, Arizona. Weeks and Spielberg Benítez (206) have surveyed the cultural demography of Chicanos in the midwest, and the latter has explored Chicano work values and cultural traditions (151, 153).

*The Chicano movement* has been studied in a useful ethnography (42) of a south Texas community influenced by the *Raza Unida* movement in the early 1970s. This work has been innovative in using a historical perspective and by printing commentaries on the monograph by community members. Vigil's (193) superficial panoramic sketch, touching all from the Olmecs to the present, attempts to comprehend the Chicano movement in its most sweeping historical context. Other more focused essays on the Chicano movement include Kuroda (81), Vélez-Ibáñez (185), and Vigil (190). In a number of telling papers, Limón (92, 93, 96, 98) has studied the Chicano movement in its historical antecedents and among University of Texas at Austin students during the 1970s. His concerns have tacked back and forth between the "folk" and the university and between ideas and practical activities.

*Cultural life* has been explored in a number of studies that range from philosophy (78) and values (151), through nationalistic celebration (106), to mural art (52) and popular culture (54). Readers interested in folklore, particularly in its social context, should consult the fine works by Paredes (121–133) and Limón (92–104). Paredes (131, 133) and Limón (101, 104) have also written on Chicano literature, and Herrera is both a doctoral student in anthropology and a noted Chicano poet. García Castañón (44) has written an insightful interpretation of *Bernabé*, a work performed by the Teatro Campesino.

*Theory and method* have been developed in ways that reflect issues in the discipline and the exigencies of a politically committed anthropology. The concept of culture in relation to applied anthropology has received attention (10, 11, 49, 194). Poggie (134) has published a life history. The extended case method of the Manchester school has been used and explicated by Cuéllar (28, 32) and Vélez-Ibáñez (182). Marxist analysis has been invoked by Vigil (191) and given substantial formulation by Limón (103). Action research as method has been discussed in a number of papers (40, 111, 136, 144–147, 175).

Issues concerning insider research have been discussed by Aguilar (2) and Vélez-Ibáñez (183). Cuéllar (30) has compared insiders and outsiders in applied projects. Playing on Carlos Castañeda's *Teachings of Don Juan*, Cuéllar suggests that insiders face four enemies: fear, clarity, power, and fatigue. The privileged access that insiders can attain, in other words, creates its own characteristic dilemmas. Reflections on the position of Chicano anthropologists also notably include a report on minority participation in the profession coauthored by Weaver (203).

## THE COMING GENERATION

Future anthropological writings on Chicanos will be significantly shaped by four scholars in their late 30s and early 40s. Their work has developed by combining, with varying degrees of emphasis, concerns at once political,

applied, and theoretical. Each of these writers has a distinctive style and voice, reflecting their political commitments, research topics, and theoretical predilections.

Cuéllar (12, 25–34, 205) has studied Chicano gerontology and minority aging, often in collaboration with people from other disciplines and usually with an eye to applied interests. His distinctive methodological tool has been the analysis of generational cohorts. In doing cohort analysis, he includes historical factors and period of immigration from Mexico, with a view to studying the formative life experiences within age strata as well as the patterns of interaction between age strata. Recently, Cuéllar has turned from the aged to youth culture. He has embarked on a comprehensive investigation of the *cholo* style in urban culture, both in its homeland of east Los Angeles and as it has diffused to the American southwest and northwestern Mexico.

Vélez-Ibáñez (182–189) has done field research in Mexico City and Tucson, Arizona, concentrating on politics and economics, particularly rotating credit associations. His analyses combine concepts from economic anthropology with the Manchester School's extended case method. Recently, Vélez-Ibáñez has started a survey of relations of exchange and *confianza* in Tucson, Arizona, where he hopes to develop a community profile of social inequality and interpersonal alliances. This promises to be the most systematic study of a Chicano urban community to date.

Wells (209–221) has done field research on labor migration in the midwest, and on California's coastal strawberry industry. Her work draws creatively on neoclassical economics and Marxian analyses of political economy. Her study of the strawberry industry shows how labor has been empowered by the practical exigencies of production processes themselves. Strawberries, in a word, require extensive labor inputs that cannot be mechanized. Here ethnographic method illuminates a problem that aggregate statistical analysis cannot even discern. Following broader trends in Marxian thought, her work will probably devote more attention to political consciousness in the future. She is now writing a book that builds on the fine analyses in her articles on the strawberry industry.

Limón (92–104) has recently entered an especially creative phase. His studies of folklore have fruitfully combined symbolic anthropology and Marxian analysis, especially on the topics of culture, class, and ethnicity. His studies focus on local contexts such as student meetings, meals, or a restaurant, where folklore is practiced in everyday life situations. As he shows how folklore reveals class and ethnic conflict, he moves from specific practices to class relations and back again. Limón's studies have been theoretically explicit, employing and critiquing concepts authored by theorists ranging from Mary Douglas to Antonio Gramsci. Work of this caliber promises to make Chicano studies increasingly visible in the ongoing debates and dialogues of anthropology.

Anthropological writings on Chicanos over the past 15 years must be understood in relation to the politics of the late 1960s and early 1970s. As a direct outgrowth of that period, this subfield has developed a committed stance, engaged at once with the ideology of a broader political movement and concerned with applied problems involving migrant workers, health care delivery, and education. Unlike Thomas Kuhn's paradigm-bound scientists who systematically blind themselves to social problems, anthropologists studying Chicanos find that their research projects emerge from community politics and issues of social justice as often as from pressing conceptual puzzles in their discipline. Chicano studies, for the most part, share in the broader endeavor of combating ideological, political, and economic forms of oppression confronted by their research subjects.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This essay began toward the end of my year (1980–1981) as a Fellow at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences. That year was financially supported by a National Research Council Fellowship for Minorities, supplemented by National Science Foundation Grant #BNS 76 22943. Subsequent funds for institutional support from the National Research Council plus matching funds from Stanford University aided in completion of this project. Janice Stockard provided highly skilled help as a bibliographic research assistant. I am especially indebted to most of the people cited here for their active cooperation, correspondence, and conversation. I have learned much about Chicano studies from the following Stanford anthropology graduate students: R. R. Alvarez, Jr., S. F. Arvizu, L. R. Chávez, II, M. Díaz-Barriga, P. T. Espinosa, J. Garcia-Castañón, N. Geilhufe, J. F. Herrera, M. Menchaca, M. Ramírez, D. Reynolds, R. Rouse, and R. Sánchez. Mary Louise Pratt commented with insight on earlier drafts of the manuscript.

