

How Women Work: The Symbolic and Material Reproduction of Migrant Labor Camps in United States Agribusiness

Robert CARLEY, Hilario MOLINA II

Abstract. This article analyzes gender exploitation in Mexican and Central American migrant farm worker camps in the U.S through small group interactions. We describe how gender exploitation and oppression is transmitted through the social fabric of the camp. We argue that the camp produces an endogenous system of social interaction, which maintains uneven gender relationships. Our data is based on observations of twenty-five women and girls in three labor camps in North Carolina. Research was conducted over a period of six weeks. We found that women who served as the primary bearers of patrimonial authority best maintained the camp community. We conclude that women who successfully reproduce the authority structure gain social status in the camps and are more likely to stay.

Keywords: *labor, immigration, capitalism, agriculture, women, exploitation, gender theory, significant symbols*

Introduction

A good part of the cultural and social norms of the United States were founded, in no large part, through the cultivation and the expansion of agriculture. For example, the Civil War was a conflict over the issue of cheap labor between the plantation states in the southern part of the United States and emerging industries in the north (Silberman, 2003). Generations of African Americans enslaved in the southern United States experienced exploitation and cruel working and living conditions well after the end of the Civil War. Given the racial ideology in America during this time, their maltreatment simply didn't register at the level of either general worker's concerns or a larger public moral sentiment. However, during the Great Depression and mass migration of "Okies" and "Arkies" to California's agricultural sector resulted in general public outrage. The mistreatment of White

workers by foreman and farmers along with the sub-standard living and working conditions of these White Americans was popularly portrayed in John Steinbeck's novel *Grapes of Wrath* published in 1940.

When the United States was young, Mexican labor was also responsible for a good deal of agricultural production in what now comprises the southwestern United States; now, the migration of Whites and African Americans into the farm-work sector has been replaced by Mexican and Mexican American labor (Gonzalez, 2000). These migrant farm workers find themselves in working and living conditions similar to their predecessors. Farmers have a vested interest in the maintenance of a mass-migrant system of labor because it permits them to exploit farm workers while maintaining high profits and without the additional need to regularly invest in new technology. Given the history of labor exploitation within this industry, why has there not been mass sustained labor unrest? The most likely explanation is that the agricultural industry encourages patrimonial authority to flourish within the migrant farm worker communities—labor camps.

Differences from Migration and Labor Literature

Previous studies on migrant labor focus on economic relations even where gender is a salient variable (Donato et al., 2006; Hondagneu-Sotelo, 1994, 2001, 2003a, 2003b; Mahler and Pessar, 2001b; Pessar and Mahler, 2003) or they focus on the migrant experiences of specific ethnic-national groups (Castellanos and Boehm 2008; Boehm 2008; Karjanen 2008; Castellanos 2008; Seif 2008). Our analysis looks at migrant labor, in the context of a single labor camp (where ethnic-nationalities are multiple but linguistic communities are shared) from a cultural, communal, symbolic perspective. We also consider the role of economics as the primary context that comprises the social formation of the camp. Our theoretical focus is oriented around:

1. Gender formation: In our work women are seen as agents of the social structure and not as ancillary to it. We view the role of women as central to maintaining the authority structure in the camp.

2. Theory of power/authority: Our analysis expands the definition of power beyond the social and economic structure to encompass culture and cultural meaning through symbolic interaction. In doing so, we explain how power works within the context of the camp and to the advantage of the farmer/owner who

employs the camp as an aggregate labor force.

3. Level of analysis/empirical focus: We focus our analysis at the level of the camp and not “labor force” and are able, then, to understand labor at a cultural and communal level not, exclusively, as a capital-labor relation. Our theoretical focus is on ethnic identity, custom/tradition, language and symbols and interaction.

The un-evenness of capital labor relations provide a descriptive context and are discussed in detail in the theoretical overview section Our theoretical perspective (discussed in the section subsequent to the “theoretical overview” and entitled “theoretical orientation”) is, in many ways, unique to this literature. It relies, primarily, on symbolic-interactionism, but also includes other feminist-based theoretical approaches that discuss symbols and power. The total theoretical framework links culture, tradition and symbols to gender and power, specifically gender and the analysis of micro-power (Mead 1932/1962; Douglas 1966; Dalla Costa 1973; Irigaray 1977; Weber 1978; Hartman 1981; Kristeva 1982; Butler 1990; Rubin 1997). In the following two sections we discuss or theoretical framework in detail.

Theoretical Overview

In *Economy and Society* (1978) Max Weber describes the traditional authority of patrimonial system as having the capacity to preserve legitimate degrees of authority within a given community. Through traditional authority migrant farm workers are kept in a subordinate position; they “freely” subsume themselves under the total authority of the farmer and the institution. As a result, the farmer’s pursuit for profit in the United States enables him to have a “hands-off” approach with regard to the management of migrant farm worker communities. Contained within the patrimonial system, families exercise authority though a patriarchal structure, in this case ironically, within a larger society that advocates gender equality.

The socio-economic structure of small farms depends upon the capital-labor relation and, hence, the exploitation of labor and extraction of surplus value can be understood as a legitimate and automatic form of systemic authority. This authority structure is not visible but, rather, a given aspect of the social structure that limits choice within its own terms (Przworski 1985). Labor exploitation has a pervasive structural presence that is legal and economic; it resides within the very foundation of modern civil society. The extraction of surplus value from labor is a

right to those who employ labor power and that surplus is converted into profit. Profit represents the difference between costs, including labor, and earnings. According to Karl Marx, capitalist institutions profit from the economy at a greater degree by investing in variable over fixed or constant capital at the beginning of a production cycle. This changes with investment, capital concentration and centralization however, in the context of this study, investment is largely represented in investment in labor power alone. As a result, when variable capital is higher than fixed capital, more value is produced and, by extension, a greater potentiality for profit (Marx, 1970: 209). Over time, this process becomes more complex. The question remains, why would capitalists seek to introduce new technologies into the production process if it would, ultimately, result in—on the one hand—greater input expenditures and—on the other hand—a lower rate of profit on capital invested?

