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Using data from the 1990 Panel Study of Income Dynamics Latino Sample, this study examines three competing hypotheses for understanding extended family living among Mexican, Puerto Rican and Cuban immigrants. The findings indicate no significant relationship between living with extended kin and cultural indicators – such as English fluency – or economic factors – such as employment and income. Rather, the data support a life course explanation. Extended family living arrangements among Latino immigrants represent a resource generating strategy for caring for young children and older adults. Differences in age, relative location in the life course, and migration opportunities inform group variation in extended living arrangements for Mexican, Puerto Rican and Cuban immigrants. These findings verify patterns of household composition among Latino immigrants suggested by nonrandom, ethnographic samples.

Although much of the extant literature on Latino immigrants has dealt with the importance of family networks in the immigration process (Massey et al., 1987; Portes and Bach, 1985; Tienda, 1980), research on the living arrangements of these migrants remains scant and inconclusive. Two competing hypotheses dominate research on the household composition of Latinos. One such hypothesis suggests that cultural values are the most salient determinants of living arrangements among Latinos (Burr and Mutchler, 1993; Perez, 1986; Tienda and Angel, 1982; Tienda and Glass, 1985). The second hypothesis maintains that structural factors, such as economic standing, are more important in determining the living arrangements for this population (Baca Zinn, 1994, 1995; Sanders and Nee, 1996; Vega, 1995). There exists some support for both hypotheses. However, findings regarding the impact of cultural and economic parameters on the living arrangements of Latino
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immigrants remain contradictory and poorly understood. Scholars also have recognized a need for comparative studies of Latino immigrants, as different Latino groups experience distinct social, political and historical circumstances (Massey, 1995; Portes and Bach, 1985; Vega, 1995).

This study examines the effects of cultural and economic factors on the living arrangements of Mexican, Puerto Rican and Cuban immigrants. It also addresses the importance of the life-course stages and events for fully understanding the household patterns of Latino immigrants, examining the relationship between specific life-course events, and household composition.

**THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

There is a sizable literature on the importance of family networks among Latino immigrants. Research emphasizes that family networks play an important role in the adaptation, settlement, and living arrangements of these immigrants (Howe, 1976; Portes and Bach, 1985; Smith, 1985; U.S. Immigration Commission, 1911; Palerm, 1991; Tienda, 1980; Chavez, 1990, 1992). Social and economic support from family and geographical proximity also signify the importance of "familism" among Latinos (Hurtado, 1995). The cultural perspective asserts that an emphasis on familism derives from Latino cultural traditions of the past (Baca Zinn, 1994). Extended family households reflect social and cultural norms which encourage attachment and participation of nonnuclear kin (Tienda and Angel, 1982; Tienda and Glass, 1985).

According to this cultural perspective, less acculturated Latinos are likely to display a preference for extended households, while more acculturated Latinos are more apt to live in nuclear family arrangements. Researchers, however, are critical of such an approach. Family formation patterns of immigrants often differ from those of individuals in the homeland and thus do not necessarily represent an accurate baseline for examining effects of cultural assimilation across generations (Landale, 1994). Also, the experiences of Latino groups vary according to demographic characteristics. Perez (1986) attributes the high degree of retention of Cuban culture among Cuban immigrants partly to the older age of the population. There is also evidence that the availability of economic resources makes it possible for Latinos who prefer extended living arrangements to realize this preference, despite high levels of acculturation (Keefe and Padilla, 1987; Griffith and Villavicencio, 1985). Other studies demonstrate that cultural factors influence Latinos’ preference for extended living even after controlling for economic standing (Tienda and Angel, 1982; Burr and Mutchler, 1993).

