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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Problem

To what extent does the adaptation of migrant families to the urban society vary by family structure? Social scientists frequently make the assumptions that urbanization implies the depersonalization of social ties, the ascendancy of secondary over the primary social relationships, the bureaucratization of the occupational structure, and weakened ties of the nuclear family and the extended family. While it is clear that such processes are at work in the urbanization of modern Latin America, one is less certain that these processes are as unequivocal or as overmastering as in the classic model of the Western metropolis from which these assumptions were drawn. The present study approaches the problem by testing generalizations concerning influence of various family structures on the adaptation of rural migrants to a Latin American urban society.
The urban Latin American society under question is Bogotá, Colombia, and the specific area is a shantytown neighborhood therein. The investigation employs a macro-functional approach, a study of large social units. Bell and Vogel's framework for functional analysis of nuclear family behavior is utilized as the theoretical model and is expanded to include the extended family. The migrant family is the unit of analysis and is visualized as a subsystem of urban society which has functional interchanges with the other subsystems of society (economy, community, polity, and value). The purpose of the study is to test a series of theoretical generalizations concerning the interchanges between the family and the other subsystems with empirical findings. Thus the study is analytical in method and permits comparison between the family types and their participation in the large culture outside the family.

Importance of the Problem

Even the most unobservant viewer of the larger Latin American cities cannot help but notice the evidence pointing to the mass migration of the peasant family to the city and the resulting inability of the urban areas to absorb migrants into productive industrial
jobs. This exchange of rural underemployment for urban unemployment is manifested in the large shantytowns which ring most of the capitals and other South American cities. In Rio de Janeiro, for example, nearly one-third of the city's two million inhabitants lived in such conditions in 1957. In 1956, 10 per cent of the population of Lima, Peru, most of whom originated in rural areas, lived in poor areas of the city called barriadas. The city of São Paulo grew 62 per cent in the decade 1940 to 1950 and 72.5 per cent of the growth came from migration. In the same decade, internal migration increased the population of Mexico City 28 per cent.

Because of the spectacular influx of migrants to Bogotá, the city planning office has called Bogotá the Cuidad Asilo (City of the Asylum) or Cuidad Refugio (City of Refuge). In 1950, the population of Bogotá was 500,000. By 1958 it had risen to 900,000 and is expected to increase to 2,334,000 by 1970. Thus one is little puzzled by the fact that 52 per cent of the inhabitants of Bogotá were born in other parts of Colombia.

The inability of the system to absorb the migrants is apparent. The invasiones (squatters) exercise their squatters' rights not only in the
shantytown fringe that encircles Bogotá, but in vacant lots in the most fashionable sections of the city. Whole shantytowns, such as Las Colinas, Segundo Puerto, El Quindo, and Las Mercedes, have sprung up on Bogota’s outskirts recently. 6

The problems which the single migrant and the migrant families encounter in these shantytowns are fairly adequately captured in the nomenclature for these areas of the city. Fravela in Brazil, villas de mallecas in Puerto Rico, tugurios in Colombia, villas miseries in Argentina, colineas in Lima, barrio bajo in Chile, campalla in Argentina, barriadas brujas in Panama, and jacoles in Mexico City are all examples of local terminology one finds to describe these situations.

Echavarria and Hauser state that in fact many of the social problems in Latin America can be associated with the large scale migration of people from rural areas. 7 The in-migrants as a rule are illiterate, unskilled, and as a result do not possess the skills required to adapt and integrate into the economic, social, and political aspects of the urban environment. This mal-adaptation is manifested in shantytowns, social disorganization, delinquency, crime, prostitution, family disintegration, mental illness, etc.—which is disproportionately common among migrant families.
This view is fairly prevalent in the literature on the adaptation and integration of the family in the modern industrialized world. Lost of these generalizations concerning adaptation of rural-urban migrants in Latin America have been inferred from the conclusions of studies made in other parts of the world and from limited statistical data. Many researchers have assumed in an a priori fashion that a well-adapted family life must be extremely difficult in the living conditions in which migrants find themselves in urban areas, for these conditions usually foster family disintegration. In essence, this school of thought argues that the family deteriorates under the impact of urban life.

At least one study provides a contradiction. Oscar Lewis finds "very little evidence of family disorganization in the city." There seems to occur little weakening of parental authority over children and no decline in church attendance and religious practices. It even appears that the trials of urban life strengthen family solidarity.

On the other hand, Parsons argues that it is erroneous to refer to family changes in urban society as disorganization, but rather the family has become a more specialized structure. Parsons believes that extended family relations are not functional in a
modern democratic industrial society partly because such
societies interfere with occupational mobility. The
nuclear family, by contrast, is thought to be highly
functional because it does not discourage mobility.

This argument, however, fails to explain the
fact that a study which compared rural Venezuelan
communities and migrant communities in Caracas, reveals
that the number of extended-family households dropped
by only one per cent in the city and that the average
family size actually increased. Also, Oscar Lewis
followed his study of the Mexican town of Tepoztlán with
studies of districts of Mexico City inhabited by
migrant Tepoztecanos. He states not only was the
average household size in Mexico City larger than in
Tepoztlán (5.8 against 5), but the city households
contained a slightly larger percentage of extended
families.

As the previous discussion suggests sufficient
data on the social correlates of family types do not
exist. One lacks the knowledge as to the social
situation with which family types are associated and
the social behavior that characterizes them. Thus, the
present investigation aims to determine which family
type or types adapt to an urban society through
functional interchanges.
Social Setting

The present research project investigated Barrio El Carmen, a neighborhood, which is located at the south-west edge of Bogotá in the shantytown fringe area. The neighborhood is a flat, poorly drained area of one story houses, the majority of which are constructed of bricks and sheet metal. Approximately 18 per cent of the dwellings are tenement houses in which 40 per cent of the people live. Almost all these families rent one room. Another 25 per cent are one roomed-dwellings constructed of scrap material, flattened tin cans, bamboo poles, mud, cardboard, etc.

The area was settled in 1948 by invasion and also partial payment for the land. The area is not a typical shantytown. It has become permanent with expropriation and improvement of land and services. The public services consist of water, electricity, and sewage; however, a large percentage of the houses do not have connections with these facilities. Other services such as police protection, transportation, churches, and schools are inadequate for the existing population. Still other services such as fire protection, paved streets, and garbage collection are non-existent.

The barrio is described as a worker's neighborhood by city planning offices. The main occupations
of the men are brick masons, carpenters, mechanics, construction workers, taxi and bus drivers, and a few businessmen. Most women do not work outside the house; however, a few work in milk plants, as street vendors, and in other marginal occupations. According to the priest a large number of the younger women work as prostitutes.

The place of employment for 95 per cent of the workers is outside El Carmen. Salaries range from nothing for the unemployed to $75 a month for some workers. The modal income, however, for the community is $25 per month.

The 1964 Colombian pre-census counted 14,130 people in the 90-acre area. The average age for the adults was 36 years. Pre-adolescent children and adult females are overrepresented in the population.

The majority of these in-migrants came directly to Bogotá from small population centers within a radius of 100 miles of Bogotá and lived in some other neighborhoods before moving to El Carmen. The overwhelming majority of the migrants were motivated to migrate for economic reasons. When the migrants arrived, they possessed no more than the tools of their professions, little or no money, and the clothing on their backs.
Sampling

A neighborhood in Bogotá, Colombia, was selected which contained a high percentage of migrants. A map of this barrio, El Carmen, was obtained from the city planning office and was revised to account for the new houses.

A short preliminary census of the number of families, areas of origin, and length of residence was attempted. This rough census indicated that approximately 14,000 people and 2,200 families lived in the neighborhood. The researcher decided that available time, money, and adequate sample size for statistical purposes would allow a sample of 120 families, or 6 percent of the total number of families living in the neighborhood.

A random sample of the housing units was drawn. This sampling procedure did not ensure an equal opportunity for all families within the dwelling to be included in the sample. The interviewers, therefore, were instructed to determine the total number of families in the dwelling; assign each a number; and select a family at random.

In addition, the method of sampling did not guarantee that all the respondents would be in-migrants. The Centro Interamericano de Vivienda y Planeamiento indicated in
their study that 18 per cent of the population were Bogotanos. The present study yielded a figure of 11 per cent. These non-migrants were dropped from the sample, which left a sample of 106 migrant families. Also persons housing units were counted but not included in the sample because they did not constitute a family.

Gathering the Data

Having determined the study's objectives, the interview schedule was constructed at the Faculty of Sociology at the National University with the aid of the Land Tenure Center of the University of Wisconsin and the approval of the Ph.D. adviser at the Ohio State University. The schedule was pretested in Barrio Restrepo and as a result several questions were modified.

The interviewers were fourth-year university students from the Faculty of Sociology at the National University of Colombia. Although they all had had previous interviewing experience on a number of projects, they were given additional training.

The time of the interview averaged about an hour; the interviewee preferably was the family head. In situations where the family head was not available his wife or compañera was interviewed. The interviewing was, for the most part, conducted on holidays and weekends in November, 1964. The family head was
interviewed in 60 per cent of the cases. Ninety-six per cent of the interviews were completed.

Statistical Tests

The chi-square test was the statistical method employed in the analysis of the generalizations. Four variables were used as controls; length of residence in Bogotá, length of residence in the barrio, educational level of the household head, and population size of the area of origin.

Summary

The present investigation employs a functional approach to the observation and measurement of functional interchanges between migrant family types and the subsystems of the urban Bogotá society. The study is designed to determine which family structures adapt to the urban setting through interaction.
Footnotes


6El Espectador (Bogotá), No. 20434, September 29, 1964.