#### Literature Cited

1. Achor, S. 1978. *Mexican Americans in a Dallas Barrio*. Tucson: Univ. Arizona Press
2. Aguilar, J. L. 1981. Insider research: An ethnography of a debate. In *Anthropologists At Home in North America: Methods and Issues in the Study of One's Own Society*, ed. D. A. Messerschmidt, pp. 15–26. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press
3. Aguilar, J. L., Vallejo, C. 1984. The "culture" in bilingual/bicultural education. In *Chicano Studies: A Multidisciplinary Approach*, ed. E. García, F. Lomeli, Y. Ortiz, pp. 227–35. New York: Columbia Univ. Teachers' Press
4. Alvarado, A. L. 1978. Utilization of ethnomedical practitioners and concepts within the framework of Western medicine. In *Modern Medicine and Medical Anthropology in the United States-Mexico Border Population*, ed. B. Velimirovic, pp. 17–21. Washington, DC: Pan Am. Health Organ. Sci. Publ. No. 359
5. Alvarado, A. L. 1980. The status of Hispanic women in nursing. See Ref. 109. pp. 208–16
6. Alvarez, R. R. Jr. 1984. The border as social system: The California case. *New Scholar* 9(1-2):119–34
7. Arvizu, S. F. 1974. Education for constructive marginality. In *The Cultural Drama*, ed. W. Dillon, pp. 123–35.



- Washington, DC: Smithsonian Inst. Press
8. Arvizu, S. F. 1978. Critical reflections and consciousness. *Grito del Sol* 3 (1):119-23
  9. Arvizu, S. F. 1978. Home-school linkages: A cross-cultural approach to parent participation. In *Bilingual Education Training Series: A Cultural Approach to Parent Participation*. Sacramento: Calif. State Univ. Dep. Anthropol. Cross-Cult. Resource Cent.
  10. Arvizu, S. F. 1978. Introductory comments. *Grito del Sol* 3(1):11-16
  11. Arvizu, S. F., Snyder, W. A., Espinoza, P. T. 1978. *Demystifying the Concept of Culture: Theoretical and Conceptual Tools*. Sacramento: Calif. State Univ. Dep. Anthropol. Cross-Cult. Resource Cent. Monogr. 1
  12. Bengston, V. L., Cuéllar, J. B., Ragan, P. K. 1977. Stratum contrasts and similarities in attitudes toward death. *J. Gerontol.* 32(1):76-88
  13. Briggs, C. L. 1980. *The Wood Carvers of Cordova, New Mexico: Social Dimensions of an Artistic "Revival."* Knoxville: Univ. Tenn. Press
  14. Briggs, C. L. 1983. A conversation with Saint Isidore: The teachings of the elders. See Ref. 208, pp. 103-15
  15. Briggs, C. L. 1983. Questions for the ethnographer: A critical examination of the role of the interview in fieldwork. *Semiotica* 46(2-4):233-61
  16. Brown, L. W., Briggs, C. L., Weigle, M. 1978. *Hispano Folklife of New Mexico: The Lorin W. Brown Federal Writers' Project Manuscripts*. Albuquerque: Univ. New Mexico
  17. Carlos, M. L. 1975. Traditional and modern forms of Compadrazgo among Mexican Americans. In *Proc. Int. Congr. Americanists, 40th, Roma-Genova, 1972*. 3:469-83
  18. Carlos, M. L. 1982. Chicano households, the structure of parental information networks, and family use of child-related social services. *Borderlands J.* 6(1):49-68
  19. Carlos, M. L., Brokensha, D. 1972. Agencies, goals and clients: A cross-cultural analysis. *Stud. Comp. Int. Dev.* 7(2):130-55
  20. Casas, J. M., Keefe, S. E., eds. 1978. *Family and Mental Health in the Mexican American Community*. Los Angeles: Univ. Calif. Spanish Speaking Mental Health Res. Cent. Monogr. 7
  21. Chávez, L. R. II 1983. Undocumented immigrants and access to health services: A game of pass the buck. *Migration Today* 11:15-19
  22. Chávez, L. R. II 1984. Doctors, Curanderos and Brujas: Health care delivery and Mexican immigrants. *Med. Anthropol. Q.* 15(2):31-37
  23. Cornelius, W. A., Chávez, L. R. II, Castro, J. G. 1982. *Mexican Immigrants and Southern California: A Summary of Current Knowledge*. La Jolla: Univ. Calif. San Diego Cent. U.S.-Mex. Stud. Res. Rep. Ser. No. 36
  24. Cornelius, W. A., Mines, R., Chávez, L. R. II, Castro, J. G. 1982. *Mexican Immigrants in the San Francisco Bay Area: A Summary of Current Knowledge*. La Jolla: Univ. Calif. San Diego Cent. U.S.-Mex. Stud. Res. Rep. Ser. No. 40
  25. Cuéllar, J. B. 1971. Toward the study of Chicano urban adaptation: The multivariate environmental taxonomy. *Aztlan* 2(1):37-65
  26. Cuéllar, J. B. 1976. Chicano power in old age. *Participant: The Pitzer College Magazine* 9(1):15-18
  27. Cuéllar, J. B. 1977. Paradigms in ethnic studies: Notes on the Chicano experience. In *The Political Economy of Institutional Change: The Proceedings of the Ethnic Studies Symposium*, ed. D. Moreno, R. Torres, pp. 3-11. Irvine: Univ. Calif. Program Comp. Cult.
  28. Cuéllar, J. B. 1978. El Senior Citizens Club: The older Mexican-American in the voluntary association. In *Life's Career—Aging: Cultural Variations On Growing Old*, ed. B. G. Myerhoff, A. Simic, pp. 207-29. Beverly Hills: Sage
  29. Cuéllar, J. B. 1978. What is the history of minority senior programs? *Somos* 1(5):12-14
  30. Cuéllar, J. B. 1979. Insiders and outsiders in minority aging. In *Minority Aging Research: Old Issues—New Approaches*, ed. E. P. Stanford, pp. 67-77. San Diego: Campanile Press
  31. Cuéllar, J. B. 1980. A model for Chicano culture for bilingual education. In *Ethnoperspectives in Bilingual Education Research*, Vol. II: *Theory in Bilingual Education*, ed. R. V. Padilla, pp. 179-204. Ypsilanti: Eastern Mich. Univ.
  32. Cuéllar, J. B. 1981. Social science research in the U.S. Mexican community: A case study. *Aztlan* 12(1):1-21
  33. Cuéllar, J. B., Ragan, P. K. 1977. Stratum contrasts and similarities in attitudes toward death. *J. Gerontol.* 32(1):76-88
  34. Cuéllar, J. B., Torres-Gil, F. 1978. A rationale for developing minority components in gerontological programs. In *Handbook for Training and Research in Minority Aging*, pp. 66-84. Washington, DC: Natl. Cent. on Black Aged
  35. Davidson, R. T. 1974. *Chicano Prison-*