In contrast to the cultural hypothesis, the structural perspective contends that family characteristics of Hispanics represent a response to socioeconomic conditions (Vega, 1990). Griswold del Castillo (1984) notes in a historical
study that Mexican American families have always been flexible and adaptive to the structural constraints imposed upon them in the United States. The relatively large size of Latino households is, at best, a resource generating strategy aimed at correcting differential access to economic resources – which disadvantaged minority groups, Latino or otherwise, tend to experience (Stapples and Mirande, 1981; Bean and Tienda, 1987; Bianchi, 1980; Ross and Sawhill, 1975). An increasingly bifurcated labor market, racial discrimination, legal status, and low levels of education and English fluency make it difficult for Latino immigrants to find high paying jobs in the primary labor sector (Portes and Bach, 1985; Massey, 1995). Sharing housing with extended kin reduces living costs and promotes accumulation of capital for entrepreneurial business (Chavez, 1992; Sanders and Nee, 1996). Having other adults in the household can provide a source of labor for a family enterprise (Sanders and Nee, 1996). Extension can also provide a temporary solution to economic hardship and unemployment immediately following divorce (Tienda and Glass, 1985).

Based on the structural perspective, a relationship should exist between economic resources and household arrangements. Immigrants with greater resources – such as employment and personal or spousal income – should be less likely to reside with extended family because they can afford independent housing. However, differences in education levels, employment participation, the rate of single parenting, and legal status among Mexican, Puerto Rican and Cuban immigrants suggest that the effect of economic resources on living arrangements may vary by group.

A third explanation suggests that the living arrangements of Latino immigrants parallel life-course stages and events, which reflect shifting levels of dependence, economic need and desire for privacy within the household (Massey et al., 1987). Young, single, adult immigrants should be as likely to live with other adults or families as they are not apt to have developed the work experience necessary for economic independence and have yet to enter into the stages of the life course where privacy is most desired. In fact, Chavez (1992) noted that some young, single migrants share housing precisely so that they can save enough money to marry. After marriage, however, privacy is more important and economic independence more likely, making independent family living more desirable and feasible. Villar (1990) noted that once married or reunited with a spouse, Mexican immigrants prefer the “freedom” and “privacy” of an independent home, even if they incur new costs that make saving more difficult.

After the birth of children, family needs change. Younger immigrants with newly formed families are at the most vulnerable stage of the life course when child costs are highest and childcare needs are greatest (Browning and Rodriguez, 1985; Hondagneu-Sotelo, 1994). Young children under the age of six place considerable constraints on parents’, especially mothers’, time
If both parents, or single mothers, are to enter – or remain in – the paid workforce, alternative childcare providers are needed. Low cost childcare is especially crucial for unmarried mothers, as they are more likely to be in the paid labor force than married mothers (Ortiz, 1995). Several studies have shown that in Latino extended households, elderly family members care for young children (Boswell and Curtis, 1984; Carrasquillo, 1994; Hurtado, 1995; Perez, 1986; Tienda and Glass, 1985). Puerto Rican women sometimes bring their mothers to the United States to provide the childcare and housekeeping services that enable them to participate in the paid labor market (Boswell and Curtis, 1984; Figueroa and Melendez, 1993; Toro-Morn, 1995). Mexican single mothers sometimes arrange for young relatives from Mexico, such as sisters or nieces, to live in their homes and share childcare responsibilities (Chavez, 1992). Such arrangements also insure undocumented single mothers that someone will be able to care for their children if they are apprehended at work (Chavez, 1992). Extended family household strategies should be more common among Mexican single mothers, rather than Puerto Rican or Cuban single moms, because for some, their legal status may not permit them to rely on public assistance, and therefore entering the workforce is more of a necessity.

At the later stages of the life course, elderly family members require special assistance and support. Adult children often manage such circumstances by moving the elderly family member to an institutional-care setting or by providing care in their own homes. However, elderly Latinos are half as likely to be residents of group quarters and over twice as likely to reside in the homes of extended family when compared to the total U.S. population (Perez, 1986). Among Latinos, Cuban elderly are the most likely to live in extended households and the least likely to receive institutional care (Perez, 1986).