9Oscar Lewis, "Urbanization Without Breakdown, A Case Study," The Scientific Monthly, LXXV (July, 1952), pp. 31-41.
10 Talcott Parsons and others, Family, Socialization, and Interaction Process (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1955), Chapter I.

11 Inter-American Economic and Social Council, Pan American Union, Causas y efectos del exodo rural en Venezuela (Washington, D.C.), p. 188.

12 Lewis, op. cit., p. 36.

13 Carlos Esmeral Barros, Emerce Tijasz, and Jorge Murcia Barrero, Evaluacion del Barrio El Carmen (Bogota: Centro Interamericana de Vivienda y Planeamiento, in press).
CHAPTER II

CONSTRUCTION OF THE MODEL

The present study follows the familiar functional analysis approach which has found extensive use in biology, psychology, sociology, and anthropology. In essence one employing this approach has in mind some conception of society in some way similar to an organism. This social organismic model is, however, employed quite differently from earlier writers like Herbert Spencer who seemed more concerned with preserving the analogy than with using the model as a source of verifying hypothesis.¹

The primary intent of functional analysis is to learn how a system, any system, biological, social, or mechanical, operates. In other words, an observer wishes to learn what the objective consequences of any one part are for another part or parts or for the system as a whole. The system possesses a structure of identifiable elements. In the present study the system is a community known as Barrio El Carmen which may be viewed as a subsystem of the larger urban society of Bogotá.
Indeed, the concept of system can be applied at many levels other than the societal level, from which the two preceding examples are drawn.

The social structure of El Carmen is composed of interrelated statuses; example: preacher and congregation. The people who occupy these statuses perform social roles. When these roles are stable, permanent, and persistent, they are usually organized in subgroups and subsystems. Thus the Protestant group is part of the larger grouping, the barrio. This Protestant subgroup may then be viewed as a subsystem of the religious social system and is an identifiable partial structure.

Full understanding of the concept, structure, depends upon an understanding of function. Function has many definitions and meanings. Generally, however, it is agreed that if a structure contributes to fulfillment of one or more social needs of a social system or subsystem then the structure is said to possess a function. Merton states that function is the observable consequence which makes for the adaptation of a given system. On the other hand, a social structure may be dysfunctional, an observed consequence which lessens the adaptation of the system. Therefore, the consequences that contribute to the integration of the rural migrant families into
the barrio are functional. The consequences that hinder the integration of the migrant families are dysfunctional.

Hobbes states that almost all men strive to gain possession of the scarce valuable things around them. These social needs arise not in the nature of man but in social interaction. There are some needs that every social system must fulfill. Broadly speaking, the social structure of every social system must solve four functional problems; (1) pattern maintenance and tension management, (2) adaptation, (3) goal attainment, and (4) integration. Pattern maintenance and "tension management" refers to the motivation to conform to the norms and values of the society. Adaptation refers to the adjustment of one system to other systems or one part of a system to the other parts. Goal attainment refers to the requirement that there must be the satisfaction of ends or goals. Integration refers to maintaining or retaining internal harmony within a given social system. Bredemeier and Stephenson state that as far as can be deduced, integration and adaptation are the two basic and essential requirements for the operation of any social system. Others may be involved, but they are likely to be encompassed by these two.
Bell and Vogel state that there are four subsystems; economy, the polity, the community, and the value system which meet these problems for any society. The functional subsystems should not be thought of as having a concrete structural referent. Anyone of these functional subsystems is composed of all those aspects of the total social structure which have a bearing on one of the functional problems. A structural subsystem, on the other hand, is made up of concrete groups. For example, the economy is the functional subsystem which deals with the adaptive problem of the society. But the economy is not composed of a definite number of groups, each of which is exclusively an economic group. Both business firms and the family produce goods and services, but they also make contributions to the solutions of the other functional problems of the society. Analytically, however, every society, in fact, every group, does have the four functional subsystems previously described.

Bell and Vogel further indicate that the family faces the same kinds of functional problems as society. They state that some type of balance must be achieved between the subsystems of society and the family through functional interchanges. These interchanges need not establish a stable or perfect balance, particularly
in the short run, nor consist of concrete goods. They may simply consist of behavior and behavior responses.

Parsons notes that without a balance or a minimum degree of integration and adaptation the social system will cease to exist. This does not imply that conflict cannot or does not exist, but simply that there are limits beyond which it can go.

The present investigation is concerned with the adaptation of rural migrants to the subsystems of the society. Adaptation of the family refers to the extent to which the family as a whole secures through functional interchanges from other subsystems the attitudes, services, and goods its members have learned to need. The relationship of the migrant family to the subsystems of the urban society is important because the position of the family is intimately related to the problem of integration of the family. Integration refers to the extent to which family members secure from one another the attitudes, services, and goods they have learned to need. This latter functional problem is beyond the scope of this investigation and remains for future exploration.

Much literature has centered on the adaptation and integration of the family in the modern industrialized world. As stated earlier, a large amount of this literature emphasizes the dysfunctional aspects of the
relationship of industrial society to the family, postulating the weakening of kinship ties as a result of mobility, both physical and social. The modal family type is described as nuclear, as relatively isolated from kin, and as dependent largely on secondary rather than primary relationships. On the other hand, Parsons argues that it is erroneous to refer to family changes in an urban society as disorganization, but rather the family has become a more specialized structure.\textsuperscript{13} Litwak has posed an even different alternative.\textsuperscript{14} He asserts that the modern occupation structure makes for high family mobility but has not destroyed the extended family. Thus what persists is a sort of "modified extended family." In sum, one is unable to definitely assess the importance and impact of urban life on the family.

At this level, however, Bell and Vogel note

...that it is often said that the 'functions' of the family are being lost in modern society, but it is not clear whether the nuclear family or the extended family is the unit under consideration. In some primative and agrarian societies, the family is said to have (or have had) major economic, political, religious, and educational duties, but in many cases these are (or were) functions of the extended family, not the nuclear family. In more complex societies, these functions are performed not by the extended family, but by specialized institutions organized on other bases than kinship; the nuclear family's relationship with these institutions has become more important, while the relationship with the extended family has become less important.\textsuperscript{15}
Goode asserts that the various forms of the households have a number of implications for family interaction. Smelser further notes that one finds...a rough structural congruence between type of family structure and type of economic activity. Hopefully the present study may be able to determine which family types encourage or discourage interchanges in urban society thus facilitation or hindering adaption of these migrant family types to the other subsystems. The general proposition, therefore, is that the functional interchanges between the rural migrant family and the subsystems of society vary by family type.

A discussion of each of the functional subsystems; the family, the polity, community economy, and the value system, and their functional interchanges will follow. For purpose of the study only interchanges between the family and the other subsystems are emphasized. This is not to deny that there are interchanges between the other subsystems, but this is beyond the scope of the present study.

Bell and Vogel's Model

If one means by model a hypothetical representation of those phases of reality toward which research is directed then Bell and Vogel's framework for functional analysis of family behavior may be so defined.
The concepts of any model secure "meaning" through their connection with sense experiences. The degree of certainty of this connection, differentiates empty fantasy from scientific knowledge.

**The Family Subsystem**

Despite its loss of function and smaller size, the Latin American family remains a fairly stable institution. Frequently it includes a larger number and variety of people than does the conventional United States family. Occasionally two generations, including first or second cousins, live under one roof or in adjacent houses. Only now is the nuclear family replacing the extended structure and this change is mostly among the urban middle class and the migrant lower classes.

Extended family forms continue to thrive among the rural and urban lower classes because the combined earning power of extra people offers advantages over the nuclear family. In the shantytowns and urban slums, large family groups often occupy apartments in the same buildings. These family groups may work in the same home handicrafts, others as beggars, in factories, etc., and contribute to family income and survival.
The boundaries of the family are extended by padrinos (godparents). By this universal Catholic relationship, the people who are godparents of a child are expected to assume some responsibility for his religious and moral welfare and even for the care of the child in the event the parents are unable. Particularly peasant families prefer to select godparents in a higher social class. If the godparents fulfill their obligation, both the family and the child will benefit. Like the blood relative part of the family, godparenthood is disintegrating under urban pressure. In the major cities of Chile, Mexico, Brazil, and Argentina, this relationship has become empty. But in the rural area, the peasants take the selection of godparents very seriously.

The Colombian family is a mutual aid society. The family members help each other find employment, residence, work, and in a number of other ways. Friendship outside the family's existing circle of friends are entered into only with caution. They rely on a relationship only when confianza (type of trustworthiness) has been established.

Within Barrio El Carmen, the structure of the family is patrilineal with authorian powers in the hands of the male head of the household. Women are
subordinate and submissive. Marriage is the acceptable career; however, these lower classed women have long worked outside the house, mainly as servants and to some extent in industrial jobs and marginal occupations.

In Latin America, consensual marriage is very common among the lower classes; however, in Colombia this is not true. The Catholic church is a strong force among the peasant population. In the present study, consensual marriage may constitute as high as 25 per cent of the unions. Monogamy probably best describes the form of the family; however, a man may have mistresses. Usually because of the financial burden, the male has only one lover at a time in what may be termed serial monogamy. Promiscuity and adultery are also fairly high. Approximately 80 per cent of the families in El Carmen have a male household head.

There are many household forms in the barrio, ranging from one-person units to several generations living under the same roof. The main family type or types depend on one's definition. Most social scientists define the nuclear family as composed of husband, wife, and their children. The extended family, however, is usually loosely applied to a
system in which the ideal of the society is that several generations should live under one roof. As this definition implies there are a range of meanings applied to this concept. Perhaps at the opposite end of the definitions is the idea that the extended family is any grouping, related by descent, marriage, or adoption, that is broader than the nuclear family. Thus, the first step that is required has to do with clarification of the concepts. Nimkoff states that...