- ers: *The Key to San Quentin*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston
36. Del Castillo, A. R. 1980. Mexican women in organization. See Ref. 114, pp. 7-16
  37. Del Castillo, A. R. 1980. Sterilization: An overview. See Ref. 114, pp. 65-70
  38. Del Castillo, A. R., Mora, M. 1980. Sex, nationality and class: La obrera Mexicana. See Ref. 114, pp. 1-4
  39. Edgerton, R. B., Kamo, M., Fernández, I. 1970. Curanderismo in the metropolis. *Am. J. Psychother.* 24:124-34
  40. Eiselein, E. B., Marshall, W. 1976. Mexican-American television: Applied anthropology and public television. *Hum. Organ.* 35(2):147-56
  41. Fernandez Kelly, M. P. 1981. The U.S.-Mexico border: Recent publications and the state of current research. *Latin Am. Res. Rev.* 16(3):250-67
  42. Foley, D. E., Mota, C., Post, D. E., Lozano, I. 1977. *From Peones to Politicos: Ethnic Relations in a South Texas Town 1900-1977*. Austin: Univ. Texas Cent. Mex. Am. Stud. Monogr. 3
  43. Galarza, E. 1972. Mexicans in the southwest: A culture in process. In *Plural Society in the Southwest*, ed. E. Spicer, R. H. Thompson, pp. 261-97. New York: Interbook
  44. García Castañón, J. 1978. Teatro Chicano and the analysis of sacred symbols: Towards a Chicano world-view in the social sciences. *Grito del Sol* 3(1):37-49
  45. García Castañón, J. 1980. Witchy-Witchy: Estilo Chicano. *Metamorfosis* 3(1):11-12
  46. Geilhufe, N. 1976. Urban life. In *The Study of Anthropology*, ed. D. Hunter, P. Whitten, pp. 408-27. New York: Harper & Row
  47. Geilhufe, N. 1978. Discrimination against women in jail: An analysis of advocacy anthropology. *Hum. Organ.* 37(2):202-10
  48. Geilhufe, N. 1979. *Chicanos and the Police: A Study of the Politics of Ethnicity in San Jose, California*. Washington, DC: Soc. Appl. Anthropol. Mongr. 13
  49. Gibson, M. A., Arvizu, S. F. 1978. *Demystifying the Concept of Culture: Methodological Tools and Techniques*. Sacramento: Calif. State Univ. Dep. Anthropol. Cross-Cult. Resource Cent. Mongr. 2
  50. Gilbert, M. J. 1978. Extended family integration among second-generation Mexican-Americans. See Ref. 20, pp. 25-48
  51. Gilbert, M. J. 1980. Communities within communities: Social structural factors and variation in Mexican American communities. *Hispanic J. Behav. Sci.* 2(3): 241-68
  52. González, A. M. 1982. Murals: Fine, popular, or folk art? *Aztlan* 13(1 & 2):149-63
  53. Hernández-Chávez, E., Alvarez, R. R., Arvizu, S. F., Llanes, J. 1982. *The Federal Policy Toward Language and Education: Pendulum or Progress?* Sacramento: Calif. State Univ. Cross Cult. Resource Cent. Monogr. 12
  54. Herrera, J. F. 1980. On Cantinflas: Towards a concept of popular culture. *Metamorfosis* 3(1):2
  55. Jiménez Núñez, A. 1974. *Los Hispanos de Nuevo Mexico*. Sevilla: Univ. Sevilla, Publ. Semin. Antropol. Am., Vol. 12
  56. Kay, M. 1974. Disease concepts in the barrio today. In *Communicating Nursing Research*, ed. M. V. Batey, pp. 185-94
  57. Kay, M. 1976. The fusion of Utoaztecan and European ethnogynecology in the Florilegio Medicinal. *Proc. Int. Congr. Americanists, 41st, Mexico, 1974*, 3: 323-30
  58. Kay, M. 1977. Health and illness in a Mexican American barrio. In *Ethnic Medicine in the Southwest*, ed. E. H. Spicer, pp. 99-166
  59. Kay, M. 1977. Mexican American fertility regulation. See Ref. 56, pp. 279-94
  60. Kay, M. 1978. The Mexican American. In *Culture/Childbearing/Health Professionals*, ed. A. L. Clark, pp. 89-108. Philadelphia: Davis
  61. Kay, M. 1979. The Florilegio Medicinal: Source of southwest ethnomedicine. *Ethnohistory* 24(3)1977:251-59
  62. Kay, M. 1979. Lexemic change and semantic shift in disease names. *Cult. Med. Psychiatry* 3:73-94
  63. Kay, M. 1980. Mexican, Mexican American, and Chicana childbirth. See Ref. 109, pp. 52-65
  64. Kay, M. 1981. Meanings of menstruation to Mexican American women. In *The Menstrual Cycle*, ed. P. L. Komnenich, M. McSweeney, J. Noak, N. Elder, 2:114-23. New York: Springer
  65. Kay, M., Voda, A., Olivas, G., Rios, F., Imle, M. 1982. Ethnography of the menopause-related hot flash. *Maturitas* 4(2):217-27
  66. Keefe, S. E. 1976. Sex and ethnicity in politics: A minority group model of political interaction. *West. Can. J. Anthropol.* 6(3):213-42
  67. Keefe, S. E. 1979. Mexican Americans' underutilization of mental health clinics: An evaluation of suggested explanations. *Hispanic J. Behav. Sci.* 1(2):93-115
  68. Keefe, S. E. 1979. Urbanization, acculturation, and extended family ties: Mexi-