Due to the varying sociodemographic make-up of the Mexican, Puerto Rican and Cuban immigrant populations, the influence of life-course stages on living arrangements should vary for each group. The relative youth of the Mexican immigrant population means that early life-course stages, such as parenting young children, should be important for understanding extended household arrangements for this population (Bean and Tienda, 1987). For Puerto Ricans, a high rate of single parent households may make residing with extended kin preferable when children are young, especially for single mothers (Landale and Hauan, 1992; Pelto, Roman and Liriano, 1982). Likewise for Puerto Ricans, the relative ease of bringing older relatives to the United States for assisting with childcare should make extended family living a common aspect of the later segment of the life course (Toro-Morn, 1995). Finally, the older age and large number of female, widowed elderly among the Cuban immigrant population suggest that the later stages of the life course will be important for understanding extended family patterns for this group (Perez, 1986).
The present study addresses three differing explanations for the living arrangements of Latino immigrants. The cultural perspective suggests that residing with extended family reflects traditional family patterns brought from the home country. As familiarity with the dominant U.S. culture increases, extended family living should be less common. On the other hand, the economic resource hypothesis proposes that individuals with the fewest economic resources will be the most likely to live in extended arrangements. Finally, the life-course explanation suggests that living arrangements reflect the varying constraints and needs of life-course events and stages. Because of varying historical circumstances, social demographic characteristics, and legal statuses of Mexican, Puerto Rican and Cuban immigration, we expect differences in the way in which culture, economics, and the life course intersect with living arrangements. We argue that the emphasis on culture, as a determinant of living arrangements, is misleading insofar as it prevents us from understanding how different immigration patterns and life-course events shape the structure of Latino households.

RESEARCH DESIGN

To analyze the impact of cultural factors, economic indicators, and life-course events on Latino immigrants, we employ data from the 1990 Panel Study of Income Dynamics–Latino National Political Survey (PSID/LNPS). The sample contains a nationally representative selection of 2,043 Latino households followed successfully from the 1989 Latino National Political Survey (LNPS) sample. LNPS researchers selected households by using multistage, area probability sampling procedure based on the 1980 census data. Researchers initially screened 12,187 households, and from these, they determined 3,419 eligible for study inclusion – at least one adult living in the household was Latino. Within each household, researchers randomly selected from all eligible adults one member to be interviewed. Between July 1989 and March 1990, LNPS researchers conducted interviews with the randomly selected adult member of 2,817 Latino households. This created a response rate of 82 percent. Then, in summer and fall of 1990, PSID investigators relocated the original LNPS respondents and interviewed the heads of their households. PSID researchers conducted 2,043 interviews for a follow-up response rate of 73 percent. The variables in the present analysis are from data collected during the 1990 PSID follow-up interview. In addition, we use data from the 1989/1990 LNPS interview to create our sample of Latinos born outside the U.S. mainland.

2The Latino adult had to have at least one parent solely of Mexican, Cuban or Puerto Rican ancestry.
3The only exception is the variable for years in the United States which appears in Table 2, Sample Characteristics of Immigrants. It is not included in our multivariate analysis.
The unit of analysis for this study is the individual. Although the PSID/LNPS survey collected limited information on all household members, measurements for generation in the United States were compiled only for the original LNPS respondent and the PSID head of household. Using head of household as the unit of analysis, however, would have underrepresented women and young adults. Because international migration is a gendered process and is experienced differently by young and old migrants, it was essential to use as our unit of analysis the randomly selected LNPS individual (Hondagneu-Sotelo, 1994; Toro-Morn, 1995; Sluzki, 1979). Of the 1,283 respondents in our migrant sample, 42 percent are Mexican immigrants, 24 percent are originally from Puerto Rico, and 34 percent are Cuban natives. While we refer to Puerto Ricans in this study as “immigrants,” we use the term as a descriptive, rather than legal, characteristic and recognize the importance of Puerto Ricans’ status as U.S. citizens.

