

1-1-1977

Puerto Rican migrant farmworkers in Massachusetts and Connecticut : a case study of perceived training and service needs.

Frank R. Llamas

University of Massachusetts Amherst

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.umass.edu/dissertations_1

Recommended Citation

Llamas, Frank R., "Puerto Rican migrant farmworkers in Massachusetts and Connecticut : a case study of perceived training and service needs." (1977). *Doctoral Dissertations 1896 - February 2014*. 3164.

https://scholarworks.umass.edu/dissertations_1/3164

This Open Access Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. It has been accepted for inclusion in Doctoral Dissertations 1896 - February 2014 by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. For more information, please contact scholarworks@library.umass.edu.

UMASS/AMHERST



312066009028367

PUERTO RICAN MIGRANT FARMWORKERS IN
MASSACHUSETTS AND CONNECTICUT:
A CASE STUDY OF PERCEIVED TRAINING AND SERVICE NEEDS

A Dissertation Presented

by

Frank R. Llamas

Submitted to the Graduate School of the
University of Massachusetts in Partial
Fulfillment of Requirements for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

September

1977

2,0


(c) Frank Robert Llamas 1977
All Rights Reserved


PUERTO RICAN MIGRANT FARMWORKERS IN
MASSACHUSETTS AND CONNECTICUT
A CASE STUDY OF PERCEIVED TRAINING AND SERVICE NEEDS


A Dissertation Presented
by
FRANK ROBERT LLAMAS

Approved as to style and content by:


Arthur W. Eve, Chairperson


David Bloodsworth, Committee Member


Norma Gluckstern, Committee Member


Mario Fantini, Dean
School of Education

DEDICATION

A mi padre,
quien a través de una vida de dura labor,
cambió el destino de su progenie

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The completion of this study involved the patience and the hard work of many more people than its principal investigator. The author would like to thank Arthur Eve for his guidance, patience and persistence; also thanks to David Bloodsworth, Norma Gluckstern and Ernest Washington.

Special thanks to four good friends who gave their time, their support, and their invaluable effort, and without whom this work would have never been completed - Edgardo and Adriana Rothkegel, David Sheehan, and Janet Owens.

Throughout the process my wife Barbara sacrificed most and contributed her time, her skills and most importantly her love.

The basic stuff that led to the eventual completion of this task came from two additional very special people - my mother who sacrificed a great deal and gave years of encouragement, and my good friend and most important teacher who over the years has struggled to make me literate, Joseph Vertalino.

Puerto Rican Migrant Farmworkers in
Massachusetts and Connecticut:
A Case Study of Perceived Training and Service Needs
(September 1977)

Frank R. Llamas, B.A.

State University of New York at Buffalo

M.Ed., Springfield College

Directed by: Dr. Arthur W. Eve

This work is a case study of Puerto Rican migrant farmworkers living and working on labor camps in Massachusetts and Connecticut in the summer of 1975. Selected Puerto Rican migrant farmworkers were individually interviewed at various camps concerning their demographic background, their attitudes and preferences toward education and training, their attitudes toward migration, their reasons for migration, their perception of migrant organizations, and their self-perceived needs.

A total of 54 interviews were collected during a total of 26 visits to 18 different camps between May and October of 1975. A uniform, pre-tested, Spanish language questionnaire was presented to each subject by a trained, native Spanish-speaking interview team and each interview lasted for approximately one half hour.

Based on the data collected, findings and recommendations are presented concerning (1) the Puerto Rican migrant farmworker's preferences toward retraining for jobs other than farmwork, (2) his attitudes and opinions concerning preferences toward working and/or living on the Island of Puerto Rico or on the United States mainland, (3) his reasons for migrating to the United States mainland including both economic and non-economic reasons, (4) his self-perceived need for services, and (5) his familiarity with organizations and agencies that exist to help him.

In addition, this work includes a description of the camps visited and a description of the difficulties encountered in attempting to interview this population. Chapter II of this work includes a history of the migrations of farmworkers from Puerto Rico which began when the United States acquired the possession of Puerto Rico, and includes pertinent references to historical, sociological, anthropological, educational, and legal works. It also includes a description of the evolution of advocacy groups, agencies, and government attempts to ameliorate the conditions under which the migrant farmworker earned his living. Some of the struggles and confrontations involved in the attempt to unionize the farmworkers are also described.

An addendum is included in this work which focuses on the year 1975, when no farm labor was imported, examines the

factors which led to this pivotal decision by the tobacco growers, and postulates upon the future trends of Puerto Rican farm labor.

T A B L E O F C O N T E N T S

	<u>Page</u>
<u>CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION</u>	
A. Background	1
B. Statement of the Problem	3
C. Significance of the Problem	6
D. Goals of the Study	9
E. Assumptions of the Study	9
F. Limitations of the Study	10
G. Definition of Terms	10
H. Organization of the Study	12
 <u>CHAPTER II: HISTORICAL OVERVIEW AND SOURCES</u>	
A. Introduction	14
B. Historical Overview	16
1. The Early Farmworker Migrations	16
2. Government Intervention in the Migration of Farmworkers	17
3. The Development of Puerto Rican Farmworker Advocacy Groups	25
4. The Development of a Puerto Rican Farmworkers Union	30
C. Studies and Documents Related to the Puerto Rican Migrant Farmworker	37
 <u>CHAPTER III: PROCEDURAL DESIGN AND METHCODOLOGY</u>	
A. Introduction	48
B. Design of the Interview Instrument	48
1. The Interview Instrument	48
2. Pre-Testing	52
C. Data Collection Procedures	54
1. The Interviews	54
2. The Interview Calendar	56
D. Description of Migrant Camps	57
E. Procedures for Processing and Analyzing the Data	59

T A B L E O F C O N T E N T S (Cont.)

	<u>Page</u>
<u>CHAPTER IV: PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA</u>	
A. Introduction	69
B. Demographic Background	70
1. Age	70
2. Family Responsibilities	73
a) Marital Status	73
b) Number of Children	75
c) Number of Dependents	76
3. Educational and Vocational Background	79
a) Education	79
b) Work Experience	83
4. Puerto Rican Background	88
5. Farmwork Background	90
6. Recruiting Information	97
7. Other Background Information	102
C. Attitudes Toward Education and Training	105
D. Attitudes Toward Migration	112
1. Island-Mainland Preferences	112
2. Stated Reasons for Migration	115
3. Additional Reasons for Migration	117
E. Attitudes Toward Migrant Organizations	123
1. Recognition of Migrant Organizations	123
2. Assistance Received from Migrant Organizations	126
3. The Need for Migrant Organizations	129
<u>CHAPTER V: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</u>	
A. Summary	135
B. Findings and Conclusions	136
C. Recommendations	139

T A B L E O F C O N T E N T S (Cont.)

	<u>Page</u>
POSTSCRIPT	144
APPENDIX A SUMMARY OF MIGRANT FARMWORKER STATISTICS	157
APPENDIX B ENGLISH QUESTIONNAIRE	160
APPENDIX C SPANISH QUESTIONNAIRE	171
BIBLIOGRAPHY	182

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A. Background

For years, the plight of the Mexican-American farmworker has been well publicized. Most people have been aware of the conditions of poverty, depression, and squalor which have followed the migrant families from camp to camp as they have harvested the produce of America. The Mexican-American migrant farmworkers have their heroes and their politics and their issues. They have bases of power to exert some small impact upon the marketplace.

It is only recently that the public has begun to be aware that every spring, tens of thousands of Puerto Rican men leave their families behind and migrate to work the fields and pick the crops in states along the eastern seaboard of the United States.

More than seventy-five years have passed and more than a million individual migrations¹ have occurred since the

¹ See Appendix A for statistics on the number of contract farm laborers who have annually migrated to the United States mainland. According to the 1969 and the 1975 Annual Farm Labor Report of the Puerto Rican Department of Labor, 378,141 Puerto Rican workers signed contracts to migrate to the mainland for work between the years 1948 and 1975. It is conservatively estimated that this contracted labor force represents less than half of the total Puerto Rican migrant labor force migrating to the mainland.

Simón Rosenthal states that "Island Department of Labor statistics indicate over 15,000 such laborers are formally

first expedition of Puerto Rican farmworkers left the Island to work the sugar cane plantations of Hawaii in 1901. The evolution, the history, and the conditions of these migrations have remained largely unexamined, unreported, and unknown to the general population.

A number of factors have contributed to the lack of attention and public concern toward the population of Puerto Rican migrant farmworkers. Some of these factors are economic in nature, some are political, and some factors are cultural.

The facts are that migrant farm labor has been recruited from the Island of Puerto Rico for as long as Puerto Rico has been a United States possession, and that the men who have been recruited have been kept isolated, both physically and culturally, from the surrounding communities. Those who have filled the labor camps in mainland communities have been

contracted each year, with an additional 30,000 or more migrant workers going to the mainland outside the scope of the Department of Labor contract." Evaluation of the Migrant Division, Puerto Rico Legal Services, Simon Rosenthal, December 19, 1974, in an evaluation report submitted to the Office of Economic Opportunity by the Quincy Company, Washington D.C., on February 13, 1975.

Michael J. Piore states "About 40,000 Puerto Ricans come to the United States annually as seasonal agricultural workers. About half of these workers come under a contract negotiated by the Puerto Rican government...", Puerto Rican Migration and Labor Market Institutions, Michael J. Piore, a working paper prepared for the Office of Research and Development of the Manpower Administration of the Department of Labor for a conference, May 18, 1973, p.2.

men who lived in Puerto Rico and who, when they migrated, left their poor families, and the poverty resulting from their low wages, behind them on the Island. The fact that mainland citizens have not seen this poverty has been a significant factor in the lack of public concern for issues that have effected the lives of Puerto Rican farmworkers.

B. Statement of the Problem

The growing interest in the problems of the Puerto Rican migrant farmworker is largely the result of the efforts of various advocacy groups which have developed from the work of anti-poverty programs, from the publicity evolved from various class action lawsuits, and from attempts to unionize the workers. In response to this growing public visibility, journalists and various advocacy groups have been publishing articles, pamphlets, and monographs which attempt to describe the Puerto Rican migrant farmworker and the conditions under which the Puerto Rican migrant has lived and worked.

Many groups and individuals involved with the cause of the migrant farmworker have outlined recommendations or plans of action for improving the situation of these men. These plans have often included agendas for moving men from farm work to other kinds of jobs. Education, training, and retraining are advocated and argued on assumptions which

have never been validated by the workers themselves. Few systematic research surveys of Puerto Rican migrant farmworkers are available and the workers themselves have seldom been demographically identified or assessed concerning their own felt needs in terms of retraining for non-agricultural work.

Some of the assumptions made have been based upon stereotypes and surface indications, or upon unwarranted projections of the information concerning the urbanized Puerto Rican population. For example, unemployment has been generally offered as the sole reason for the seasonal migration of these men. Although unemployment may be a major factor, it may not be the only factor affecting an individual's decision to seek farmwork on the mainland. To this migrating population, which encompasses diverse socio-cultural groups with a wide range of ages and educational levels, the mainland may represent not only a small weekly paycheck, but an escape mechanism which has functioned in response to a variety of social ills and individual needs. Whatever ills and individual needs the migrant farmworker left on the Island, it is certain that a new set of problems awaited him on the mainland.

To begin with, agricultural work, as practiced by the migrant farmworker on the United States mainland, is difficult, socially undesirable, and low paying employment. Despite this, the mainland farms, especially along the

eastern seaboard, have provided employment for some forty thousand or more Puerto Rican men each year. It should be noted that these positions are filled almost exclusively by males. The Puerto Rican migrant farmworker on the eastern seaboard does not travel with his family as does the Chicano migrant farmworker in other parts of the United States.

Secondly, it is anticipated that this utilization of Puerto Rican migrant farm labor will diminish as mechanization and economic conditions change the nature of farmwork on the eastern seaboard. As this process advances, some forty thousand men presently employed as migrant farmworkers, must become either unemployed or they must be absorbed into the work force, either on the Island or on the mainland.

Despite the considerable number of Puerto Rican men involved in migrant farmwork, the primary focus of studies, planning, and services for the agricultural worker has concentrated on the Chicano, the Mexican-American farmworker, almost to the exclusion of the Puerto Rican migrant farmworkers.

A review of the literature clearly indicates that very little research on the Puerto Rican agricultural migrant is available and that little of the information published to date has analyzed responses from the migrant farmworkers themselves.

This study has attempted to address some aspects of this situation by directly interviewing Puerto Rican migrant farmworkers on labor camps in Massachusetts and Connecticut in order to derive demographic and attitudinal information from the workers themselves. In this study, the migrants' perceived needs were elicited and examined, as well as their attitudes toward education, retraining, and agricultural work. In addition, attitudes and preferences toward Island or mainland settlement and employment were examined.

The Puerto Rican migrant is an understudied minority among the agricultural workers on the United States mainland, with their own particular social problems, needs, and cultural dynamics. This study has attempted to gather and examine some information relative to that culture, those problems, and those needs.

C. Significance of the Problem

Each year approximately 40,000 men leave their homes in Puerto Rico to spend a considerable part of the year living and working on the eastern coast of the continental United States. The problems of these migrant farmworkers have been the object of considerable plans and activities. Large sums of government funds have been expended on programs to improve their plight. Education and manpower training programs have been funded to operate on the United States mainland to "settle out" and "economically upgrade" the Puerto

Rican migrants. However, to date there have been few formal studies involving direct personal interviews with the workers, and no formal studies concerning potential retraining or employment options.

There has been speculation that changing attitudes between older and younger workers toward farm labor are having an effect upon the recruitment and maintenance of a Puerto Rican farmworker labor force. At one time, it was even speculated that immigration laws should be changed to allow for the importation of other sources of cheap labor.² If it is true that changing attitudes and other social phenomena have been affecting the Puerto Rican farmworker labor force, both on the mainland and on the Island, and that education and training is required to prepare this large labor force for other types of employment, then a study of the Puerto Rican farmworker population can be an important contribution to help identify the types of training which the farmworkers want and need. If meaningful training and/or retraining programs are to evolve, information on the population of Puerto Rican migrant farmworkers is necessary.

There has been some minimal research done within mainland cities which has attempted to identify the relationships between the urban Puerto Rican and the farmworkers who live

²Piore, Ibid., p.4.

on the camps, but there has been no study which directly involved a significant number of farmworkers in terms of employment and education. Without such information, sensible governmental labor policies cannot be developed or implemented.

It has been difficult to design direct and valid studies to obtain information concerning the Puerto Rican migrant farmworker. This has been partially due to cultural and social considerations. For instance, contacts with farmworkers attempted on the Island have been difficult because farmworkers, especially younger men, often refuse to acknowledge the fact that they have done farmwork on the mainland because of the low social status of the work. When such contacts have been attempted on the mainland, there are physical problems associated with meeting the farmworkers after a long work day in labor camps which are extremely isolated. Access to these camps is often difficult and rigidly controlled by the grower or farmer. Interviewers have met with distrust and suspicion by both the grower, who often refuses access to the camps, and by the worker who may be fearful of eroding his tenuous position in the camps by talking to strangers.

The methods evolved and the problems associated with gathering data for this study will serve to provide both background and information for any future, more intensive

and extensive studies of the problems associated with the population of Puerto Rican migrant farmworkers.

D. Goals of the Study

The goal of this study was to interview selected Puerto Rican migrant farmworkers who were present in Massachusetts and Connecticut during the 1975 growing season in order to obtain information regarding the following issues:

1. their preferences toward retraining for jobs other than farmwork,
2. their attitudes and opinions concerning preferences toward working and/or living on the Island of Puerto Rico or on the United States mainland,
3. their reasons for migrating to the United States mainland, including both economic and non-economic reasons,
4. their self-perceived need for services, and
5. their familiarity with organizations and agencies that exist to assist them.

E. Assumptions of the Study

1. It was assumed that the questionnaire and data gathering techniques used in this study provided information in an accurate and forthright manner.
2. It was assumed that the questionnaire was responded to candidly and honestly.
3. It was assumed that, because of the study processes used, there was no language-based distortion of the questionnaire or the responses.

F. Limitations of the Study

1. This study was limited to Puerto Rican migrant farmworkers employed in Massachusetts and Connecticut during the 1975 growing season.
2. This study was limited to those workers who were present when the interviewers visited the camps.
3. This study was limited to those workers who would respond to the interview instrument.
4. This study was limited to those camps in which the grower did not forcefully evict the interview team in order to prevent interviews with the workers.
5. This study was limited by the fact that the growing season during which the interviews were conducted, 1975, was atypical in that the largest employer of migrant labor in Massachusetts and Connecticut, the Shade Tobacco Growers Agricultural Association, failed to reach an agreement with the Puerto Rican Department of Labor, and therefore did not import their labor, thus severely limiting access of this study to contract workers.

G. Definition of Terms

A.T.A. - (Asociación de Trabajadores Agrícolas de Puerto Rico) - A Puerto Rican farmworkers union founded in Connecticut in August 1973.

Barrio - a neighborhood - a sub-section of a city or town; on the mainland - a section of a city or town where the Spanish-speaking population lives.

C.A.M.P. - (Comite de Apoyo al Migrante Puertorriqueno) - a coalition of people, mostly labor and religious leaders, who organized, in Puerto Rico in 1969, to plan for the organization of a Puerto Rican farmworkers union.

Chicano - A Mexican-American.

Contract Worker - A farmworker recruited by, and registered with, the Department of Labor in Puerto Rico and protected by the contract negotiated by the Puerto Rican Department of Labor.

F.C.N.J. - (Farmworkers Council of New Jersey) - a private, non-profit corporation established to represent farmworkers in New Jersey; founded in 1972.

M.E.T.A. - (Ministerio Ecumenico de Trabajadores Agricolas) - an organization founded in Puerto Rico in 1972 by a group of church leaders to begin the process of organizing Puerto Rican farmworkers.

N.E.F.W.C. - (New England Farmworkers Council, Inc.) - a private, non-profit corporation established to represent farmworkers in Massachusetts and Connecticut; founded in 1971.

Parcela - A small plot of land of about 300 square meters given, by the Puerto Rican government, to families, in perpetuity, to build a home and to maintain a garden or small farm.

Público - An independent driver of a car for hire, similar to a taxi driver. Driving a public car, for hire, in Puerto Rico is viewed as a private, independent business.

Puerto Rican Migrant Farmworkers - Puerto Rican agricultural workers whose primary residence is Puerto Rico, and who leave the Island of Puerto Rico to perform agricultural work on the mainland of the United States on a seasonal basis.

Shade Tobacco Growers Agricultural Association - An association located in Windsor, Connecticut, organized in 1942 by the 16 largest tobacco growers in the Connecticut Valley, which oversees much of the recruitment and deployment of seasonal, unskilled farm labor in Connecticut and Massachusetts.

H. Organization of the Study

Chapter I of this study has consisted of the statement of the problem addressed in this study, the goals of the study, the assumptions and limitations of the study, the definition of terms used within the study, and a description of the organization of this study. Chapter II will present an overview of the background history of the Puerto Rican migrant farmworker which includes the early farmworker migration from Puerto Rico, government intervention, the development of farmworker advocacy groups, and the development

of a farmworkers union. Chapter II will also present a review of studies and documents closely related to the present study. Chapter III presents the procedures used to design the interview instrument, the data collection procedures, a description of the migrant camps visited during the study, and the procedures used for processing and analyzing the data. Chapter IV is a presentation and analysis of the data. Chapter V includes a summary of this study as well as findings and conclusions based upon the objectives of the study, and the recommendations of the study.

C H A P T E R II
A HISTORICAL OVERVIEW AND SOURCES

A. Introduction

This study concerned the circumstances and the self-perceived needs of Puerto Rican migrant farmworkers in Massachusetts and Connecticut. In order to gain any understanding of the particular situation of the Puerto Rican migrant farmworker, a wide variety of works and disciplines were culled to extract information about the Puerto Rican population, the agricultural industry which employs members of this population, and the forces and mechanisms which bring the men from the barrios and countryside of Puerto Rico to the fields of the United States mainland.

Most of the relevant research, studies, and literature that was available as background information on the Puerto Rican population for this study concerned Puerto Ricans on the Island, Puerto Ricans in New York City, or Puerto Ricans in transit between these two locations.

Some literature was available which described the Puerto Rican population as it spread out to settle on the mainland, and some literature described the return of this population from the mainland to the Island, but little of the literature described or related to the Puerto Rican migrant who is hired seasonally to do farmwork on the mainland and then returns to the Island which he considers his permanent home.

Relevant research concerning the migrant agricultural labor force was predominantly and overwhelmingly focused upon the Chicano, i.e. the Mexican-American farmworker, who follows the crops with his entire family. Few references were found to the Puerto Rican migrant farmworker who does not travel with his family and who is specifically contracted to work for a limited time in a particular region.

In addition, because of the peculiar legal status of Puerto Rico and her citizens, and because the labor contract between the workers and the growers had been negotiated by the government of Puerto Rico through its Department of Labor, many government surveys and studies which might have had relevance to this study were unavailable, unobtainable, or so politically eviscerated as to be almost useless. Despite this, an examination of pertinent laws of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico was necessary, as well as an examination of relevant Senate proceedings, legal briefs, court depositions and Federal rulings involving a number of states, federal agencies and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

Finally, as the Puerto Rican population began to emerge on the mainland, outside of New York City, local and area newspaper reports described aspects of the Puerto Rican situation and the community reactions to that situation. Some of these reports provided extremely valuable insight on the impact of a Puerto Rican community in various areas.