"the terms, nuclear family and extended family have been loosely used, often with the implication that are only two mutually exclusive types, whereas in reality there are varieties of each." For the purpose of research, these varieties need to be specified, so that we have an operational definition of family type.

The present investigation is concerned with the following household units:

1. Person units are bachelors or spinsters living alone. These units are not considered families nor used in the present investigation other than in computing the total population of the barrio.

2. Nuclear family
   a. Sibling family is a structure in which the older child is head of the
household of the younger siblings.
Both parents are absent. Sometimes referred to as a quasi or incomplete nuclear family.

b. **Mother-child or children family** is a structure in which the father is absent. Also sometimes referred to as a secondary, quasi, or incomplete nuclear family.

c. **Father-child or children family** is a structure in which the mother is absent.

d. **Husband-wife and unmarried children family** is the structure commonly referred to as the nuclear family.

e. **Husband-wife family** is a structure in which there are no children.

3. Extended family

a. **Collateral extension of extended family** is two or more interlocking nuclear families. This subtype includes both in-laws and blood kin. Their interrelationships are determined by choice and residential proximity in the same tenement house and not by culturally binding or enforced normative system.
b. **Lineal extension of extended family** is three or more generations living under one roof.

The following family types were determined from the extensive family census taken on the first and second page of the interview schedule.

**TABLE 1**

**FAMILY COMPOSITION OF IN-MIGRANT RESIDENTS TO BARRIO EL CARMEN, BOGOTA, COLOMBIA, 1964**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family type</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person unit</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear family</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibling family</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother-child or children</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father-child or children</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband-wife and children</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband-wife</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended family</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collateral extension</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lineral extension</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Person units are not considered families and are dropped from the analysis. As stated previously, they were included only to obtain their relative importance in the **barrio**. A large portion of these person units were females.
Because of the small frequencies in some cells the different varieties of family types were collapsed into nuclear and extended families. Thus, these two types of family structures are used to test a series of generalizations concerning the functional interchanges between family type and the subsystems of society.

In their interchanges with the other subsystems, these family types are regarded as a separate subsystem by the external systems. An individual is regarded as a representative of his family. The functional interchanges between the family and the subsystems may take place either as a family acting as a unit or an individual acting as a representative of his family. Figure 1 depicts the functional interchanges between the family and the other subsystems of society. It is the author's contention that Bell and Vogel's model is not limited to any specific structural referent such as the nuclear family as they have implied.

**Economic Subsystem**

The economic subsystem is defined as "that part of a society which is concerned with the production and distribution of valued goods and services." The first interchange is the contribution of labor by the family in exchange for rewards for services. In Bogotá, the functional interchange between labor and wage might take many forms depending on the family type.
FIGURE 1

THE INTERCHANGES BETWEEN THE NUCLEAR FAMILY AND THE FUNCTIONAL SUBSYSTEM OF SOCIETY

Nuclear Family  
  \[\rightarrow\text{Wages}\]  
  \[\rightarrow\text{Labor}\]  
  \[\rightarrow\text{Goods}\]  
  \[\rightarrow\text{Family Assets}\]  
  \[\rightarrow\text{Leadership}\]  
  \[\rightarrow\text{Loyalty}\]  
  \[\rightarrow\text{Decisions}\]  
  \[\rightarrow\text{Compliance}\]  
  \[\rightarrow\text{Support}\]  
  \[\rightarrow\text{Group Participation}\]  
  \[\rightarrow\text{Identity}\]  
  \[\rightarrow\text{Adherence}\]  
  \[\rightarrow\text{Specification of Standards}\]  
  \[\rightarrow\text{Acceptance of Standards}\]  
  \[\rightarrow\text{Approval}\]  
  \[\rightarrow\text{Conformity}\]

\[\text{Economy}\]
\[\text{Polity}\]
\[\text{Community}\]
\[\text{Value System}\]

---

The extended family may affect the labor interchange of a cottage industry or a general store which is located within the home. Persons helping their relatives may work without payment of wage, but for payment in kind or no payment. A study in Japan indicates this is quite common in small producing units. This could also be true for Colombia which is also characterized by small producing units. Ninety-seven per cent of the countries had no more than 20 workers. On the other hand the family may be the more specialized nuclear type with the father working for an industry or company outside the barrio. In this instance, the father is participating in a more differentiated society with money as the medium of exchange as is true of modern industrial societies.

Occupational status and place of employment should indicate the degree to which the family head is engaged in a stable, industrial occupation as opposed to a day laborer living in El Carmen and working in the barrio whenever the opportunity presents itself. The assumption is that those individuals engaged in the stable, industrial occupations will have more meaningful contact with the urban norms and values via new reference groups. Thus, integration and adaptation should be enhanced. Specifically the generalization states that
nuclear families will be disproportionately represented in the stable, industrial, outside--barrio jobs than the extended units.

Generalization I: Nuclear families will have a significantly lower total family income than extended families. The nuclear families have to apportion its rewards among fewer people, but correspondingly there are fewer people who are contributing to the income. As a consequence, the extended family is better able to amass capital for economic enterprises.

Generalization II: A significantly higher proportion of nuclear families than extended families will be employed outside the neighborhood. Extended families are traditionally engaged in cottage industries or family enterprises in the home while industrial employment has developed a division of labor outside the house. The nuclear family is a unit of economic consumption, not production.

Generalization III: Nuclear families will have a significantly higher number of people employed in industrial labor pursuits than extended families. The extended family would be expected to have a higher proportion of people self-employed in shops, stores, and crafts than the nuclear families.
Polity Subsystem

The polity subsystem is a type of administration of the social system's activities..."to attain the system goals." The polity cannot be considered coterminous with government or clan as both perform other functions beyond the polity level.

The barrio has administrative activities to attain the system goals. Ideally the family acts as a unit in relationship with the polity. The family contributes loyalty in exchange for leadership. The leadership of the barrio is traditional. The gamonales (political bosses) for each barrio have direct ties to one of the political parties. They work for attaining positive sanctions from hierarchy by obtaining votes for candidates, buying votes, and power relationships. In exchange, the people pay deference and loyalty to the gamonales in order to attain small favors for the barrio (such as lights, bricks, sewage system, etc., which gamonales can obtain from higher political bosses).

In rural Colombia there is usually one very important type of polity relationship, patronage. The campesino (peasant) seeks protection and defense from the patron (landlord) in return for service and loyalty. Often the peasant tenants seek to get their patron to be godfather of their children. The status of godfather
creates extensive obligations for the patron who assumes the role. Not only is the godfather responsible to the godchildren, but also to the family of the child. The family and/or the child could ask the patron for money, help in getting a job, etc. Once in the urban setting, the immigrant often seeks a new patron which may be his employer, the camonales of the barrio, or the priest.

In the second interchange between the polity and the family, the family supplies compliance in exchange for decisions at the societal level. The camonales effectuate decisions from above since he represents the controls to means of powers, for example; job, police force, etc. There is a close relationship between the political structure and the church structure; therefore, positive and negative sanctions as imposed by occupants of perceived legitimate authority holders. Thus, the priest, camonale, and junta de mejores (community improvement group) obtain compliance from the people.

Channels for expressing opinion, however, are limited mostly to upper status groups. In recent years the leadership of organized labor has entered the circle of those whose opinions can be brought to bear on the policy-making process without resorting to violence. On some occasions, public pressure from quiescent areas of society has flowed upward, but this is not the normal
day-to-day situation. The political power of the slum dwellers is at present minimal. They are apathetic and alienated from the political process. These sectors of the urban lower class are for the most part a social problem not a social force, an object rather than a subject. Under these circumstances, the interchanges may be quite imperfect, but the generalization states that a direct relationship exists between the type of family and the degree of functional interchange between family and polity.

Generalization IV: Nuclear families will be significantly more likely to vote than extended families. The extended family is more concerned with their own internal power and authority patterns than they are with the community. The extended family performs the political function for its members.

Generalization V: Nuclear families will know significantly more political figures than the extended families. Knowledge of political figure is assumed to be an indicator of one's participation in the polity subsystem. The diverse contacts of the nuclear family members help them develop interest groups which remove them from the home in order to participate in economic, recreational, and political activities.
Generalization VI: Nuclear families will have significantly more contact with political bosses than the extended families. The extended family usually performs the political functions for its members which other specialized agencies and organizations perform for the nuclear family. True, an extended family of clan size has considerable bargaining power with the political structure, but none of this size exists in El Carmen.

The Community Subsystem

Community is not defined here in terms of a "concrete group such as a village or neighborhood," but rather as "diffuse affective relationships of varying extensiveness,"26 such as one's reference group or groups. According to this definition, in a relatively undeveloped country the community may be composed of several discrete collectivities such as industrial work groups, interest groups, religious groups and possibly barrios with primary relationships.