Table 1 describes the variables in the analysis. The dependent variable is a dichotomous indicator that equals 1 for individuals in extended households, 0 otherwise. For the purposes of this study, an extended household is defined as one that includes extended kin, such as siblings, in-laws, parents, and other relatives. Respondents living with unrelated persons are coded as 0—the otherwise category. The number of these cases is small.4

The analysis uses English proficiency as a measure of acculturation. Language in general, and English proficiency specifically, are well established in the literature as good proxies for determining the level of cultural isolation experienced by immigrants in the host society and the extent of their own ethnic identification (Stevens, 1991; Alba, 1990; Burr and Mutchler, 1993). A dummy variable for English proficiency categorizes respondents based on how much English they speak. Latino immigrants who speak English as well as, or better than, Spanish are assumed to be more acculturated in the host society than are their counterparts.

The study uses three measures of economic resources. We employ a measure of joint personal income to capture the impact of economic status on the living arrangements of Latino immigrants. For married or cohabiting immigrants, income represents the combination of one’s personal income plus the personal income of one’s partner. For single immigrants, income includes only one’s own personal income. Using this combined measurement of income, rather than just individual income, should better capture the economic resources to which a respondent has access. The income variable itself is the sum of labor, asset, and transfer income earned in 1989 by the individual and the domestic partner, if applicable. The analysis also includes dummy variables to measure whether or not the immigrant is employed and whether or not the spouse or partner of the immigrant is employed.

4Only 12 Mexican respondents, 6 Cuban respondents, and 6 Puerto Rican respondents share their home with nonfamily members.
# TABLE 1
## VARIABLE DEFINITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Coding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extended Family Household</td>
<td>A household that includes extended kin of the head, such as siblings, in-laws, parents, etc.(^a)</td>
<td>1 = yes, 0 = no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluent English</td>
<td>The individual speaks English as well as or better than person speaks Spanish</td>
<td>1 = yes, 0 = no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>Total labor, asset and transfer income earned in 1989 by respondent and her or his spouse or cohabiting partner,(^b) if applicable</td>
<td>1 = yes, 0 = no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>The individual was employed at the time of 1990 interview</td>
<td>1 = yes, 0 = no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse Employed</td>
<td>The individual’s spouse or cohabiting partner(^c) was employed at the time of 1990 interview</td>
<td>1 = yes, 0 = no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Married</td>
<td>The respondent was not married at the time of 1990 interview</td>
<td>1 = yes, 0 = no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under Age 30</td>
<td>The individual was less than age 30 at the time of 1990 interview</td>
<td>1 = yes, 0 = no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 30–54</td>
<td>The individual was age 30–54 at the time of 1990 interview(^d)</td>
<td>1 = yes, 0 = no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>The individual is a parent</td>
<td>1 = yes, 0 = no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Child in Family Unit</td>
<td>The respondent’s “family unit” contains at least one person under the age of 6</td>
<td>1 = yes, 0 = no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>The respondent is female</td>
<td>1 = yes, 0 = no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Schooling Completed</td>
<td>The number of years of schooling completed at the time of 1990 interview</td>
<td>1 = yes, 0 = no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{a}\)Because PSID researchers coded extended kin based on respondent's family unit composition, rather than household composition, in this study only respondents in extended family units were coded as residing in extended family households. An individual who is a member of a simple family unit, but who has extended kin residing in the same household as members of a second family unit would not receive a 1 for the variable, Extended Family Household. Furthermore, because PSID researchers used a priority coding scheme, individuals whose family unit contains persons unrelated to the head, in addition to extended kin, are coded as members of a family unit with “unrelated” persons, rather than an extended family unit. However, there are few multiple family households and family units with “unrelated” persons in the sample.

\(^{b}\)Cohabiting partner includes a cohabitor who has been living with the respondent for one year more, or who was residing in the household during both the 1989 and 1990 interviews. Cohabitors are those individuals living in a marriage-like relationship.

\(^{c}\)Age 30–54 is the omitted category for age in the research models.