B. Historical Overview

1. The Early Farmworker Migrations

Puerto Rican agricultural workers have left the Island of Puerto Rico to work crops in other lands almost as long as Puerto Rico has been governed by the United States. An expedition of more than a thousand sugar cane workers was sent to the territory of Hawaii in 1901 and this migration of farm labor has continued, in varying degrees and to various places, until the present.³ More than 50,000 men, in some years, have left the Island to work crops on the United States mainland and then return to the Island. More than 75 years have passed and more than a million migrations⁴ have taken place since that first expedition left Puerto Rico for Hawaii.

Much of the early history of the movement of migrant Puerto Rican farmworkers is unrecorded. The research of Luis Nieves Falcón⁵ reports on the miseries of the Hawaiian

³Annual Farm Labor Report, Bureau of Employment Security, Department of Labor, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico (1969), p.1.

⁴Puerto Rico Annual Farm Labor Reports (1969-1975), records 378,141 contract workers for the years 1948-1973. (See Appendix A.) Authorities estimate that at least 2 non-contract farmworker migrants go to the mainland for every contract worker who makes the journey.

⁵Luis Nieves Falcón, Maleta'nd Go: Puerto Rican Seasonal Migration, (unpublished manuscript made available to the author by an associate), Section 2, "Puerto Rican Migration: An Overview," pp. 2-10.

expedition; the presence of Puerto Rican farmworkers, presumably remnants of the Hawaiian expedition, in California in 1913;⁶ and on various other expeditions to Cuba, Mexico, the Dominican Republic and the Virgin Islands as well as another Hawaiian expedition in 1921 which included the emigration of entire families.

2. Government Intervention in the Migration of Farmworkers

The government officially began its involvement with the movements of migrants in 1919 when the Puerto Rican Department of Agriculture and Labor was authorized to approve working conditions for migrants on the mainland. In the middle twenties, the policy of the Insular Bureau of Labor was to actively facilitate and stimulate migration. Representatives of the Insular Bureau of Labor visited Hawaii and locations in the western United States seeking work contracts for a Puerto Rican migrant farm labor force. One result of these government arrangements to export excess labor was the Arizona Expedition of 1926.

In the Autumn of 1926, arrangements were made to transport some 1,500 Puerto Rican cotton pickers to Arizona, under an agreement between the Arizona Pima Cotton Growers Association and the Insular Bureau of

⁶ Carey McWilliams, Factories in the Field: the Story of Migratory Farm Labor in California, Hamden, Conn: Anchor Books, 1969 (1942).

Labor. The first parties consisted of families, and were accompanied by representatives of both the employees' association and the Insular Government. Every precaution was taken to carry out the arrangement smoothly. Nevertheless, the results were so unsatisfactory that the sailing of the last three shiploads arranged for was cancelled and the experiment seems to have been a failure.⁷

The original enacting legislation of 1919 was amended in 1939 to transfer the administrative functions involving migrant farmworkers from the Insular Bureau to the Puerto Rican Department of Labor. During World War II, the United States Manpower Commission, which directed the distribution of the labor force of the United States, was informed by the Governor of Puerto Rico, Doctor Rexford G. Tugwell, that, in 1943, "there were 250,000 employable persons in Puerto Rico without work and that unemployment was increasing day by day."⁸ The tapping of this Puerto Rican population as an interstate source of labor was facilitated by the activities of the United States Manpower Commission and was augmented by the post-war implementation of inexpensive and abundant commercial air transportation between the Island and the mainland United States.

With the increase of the interstate movement of migrant farm laborers, there was an attendant rise in abuses

⁷Victor S. Clark, ed., Puerto Rico and its Problems Washington D.C.: The Brookings Institution: 1930, p. 518.

⁸Annual Farm Labor Report: 1969, Op. Cit., p. 3.

of these laborers. Employment was funnelled through abusive private "employment agencies" which received payment from both the employer and the employees who were brought together. As a result of some of these abuses, Puerto Rican Public Law #25 was enacted in 1947. Public Law #25 required that all Puerto Rican citizens who were travelling to the mainland, whether to settle there or to work temporarily, must receive an orientation on the conditions to be expected when they arrived.

An investigation into abuses of Puerto Rican migrants was ordered by Governor Jesus T. Pinero in 1947. Some of the recommendations of this investigation included a reorganization of the Office of Employment and the establishment of offices in New York City and other areas with potentially heavy Puerto Rican populations. A similar study with similar recommendations was conducted simultaneously by Columbia University. Some of these recommendations were incorporated into Act 89 which was enacted in May of 1947. Under Act 89, guidelines were established for the selecting and contracting of workers. Contracts between growers and the Puerto Rican government were negotiated and performance bonds were required of the employers. In Puerto Rico it was no longer legal to collect job-finding fees from the migrant who was hired.

Despite the studies and legislation, abuses of the

migrant labor force continued.

In 1948, a mainland recruiter took over 200 workers to Detroit to work on the local harvest. He charged them for finding them jobs, flew them to Detroit, and abandoned them at the airport. The jobs were nonexistent. The workers were unprepared for the cold weather, they had no money and most could not speak a word of English. The news hit the press and became an issue. The Legislature of Puerto Rico acted, and through a special appropriation brought the men back to the Island. This took care of the immediate situation, but not the long term problem of unconscionable recruiters who were having a heyday on the Island. The Legislature then passed a law making it a criminal offense to recruit workers in the Commonwealth unless it was done under rules and regulations established by the Secretary of Labor.⁹

To enforce the provisions of Act 89, the Bureau of Employment and Migration and the Office of Puerto Rico in New York (the Migration Division of the Department of Labor of Puerto Rico) were established in 1948. Also, in 1948, 4,906 contract workers, the first group to be covered by a master agreement with employers, migrated to the mainland.¹⁰

This linkage between the work forces of Puerto Rico and the United States mainland was formalized in early 1949 when an agreement between the United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Employment Security and the Department of

⁹Manuel A. Bustelo, "Migrant Workers--the Last Harvest," The San Juan Star, October 5, 1975.

¹⁰Annual Farm Labor Report: 1969, op. cit., p. 3.

Labor of Puerto Rico recognized the work force of Puerto Rico (United States citizens since 1917) as part of the United States domestic labor force. This meant that, as domestic labor, Puerto Rican farm workers were given preference over foreign laborers for available work. It also meant that employment channels were opened through which local Employment Service Offices in various states could request Puerto Rican farm labor directly.

It has been argued that, by the use of foreign labor in a competitive labor market:

A self-reinforcing cycle is...created: foreign workers tend to depress wages; depressed wages discourage domestic workers from taking the jobs; and inability to recruit domestic workers is used to justify the use of foreign workers. The result is the continuation and expansion of foreign workers despite an oversupply of domestic workers.¹¹

The Puerto Rican agricultural workers, although not foreigners, were used in precisely this manner with the additional factor that, by being technically classified as "domestic labor" Puerto Ricans were favored over other non-English speaking groups and had the resources of the United States Department of Labor to facilitate employer contracts and recruitment for growers on the mainland.

¹¹Special Review Staff, Manpower Administration of the U.S. Department of Labor, Review of the Rural Manpower Service (Washington: Department of Labor, 1972), p. 37.

Although the Migration Division may have been established to correct the more flagrant abuses of migrant workers, it was soon subsumed into larger agendas of the Puerto Rican government. The Migration Division began to function as a conduit facilitating the flow of an excess and prolific labor population in order to relieve social and economic pressures.

The obvious, though unofficial, line of action adopted by the Puerto Rican government and its agencies at this time closely followed the conclusions described by Harvey S. Perloff in his work Puerto Rico's Economic Future: A Study in Planned Development.¹² A premise of this important work is that any economic advances to be made within the Island's economy would be more than negated by the rate of population increases, especially among the poorest segment of the population. It is precisely this segment of the population which has the least to offer a technological society, which costs the most to maintain, and which holds the greatest potential for disruption of the society. Perloff suggested, and the Puerto Rican government implemented, a two-pronged approach: birth control and extensive migration. The success of these attempts may be judged by the fact that approximately one-third of the women of childbearing age in Puerto

¹² Harvey S. Perloff, Puerto Rico's Economic Future: A Study in Planned Development, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1950.

Rico have now been sterilized and approximately one-third of the population of Puerto Rican people now do not live on the Island of Puerto Rico.

While the government officially adopted the position expressed in the Statement of Purpose of Law #25, that "the Government of Puerto Rico neither stimulates nor discourages the migration of Puerto Rican laborers to the United States...", nevertheless, the figures on the net outflow of population are revealing. Over 20 years ago, Clarence Senior described the situation as follows:

Only since World War II has net out-migration helped significantly to reduce population pressures. About 4,000 persons per year were lost through migration between 1908, when dependable figures first became available, and 1945. The annual net outflow since has been as follows:
 1945, 13,573; 1946, 39,911; 1947, 24,551;
 1948, 32,775; 1949, 25,698; 1950, 34,703;
 1951, 52,900.¹³

When this article was written in 1953, the Puerto Rican urban migration, primarily to New York City, was the major concern. Yet the seasonal migration of farmworkers had emerged as a discreet phenomenon with its own problems and its own continuing abuses.

The numbers involved in the farmworkers stream are increasing. Those protected by the work agreement numbered 3,000 in 1947 and had risen to 12,500 in 1952.

¹³ Clarence Senior, "Migration and Puerto Rico's Population Problem", The Annals, Vol. 285 (January 1953), p. 131.

Several thousand others established satisfactory relations with their employers during their first season or two, and now come each summer on their own. One obstacle to the program is the private labor contractor who wants to help some employers to secure workers without paying prevailing wages or assuming the responsibilities required by the agreement. Last season eight such agents were jailed for illegal recruiting on the island.¹⁴

Despite the continuing abuses and exploitation of the system for the recruitment of Puerto Rican farm labor, no further significant legislation was enacted until June of 1962 with the passage of Act #87:

The Secretary of Labor of Puerto Rico, by authority granted under Act No. 87 of June 1962, establishes the minimum requirements that must be met by mainland employers before an order extended to Puerto Rico can be accepted. The employer is required to sign a contract with the workers guaranteeing a minimum term of employment; payment of not less than the minimum wages approved by the Department of Labor of Puerto Rico, or the prevailing wages in the work area, whichever are higher; a minimum of 160 hours of work every four weeks; workmen's compensation coverage; adequate housing and, a minimum charge for meals, when provided. The employer is required to arrange for, and procure transportation for the workers from Puerto Rico to the work location, and to absorb the cost of this transportation and return transportation to Puerto Rico if the worker completes his contract. The contract provides also for air-flight and non-occupational insurance coverage. The employer is required to post a performance bond with the

¹⁴Ibid., p. 132.

Secretary of Labor as guarantee to the contract, in an amount which varies according to the number of workers contracted and the area where the workers are to be employed.¹⁵

3. The Development of Puerto Rican Farmworker
Advocacy Groups

In 1964, under President Johnson's plan for a "Great Society", Congress established the Office of Economic Opportunity in the executive branch of the federal government. Title III-B of the Economic Opportunity Act provided for funding of programs for migrant and seasonal workers. These programs were to be used to assist migrants, and the fact that migrants moved from state to state dictated that the programs be designed to serve areas and times of need, rather than be limited to state geographies and state bureaucracies.

Within the next few years, programs for Mexican-American farmworkers and black farmworkers emerged in areas where strong advocacy groups already existed. Although federal money came to states containing large numbers of Puerto Rican migrant farmworkers, no strong, interstate Puerto Rican farmworker advocacy groups came forward with the sophistication to apply for, to receive, and to administer such funds. Consequently, these funds were initially

¹⁵Puerto Rico Annual Farm Labor Report: 1969, Cp. Cit., p.3.

administered by various, existing state agencies.

For example, in 1965, the New Jersey Office of Economic Opportunity, a state agency, received more than \$464,000 to provide services to migrants in the areas of early childhood education and planned recreational activity for migrant youth. The Puerto Rican migrants, unlike the Chicano migrants, do not travel with their families. The fact that there were no Puerto Rican migrant farmworker children or youth may have led this agency to switch their program emphasis to Adult Basic Education and to Medical Services in 1966, when they received nearly \$900,000 for these services. Simultaneously, in 1966, a private, non-profit agency, the Southwest Citizens Organization for Poverty Elimination (S.C.O.P.E.) was funded to provide day-care services for migrant children at the \$85,000 level. In 1967, the state agency was defunded by O.E.O. and S.C.O.P.E.'s funding was reduced to \$17,000.

The situation which emerged in Massachusetts during this time was similar to that of New Jersey. In 1966, the Commonwealth Service Corps in Massachusetts, under the State Department of Community Affairs was funded by O.E.O. for \$152,000, to provide education for migrants in Western Massachusetts, where migrants worked the tobacco crop, and in the Cape Cod area, where migrants worked the cranberry bogs and nurseries. This agency did work with migrant farmworkers on the camps where the migrants lived, too aggressively

some would say. In the course of fulfilling their mandate to provide education classes in language, health, and citizenship training, some members of the agency became associated with attempts to organize the workers in Southwick, Massachusetts. Access to the camps became a major issue and demonstrations resulted with the subsequent involvement of local police, state police, university students, and agribusiness interests. In fact, because one of the large tobacco growers was a subsidiary of a multi-national corporation based in the Netherlands, international and diplomatic pressures were brought to bear in the course of this early confrontation. This issue of access to the camps was to emerge repeatedly over the years, and was not formalized until:

On August 10, 1971, the Department of Public Health approved 'Regulations on the Rights of Visitation for Migrant Workers' under authority of Massachusetts General Laws, Chapter III, Section 128H. These regulations recognize the workers' right to unhindered visitations after working hours, or beginning at 6 P.M. and ending no later than 10:30 P.M. ¹⁶

As a result of heavy political pressures upon the state government, both local and national pressures, the

¹⁶James A. Nash, Migrant Farmworkers in Massachusetts: A Report with Recommendations, The Strategy and Action Commission of the Massachusetts Council of Churches; 1974, p. 46.

O.E.O. funds for migrant workers were moved, in 1967, from the Commonwealth Service Corps to the Migrant Education Project. Concurrently, the term "migrant" was redefined, by state bureaucrats to include "in-city migrants", emphasis was shifted from migrant farmworkers to urban Puerto Ricans, and the target sites of the agency shifted from the camps to the cities of New Bedford and Lowell. A large "administrative overhead" came out of these O.E.O. migrant farmworker funds and remained in the Department of Community Affairs while the remainder of the grant money was parcelled out to the two cities, leaving no support for the migrant farmworker in Western Massachusetts or on Cape Cod despite the fact that these funds were dispursed to the state specifically to serve the farmworker population.

In order to correct this misappropriation of federal funds

In May of 1971 the O.E.O. Migrant Division asked several interested staff members of the Department of Community Affairs to begin the process of spinning off a migrant program which would not only include the Massachusetts counties in the Connecticut Valley, but also the southern extension of the same valley in the State of Connecticut.¹⁷

The author of this study was the Regional Coordinator for

¹⁷An Evaluation of the New England Farmworkers Council, Inc., Springfield, Massachusetts, Submitted to the Office of Economic Opportunity, Migrant Division, Development Associates, Inc., Washington D.C., July 1972.

Western Massachusetts hired to create such an agency to serve the migrant farmworkers. That agency was created and incorporated in June of 1971 as the New England Farmworkers Council, Inc.

A similar movement to more properly apply federal migrant funds was occurring simultaneously in New Jersey. O.E.O. Migration Division funds went first to a state agency, the New Jersey O.E.O., shifted to S.C.O.P.E., a community based anti-poverty agency which did not directly address the needs of the farmworker, to the Farmworker's Corporation of New Jersey, an organization similar to NEFWC, designed to work with and serve the needs of Puerto Rican migrant farmworkers.

One new and, ultimately very important, component of both these new agencies was the delegation of funds to legal service corporations to provide legal service for migrant farmworkers and for migrant farmworker causes. NEFWC became associated with Hartford Legal Services and FCNJ became associated with Camden Regional Legal Services. This liaison between advocacy-service agencies and legal expertise had considerable impact upon the situation of the farmworker by helping to focus farmworker issues in the courts, where changes could be mandated, issues could be mediated, and public awareness could be augmented.

Although agencies to aid the Puerto Rican migrant farmworker were functioning, to various extents, on the

mainland in the late sixties and early seventies, no comparable anti-poverty advocacy agencies were funded on the Island of Puerto Rico itself despite attempts by the O.E.O. to establish such agencies. The Puerto Rican Government fought against the establishment of such agencies on the Island, and, in fact, allied itself with agribusiness interests on the mainland in attempts to defund those agencies functioning on the mainland.¹⁸ It was not until 1973 that O.E.O. finally managed to fund a legal service agency, Puerto Rican Legal Services, Inc., on the Island.

4. The Development of a Puerto Rican Farmworkers Union

In 1969, the Industrial Mission of Puerto Rico, an organization of labor union people (principally from the Amalgamated Meat Cutters Union), "concerned about the plight and powerlessness of migrants, brought union and religious leaders together to create C.A.M.P. (Comité de Apoyo al Migrante Puertorriqueño), a coalition with a plan to organize migrants on the Island and to inform public opinion. Organizers were sent into island villages and some mainland camps."¹⁹ The coordinator of the project, Juan Reyes Soto, visited New Jersey, Connecticut, and Massachusetts to assess

¹⁸ Correspondence to Peter Mirales, Director of the Migrant Division of OEO, from Julia Rivera de Vincenti, Secretary of Labor for the Government of Puerto Rico.

¹⁹ Nash, Op. Cit., p. 64.

the farmworker situation and to formalize a plan to begin the organization of the farmworkers.

As a result of the background assessments and contacts developed by C.A.M.P., in 1972, a religiously grounded group, the Ministerio Ecumenico de Trabajadores Agricolas, (M.E.T.A.), was created. Church and foundation funding provided this relatively militant group with a year-round existence to advocate for migrant farmworkers as well as with a physical base on the Island, where the workers lived when not migrating to the mainland and where the strongest opposition to migrant farmworker advocacy existed. With the formation of M.E.T.A., C.A.M.P. was dissolved since many of the same people were the active agents in both groups.

One of the principle objectives of M.E.T.A. was the organization of migrant farmworkers on the mainland into a viable labor union. In pursuing this objective, much of the groundwork was laid for the creation of Asociación de Trabajadores Agricolas de Puerto Rico (A.T.A.), a farmworkers' union which came into being in August of 1973. M.E.T.A. helped to identify farmworker leadership and supported those leaders in their attempts to form a union.

A significant confrontation between M.E.T.A. organizers and the Shade Tobacco Growers Association during the 1973 growing season resulted in legal actions, public involvement, and the formal creation of A.T.A. In April 1973, about 30 workers, along with M.E.T.A. representatives staged

a demonstration at Camp Windsor in Connecticut over the quality of meals provided for the workers. Consequently, during May and June, M.E.T.A. workers were allowed only extremely limited access to the camps. The Association also limited M.E.T.A. workers by defining and delimiting how many men they might gather together, where they might meet, when they might meet, and what might be discussed. For example, Sister Betsy, a nun associated with M.E.T.A., was allowed to conduct English classes as long as the classes did not exceed 25 men and as long as there was no discussion of "labor matters or distribution of M.E.T.A. materials."²⁰

On July 18, 1973, two M.E.T.A. members, the Reverend Wilfredo Velez and Juan Irizzary, defied the Shade Tobacco Grower Association's visiting regulations, arrived at the camp at an unauthorized time, refused to be evicted, and were arrested by local police. The next day, a newsman attempting to cover this story was barred from the camp. Following this, a large demonstration took place during which the Mayor of Hartford, Connecticut, and a number of newsmen were initially denied access to the camp. A counter-demonstration occurred, allegedly orchestrated by the Shade Tobacco Grower's Association, and insults, milk cartons, and water were thrown at the demonstrators. It was alleged that

²⁰Velez v. Amenta, Civil Action #117, United States District Court, District of Connecticut, Memorandum of Decision, 1974, p. 6.

the men who took part in this counter-demonstration were promised three free movies a week for taking part in the confrontation. On July 26, Irizzary, Velez, and others filed a suit against the Shade Tobacco Growers Association, were denied a temporary restraining order, and the matter was assigned to the United States District Court for a hearing on August 7, 1973.

On August 5, the Asociación de Trabajadores Agrícolas de Puerto Rico (A.T.A.) was officially created by some one hundred migrants outside Camp Windsor despite the climate of violence and fear engendered by the demonstrations. Juan Irizzary was elected the interim president of A.T.A. On August 7, the United States District Court met with the opposing lawyers and worked out a temporary truce in which M.E.T.A. and A.T.A. workers gained access to the camp under court-defined limitations. It was later alleged that the provisions of this truce were ignored by the growers but this case concerning access to Camp Windsor was ultimately decided in favor of M.E.T.A. and A.T.A. The court concluded that M.E.T.A. and A.T.A. representatives had a federal constitutional right to visit the camp. The court ordered unfettered access at all reasonable times.²¹

While pursuing these matters in the courts, A.T.A. was, simultaneously, attempting to gain recognition as the

²¹Ibid., p. i-ii.

bargaining agent of the farmworkers.