- can Americans in cities. *Am. Ethnol.* 6(2):349-65
69. Keefe, S. E. 1980. Acculturation and the extended family among urban Mexican Americans. In *Acculturation: Theory, Models and Some New Findings*, ed. A. M. Padilla, pp. 85-110. Boulder, Colo: Westview. AAAS Selected Symp. 39
  70. Keefe, S. E. 1980. Personal communities in the city: Support networks among Mexican Americans and Anglo Americans. *Urban Anthropol.* 9:51-74
  71. Keefe, S. E. 1981. Folk medicine among urban Mexican Americans: Cultural persistence change and displacement. *Hispanic J. Behav. Sci.* 3(1):41-58
  72. Keefe, S. E. 1982. Help-seeking behavior among foreign-born Mexican Americans. *Soc. Sci. Med.* 16:1467-72
  73. Keefe, S. E. 1984. Real and ideal extended familism among Mexican Americans and Anglo Americans: On the meaning of "close" family ties. *Hum. Organ.* 43:65-70
  74. Keefe, S. E., Casas, J. M. 1980. Mexican Americans and mental health: A selected review and recommendations for mental health service delivery. *Am. J. Community Psychol.* 8(3):303-26
  75. Keefe, S. E., Padilla, A. M., Carlos, M. L. 1978. *Emotional Support Systems in Two Cultures: A Comparison of Mexican Americans and Anglo Americans*. Los Angeles: Univ. Calif. Spanish Speaking Mental Health Res. Occas. Pap. 7
  76. Keefe, S. E., Padilla, A. M., Carlos, M. L. 1979. The Mexican-American extended family as an emotional support system. *Hum. Organ.* 38(2):144-52
  77. Klor de Alva, J. J. 1974. Toward a philosophy of bilingualism. *Calif. J. Educ. Res.* 25(5):310-13
  78. Klor de Alva, J. J. 1977. Critique of national character versus universality in Chicano poetry. *De Colores: J. Chicano Expression Thought* 3(3):20-24
  79. Knowlton, C. 1975. Neglected chapters in Mexican-American history. In *Mexican-Americans Tomorrow*, ed. G. Tyler, pp. 19-59. Albuquerque: Univ. New Mexico
  80. Knowlton, C. 1980. The town of Las Vegas community land grant, an Anglo American coup d'état. *J. West* 19:12-21
  81. Kuroda, E. 1978. The social and cultural characteristics of Spanish- and Mexican-Americans and the Chicano movement. In *Ethnicity and Cultural Pluralism in the U.S.A.*, ed. T. Ayabe, pp. 51-112. Fukuoka, Japan: Kyushu Univ. Faculty Educ. Res. Inst. Comp. Educ. Cult.
  82. Kuroda, E. 1981. Ethnicity and ethnic culture in crisis: The struggles for existence of the Spanish-Americans in Taos, New Mexico. In *Ethnicity and its Identity in the U.S.A.*, ed. T. Ayabe, pp. 33-86. Ibaraki, Japan: Univ. Tsukuba Inst. Hist. Anthropol.
  83. Kutsche, P. 1976. A New Mexico test of modernization theory. *Pap. Anthropol.* 17(2):138-49
  84. Kutsche, P. 1979. Introduction: Atomism, factionalism and flexibility. In *The Colorado College Studies: The Survival of Spanish American Villages*, ed. P. Kutsche, pp. 7-20. Colorado Springs: Colo. Coll. Res. Comm.
  85. Kutsche, P. 1983. Family and household in northern New Mexico. *J. Comp. Family Stud.* 14(2):151-65. Spec. issue
  86. Kutsche, P. 1983. Theories of borders and frontiers. In *Borderlands Sourcebook: A Guide to the Literature on Northern Mexico and the American Southwest*, ed. E. R. Stoddard, R. L. Nostrand, J. P. West, pp. 16-19. Norman: Univ. Oklahoma Press
  87. Kutsche, P., Gallegos, D. 1979. Community functions of the *Cofradía de Nuestro Padre Jesús Nazareño*. See Ref. 84, pp. 91-98
  88. Kutsche, P., Van Ness, J. R. 1981. *Cañones: Values, Crisis, and Survival in a Northern New Mexico Village*. Albuquerque: Univ. New Mexico Press
  89. Kutsche, P., Van Ness, J. R., Smith, A. T. 1976. A unified approach to the anthropology of Hispanic northern New Mexico: Historical archaeology, ethnohistory, and ethnography. *Hist. Archaeol.* 10:1-16
  90. Lauderdale, M., Peterson, J., Swadesh, F. L. 1970. Sistemas Cuantitativos en el Estudio del Cambio Sociocultural. *Am. Indig.* 30(1):107-34
  91. Leon-Portilla, M. 1972. The Norteño variety of Mexican culture: An ethnohistorical approach. See Ref. 43, pp. 77-114
  92. Limón, J. E. 1973. Stereotyping and Chicano resistance: An historical dimension. *Aztlán* 4(2):257-70
  93. Limón, J. E. 1974. El Primer Congreso Mexicanista de 1911: A precursor to contemporary Chicanismo. *Aztlán* 5(1 & 2):85-117
  94. Limón, J. E. 1977. Agringado joking in Texas-Mexican society: Folklore and differential identity. *New Scholar* 6:33-50
  95. Limón, J. E. 1977. El Folklore y los Mexicanos en los Estados Unidos: Una Perspectiva Cultural Marxista. In *La Otra Cara de Mexico: El Pueblo Chicano*, ed. D. Maciel, pp. 224-42. México, D. F: Ediciones El Caballito