Immigration often disrupts the life course of immigrants (Blank, forthcoming). Compared to nonimmigrants, Latino immigrants typically marry at older ages, experience high rates of marital separation, and often endure fertility disruption (Paz, 1985; Massey et al., 1987; Melville, 1978; Portes and Bach, 1985; Tienda, 1980; Massey and Mullan, 1984). This disrupted progression of life-course events presents some formidable challenges to immigrants and impacts the structure of their household. To capture the importance of life-course events in the living arrangements of Latino immigrants, the analysis includes four life-cycle measurements identified in the literature as important to an international migrant’s household structure (Massey et al., 1987): 1) a dummy variable measuring whether or not the individual is married; 2) a dummy variable indicating whether the respondent is a parent; 3) a dummy variable representing whether the family unit includes a child under
the age of six; and 4) two dummy variables for age which allow us to measure the effects of being a young adult and the effects of being elderly. Finally, we control for gender, which is known to impact the living arrangement options of immigrants (Hondagneu-Sotelo, 1994; Toro-Morn, 1995). We also control for years of schooling.

Because the dependent variable is dichotomous, we use logistic analysis. Two models are estimated for each of the three groups of Latino immigrants. The first model includes the additive terms for cultural, economic and life-course determinants, as well as the control variables.

The second model adds three interaction terms to test the multiplicative impact of single parenting and labor force participation on the likelihood of extended living arrangements among Latino immigrants. Residing with extended kin can allow single mothers, especially those with young children, to participate in the paid labor market (Tienda and Glass, 1985; Toro-Morn, 1995). The first interaction term includes not married and parent, which we call single parent. For all three immigrant groups, the majority (75% or higher) of single parents are female. Therefore, we do not add an additional multiplicative term for single parent and gender. The additional interaction terms include measurements for employed single parent (not married*parent*employed) and single parent with young child (not married*parent*young child in household).

RESULTS

Sample Characteristics

Table 2 reports summary characteristics of the sample population for the variables in the multivariate analysis. Briefly, the table shows that extended living arrangements are more common among our sample of Mexican and Cuban immigrants than our sample of Puerto Rican immigrants, 19 and 13 percent respectively. Results presented in Table 2 also show that extended living arrangements vary by gender. This variation reflects differences in both migration histories across Latino groups and migration patterns for men and women. Mexican immigrants, for example, are often young men who are either single or who migrate without their spouses and children. For these

5We use dummy variables rather than exact years old to measure age because we are trying to capture the specific effects of life-course stages on living arrangements. We do not expect a simple, unidirectional relationship between age and extended family living. Rather, we expect the direction of the relationship between age and extended family residence to vary across stages of the life course.

6For our sample population, the percentage of all respondents that are young males (age 30 or less) is higher for Mexicans — 18% (N=98) compared to 6% (N=18) for Puerto Ricans and 6% (N=25) for Cubans.
TABLE 2
SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS OF IMMIGRANTS BY COUNTRY OF ORIGIN AND SEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mexican Immigrants</th>
<th>Puerto Rican Immigrants</th>
<th>Cuban Immigrants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Male Female</td>
<td>Total Male Female</td>
<td>Total Male Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=533</td>
<td>N=249 N=284</td>
<td>N=312 N=111</td>
<td>N=438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Extended Family Householder</td>
<td>19 24</td>
<td>14 13</td>
<td>10 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(% of Household)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluent in Spoken English (%)</td>
<td>17 19</td>
<td>16 14</td>
<td>15 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Years of Schooling Completed</td>
<td>6 6</td>
<td>6 10</td>
<td>10 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median 1989 Individual Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed (%)</td>
<td>59 84</td>
<td>38 34</td>
<td>49 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have Employed</td>
<td>42 31</td>
<td>51 20</td>
<td>23 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse/Cohabitor (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married (%)</td>
<td>68 75</td>
<td>62 36</td>
<td>60 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under Age 30 (%)</td>
<td>30 34</td>
<td>27 15</td>
<td>15 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 30-54 (%)</td>
<td>56 54</td>
<td>57 52</td>
<td>52 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 55 or Older (%)</td>
<td>14 12</td>
<td>16 27</td>
<td>23 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Age</td>
<td>35 33</td>
<td>36 43</td>
<td>47 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Child in Family Unit (%)</td>
<td>46 47</td>
<td>46 25</td>
<td>14 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Years since First in United States</td>
<td>19 17</td>
<td>20 26</td>
<td>28 24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aThe data is from the 1990 Panel Study of Income Dynamics Latino Sample. After weighting the data to represent the U.S. Latino immigrant population, we found no differences between weighted data and sample data for the characteristics presented in this table.