The city proper of Bogotá is divided into 459 barrios, while the annexed area of 1954 has 190 barrios. These geographically defined units vary greatly in size and in social interaction. Often many of the barrios which constitute the shantytown fringe are composed of rural in-migrants from a specific rural town or region. Some sources feel that these semirural enclaves make
available new possibilities for urban social reconstruction on the basis of neighborhood communities, regional and kinship ties, mutual and associations, and small-group political activity.27

The barrio is probably a significant frame of reference and may serve as an articulator of urban expectations. It is organized as a community system particularly in the lower class areas in the sense that it provides the majority of services, jobs, religion, schools, politics, market, etc. It is shaped, however, by the larger urban society. Perhaps some families can identify two communities, the barrio and the work group. One study, however, indicates that the social participation of residents of one lower classed barrio, Perseverancia, was mostly intra-barrio rather than outside of the barrio with other friends and fellow workers.28

As one of the functional interchanges, the migrant family participates in barrio activities in exchange for the support of the barrio. Solidarity of the bonds among families are symbolized by daily interaction, gifts, special kindness, and the like. These types of interchanges imply an obligation of the receiver to the giver and to the barrio in general. Many times, the reciprocal relationships between the family are relatively latent and come to have real significance only in times of crises.
In the other functional interchange described by Bell and Vogel the *barrio* gives the migrant family an identity in exchange for adherence to *barrio* patterns. The *barrio* provides the family with a specific status position, as well as appropriate standards of conduct and rewards for conduct which are in harmony with the norms. The membership in the *barrio* provides the individual and the family with an identity. This identity gives the individual and the family a specific position within the *barrio* and gives the family a feeling of belonging and prevents anomie. Otherwise the feeling of separateness could lead to "simple anomie." Metron defines this type of anomie as..."the state of confusion in a group or society which is subject to conflict between value systems, (rural and urban) resulting in some degree of uneasiness and a sense of separation from the group...."  

Perhaps the situation could possibly lead to "acute anomie,...the disintegration of value systems, which results in marked anxieties." Here one notices the blurring of the fringe areas of the value and community subsystems and problems of treating them analytically separate.

The theoretical generalization states that a direct relationship exists between the types of family and the degree of functional interchange between the
family and community. The generalizations are as follows:

Generalization VII: Nuclear families will have a significantly higher identification score with the barrio than the extended families. Nuclear families develop primary bonds with the community and derive a sense of identity from the barrio. Extended families are communities within the larger community of El Carmen. As a consequence, extended family members identify and are loyal to a large number of relatives and not with the barrio.

Identification, refers to the degree to which a person is committed to a group. It indicates whether a respondent perceived that what happens in Barrio El Carmen will affect him as a person. This concept was measured by the use of an eight-item scale. The items which composed the scale were:

1. One should work for the betterment of the barrio.
2. I am pleased to live in this barrio.
3. The problems of the barrio are not important to me.
4. This barrio is important to me only as a place to live.
5. I am optimistic and feel that good things will come to this barrio.
6. I do not feel like a member of this barrio.
7. I believe that I am someone important in this barrio.
8. I feel pleased when I tell people that I live in this barrio.

The responses were recorded on a Likert-type scale. Table 2 shows the results of the test for internal consistency as determined by the item-to-total score correlation coefficients. All coefficients were significant at the .05 per cent level of significance.

The reliability of the scale was tested by means of the split-half procedure. The scale was divided randomly into two halves, using the odd-numbered items for one half and the even-numbered items for the other half. Each of the two sets of items was treated as a separate scale and scored accordingly. The two subscales were then correlated and this was taken as a measure of reliability. A correlation value of .536 was obtained when the Spearman-Brown prophecy formula was used to correct for halving the scale. This is significant at the .01 level of significance.

Generalization VIII: Nuclear families will have a significantly higher anomie score than the extended families. The extended family protects its individual members from a feeling of isolation from group membership. The individuals maintain primary relationships
with several other kinmen so that many emotional shocks peculiar to the nuclear family are successfully avoided. In addition the extended family furnishes social services that are lacking in the *barrio*. In other words, people who live in extended families can turn to kin for help.

**TABLE 2**

INTERNAL CONSISTENCY OF ITEMS IN THE IDENTIFICATION SCALE IN BARRIO EL CARMEN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Coefficient of Correlation&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. One should work for the betterment of the <em>barrio</em>.</td>
<td>+.227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I am pleased to live in this <em>barrio</em>.</td>
<td>+.611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The problems of the <em>barrio</em> are not important to me.</td>
<td>+.656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. This <em>barrio</em> is important to me only as a place to live.</td>
<td>+.495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I am optimistic and feel that good things will come to this <em>barrio</em>.</td>
<td>+.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I do not feel like a member of this <em>barrio</em>.</td>
<td>+.704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I believe that I am someone important in this <em>barrio</em>.</td>
<td>+.538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I feel pleased when I tell people that I live in this <em>barrio</em>.</td>
<td>+.675</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>A correlation of .191 and .250 is required for significance at the .05 and .01 levels, respectively.
The term "anomie" was first used by Durkheim to refer to a mental state of normlessness, of being without values to structure one's behavior. The anomie person's mental state is one of hopelessness. He has a sense of meaninglessness and the frame of mind suggested by Housman's lines about finding himself "a stranger and afraid in a world (he) never made." The anomie person lives in a world without direction or purpose or sense of any concern of others for his actions. Quite probably he will sink into a state of apathy and despair.

McGee states a necessary consequence of anomie is isolation from others. The anomie person is estranged from group membership with its reinforcing functions of support and solidarity.31

The initial work on the anomie scale was conducted by Srole, but since the scale has been utilized in a number of studies. The responses again were arranged on a Likert-type scale.32 The anomie scale has been tested, modified and retested by Havens and Lipman in Colombia.33

The present investigation utilized the following form developed by the previously mentioned researchers:

1. Most public officials aren't interested in the problems of the average man.

2. These days a person doesn't really know in whom he may have confidence.
3. Nowadays a person has to live pretty much for today, and let tomorrow take care of itself.

4. In spite of what people say, the lot of the average man is getting worse, not better.

5. Most people don't care what happens to others.

Table 3 shows the results of the test for internal consistency as determined by the item-to-total score correlation coefficients. All coefficients were significant at .05 per cent level of significance.

The reliability of the anomie was also tested by means of the split-half procedure. A correlation coefficient of .564 was obtained when the Spearman-Brown prophecy formula was used. This is significant at the .01 level of significance.

Generalization IX: Nuclear families will have less interaction with kin than the extended families. This is not to say that the nuclear family does not maintain contact with a wide range of relatives but simply that the nuclear family has fewer contacts. The extended family is an intimate primary group. The individual maintains lifelong rather than discontinuous relationships with many kinmen.
TABLE 3
INTERNAL CONSISTENCY OF ITEMS IN THE ANOMIE SCALE IN BARRIO EL CARMEN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Coefficient of Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Most public officials are not interested in the problems of the average man.</td>
<td>.489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. These days a person does not really know in whom he may have confidence.</td>
<td>.355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Nowadays a person has to live pretty much for today and let tomorrow take care of itself.</td>
<td>.650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In spite of what people say, the lot of the average man is getting worse, not better.</td>
<td>.371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Most people do not care what happens to others.</td>
<td>.748</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A correlation of .191 and .250 is required for significance at the .05 and .01 levels, respectively.

Generalization X: The nuclear families will be significantly less likely to express desires to live elsewhere than the extended families. Even though the extended family may be made up of two or more generations, it still has strong ties with other relatives in the area of origin and desire to return.

Generalization XI: The nuclear families will know significantly more neighbors than the extended families.
The nuclear family virtually frees the individual from family ties and allows him to interact more with non-consanguineal and affinal kin.

Value Subsystem

The society needs certain..."general orienting principles." Value patterns do not simply force compliance upon the family, but there is an active interchange between the family and the value system. Problems, which may result from attempts to follow the societal values, may lead to modifications and change in the family value pattern. For instance let us consider an in-migrant from a nuclear family who is employed in industry instead of self-employed which he considers more desirable. His fellow workers may possess and espouse certain values which are contrary to his rural values. As a result, the in-migrant is exposed to a system which may try to motivate him to participate in labor unions, political parties, community action groups or other voluntary associations. On the other hand consider an in-migrant in an extended family. He is continually interacting with people of similar rural and regional values and receives reinforcement and consensus. Thus one would expect the nuclear family to adapt to the "new" value system more quickly than the extended family because the former received less reinforcement of the...
"old" value system via the kinship system. One study, however, showed that the kin group is important in resocializing the in-migrant to the "new" urban value system.35

Nevertheless, it is stated that a direct relationship exists between the type of family and the degree of functional interchange between the family and community. The generalization states that nuclear families, as distinguished from extended, will have a higher degree of commitment to the community value pattern.

An attempt to define value is more than an ample topic for a lengthy dissertation. In order to operationalize the concept, the present study refers to value as internalized conceptions of standards for behavior. A series of statements was elicited from migrant residents of Barrio El Restrepo in Bogotá concerning their values for their family, occupation, neighborhood, and country. The seven statements listed the most frequently were included in the interview schedule for Barrio El Carmen. The respondents were asked to make comparative judgments of the importance of the seven statements. The seven statements were presented in all possible pairs so that each individual made \(7(7-1)/2=21\) comparative judgments.
The seven statements were as follows:
1. Live like my grandparents.
2. To have a house.
3. Better possibility for work or a job.
4. To educate my children.
5. A peaceful country.
6. A world in which everyone lives well.
7. Free education for everyone.

Table 4 gives the F matrix or the frequency with which each column was judged more favorable than the row statement. The total number of comparative judgments for each pair of statements is 106, the number of respondents making the judgments.

As the table indicates, statement one was least important while at the opposite end statement seven was the most important. This ordering was termed the community value pattern.

In order to determine the degree to which the migrant families were in agreement with the community pattern, a commitment score was constructed. A respondents' answers were scored one for each pair of statements which agreed with the community pattern and a zero for each pair which did not agree. Thus if all a respondents answers corresponded to the community pattern he would receive a score of 21, the total number of comparative
judgments. If the respondent switched one pair of statements he would receive a 20, two pairs—a score of 19, etc.