96. Limón, J. E. 1981. The folk performance of "Chicano" and the cultural limits of political ideology. In *"And Other Neighborly Names": Social Process and Cultural Image in Texas Folklore*, ed. R. Bauman, R. D. Abrahams, pp. 197-225. Austin: Univ. Texas Press
97. Limón, J. E. 1982. History, Chicano joking, and the varieties of higher education: Tradition and performance as critical symbolic action. *J. Folklore Inst.* 19:141-66
98. Limón, J. E. 1982. El Meeting: History, folk Spanish and ethnic nationalism in a Chicano student community. In *Spanish in the United States: Sociolinguistic Aspects*, ed. J. Amastae, L. Elfás-Olivares, pp. 301-32. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press
99. Limón, J. E. 1983. Folklore, social conflict, and the United States-Mexican border. In *Handbook of American Folklore*, ed. R. Dorson, pp. 216-26. Bloomington: Indiana Univ. Press
100. Limón, J. E. 1983. Legendry, metafolklore, and performance: A Mexican-American example. *West. Folklore* 42: 191-207
101. Limón, J. E. 1983. A 'Southern Renaissance' for Texas letters. *Texas Observer* (Oct. 28):20-23
102. Limón, J. E. 1983. Texas Mexican popular music and dancing: Some notes on history and symbolic process. *Latin Am. Music Rev.* 4:229-46
103. Limón, J. E. 1983. Western Marxism and folklore: A critical introduction. *J. Am. Folklore* 96(379):34-52
104. Limón, J. E. 1984. Healing the wounds: Folk symbols and historical crisis. *Texas Humanist* 6(4):21-23
105. Long, J. M., Vigil, J. D. 1980. Cultural styles and adolescent sex role perceptions: An exploration of responses to the value picture projective test. See Ref. 109, pp. 164-72
106. Melville, M. B. 1978. The Mexican-American and the celebration of the Fiestas Patrias: An ethnohistorical analysis. *Grito del Sol* 3(1):107-16
107. Melville, M. B. 1978. Mexican women adapt to migration. *Int. Migr. Rev.* 12(2):225-35
108. Melville, M. B. 1978. Minority medical issues: Two views. See Ref. 4, pp. 73-76
109. Melville, M. B., ed. 1980. *Twice a Minority: Mexican American Women*. St. Louis: Mosby
110. Melville, M. B. 1983. Ethnicity: An analysis of its dynamism and variability focusing on the Mexican/Anglo/Mexican American interface. *Am. Ethnol.* 10 (2):272-89
111. Melville, M. B., Melville, T. R. 1978. Anthropologists and political action. In *Anthropology for the Future*, ed. O. B. Shimkin, S. Tax, J. W. Morrison, pp. 214-93. Urbana: Univ. Ill. Dep. Anthropol. Res. Rep. 4
112. Moles, J. A. 1979. Who tills the soil? Mexican-American workers replace the small farmer in California: An example from Colusa County. *Hum. Organ.* 38(1):20-27
113. Moore, J., Vigil, J. D., García, R. 1983. Residence and territoriality in Chicano gangs. *Soc. Probl.* 31(2):182-94
114. Mora, M., Del Castillo, A. R., eds. 1980. *Mexican Women in the United States: Struggles Past and Present*. Los Angeles: Univ. Calif. Chicano Stud. Res. Cent. Occas. Pap. No. 2
115. Newton, F. C. 1978. The Mexican American emic system of mental illness: An exploratory study. See Ref. 20, pp. 69-90
116. Newton, F. C. 1980. Issues in research and service delivery among Mexican American elderly: A concise statement with recommendations. *Gerontologist* 20(2):208-13
117. Newton, F. C. 1981. The Hispanic elderly: a review of health, social, and psychological factors. In *Explorations in Chicano Psychology*, ed. A. Baron, pp. 29-49. New York: Praeger
118. Newton, F. C., Ruiz, R. A. 1981. Chicano culture and mental health among the elderly. In *Chicano Aging and Mental Health*, ed. M. R. Miranda, R. A. Ruiz, pp. 38-75. Rockville, Md: U.S. Dep. Health Hum. Sci.
119. Padilla, A. M., Carlos, M. L., Keefe, S. E. 1976. Mental health service utilization by Mexican Americans. In *Psychotherapy with the Spanish-Speaking: Issues in Research and Service Delivery*, ed. M. R. Miranda, pp. 9-20. Los Angeles: Univ. Calif. Spanish Speaking Mental Health Res. Cent. Monogr. 3
120. Padilla, A. M., Keefe, S. E. 1984. The search for help: Mental health resources for Mexican Americans and Anglo Americans in a plural society. In *The Pluralistic Society: A Community Mental Health Perspective*, ed. S. Sue, T. Moore, pp. 77-115. New York: Hum. Sci. Press
121. Paredes, A. 1970. Proverbs and ethnic stereotypes. *Proverbium* 15:95(511)-97 (513)
122. Paredes, A. 1972. The legend of Gregorio Cortez. In *Mexican-American Authors*, ed. A. Paredes, R. Paredes, pp. 35-50. Boston: Houghton Mifflin
123. Paredes, A. 1972. The United States,