On August 23, a delegation from A.T.A. travelled to Puerto Rico to demand before officials of that government the recognition of the exclusive right of A.T.A. to negotiate the terms and conditions of employment with defendant Shade Tobacco. On September 5, A.T.A. presented a formal demand to defendant Shade Tobacco that A.T.A. be recognized as the exclusive bargaining agent for Puerto Rican farmworkers employed by the defendant association.²²

These demands were ignored by the Puerto Rican Government and by the Shade Tobacco Growers Association and, as a result, on December 18, 1973, A.T.A. filed a law suit against the Governor of Puerto Rico, the Secretary of Labor of Puerto Rico, and the Director of the Migration Division challenging the right of the Puerto Rican government to bargain collectively for the farmworkers and challenging the constitutionality of Puerto Rican Law #87. In addition, A.T.A. petitioned the Labor Relations Board for recognition as the sole bargaining agent for the farmworkers migrating from Puerto Rico. This legal action has been referred to the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico and, at this time, neither of these cases have been resolved.

By the end of 1973, A.T.A. had gathered more than 1500 members in Massachusetts, Connecticut, and New Jersey.

²²Velez v. Amenta, Civil Action H-117, United States District Court, District of Connecticut, Plaintiffs' Trial Brief, 1973, p. 10.

had received the official endorsement of the United Labor Movement of Puerto Rico, the United Farmworker's Union with Cesar Chavez, and several member unions of the A.F.L.-C.I.O. After extensive negotiations in 1975, A.T.A. merged with Cesar Chavez and the United Farmworkers Organizing Committee of the A.F.L.-C.I.O. Juan Irizzary, former president of A.T.A., became the Northeast Regional Coordinator of the United Farmworkers Union for union organizing of farmworkers along the east coast.

The impact of labor organizing efforts in conjunction with legal efforts initiated when NEFWC and the Farmworker's Corporation of New Jersey first delegated funds for legal services has totally changed the patterns of east coast employment of Puerto Rican migrant farmworkers. These changes were accelerated when, after much effort, the Migrant Division of the O.E.O., in August of 1973, funded Puerto Rican Legal Services, Inc. on the Island. Thereafter, legal services could be coordinated and

With the lawsuits, the growers' legal expenses rose in some cases to hundreds of thousands of dollars. They found themselves involved as defendants in Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, New York, and New Jersey. Because they had also submitted to the jurisdiction of our local courts, (on the Island of Puerto Rico) they had to retain local counsel to defend cases filed against them by local legal service organizations.²³

²³Bustelo, Op. Cit.

As a result of all this litigation, organization, and attendant publicity, the government of Puerto Rico, in attempting to negotiate a contract for the 1975 growing season, assumed a stronger position for the farmworker than it had in the past. However, because of the severe economic conditions on the mainland, the growers decided to reject the Puerto Rican government's stronger demands and to rely on local labor. No contract was signed in 1975.

Naturally, the executive directors of growers associations began to feel the pressure from their boards of directors to look for an alternate source of labor. They had tried for certification of foreign workers in the past and had not obtained it, and they had to comply with the requirements of the Wagner-Peyser Act; unless, of course, they could obtain a ruling that the contract program effectively removed Puerto Rico from the provisions of the Wagner-Peyser Act.²⁴

This ruling was obtained in the case of Galan v. Dunlop,²⁵ a case against the United States Secretary of Labor involving the attempt to hire Jamaican pickers to harvest the apple crop in Vermont. In effect, this ruling states that, if a grower can not come to contract terms with the Puerto Rican government contract negotiators, those

²⁴Bustelo, Op. Cit.

²⁵Galan v. Dunlop, Civil Action No. 75-1454, United States District Court, District of Columbia, Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, 1975.

workers represented by the Puerto Rican government are effectively not available as domestic labor and, therefore, foreign, i.e. cheaper, labor may be hired.

Thus, laws such as Puerto Rican Law #87, initiated to improve the position of the Puerto Rican migrant farmworker, were eventually used to control the Puerto Rican migrant farmworker, and finally used to exclude the Puerto Rican migrant farmworker.

C. Studies and Documents Related to the Puerto Rican Migrant Farmworker

There are no published, comprehensive studies of the Puerto Rican migrant farmworker. Extensive unpublished data is available on the contracted farmworker within the Puerto Rican Department of Labor, but this population is less than half of those who migrate to the mainland to do farmwork. There has been no published extensive analysis of this Department of Labor data to date.

Despite an extensive literature concerning the population of Puerto Ricans on the mainland, little or no literature on the farmworker exists. Generally, the classic studies of Puerto Ricans on the mainland contain only an occasional reference to the farmworker and little or no significant data.

Periodically, there have been flare-ups of journalistic interest in the farmworker with attendant public

conferences, senate investigations, and topical examinations of the local Puerto Rican farmworker and his problems. This sporadic interest generally resulted in a report, some recommendations, and a waning of interest.

During the fifties a number of small studies involving Puerto Rican migrants on the eastern seaboard began to emerge. At this time, the majority of Puerto Rican migrant farmworkers were concentrated in New Jersey and New England. In 1958, Daniel Donchian made a study of Puerto Rican farmworkers in the New Haven area.²⁶ This was the first published study of the Puerto Rican migrant farmworker in New England, although this annual migration had been occurring since the middle forties.

The Department of Public Health of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts conducted health programs for the Puerto Rican migrant farmworkers through the mid and late sixties. Two of their reports, in particular, and all of their funding proposals submitted to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare contain basic information concerning the migrant farmworkers in Massachusetts. "A Survey of 317 Migrant Workers on 30 Farms"²⁷ and "A Survey of Puerto

²⁶Daniel Donchian, "A Study of Migratory Puerto Rican Agricultural Workers on Farms and Nurseries in the New Haven Area," New Haven, Connecticut, Human Relations Council of Greater New Haven, 1958 (mimeographed).

²⁷"A Survey of 317 Migrant Workers on Thirty Farms," in Massachusetts Migrant Health Project, Annual Progress Report, 1965.

Rican Migrant Farmworkers in Western Massachusetts"²⁸ are valuable demographic source documents.

Documentation of the abuses of the terms of the contract agreement between Massachusetts growers and the government of Puerto Rico, with a particular emphasis on the housing of migrant farmworkers, is contained in the Massachusetts Legislative Council work "Report Relative to Migratory Labor."²⁹

Another important source of demographic data on the migrant farmworker is the Annual Farm Labor Report³⁰ of the Bureau of Employment Security of the Department of Labor of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. Although insights upon some problems which emerged during each year are contained in each report, these problems have been minimally explored. Often, important events affecting the status of farm labor, such as important law cases, are barely mentioned or are ignored.

Two studies describing the situation of the migrant farmworkers in New Jersey are Seasonal Farmworkers in the

²⁸"A Survey of Puerto Rican Migrant Workers in Western Massachusetts," Massachusetts Migrant Health Project, Evaluating the Radio Program Que Tal Amigos, 1969.

²⁹"Report Relative to Migratory Labor," Massachusetts Legislative Research Council, 1967.

³⁰Annual Farm Labor Report, Bureau of Employment Security, Department of Labor, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico (1969-75).

State of New Jersey (1966)³¹ and Puerto Rican Farmworkers: Research Report (1972).³² The first work makes use of interviews of farmworkers, growers, and local citizens and describes employment and travel patterns, income and expenditures, health characteristics, education and child care, community attitudes, and New Jersey's agricultural economy.

"Considerations Relevant to the Proposed, Non-Profit, Migrant Service Corporation for the Connecticut Valley"³³ by Rolando Castañeda is an analysis of the characteristics of the migrant population of Western Massachusetts. This analysis was conducted in order to suggest possible program functions for a non-profit migrant services corporation as the Massachusetts Migrant Education Project was being phased out by the Office for Economic Opportunity because this program did not serve the needs of migrant farmworkers.³⁴

³¹Seasonal Farmworkers in the State of New Jersey, The Governor's Migrant Labor Task Force, March 1968.

³²Puerto Rican Farmworkers: Research Report, Puerto Rican Congress of New Jersey, 1972.

³³Rolando Castañeda, "Considerations Relevant to the Proposed, Non-Profit Migrant Service Corporation for the Connecticut Valley," Unpublished Public Policy Program Major Exercise, Harvard University, April 1971.

³⁴At this time, the author was the Western Massachusetts Regional Coordinator for the Migrant Education Project and was in the process of incorporating a Board of Directors and overseeing the transfer of funds from the

"Conditions of Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts,"³⁵ is a background study of the environment and the context in which the Puerto Rican migrant farmworker works and lives during his stay in Massachusetts. An important conclusion of this research seminar is that migrants did not understand their contracts and their rights under those contracts.

On March 21, 1971, the Senate of Puerto Rico created a special commission to investigate the Office of Migration in the United States and to visit several farms where Puerto Rican migrant farmers were working. The results of this investigation, Report on the Investigation of the Migration Division and Conditions of Work and Living of the Migrant Farmworker,³⁶ indicates that the Puerto Rican migrant farmworker earned an average of \$1768 in migrant farmwork toward the \$2600 average income of this population. The migration division is strongly condemned for not fulfilling its mandate to protect the farmworkers.

Department of Community Affairs to the new service agency, the New England Farmworkers Council. Castañeda, after spending several days with the author, concluded that the de-funding of the Department of Community Affairs and the funding of the new service agency was in the best interest of the migrant farmworker.

³⁵Tufts University, Department of Political Science, "Conditions of Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts," 1971, (mimeographed).

³⁶Report on the Investigation of the Migration Division and Conditions of Work and Living of the Migrant Farmworker, Senate of Puerto Rico, April 1972.

Ward W. Bauder, under a Northeast Farm Labor Research Technical Committee (NE-58) Project, collected data in the summer of 1970 and, in the State of Florida in December 1970, and January and February 1971 for a study of agricultural workers. Two reports were developed from this work. Puerto Rican Hired Agricultural Workers in the United States³⁷ is a confidential report presented to the Puerto Rican Senate in January 1972, and Impact of Extension of Unemployment Insurance to Agriculture,³⁸ published in October of 1972, points out that if unemployment benefits were extended to farmworkers, minority groups would gain considerable coverage and the Puerto Rican groups would gain the most.

"The Invisible Puerto Rican,"³⁹ by Ricardo Puerta, describes conditions on the labor camps and the problems of the men on the camps in New York State.

By the end of the first year of operation of the New England Farmworkers Council, in 1972, controversial legal

³⁷Ward W. Bauder, Puerto Rican Hired Agricultural Workers in the United States, a report presented to a special commission of the Senate of Puerto Rico (Senate Resolution 283, March 24, 1971).

³⁸Ward W. Bauder, et.al., Impact of Extension of Unemployment Insurance to Agriculture, prepared in conjunction with: Regional Research Project NE-58 of the Northeast Agricultural Experiment Stations, submitted to the U.S. Department of Labor, October 31, 1972.

³⁹Ricardo Puerta, "El Puertorriqueño Invisible," La Escalera, May 1972, pp. 22-31.

issues began to emerge with an attendant rise in journalistic interest in the Puerto Rican migrant farmworker in Massachusetts and Connecticut. Two newspaper articles were of particular interest. In August of 1972, the Boston Phoenix published an article entitled "Migrants of Massachusetts - Slavery in the Suburbs"⁴⁰ which focuses on the truck farms and the cranberry bogs in eastern Massachusetts. In September of 1972, the Naugatuck News⁴¹ published a series of three articles dealing with the situation of the Puerto Rican migrant farmworker employed by the tobacco growers of the Connecticut Valley.

"The Connecticut Valley Shade Tobacco Industry"⁴² is an overview of the tobacco industry of the Connecticut Valley and includes a section on labor and the Connecticut Valley Shade Tobacco industry. This work describes, from a business point of view, the situation of the Puerto Rican

⁴⁰ Jonathon Maslow, "Migrants of Massachusetts - Slavery in the Suburbs," The Boston Phoenix, Vol. 1, No. 4, Aug. 22, 1972, p. 1.

⁴¹ James V. Healion, "Migrant Farm Laborers Hit Out at Tobacco Growers," Naugatuck News, Connecticut, September 6, 1972, p. 8.

Ibid., "Shade Grown Tobacco Originally Brought from Sumatra to Florida," September 7, 1972, p. 11.

Ibid., "Puerto Rican Migrant Workers May Form Their Own Union," September 8, 1972, p. 3.

⁴² Kenneth L. Hoadley, "The Connecticut Valley Shade Tobacco Industry," Agribusiness Research Report, April 1973.

migrant worker.

In 1973, the author, with a grant from the Massachusetts Department of Education, compiled a resource directory on information relevant to migrant and seasonal farm labor in Massachusetts. The directory is divided into two sections. The first section contains information on labor recruitment and the demographic characteristics of farm labor, and the second section contains a directory of organizations, educational resources, and people who could assist the Massachusetts Department of Education in developing materials for the Migrant Children's Education Project.⁴³

Migrant Farmworkers in Massachusetts: A Report with Recommendations⁴⁴ is the most comprehensive and sensitive study of the situation of the Puerto Rican migrant farmworkers in Massachusetts. The study was commissioned by the Massachusetts Council of Churches in order to develop strategies for actions to address the farmworker issue in Massachusetts. Nash travelled throughout the state and to Puerto Rico and talked to key individuals knowledgeable about all aspects of the situation. After analyzing the most important issues affecting the Puerto Rican farmworkers, Nash presents nine recommendations and concludes, on

⁴³Frank Llamas, et.al., Sources and Demographic Characteristics of Migrant and Seasonal Farm Labor in Massachusetts: A Resource Directory, Institute for Governmental Services, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Ma., 1973.

⁴⁴Nash, Op. Cit.

the final page, that the State Council of Churches should promote unionization.

Maleta'nd Go: Puerto Rican Seasonal Migration⁴⁵ primarily deals with community attitudes toward Puerto Rican migrants in New Jersey. This study consists of 5 parts: a brief survey of Puerto Rican migration; a narrative on the field experience lived by the interviewers in the course of the investigation, this phase intended not so much to deal with methodological questions as to project the human climate which surrounds the workers; an analysis of the perceptions of the community relative to the workers; a description of the workers and their conditions; and finally, an inquiry into the role of the government of Puerto Rico as it relates to the social conditions of the workers. The strength of this study is in the introduction and the overview on Puerto Rican migration.

"Report of Contract Migrant Workers in Connecticut"⁴⁶ is an official document of the Department of Community Affairs of the State of Connecticut, a study to aid the State Migrant Division Staff "to get better acquainted and updated with the farmworkers' personal, working and living environment as well as their own needs and aspirations."

⁴⁵Falcón, Op. Cit.

⁴⁶"Report of Contract Migrant Workers in Connecticut," Migrant Division Staff, State Department of Community Affairs, Connecticut, December 1974 (mimeo).

300 workers were contacted to fill out a single page, 15 question interview. 87 men responded.

"Estudio de Viabilidad Económica y Social Para Establecer una Cooperativa de Ahorro y Crédito Entre los Migrantes Agrícolas Puertorriqueños en Nueva Inglaterra,"⁴⁷ is a study done in 1974 in which 112 farmworkers in Massachusetts and in Connecticut were interviewed concerning needs and attitudes toward a banking cooperative. This study also included directly derived demographic data. This study concluded that a banking cooperative is feasible, that operations should be based on the Island, and that this should be an inter-agency project of the Puerto Rican government.

"Migrant Health in Connecticut: an Interim Report"⁴⁸ is a health study of, principally, non-contract workers in Connecticut. The men were interviewed directly on the camps, but access to the camps was a problem in several

⁴⁷ Dr. Martin Hernandez Ramirez, Consultor Economico, "Estudio de Viabilidad Económica y Social para Establecer una Cooperativa de Ahorro y Crédito Entre los Migrantes Agrícolas Puertorriqueños en Nueva Inglaterra," Administración de Fomento Cooperativo Estado Libre Asociado de Puerto Rico en Colaboración con el Consejo de Trabajadores de Finca de Nueva Inglaterra, 1974.

⁴⁸ Lefkowich, Stuart, and Faraclas, William, "Migrant Health in Connecticut: an Interim Report," Hartford: Connecticut State Department of Community Affairs, 1974, (mimeographed).

cases and the survey team was excluded from two camps even though the interviewers were state employees. Growers reported the migrant health as excellent. Workers reported their health to be fair.

"The New England Farmworkers' Council: Case Study of a Community Service Organization"⁴⁹ is a doctoral dissertation dealing with the operating of the New England Farmworkers Council, a service organization designed and developed to identify, and serve the needs of the Puerto Rican migrant farmworker in the New England area. This work provides an overview of the background and the current situation of the Puerto Rican migrant farmworker, especially in the Connecticut Valley.

⁴⁹ Bruce Young, "The New England Farmworkers' Council: Case Study of a Community Service Organization," Doctoral Dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts, 1975.

C H A P T E R I I I
P R O C E D U R A L D E S I G N A N D M E T H O D O L O G Y

A. Introduction

This Chapter of the study will deal with the design of the interview instrument, the procedures used to collect the data, the environment surrounding the collection of the data and the procedures utilized to process and analyze the data collected.

The interview instrument was designed, pilot tested, and refined twice before being presented to fifty-four Puerto Rican migrant farmworkers living on eighteen labor camps in Massachusetts and Connecticut during the course of twenty-six separate visits by the interview team in the summer of 1975.

B. Design of the Interview Instrument

The questionnaire presented by the interview team to all the men who were interviewed for this study was a uniform Spanish language document (see Appendix B and C) devised on the basis of indicators drawn from the goals of the study, the review of relevant literature and previous research, and the experiences of the author.

1. The Interview Instrument

The questionnaire focuses on gathering information that falls into four general areas: (1) demographic

information, (2) attitudes toward education and training, (3) attitudes toward migration, and (4) attitudes toward organizations that serve migrants. Questions were formulated in each of these general areas, further subdivisions were constructed, and the individual questions were prioritized in terms of importance, continuity, and effectiveness. In analyzing the data, the questions were regrouped back into the four basic areas of concern.

In order to create an initial frame of reference for the balance of the study, a series of demographic questions were devised to determine, from the worker, his age and his family responsibilities, such as marital status, number of children, number of dependents, and the nature of those dependencies. This section also elicited information on the educational background and vocational background of the worker, his Puerto Rican background, his farmworker background, recruiting information, and other background information.

Information on the rural or urban residency of the men interviewed, which might be expected in this section, was not elicited. It was decided that, because of the rapid population shifts which have occurred on the Island, because of the massive uprooting which has occurred due to the rapid industrialization of the relatively small island area, and because of the contiguity of urban and rural

pockets in most areas of the Island, any matrix to determine the "urbanness" or "ruralness" of the individuals in a meaningful way was beyond the scope of this study.

Information on the annual income of the men interviewed, which might also be expected in this section, was not elicited. It was decided that, because of the irregularity of employment encountered by most of this population, because of the cultural nature of the Puerto Rican extended family in which contributions are made toward the upkeep of the family as temporary jobs are secured, and because of cottage industries and part-time work, a matrix to determine the annual income of this population would be extremely complex. In addition, because there is not a great deal of deviation from the contract wage, which is known, and because questions on income are often viewed as an affront by this population, it was decided not to question this population concerning the individual's "annual wages."

The second general area of concern of this study was the determination of attitudes of the population interviewed toward education and training. A series of questions was included in the interview instrument to determine if the population interviewed was interested in training for non-agricultural employment. Questions were devised to determine attitudes of the population toward education and training, to determine their satisfaction with farmwork, to determine their self-perceived ability to be trained, and to

determine attitudes toward education in general and toward adult education in particular. In addition, the population was questioned concerning financial support as a variable in the decision to participate in a training program. The migrants were also questioned concerning what type of training they would prefer if training were available.

The third area of concern of this study was the determination of attitudes of the population interviewed toward migration. In order to attempt to examine the strength of the forces involved in the decision to migrate to the United States mainland for work, it was necessary to examine the population's preferences for living and working on the United States mainland or on the Island of Puerto Rico. A series of questions was devised to ascertain where the population interviewed preferred to work and where they preferred to live. In addition, the population was asked where they thought the farmworker was "better off" and whether or not they would be willing to migrate permanently to the mainland if permanent employment were available.

Since examination of the stated reasons for migration of this population is an important part of this study this question was posed as an open-ended question near the beginning of the interview before any other references to migration were introduced. A later series of questions concerning reasons for migration were posed at a mid-point in the interview. This series of questions required a

forced response from the population. The purpose of this series of questions was to verify the primary reasons for migration reported by the population and to weigh the relative importance of secondary reasons for migration.

The fourth general area of concern of this study was the determination of attitudes of the population interviewed toward migrant organizations. A series of questions was devised to determine which migrant organizations the population was familiar with, how they found out about these organizations, what level of assistance was received from these organizations, and what kind of services were performed by these organizations. In addition, a series of questions was devised to ascertain the perceived organizational needs of this population, the location of such organizations, and the priorities of such organizations.

2. Pre-testing

After the original interview instrument was assembled in May of 1975, the interview instrument was administered in Spanish to an ex-farmworker who was a student. This interview was conducted with the ex-farmworker in the presence of the author, and the chief interviewer.