TABLE 4

THE PM MATRIX FOR SEVEN STATEMENTS JUDGED BY 106 RESPONDENTS IN BARRIO EL CARMEN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The previous discussion in this chapter can perhaps best be summarized by utilizing Figure 2. The paradigm presents both the generalizations and measures.
FIGURE 2
A PARADIGM OF THE GENERALIZATIONS AND THEIR MEASUREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extended Family</th>
<th>ECONOMIC SUBSYSTEM</th>
<th>Nuclear Family</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>Family Income</td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home or Cottage</td>
<td>Place of Work</td>
<td>Company or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Occupational Status</td>
<td>Factory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independently</td>
<td></td>
<td>Industrial Wage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td></td>
<td>Laborer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLITY SUBSYSTEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMUNITY SUBSYSTEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Likely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VALUE SUBSYSTEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CHAPTER III
THE FINDINGS

In the first two chapters the problem has been defined, the setting described, the model set forth and applied to El Carmen, and the tools of the analysis explained. At this point, the results of the statistical computation are reported.

Economic Subsystem

The theoretical generalization set forth was that nuclear families will be more disproportionately represented in the stable, industrial, outside-barrio jobs than the extended units. The variables selected for testing this generalization were total family income, occupational status, and place of work. These variables were used in formulating and testing the following generalizations.

Generalization I: Nuclear families will have a significantly lower total family income than extended families. Both family types, extended and nuclear, have low family incomes. The extended family's income averages $26 a month, while the nuclear family's income averages
$24 a month. The chi-square value obtained is .02, which is less than the $3.84 required for significance at the five per cent level with one degree of freedom. Generalization I is not supported.

Generalization II: A significantly higher proportion of nuclear families than extended families will be employed outside the "barrio." The chi-square value is .33 which is less than the $3.84 required for significance at the five per cent level. Generalization II is not supported.

Generalization III: Nuclear families will have a significantly higher number of people employed in industrial labor pursuits than extended families. Only 19 per cent of the respondents are employed in industrial jobs. The chi-square value was .92 which is less than the $3.84 required for significance at the five per cent level with one degree of freedom. Generalization III was not supported.

The control variables, years of education, population size of area of origin, years of residence in Bogota, and years of residence in El Carmen, increased the chi-square in some instances but not significantly. (See Appendix I.) Thus, the statistical computations did not reveal any significant differences between the family types. Therefore, the theoretical generalization is rejected as the data give evidence that the
interchanges between the family and the economic sub-
system are independent of family type.

Polity Subsystem

The second theoretical generalization was that
nuclear families will have a higher degree of functional
interchange with the polity subsystem than extended
families. As shown in Figure II, the variables selected
to test these interchanges are: 1) voting participation,
2) knowledge of political figures, and 3) contact with
local political bosses.

The generalizations are as follows:
Generalization IV: Nuclear families will be signi-
ficantly more likely to vote than extended families.
Seventeen per cent of the respondents voted, but the chi-
square value of .06 is less than the 3.84 required for
significance at the five per cent level with one degree
of freedom. The generalization is rejected.
Generalization V: Nuclear families will know significantly
more political figures than the extended families. No
respondents knew three political figures. Only 45
per cent knew one or two, while 65 per cent couldn’t
identify even one. The chi-square value was .32, which
is less than the 3.84 required for significance at the
five per cent level with one degree of freedom. Again,
the generalization is rejected.
Generalization VI: **Nuclear families will have significantly more contact with political bosses than the extended families.** Only two per cent of the respondents claimed to have contact with local political leaders. Obviously, some cells in the chi-square analysis did not have sufficient frequencies to test the generalization.

Again the control variables increased the chi-square values, but not significantly. (See Appendix I.)

Therefore, the theoretical generalization is rejected as the data support the notion that the polity-family interchanges are independent of family types.

**Community Subsystem**

The third theoretical generalization states that a direct relationship exists between the types of family and the degree of functional interchange between the family and community.

Generalization VII: **Nuclear families will have a significantly higher identification score with the neighborhood than the extended families.** The data indicate that most respondents are only slightly identified with the barrio. The chi-square value between family types and identification is .08 which is less than the 3.84 required for significance at the five per cent level with one degree of freedom. Generalization VII is not supported.
Generalization VIII: Nuclear families will have a significantly higher anomie score than the extended families. Most of the families regardless of type are highly anomie. The average score was 21 with the highest possible score being 25. The chi-square value between family type and anomie is 1.79, which is less than the 3.84 which is required for significance at the five per cent level with one degree of freedom. Empirical generalization VIII is not supported.

Generalization IX: Nuclear families will have less interaction with kin than the extended families. Fifty-eight per cent of all the families interact with kin groups while 32 per cent did not visit kin. The chi-square value between family type and kin interaction is .67 which is less than 3.84 required for significance at the five per cent level with one degree of freedom. Thus, the difference between the family types with reference to visiting relatives can be attributed almost entirely to chance.

Generalization X: The nuclear families will be significantly less likely to express desires to live elsewhere than the extended families. The chi-square value is .16 which is less than the 3.84 required for significance at the five per cent level with one degree of freedom. Thus generalization X is rejected.
Generalization XI: The nuclear families will know significantly more neighbors than the extended families. Thirty-four per cent of the respondents did not know their neighbors while 56 per cent could identify them. The chi-square value between family types and knowing neighbors is .02 per cent, which is less than the 3.84 required for significance at the five per cent level with one degree of freedom. Generalization XI is not supported.

The four control variables increased some chi-square values but not significantly. (See Appendix I.)

As none of the variables are significant, the theoretical generalization is rejected. The data present evidence to suggest that there is no difference in degree of interchange between the community and the nuclear and extended in-migrant families.

Value Subsystem

The theoretical generalization states that a direct relationship exists between the type of family and the degree of functional interchange between the family and the community value system. Operationally, the generalization states that the nuclear families, as distinguished from extended, will have a higher degree of commitment to the community value pattern. The chi-square value is .25 which is less than the 3.84 required
for significance at the five per cent level with one
degree of freedom. Both family types possessed a high
degree of value commitment to the community value pattern.
Thus, generalization XII is rejected.

Again the control variables increased the chi-
square value slightly, but not significantly. (See
Appendix I.)

In summary, the analysis of data suggests that
the interchange between the family and the subsystem of
society are independent of family type.
CHAPTER IV

CASE STUDIES

The case studies in this chapter serve three purposes. First, the case materials are illustrations of the most prevalent family types. Secondly, the case records are offered as a partial check on the reliability of the survey results. Finally, the case materials are offered as aids for explaining the research findings.

The case studies were selected for their representativeness of the total sample with regard to the area of origin, age, migration motives, and length of residence in Bogota.

Another important consideration for selecting the particular families was the willingness of the people to cooperate. As many as three days were spent on each case study. A large amount of data was obtained, but only data relating to the generalizations set forth in the theory chapter are reported in the following pages. A supplementary questionnaire was used to guide the gathering of the information. This information was then
combined with the data secured from the general survey of the family and additional information provided by the priest. All case studies were made in May 1965.

Case Study Number 1

José J. Castellano's family is an example of a collateral extension of an in-migrant extended family from the State of Boyacá. The family migrated to Bogotá eleven years ago and moved to Barrio El Carmen to live with relatives a year and a half ago.

José's family lives in a tenement house which they share with his brother's family. José and his wife have seven children, all of which live at home. The children range in age from 11 years to 16 months. In addition, a single brother-in-law and a sister-in-law, whose husband has deserted her, live in the house.

The four-roomed house is brick with board floors and a tile roof. The in-laws and blood kin pay for two-thirds of the rent, and José pays the other third. The house has a water spicket in the patio and electricity, but no latrine. All services are used and paid for jointly by the household as is the kitchen. The kin group owns the electric iron jointly, but other appliances such as radios, clocks, etc. are owned separately. The closeness, crowding of the household and sharing of facilities makes for much interaction and reinforces the extended family.
José is the undisputed head of his nuclear unit. All the important decisions are made by him. If he spends too much money while drinking with his cronies, nothing is said. He always eats first, and often if there is any meat he will eat it all. He has nothing to do with the children. Jose's wife's role is keeping house, caring for the children, and taking a warm lunch to her husband. In order to accomplish the latter task, she must ride a crowded bus across town.

Although both José and his wife are older than the other relatives in the house, they do not exert influence over their decisions. The bonds between the relatives are strong, but also the relationship is an economic necessity because of the rent.

**Economic Subsystem**

José is a filling station attendant in the center of the city. His monthly wage averages about $21 which is less than the average for the community. Both the brother and the brother-in-law work for Avianca, the national airlines, loading and unloading trucks. According to the priest, the sister-in-law, whose husband deserted her, works as a prostitute. Each of these nuclear units also has a lower family income than neighborhood average. They do not pool their incomes nor participate jointly in such economic activities as the
purchasing of food. Occasionally, however, the single members of the extended family loan money to the other members.

Thus, Jose's family does not support the generalizations concerning the relationship between the extended family and the economic subsystem set forth in Chapter II. Most of the family members are employed outside the house which is contrary to the cottage type industry predicted, and none of the family members except the sister-in-law are independently employed.

Polity Subsystem

Jose has never attended any community action meeting. Neither he nor the other family members belong to any political organizations. They do not know who the *camonales* are and could not name the mayor of Bogotá, their state representatives, nor the area representative to the city council. None of the men voted in the last election. All of this data support the generalization concerning the polity subsystem extended family interchange.

Community Subsystem

The family members are about average in their identification with Barrio El Carmen and in their anomie score. The informal discussions with them seemed to substantiate this finding.
Jose's spends his free hours with his small group of friends, eight men from Boyaca, of whom four are relatives from his hometown. Another of these men is a godfather to Jose's children. The group's entertainment consists of late Saturday afternoon and evening drinking bouts in a local canteen and usually a game of *tejo* with an occasional bet. He also knows all of his neighbors, and occasionally he talks and drinks with them.