- Mexico and machismo. *J. Folklore Inst.* 8(1):17-37
124. Paredes, A. 1973. José Mosqueda and the folklorization of actual events. *Aztlan* 4(1):1-30
  125. Paredes, A. 1976. The role of folklore in border relations. In *The International Border in Community Relations: Gateway or Barrier?*, ed. K. Skagen, pp. 17-22. San Diego: Fronteras
  126. Paredes, A. 1976. *A Texas-Mexican Cancionero: Folksongs of the Lower Border*. Urbana: Univ. Ill. Press
  127. Paredes, A., ed. 1977. *Humanidad: Essays in Honor of George L. Sanchez*. Los Angeles: Univ. Calif. Chicano Stud. Cent. Monogr. 6
  128. Paredes, A. 1977. Jorge Isidoro Sánchez y Sánchez (1906-1972). See Ref. 127, pp. 120-26
  129. Paredes, A. 1978. On ethnographic work among minority groups. In *New Directions in Chicano Scholarship*, ed. R. Romo, R. Paredes, pp. 1-32. La Jolla: Univ. Calif. San Diego, Chicano Stud. Program. Chicano Stud. Monogr. Ser.
  130. Paredes, A. 1978. The problem of identity in a changing culture: Popular expressions of culture conflict along the lower Rio Grande border. In *Views across the Border: The United States and Mexico*, ed. S. R. Ross, pp. 68-94. Albuquerque: Univ. New Mexico Press
  131. Paredes, A. 1979. The folk base of Chicano literature. In *Modern Chicano Writers: A Collection of Critical Essays*, ed. J. Sommers, T. Ybarra-Frausto, pp. 4-17. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall
  132. Paredes, A. 1982. Folklore, Lo Mexicano, and proverbs. *Aztlan* 13(1 & 2):1-11
  133. Paredes, A. 1983. A sense of place. *Discovery* 8(2)(Austin: Univ. Texas):21-24
  134. Poggie, J. J. Jr. 1973. *Between Two Cultures: The Life of an American-Mexican*. Tucson Univ. Arizona Press
  135. Reich, A. H. 1979. Spanish American village culture: Barrier to assimilation or integrative force? See Ref. 84, pp. 107-13
  136. Ríos, S. 1978. An approach to action anthropology: The community project, C.S.U.S. *Grito del Sol* 3(1):51-65
  137. Romano-V, O. I. 1967. Minorities, history and the cultural mystique. *El Grito* 1(1):5-11
  138. Romano-V, O. I. 1968. The anthropology and sociology of the Mexican-Americans: The distortion of Mexican-American history. *El Grito* 2(1):13-26
  139. Romano-V, O. I. 1969. The historical and intellectual presence of Mexican-Americans. *El Grito* 2(2):32-46
  140. Romano-V, O. I. 1970. Social science, objectivity and the Chicanos. *El Grito* 4(1):4-16
  141. Romano-V, O. I. 1976. The scientists. *Grito del Sol* 1(1):85-108
  142. Rosaldo, R. 1983. Anthropological perspectives on Chicanos 1970-1980. In *Chicanos and the Social Sciences: A Decade of Research and Development (1970-1980)*, ed. I. D. Ortiz, pp. 59-66. Santa Barbara: Univ. Calif. Cent. Chicano Stud.
  143. Sayers, R., Weaver, T. 1976. Explanation and theories of migration. In *Mexican Migration*, ed. T. Weaver, T. Downing, pp. 10-29. Tucson: Univ. Arizona Bur. Ethnic Res.
  144. Schensul, S. 1973. Action research: The applied anthropologist in a community mental health program. In *Anthropology Beyond the University*, ed. A. Redfield, pp. 106-19. S. Anthropol. Soc. Proc. No. 7. Athens: Univ. Georgia Press
  145. Schensul, S. 1974. Skills needed in action anthropology: Lessons from El Centro de la Causa. *Hum. Organ.* 33(2):203-9
  146. Schensul, S., Bakszys-Bymel, M. 1975. The role of applied research in the development of health services in a Chicano community in Chicago. In *Topias and Utopias in Health*, ed. S. Ingman, A. Thomas, pp. 425-43. The Hague: Mouton
  147. Schensul, S., Schensul, J. 1978. Advocacy and applied anthropology. In *Social Scientists as Advocates: Views from the Applied Disciplines*, ed. G. H. Weber, G. McCall, pp. 121-65. Beverly Hills: Sage
  148. Spicer, E. H. 1972. Introduction. See Ref. 43, pp. 1-20
  149. Spicer, E. H. 1972. Plural society in the southwest. See Ref. 43, pp. 21-76
  150. Spielberg Benítez, J. 1974. Humor in a Mexican-American palomilla: Some historical, social and psychological implications. *Revista Chicano-Riqueña* 2,3:41-50. Bloomington: Indiana Univ.
  151. Spielberg Benítez, J. 1977. Dimensions for the study of work-related values in Mexican-American culture: An exploratory essay. In *American Minorities and Economic Opportunity*, ed. H. R. Kaplan, pp. 109-47. Itasca, Ill: Peacock
  152. Spielberg Benítez, J. 1979. Systemic changes in health policy and health service delivery: The case of Chicanos. In *The Hispanics: A Missing Link in Public Policy*, ed. V. Correa-Jones, A. H. Benavides, M. A. Terán. Des Moines: Spanish-Speaking Peoples Commission of Iowa