As a result of this first pre-test, two alterations were made upon the original questionnaire. Question number six (see Appendices B and C) was altered from "Do you live in Puerto Rico now?" to "Do you have your home in Puerto

Rico now?" Question number twenty-seven was altered to add the option "Yes, a government parcela" to the question "Is your home a farm?"

On May 25, the Cecchi Camp in Agawam, Massachusetts, a vegetable farm, was visited and the pre-test interview instrument was administered to six migrants. As a result of this pre-test, several further alterations were made to the original interview instrument.

Question number three was altered from "The three most important reasons" to "some reasons" because most of the men interviewed offered only a single dominant reason.

Question number twenty-five was altered from three options, "very important reason, less important reason, and not a reason" to two options, "a reason" or "not a reason" because it was felt that the men had difficulty quantifying responses to this series of questions. In addition, the reason "because I wanted to make money to help my parents" was added to the questionnaire because of the youth of the pre-test group and the reason "because it was a way to get money for things I needed for my farm in Puerto Rico" was dropped from the questionnaire because of conflicting responses with the number of men who claimed to own farms.

Question number twenty-six ("Do you own your own home or do you rent?") was altered to include the phrase "or do you live with your parents" due to the youth of the population interviewed.

Question number thirty-six on recruitment was altered to include the option "by the farmer" because a number of pre-test respondents submitted this option in the space marked "other."

After making these alterations to the interview instrument as a result of pre-testing, the document was printed and presented to the interview team for final review before interviewing for the study began.

C. Data Collection Procedures

1. The Interviews

All interviews were conducted by three experienced, native Spanish-speaking, trained interviewers who were graduate students at the University of Massachusetts. The interview team consisted of the team leader, a Chilean who had previous experience in working with and in teaching Puerto Rican migrant workers, a Chilean woman who had previously visited many of the camps in Western Massachusetts as a volunteer in a local program, and an Ecuadorian who had experience working in a rural adult education project among Indians in Ecuador.

The team leader made opening remarks on every camp visited. In every instance, the author and at least one other member of the interview team was present. After the opening remarks the men would be interviewed separately by one of the interview team. Each interview took approximately

thirty minutes and at the conclusion of the interview each man was presented with a sealed envelope containing three dollars "for his time." In two instances, the men refused the "gift" as being unnecessary if this study was "to help the migrant." In other instances, it was felt that men allowed themselves to be interviewed primarily because of the money. The most interviews completed in a single session were ten interviews.

The interview team experienced a wide variety of receptions. In some camps, all or most of the men were eager to interview while on other camps, there was a general atmosphere of distrust and fear and none of the men would interview. In one case the interview team was evicted by the farmer from the premises after obtaining only a single interview.

In some cases the interview team found, but did not interview, Spanish-speaking men who were not Puerto Rican. Mexican-Americans, El Salvadorians, and in one instance, a Spaniard were found on the camps. The interview team also found a camp where twenty black farmworkers lived and a camp where five Polish men lived, men who have come to work in the tobacco fields since the end of the Second World War.

The majority of interviews were conducted in the evening. In a few instances, interviews were conducted during the day. One interview session was conducted in the field while three men were working and three interview

sessions were conducted on Sunday afternoons at the camps.

The greatest success in obtaining interviews resulted when the interview team visited the target camps in advance to establish, with the workers, a definite time when the interview team would return. The interview team made no effort to obtain advance permission from the grower or the farmer.

2. The Interview Calendar

All interviews for this study, including pre-testing, were conducted during the summer of 1975. The first interviews were held in May of 1975 and the last interviews were completed in the first week of October, 1975.

There were several important factors which limited the times when the interview team could actively conduct interviews. Most of the interviews had to be obtained in the evening or on Sunday afternoons. All interviews had to be conducted when the members of the interview team could arrange simultaneous free time from their own primary work and studies. Travel time to the camp areas and the actual locating of the individual, often well hidden camps, took a great deal more time than had been anticipated. This was particularly true in the Cape Cod area where the interview team had no previous contact with the various camps. The interview team made a total of 26 visits to 13 different camps between May 1975 and October 4, 1975.

After pre-testing the interview instrument on May 25, and after revising the questionnaire, the first ten interviews were conducted in Western Massachusetts on June 1, a Sunday afternoon. The interview team visited the Cape Cod area on the weekend of July 18 - July 20 and completed ten interviews on four different camps. During the week of July 21 - July 27, sixteen interviews were completed on two camps in Western Massachusetts and one camp in Connecticut. The remaining fifteen interviews were conducted in the Cape Cod area during the first week in October.

It was expected that many of the camps of the Shade Tobacco Growers Agricultural Association located in Western Massachusetts and Connecticut would be visited in the course of this study. However, because the Association failed to reach a contract agreement with the Puerto Rican Department of Labor, the normal labor force of these camps, more than four thousand Puerto Rican migrant farmworkers, was not present. As these camps were the most familiar to the author and the interview team, and as the contract situation remained unsettled, fewer interviews were actually performed than had been anticipated in the design of the study.

D. Description of Migrant Camps

In the course of this study Puerto Rican migrant farmworkers were found to be living in a wide variety of accommodations ranging from large old houses to one-room shacks,

from well-kept, sanitary and attractive premises to shabby, unkempt and probably unlicensed barracks. Generally, the housing conditions on the Cape were inferior to the housing conditions found in Western Massachusetts and Connecticut. In almost all cases, no matter what kind of housing was contained in the camps, the camps were well hidden from the roads and difficult to locate, even when the address was known.

There does exist a group of people who do know the location of these camps and who make regular visits to them. These include hucksters, salesmen, and prostitutes, as well as some local people, often Puerto Ricans, who visit the camps specifically to provide services, such as transportation to movies and bars, banks, and food stores, for a fee. In addition, the staff of the New England Farmworkers Council regularly visits the camps and provides a Spanish newspaper, *El Espuelazo*. Generally, the only other local contact with the camps is by the police in the event of trouble.

In the larger camps, food is served to the men cafeteria style in communal dining areas. The price of these meals is fixed in the work contract negotiated with the Puerto Rican Department of Labor and this amount is deducted from the men's wages. In the smaller camps, the men prepare their own meals, do their own shopping, and, often have a small plot of land on which they can grow some vegetables

for their own use. Often the men will "chip in" to pay one of their members to cook for them.

For an account of the individual camps visited, the author has prepared a series of tables, Table 1-A to Table 1-R, which provide information and observations on the individual camps visited in the course of this study.

E. Procedures for Processing and Analyzing the Data

The questionnaire was designed so that all responses could be directly key-punched on standard I.B.M. cards. After the data was key-punched and verified, a "Statistical Package for the Social Sciences" (S.P.S.S.) program was prepared which was compatible with the computer services offered by the University of Massachusetts.

The data was tabulated to percent of responses, and, where appropriate, median figures, modality, and standard deviation were calculated. A narrative content analysis was developed in accordance with the data collected and the cited goals of the study.

CAMP:	Cecchi
DATE:	Sunday, May 25
ADDRESS:	Feeding Hills Agawam, Mass.
# OF INTERVIEWS:	6 - pretest
# OF PUERTO RICANS ON CAMP:	6
# OF OTHERS ON CAMP:	0
ETHNIC BACKGROUND OF OTHERS:	-
DESCRIPTION OF HOUSING:	Small single family house - on farm - off road
COMMENT ON INTERVIEWING:	All interviewed; 2 interview- ers - male in house, female outside; friendly, coopera- tive atmosphere

Table 1 A

CAMP:	Hibbard
DATE:	Sunday, June 1
ADDRESS:	Hadley, Mass.
# OF INTERVIEWS:	10
# OF PUERTO RICANS ON CAMP:	12
# OF OTHERS ON CAMP:	3
ETHNIC BACKGROUND OF OTHERS:	El Salvadorians
DESCRIPTION OF HOUSING:	Older, large house; hidden off the road
COMMENT ON INTERVIEWS:	One Puerto Rican refused to interview; one not at camp

Table 1 B

CAMP:	Littlefield Wyman Nurseries
DATE:	Friday, July 18
ADDRESS:	Abington, Mass.
# OF INTERVIEWS:	0
# OF PUERTO RICANS ON CAMP:	7
# OF OTHERS ON CAMP:	0
ETHNIC BACKGROUND OF OTHERS:	-
DESCRIPTION OF HOUSING:	Bad, broken down barracks hidden behind garage off main road
COMMENT ON INTERVIEWS:	4 Puerto Ricans were on camp and consented to interview - a visiting woman stopped interviews

Table 1 C

CAMP:	Federal Furnace
DATE:	Saturday, July 19
ADDRESS:	Carver, Mass.
# OF INTERVIEWS:	3
# OF PUERTO RICANS ON CAMP:	3
# OF OTHERS ON CAMP:	0
ETHNIC BACKGROUND OF OTHERS:	-
DESCRIPTION OF HOUSING:	6 or 8 small buildings - shacks - the 3 men lived in the best small house

Table 1 D

CAMP:	Johnson Landscape
DATE:	Saturday, July 19.
ADDRESS:	Abington, Mass.
# OF INTERVIEWS:	6
# OF PUERTO RICANS ON CAMP:	12
# OF OTHERS ON CAMP:	3
ETHNIC BACKGROUND OF OTHERS:	El Salvadorians
DESCRIPTION OF HOUSING:	Poor housing conditions - one small crowded house, a remodeled gas station, another small house behind
COMMENT ON INTERVIEWS:	7 Puerto Ricans on camp, 6 interviewed, one slept, 5 were out

Table 1 E

CAMP:	Crane Brook
DATE:	Sunday, July 20
ADDRESS:	Carver, Mass.
# OF INTERVIEWS:	2
# OF PUERTO RICANS ON CAMP:	2
# OF OTHERS ON CAMP:	1
ETHNIC BACKGROUND OF OTHERS:	Spanish
DESCRIPTION OF HOUSING:	Small, modern, relatively new house
COMMENT ON INTERVIEWS:	Both Puerto Ricans interviewed

Table 1 F

CAMP:	Pinewood
DATE:	Sunday, July 20
ADDRESS:	Plymouth, Mass.
# OF INTERVIEWS:	2
# OF PUERTO RICANS ON CAMP:	3
# OF OTHERS ON CAMP:	0
ETHNIC BACKGROUND OF OTHERS:	-
DESCRIPTION OF HOUSING:	4 small shacks - 3 men lived in one shack
COMMENT ON INTERVIEWS:	One Puerto Rican out

Table 1 G

CAMP:	Shaw Bog
DATE:	Sunday, July 20
ADDRESS:	Plymouth, Mass.
# OF INTERVIEWS:	0
# OF PUERTO RICANS ON CAMP:	2
# OF OTHERS ON CAMP:	0
ETHNIC BACKGROUND OF OTHERS:	-
DESCRIPTION OF HOUSING:	4 small shacks - one man lived in each of two of the shacks, 2 empty
COMMENT ON INTERVIEWS:	Both refused interview

Table 1 H

CAMP:	Lambson
DATE:	Monday, July 21
ADDRESS:	Southwick, Mass.
# OF INTERVIEWS:	1
# OF PUERTO RICANS ON CAMP:	5
# OF OTHERS ON CAMP:	0
ETHNIC BACKGROUND OF OTHERS:	-
DESCRIPTION OF HOUSING:	Men lived in remodeled section of the barn - very nice, cleanest camp
COMMENT ON INTERVIEWS:	5 Puerto Ricans consented - thrown off camp after first interview completed

Table 1 I

CAMP:	Hatfield
DATE:	Tuesday, July 22
ADDRESS:	Hatfield, Mass.
# OF INTERVIEWS:	0
# OF PUERTO RICANS ON CAMP:	0
# OF OTHERS ON CAMP:	20
ETHNIC BACKGROUND OF OTHERS:	Mexican American
DESCRIPTION OF HOUSING:	Large U-shaped, well constructed concrete block building - clean - like barracks - could house 45 men
COMMENT ON INTERVIEWS:	

Table 1 J

CAMP:	Hartman
DATE:	Wednesday, July 23
ADDRESS:	Hazardville, Connecticut
# OF INTERVIEWS:	10
# OF PUERTO RICANS ON CAMP:	20
# OF OTHERS ON CAMP:	Undetermined
ETHNIC BACKGROUND OF OTHERS:	Blacks
DESCRIPTION OF HOUSING:	<u>Large</u> dormitory type house, bad shape, probably 15 bed- rooms
COMMENT ON INTERVIEWS:	4 older, 3 middle-age, 3 younger refused interviews - many young blacks (teen- agers)

Table 1 K

CAMP:	Norse
DATE:	Sunday, July 27
ADDRESS:	Hatfield, Mass.
# OF INTERVIEWS:	5
# OF PUERTO RICANS ON CAMP:	7
# OF OTHERS ON CAMP:	0
ETHNIC BACKGROUND OF OTHERS:	-
DESCRIPTION OF HOUSING:	7 men lived in a nicely re- modeled living quarters above the barn
COMMENT ON INTERVIEWS:	1st visiting on July 22, interviews established for 27th

Table 1 L

CAMP:	Beldon
DATE:	Sunday, September 28
ADDRESS:	Hatfield, Mass.
# OF INTERVIEWS:	0
# OF PUERTO RICANS ON CAMP:	8
# OF OTHERS ON CAMP:	0
ETHNIC BACKGROUND OF OTHERS:	-
DESCRIPTION OF HOUSING:	Large dormitory barracks with attached dining hall - house 100 men
COMMENT ON INTERVIEWS:	1st visiting on July 22, Puerto Ricans left were closing camp - had more Puerto Ricans and many blacks earlier in the season

Table 1 M

CAMP:	Imperial Nurseries #1
DATE:	Wednesday, October 1
ADDRESS:	Windsor, Connecticut
# OF INTERVIEWS:	0
# OF PUERTO RICANS ON CAMP:	0
# OF OTHERS ON CAMP:	5
ETHNIC BACKGROUND OF OTHERS:	Polish
DESCRIPTION OF HOUSING:	Larger, older house - hidden behind large modern plant - men live there all year - for 25 years
COMMENT ON INTERVIEWS:	-

Table 1 N

CAMP:	Imperial Nurseries #2
DATE:	Wednesday, October 1
ADDRESS:	Windsor, Connecticut
# OF INTERVIEWS:	0
# OF PUERTO RICANS ON CAMP:	12
# OF OTHERS ON CAMP:	0
ETHNIC BACKGROUND OF OTHERS:	-
DESCRIPTION OF HOUSING:	Large wooden barracks hidden off road - among barns and greenhouses
COMMENT ON INTERVIEWS:	12 mostly older Puerto Ricans refused interview, appeared afraid

Table 1 O

CAMP:	Wankinco
DATE:	Saturday, October 4
ADDRESS:	Carver, Mass.
# OF INTERVIEWS:	1
# OF PUERTO RICANS ON CAMP:	7
# OF OTHERS ON CAMP:	0
ETHNIC BACKGROUND OF OTHERS:	-
DESCRIPTION OF HOUSING:	A single family house
COMMENT ON INTERVIEWS:	Men were eating dinner; 5 refused interview, 1 out

Table 1 P

CAMP:	Tehonet
DATE:	Saturday, October 4
ADDRESS:	Wareham, Mass.
# OF INTERVIEWS:	6
# OF PUERTO RICANS ON CAMP:	6
# OF OTHERS ON CAMP:	0
ETHNIC BACKGROUND OF OTHERS:	-
DESCRIPTION OF HOUSING:	3 buildings - 2 small houses like shacks, a separate newer small building for showers
COMMENT ON INTERVIEWS:	All interviewed

Table 1 Q

CAMP:	Century Bog
DATE:	Saturday, October 4
ADDRESS:	Wareham, Mass.
# OF INTERVIEWS:	8
# OF PUERTO RICANS ON CAMP:	8
# OF OTHERS ON CAMP:	0
ETHNIC BACKGROUND OF OTHERS:	-
DESCRIPTION OF HOUSING:	2 single family houses - good shape
COMMENT ON INTERVIEWS:	All interviewed

Table 1 R

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

A. Introduction

This chapter is intended to present and to examine data accumulated through structured interviews with Puerto Rican migrant farmworkers. These interviews were conducted solely on the camps in Massachusetts and Connecticut where these men lived and worked. The interview instrument was presented in the Spanish language and all interviews were conducted in Spanish by native Spanish-speaking interviewers.

In order to clarify the data, the questions from the interview instrument have been regrouped into more meaningful clusters including demographic information, attitudes toward education and training, attitudes toward migration, and attitudes toward migrant organizations.

The interview instrument is presented in English (Appendix B) and in Spanish (Appendix C). The bracketed numbers following each question refer to the numeration of the Questionnaire.

This chapter includes commentary on each of the questions contained in the interview instrument as well as discussion and analysis of the responses elicited from the target population.

B. Demographic Background

One of the primary objectives of this study was to determine demographic characteristics of the population of Puerto Rican migrant farmworkers who travel each year to work the cranberry bogs and nurseries of Massachusetts and the tobacco fields of the Connecticut Valley.

A series of questions was devised to elicit basic but relatively undetermined information about this population, such as age, marital status, number of dependents, education, religion, veteran status, and other background information.

1. Age

Because much of the data to be elicited from the migrant farmworkers concerned attitudes toward education, training, migration, and migrant service organizations, it was felt that age would be an important factor in determining the individual worker's response. By examining the age groupings of this population, conclusions might be formulated about the factors involved in the decision to migrate to the United States mainland as a farmworker. In addition, it was hoped that by examining attitudinal responses within various age groupings, shifts in attitudes might be detected and projected into relevant recommendations.

In general, the population was a young population with a median age of 21. Although ages ranged from 18 to 60, over 60% of the population was 25 or younger.

Q - HOW OLD ARE YOU? [2]

TABLE 2

Years	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
18	6	11.1	11.1
19	9	16.7	27.8
20	3	5.6	33.3
21	8	14.8	48.1
22	4	7.4	55.6
24	1	1.9	57.4
25	2	3.7	61.1
26	1	1.9	57.4
27	1	1.9	64.8
31	1	1.9	66.7
35	3	5.6	72.2
37	2	3.7	75.9
38	1	1.9	77.8
41	1	1.9	79.6
45	1	1.9	81.5
47	2	3.7	85.2
48	1	1.9	87.0
50	2	3.7	90.7
55	1	1.9	92.6
56	1	1.9	94.4
58	1	1.9	96.3
59	1	1.9	96.3
60	1	1.9	100.0
	n=54	100.0	

TABLE 3

Number	Mean	Median	Mode	S. D.
54	29.37	21.75	19	13.288

All the men interviewed responded to the question "How old are you?" Table 2 and Table 3 show the population interviewed to be a young population. More than half of the respondents were twenty-one or younger, and, although the population ranged between the ages of eighteen and sixty, the most frequent response given was age nineteen. It should be noted that the middle group, men between the ages of twenty-five and forty who generally constitute the majority of any labor group, represent only one-fifth, or 20.4% of this labor group.

The data on age in this report may be slightly skewed toward youth because it was observed that most of those workers who were present on the camps but who refused to be interviewed tended to be older workers. Whether this reluctance to interview was due to reticence, suspicion, position, or allegiance to the farmer could not be determined. However, it was observed that the population was relatively old or relatively young with very few workers in the middle group. It was also observed that some of the workers were probably not even the legally required eighteen years of age. In one instance, a worker gave his

age as seventeen, and then, realizing this answer might cause problems for him or for his employer, changed his answer to eighteen. No outside verification of the given ages of the men was attempted, and therefore these figures reflect only what the men themselves told us. If there are any factors which might cause the men to represent themselves as older or younger than they actually are, they are beyond the scope of this report. With the possible exception of seventeen year olds representing themselves as eighteen year olds for legal reasons, this report assumes the given ages to be the correct ages for the population interviewed.

2. Family Responsibilities

A series of questions was devised to determine the marital status of the population, the number of children, the number of dependents, and the nature of the dependency relationship. The answers to this series of questions generally reflected the youth of the population, strong family ties, and a relatively large number of dependents, even for those who are young and unmarried.

a. Marital Status

A question was devised to determine the marital status of the population interviewed.

Q - ARE YOU: NEVER MARRIED, COMMON LAW MARRIED, SEPARATED, WIDOWED, DIVORCED, OR MARRIED? [31]

TABLE 4

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Never Married	35	64.8
Married	12	22.2
Common Law Marriage	3	5.6
Separated	3	5.6
Divorced	1	1.9
Widowed	0	0.0

Most of the men interviewed were never married. This would seem to be consistent with a population in which the majority of respondents was less than twenty-two years old. In response to this question only 12 men, or 22.2% of the respondents, claimed to be presently married and 3 men, or 5.6% of the respondents, claimed to be living in a common-law marriage. Table 4 illustrates these figures and shows that 64.8% of the population interviewed had never been married. Only 4 of the 54 men interviewed, or 7.4% of the population, were separated or divorced. The fact that 83.3% of the men claimed to be Catholics may be a factor in the figures which show that only 1 respondent had been divorced and that respondent claimed no religion. (See Table 32.)

Again, these figures may have been weighted slightly toward younger and non-married population because

more older workers than younger workers refused to be interviewed on the camps.

b. Number of Children

A question was devised to determine the number of children of the men interviewed.