Marx discusses this issue further in Chapters 8 and 25 of *Capital*. In short, producers revolutionize their means of production, within a given branch of production, in the interest of competing for ever-greater shares of a particular market. Producers often gain the lion-share of profit by introducing a new product onto the market. However, over time, when the use of this new innovation in production becomes available to other producers, the average rate of profit declines. Furthermore, and most importantly, the introduction of this new product and the concomitant productive technologies forces innovation on the part of other producers with the compounded threat of overall success to an individual producers business. And, finally, Marx points out that while the average rate of profit on capital invested at the beginning of production cycles within a given branch of production may decline, the volume of profit in the economy will increase since it is the case that more output can be produced and sold in a given period, using new technology. However, in the context of this study, the camps were either subsidiary producers for larger agribusiness or small-scale “petite-bourgeoisie” farming enterprises that relied upon a large-scale, cheap, and *compliant* labor force. In other words, agribusiness allows for certain sectors of production to innovate while others may be profitable, in a “primitive” sense, by exploiting cheap labor through certain tasks: e.g. picking and packing. Hence, in this case, labor power represents the primary means of investment, on the one hand, but also it is the primary function of people in the camps and, hence, it is also the primary social factor in this study.

Since the majority of the migrant farm workers are first generation immigrants, a patrimonial authority structure does not seem as unfamiliar as the language or customs of the host society. Therefore, a patrimonial system permits migrant farm worker men to govern the affairs of the family in the camp. Through patrimonial authority the traditional norms govern the affairs of the community. Men assume a position of authority while women are subsumed beneath male authority (patrimonialism). Thus, the fact that men have power over the affairs of the family reinforces the *status quo* within the labor camps and facilitates the structure of profit and production. Patrimonial authority functions like a frame, delimiting the norms and values that are then reproduced within the second generation of migrant farm workers through significant symbols. It allows the camp to maintain an endogenous set of social relations and, as a result, it facilitates the capital-labor relation since the latter requires little or no “alien” social control in the form of labor rationalization. In short people work because the society of the camp works for them. Although other theories about economic power and social structure regarding agricultural labor, generally, have been advanced in other similar studies (Shaffner 1995; Bardhan, 1991a; Bardhan, 1991b; Bardhan, 1983) the dimensions, focus, and deployment of our theory differs significantly.

Theoretical Orientation

At the macro-sociological level, the mode of production (capitalist, agriculture) confers upon our theoretical framework determinate social relations which explain the presence of the camp, this material configuration of socially necessary labor, the role of the capitalist, etc. At the meso-sociological level, the structure of patrimonial authority explains the normative moral totality of the social structure—it is an ‘idea type’ and, as such, a frozen abstraction. At the micro-sociological level—which is the focus of this paper—we explain the reproduction of the social structure through Mead’s discussion of symbolic structures and significant symbols (1932/1966) as well as the role that symbolic violence plays in maintaining patrimonial authority (Douglas 1966; Dalla Costa 1973; Irigaray 1977; Hartman 1981; Kristeva 1982; Butler 1990; Rubin 1997).

Significant symbols are instrumental in the development and the “moral” or normative maintenance of the individual and their connection to the general community. Indeed, significant symbols enable the individual to learn how to

communicate with other members of the group while simultaneously conveying the customs of the group (Mead 1932/1966). The locus and the primary distributive mechanism of significant symbols remain women, specifically mothers or matrons (women can serve in this latter social role whether or not they have any biological children or, if their children are now adult and mostly autonomous). This burden, relegated to gender roles, is described in second wave feminist literature, specifically through the work of Lacanian oriented theorists (Irigaray 1977; Kristeva 1982; Butler 1990; Rubin 1997). Lacanian oriented feminist theory locates patrimonial authority structures within the “symbolic” which is configured or presided over by the phallus: a master-code of authority structures in the names, and their associated kin-meanings (Rubin 1997). Whereas patrimonial authority represents an “ideal type” the phallus, like the patrimonial authority structure, is a static and abstract conceptual category that confers law—a symbolic structure or frame, border, or boundary—upon the process of identity construction or, in the language of Lacanian theory, “subjectivity.” The primacy of this law is to differentiate men from women in such a way that the man is dominant due to his access to the phallus and hence to the law itself; this renders these boundaries “natural” (Douglas 1966; Kristeva 1982; Rubin 1997: 47). In this sense, the earlier statement that through patrimonial authority men’s social role is to frame the structure of values and norms—delimiting the nature of the reproduction of the system itself—is entirely commensurable with the Lacanian feminist theoretical orientation. As such, women are “responsible” for producing and maintaining symbolic content limited, *in situ*, by the patrimonial authority structure or phallic law (i.e. phallogocentrism).

The relationship between our theory and data leads to the following analysis: We examine how significant symbols have produced a system of endogenous (socially symbolic) consciousness within the patrimonial system of the migrant labor camps; a system which doubly exploits women, first in their responsibilities to rear children through symbolic content and second through the labor they provide in the sphere of the camp and family. Their double exploitation contributes to the preservation of the societal status quo whereby the needs of women are subordinated to those of their families. What follows is an investigation into the roles of women in the camp through our deployment of Mead’s symbolic theory of social situations.

Argument

Farmers do not worry about labor resistance because the patrimonial system endogenous to the camp ensures a beneficial capital-labor relation. The data demonstrates that one farmer may preside over several camps but the boundaries between the camps are more than geographic. Within a single camp shared linguistic, religious, or cultural symbols (or all three, simultaneously) form a normative strata (i.e. a single camp may contain Mexicans, or Mexicans and Guatemalans, or Hatians but not Mexicans and Hatians). But, more significantly, the endogenous patrimonial authority structure also ensures the removal of individuals who may threaten it. In other words, the endogenous authority structure not only forms a compliant relationship between capital and labor but it has its own internal mechanisms to reproduce a compliant relationship within the camp itself through either language, religion, culture, tradition, or some combination of these factors. In the camps workers organize authority structures in a patrimonial fashion, i.e. around a “head of household.” A traditional familial structure is reproduced, willy-nilly, in the camps. Anyone who does not abide by the endogenous authority structure is pushed out by means of negative sanctions. Furthermore, as sanctioned workers are being pushed out of the camp new, first generation, immigrants are entering the labor camps. In other words the endogenous authority structure within the camp, which is expressed through forms of symbolic exchange, renews the labor side of the capital-labor relation: new immigrant farm workers replace those who are exiting. Also, this enables the camp to preserve the traditional authority structure the farmer/owner is sated with a new labor force. Sanctions which ensure the exclusive nature of patrimonial authority within the camps are, at the same time, examples of strong social cohesion, communal authority and identity. This general theory of the social and economic structure of migrant labor is supported by more quantitative analyses of Mexican labor in the U.S. agricultural sector (US Dept. of Labor, 2005; Martin, 2002).

Structure of the paper

The following section provides detailed ethnographic accounts of the symbolic and cultural mechanisms that reproduce the circuitry of subjection and exploitation. One of the most basic and salient examples of gender identity and

visibility comes from Tom Conover's book *Coyotes* (1987). As Conover is initially greeted by members of the community he studies he states that he, "...glanced toward the women, expected them, too, to be introduced, but it was not to be...when the men had the floor, women were silent" (173). In addition, this paper will also describe the ways in which women work, how they provide economic wealth for families by either working alongside of their spouse, by cooking for the single men in the camp, or by selling home-made food, such as *elotes* (corn on the cob). Through negotiations and the creation of small, yet effective, businesses within the camp women have been able to address men on a more equal basis, despite the persistence of a negative social stigma regarding women, gender, and autonomy.