bThe value of N varies slightly for each variable category due to missing values within categories.

cThe median value of $0 for joint income for female Puerto Ricans reflects older age of population. Of those age 55 or older, 79% have no joint income. Twenty-four % of female Puerto Ricans are age 55 or older.

reasons, Mexican men are more likely to share a household with extended kin, and it is not until marriage or family reunification that an independent household becomes preferable (Villar 1990). The percentage of females in extended households is higher for Cubans (21%) than Puerto Ricans (15%) or Mexicans (14%). The older age of the Cuban population may point to the popularity of this arrangement among female immigrants from Cuba (Boswell and Curtis, 1984; Hurtado, 1995; Perez, 1986).

While Latino families have followed the general pattern of decline in husband-wife households, the number of couple-headed households among Latinos in 1990 exceeds that for other minorities (Frisbie and Bean, 1993). Table 2, however, demonstrates that there exists some variation in the percentage of Latino immigrants in our sample that reside with a spouse. Specifically, Mexicans have the highest percentage of husband-wife families (68%), followed by Cubans (59%) and Puerto Ricans (39%). The percentage of parents among respondents is high among all three immigrant groups.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mexican Immigrants</th>
<th>Puerto Rican Immigrants</th>
<th>Cuban Immigrants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Indicator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaks fluent English</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Resource Indicators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>5.3E-7</td>
<td>-3.2E-5</td>
<td>-3.2E-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse employed</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>-0.057</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Course Indicators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not married</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under age 30</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-0.82</td>
<td>-0.98c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 55+</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>-1.65**</td>
<td>-1.02**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young child in family unit</td>
<td>.82*</td>
<td>2.09**</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-0.57</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of schooling completed</td>
<td>0.0098</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.0098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction Terms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not married*parent</td>
<td>-1.15</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not married<em>parent</em></td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not married<em>parent</em></td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>young child in family unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


---

a Data is from 1990 Panel Study of Income Dynamics Latino Sample.
b Income represents total income earned in 1989 by respondent and spouse or cohabiting partner, if applicable.

*p<.05  
**p<.01  
***p<.001
The historical conditions and circumstances of migration vary for Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, and Cubans. Although large numbers of Mexicans migrated to the United States during the Mexican Revolution of 1910–1920 and through the bracero contract labor program of 1942–1964, the largest wave began in the 1970s with combined population growth and economic crisis in Mexico (Ehrlich, Bilderback and Ehrlich, 1979). Table 2 reflects this recent historical trend with Mexicans residing on average nineteen years in the United States. Cubans have also lived on average nineteen years in the United States, with mass migration beginning in 1959 as refugees fled communist Cuba (Perez, 1986). Puerto Ricans, however, have a longer history of migration to the mainland, arriving as early as the 1950s to work in factories (Portes and Rumbaut, 1990). On average, Puerto Rican immigrants first arrived in the United States 26 years ago.

**Multivariate Analysis**

The logistic models described below examine the impact of cultural, economic and life-course variables on living arrangements among Latino immigrants. Model 1 estimates the additive impact of cultural, economic and life-cycle factors, as well as the control variables of gender and years of schooling. Next, Model 2 adds to the baseline model three multiplicative terms for the interactions of never married and parent; never married, parent and employed; and never married, parent, and young child in family.\(^7\)

As shown in Table 3, results from Model 1 suggest that for all three groups of immigrants acculturation and economic status have no impact on the likelihood of living in extended households as compared to other living arrangements. Therefore, the results do not support the hypothesized negative effects of English proficiency, income, and employment on the likelihood of extended living among Latino immigrants.