Q - HOW MANY CHILDREN DO YOU HAVE? [32]

TABLE 5

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage	No. of Children
0	39	68.5	68.5	0
1	2	3.7	72.2	2
2	4	7.4	79.6	8
3	3	5.6	85.2	9
4	1	1.9	87.0	4
5	3	5.6	92.6	15
7	2	3.7	96.3	14
10	1	1.9	98.1	10
11	1	1.9	100.0	11
	n=54	100.0		73

As would be expected from a young population in which only 27.8% of the workers were married, (see Table 4), 68.5% of the men interviewed claimed no children of their own. Table 5 shows that the number of children claimed by the workers ranged from zero up to as many as eleven. Of the workers who responded positively to the question "How many children do you have?" the most

frequent response was two children.

c. Number of Dependents

A series of questions was devised to determine the number of dependents and the nature of the dependency relationships.

Q - HOW MANY OF YOUR CHILDREN DEPEND ON YOU FOR SUPPORT? [33]

TABLE 6

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage	No. of Children
0	2	11.8	11.8	0
1	2	11.8	23.5	2
2	4	23.5	47.1	8
3	4	23.5	70.6	12
4	1	5.9	76.5	4
5	2	11.8	88.2	10
9	1	5.9	94.1	9
10	1	5.9	100.0	10
	n=17	100.0		55

TABLE 7

Number	Mean	Median	S.D.
17	3.235	2.625	2.773

Table 6 and 7 indicate the response of the seventeen men who claimed to have children to the question "How many of your children depend on you for support?"

55 children out of the total of 73 children claimed by the workers, 75.3%, were still dependent children. Of those men supporting dependent children, more than half, 52.9%, had three or more dependent children. The number of dependent children ranged as high as ten. The fact that more than three-quarters of the children claimed were still dependent children is indicative of the relative youth of this work force.

Q - ARE THERE ANY OTHER PEOPLE WHO DEPEND ON YOU FOR SUPPORT? [34]

TABLE 8

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	30	55.6
No	24	44.4
	n=54	100.0

Q - HOW MANY OTHERS DEPEND ON YOU FOR SUPPORT? [34A]

TABLE 9

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
1	8	26.7	26.7
2	11	36.7	63.3
3	4	13.3	76.7
5	1	3.3	80.0
6	2	6.7	86.7
7	2	6.7	93.3
9	1	3.3	96.7
11	1	3.3	100.0
	n=30	100.0	

The entire population was also asked "Are there any other people who depend on you for support?" and "How many others depend on you for support?" The responses to these questions are seen in Table 8 and Table 9. More than half of the population, 55.6% of the men interviewed, indicated that people other than their own dependent children required their support. Thus, although 68.5% of the population do not have children, or claim to have no children, only 44.4% of the men interviewed are not helping to support people other than their own dependent children. A total of 93 dependents were claimed by the farmworkers in addition to the 55 dependent children for a total of 148 dependents. Only 13 of the 54 men interviewed, or 24.1% of the population, claimed no dependent children and no others dependent upon them for support. Of these 13 men who claimed no dependents, 2 were separated from their wives and, although they did not support them, they claimed a total of twelve children between them.

Q - WHAT IS THEIR RELATIONSHIP? [34B]

TABLE 10

Response	Frequency	Percentage
One or Both Parents	12	40.0
Parent(s) + Sibling(s)	10	33.3
Sibling(s)	3	10.0
Other(s)	5	16.7
	n=30	100.0

The 30 respondents who contributed to the support of other than their own dependent children were asked "What is their relationship?" 73.3% of those respondents indicated that they were helping to support one or both parents while 43.3% indicated that they were contributing to the support of siblings. This question was asked as an open ended question and the responses were later clustered into the groupings seen in Table 10. The heavy percentage of those who still contribute to the support of their parents and siblings, 46.3% of the total population, is reinforced by the finding that 46.3% of the men interviewed lived with their parents. (See Table 31.)

3. Educational and Vocational Background

A series of questions was devised to determine both the educational and work backgrounds of the farmworkers. The population was questioned concerning both formal education and skills training and was further questioned on previous employment.

In general, the education level was extremely low, considering the youth of the men interviewed. The average grade completed for this group was 5th grade. Over 80% of the men interviewed had held jobs other than farmworking.

a. Education

Questions were devised to determine the level of formal education of the population interviewed and

determine the extent of any skills training possessed by the population interviewed.

Q - WHAT WAS THE LAST GRADE YOU COMPLETED IN SCHOOL? [4]

TABLE 11

Grade Completed	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
0	4	7.5	7.5
1	0	0.0	7.5
2	10	18.9	26.4
3	3	5.7	32.1
4	5	9.4	41.5
5	4	7.5	49.1
6	7	13.2	62.3
7	5	9.4	71.7
8	7	13.2	84.9
9	8	15.1	100.0
	n=53	100.0	

TABLE 12

Number	Median	Mode
53	5.170	2.0

In response to the question "What was the last grade you completed in school?" none of the respondents indicated that they had completed a high school education. 4 of the men, or 7.5% of the total population, indicated that they had received no formal education. Table 11 and Table 12 show that, although the average grade completed

was 5th grade, the most frequent response was two years of schooling. More than one quarter of the respondents had completed only two years or less of formal education. None of the respondents had completed more than ninth grade. Although the four respondents who indicated no formal education were all over 35 years of age, given the overall youth of the population, the educational level found was extremely low.

Q - HAVE YOU EVER ATTENDED A VOCATIONAL SCHOOL, A BUSINESS SCHOOL, OR SOME OTHER SCHOOL OF THIS KIND? [20]

TABLE 13

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	14	25.9
No	40	74.1
	n=54	100.0

25.9% of the respondents indicated that they have attended special or vocational schools. The names or types of schools are indicated in Table 14.

Q - WHAT SCHOOLS? [20A]

TABLE 14

School or Type of Training	Number
Vocational Center for Education and Work	1
Technical School	1
Trade School: Plumbing	1
Trade School: Auto Mechanics	2
Trade School: Electrical Repairs	2
Trade School: Agricultural Machinery	1
Trade School: Wood Finishing	1
Trade School: Carpentry	1
Job Corps	2
	n=12

In response to the question "Have you ever attended a vocational school, a business school, or some other school of this kind?" nearly three-quarters of the men indicated that they have never received any special education or skills training. Table 13 shows the response to this question and Table 14 indicates the schools or type of training received by the farmworkers. The question "What schools?" was left as an open response and the answers were later clustered into the groups shown in Table 14. Two-thirds of the training received was of the trade school type. If these men have been trained to be plumbers, carpenters, electricians, auto mechanics, and so forth, they are presently underemployed. This may be indicative of the relative strength of the economic forces

which lead these men to accept farm labor despite the growing reluctance of youth to enter into farmworking, a low status job. The low priority of farmwork is emphasized by the fact that 83.4% of the population have worked other jobs before becoming farmworkers (see Table 15). This would seem to indicate that, minimally, 25.9% of the population interviewed is underemployed.

b. Work Experience

A series of questions was devised to determine the employment background of the population interviewed.

Q - HAVE YOU EVER DONE WORK OTHER THAN FARMWORK? [30]

TABLE 15

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	45	83.4
No	9	16.6
	n=54	100.0

Q - WHAT KIND OF WORK? [30A]

TABLE 16

Type of Work	Frequency
Factory Work	17
Construction Work	12
Carpentry	6
Vendor	2
Plumbing	1
Sheetmetal Work	1
Sugar Refinery Work	1
Steel Factory Work	1
Department Store Work	1
Leather Worker	1
Book Distributor	1
Restaurant Work	1
	n=45

In response to the question "Have you ever done work other than farmwork?" only one out of six, or 16.6% of the men interviewed indicate they have never worked in jobs other than farmwork. Table 15 shows that 83.4% of the men interviewed have held other types of jobs before they took jobs as farmworkers. This indicates the transitory nature of much of the available employment on the Island, especially when the relative youth of the population is considered. The fact that the population is very young, and the fact that a large proportion of the population has worked other jobs first, hints at both the difficulty of

finding and keeping jobs, and the relatively low status of farm work. The population tended to take other jobs when they could, and to accept farmwork when they had to.

Table 16 shows the kinds of previous employment experiences of the men interviewed. Of the 45 men who said they have held jobs other than farmwork, 39 indicated that they have held jobs in the areas of factory work or construction work. Nearly two thirds, or 64.5% of the entire population interviewed, have held jobs in these two areas.

44% of the men who have worked jobs other than farmwork have worked in the general area of construction work, (see Table 16), and 38% of the entire population indicated they would be interested in training in construction related skills (see Table 38).

This high interest in construction skills may be the result of several factors operant on the Island of Puerto Rico. First, traditionally, a large proportion of the Island population build their own homes. 35.2% of the men interviewed claimed to own their own homes despite the fact that the population interviewed was relatively young and relatively poor. (See Table 31.) Because of the semi-tropical climate of the Island, home construction is much simpler with no need for basements, heavy insulation, or precise and weather-proof construction.

Table 16 also shows that 19 of the men interviewed or 42% of the men who held jobs other than farm

jobs held jobs in factories or plants. The fact that these men are now working agricultural jobs, which have a lower social status and/or paycheck on the Island indicates that factory jobs have become less plentiful.

This can be partially explained by the general economic recession existing during the time these interviews were conducted in the spring and fall of 1975, and partially explained by the circumstances which brought a large number of factories to the Island of Puerto Rico in the first place.

The Economic Development Administration, or Fomento, conceived "Operation Bootstrap", an industrialization program begun in 1950. Under government sponsorship, "Operation Bootstrap" encouraged foreign investment through an integrated program of tax incentives and peripheral support, such as technical assistance, loans, personnel training programs, and financial subsidies. In addition, resource support, such as the construction of roads, sewage plants and utilities was undertaken on an Islandwide scale. Industry was encouraged to settle on the Island and to take advantage of the lower wage scale by offering, in some cases, tax-free operation for a period of from ten to seventeen years. The expectation was that after the tax-free period had expired, the industry would stay to become a permanent part of the Island's economy.

The number of new factories in operation as a result of Operation Bootstrap grew from 548 in 1957-1958 to 1003 in 1964-1965, and then jumped dramatically to 1,674 in 1967-1968 when heavy capital investments were beginning to establish a foothold in the Puerto Rican economy.⁵⁰

During this period, the government of Puerto Rico engaged in a large scale program of construction of roads, sewage systems, and utility systems as well as other ancillary systems to encourage industrialization in what had been rural areas:

For firms locating in areas away from metropolitan San Juan in particular, other government incentives included payment of 'the costs of training supervisory personnel, salaries of supervisory personnel while training production workers, payment of building rent, payment of mortgages on building purchases, payment of freight on machinery and equipment from point of origin to plant site, and costs of certain additional facilities needed to carry on the operation - such as power stations, transformers, electrical installations, machinery and equipment installation and other relevant costs.'⁵¹

Much of the labor force for these construction projects was locally recruited. Work, other than farmwork,

⁵⁰ Morris Morley, "Dependence and Development in Puerto Rico" in Adalberto Lopez and James Petras (eds.), Puerto Rico and Puerto Ricans, New York: Schenkman Publishing Company, John Wiley & Sons, 1974, p.226.

⁵¹ Ibid., pp. 224-225.

was made available to the local population who acquired new skills and new employment interests. To work in construction, or in the factories which followed, became more socially and financially desirable than farmwork.

Many industries utilized the local resources and tax advantages offered by "Operation Bootstrap" but began to move out as the tax advantages expired, as tariffs reduced the profitability of extra-continental locations, and as the general economic recession became more pronounced. As these industries moved out or tightened up their employment practices, the men who had been employed in industry have been forced to seek work in other areas, in many cases by a return to farmwork.

The effects of this diminishing source of employment were accelerated by the international economic recession which was affecting the economy during the period when these interviews were collected.

These economic factors may partially explain what was observed during the interviews: farmworkers with a high interest in training for construction related skills, and a large number of the farmworkers who were either under-employed or possessed skills which were not being utilized.

4. Puerto Rican Background

A series of questions was devised to determine the nationality, the birthplace, and the present residence of

the men who were interviewed.

Q - ARE YOU A PUERTO RICAN? [pre-interview]

Q - WERE YOU BORN IN PUERTO RICO, OR ON THE U.S. MAINLAND,
OR IN A FOREIGN COUNTRY? [1]

Q - HAVE YOU EVER LIVED IN PUERTO RICO? [5]

This study was concerned solely with the Puerto Rican migrant farmworker. Although the interviewers found Chicanos, Blacks, El Salvadorians, Polish, out of state youth - both black and white, and one Spaniard on the various camps visited, only Puerto Rican migrants were interviewed. 100% of those interviewed called themselves Puerto Ricans (n=54), were born in Puerto Rico (n=54) and have lived in Puerto Rico (n=54).

Q - DO YOU HAVE YOUR HOME IN PUERTO RICO NOW? [6]

TABLE 17

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	43	82.7
No	9	17.3
	n=52	100.0

Nearly five out of six, or 82.7% of the men interviewed, indicated that Puerto Rico is their home. Only 17.3% of the men interviewed on the camps live on the mainland and stay at the camps during the growing season.

Despite the fact that 90% of the men interviewed are not working under a Puerto Rican Department of Labor contract (see Table 27) these men still traveled to and from the Island of Puerto Rico specifically to work the cranberry bogs, nurseries and tobacco fields of Massachusetts and the Connecticut Valley.

5. Farmwork Background

A series of questions was devised to determine the extent of the previous farm experience of the population interviewed. The men were asked if they lived on a farm and if they farmed their land. They were asked if their father owned a farm or worked his land. The men were also questioned about the number of times they have migrated to the mainland to do farmwork and whether or not their fathers had been migrant farmworkers.

In general, it was found that more than one third of the men lived on farms, but only a little more than half of those who live on farms actually farm their land. Nevertheless, most of the men have worked on farms in Puerto Rico.

Most of the men have only worked as migrants on the mainland three times or less and most of the men have worked in areas other than farmwork.

A large proportion of the population are the sons of farmworkers, more than 40% of the population are the sons of migrant farmworkers, and nearly one third of the population

are the sons of men who owned farms in Puerto Rico.

Q - IS YOUR HOME A FARM? [27]

TABLE 18

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	8	14.8
Yes, a Government Parcela	12	22.2
No	34	63.0
	n=54	100.0

More than one third, or 37% of the men interviewed, live on farms or government parcelas and consider their homes to be farms. Government parcelas are small packages of about 300 square meters of land given to families in perpetuity on which individuals may build a home and farm the land. 22.2% of the men interviewed lived on such parcelas. Nearly half, or 46.5% of the men who have their homes in Puerto Rico now, live on farms or government granted parcelas. (See Table 17 and Table 18.) These figures suggest that more than half of the population interviewed do not consider their homes in Puerto Rico to be farms.

Q - DO YOU FARM YOUR LAND? [27A]

TABLE 19

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	11	52.4
No	10	47.6
	n=21	100.0

52.4% or more than half the men who claim to live on farms, actually farm the land they live on in Puerto Rico. One respondent does not consider his home a farm but does do farmwork where he lives. Of the entire population interviewed, only one fifth, or 20.3% of the men are actively engaged in farmwork on their own land although 58.5% of the population interviewed has engaged in farmwork in Puerto Rico (see Table 22). This suggests that farmwork, for this population, is employment rather than avocation.

Q - HOW MANY TIMES HAVE YOU DONE FARMWORK ON THE UNITED STATES MAINLAND? [7]

TABLE 20

Number of Times	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
1	12	24	24
2	9	18	42
3	8	16	58
4	4	8	66
5	4	8	74
6	1	2	76
7	2	4	80
8	3	6	86
10	1	2	88
14	2	4	92
15	1	2	94
21	1	2	96
24	1	2	98
30	1	2	100
	n=50	100	

TABLE 21

Number	Mean	Median	Mode	S.D.
50	5.240	3.000	1	6.179

Although the range of responses to the question "How many times have you done farmwork on the United States mainland?" varies from one year to thirty years, the most frequent response given was one time. This would seem to be consistent with the fact that more than half of this population is twenty one or younger and the most frequent response to the question of age was nineteen years. (See

Table 2.) In addition, 83.4% of the population interviewed has worked in areas other than farmwork. (See Table 15.)

58% of the men were doing farmwork on the United States mainland for the third time or less and nearly one quarter, 24% of the men, had only done farmwork on the United States mainland one time. Nearly three quarters of the men interviewed, 74% of the population interviewed, have done farmwork on the mainland five times or less. The frequency of responses steadily diminishes for the first six years, which covers 76% of the population, while the remaining 24% are spread out between seven and thirty return trips to the mainland farm camps.

Q - HAVE YOU EVER DONE FARMWORK IN PUERTO RICO? [8]

TABLE 22

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	31	58.5
No	22	41.5
	n=53	100.0

Q - FOR HOW MANY YEARS? [9]

TABLE 23

Response	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
1	4	14.3	14.3
2	5	17.9	32.1
3	2	7.1	39.3
5	1	3.6	42.9
6	2	7.1	50.0
8	3	10.7	60.7
10	1	3.6	64.3
13	2	7.1	71.4
15	1	3.6	75.0
16	2	7.1	82.1
20	1	3.6	85.7
25	1	3.6	89.3
30	1	3.6	92.9
50	2	7.1	100.0
	n=28	100.0	

TABLE 24

Number	Mean	Median	Mode	S.D.
28	11.393	6.500	2	13.329

58.5% of the men interviewed have done farmwork in Puerto Rico. However, since only 37% of the population claims to live on a farm (see Table 19), this indicates a population who are employed on the Island as farmworkers rather than a population of farmers who migrate during the off season to augment their income.

In response to the question, "How many years? (have you done farmwork in Puerto Rico)", 50% of the population have done farmwork for six years or more. This is in spite of the fact that 50% of the population is only twenty one years of age or younger. (See Table 2.) Table 23 and Table 24 show that the number of years of farmwork in Puerto Rico range from one year all the way to fifty years with the most frequent response being two years.

Q - DID YOUR FATHER EVER DO FARMWORK IN PUERTO RICO? [10]

Q - DID YOUR FATHER EVER DO FARMWORK ON THE U.S.
MAINLAND? [11]

Q - DID YOUR FATHER EVER OWN A FARM IN PUERTO RICO [12]

TABLE 25

Response	In Puerto Rico		In U.S.		Father own Farm	
	Freq	Percent	Freq	Percent	Freq	Percent
Yes	38	71.7	22	41.5	16	30.2
No	12	22.6	30	56.6	37	69.8
Don't Know	3	5.7	1	1.9	--	--
	n=53	100.0	n=53	100.0	n=53	100.0

The questions examined in Table 25 were designed to elicit information about the farmworker background of the respondents' fathers. It was found that more than seven out of ten, 71.7% of the men who were interviewed, are the sons of farmworkers and that 41.5% of the men who were

interviewed were the sons of migrant farmworkers who had worked on the United States mainland. 30.2% of the population, nearly one third of the men interviewed, were the sons of men who owned farms in Puerto Rico.

6. Recruiting Information

A series of questions was devised to determine how the farmworker was recruited by the farmer, whether or not the farmworker was working under a contract, and whether he traveled to the mainland in a group.

In general, the largest group of men claim they came to the camps on their own while a substantial portion claim to have been recruited directly by the farmer who employs them. Most of the men are not working under Puerto Rican Department of Labor contracts, yet most of the men traveled to the camps with a group of workers. 55.5% of the population traveled with acquaintances and 22.2% of the population traveled with relatives.

Q - DID YOU GET YOUR TICKET TO THE UNITED STATES MAINLAND FROM, OR WERE RECRUITED BY A RELATIVE, THE PUERTO RICAN DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, THE COMPANY FOR WHICH YOU ARE NOW WORKING, THE FARMER, A PERSON WHO WORKS FOR THE FARMER AND WHO TRAVELED WITH YOU, OR ON YOUR OWN? [36]

TABLE 26

Response	Freq	Percentage
A Relative	3	5.6
The Puerto Rican Department of Labor	7	13.9
The Company	9	16.7
The Farmer	14	25.9
The Farmer's Recruiter	1	1.9
On Your Own	20	37.0
	n=54	100.0

Table 26 shows that 25.9% of the men, or more than one quarter of the population interviewed, were recruited directly by the farmers who employed them. 44.5% of the men were recruited by the company, the farmer, or the farmer's recruiter. 37% of the men claimed to have arrived here "on their own."

Only 13.9% of the men claimed to have been recruited by the Puerto Rican Department of Labor. This is of particular interest since the Puerto Rican Department of Labor is the only organization empowered to recruit and contract for migrant farm labor on the Island, and, indeed, it is illegal for any other individual or group to recruit farmworkers on the Island. If we accept that 37% of this population did, indeed, get their tickets "on their own" and add in the 13.9% who were recruited by the Puerto Rican Department of Labor, this still leaves nearly half the men, or 49.1% of the population, who were not recruited through "legal" or

government sponsored channels. In general, since more than eight out of ten of the men interviewed live presently on the Island, (see Table 17), most of the men interviewed should have been recruited by the Puerto Rican Department of Labor and should be working under contracts negotiated through the Puerto Rican Department of Labor. Only 7 of the men, or 13.9% of the population interviewed, claimed to be working under contract and only 5 men, or 9.4% of this population, claimed to be working under Puerto Rican Department of Labor Contracts. (See Table 27.)