In the following sections (the literature review, methodology, field research, discussion and conclusion) we discuss others' ethnographic contribution to the literature on gender formation, exploitation, and capitalism—especially central contributions from Chicana feminism. Our methodological claims are based in the information collected by observing the daily interaction of migrant farm workers in three labor camps in North Carolina. The fieldwork section provides a descriptive and narrative analysis of central events in the context of the labor camps: episodes that demonstrate how gender identity issues form out of symbolic, non-material, cultural forms. This paper ends with a discussion of the findings and a conclusion section that makes suggestions for future theoretical contributions.

Literature Review

The structure of the migrant farm worker culture is such that it places the values and the needs of the family above the needs of the woman (Segura 1978; Cromie 1987). For migrant farm workers, North American culture is alien to their family structure, because of the particularities through which it advocates specific values/norms of achievement and independence. North American norms do enter the camps through second-generation, younger, laborers who have entered the U.S. public schooling system. Regardless, these values situate the husband-father as the exclusive authoritative breadwinner and view women as a submissive wife-mother who cares for the home and rears the children (Zavella 1987). Gloria Anzaldúa discusses the consequences of deviating from these norms:

...I heard mothers and mothers-in-law tell their sons to beat their wives for not obeying them, for being *hociconas* (big mouths), for being *callerjeras* (going to visit and gossip with neighbors), for expecting their husbands to help with the rearing of children and the house work... (38).

Women in a migrant farm worker community are expected to comply with beliefs that support the patrimonial structure. They assume the role of a “good woman” Violators, as Anzaldúa points out, are sanctioned through symbolic (if not through the suggestion or administration of real) violence. As a result, the migrant farm worker woman is trapped in a torrent of values; a combination emerging from out of both the host culture and native culture. A mediation of sorts is witnessed in the development of a middle ground where the woman is allowed to work but does not have the authority to question her husband’s decisions (Thompson 1985). For example, if the husband’s wage is insufficient to meet the families’ expenses, then the woman is encouraged to contribute to the family income by working too. Yet, the woman still remains primarily responsible for the care of the family and the home (Thompson 1985; Cobas 1987).

While it remains beyond question that the women can perform the same complicated work as their male counterparts, the social recognition, prestige, or “social capital” gained by men for completing this work is absent from women’s contributions to the migrant farm worker culture. This is demonstrated by Villaseñor (1991) who recorded an interaction between two young migrant farm workers. The young woman was helping her mother with the dishing after a day in the work field:

...the young girl, Lydia, who was a senior in high school and not much of a good student, said, ‘Please, tell me one thing before you go.’ Roberto stopped. She brushed back her hair with the back of her hand. Her hand was still covered in white wet suds...He had not really noticed this girl all evening. She was still in boots and pants and long-sleeve shirt. She looked more like a boy than a girl... (194).

Thus, the division of labor, especially at the site of the household, exposes a bias toward migrant farm worker women. The value of done by is of diminutive value compared to the work performed by men (Segura 1978). Anthony Giddens (1971) also notes that socialistic and moralistic distinctions are instrumental to establishing and maintaining the value of one’s labor (i.e. labor differentiation in specific contexts). Moral individualism is contextual; it describes an individual’s understanding of right and wrong within, in this case, the migrant farm worker

community. One's moral understanding is limited by what the patrimonial culture defines acceptable or unacceptable. Therefore, in situation of production, the division of labor in the workplace mirrors the relegation domestic tasks, where women perform tasks similar in complexity to those at home. In case of Lydia and Roberto, Lydia performed her domestic chores dressed as a boy. Since she contradicted Roberto's understanding of gender and attire (i.e. gender and representation) Roberto overlooked her.

The feminization of labor cuts both ways. Men apply this moral individualism to the division of labor when assigning themselves tasks in an industrial or post-industrial context. For example, Carmen Ramos Escandón notes, "...of the distribution of labor between men and women...men claimed exclusive use of new device, relegating women...to other activities..." (74). Therefore, in the migrant farm worker community, a man will, if given the opportunity to learn, operate the heavy equipment, such as a tractor, and a woman will perform the least skilled job, hand picking the crop.

Although women are limited in their capacity to question the decision making process of their husbands they are, however, encouraged to provide means to assist in meeting family expenses. This contradiction is mitigated by relationships which they develop within the enclave of the migrant farm worker community. Since the capacity to provide significant surplus assistance is embedded in a gendered network of social relations within the women's enclave, the men need not acknowledge it as a legitimate contribution. Moreover, women who work must find the means to mitigate negative social stigmas to which they inadvertently expose themselves as they contribute to the family (Reitz and Sklar 1997).

This somewhat tenuous relationship has its effects on young, first generation, girls in the camp who are establishing their identities as workers and semi-autonomous members of the family. According to George Herbert Mead ([1932]1962) the development of the *self* starts to take shape as the individual begins to develop a socialized identity. He states the following:

What goes to make up the organized self is the organization of the attitudes which are common to the group. A person is a personality because he belongs to a community, because he takes over the institutions of that community into his own conduct (162).

The development of the self occurs through role playing with others. Girls, then, learn roles through significant symbols by, for instance, partaking in social

rituals described, by Mead, as “stages.” Mead refers to these stages as *play* and *games*. In the play stage, based in imitation or mimesis, the girl plays at “being” a mother, often through the repetition of activities, while in the game stage she learns not only the role of her mother but also more complex levels of social interaction between her mother, father, and everyone in the orbit of the community. In these instances, the development of “the” self is, in actuality, the development of “a” cultural self; imbedded within the development are the cultural values that define, implicitly, what a self is within the boundaries of a specific cultural form.

This ability to understand the relations between the self and the community is referred to, by Mead, as the *generalized other*. Given the patrimonial frame, the girl learns, implicitly, to accept a subordinated role. Internalizing these norms is a kind of passive and mimetic learning. By imitating the activities of their gender peers, they learn to accept the commands of their male siblings and father (Vold Bernard & Snipes 1998; Mead 1962). The young girl learns skills that would be applied, in later years, to the role of wife and mother. She also learns that the men do not assist in the daily duties of the house. The men must maintain a traditional *machismo*, in the presence of his peers, and that gender role does not include housework or childcare tasks (Hawks & Taylor 1975; Zavella 1987).