Mrs. Castellano's social participation is more varied. She visits the school occasionally and receives service regularly from the health center in the *barrio*. Her most significant interaction is with a sister and a friend in the *barrio* in which she previously lived.

The other relatives in the house also have friends and relatives in the neighborhood. These family members indicate that their social participation in community affairs is approximately what it was before in the rural area with one exception, the church. Also they have developed *confianza* with a few new friends all from their native state. Some of these are godparents to their children. This has in effect extended the family membership to include several non-blood kin. The bulk of the interaction outside the household is with these people and relatives in a neighboring *barrio*. 
Both Castellano and his wife are relatively satisfied in El Carmen, certainly more so than if they were in Boyacá. Their present home is better than the one in which they previously lived in Boyacá. It is also an improvement over their previous house in Barrio Claret which lacked water and had a dirt floor. Nevertheless, they still would like to live in another area of the city where the rent is even lower and closer to Jose's work because of transportation costs. Also they highly despise the muddy streets in the winter time.

Values Subsystem

The family places the highest value on a free education for everyone. Jose says without a good education it is impossible to earn a living. He is quick to point out the fact that it is impossible for him to provide adequate education for his children because of the expense. As a consequence, he places higher values on a peaceful country and living well than on educating his children.

The reason for such a high value on stopping the violence is quite obvious. In 1954, during the violence, Jose's crops were burned, which was the primary motivating force in his migration. Also his brother was decapitated in a raid on a bus in rural Boyacá. His wife also has a brother who lost an arm in the violence.
Mr. Castellano places lower values on owning a home and securing a better job. He is quite a realist and knows that both are impossible given his financial status and educational level.

Case Study Number 2

The Florentino Parra family is a nuclear immigrant family from the state of Cundinamarca. Three years ago, Florentino moved to Bogotá from Santa, Cundinamarca, an agricultural village with a population of 470. He left his family behind to manage the farm and went by bus to Bogotá. As Parra had no relatives or friends in Bogotá, a godfather provided him shelter and helped him look for employment. As soon as Florentino became established in his new job, he sent for his wife and children.

**Economic Subsystem**

Florentino is in better financial position than most of the families in the neighborhood. He and his family own the four-room house in which they live. Parra earns about $35 per month, which is $10 above the average salary. In addition, the oldest son, Joaquin, works as a semi-skilled industrial laborer and earns about $30 a month. The next oldest is also a son, Eduardo, who is nineteen years old and works as a hod carrier.
Florentino's godfather obtained the job for Eduardo in his brick mason's trade. Both boys contribute money to the family and help send their sister to secondary school. The younger daughter is currently in the first grade in the barrio. Thus, Florentino's wife, does not work outside the home.

**Polity**

Parra feels that politicians are more dangerous in the city than in the countryside and the political arguments are sharper. For this reason, Parra has no contact with local political bosses nor can identify any local, state, or city political figures. He did not vote in the last election.

**Community Subsystem**

Florentino spends most of his free time at home. He occasionally listens to soccer games and bicycle races on the radio. He is a moderate drinker and has an occasional shot of whiskey at home. Parra is very suspicious of city people and has never developed a trusted friendship with anyone in El Carmen. As this data suggests, Parra does not identify with the neighborhood, but at the same time, he is less anomic than the average person. Perhaps his relative low level of anomie is due to the solvent economic position of the family.
Florentino's visiting patterns are mostly limited to his godfather which he visits about twice a month. Although Parra knows most of his neighbors, he seldom drinks or talks with them. Ines often visits her cousin and niece both of whom live in the barrio.

Regardless of his reservation about the trust-worthiness of city people, Florentino still prefers the city to the country. Neither he nor any of his family members wish to live elsewhere. Parra feels that his house and income are greatly improved even though his meals contain less meat. He has less friends now than in the country, but is willing to sacrifice this for his children's education. Mrs. Parra is also satisfied with city life mostly because of the increased services such as water, lights, and electrical appliances. The children also prefer the city to the country and are the most satisfied.

**Value Subsystem**

Mr. Parra deviates from the value pattern of the barrio to some extent (See Table 4). Florentino values free education for everyone and believes everyone should live well. Closely behind he ranks educating his children and a peaceful country. However, at this point his values vary considerably from the community pattern. Florentino
emphasizes living like one's grandparents, particularly in the sphere of religion. In the remaining two categories, he places owning a home and a better possibility for work.

Case Study Number 3

The Rafael Herrera family is an example of a nuclear in-migrant family from the state of Boyacá. In 1957, during the political violence, Rafael left his family behind in Turmique, Boyacá, and set out for Bogotá in search of employment. Some relatives and friends in Bogota helped him find a boarding house in which to live. After a week he rented a room in a tenement house and returned for his family. Today, the Herrera family offers some help to newly arriving friends and relatives, usually in the form of meals. They cannot, however, put them up in their one room or give them financial assistance because they are too poor.

The Herrera family shares the house with two other families, each of whom rents a room. One family from the state of Tolima has eight family members. They live in the front of the house next to the street and operate a small general store in another front room. The other family is from the state of Boyacá near Turmique and has eight family members. Thus, 26 people live in three rooms, as the other room is a kitchen.
All services are communal, but the services are paid separately by each family. The communal service facilitates some interaction between the families, but the relationship is not a strong friendship. The families go to their own rooms and do not visit each other. They "do not like to meddle in other people's lives."

Rafael and his wife, Etelvina, have been married 15 years and have eight children living and three dead. The children range in age from 15 years to three months, all of which live at home. Five of the children are girls, and three are boys.

Economic Subsystem

Rafael is a furniture maker and works for another man who owns a furniture shop. They are not close friends but get along fine. The only other person who works in the shop is Rafael's oldest son, an apprentice. Rafael earns $40 to $50 monthly; however, some months when business is poor he only earns $15. Regardless of the business situation, he usually makes more money than the average salary for barrio.

Polity Subsystem

Herrera does not belong to a union because the shop in which he works is too small for union organization. He thinks unions are good and would join if he worked in a factory. He belongs to a political party and is quite
active. Rafael is one of the few individuals in the study who would admit having contact with the camonales. In addition he voted in the last election and could give the correct names of the mayor of Bogotá plus a congressman.

**Community Subsystem**

The Herrera family is highly anomic and has low identification with the barrio. Even though the Herrera family has had many problems in Bogotá, they do not care to return to the country. They would like to live in another part of the city closer to the central business district and have a garden. They believe that the opportunity to educate the children is worth more than the inconvenience of city life.

Regardless of their place of residence, the family is still dissatisfied with the expenses of city life. Rafael says, "In the city I see everything which I want to buy but can’t buy. I earn more money, but then it costs more to live."

Rafael has about ten friends in the barrio, four from the state of Boyacá, and the others from the states of Tolima and Santander. Four of the men from Boyacá are cousins another is a brother-in-law. Occasionally, they play *tejo* and buy a case of beer. Etelvina visits one sister in the barrio and two other relatives
in other parts of the city. The only person who visits them frequently is the children's godfather, a store-keeper, who lives in the neighborhood. Occasionally when finances are low, this godfather extends the family credit for buying groceries. Otherwise they cannot borrow because their relatives do not possess adequate financial reserves to loan.

Values Subsystem

The Herrera family also deviates from the community value pattern. They place higher emphasis on educating the children and owning property than most people. When Rafael and Etelvina were asked what they would do with $5000 if they had it, they both replied that they would buy a house and equip a furniture shop for Rafael.

Summary

The case studies in this chapter were presented as illustrations of the most prevalent family types and as a partial reliability check on the survey data. The case study observations agree with the theoretical generalizations in only 50 per cent of the incidents. (See Table 5.) Thus, the case studies indicate that adaptation of the rural migrant to the urban society
of Bogota is independent of family type and support the findings obtained by the larger survey.

The case studies further indicate that perhaps the concepts of nuclear and extended families as they are operationalized in the present study are not social meaningful categories. The case studies suggest that perhaps some version of the extended family may be the basic social unit common to this shantytown neighborhood. Visiting patterns tend to occur among kin groups of the same or different barrios rather than among neighbors. Also new kin groups are created within the city by the appointment of godparents which may either reinforce the existing family or extend it by the incorporation of non-kin.
### TABLE 5

**CONGRUENCY BETWEEN THE THEORETICAL GENERALIZATIONS AND THE CASE STUDY OBSERVATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theoretical Generalizations</th>
<th>Case Study Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Congruent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic subsystem</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Family income</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Place of work</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III Occupational status</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Polity subsystem</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV Knowledge of political figures</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V Vote</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI Contact with local bosses</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community subsystem</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII Identification</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII Anomie</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX Kin interaction</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Desire to live elsewhere</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI Knowing Neighbors</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Value subsystem</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII Community value pattern</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The general orientation of this study has been an attempt to determine if the functional interchanges between the in-migrant families and the subsystems of society vary by family type. In other words, the study is an examination of the differences between the nuclear and extended families in their participation in the economic, polity, community, and value subsystems of Bogota.

In order to test the generalizations set forth in the study, data were collected on in-migrant families in one Shantytown, El Carmen. El Carmen is a workers' neighborhood which was settled by land invasion. The barrio has become permanent with expropriation and improvement of land and services. Both the public and community services, however, are still poor. The inquiry disclosed that more than one-half of the dwellings lacked bathrooms while others lacked sewage, water, electricity, and laundry facilities and services. Most of the population live in a one-room shack or in a rented room in a tenement house.
Summary

The generalizations that family-economy, family-polity, family-community, and family-value interchanges vary with family type were rejected. Thus, research findings do not document the theoretical proposition that differences exist between nuclear and extended in-migrant families in their adaptation to the urban society of Bogotá. The major influence which may be drawn from the findings is that in Barrio El Carmen the functional interchanges between the sub-systems of the urban society are independent of family type as defined in this study.