Q - ARE YOU WORKING UNDER A PUERTO RICAN DEPARTMENT OF LABOR CONTRACT? [15]

TABLE 27

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	5	9.4
No	48	90.6
	n=53	100.0

Q - HOW MANY WEEKS IS YOUR CONTRACT FOR? [16]

TABLE 28

Response	Frequency
16 weeks	1
24 weeks	5
26 weeks	1
	n=7

Table 27 shows that more than 90% of the men interviewed were not working under Puerto Rican Department of Labor contracts.

Two of the seven respondents who indicated they had contracts may have signed contracts with the farmer or the company who employed them outside of the Puerto Rican Department of Labor contract process. In addition, they may have worked at the same camp for the previous season and made arrangements with the farmer to return.

Two other factors influenced both the number of contract workers shown in Table 27 and the size of the groups the men traveled with shown in Table 30. First, because of economic conditions and because of incipient labor and union disputes, the Shade Tobacco Growers Association, the largest regional employer of Puerto Rican Migrant farmworkers, did not bring in its usual complement of more than four thousand men from the Island. Most of those men would have been situated on the larger camps but it was found that the larger camps were filled with white youth, with some Chicanos and with southern Black workers. In addition, the two major periods of interviewing fell at the beginning and at the end of the growing season, before and after the peak number of migrants were living on the camps.

Q - WHEN YOU CAME TO THE CAMP TO WORK, DID YOU COME WITH A GROUP OF WORKERS? [28]

TABLE 29

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	34	63.0
No	20	37.0
	n=54	100.0

Q - HOW MANY MEN WERE IN THE GROUP? [28A]

Q - HOW MANY OF THE MEN WERE YOU ACQUAINTED WITH? [28B]

Q - HOW MANY OF THE MEN WERE YOUR RELATIVES? [28C]

TABLE 30

Number of Men in Group	How Many Men in Group		How Many Were Acquaintances		How Many Were Relatives	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
0	0	0.0	4	11.8	22	64.7
1	2	5.9	8	23.5	8	23.5
2	5	14.7	7	20.6	2	5.9
3	8	23.5	1	2.9	1	2.9
4	11	32.4	9	26.5	1	2.9
5	2	5.9	1	2.9	0	0.0
7	1	2.9	1	2.9	0	0.0
11	1	2.9	1	2.9	0	0.0
15	0	0.0	1	2.9	0	0.0
18	1	2.9	0	0.0	0	0.0
20	1	2.9	0	0.0	0	0.0
100+	2	5.9	1	2.9	0	0.0
	n=34	100.0	n=34	100.0	n=34	100.0

Table 29 shows that 63% of the men interviewed came from Puerto Rico to work the mainland camps with a group of farmworkers. This is despite the fact that less than 10% of the men were traveling under Puerto Rican Department of Labor work contracts, (see Table 27), and 37% of the men claimed to have gotten their tickets "on their own" (see Table 26).

Table 30 shows that, although the number of men in these travel groups ranged up to greater than 100 men, more than three quarters, or 76.5% of the men who came with a group came in groups of four men or less.

More than half of the men who came to the mainland in a group, 55.9% of this population, were acquainted with two or fewer of the group they traveled with. More than one third of the men who traveled with a group, 35.3% of this group, traveled with one or more relatives.

7. Other Background Information

Miscellaneous demographic questions such as the residential situation, the religious affiliation, and veteran status of the population are presented in this section.

Q - DO YOU OWN YOUR OWN HOME OR DO YOU RENT, OR DO
YOU LIVE WITH YOUR PARENTS? [26]

TABLE 31

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Own	19	35.2
Rent	8	14.8
Live with Parents	25	46.3
Other	2	3.7
	n=54	100.0

As might be expected in such a relatively young population, nearly half the men, or 46.3% of the population, live with their parents. The fact that a large number of those interviewed are still living with the parental family is reflected by the fact that 64.8% of this population has never been married (see Table 4), and by the fact that 55.6% of this population claims that other people, other than dependent children, depend on them for support (see Table 8).

Of those who do not live with their parents, 35.2% of the population own the home they live in and 14.6% of the population rent the houses they live in.

The percentage of this population who own their own homes is rather large, considering the relative youth and poverty of the men interviewed. This is partially explained by the government "parcela" land distribution in which small packets of land are granted to families in perpetuity in order that they might build homes and farm the land. Home construction is relatively easy in the semi-tropical climate

of the Island with less need for cellars, insulation, and weather-tight construction.

A heavy family influence can be perceived in the fact that 85.4% of the population either lives with their parents or own their own homes. Only 14.6% of this population rent the homes they live in.

Q - WHAT IS YOUR RELIGION? [35]

TABLE 32

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Catholic	45	83.3
Protestant	2	3.7
Pentecostal	1	1.9
Other	1	1.9
None	5	9.3
	n=54	100.0

The overwhelming majority, 90.8% of the respondents who have a religious affiliation, are Catholic. Less than 10% of the population responded that they had no religious affiliation.

Q - ARE YOU A VETERAN OF THE ARMED SERVICES? [13]

TABLE 33

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	2	3.8
No	51	96.2
	n=53	100.0

Almost none of the men interviewed are veterans or eligible for veterans training or benefits. Only 2 men, or 3.8% of the population, are veterans. Both of these men are over 46 years of age and would have been veterans of the Korean War.

C. Attitudes Toward Education and Training

One of the primary objectives of this study was to determine some basic attitudes of the Puerto Rican migrant farmworkers interviewed toward education and training.

The purpose was to determine if this population was interested in training for non-agricultural employment, or if this population preferred to continue to work at farming. Information was also sought on migrant attitudes toward adult education and migrant preferences for various types of training.

A series of questions was designed to determine attitudes of Puerto Rican migrant farmworkers toward education and training. The population was questioned about their satisfaction with farmwork, about their self-perceived

ability to be trained, and about their attitudes toward education and toward adult education.

In addition, the men were asked if they would consider attending training programs, if they would attend such programs with financial support, and what kind of training they would choose.

In general, it was found that nearly 80% of the men would rather do work other than farmwork, more than 90% of the men think that they could be trained for other work, more than 90% of the men had positive attitudes toward education in general and adult education in particular, and about 90% of the men would consider attending a training program. Money seems to be less of an incentive than opportunity for advancement. Although most of the men indicated they would choose vocational training, nearly one fifth of the men expressed interest in basic education, literacy, or English.

Q -- WOULD YOU PREFER TO WORK AS A FARMWORKER OR
IN SOMETHING ELSE? [29]

TABLE 34

Response	Frequency	Percentage
As A Farmworker	12	22.2
In Something Else	39	72.2
No Difference	3	5.6
	n=34	100.0

Only a few more than one out of five, or 22.2% of the men interviewed, prefer to work as farmworkers. More than three quarters of the population would rather not do farmwork, or feel that it makes no difference.

Q - DO YOU THINK YOU COULD BE TRAINED FOR A JOB
OTHER THAN FARMWORKER? [14]

TABLE 35

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	49	92.5
No	2	3.8
Don't Know	2	3.8
	n=53	100.0

More than nine out of ten, or 92.5% of the men interviewed, felt that they could be trained to do some other kind of work rather than farmwork.

Q - PLEASE TELL ME IF YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH
THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS:

- A. MOST EDUCATION PROGRAMS FOR ADULTS ARE A WASTE OF TIME.
- B. ADULTS WHO GO BACK TO SCHOOL WILL PROBABLY BE ABLE TO GET BETTER JOBS.
- C. SCHOOL IS FOR YOUNG PEOPLE; A MAN SHOULD WORK.
- D. ONE REASON WHY MANY FARMWORKERS DO NOT GET FURTHER AHEAD IS BECAUSE THEY DO NOT HAVE ENOUGH SCHOOLING.

TABLE 36

	Agree	Disagree	Totals
(A) Frequency	9	42	n=51
Percentage	17.6	82.4	100.0
(B) Frequency	50	2	n=52
Percentage	96.2	3.8	100.0
(C) Frequency	11	41	n=52
Percentage	21.2	78.8	100.0
(D) Frequency	46	6	n=52
Percentage	88.5	11.5	100.0

Despite, or perhaps because of, the low level of education of the population interviewed (see Table 11 and Table 12) more than nine out of ten of the men indicated positive attitudes toward education. Table 36 shows that 96.2% of the men agreed that education leads to better employment and 88.5% of the men agreed that lack of education was one reason why farmworkers were not further ahead. This may be partially explained by the Puerto Rican tradition of high esteem and deference toward educated people and partially explained by the fact that this population is excluded from many jobs by a lack of education.

In particular, much of the economy of Puerto Rico has moved away from labor-intense industries, such as agribusiness and toward capital-intense industries, such as oil refineries. Skilled staff are "imported" to administer these facilities, and consequently, the ability to speak

and/or read English has become a criteria for the more desirable jobs available to the local population.

Table 36 also shows that 21.2% of the men interviewed considered education more appropriate for youth and 17.6% of the men considered adult education to be a waste of time.

However, of the 14 men, or 25.9% of the population, who have attended vocational schools or business schools (see Table 13) only one thinks that adult education is a waste of time.

TABLE 36A

Men who attended Special School N=14			
	Agree	Disagree	No Response
Most educational programs for adults are a waste of time	1	11	2

- Q - WOULD YOU CONSIDER ATTENDING A VOCATIONAL TRAINING PROGRAM OR SCHOOL? [19]
- Q - WOULD YOU CONSIDER ATTENDING A VOCATIONAL TRAINING PROGRAM OR SCHOOL IF YOU WERE PAID ENOUGH MONEY TO SUPPORT YOU WHILE YOU WENT TO SCHOOL? [21]

TABLE 37

	Yes	No	Maybe	Don't Know	Totals
Attend School (No Pay)					
Frequency	48	5	1	0	n=54
Percentage	88.9	9.3	1.9	0.0	100.0
Attend School (With Pay)					
Frequency	50	1	0	3	n=54
Percentage	92.6	1.9	0.0	5.6	100.0

Table 37 shows that nine out of ten of the men interviewed would consider vocational training for themselves. 88.9% of the men said they would consider training before any mention of support was made and 92.6% of the men said they would consider training if they could receive financial support. Only 2 men, or 3.7% of the population, switched to a positive response to this question when the incentive of financial support was suggested. When the incentive of support was suggested, there was only a single negative response.

Opportunity, more than money, seems to be the major incentive toward further training of this population. When Table 37 is taken into consideration with the dissatisfaction with farmwork shown in Table 34, the positive self-image shown in Table 35, and the positive attitudes toward education shown in Table 36, it becomes obvious that most of the men interviewed would consider taking advantage of a

good skill development program.

Q - IF YOU DECIDED TO GO TO A TRAINING PROGRAM OR SCHOOL,
WHAT KIND OF TRAINING OR SCHOOL WOULD YOU CHOOSE? [21A]

TABLE 38

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Auto Mechanics	18	36.0
Carpentry	6	12.0
Electricity	6	12.0
Basic Education	5	10.0
English	3	6.0
Heavy Machinery Operator	3	6.0
Machinist	2	4.0
Literacy	1	2.0
Vocational Training	1	2.0
Welding	1	2.0
Sheetmetal	1	2.0
Radio and TV Repair	1	2.0
Wood Finishing	1	2.0
Construction	1	2.0
	n=50	100.0

More than one third, 36%, of the men who would accept training indicate they would choose training as automobile mechanics. This disproportional interest is indicative both of the youth of the population and the strength of the automobile as a status symbol on the Island. In addition, many independent drivers or públicos earn their living by driving people around the Island for hire. This is viewed, on the Island, as a small business, run by an individual, on his

own time, and with no overseers.

Nearly one quarter, or 24% of the men, indicated they would choose training as carpenters or electricians and 18% of the responders expressed interest in basic education, literacy, or English.

D. Attitudes Toward Migration

One of the primary goals of this study was to determine some basic attitudes of the Puerto Rican migrant farmworkers interviewed toward migration.

The first objective of this section was to establish the Island-mainland preferences of this group in terms of both residential choices and employment choices.

The second objective of this section was to examine the stated reasons for migration as directly offered by the men in response to an open-ended question at the beginning of the interview process.

The third objective of this section was to examine additional reasons for migration as determined by a series of direct questions with forced responses.

1. Island-Mainland Preferences

In order to examine the strength of the forces involved in the decision to seasonally migrate to the United States mainland for work, it was first necessary to examine the migrant preferences for living and working between the

United States mainland and the Island of Puerto Rico.

A series of questions was designed to ascertain where the population interviewed preferred to work and where they preferred to live. In addition, the population was asked where they thought the farmworker was "better off" and whether or not they would be willing to migrate permanently to the mainland if permanent employment were available.

In general, it was found that most of the men would prefer to live on the Island and would prefer to work on the Island despite the fact that nearly half the men thought the farmworker was "better off" on the mainland.

More than two thirds of the men would be willing to migrate permanently, despite their island preferences, if secure employment were available. Less than 20% of the men stated that they would not migrate permanently to the mainland, even with a secure job.

- Q - (A) IF YOU COULD CHOOSE, WOULD YOU PREFER TO WORK ON THE ISLAND OR ON THE U.S. MAINLAND? [22]
- Q - (B) IF YOU COULD BE SURE OF A JOB, WOULD YOU PREFER TO LIVE ON THE ISLAND OR ON THE U.S. MAINLAND? [23]
- Q - (C) DO YOU THINK THAT THE MIGRANT FARMWORKER IS BETTER OFF ON THE ISLAND, OR ON THE U.S. MAINLAND, OR THAT THERE ISN'T ANY DIFFERENCE? [24]

TABLE 39

	Island	Mainland	No Difference	Don't Know	Totals
(A)					
Frequency	32	17	3	2	n=54
Percentage	59.3	31.5	5.6	3.7	100.0
(B)					
Frequency	33	20	1	0	n=54
Percentage	61.1	37.0	1.9	0.0	100.0
(C)					
Frequency	15	26	7	6	n=54
Percentage	27.8	48.1	13.0	11.1	100.0

Approximately six out of ten of the men interviewed would prefer to live and to work on the Island of Puerto Rico rather than on the United States mainland. Table 39 shows that 59.3% of all the men interviewed would prefer to live on the Island.

Despite this preference to live and work on the Island, nearly half of the men, or 48.1% of the population interviewed, thought that the farmworker was better off on the mainland than on the Island. This response may simply be due to the fact that these men actually found employment on the mainland. Since unemployment and economic factors were the major stated reasons for migration (see Table 41) this response is not surprising.

Q - WOULD YOU STAY ON THE U.S. MAINLAND THE YEAR ROUND
IF YOU COULD GET A PERMANENT JOB?

TABLE 40

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	36	67.9
No	10	18.9
Maybe	5	9.5
Don't Know	2	3.7
	n=53	100.0

Despite the fact that 61.1% of the men interviewed would prefer to live on the Island (see Table 39), more than two thirds, or 67.9% of the migrants interviewed, indicated they would be willing to migrate permanently to the United States mainland if they could be assured of a permanent job. This further reinforces the relative strength of the economic factors involved in the decision to migrate. Less than one fifth of the men, only 18.9% of the population interviewed, stated that they would not migrate to the mainland permanently, even with a secure job.

2. Stated Reasons for Migration

Since examination of the farmworker's reasons for migration was considered to be an important part of this study, the men were asked directly, very early in the interview, and before any other references to migration were introduced, why they migrated to the mainland to do farmwork.

The responses to this open-ended question were later grouped into the responses found in Table 41.

In general, the open responses elicited by this question were overwhelmingly economic in nature. Often the response was the single word "dinero", i.e. "money". The men migrated to work on farms on the mainland because there was no work in Puerto Rico for the men or because the men felt they could make more money on the mainland.

Q - COULD YOU TELL ME SOME REASONS WHY YOU DECIDED TO COME HERE TO DO FARMWORK THIS YEAR? [3]

TABLE 41

	Frequency	Percentage
No work in Puerto Rico	26	48.0
Could make more money in U.S.	13	24.0
To make money to help parents	4	7.4
To make money to get married	3	5.6
To get away from the city	3	5.6
To do farmwork when there is no farmwork in Puerto Rico	2	3.7
To make money to build a house	1	1.9
A chance to do something different	1	1.9
To visit the U.S. with Spanish-speaking people	1	1.9
	n=54	100.0

Table 41 shows that less than one out of ten, or 9.4% of the men interviewed, offered reasons for migration which were not directly related to economic factors. 90.6% of the

men interviewed cited reasons which were directly economic in nature.

51.7% of the men cited either "no work in Puerto Rico" or "no farmwork in Puerto Rico" as reasons for migrating to the mainland to work. 38.9% of the men cited money as a direct reason for migration. Nine of ten men cited unemployment or the need for money or better wages as their reason for migrating, while the remaining 9.4% cite various reasons such as the need to get away from the city, the desire to do something different, and the wish to visit the mainland.

3. Additional Reasons for Migration

At a mid-point in the interview, after the population had been asked to directly state their reasons for migration, a series of questions concerning reasons for migration which elicited forced responses from the men was introduced.

The purposes of this series of questions were, first, to check the forced responses against the original responses to the open-ended question, and second, to determine the relative strength of some of the secondary reasons for migration.

In general, it was found that, as with the open questions, the primary motivation for migration was economic motivation. Important secondary reasons for migration, such as "to see more of the world", and "to learn English" were quantified. It was found that peer influence, "my friends were coming", was not an important primary or secondary reason for migration.

1 - NOW I'M GOING TO READ YOU SOME REASONS THAT PEOPLE HAVE GIVEN FOR COMING HERE TO DO FARMWORK. PLEASE TELL ME IF EACH ONE IS A REASON WHY YOU CAME HERE OR IF IT WAS NOT A REASON WHY YOU CAME HERE.

TABLE 42

Reasons	A Reason		Not a Reason	
	No.	%	No.	%
1. Because I thought I could get a better job on the U.S. mainland than in Puerto Rico	48	88.9	6	11.1
2. Because I thought I could make more money on the U.S. mainland	48	88.9	6	11.1
3. Because it was a way for me to see more of the world	43	79.6	11	20.4
4. Because I wanted to learn English	41	75.9	13	24.1
5. Because I wanted to make money to help my parents	40	74.2	14	25.9
6. Because it gave me a chance to do something different	38	70.4	16	29.6
7. Because it is a way for me to do farmwork when I am not doing farmwork in Puerto Rico	37	68.5	17	31.5
8. Because there was no work for me in Puerto Rico *(N=52)	*36	69.2	16	30.8
9. Because I needed to work more to get social security	36	66.7	18	33.3
10. Because I was considering moving to the mainland and I wanted to see for myself what it was like	34	63.0	20	37.0
11. Because it gave me a chance to visit the U.S. mainland while living with a group of Spanish people like myself	33	61.1	21	38.9
12. Because I wanted to make some money to go to school	26	48.1	28	51.9
13. Because it was a way to visit my friends and family on the mainland	24	44.4	30	55.5
14. Because I wanted some money to start a business	24	44.4	30	55.6
15. Because I needed some time away from my family	19	35.2	35	64.8
16. Because my father was a farmworker	18	33.3	36	66.7
17. Because I wanted to make some money to buy myself a farm in Puerto Rico	16	29.6	38	70.4
18. Because it was a way to get money to buy a car	16	29.6	38	70.4
19. Because many of my friends were coming	7	13.0	47	87.0

N = 54

These "reasons for migration" were presented to the men interviewed as closed questions in a random manner. (See Appendix B, Questionnaire, Question #25.) Each man interviewed was read a series of "reasons for migration" and asked if each were a reason or not a reason in their decision to come to the mainland. For the purpose of reporting, these "reasons for migration" are presented in tabular form with the most frequently chosen reasons displayed in descending order.

The two reasons for migration with the highest positive response were directly related to economic factors. 88.9% of the men interviewed gave as a reason for migration the search for better jobs and for better wages than they could obtain in Puerto Rico.

Reason #3, "to see more of the world" is clearly an important secondary reason for migration. Although only one of the men gave a similar primary response (see Table 41), 43 men, or 79.6% of the population, agreed that this was a reason for migration.

Reason #4, "to learn English", is another important secondary reason for migration. None of the men gave this as a primary reason for migration, yet more than three quarters of the men, 75.9% of the population interviewed, considered this a reason for migration. As the economic investment in Puerto Rico shifts from labor-intense to capital-intense industry, more of the management personnel are

mainland and English-speaking people. The need to speak English is becoming a criteria for the more desirable and higher paying jobs.

Recently one of the large continental automobile manufacturing companies began operations in its ball-bearing plant which is expected to employ about 300 people when working at full capacity...Most of the labor force cannot meet the educational requirements which include a working knowledge of English...Although the ball-bearing plant could provide employment for many young Ciprianeros, the vast majority cannot and will not apply because of the educational requirements and the rigorous training period. Moreover, the prospect of confronting English-speaking supervisors and instructors dampens the ambitions of the few who might otherwise qualify.⁵²

Reason #5, reason #7, and reason #8 were all direct economic reasons for migration cited at above the 50% response level. 74.1% of the population gave reason #5, "to make money to help parents", as a reason for migration. This might be expected from a population in which the median age is 21, 64.8% have never been married, 46.3% live with their parents, and 55.6% claim dependents other than their own children.