A negative effect produced through patrimonial authority is that it fails to confer social capital on women. Social capital requires the recognition of an individual’s financial contribution to both the household and the community. There are social rewards that are visible within the migrant farm worker community, such as the title of “*Don*” (Mr.) and *Doña* (Mrs.). However, the title *Don*, which confers prestige upon the husband (and which can be gained through the recognition of services provided by his wife to the community), the word *Doña* merely signifies that a woman, in the migrant farm worker community, is married to a *Don* (Light, Sabagh, Bozorgmehr, & Der-Martirosian, 1994). When a woman is addressed as *Doña*, that honor is based on the recognition of her husband’s social capital, not hers.

Methodology

The evidence comes from observing approximately 25 females (children, young adults, and married women) in three major migrant farm labor camps in

North Carolina. In the summer of 2004, for a duration of six weeks (spending two weeks in each camp), one of the researchers lived, slept, ate, and worked in a migrant farm worker community. The majority of the women in this study consist of first and second generation immigrants. Regarding the issue of language, mothers only spoke Spanish while non-mothers (women over the age of fifteen) spoke both Spanish and English.

Thus, we feel confident that those women who only spoke Spanish were first generation immigrants and the “non-mothers,” who spoke both languages, were second generation immigrants (Portes 1995). Regardless of age, women spoke Spanish with members of their family and with camp community members. Yet, there were times they spoke English to people of their own age. The prevalence of English speaking could be credited to states’ educational laws requiring all children to attend school if they are of the rightful age during the regular school year. As a result, for these children, their lives consist of two different worlds. In the morning, they worked in a school environment; in the evening, they worked alongside their families until sunset.

With regard to the interviews, most of the field notes presented in this study consist of conversations that occurred in the presence of the researcher conducting the ethnography or they were comments addressed to the researcher without him initiating the conversation. This situation was conducive to the time frame of the harvest and the patience of the contact (gatekeeper) in North Carolina as well as the bureaucracy of the Internal Review Board (IRB). As such, an official patterned questionnaire was not developed (Molina, 2004). As a result, the author conducting the ethnography was unable to ask questions because it would have been required of him to develop, in advance, an approved IRB questionnaire. The dilemma introduced through this approach could be referred to as a “come as you are” style of social encounters. However, since there was no prior knowledge as to what would be an appropriate question to ask (i.e. questionnaire-based interaction), the study would have been limited to patterned questions. Also, anything else not mentioned, questions which would have been found important while conducting the field study, could not have been used in the study because it would have violated the agreement with the IRB.

While this might seem to be an obstacle, the nuance of the life-style within each of these communities was grasped through participant observation and conversation as well as reliance upon Mead’s theory of significant symbols as the

means of communication: e.g. body language, gestures, and speech. Furthermore, we believe that the forced adoption of a first person account may have spared us from a well recognized tendency among ethnographers to provide accounts based on particularities which might raise doubts about the validity of these accounts (Geertz 1983; Shokeid 1997).

Field Research

As mentioned above, significant symbols provide a social control mechanism through which migrant farm worker women are configured within a nexus of exploitation. In addition, symbols manifest learned behavioral patterns through interaction with elder women peers, such as mothers, grandmothers, or extend relatives (aunts). Significant symbols are renewed when a girl learns to clean, cook, and learns other skills which will form the basis of domestic responsibilities. For example one morning, in Camp B's kitchen a conversation, between older women, and younger girls, took place. This discussion provides an example of how women reinforce domestic responsibilities. We describe the event below:

Lying in a room surrounded by thin plywood, I hear the sounds of pans and female voices coming from the kitchen (which is located at the end of the single men's sleeping area). I try to return to my sleep, but I wonder about the conversation taking place in the kitchen. Everyday is the same thing. For them, the day starts before the break of dawn while the rest of the camp is still asleep. At times, one hears children's voices—girls, most of the time, from the kitchen. Sometimes, the adult's voice says, "no, do not play with the pan that way; if you want to play with the pan, then use it the right way. "*Esa es miya* (that is my daughter)," the mother says when the daughter does something well. The child's laughter echoes through the rooms.

In this case, the girl learns that a pan has a specific use and purpose. When the child plays with the pan correctly, she is praised by her mother. Hence, play has both putative and confirmatory aspects, the effect of which is to strengthen the mother and daughter bond. For the child, the activity becomes associated with a positive experience and, later in life, she may associate knowing how to cook with an affirmative learning relationship. Through the play stage, the child begins to develop a concept of self that will later provide positive association between playing with pans and becoming the wife of a domestic farm worker.

Women not only cook for their family they often cook for the single men in the camp as well. Women can receive a regular fee for providing breakfast, lunch, and/or dinner to the single men in the camp. This fare is similar to what she might provide to her own family which, most of the time, consists of eggs, beans, flower-tortillas, rice and, when available, meat. The services of wives are offered up at the discretion of her husband. For example, this service was offered to me while I moved from one cucumber field to another:

I was approached by one of the married men in the camp and, in a proud and ostentatious manner, he told me that his wife could cook breakfast, lunch, and dinner, five days a week, for a fee of \$40. We were in the back of the crew leader's pickup when he made me the offer. I was confused at the offer since, most of the time that I'm on the bus, I noticed that his wife never speaks with anyone or makes eye contact with any of the other males in the camp. Now he, seated next to me, is smiling and eagerly awaiting my reply to a prospective agreement in which, I assumed, his wife had no say. Seeing that I was going to decline his offer he augmented his sales pitch, "My wife is a good cook; if you do not believe me, ask some of the men in the camp, she cooks for them too," he said in an excited tone of voice.

This represents a typical business transaction between married men and single men whereby the object mediating the interaction is the women's skill; the woman is present through an invocation of her skill but physically and symbolically absent. In the presence of women, the interaction between married and single men is altered when boarding and disembarking from the work bus but this social principle remains salient: there is no direct interaction between the migrant farm worker women and the single males. For example, every morning while boarding the bus, *buenos dias* (good mornings), are exchanged among those getting on and those already seated. The majority of the time, greetings are made exclusively to family men by women; either husbands or eldest sons.

Women do not interact with the single men in the camp. Husbands reserve the privilege of negotiation with other men because any interaction between single men and women is considered shameful and disrespectful to the family. In some instances preceding a business transaction the husband will seek out the approval of the wife. He may, for instance, ask her if she could handle an extra client before advertising his wife's services as a cook. For the husband, there is nothing worse than making an agreement with another man having, only later, to renege. Subsequent to the offer made to me I was told of such an incident which had

occurred in the camp before my arrival. The other men in the camp referred to this married man as *mandilon* (a slang word for a submissive husband) because the wife told him that it was not okay for her to cook for another man despite him having made the agreement in advance.