153. Spielberg Benítez, J. 1980. The "little" cultural tradition of Hispanics. *Agenda: A Journal of Hispanic Issues* 10(3):30-36
- 153a. Stoller, M. L. 1980. Grants of desperation, lands of speculation: Mexican period land grants in Colorado. See Ref. 181, pp. 22-39
154. Swadesh, F. L. 1972. The social and philosophical context of creativity in Hispanic New Mexico. *Rocky Mt. Soc. Sci. J.* 9(1):11-18
155. Swadesh, F. L. 1974. *Los Primeros Pobladores: Hispanic Americans of the Ute Frontier*. Notre Dame, Ind: Univ. Notre Dame Press.
156. Swadesh, F. L. 1976. Archeology, ethnohistory and the first plaza of Carnuel. *Ethnohistory* 23(1):31-44
157. Swadesh, F. L. 1979. Structure of Hispanic-Indian relations in New Mexico. See Ref. 84, pp. 53-61
158. Trueba, H. T. 1976. Chicano bilingual/bicultural education. In *The Anthropological Study of Education*, ed. C. J. Calhoun, F. A. J. Ianni, pp. 299-309. The Hague: Mouton
159. Trueba, H. T. 1976. Issues and problems in bilingual bicultural education today. *J. Nat. Assoc. Biling. Educ.* 1(2):11-19
160. Trueba, H. T. 1977. Bilingual-bicultural education: An overview. In *Curriculum Handbook*, ed. L. Rubin, pp. 223-33. Boston: Allyn & Bacon. Abridged ed.
161. Trueba, H. T. 1978. The Mexican American family: A cultural dilemma. *J. Soc. Ethnic Spec. Stud.* 2(1):20-23
162. Trueba, H. T. 1979. Bilingual-education models: Types and designs. In *Bilingual Multicultural Education and the Professional: From Theory to Practice*, ed. H. Trueba, C. Barnett-Mizrahi, pp. 54-73. Rowley, Mass: Newbury House
163. Trueba, H. T. 1981. Bilingual education: An ethnographer's perspective. *J. Teacher Educ.* 8(3):15-41
164. Trueba, H. T. 1981. A challenge for ethnographic researchers in bilingual settings: Analyzing Spanish/English classroom interaction. *J. Multiling. Multicult. Dev.* 2(4):243-57
165. Trueba, H. T. 1983. Adjustment problems of Mexican and Mexican-American school children: An anthropological study. In *Learn. Disability Q.* 6(4):395-415
166. Trueba, H. T., Sridhar, K. K. 1979. Language assessment and evaluation. In *Bilingual Education for Latinos*, ed. L. A. Valverde, pp. 35-50. Washington, DC: Assoc. Supervision and Curriculum Dev.
167. Trueba, H. T., Wright, P. G. 1980-81. On ethnographic studies and multicultural education. *J. Nat. Assoc. Biling. Educ.* 5(2):29-56
168. Urdaneta, M. L. 1975. Fertility and the "pill" in a Texas barrio. See Ref. 146, pp. 69-83
169. Urdaneta, M. L. 1977. Health status profile of Chicanos in the United States. In *The Chicana Handbook*, ed. M. Cotera. Austin, Texas: Statehouse Press
170. Urdaneta, M. L. 1979. Fleshpots, faith, or finances? Fertility rates among Mexican Americans. In *The Chicano Experience*, ed. S. West, J. Macklin pp. 191-206. Boulder, Colo: Westview
171. Urdaneta, M. L. 1980. Chicana use of abortion: The Case of Alcala. See Ref. 109, pp. 33-51
172. Urdaneta, M. L., Aceves, J. B. 1970. Retrained, relocated workers from Rio Grande City: Three case studies. In *Mexican American Industrial Migrants*, ed. B. Reagan. Dallas, Texas: Southern Methodist Univ. Press
173. Vaca, N. C. 1970. The Mexican-American in the social sciences 1912-1970. Part I: 1912-1935. *El Grito* 3(3):3-24
174. Vaca, N. C. 1970. The Mexican-American in the Social Sciences 1912-1970. Part II: 1936-1970. *El Grito* 4(1):17-51
175. Valadez, S. 1978. In search of a perspective: An apology long overdue. *Grito del Sol* 3(1):67-74
176. Valadez, F. 1979. Vergüenza. See Ref. 84, pp. 99-106
177. Van Ness, J. R. 1976. Modernization, land tenure, and ecology: The costs of change in northern New Mexico. *Pap. Anthropol.* 17(2):168-78
178. Van Ness, J. R. 1976. Spanish-American vs. Anglo-American land tenure and the study of economic change. *West. Soc. Sci. J.* 13(5):45-52
179. Van Ness, J. R., Kutsche, P., Smith, A. 1979. Hispanic village organization in northern New Mexico: Corporate community structure in historical and comparative perspective. See Ref. 84, pp. 21-44
180. Van Ness, J. R., Kutsche, P., Smith, A. 1980. The Polvadera grant: Hispanic settlement in the canones region. In *Spanish Colonial Frontier Research*, ed. H. F. Dobyns, pp. 79-84. Albuquerque, NM: Cent. Anthropol. Stud. Spanish Borderlands Subser. No. 2
181. Van Ness, J. R., Van Ness, C. M., eds. 1980. *Spanish and Mexican Land Grants in New Mexico and Colorado*. Manhattan, Kansas: Sunflower Univ. Press
182. Vélez-Ibáñez, C. G. 1975. An evening in