Reason #7, "a way to do farmwork when not doing farmwork in Puerto Rico", and reason #8, "no work for me in Puerto Rico", are related to both seasonal and general unemployment in Puerto Rico. 68.5% of the men and 69.2% of the

⁵²LaRuffa, Anthony L., San Cipriano: Life in a Puerto Rican Community, Gordon & Breach Science Publishers, 1972, p.23.

men respectively, cited these unemployment factors as reasons for migration. The importance of unemployment as a factor in the decision to migrate is verified by the fact that 45% of the population gave, as a primary response, lack of work as a reason for migration (see Table 41).

Reason #6, "a chance to do something different", which was only cited once as a primary response (see Table 41) was given as a secondary reason for migration by 70.4% of the population interviewed. This might, in part, be due to such factors as unemployment, lack of opportunities for real advancement in the employment available, and family pressures. The normal pressures of youth are accentuated in an environment with high responsibilities and low opportunities. The temporary nature of much of the available employment is also indicated by the fact that 83.4% of the population interviewed have worked jobs other than farmwork in a wide variety of work. (See Table 15 and Table 16.)

Reason #9, "need to work more to get social security", was included on the interview instrument as a possible secondary reasons why some of the older men might migrate. The surprising results show that, in a population in which only 10% of the men are over the age of 50 (see Table 2), two thirds of the men, 66.7% of the population, cited this response as a reason for migrating. Unless this question was misunderstood in some way, no explanation for this result can be offered.

Reasons #10, #11, and #13 involved farmwork as a means for getting to the United States mainland. 63% of the men said they "were considering moving to the mainland and wanted to see what it was like" and 61.1% wanted to visit the mainland "with a group of Spanish people." Less than 2% of the population gave this as a primary response, but more than 60% gave this as a secondary response. 44.4% of the men thought that migration as a farmworker would provide them with a way "to visit friends and family on the mainland."

Reasons #12, #14, #17 and #18 were specific economic goals. All were cited at below the 50% level but approximately one third of the men agreed that these were secondary reasons. 48.1% wanted "to make money to go to school." This is an interesting secondary reason in that half of this population did not finish 5 years of schooling and none of this population graduated from high school (see Table 11 and Table 12).

44.4% of the men wanted money "to start a business", 29.6% of the men wanted money to "buy a farm in Puerto Rico" and 29.6% of the men wanted money to "buy a car."

Reasons #15 and #16 are family related reasons for migration. 35.2% of the men claimed to need "some time away from my family" while 33.3% of the men cited, as a reason for migration, the fact that "my father was a farmworker." This would be in agreement with the data which shows that 41.5% of the population interviewed claimed that their fathers have

done farmwork on the United States mainland (see Table 25.)

Reason #19, "because my friends were coming" was, by far, the least cited reason for migration. Only 13% of the men said that this was even a secondary reason for migration to the mainland.

D. Attitudes Toward Migrant Organizations

A goal of this study was to determine some basic attitudes of the Puerto Rican migrant farmworkers interviewed toward migrant organizations.

The first objective of this section was to establish which migrant organizations were familiar to the men interviewed and how the men had heard about these organizations.

The second objective of this section was to determine how much assistance had been given to the men interviewed by these organizations.

The third objective of this section was to examine the perceived needs of the migrants interviewed and to find out what services the migrants desired from migrant organizations.

1. Recognition of Migrant Organizations

A series of questions was designed to determine which migrant organizations the workers were familiar with and how the workers found out about these organizations.

In general, about 60% of the men did know of migrant organizations, primarily the New England Farmworkers Council

(NEFWC), because of their visits on the camp site.

Q - DO YOU KNOW THE NAMES OF ANY GROUPS, ORGANIZATIONS OR AGENCIES WHICH HELP THE PUERTO RICAN MIGRANT FARMWORKERS? [37]

TABLE 43

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	33	61.1
No	21	38.9
	n=54	100.0

Q - (IF YES) WHICH ONES? [37A]

TABLE 44

	Frequency	Percentage
New England Farmworkers Council	30	91.0
Department of Labor, Boston	1	3.0
Religious Organizations	1	3.0
Don't Remember	1	3.0
	n=33	100.0

About six out of ten, or 61.1% of the men knew, by name, organizations to assist Puerto Rican migrant farmworkers. By far, the best known organization was the New England Farmworkers Council (NEFWC). 55.5% of the entire population interviewed, or 91% of the population who knew the names of migrant organizations, knew of NEFWC. One response identified the Department of Labor, Boston, one response specified

"a religious organization", and one respondent "didn't remember." The rest of the population either did not know of any organization or identified NEFWC.

Q - HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THEM? [37B]

TABLE 45

	Frequency	Percentage
Visited the camp	21	67.7
Recreation programs	1	3.2
Delivered newspapers	3	9.9
English classes	1	3.2
Health programs	2	6.4
Department of Labor, Puerto Rico	1	3.2
Other workers	2	6.4
	n=31	100.0

More than two thirds, or 67.7% of the men who knew of migrant organizations heard about these organizations through visits to the camps by members of the organizations involved. Since the only organization named by the men is the New England Farmworkers Council, this means that the men found out about this particular organization primarily because NEFWC staff visited the camp.

In addition, NEFWC has implemented a communications project which publishes and distributes the newspaper "El Espuelazo", also known by the NEFWC symbol "EL GALLO." This accounted for nearly 10% of the responses to the

question "How did you hear about (such organizations)?"

The New England Farmworkers Council also has established health programs and English language programs which account for another nearly 10% of the responses to this question.

Therefore, about 90% of the information on migrant services and organizations received by the farmworker concerns NEFWC projects and was received through NEFWC workers, organs, or programs. This is despite the fact the formation of the New England Farmworkers Council was opposed by the Farm Bureau, by large growers, by the Department of Labor of Puerto Rico, and by Governor Meskill of Connecticut on the grounds that it would duplicate services to the migrant farmworkers.

2. Assistance Received from Migrant Organizations

A series of questions was designed to determine the level of assistance received from organizations by the farmworkers and to determine the kinds of assistance which were performed.

In general, of the men who knew of the organizations to help the migrant farmworker, more than half had received help from such organizations. The kinds of help received involved, primarily, health services, transportation services, and banking services.

Q - DID THEY EVER HELP YOU? [37C]

TABLE 46

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	17	53.1
No	15	46.9
	n=32	100.0

Q - HOW DID THEY HELP YOU? [37D]

TABLE 47

	1st Response No.	2nd Response No.	Total No.	Response %
They took me to the hospital	3		3	14.2
They helped me cash checks	3		3	14.2
They helped me study English	3		3	14.2
They took me to the dentist	1	1	2	9.5
They told me about coop savings	1	1	2	9.5
They helped me attend church	1	1	2	9.5
They took me to a doctor	1		1	4.8
They took me to a drugstore	1		1	4.8
They helped me find someone		1	1	4.8
They helped me look for a job	1		1	4.8
They helped me settle pay disputes	1		1	4.8
They helped me get information	1		1	4.8
	n=17	n=4	n=21	100.0

Of the men who knew of migrant organizations to help farmworkers, Table 46 shows that more than half, or 53.1% of the men had received help from such organizations.

The responses concerning the kind of help received are listed in Table 47 and are a tabulation of the open responses of the men interviewed. When more than one response was offered by the men interviewed, this was also included.

The major areas in which migrants received assistance from organizations were health related areas, banking related areas, and transportation.

7 of the responses, or 33.3% of the assistance received, was in the area of health and medical care. Migrants were assisted at or taken to hospitals, doctors, dentists, and drug stores.

5 of the responses, or 23.8% of the assistance received, was in the area of banking services. Migrants were assisted in cashing checks and given both information about and access to a savings cooperative.

14.2% of the responses involved the study of English, 14.2% of the responses involved helping the migrants to get information, and, in one case, to help settle a pay dispute.

Responses in all these areas often involved transportation. 42.8% of the responses involved providing transportation for the farmworkers to doctors, drug stores,

and churches.

3. The Need for Migrant Organizations

A series of questions was designed to determine the migrant farmworkers' perceived organizational needs. Workers were questioned concerning the need for organizations, the location of such organizations, and the priorities of such organizations.

In general, more than 90% of the men interviewed felt there was a need for more organizations to help the Puerto Rican migrant farmworker. Most of the men felt that organizations were needed both on the Island of Puerto Rico and on the United States mainland.

The major areas of concern to be addressed by such organizations were prioritized by the frequency of responses to an open-ended question. These areas include health programs, legal assistance, education, alienation from the community, assistance with problems, unionization, employment, government interaction, and transportation.

Q - DO YOU THINK THERE OUGHT TO BE MORE ORGANIZATIONS TO HELP THE PUERTO RICAN MIGRANT FARMWORKER? [48]

TABLE 48

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	49	92.5
No	2	3.8
Makes no Difference	0	0
Don't Know	2	3.8
	n=53	100.0

Q - (IF YES) SHOULD THERE BE MORE ORGANIZATIONS ON THE ISLAND OR ON THE U.S. MAINLAND, OR ON BOTH? [38A]

TABLE 49

	Frequency	Percentage
Island	5	10.2
U.S. Mainland	13	26.5
Both	31	63.3
	n=49	100.0

Table 48 shows that the overwhelming majority of the men interviewed, 92.5% of this population, felt that there was a need for more organizations to help the Puerto Rican migrant farmworker. Only 3.8% of the men felt there was no such need and 3.8% of the men had no opinion on this question. Most of the men, 63.3% of those who thought there should be more organizations, felt that such organizations were needed on both the Island and on the mainland. About one tenth of the men felt that such organizations should be concentrated on the Island of Puerto Rico while more than one quarter of the men felt that such organizations should be concentrated on the United States mainland.

Q - WHAT ARE SOME OF THE THINGS ORGANIZATIONS SHOULD DO FOR FARMWORKERS?

TABLE 50

Responses	1st Response Freq	2nd Response Freq	Total Freq	Response %
	46	20	66	100.0
1. To provide a health program	10	2	12	18.1
2. To help farmworkers by providing attorneys	7	-	7	10.5
3. To help farmworkers receive just treatment	4	3	7	10.5
4. To provide education programs	1	5	6	9.1
5. To help farmworkers with cultural programs	3	2	5	7.5
6. To help farmworkers with contract problems	3	1	4	6.0
7. To help farmworkers with personal problems	3	-	3	4.5
8. To help farmworkers organize a union	3	-	3	4.5
9. To provide farmworkers with an orientation and information program	2	1	3	4.5
10. To help farmworkers get better wages	1	1	2	3.0
11. To help farmworkers get better housing	1	1	2	3.0
12. To help farmworkers in Puerto Rico	1	1	2	3.0
13. To help farmworkers get a better job	1	1	2	3.0
14. Don't know	2	-	2	3.0
15. To help farmworkers get a job in Puerto Rico	1	-	1	1.5
16. To help farmworkers get to jobs on the mainland	1	-	1	1.5
17. To provide job training programs	1	-	1	1.5
18. To help farmworkers to receive the support of the government	1	-	1	1.5
19. To help farmworkers collect unemployment	-	1	1	1.5
20. To help farmworkers with transportation	-	1	1	1.5

Table 50 is a tabulation of responses to the open-ended question "What are some of the things organizations should do for farmworkers?" In 20 cases, there were multiple responses to this question. All responses to this question were grouped, identified as primary or secondary responses, and then listed in a descending order of frequency.

The provision of health programs was the major concern of the population. 18.1% of the responses indicated that the men thought there should be an organization which provided a health program. 10 men gave the provision of a health program as a primary response and 2 men gave this as a secondary response.

The second and third priorities listed by the men involved justice and legal aid. 21% of the population thought organizations should provide farmworkers with some kind of legal assistance. 10.5% of the men gave, as a primary response, that organizations should "help farmworkers by providing attorneys." 6% of the men, as a primary response and 4.5% of the men, as a secondary response, thought that organizations should "help farmworkers receive just treatment."

The fourth priority listed by the men involved education. 9.1% of the men felt that there should be organizations to "provide education programs." The interviewers felt that this response referred to educational programs as opposed to training programs since only one man offered

this as a primary response while five men offered this as a secondary response despite this population's overwhelming acceptance of training programs. (See Table 37.)

The fifth priority listed by the men involved alienation and segregation from the communities in which the men worked. 7.5% of the men felt that organizations should "help farmworkers with cultural programs." 4.5% of the men offered this as a primary response and 3% of the men offered this as a secondary response.

The sixth and seventh priorities listed by the men involved assistance with problems. 6% of the men thought there should be organizations "to help the farmworkers with contract problems," and another 4.5% of the men thought there should be organizations "to help farmworkers with personal problems."

The next group of priorities listed by the men involved typical union activities. 15% of the men gave responses in this area of need. 4.5% of the men felt a need "to help farmworkers organize a union." These were all primary responses. 4.5% of the men felt there should be an organization "to provide farmworkers with an orientation and information program," 3% of the men felt there should be an organization "to help farmworkers get better housing." In the case of the farmworker, better housing could, to a large extent, fall under the general union issue of better working conditions since the migrant worker is housed "on

the job" in accommodations provided by the employer.

The next group of priorities listed by the men involved employment and employment opportunities. 10.5% of the men gave responses in this area of need. 3% of the men felt there should be organizations "to help farmworkers in Puerto Rico." More specifically, 3% of the men felt there should be organizations "to help farmworkers get a better job." 1.5% of the men felt there should be organizations "to help farmworkers get to jobs on the mainland," and 1.5% of the men felt there should be organizations "to provide job training programs."

The next area of priority listed by the men involved farmworker interaction with the government. 1.5% of the population thought there should be organizations "to help farmworkers to receive the support of the government" and, more specifically, 1.5% of the population thought there should be an organization "to help the farmworkers collect unemployment."

In addition, 1.5% of the population felt there should be organizations "to help farmworkers with transportation."

Finally, 3% of the population felt there should be more organizations to help the migrant but they "don't know" what, specifically such organizations should do.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Summary

This study was conducted because there are no studies of Puerto Rican migrant farmworkers which have directly solicited their input concerning what they feel to be important for upgrading their skills and for assisting them in seeking alternative employment. There are, and will continue to be, education and manpower training programs implemented to serve their needs, and it will be necessary for these programs to increase their activities as the opportunity for the Puerto Rican migrant farmworker to find work on the mainland decreases.

The major objectives of this study were to obtain information from Puerto Rican migrant farmworkers regarding the following issues: (1) their preferences toward re-training for jobs other than farmwork, (2) their attitudes and opinions concerning preferences toward working and/or living on the Island of Puerto Rico or on the United States mainland, (3) their reasons for migrating to the United States mainland including both economic and non-economic reasons, (4) their self-perceived need for services, and (5) their familiarity with organizations and agencies that exist to help them.

B. Findings and Conclusions

The Puerto Rican migrant farmworker population is a young population. Most of the men are single, and, although many have no children, they have a large number of other dependent relatives. Although many of the migrants are the sons of farmworkers, and many have done farmwork for several years, they are not a population of farmers who migrate to the mainland to augment their income during the off season; they are, rather, a group of under-employed men for whom farmwork represents employment of last resort rather than avocation.

The most significant findings and conclusions that can be summarized from the responses of the men interviewed are:

1. A high percentage of the men who migrate from Puerto Rico to do farmwork would consider training for jobs other than farmwork.
2. A high percentage of Puerto Rican migrant farmworkers would consider attending a vocational training or skills development program.
3. The highest preference for training for young migrants would be auto mechanics.
4. A second important area of interest for training would be the construction trades, i.e., training that would lead to working as an electrician or as a carpenter.
5. A high percentage of Puerto Rican migrant farmworkers, although poorly educated in the formal sense,

- have skills or previous training that indicates that they are under-employed.
6. The men who migrate as farmworkers have positive attitudes toward education in general and toward adult education in particular.
 7. Although money seems to be less of an incentive than opportunity for the migrants who would consider a training program, a stipend would be required to assist the migrants in supporting their many dependents.
 8. Few of the migrants are veterans, therefore, veteran's benefits would not be a significant source of support for Puerto Rican migrants in training programs.
 9. A basic education program or an English language training program, not integrated into a skill development program, would have only minimal appeal to the Puerto Rican farmworkers population.
 10. Most of the men would prefer to live on the Island and would prefer to work on the Island, despite the fact that nearly half of the men interviewed thought that the farmworker was "better off" on the mainland.
 11. Regardless of the fact that a high percentage of the men interviewed consider Puerto Rico to be their home, have strong family ties on the Island, and have a large number of dependents, more than two-thirds of the men would consider migrating permanently if secure employment were available.

12. Economic factors, unemployment and low wages on the Island, are the major reasons that Puerto Rican men migrate as farmworkers.
13. A notable secondary reason that the migrant farmworkers come to the mainland can be attributed to a sense of adventure, i.e., a desire to do something different or to experience new things.
14. Although more than one-third of the men interviewed were the sons of migrant farmworkers, and more than one-half of the men traveled with companions, and more than one-fifth of the men traveled with relatives, they did not make their decision to come to the mainland based upon peer or family influences.
15. Organizations that serve Puerto Rican migrant farmworkers ought to operate on both the Island and on the mainland.
16. There should be more organizations to help migrant farmworkers on the Island.
17. Organizations that serve Puerto Rican migrant farmworkers ought to provide, first, legal assistance (including assistance with their work contracts and their working conditions, and assistance with their gaining and enjoying their full civil rights), second, organizations should provide health programs, and, as a third priority, organizations ought to provide training and skill development programs.
18. More than one-half of the men interviewed identified the New England Farmworkers Council as an agency that helps farmworkers.

19. Only one migrant identified the Puerto Rican Department of Labor as an organization that helps farmworkers.
20. None of the men interviewed identified A.T.A. as an organization that helps farmworkers.
21. The most effective way of being identified as an agency or an organization that helps farmworkers is to visit the camps and to communicate with the migrants on a regular basis as N.E.F.W.C. does with its newspaper.

C. Recommendations

The following recommendations are based upon the findings and conclusions of this study.

1. Recommendations of concern to those responsible for services to Puerto Rican migrant farmworkers:
 - a. Agencies that provide services to Puerto Rican migrant farmworkers should first attempt to provide legal assistance.
 - b. As a second priority, agencies ought to attempt to provide Puerto Rican farmworkers access to health services on the mainland.
 - c. To be more effective, training and education programs for Puerto Rican farmworkers should be offered on the Island of Puerto Rico, not on the mainland.
 - d. Training programs should provide the option for the men to train as auto mechanics and in the construction trades.

- e. Intake procedures for training programs should carefully assess the skills that the farmworker may already possess before recommending a training program. Many of the migrants are job ready and only need assistance in finding a job.
 - f. Training should not necessitate learning English, and the skills taught should be applicable to the job market in Puerto Rico.
 - g. Training should be provided on a full-time basis in a stipended program rather than on a part-time basis after the men have finished a work day.
 - h. Programs should not attempt to settle migrants on the mainland unless a permanent job is the first priority of the program.
 - i. Agencies that provide services to Puerto Rican migrants should provide them with a news service, should facilitate communication between camps, and should assist the migrants in breaking down the isolation that they experience on the mainland.
 - j. Agencies that serve Puerto Rican farmworkers on the mainland should be affiliated with agencies and programs on the Island.
2. Recommendations of concern to those who advocate for Puerto Rican migrant farmworkers:
- a. Advocacy groups should direct their resources toward seeing that the migrants get their legal rights. The most important services that can be provided to Puerto Rican migrant farmworkers from their point of view is first, individual

legal assistance concerning the injustices they routinely experience, and second, collective legal services.

- b. Advocacy groups should direct their resources toward seeing that Puerto Rican migrant farmworkers have access to health services when they are working on the mainland.
- c. Advocacy groups should pressure the Federal Government and governmental agencies on the Island to establish manpower training and adult education programs for farmworkers on the Island.
- d. Advocacy groups should assist agencies that serve Puerto Rican migrants in cutting through the political and bureaucratic barriers that prevent Island/mainland coordination of services.
- e. It appears to the author that the priority needs identified by the migrants are for the types of protection and services that are most often provided by labor unions, hence, advocacy groups should aid migrants in developing the mechanisms for collectively bargaining with their employers.

3. Recommendations for future research on the Puerto Rican migrant farmworker:

- a. A thorough researching of the Puerto Rican Department of Labor's records on contract workers should be conducted and published.
- b. A detailed history of the Puerto Rican migrant farmworker which includes a review of original sources on the Island should be written and published.

- c. An action research project which interviews Puerto Rican farmworkers, both contract and non-contract, living on camps on the mainland with a follow-up study of their situation back on the Island should be conducted and published.
 - d. Research should be conducted to determine if shifts in the annual number of non-contract versus contract workers is related to the success or failure of the Puerto Rican Department of Labor in exercising its power to negotiate contracts with mainland growers. The findings of such a research project would have a significant impact on the future options available to Puerto Rican migrant farmworkers.
 - e. Evaluations should be conducted concerning the success of existing publicly funded projects serving Puerto Rican migrant farmworkers. These evaluations should include both retrospective studies and longitudinal studies.
4. Recommendations of concern to researchers who plan to interview migrant farmworkers:
- a. Researchers who plan to interview Puerto Rican migrant farmworkers should anticipate the time it takes to find migrant camps. Even when the address of a camp is known, finding it may be difficult. Most camps are hidden from the view of main roads and are difficult to locate. The assistance of service agencies or local advocates who visit migrant camps will greatly facilitate locating the camps.