Conclusions

The foregoing inference must be viewed with caution. At least three factors in the present study limit the legitimacy of the inference. First, the data may be unreliable. Second, the method of defining family types may be inadequate. Third, the Bell and Vogel model may not adequately represent the phenomena.

In relation to the first point, available evidence indicates that the research data are reliable. A partial reliability check was obtained from the membership records of the Catholic Church in the barrio. The local priest made available detailed church records on 25 families who were both church members and
respondents in the present study. Basic data on each family member such as age, sex, education, length of residence in Bogotá, area of origin, income, and marital status were compared. The comparison indicated the responses to these items matched 95 per cent of the time. The greatest discrepancy appeared in response to marital status. More couples reported being married in the present study than in the church records. Also the monthly family figures tended to vary within a $5 range.

The validity of the attitudinal scale may be challenged; however, statistically the scales were reliable and internally consistent. Also, as noted by Havens, some respondents experienced difficulty making distinctions on a five point Likert-type scale. Future research should probably rely more heavily on direct questions and less on attitudinal scales.

In relation to the second point, inadequate operationalization of the concepts, nuclear family and extended family, might have produced invalid results. The present study was relying heavily on the actual place of residence to determine family type. This seemed reasonable in the face of Johnson's statement that...
"taking into account both rules of residence and forms
of marriage, we can classify families according to a typology. In essence, the present study termed any neolocal grouping composed of no more than a man and woman and their children as nuclear.

This approach obviously ignores the factor of kinship bonds in delineating family types and does not determine the extent to which traditional family consciousness is maintained separate from residence. Future research should determine the extent to which a relationship, if any, exists between type of household and type of family before using household as a criterion for differentiation of family type.

Perhaps a more valid method of establishing family types, quite apart from the fact of residential togetherness or lack of it, is how people perceive the composition of their families, whom they include and whom they exclude. Or perhaps, a familism scale such as the one developed by Panos D. Bardis could be employed. This scale gives separate scores for nuclear family integration and extended family integration. Thus, either of these methods would provide a more valid criterion for establishing family structure than type of household.

Thirdly, the Bell and Vogel model as applied in the present study may not fit the phenomena.
criteria for dividing migrant families into the dichotomous categories of nuclear and extended may be an oversimplification of the situation. Nuclear-extended family difference may occur in relative degrees in a range extending between the two polar extremes of nuclear and extended. The characteristics of one shade or blend into those of the other as the observer moves from the core area of either.

Perhaps most of the migrant families in the present study occupy a similar point on the continuum and possess both extended and nuclear family characteristics. Thus the hypotheses concerning differences between family types would not apply. The data in the case studies and survey questionnaire seem to support this as an explanation for the negative findings in the study.

The case studies, although few in number and limited in generality, indicate that the nuclear family has extended bonds in the urban society. Also other general data in the questionnaire lend support to this serendipitous finding.5

Only 26 per cent of the families had no kin in Bogotá when they migrated and only 8 per cent had neither kin nor friends. The kin gave a great deal of assistance to the in-migrants such as paying for the transportation
of the migrants, securing employment, and securing temporary housing. Most of the migrants became acquainted with Bogotá and the barrio through a relative.

There is also every indication that new kin groups are created within the city by the appointment of godparents. The majority of the families had selected godparents for their children. Almost all of these people were from Bogotá and were friends, bosses, or relatives. A large percentage of these people lived in the same barrio or in neighboring barrios. Approximately 20 per cent of the families had received some form of aid from the godparents.

In addition, visiting tended to occur among kin-groups of the same or different barrios rather than among neighbors. Fifty-eight per cent of the families visited kin with regular frequency. These figures are probably very conservative because the respondents did not consider casual conversation over the backyard fence or meetings in bars as visits.

A further indicator of the strength of extended family ties was obtained by asking the respondents if they would prefer to live in another part of the city or Colombia. If they answered in the affirmative, the reason most listed was to live closer to relatives. If
they responded in the negative, again the most often given answer was because they did not wish to leave family and friends.

The point may not be that the extended family or a "modified extended family" is indefinitely preserved or precisely duplicated in the city, but rather the utilization and adaptation of the extended family is a requirement rather than a functional alternative given the near-absence of other mechanisms for the rapid assimilation of the migrant families into the urban society.  

Future research should investigate the possibility that migrant families are highly functionally autonomous.  

Functional autonomy is the ability of the migrant family to survive separate from the urban societal system. The Colombian urban system preserves the spirit of face to face relations to secure goods and other needs. This nepotism does not favor the organization of common interest groups or cooperative groups, and power is usually delegated downward rather than upward. Migrant families fit easily into this situation, for they do not know either how to obtain their legal rights or how to operate successfully even in the lower echelons of the power and influence structure. In addition, the migrants lack the education
and the skills necessary to participate in the societal subsystem as more than marginal individuals. As a result, the migrant families may have adapted and utilized the rural extended family institution in the urban setting to satisfy their needs which other subsystems cannot and do not provide. This conjecture, however, awaits future research.
Footnotes


# TABLE 6

CHI-SQUARE VALUES BETWEEN EACH VARIABLE AND FAMILY TYPE WITH CONTROL FOR LENGTH OF RESIDENCE IN BOGOTA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Chi-Square Values</th>
<th>Chi-Square Values&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non Control</td>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Six Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Family Income</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Place of Work</td>
<td>.920</td>
<td>1.272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Occupational Status</td>
<td>.330</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Knowledge of Political Leaders</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Vote in Last Election</td>
<td>.324</td>
<td>.236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Contact with Local Bosses</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Identification with barrio</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Anomie</td>
<td>1.787</td>
<td>.408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Kin Interaction</td>
<td>.672</td>
<td>.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Desire to Live Elsewhere</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Knowing One's Neighbors</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Commitment to Value Pattern</td>
<td>.247</td>
<td>.206</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>A chi-square value of 3.84 is required for significance at the .05 level with one degree of freedom.

<sup>b</sup>Control variable, length of residence in Bogota, was divided at the median.

<sup>c</sup>Cell frequencies were too low for calculation of chi-square value.

<sup>d</sup>Cell frequencies were too low for calculation of chi-square value.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Chi-Square Values</th>
<th>Chi-Square Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non Control</td>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Two Years More Than</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Family Income</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>1.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Place of Work</td>
<td>.920</td>
<td>2.293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Occupational Status</td>
<td>.330</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Knowledge of Political Leaders</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Vote in Last Election</td>
<td>.324</td>
<td>.457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Contact with Local Bosses</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Identification with barrio</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Anomie</td>
<td>1.787</td>
<td>2.204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Kin Interaction</td>
<td>.672</td>
<td>1.360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Desire to Live Elsewhere</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>.487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Knowing One's Neighbors</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Commitment to Value Patterns</td>
<td>.247</td>
<td>.570</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ a \] A chi-square value of 3.84 is required for significance at the .05 level with one degree of freedom.

\[ b \] Control variable, educational level, was divided at median.

\[ c \] Cell frequencies were too low for calculation of chi-square value.
Table 8

Chi-Square Values Between Each Variable and Family Type with Control for Length of Residence in El Carmen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Chi-Square Values</th>
<th>Chi-Square Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non Control</td>
<td>Two Years or Less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Family Income</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Place of Work</td>
<td>.920</td>
<td>2.501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Occupational Status</td>
<td>.330</td>
<td>.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Knowledge of Political Leaders</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Vote in Last Election</td>
<td>.324</td>
<td>.423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Contact with Local Bosses</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Identification with barrio</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Anomie</td>
<td>1.787</td>
<td>1.564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Kin Interaction</td>
<td>.672</td>
<td>1.886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Desire to live elsewhere</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Knowing One's Neighbors</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Commitment to Value Patterns</td>
<td>.247</td>
<td>.259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^A chi-square value of 3.84 is required for significance at the .05 level with one degree of freedom.

^b Control variable, length of residence in El Carmen, was divided at median.

^c Cell frequencies were too low for calculation of chi-square value.
TABLE 9

CHI-SQUARE VALUES BETWEEN EACH VARIABLE AND FAMILY TYPE WITH CONTROL FOR POPULATION SIZE OF AREA OF ORIGIN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Chi-Square Values</th>
<th>Chi-Square Values&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non Control</td>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of 2,000</td>
<td>of more than 2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Family Income</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Place of Work</td>
<td>.920</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Occupational Status</td>
<td>.330</td>
<td>.571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Knowledge of Political Leaders</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>3.452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Vote in Last Election</td>
<td>.324</td>
<td>2.307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Contact with Local Bosses</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Identification with barrio</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Anomie</td>
<td>1.787</td>
<td>2.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Kin Interaction</td>
<td>.672</td>
<td>2.310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Desire to Live Elsewhere</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>1.157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Knowing One's Neighbors</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Commitment to Value Patterns</td>
<td>.247</td>
<td>.317</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>A chi-square value of 3.84 is required for significance at the .05 level with one degree of freedom.

<sup>b</sup>Control variable, population size of area of origin, was divided at median.