- Cuidad Reyes: A processual approach to Mexican politics. *New Scholar* 5(1):5-17
183. Vélez-Ibáñez, C. G. 1979. Ourselves through the eyes of an anthropologist. In *The Chicanos: As We See Ourselves*, ed. A. D. Trejo, pp. 37-48. Tucson: Univ. Arizona Press
  184. Vélez-Ibáñez, C. G. 1980. Mexicano/Hispano support systems and confianza: Theoretical issues of cultural adaptation. In *Hispanic Natural Support Systems*, ed. B. Valle, W. Vega, pp. 45-54. Calif. Dep. Mental Health
  185. Vélez-Ibáñez, C. G. 1980. Los Movimientos Chicanos: Problemas y Perspectivas de las Luchas Históricas al Norte del Río Bravo. *Las Relaciones México Estados Unidos*, ed. D. Barkin, G. Esteva, M. Kaplan, pp. 217-34. México: Nueva Imagen, Universidad Nacional Autónoma
  186. Vélez-Ibáñez, C. G. 1980. The nonconsenting sterilization of Mexican women in Los Angeles. See Ref. 109, pp. 235-48
  187. Vélez-Ibáñez, C. G. 1980. Se Me Acabó la Canción: An ethnography of non-consenting sterilizations among Mexican women in Los Angeles. See Ref. 114, pp. 71-91. Occas. Pap. No. 2
  188. Vélez-Ibáñez, C. G. 1982. Social diversity, commercialization, and organizational complexity of urban Mexican/Chicano rotating credit associations: Theoretical and empirical issues of adaptation. *Hum. Organ.* 41(2):107-20
  189. Vélez-Ibáñez, C. G. 1983. *Bonds of Mutual Trust: The Cultural Systems of Rotating Credit Associations among Urban Mexicans and Chicanos*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers Univ. Press
  190. Vigil, J. D. 1974. *Early Chicano Guerrilla Fighters*. Upland, Calif: 915 W. 23 St. Private printing
  191. Vigil, J. D. 1978. Marx and Chicano anthropology. *Grito del Sol* 3(1):19-34
  192. Vigil, J. D. 1979. Adaptation strategies and cultural life styles of Mexican American adolescents. *Hispanic J. Behav. Sci.* 1(4):375-92
  193. Vigil, J. D. 1980. *From Indians to Chicanos: A Sociocultural History*. St. Louis: Mosby
  194. Vigil, J. D. 1981. Towards a new perspective on understanding the Chicano people: The Six C's model of sociocultural change. *Campo Libre: J. Chicano Stud.* 1(2):141-67. Los Angeles: Calif. State Univ.
  195. Vigil, J. D. 1982. Chicano high schoolers: Educational performance and acculturation. *Educ. Forum* 47(1):59-73
  196. Vigil, J. D. 1982. Human revitalization: The six tasks of victory outreach. *Drew Gateway* 52(3):49-59
  197. Vigil, J. D. 1983. Chicano gangs: One response to Mexican urban adaptation in the Los Angeles area. *Urban Anthropol.* 12(1)
  198. Vigil, J. D., Long, J. M. 1981. Unidirectional or nativist acculturation—Chicano paths to school achievement. *Hum. Organ.* 40(3):273-77
  199. Weaver, T. 1970. Use of hypothetical situations in a study of Spanish American illness referral systems. *Hum. Organ.* 29(2):140-54
  200. Weaver, T. 1975. The cultural ecology of a border town. In *The Douglas Report: The Community Context of Housing and Social Problems*, ed. T. Weaver, T. Downing, pp. 1-18. Tucson: Univ. Ariz. Bur. Ethnic Res.
  201. Weaver, T. 1983. The social effects of the ecology and development of the U.S.-Mexico border. In *Ecology and Development of the Border Region. Proc. 2nd Binational Univ. Symp.-Border Stud.*, ed. S. Ross, pp. 233-70. Mexico: Anúies
  202. Weaver, T. 1984. Visibilidad Étnica y Distancia Étnica. In *Estratificación Étnica y Relaciones Interétnicas*, ed. M. Nolasco, pp. 23-28. México, D. F: Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia
  203. Weaver, T., Hsu, F. L. K., Jones, D. J., Lewis, D., Medicine, B., Gibbs, J. L. 1973. *The Minority Experience in Anthropology: Report of the Committee on Minorities and Anthropology*. Washington, DC: Am. Anthropol. Assoc.
  204. Weaver, T., Hubbard, G. P. 1975. Health. See Ref. 201, pp. 236-54
  205. Weeks, J. R., Cuellar, J. B. 1983. Isolation of older persons: The influence of immigration and length of residence. *Res. Aging* 5(3):369-88
  206. Weeks, J. R., Spielberg Benitez, J. 1979. The cultural demography of mid-western Chicano communities. See Ref. 171, pp. 229-51
  207. Weigle, M., ed. 1976. *Brothers of Light, Brothers of Blood: The Penitentes of the Southwest*. Albuquerque: Univ. New Mexico Press
  208. Weigle, M., ed., with Larcombe, C., Larcombe, S. 1983. *Hispanic Arts and Ethnohistory in the Southwest*. Santa Fe: Ancient City Press and Univ. New Mexico Press
  209. Wells, M. J. 1975. Ethnicity, social stigma and resource mobilization in rural America: Reexamination of a mid-western experience. *Ethnohistory* 22(4):319-43
  210. Wells, M. J. 1976. Immigrants from the

- migrant stream: Environment and incentives in relocation. *Aztlan* 7(2):267-90
211. Wells, M. J. 1979. Brokerage, economic opportunity and the growth of ethnic movements. *Ethnology* 18(4):399-414
  212. Wells, M. J. 1980. Oldtimers and newcomers: The role of context in Mexican-American assimilation. *Aztlan* 11(2):271-95
  213. Wells, M. J. 1981. Alienation, work structure, and the quality of life: Can cooperatives make a difference? *Soc. Probl.* 28(5):548-62
  214. Wells, M. J. 1981. Rural Mexican American familism: Continuity and variation. In *The Family in Rural Society*, ed. R. Coward, W. Smith, pp. 96-105. Boulder, Colo: Westview
  215. Wells, M. J. 1981. Social conflict, commodity constraints, and labor market structure in agriculture. *Comp. Stud. Soc. Hist.* 23(4):679-704
  216. Wells, M. J. 1981. Success in whose terms? Evaluations of a cooperative farm. *Hum. Organ.* 40(3):239-46
  217. Wells, M. J. 1982. Political mediation and agricultural cooperation: Strawberry farms in California. *Econ. Dev. Cult. Change* 30(2):413-32
  218. Wells, M. J. 1983. Collective goals and individual interests in agricultural production cooperatives. In *Values, Ethics, and the Practice of Policy Analysis*, ed. W. N. Dunn, pp. 151-71. Lexington, Mass: Heath
  219. Wells, M. J. 1983. Mediation, dependency, and the goals of development. *Am. Ethnol.* 10(4):770-88
  220. Wells, M. J. 1984. The resurgence of sharecropping: Historical anomaly or political strategy? *Am. J. Sociol.* 90(1):1-29
  221. Wells, M. J., Climo, J. 1984. Parallel process in the world system: Intermediate agencies and local factionalism in the United States and Mexico. *J. Dev. Stud.* 20(2):151-70
  222. Whitecotton, J. W. 1970. The social history of a New Mexican region: A preliminary analysis. *Pap. Anthropol.* 11:1-20
  223. Whitecotton, J. W. 1976. Tradition and modernity in northern New Mexico: An introduction. *Pap. Anthropol.* 17(2): 121-37
  224. Whiteford, L. M. 1976. Context, a disambiguating factor in the study of migration. In *New Approaches to Migration Theory*, ed. J. D. Uzzell, D. Guillet, pp. 37-45. Houston: Rice Univ. Stud. 62(3)
  225. Whiteford, L. M. 1979. The border land as an extended community. In *Migration Across Frontiers: Mexico and the United States*, ed. F. Cámara, R. V. Kemper, pp. 127-37. Albany: State Univ. New York Press
  226. Whiteford, L. M. 1980. Mexican-American women as innovators. See Ref. 109, pp. 109-26
  227. Whiteford, L. M. 1982. Migrants no longer: Changing family structure of Mexican-Americans in south Texas. *De Colores: J. Chicano Expression Thought* 6(1 & 2):99-109