Life-course variables emerge as the most important determinants of extended living arrangements for Latino immigrants. Specifically, coefficients reported in Model 1 indicate that being a parent significantly decreases the likelihood of extended living among both Puerto Rican and Cuban immigrant groups. While a similar relationship also exists for Mexican immigrants, it is not statistically significant. Thus, the normative impact of parenthood in fostering independent households among the non-Latino population appears equally relevant for Latino immigrants.

\(^7\)The coefficients reported in these models indicate the effect of a unit change in the value of a variable on the log of the odds of extending living arrangements. An alternative interpretation can be obtained by exponentiating the coefficients (i.e., taking the antilog) which gives the odds ratio of extended living relative to the excluded category. In the analysis both interpretations are used.
The negative impact of parenthood on extended living arrangements of Latino immigrants contrasts with the positive effect of young children for these groups. Specifically, Mexican and Cuban immigrants with young children in their family unit are more than twice as likely to live in extended households, and Puerto Ricans are seven times more likely to do so. The robustness of this parameter suggests that Latino immigrants are likely to forgo the privacy of independent living when children are still young. This arrangement augments resources and provides immigrant parents with much needed childcare services (Boswell and Curtis, 1984; Chavez, 1992; Hurtado, 1995; Toro-Morn, 1995). Previous research indicates, however, that the effect of young children on extended living arrangements for Latino immigrants diminishes as children age (Blank, forthcoming). Thus, even in the presence of our findings, the impact of children on extended living arrangements should not be construed as unique to Latino immigrants, but rather as a resource generating strategy and a response to life course events.

Young Cuban adults are significantly less likely than their elders aged 30–54 (the omitted dummy variable for age) to reside with extended family members. This may reflect a preference for independent housing during a life-course period in which adult children are not yet needed to care for aging parents.

At the older segment of the life course, Puerto Ricans age 55 or older are almost three times more likely to live with extended kin than are adults between the ages of 30 and 54 (the omitted dummy variable for age). Although not statistically significant (P>|t|=0.077), this finding supports ethnographic accounts of Puerto Rican immigrant families. As previously stated, Puerto Rican women sometimes bring their mothers to the United States specifically to live in their homes and provide housework and childcare services (Toro-Morn, 1995). Because Puerto Rican immigrants are U.S. citizens and because traveling between Puerto Rico and the United States is relatively inexpensive, we would expect this strategy to be more common among Puerto Rican immigrants than those from Mexico or Cuba. It may also be the case that some of these elderly Puerto Ricans are living with extended kin because these relatives provide them with assistance – such as nursing care or financial assistance. Data suggest that Puerto Ricans prefer in-home care to an institutional facility when parents become too frail to care for themselves (Perez, 1986).

With respect to gender, results presented in Model 1 indicate that female Mexican immigrants are half as likely than their male counterparts to live in an extended household. Although not statistically significant (P>|t|=0.085), the negative direction of the relationship is not surprising. The tendency of male immigrants from Mexico to live in extended households reflects, in part, the sometimes temporary nature of their stay in the United States, their
young age (see Table 2), and disruption in their life course since migration often prohibits many from marrying and establishing independent households. Conversely, female Mexican immigrants often migrate to the United States to join, or return with, a husband or fiancé who has lived in the United States for several years, is farther along in the migration process, and is perhaps in a better position to establish an independent household (Massey et al., 1987; Melville, 1978; Hondagneu-Sotelo, 1994). Our results confirm the importance of viewing international migration as a gendered process in which the adaptation experiences of women and men may differ (Hondagneu-Sotelo, 1994; Sluzki, 1979; Toro-Morn, 1995).