<sup>c</sup>Cell frequencies were too low for calculation of chi-square value.
APPENDIX B
ESTUDIO DE BARRIO EL CARMEN
(Estrictamente Confidencial)

UNIVERSIDAD NACIONAL DE COLOMBIA
FACULTAD DE SOCIOLOGÍA, BOGOTÁ

Nombre del Jefe ____________________________

Dirección ____________________________ Barrio ____________

No. Código ____________ Entrevistador ______________________

Fecha ______________ Duración de la entrevista ______

Hora de iniciación ______ Hora en que terminó ______

Revisado por __________________________ Fecha ______________

Observaciones: __________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Persona entrevistada _________________________________
I. CENSO DE PERSONAS QUE VIVEN EN LA CASA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personas que viven en la casa</th>
<th>Estado Civil</th>
<th>LUGAR DE NACIMIENTO</th>
<th>Ocupación</th>
<th>Salario Aproximado</th>
<th>Otras ocupaciones y fuentes de ingreso</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jefe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esposa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otros:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ (S) Soltero; (C) Casado; (V) Viudo; (UL) Unido Libre

Hijos independientes, que no viven en la casa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hijos independientes</th>
<th>Sexo</th>
<th>Edad actual</th>
<th>Años Aprobados Escuela</th>
<th>Lugar de Nacimiento</th>
<th>Lugar de Residencia</th>
<th>Otros lugares en donde haya vivido (en orden)</th>
<th>Año en que dejó la familia</th>
<th>Motivo de Salida</th>
<th>Estado Civil cuando salió</th>
<th>Cómo salió?</th>
<th>Otra Expli- can</th>
<th>Ocupación</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Número de matrimonios del Jefe
### NUMERO DE FAMILIAS QUE HABITAN LA MISMA CASA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Otras Familias</th>
<th>Número de Miembros</th>
<th>Cuánto tiempo hace que está en Bogotá</th>
<th>Lugar de Origen</th>
<th>Relación con la familia entrevistada</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Familia 1a.**

**Familia 2a.**

**Familia 3a.**

**Familia 4a.**

**Familia 5a.**

**Familia 6a.**

**Familia 7a.**

**Familia 8a.**

---

### II. MIGRACION

1. a. Cuánto tiempo ha vivido la familia:
   1) en esta casa __________________________
   2) en Bogotá ____________________________

   b. Cuánto tiempo ha vivido el jefe:
   1) en Bogotá ____________________________

2. a. Sitios de residencia antes de venir a Bogotá: (en orden)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lugar</th>
<th>Depto.</th>
<th>Tiempo Estadía</th>
<th>Motivo salida</th>
<th>Ocupación antes de llegar a Bogotá</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) (Lugar de nacim.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Barrios donde ha vivido en Bogotá:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nombre</th>
<th>Tiempo Permanencia</th>
<th>Motivo salida</th>
<th>Ocupación</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. a. Cómo supo Ud. de Bogotá? ________________________________

b. De este barrio? ________________________________

4. Cuando el jefe llegó a Bogotá, llegó solo o con otros?

Solo ( ); Con otros ( ). Quiénes? (Indique parentesco)
5. Donde quién llegó? Familiares ( ); Paisanos ( ); 
   Casa independiente ( ); Otros (Explicar) ________

6. a. Si llegó solo, estaba casado? Sí ( ); No ( ).
   En caso afirmativo, cuándo vino la familia a Bogotá?

   b. Por qué no vino la familia con el jefe? ________

7. a. Si no estaba casado, cuándo se casó? (Fecha)

   b. Cómo conoció a su esposa? ______________________

   c. De dónde es ella? ______________________________

8. a. Ud. tenía parientes que vivían en Bogotá antes Ud. 
   llegar? Sí ( ); No ( ). Quiénes?

   b. Ellos le ayudaron para trasladarse? Sí ( );
   No ( ). En qué forma? __________________________

9. a. Ud. tenía amigos que vivían en Bogotá antes de Ud. 
   llegar? Sí ( ); No ( ). Cuáles ocupaciones 
   tenían ellos? ________________________________
b. Ellos le ayudaron para trasladarse? Sí ( ); 
No ( ). En qué forma? ______________________

10. Qué trajo con Ud. cuando vino? 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cuántos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dinero
Herramientas
Ropa
Animales
Otros (especifique) ______________________

III. PROPIEDAD

1. Posee casa?
   a) Propia ( )
   b) Arrendada ( )
   c) Inquilinato colectivo ( )

2. Qué otras propiedades posee? ______________________

IV. COMUNICACION

1. Tiene radio? Sí ( ); No ( ).
2. Lee periódicos? Sí ( ); No ( ). 3. Cuáles?
4. Con qué frecuencia? ______________________
5. Asiste a reuniones? Sí ( ); No ( ).

6. A qué reuniones? ____________________________________________

7. Con qué frecuencia? ____________________________________________

8. En los últimos 3 meses ha recibido cartas? Sí ( ); No ( ).


11. Cuántas? ______

12. A qué pueblos va Ud.? ______________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pueblos</th>
<th>Frecuencia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Por qué otro medio se entera Ud. de las noticias? ______________________________

14. Con qué familias se visita Ud. en este barrio y otros barrios?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Familia</th>
<th>Relación</th>
<th>Lugar</th>
<th>Con qué frecuencia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. Quiénes son sus padrinos?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nombres</th>
<th>Parentesco</th>
<th>Donde viven</th>
<th>Recibe ayuda de ellos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jefe:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esposa:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. ACTITUDES

Hay aquí algunas afirmaciones que otras personas han hecho:

Está Ud.: 1) Totalmente de acuerdo (TA)
2) De acuerdo (DA)
3) Indeciso (I)
4) En desacuerdo (ED)
5) Totalmente en desacuerdo (TD)

1. A la mayor parte de la gente del gobierno no les interesan los problemas

2. Hoy en día no se sabe en quién se puede tener confianza

3. Hoy la gente debe preocuparse por lo de hoy y dejar para mañana lo de mañana
4. A pesar de lo que dice la gente, la situación está empeorando y no mejorando

5. La mayor parte de la gente es indiferente a lo que pasa a los demás

6. Creo que soy algo importante en mi barrio

7. Se debe trabajar por el mejoramiento de este barrio

8. Estoy contento de vivir en este barrio

9. No me importan los problemas de este barrio

10. Este barrio me importa únicamente para vivir

11. Estoy muy contento y convencido que vendrán cosas buenas para este barrio

12. No me siento actualmente como miembro de este barrio

13. Me siento contento diciendo que vivo en este barrio

VI. PARTICIPACIÓN EN ACTIVIDADES COMUNALES

1. En qué actividades ha participado Ud.?

En qué forma:

Dinero Trab. Ideas Eleme. Otra forma

a) 

b) 

c) 

d)
2. Ha visitado Ud.:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sí</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Frecuencia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Centro de salud</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Iglesia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Escuela y maestros</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Directorios políticos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Acción Comunal (Junta)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) CARITAS (Explicarlo)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Quiénes son los representantes al Concejo de Bogotá?  
   a)  
   b)  
   c)  

4. Quiénes son los representantes a la Asamblea de Cundinamarca?  
   a)  
   b)  
   c)  

5. Quién es el Gobernador de Cundinamarca?  

6. Quién es el Alcalde de Bogotá?  

7. Ud. votó en las elecciones pasadas? (15 de mayo)  
   Sí ( );  No ( )
VII. ADAPTACION

1. Actualmente qué le agrada más:
   El campo ( ); La ciudad ( )

2. En comparación con su lugar de origen Ud. tiene:
   Más amigos ( ); Igual número de amigos ( );
   Menos amigos ( )

3. En comparación con el lugar anterior de residencia está Ud.:
   Más ( ); Menos ( ); Igual ( ) satisfecho aquí?
   Su esposa: Más ( ); Menos ( ); Igual ( ) satisfecha?
   Sus hijos: Más ( ); Menos ( ); Igual ( ) satisfechos?
   La casa es: Mejor ( ); Igual ( ); Peor ( )

4. Le gustaría más vivir en un barrio u otra parte del país diferente a éste? Sí ( ); No ( )
   (Si positivo) Qué barrio u otra parte del país?

   Por qué? ________________________________

   ________________________________

5. Conoce sus vecinos? Sí ( ); No ( )

VIII. VALOR SOCIAL

De las siguientes alternativas, cuál cree Ud. es más importante?

1. a. Tener casa propia
    b. Educar a sus hijos

2. a. Educar a sus hijos
    b. Vivir como sus antepasados

3. a. Que la educación sea gratuita para todos
    b. Que todo el mundo pueda vivir bien
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5. | a. Un país pacífico  
    b. Que todo el mundo pueda vivir bien |   |
| 6. | a. Vivir como sus antepasados  
    b. Un país pacífico |   |
| 7. | a. Tener casa propia  
    b. Mejores posibilidades para trabajar |   |
| 8. | a. Educar a sus hijos  
    b. Mejores posibilidades para trabajar |   |
| 9. | a. Vivir como sus antepasados  
    b. Que la educación sea gratuita para todos |   |
| 10. | a. Mejores posibilidades para trabajar  
    b. Un país pacífico |   |
| 11. | a. Tener casa propia  
    b. Un país pacífico |   |
| 12. | a. Mejores posibilidades para trabajar  
    b. Que la educación sea gratuita para todos |   |
| 13. | a. Tener casa propia  
    b. Que la educación sea gratuita para todos |   |
| 14. | a. Educar a sus hijos  
    b. Un país pacífico |   |
| 15. | a. Vivir como sus antepasados  
    b. Mejores posibilidades para trabajar |   |
| 16. | a. Educar a sus hijos  
    b. Que la educación sea gratuita para todos |   |
| 17. | a. Vivir como sus antepasados  
    b. Que todo el mundo pueda vivir bien |   |
| 18. | a. Mejores posibilidades para trabajar  
    b. Que todo el mundo pueda vivir bien |   |
| 19. | a. Tener casa propia  
    b. Que todo el mundo pueda vivir bien |   |
| 20. | a. Educar a sus hijos  
    b. Que todo el mundo pueda vivir bien |   |
| 21. | a. Un país pacífico  
    b. Que la educación sea gratuita para todos |   |
MAP I
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