The symbolic exchange that takes place as men are greeted by the women on the bus bears further discussion. Contained within this interaction is a gendered policing function. Its purpose is to insure that boundaries are not being violated. The demonstration of symbolic exchange produces a tacit enforcement and communal harmony. The communal, daily, and almost ritualistic interactions around the bus represent a microcosm where Mead's concept of the generalized other functions in such a way—as a kind of ritualistic repetition—to maintain harmony in the migrant farm worker community. The men, every morning, are obliged to place themselves in the shoes of one another. This “me,” which, according to Mead, consist of the unit of all the men present, is advanced towards the women present. On the bus, men protect and insure that another man will neither violate nor overstep a boundary. This would include a man doing the same thing to the women of his household (mother and/or sisters) and, as such, represents a “frame maintenance” principle which is not habitual but requires the care to recognize and not transgress boundaries established within the given context.

This literal daily departure of the men from the domestic sphere confers a set of behavioral patterns upon the boy which are further magnified through the play stage. This crucial daily event highlights a social fact: that mom and dad do not share the same daily routines and responsibilities. These behavioral patterns become solidified in the game stage. Here, the young boy views manhood as the responsibility to work, protect his family, and serve as the authoritative figure in the household. Through a negation (the absence of certain responsibilities from men's lives) it is understood that cooking, cleaning, and washing are all the responsibilities of wives and sisters. Again, in a negative form, boys learn from their parents that daily duties of the household must not involve assisting women. The positive content of this negation results in maintaining traditional *machismo* in front of peers. Walking to toward the restroom after hard days work in the field we disclose an event which further illustrates this point: this incident took place in the wash area next to the male restroom:

The sun is setting after a hard day's work in the field, as the women move clothes up and down a washboard in a rubbing motion; they splash water all over the walls

and the floor. The lack of sunlight creates puddles, which in turn become nesting grounds for mosquitoes and other insects. These damp conditions draw out mosquitoes. In the distance, one can hear the sound of hands slapping flesh as women try to kill the insects which interfere with their daily obligations. Refusing to quit, they endure the annoying insects. However, the crying children make them stop: a sign that the mosquitoes have become too much to endure; the women call it quits. However, now the wash for the next day has increased to include the unfinished wash from the previous day.

As some women excuse themselves, the other children stay close to the more persistent mothers. Now the mosquitoes swarm around them—placing them in an uncomfortable situation. The children pull on their mother for comfort and support as the mosquitoes gnaw at the smaller group. The scene intensifies as the children tug, more and more, at their mother's clothes and the mother tries gracefully to comfort the child and wash clothes at the same time. Some mothers ignore the crying children and attempt, hastily, to finish the wash because the women know that the longer it takes them to finish, the longer their children have to suffer. The men know what is happening but they do nothing. In one case a frustrated woman yells to nearest child, "Go tell your father to come and get your little brother".

The child returns within minutes and behind her appears the father. He walks slowly as if he had all the time in the world. He looks at his wife and says, "Are you almost finished? I'm hungry and so are the children." He picks up the child and walks away. The woman returns to the wash. The other women do not speak.

Often women spend a hot summer's day doing some form of agricultural work with the rest of the men however, their evenings also consist of washing and cooking for their families while the men socialize and rest. M. Melville, the author of *Mexicans at Work in the United* (1988), notes that women have a "double day" of work in the field and in the house hold while their labor, seen only as a second income, (extra money) is not considered to be of equal importance. This valuation of women's work is also evident in the example given above.

This fragment from the ethnographic record raises other important issues. The child observes, through interactions between the mother and the father, that his father does not help with the housekeeping, that he can freely express his desires (e.g. to be fed, through a demand for gratification) and, finally, that other women present do not interject—they continue to wash in silence. A male child may seek the protection of his mother but he also notices that his presence is not

reflected in the washroom. Exchanges of this sort are instrumental in enframing the future development of the *self*. What follows is an observation of a similar situation:

It is Sunday and I am seated outside of the wooden dormitory nursing my wounds from the previous day. A few yards away, four little girls are playing and laughing among themselves. They are not running around the campsite like the boys their age but, rather, are seated on the wild green grass, near their sleeping area, and they remain within view of their mothers who, like each previous evening, cook in the kitchen.

From within the kitchen, a small boy walks toward the girls playing on the grass. The other boys are running in circles near the girls. Each step this boy takes is firm; sure. He pays no attention to the other boys who, by this time, have motioned their hands in every way to get his attention. Several times, the boys call-out to him "*vente a jugar*" (come play). This boy is not easily distracted by the screaming of the other kids as they try to get his attention. I would guess that he is either seven or eight. His focus remains on the group of girls playing in the grass.

He stands over one of the girls who is seated, legs crossed, on the grass. As he stands there, the other three girls stop smiling and conversing with each other. Standing over the girl he tells her, "Mom wants you to help her in the kitchen." The other girls do not protest her departure. As she and follows her brother toward the kitchen, she pushes him in a playful manner. He immediately he turns to face her. His face is unmoved by the playful gesture, and he looks up to meet the eyes of his *hermana* (sister). He stands there motionless until she breaks eye contact. The fun ends abruptly and the smile slowly vanishes from the girl's face. He stands even more erect and proceeds to walk, while his sister drops her eyes to the ground. At a silent pace, they walk toward the kitchen, him leading and her quietly following.

This story addresses several things but most specifically it illustrates the authority that was bestowed upon the male child by either the mother or the father. To the extent that this authority trumped the other social activities of his sister he takes the role of a responsible adult. Thus, he ignores invitations to play because in that particular moment he is not a child but rather a male adult who has been given the responsibility to get his sister. In reaction to his presence, his sister fails to intervene in his authority and is acquiescent to his wishes. Her brother's reaction to her pushing him—a playful attempt to subvert his authority—simultaneously exposes and re-inscribes the patriarchal frame. She, then, identifies with and understands the message her brother is conveying with his facial

expression or gesture. The sister encounters authority “in raw form” the younger male sibling is supported by an authoritative frame. Her brother’s invocation of authority denies any possibility of revolt; a revolt against her parents—and the patrimonial authority. In this case, the boy is cognizant of receiving these privileges and acts in such a way that he may be permitted more “male” responsibilities.