Turning to Model 2, this model estimates the effects of not married and the other interaction terms, while controlling for variables in the baseline model. Except for Puerto Rican immigrants, estimates for Model 2 show no change in either the direction or the overall impact of the baseline variables. After adding the interaction terms to the baseline model for Puerto Ricans, being a parent is no longer significantly related to extended family living. The nonsignificance of all three interactions involving single parenting indicates that single parenting, either of young children or while employed, does not impel Latino immigrants to reside with extended family. Rather, having a young child in the family, regardless of one's parenting or employment status, may be sufficient enough to encourage extended family living among Mexican, Puerto Rican and Cuban immigrants.

**DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION**

Understanding of Latino immigrant households is often clouded by inaccurate public perceptions and xenophobia. The “common-sense” belief is that immigrants live in large households because they prefer large families. Natives often portray these living arrangements as a “problem,” seeing them as crowded, unhygienic, and a source of crime (Chavez, 1990). Some cities have created household density regulations, prohibiting more than a specific number of occupants per household room. In contrast, this study aims to move beyond stereotypes and misperceptions by teasing out the multiple factors that influence the living arrangements of Latino immigrants.

Rather than being an expression of cultural and economic differences, living arrangements among Latinos are an outgrowth of distinct immigration history, and life-course events are key to understanding differences in living arrangements among Latino immigrants. Informed by three competing hypotheses, the present study investigates the impact of English proficiency, economic standing, and life-cycle events on the living arrangements of Mexican, Puerto Rican and Cuban immigrants. Specifically, it tests and rejects the hypothesis that economic standing (income and employment) has
a negative independent effect on extended living of Latino immigrants. Additionally, cultural factors have no independent effect on the living arrangements of Latino immigrants. The lack of a significant relationship between English fluency and living arrangements supports recent research which argues that the process of household formation among Latino immigrants does not represent a pattern of acculturation (Hurtado, 1995; Landale, 1994).

Rather, our data support the theory that extended family living arrangements represent a resource generating strategy for caring for young children and older adults. For all three groups in our sample, the additive effect of young children emerges as a significant determinant of extended living arrangements. In addition, parenting and age 55 or older are significant determinants for Cubans and Puerto Ricans, respectively. These findings verify patterns of household composition among Latino immigrants suggested by nonrandom, ethnographic samples (Chavez, 1992; Toro-Morn, 1995; Villar, 1990).

Differences in age, relative location in the life course, and migration opportunities inform the observed variation in the extended living arrangements of Latino immigrants. Mexican immigrants are relatively young, thus more likely to accept the benefits — and sometimes the inconveniences — presented by extended family living. Puerto Ricans, who have a median age of 45, experience extended family living less frequently than Mexicans (13% versus 19%) because they are more concentrated in the middle segment of the life course and thus less likely to benefit from living with extended kin. As demonstrated by our study, 46 percent of Mexicans have children under age six, while only 25 percent of Puerto Ricans have such young children. When children are young, childcare is a greater necessity and less privacy may be acceptable. Once children get older, they need less supervision, but also require greater space, thus making extended households less necessary and less desirable.

However, the greater ease involved for Puerto Ricans, compared to Mexicans, in bringing older relatives to the United States to help with childcare, may mean that when Puerto Ricans do need child-rearing assistance they are more likely to share a home with an older relative than are Mexicans. Because Puerto Ricans are U.S. citizens, securing legal permission to travel to the mainland is unnecessary and the cost of an airline ticket is relatively inexpensive. In contrast, securing legal documents for older Mexicans to move to the United States can take years, and crossing the border without papers is expensive and dangerous (Chavez, 1992).

Finally, Cuban immigrants, while older, are more likely than Puerto Ricans and equally as likely as Mexicans to live with extended kin. This, too, is reflective of the life course. Compared to the other two groups, Cubans have
a higher proportion of elderly, who may have special care needs that require them to live with extended kin, most often their children. Cubans are also more likely than Puerto Ricans or Mexicans to choose extended family living when older relatives can no longer reside alone (Perez, 1986). In short, demographic differences among these populations illustrate that living arrangements reflect life-course stages more than culture and economic standing.
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