These symbols reinforce or renew social boundaries for the actors in the community which requires the social control of women. Individuals who attempt to brake or who accidentally violate these boundaries are bombarded with negative sanctions. The sanctions come from members of the community who share the patrimonial system with the violator. The violation of cultural norms, i.e. transgressions, results in ridicule by members of the migrant farmer worker community. Such a case of sanctioning occurred while during cucumber picking:

A Mexican family, with three children, picks cucumbers near me. I cannot help but admire the mechanical proficiency: they have divided their work like an assembly line: the mother and young children place the cucumbers in the red plastic basket, while the eldest child and father carry the full baskets to the truck. However, they are one of few families whose eldest child is female. The men tap their head wear as she approaches (trucker or baseball caps, or cowboy straw-hats). They act “chivalrous” around her by removing their hats and by allowing her, and the other women, to dump their cucumbers before them. The men permit the women to cut in front of the line where the cucumbers are being dumped and they place their buckets on the ground to assist the woman in dumping out their baskets.

However, today one man fails to allow the woman behind him to dump her bucket first. He also does not assist her with the dumping of the bucket. In fact, in one instance, he walks at a faster pace passing and cutting in the line before the young woman who was picking with her family. The other men, who see this, they ridicule him for his lack of learning appropriate manners from his father and mother. One of the men comments, “Because we work like animals, it does not mean we should act like one.” Consequently, this individual became the butt of jokes and comments (specifically addressed to his manhood) for the duration of day.

The presence of young women working in a largely male sphere results, in this case, in a soft, gestural form of a policing of the patriarchal frame manifest through teasing and ridicule. The substantive form of this sanction, disclosed above, addresses the transmission of manners through the family. It highlights the diminished potential of change (within the workplace through imagining forms of

equality) within a patriarchal social structure. In the case above, the worker overlooked the young girl and, *de facto*, treated her as an equal partner in the work process, as just another cucumber picker, but as the other men policed the symbolic boundaries of the patriarchal structure her gender required, from him, a different, formal, interaction.

The reaction of the women working in the field was also significant. They also partook, indirectly, in the sanctioning of the male individual through a complicit secondary means of supporting the sanction, e.g. smiles and laughter. The women's tacit agreement with the men, was based a perception that the act (of cutting and not assisting in the dumping of the cucumbers) did, in fact, show a lack of respect and manners (he may have behaved out of ignorance or an expectation of equality based on an assumption of age or experience—it is impossible to know for sure). The common identity of workers plays handmaiden to gender.

There is more to the story. The young girl was not aware of any impropriety. She responded to the event, after the fact, with confusion. This, in and of itself, is salient to a discussion of "the self." First the girl was called back by her father to where her family was standing in the field. Second she began to look around to see if she had done something wrong. Finally, confident that she has done nothing wrong, (e.g. shamed herself) she participated in the ridicule leveled at the man who had cut in front of her. The logic of this effect of authority (though in regard to the state, it is analogous to other systems of social organization) has been described by Louis Althusser, (using Lacan's work) specifically in his discussion of "interpolation." In this case, the injunction by the father resulted, immediately, in the subjection of the young woman to the patrimonial system mitigated only through her gradual recognition that she, in this instance, was not guilty of a transgression (Althusser 1971). However, as Althusser indicates, the sanctions do not emerge from the act; rather they emerge from out of the structure and are already embedded in the form and potentiality of the exchange.

Gender inequality is also rendered visible in the form through which financial contribution that women make to the household is represented and recognized. Put simply, women are not rewarded for identical work. For example, as described earlier, women receive a fee for supplying the single men in the camp with regular meals. Women may transform this type of work into small businesses that cater to the migrant farm worker community, regularly selling *elotes* (cooked

corn with lemon, cream, butter, and red chili pepper powder in a cup) and other food. Despite these accomplishments—the keeping and maintaining of a business, which could be considered admirable and even confer upon the women some degree of social capital—women’s financial contributions to the family is viewed as nothing special.

A wife’s contribution to the financial stability of the family is accomplished through qualities (traditional traits) already vested in her, such as her ability to cook. The apex of social capital is reserved for married women in the camp; it is represented by the title, *Doña*. *Doña* was first used by the Spaniards and it maintained its venerable connotation, through the colonization process for the indigenous acculturated community. It symbolizes a certain amount of respect that should be warranted toward the individual. The credentials of the title are related directly to the contribution and skills of married women beyond the sphere of the family to the community. Given our discussion of women’s “double day,” it is obvious that the title is warranted. However, men, in this instance, are rewarded with the title *Don* which, while it also implies respect; the degree of respect is always greater, despite the fact that the title is conferred upon him based entirely on his wife’s merit. The title, across the Latino community, is warranted only for individuals who are of older and/or married. However, the title *Don* carries more weight than *Doña*, this means, *de facto*, that a man’s indirect contribution to the migrant farm worker community was marrying someone who can cook. There are other couples in the camp where the wives do not cook for the men and these couples are referred to by their first name or by their proper name. These titles are not conferred upon or after marriage but are always already present as a feature of patrimonial authority. They are linked fundamentally and formally to the structure; coupled to one another and to the marital function.

There are, however, women who openly challenge the male dominated migrant farm worker culture. They are prostitutes. The nature of these women’s interaction with men in the camp is significantly different from all other gender based forms of social interaction. These women mitigate all social interaction through business transactions—sex for money. Below, is a detailed account of how these women interact with men in the labor camp. A visit to visit an informal “brothel” yielded the following event. Below we describe how the men gathered around in the living room, in a house farthest from the rest of the camp. It was a house intended for a large family, but the crew leader had converted it into a single

man's house. The kitchen had been made into a storage room and the rest of the house contained many beds which allowed for little personal space.

On the weekend, the house is clean and so are the men. Everyone is covered in cheap cologne. They laugh, tease and push each other around like children at a playground. None of men in the room say anything about who will go first. It became obvious, when one of the older men tells a thin, dark-skinned young man, "Go tell him that they are here!" As the door opens, the men's eyes widen and they excitedly rub their hands together.

Two figures stand in the doorway; their large size blocks the view of the women making their way toward the living room. The wood creaks with each step they take. The women enter the room and exchange greetings with the men. They ask the men about their work since working men can spend more money on sex. They stand in the living room discussing prices. The men pick the women they want after prices were agreed upon. The room falls silent.

They all stand there waiting for the crew leader's right hand man (the alpha male) to arrive. After a few minutes, the much anticipated man makes his way to the front door of the house and stands there looking at the women. In the living room, the woman who seems to be the pack leader separates herself out from the others and makes her way toward the dark-skinned man.

They greet each other and go into one of the rooms together. After they leave the common room, two of the men, known to be the fastest pickers, grab the remaining women and take them to another room. I, still seated in the common room, can hear heated conversations that were coming from inside the other rooms. "I have told you before, no condom: no sex." The same conversation was taking place in the other room between the alpha male and alpha female. The voices of the men complaining could also be heard, "I do not need a stinking condom because I'm a man and condoms are for stupid teenagers and not for a man like me."

The nature of the relationship between the women and the men here gives rise to a distinct symbolic economy. In this case, by leveling a sexual prohibition, the women predominantly control the context of interaction; to the extent that the men finally give in to the demand that they wear condoms. The women's grievance, "why it's always the same *chingadera* (fucking) thing about the condoms," is part of a larger discussion regarding Mexican/Mexican American condoms use is also found in Norma Williams' (1988) study of Mexican/Mexican American families. However, the case above demonstrates how a single symbolic

register that persists outside of “illegitimate sexual acts” (in the family, as in William’s discussion) is context based; these men engage and interact under a different set of terms with these women than with the women in the labor camp. Although, in their personal life, the women in the above case were/are somebody’s daughter, mother, sister, and/or wife, they produce a different symbolic framework within the male migrant farm worker community. The relationships embedded within this particular context give rise to a distinctively different symbolic economy. As a result, these women can gain a seemingly equal ground in the context of the exchange describe above, although their behavior could be view as deviant and the “equal ground” gained comes with a series of risks which represent non-normative communal transgressions and could be met with (or which threaten) dangerous repercussions that remain contained in a male context. The informal nature of sex work opens up greater levels of violence and risk for these women (Sanchez 1997).

Discussion

The purpose of the paper was to covey how the gender formation in the migrant farm worker camps provides 1. a compliant labor force; 2. does so “naturally” through existing forms of patrimonial authority. The capital-labor relation depends upon leaving the symbolic (e.g. cultural, traditional, linguistic, religious etc) structure of the host cultures intact and providing that context through the labor camp. The fieldwork demonstrates that in farm worker communities capitalism and patrimonial authority make strange though acceptable bedfellows. Significant symbols are the means of a social control mechanism that are limited by the patrimonial frame; they have the capacity to transcend generations. Cultural transmission, in migrant farm worker communities, requires little or no alteration to the patrimonial family structure.

This cultural transmission happens “naturally” as parents interact with their children, the group’s values and norms are exchanged and passed on to the next generation. For example, at the wash area, the children observed through parental interactions that the father is excluded from assisting with domestic duties. The father’s lack assistance with domestic duties signals a compliance with the norms of masculinity and is not viewed as insensitivity. Boys learn that one gender has exclusive access to social power (Irigaray 1977; Kristeva 1982; Rubin 1997). They internalize the roles of all the members of the family in “the game stage” through

the development of an adult *self*.

In each of the passages above that detail gendered interaction (micro power) it is evident that men had more social, economic, and symbolic power than women. At an early age both boys and girls learn about their present and future roles; they experience their relation to the larger group which is, in turn, associated with the patrimonial structure that codes authority as gendered power. Taking the example of the girl who tried to “horseplay” with her younger brother, as the interaction unfolded, she accepted his authority as legitimate. Did she have a choice? Her younger brother bears abstract conceptual category that confers law/power—a symbolic structure or frame, border, or boundary—upon the process of identity construction. Therefore, the little brother recognizes that there are certain privileges in being a “man,” and these privileges increase as he partakes in more male responsibilities which, in turn, gives him more authority over his older sister.

In addition, power and control is pre-coded but is reified and imbedded within the socialization process any challenges posed against expected gender roles are met by collective negative sanctions. Henceforth, through sanctions, the group reinforces the *status quo* which in turn benefits the male dominant culture as well as the economic (labor-capital relations) context. Consider the two examples from the fieldwork section of the paper: the man who overlooked the young woman in the fields, and the younger boy staring-down his older sister. Violations are quickly, if almost automatically, corrected. Minimizing in-group instability, both men and women depend on these symbols to negotiate transgressions as well as group membership—to the extent that any violation of norms is punishable by negative sanctions. In consequence, an individual is limited to act within the symbolic system and any attempt to alter those boundaries results in ridicule by other men and women, as in the case with the man in the field.

Conclusion

In summary, the goal of this study has been to demonstrate how patrimonial authority structures (Weber 1978), which are endogenous to the camps work, to maintain traditional power structure. Gender is the fulcrum upon which traditional authority structures rest (Mead 1932/1962; Douglas 1966; Dalla Costa 1973; Irigaray 1977; Weber 1978; Hartman 1981; Kristeva 1982; Butler 1990;

Rubin 1997). The policing of gender norms, intrinsic to the community in the camps, has the “value added” effect of community coherence so that it can function, well, as a community that ultimately labors for one another as well as another: the employer. We claim that those who exploit labor are actually exploiting an entire cultural structure as opposed to individual workers. The reason that the camp-form is so successful is because: 1. it allows members of the camp to maintain the illusion of cultural autonomy by maintaining its own authority through traditions and the symbolic structure; 2. it does not require any strict form of labor rationalization on the part of the employer.

References

- Althusser, Louis. “Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses (Notes towards an Investigation).” *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*, trans. by Ben Brewster, 127-242. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1971.
- Anzaldúa, Gloria. *Borderlands/La Frontera: The New Mestiza*. San Francisco: Aunt Lute Books, 1999.
- Bhattacharjee, Anannya. “The Public/Private Mirage: Mapping Homes and Undomesticating Violence Work in the South Asian Immigrant Community.” *Feminist Genealogies, Colonial Legacies, Democratic Futures*, edited by Alexander and Mohanty, 308-327. New York: Routledge, 1997.
- Bardhan, P. “A Note on Interlinked Rural Economic Arrangements.” In: *The Economic Theory of Agrarian Institutions*, edited by P. Bardhan, 237-242. Clarendon: Oxford, 1991a.
- Bardhan, P. “On the Concept of Power in Economics.” *Economics and Politics* 3 (1991b): 265-277.
- Bardhan, P. “Labor-tying in a Poor Agrarian Economy: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis.” *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 98 (1983): 501-504.
- Boehm, Deborah A. “‘Now I Am a Man and a Woman!’: Gendered Moves and Migrations in a Transnational Mexican Community.” *Latin American Perspectives January 2008* 35: 16-30
- Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge, 1990.
- Castellanos, M. Bianet. “Constructing the Family: Mexican Migrant Households, Marriage, and the State.” *Latin American Perspectives January 2008* 35: 64-77
- Castellanos, M. Bianet and Deborah A. Boehm. 2008. “Engendering Mexican Migration : Articulating Gender, Regions, Circuits.” *Latin American Perspectives* 35: 5, pgs. 5-15.
- Cobas, J. “On the Study of Ethnic Enterprise: Unresolved Issue.” *Sociological Perspective*, 30 (1987): 467-472
- Conover, T. *Coyotes*. New York: Random House, 1987.
- Cromie, Stanley. “Motivations of Aspiring Male and Female Entrepreneurs.” *Journal of Occupational Behavior*, 8 (1987): 251-261.
- Dalla Costa, Maria Rosa. “Women and the Subversion of the Community.” *The Power of Women and the Subversion of the Community*. Bristol: Falling Wall Press, 1973.
- Donato, Katharine M., Donna Gabaccia, Jennifer Holdaway, Martin Manalansan IV, and Patricia R. Pessar. “A glass half full? Gender in migration studies.” *International Migration Review* 11 (2006): 3-26.
- Douglas, Mary. 1966. *Purity and danger*. New York: Ark Publication.
- Ehrenreich, Barbara and Arlie Russell Hochschild (eds.)

- Durand, J. and Massey, D., "Mexican Migration to the United States: Critical Review." *Latin American Review*, 27 (1992): 3-42.
- Giddens, Anthony, *Capitalism and Modern Social Theory: An Analysis of the Writings of Marx, Durkheim and Max Weber*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971.
- Gonzalez, J, *Harvest of Empire*. Penguin: New York, 2001.
- Goss, J. and Lindquist, B., "Conceptualizing International Labor Migration: A Structuration Perspective." *International Migration Review*, 29 (1995): 317-351.
- Guerrero, Marie Anna Jaimes, "Civil Rights Versus Sovereignty: Native American Women in Life and Land Struggles." *Feminist Genealogies, Colonial Legacies, Democratic Futures*, edited by Alexander and Mohanty, 101-121. New York: Routledge, 1997.
- Hart, E, *Barefoot Heart: Story of Migrant Children*. Tempe, Texas: Juarez-Lincoln Center, National Migrant Information Clearing House, 1999.
- Hartman, Heidi, "The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism." *Women and Revolution*. Boston: South End Press, 1981.
- Hawkes, G. and Taylor, M., "Power Structure in Mexican American Farm Labor Families." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 37 (1975): 807-811
- Heaps, W, *The Wandering Worker: The Story of Migrant Farm Workers and Their Problems*. New York: Crown Publishers, 1968
- Hondagneu-Sotelo, Pierrette. *Gendered Transitions: Mexican Experiences of Immigration*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994.
- Hondagneu-Sotelo, Pierrette. *Doméstica: Immigrant Workers Caring and Cleaning in the Shadows of Affluence*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001.
- Hondagneu-Sotelo, Pierrette. "Gender and immigration: a retrospective and introduction," pp. 3-19 in Pierrette Hondagneu-Sotelo (ed.), *Gender and U.S. Immigration: Contemporary Trends*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003a..
- Hondagneu-Sotelo, Pierrette. (ed.) *Gender and U.S. Immigration: Contemporary Trends*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003b..
- Irigaray, Luce, "The Sex Which is Not One." *Ce Sexe que n'en est pas un*. Paris: Editions Minuit, 1977.
- Karjanen, David. "Gender, Race, and Nationality in the Making of Mexican Migrant Labor in the United States." *Latin American Perspectives* January 35 (2008): 51-63
- Kossoudji, S, "Immigrant Workers Assimilations: Is It a Market Phenomenon." *The Journal of Human Resources*, 24 (1989): 494-52.
- Kristeva, Julia. 1982. *Powers of horror: An essay on abjection*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Light, I., Sabagh, G., Mehdi, B., and Der-Martirosian C., "Beyond the Ethnic Enclave Economy." *Social Problems*, 41 (1994): 65-80
- Littlefield, C. and Stout, C., "A Survey of Colorado's Migrant Farmworkers: Access to Health Care." *International Migration Review*, 21 (1987): 688-708.
- Martin, Philip, *Mexican Workers and U.S. Agriculture: The Revolving Door*. *International Migration Review*, 36 (2002): 1124-1142.
- Marx, Karl, *Capital*, Volume 1. London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1970.
- Mead, G., *Mind, Self, and Society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, [1932]1962.
- Melville, M, editor. *Mexicans at Work in the United States*. Houston, TX: Mexican American Studies Program: University of Houston, 1988.
- Mohanty, Chandra Talpade. "Women Workers and Capitalist Scripts: Ideologies of Domination, Common Interests, and the Politics of Solidarity." *Feminist Genealogies, Colonial Legacies, Democratic Futures*, edited by Alexander and Mohanty, 3-29. New York: Routledge, 1997.

- Molina, H., *The Working and Living Conditions of Farm Workers*. Master's thesis, University of Texas-Pan American, 2004.
- Nicholson, Linda, "Feminism and Marx: Integrating Kinship with the Economic." *Praxis International* (January 1985): 367-380.
- Portes, A., *The Economic Sociology of Immigration*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1995.
- Przeworski, Adam. 1985. *Capitalism and Social Democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Raijman, R., "Determinates of Entrepreneurial Intentions: Mexican Immigrants in Chicago." *Journal of Social-Economics*, 30 (2001): 393-411
- Reitz, J. and Sklar, S., "Culture, Race, and the Economic Assimilation of Immigrants." *Sociological Forum*, 15 (1997): 233-277
- Rubin, Gayle, "The Traffic in Women: Notes on the Political Economy of Sex." *The Second Wave: A Reader in Feminist Theory*. Ed. Nicholson. New York: Routledge, 1997.
- Sanchez, L.E., "Boundaries of Legitimacy: Sex, Violence, Citizenship, and Community in a Local Sexual Economy." *Law & Social Inquiry*, 22, (Summer, 1997): 543-580.
- Segura, D., "Chicanas and Mexican Immigrants Women in the Labor Market: A Study of Occupational Mobility and Stratification" Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1978.
- Seif, Hinda. "Wearing Union T-Shirts: Undocumented Women Farm Workers and Gendered Circuits of Political Power." *Latin American Perspectives* January 2008 35: 78-98,
- Silberman, Matthew, *Violence and Society: A Reader*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall/Pearson Education, 2003.
- Stanford, A., "He Speaks to Whom? Inscription and Reinscription of Women in Visible Man and the Salt Eater." *Malus*, 18 (1993): 17-31
- Villaseñor, Victor. 1984. *Macho!*. Houston: Arte Público Press
- Vold, G., Bernard, T., and Snipes, J., *Theoretical Criminology* 4th Edition. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Weber, Max. *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*. Berkeley,. CA: University of California Press, 1978..
- William, Norma, "Role Making among Married Mexican American Women: Issue of Class and Ethnicity." *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 24(1988): 203-217.
- U.S. Department of Labor, "Profile of U.S. Farm Workers." *Congressional Digest*, June 94 (2005): 169-170.
- Zavella, P., *Women's Work and Chicano Families: Cannery Workers of the Santa Clara Valley*. Cornell University Press: Ithaca, 1987.