- b. Interviewers should visit the camps in advance of conducting interviews. If the interviewers visit the camps in advance, informally make the acquaintance of the men, and establish a specific time and day when they will return to conduct interviews, they will be more successful at getting the men's cooperation and consent.
- c. Interviewers should attempt to identify and impress the camp leader(s). The leader on a camp, whether formally designated by the grower or informally designated by the men, can facilitate or stop the interview process. Some camp leaders can provide access to several camps in an area.
- d. Interviewers should not attempt to interview when there are other visitors on a camp. The least success at completing interviews experienced by the interviewers for this study was when there were visitors on a camp when the interview team arrived.
- e. Researchers who plan to interview migrants on camps should to the extent possible plan to interview on Sundays. If the men have any free time it will most often be on Sundays. Interviewing for this study was most successful when interviews were conducted on Sunday afternoons.

P O S T S C R I P T

In the course of researching the situation of the Puerto Rican migrant farmworker in New England, and in the course of living in and working with the Puerto Rican community prior to this study, much valuable information, knowledge, and experience was accumulated. Much of what was learned did not fit easily into the relatively rigid format of a dissertation study and yet offered some insights toward a better understanding of the men, the background, and the situation examined in the text of this study. Therefore, it was the consensus of the dissertation committee that an addendum to the study be included in the work in order that a more narrative account of aspects of the Puerto Rican migrant farmworker might be recorded.

1975 was the first year in decades in which thousands of Puerto Rican migrant farmworkers were not imported to the Connecticut Valley to grow and harvest the wrapper-quality shade tobacco grown along the Connecticut River Valley. For years, the Shade Tobacco Growers Association hired thousands of farmworkers from Puerto Rico and had them flown from the Island to the farms in Connecticut and Massachusetts. In 1975 the Association did not reach a contract agreement with the Puerto Rican Department of Labor, which acts as negotiator for the farmworkers. Therefore, no farmworkers were imported from the Island.

By examining some of the factors which led up to the Association's decision not to import farm labor for 1975, a picture of the conditions of this employment and some of the forces brought to bear upon this farmworker population will emerge. It is the opinion of the author that this decision not to import farm labor from Puerto Rico marked a turning point in the use of Puerto Rican farm labor on the mainland and that this decision will have its effect on both the Island and on the mainland.

For years, the Division of Migration of the Puerto Rican Department of Labor managed the migration of farmworkers to the mainland. The function of this Division was to oversee the general conditions of employment, to negotiate a standard labor contract for the workers with the various farmers, growers, and associations, to recruit labor on the Island, and to protect the interests of the individual farmworker. This Division was formed by the legislature in response to flagrant abuses of the farmworkers by the growers on the mainland and by recruiters on the Island. Living conditions on the mainland camps were often sub-standard, unsanitary, and unlicensed, and the worker was often cheated, tricked, or hustled out of his less-than-minimum wages. On the Island, recruiters overcharged workers for finding them jobs which often turned out to be non-existent or vastly different from those described. Conditions on the mainland were seldom as described to the recruit on the

Island. Real wages were always less than promised, and, workers were even transported to the mainland at their own expense and then abandoned by the recruiters with no jobs, no winter clothes, and no way home. The real conditions of isolation, backbreaking and dangerous work, poor food, and incredible living arrangements were never described to the migrant.

In order to ameliorate some of these abuses, the Migration Division was established in the late forties. Its mandate was to set standards for housing and food, to negotiate wages, working conditions, and transportation, and to monitor the entire procedure, interceding on behalf of the farmworker when necessary. However, as a government agency, the Migration Division was soon subsumed and utilized for other agendas of the Puerto Rican government.

One of the major problems facing the government of Puerto Rico in the early fifties was the problem of rising unemployment in conjunction with a rapidly growing population. The rate of population growth was particularly rapid in the ranks of the poor and the uneducated who provided the bulk of the migrant labor force. The Governor of Puerto Rico chose to attack this problem from two directions. Through the Department of Health, an Islandwide program of birth control was promulgated and through the Department of Labor, including the Migration Division, migration of Puerto Rican men was facilitated. The Migration Division attempted

to facilitate the movement of farmworkers to the mainland by tightly controlling the various aspects of this migration, including recruitment, contract negotiations, job allocations, and transportation. At one time, the Migration Division maintained an office in the San Juan Airport and seized the tickets of the men who were suspected of being non-contract workers. This practice was eventually discontinued when the constitutionality of depriving an American citizen of his right to travel freely within the United States was questioned.

Although the Migration Division of the Department of Labor of Puerto Rico was created in response to flagrant abuses of migrant farmworkers, and although there was some improvement for the farmworker in such areas as recruitment, the establishment of minimum wages, and an improvement in health benefits, eventually, the government agenda to facilitate migration allied the Migration Division with certain interests of the growers. The establishment and maintenance of a predictable and tractable supply of labor and the efficient utilization of that resource became of paramount importance. The growers were able to procure their labor at minimum rates through an established network and the Puerto Rican government was able to export thousands of unemployed men for an extended period of time. These men were not on Island unemployment roles for that time, they

sent money back to the Island, they did not consume Island resources, and they did not add to the rising birth rate. The management of this resource became more important to the Migration Division than the rights or the interests of the individual farmworker.

With the establishment of the Office for Economic Opportunity, there was an attendant rise in advocacy for various groups and minorities. The Office for Economic Opportunity programs differed from previous government programs in both scope and direction. It declared a moral and relatively well-funded "war on poverty" and, unlike most government projects, was issued a "mandate of change." To some extent, the "system" was opened to issues and to groups who had previously had to expend their time, their funds, and their energies advocating changes rather than effecting them.

In those areas where issues had already been identified and publicized and where groups and leadership had already been established, progress, plans, and programs to utilize new government funds rapidly appeared. This did not happen with the Puerto Rican migrant farmworker, even though this group supplied in excess of fifty thousand men a year to harvest crops from Florida to the New England States. There are a number of reasons why such leadership did not appear, why a group identity did not emerge, and

why agency support did not proliferate. These reasons are grounded in the ambiguous legal status of the citizens and government of Puerto Rico, in language and cultural differences which were exploited in the interests of the dominant culture, and in the isolation of the group inherent in the structure of agricultural labor camp systems.

The issues of the migrant farmworker, long excluded from the ranks of organized labor in America, were co-opted by Chicano, or Mexican-American groups. Although this group seasonally migrated to perform agricultural work and were a Spanish-speaking population, they differed significantly from the Puerto Rican migrant farmworker. First of all, there were many more Chicano farmworkers than there were Puerto Rican farmworkers. Secondly, the Chicano worked through the west, the southwest, and the central states, a much larger geographical area of the mainland; this large area was contiguous with their places of residence, and was a more open area with a history which already included and incorporated aspects of Spanish culture and language. The Puerto Rican farmworker, instead of migrating through an area starting from their homes, migrated to a specific camp, from an Island home, by airplane. Upon their arrival on the mainland, they were escorted from the airport to camps which were located in rural pockets along the eastern seaboard, isolated from both the surrounding communities and from their homes. In addition, the Chicano farmworkers traveled

with their entire families. This meant that family needs and services were required from a broader community base. The needs of an entirely male population of Puerto Rican migrant workers were more efficiently met in a semi-military manner which also was conducive to both isolation and control. Thus, due to a preponderance in numbers, a difference in migratory style, a closer contact with the communities temporarily inhabited and less highly structured travel and living accommodations, the well-publicized Chicano movement was able to gain agency control of most O.E.O. funds allocated to the migrant farmworker. The Puerto Rican migrant farmworker was a low-priority subgroup of farmworkers. There were other agencies within O.E.O. designed to aid the Puerto Rican population but these agencies were primarily designed to generate programs among the urban Puerto Ricans who were also considered migrants by many state bureaucrats. To the urban Puerto Rican population the farmworker was, again, a low priority subgroup. The difference in social setting, community awareness, and sheer numbers made the problems of the Puerto Rican farmworker shrink to a low priority.

A lack of organization on the Island and a lack of communication between the isolated mainland camps, indeed the nature of the system of recruitment, transportation and accommodation of the Puerto Rican migrant farmworker, helped keep this group both leaderless and undefined. Since this

was to the advantage of both the growers and the government of Puerto Rico, little was done to institute change. When O.E.O. legislation was enacted and funds became available to improve the situation of the Puerto Rican migrant farmworkers, no groups immediately emerged to direct the disposal of these funds, to identify the needs of these men, or to formulate plans for services. Consequently, funds to aid Puerto Rican migrant farmworkers were channeled into existing state agencies such as the New Jersey Office of Economic Opportunity and, in Massachusetts, the Commonwealth Service Corps under the State Department of Community Affairs. For the most part, these state agencies were not equipped to understand the particular needs of these men nor to serve them when those needs disrupted the orderly flow of business-as-usual within the agricultural community. In effect, the state agencies designated to serve the needs of the migrant population were allied with other sister state agencies designated to serve other powerful interests such as the agribusiness community. The O.E.O., using federal rather than state funds, attempted to dismantle this "sweetheart" situation by encouraging federally funded state employees to put together an advisory group which was to become an advisory board including farmworkers. These advisory boards eventually were to become, with O.E.O. supported training, policy boards with non-profit, corporate status, i.e., boards of directors of non-profit organizations. O.E.O. would

then de-fund the state agency and channel money to new non-profit organizations. In this way O.E.O. funds moved from state bureaucracies to independent, non-profit corporations. As this process unfolded, the farmworker gained some influence over the direction of services available to him on the mainland.

On the Island, the Migration Division within the government of Puerto Rico operated with dual and often conflicting mandates, i.e., the mandate to serve and protect the migrant farmworkers and the mandate to serve the larger economic needs of the Island of Puerto Rico. They functioned to oversee and facilitate the orderly flow of labor to mainland agribusiness interests. Thus the situation of the farmworker on the Island within the government bureaucracy was similar to their situation with state agencies on the mainland. Instead of conflicting sister agencies within a state, the Puerto Rican government maintained a single state agency with conflicting mandates. The result in both cases was the attempt to maintain the status quo.

The routine function of all these agencies became the facilitation of the uninterrupted flow of Puerto Rico's excess labor. Only in a few exceptional or extreme situations were the advocacy functions of these agencies utilized. In fact, the government of Puerto Rico was so adamant about maintaining control of the entire process of

supplying migrant farmworker labor that for years it vehemently resisted any attempts to place O.E.O. farmworker agencies on the Island and refused any O.E.O. migrant funds. In addition, the Migration Division attempted to hinder both the formation and the operation of such groups on the mainland. In doing this, they found themselves in alliance with mainland agribusiness interests and with mainland state agencies who, for a variety of reasons, were opposed to the O.E.O.'s "mandate of change."

One of the few legal channels left to the farmworker to improve his situation was the move toward unionization. A group of union and religious leaders began visibly working toward this end in 1969. Organizations such as C.A.M.P. and M.E.T.A. were created to formulate plans and strategies, to identify resources and leadership, and to disseminate information. Their maturation, sophistication and areas of focus, in many ways, paralleled the evolution of O.E.O. sponsored agencies on the mainland. In 1972, when M.E.T.A. began its direct contact with migrants on the mainland, the differences between the agencies' efforts and the unionization efforts were emphasized, but, by 1973 it became obvious to both groups that the most significant advances by either group would be achieved through litigation and class action law suits.

By this time, President Nixon was in the process of dismantling O.E.O. and its agencies. As the agencies

responded to crisis pressures from both federal and state sources, they became less effective. However, M.E.T.A., not subject to these restrictive forces, had progressed to the point where they were prepared to incorporate a union of farmworkers and to pursue the legal rights of that union and its members through the federal courts. It was at this critical point that an attorney who had directed the legal component of the N.E.F.W.C. resigned from that agency and became the attorney for M.E.T.A. and later the newly incorporated union of farmworkers, A.T.A. Class action suits were brought on behalf of M.E.T.A. and A.T.A. which significantly affected the relationships between the Puerto Rican government, the large growers, and the migrant farmworkers.

During 1974 union sponsored legal activities in Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Jersey, and on the Island of Puerto Rico were having their effect. A great deal of publicity was generated which placed pressure on the Puerto Rican government to take a stronger stance in their negotiations for a labor contract with the large growers. The growers were also faced with the costs of maintaining huge legal defense efforts and the debilitating effects of consistently negative publicity attendant to their legal involvement. In addition, the nation, at this time, was in the midst of a severe economic recession. Because of the costs, the pressures, the negative publicity, and the availability of unemployed local labor, no contract to import

Puerto Rican farm labor was signed by large growers for 1975.

The implications and the effects of this failure to reach contract agreement in 1975 will impact Puerto Rican society far beyond the obvious loss of seasonal income for thousands of families. Many men, out of choice or out of desperation, will continue to come to the mainland as farmworkers but without contracts. However, many thousands will stay home. Without the active recruitment and placement activities of the Migration Division, many younger men will never migrate as farmworkers. These men will not be sending money home, but will, instead, add to the continually rising rate of unemployment, will add to the principle problem of Puerto Rico's rising birth rate, will consume rather than augment the Island's resources, and will require a larger investment of social and educational services. In addition, the percentage of this group who have always "settled out" on the mainland and gathered their families to them will remain on the Island.

If this situation is left unattended, the economic problems and social unrest inherent to this group could generate severe problems for the Puerto Rican government.

The annual migration of thousands of otherwise unemployed young farmworkers has been a control mechanism for which the Puerto Rican government has few options. For years the government has discouraged intervention with its

farmworker program. It has fought hard to cloak its activities and to cover up its abuses because of the sensitivity and importance of this group. The government must continue to move thousands of young, unemployed and untrained potential fathers from the Island.

Since the failure of contract negotiations by the Department of Labor, alternatives must be devised. What options are available to the Puerto Rican government? It can do nothing and watch this group of young and disenfranchized men become aggressively political. This could tend to force the government toward socialism and independence. It could take an active stand to receive increased federal aid in conjunction with moves toward statehood. It could acknowledge the depopulation agenda of the Migration Division and foster settlement on the mainland. However, this scheme involves a multitude of political problems, both on the mainland where the migrants would settle and on the Island where national pride is a political issue.

However the Puerto Rican government chooses to handle the closing of this safety valve, there will be significant ramifications which will extend throughout the fabric of Puerto Rican society and will help to determine the future of Island-mainland political and economic relationships.

A P P E N D I X A

SUMMARY OF MIGRANT FARMWORKERS STATISTICS

NUMBER OF CONTRACT AGRICULTURAL WORKERS
REFERRED TO UNITED STATES MAINLAND SINCE 1948

1948	4,906
1949	4,598
1950	7,598
1951	11,747
1952	12,277
1953	14,930
1954	10,637
1955	10,876
1956	14,969
1957	13,214
1958	13,067
1959	10,012
1960	12,986
1961	13,765
1962	13,526
1963	13,116
1964	14,628
1965	17,385
1966	19,537
1967	21,654
1968	22,902
1969	21,864
1970	18,884
1971	14,119
1972	11,900
1973	14,641
1974	12,760
1975	5,639

NUMBER OF CONTRACT AGRICULTURAL WORKERS REFERRED BY STATES

States	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975
California	162	877	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Connecticut	1,569	2,245	4,237	4,483	4,627	4,621	3,253	2,780	2,645	3,336	-	-
Delaware	1,678	1,586	2,105	2,875	2,444	2,365	1,922	1,587	1,691	1,670	3,546	-
Illinois	-	-	-	-	-	11	-	-	-	1,570	1,543	1,077
Indiana	-	-	-	-	-	17	19	15	43	-	-	-
Iowa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	68	-
Maine	25	20	-	69	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Maryland	290	298	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Massachusetts	928	1,423	268	375	182	248	133	129	79	145	84	22
Michigan	333	613	1,829	1,651	1,915	1,978	2,149	1,283	990	1,290	724	1,108
Minnesota	-	-	498	51	103	142	46	16	-	-	-	-
New Hampshire	43	-	-	293	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
New Jersey	7,390	8,034	33	41	42	54	23	20	19	27	14	81
New York	1,677	1,569	7,568	7,484	9,589	8,938	8,541	6,668	5,141	6,188	5,073	3,063
Ohio	-	-	2,325	3,479	2,851	2,188	1,737	1,245	957	1,375	1,158	1,745
Pennsylvania	488	597	158	333	284	299	191	-	-	-	-	-
Rhode Island	16	16	481	477	756	701	577	209	116	134	134	132
South Carolina	-	-	28	36	66	105	95	61	61	52	93	83
Washington	92	-	-	-	-	192	100	94	129	304	311	365
West Virginia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Wisconsin	7	9	7	7	43	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTALS	14,628	17,365	19,537	21,554	22,902	21,864	18,884	14,119	11,900	14,641	12,760	5,639

A P P E N D I X B

ENGLISH QUESTIONNAIRE

PUERTO RICAN MIGRANT FARMWORKER SURVEY

Frank Llamas

School of Education
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, Massachusetts

INTRODUCTION TO WORKER:

Good afternoon. I'm _____ from the University.

We're interested in finding out about some of the ideas of the Puerto Rican men who come here to work.

First, I would like to know, are you a Puerto Rican?

Yes...(Skip to next page)...[]

No.....(End interview).....[]

	Yes	No	Don't Know	
5. Have you ever lived in Puerto Rico?.....				$\frac{1}{16}$
6. Do you have your home in Puerto Rico now?.....				$\frac{1}{17}$
7. How many times have you done farmwork on the U.S. mainland? []				$\frac{1}{18}$ 1
8. Have you ever done farmwork in Puerto Rico?.....				$\frac{1}{20}$
9. [IF YES to Question #8 ask:] For how many years?..... []				$\frac{1}{21}$ 2
10. Did your father ever do farmwork in Puerto Rico?.....				$\frac{1}{23}$
11. Did your father ever do farmwork on the U.S. mainland?.....				$\frac{1}{24}$
12. Did your father ever <u>own</u> a farm in Puerto Rico?.....				$\frac{1}{25}$
13. Are you a veteran of the armed services?.....				$\frac{1}{26}$
14. Do you think you could be trained for a job other than farmwork?....				$\frac{1}{27}$
15. Are you working under a Puerto Rican Department of Labor contract?..				$\frac{1}{28}$
16. [IF YES to Question #15 ask:] How many weeks is your contract for?..... []				$\frac{1}{29}$ 3

	Agree	Disagree	
17. Please tell me if you agree or if you disagree with the following statements:			
17A. Most education programs for adults are a waste of time.....			$\frac{1}{31}$
17B. Adults who go back to school will probably be able to get better jobs.....			$\frac{1}{32}$
17C. School is for young people; a man should work.....			$\frac{1}{33}$
17D. One reason why many farmworkers do not get further ahead is because they do not have enough schooling.....			$\frac{1}{34}$

18. Would you stay on the U.S. mainland the year round if you could get a permanent job?	Yes..... []			
	No..... []			$\frac{1}{35}$
	Maybe..... []			
	Don't know..... []			

19. Would you consider attending a vocational training program or school?

- Yes.....[]
- No.....[]
- Maybe.....[]
- Don't know.....[]

20. Have you ever attended a vocational school, a business school, or some other special school of this kind?

- Yes.....[]
- No.....[]

[IF YES ask:] 20A. What schools? _____

21. Would you consider attending a vocational training program or school if you were paid enough money to support you while you went to school?

- Yes.....[]
- No.....[]
- Maybe.....[]
- Don't know.....[]

[IF YES ask:] 21A. If you decided to go to a training program or school, what kind of training or school would you choose?

22. If you could choose, would you prefer to work on the Island or on the U.S. mainland?.....

23. If you could be sure of a job, would you prefer to live on the Island or on the U.S. mainland?.....

24. Do you think that the migrant farmworker is better off on the Island, or on the U.S. mainland, or that there isn't any difference?.....

	Island	Mainland	No. Difference	Don't Know
22. If you could choose, would you prefer to <u>work</u> on the Island or on the U.S. mainland?.....				
23. If you could be sure of a job, would you prefer to <u>live</u> on the Island or on the U.S. mainland?.....				
24. Do you think that the migrant farmworker is better off on the Island, or on the U.S. mainland, or that there isn't any difference?.....				

25. Now I'm going to read you some reasons that people have given for coming here to do farmwork. Please tell me if each one was a reason why you came here or if it was not a reason why you came here.

	Reason	Not A Reason	
a. Because many of my friends were coming.....			$\frac{1}{46}$
b. Because I wanted to make money to help my parents.....			$\frac{1}{47}$
c. Because I thought I could make more money on the U.S. mainland.....			$\frac{1}{48}$
d. Because there was no work for me in Puerto Rico.....			$\frac{1}{49}$
e. Because it gave me a chance to do something different.....			$\frac{1}{50}$
f. Because I was considering moving to the mainland and I wanted to see for myself what it was like.....			$\frac{1}{51}$
g. Because it was a way to visit my friends and family on the mainland.....			$\frac{1}{52}$
h. Because it was a way to get money to buy a car.....			$\frac{1}{53}$
i. Because it was a way for me to see more of the world.....			$\frac{1}{54}$
j. Because I needed some time away from my family.....			$\frac{1}{55}$
k. Because I thought I could get a better job on the U.S. mainland than in Puerto Rico.....			$\frac{1}{56}$
l. Because it gave me a chance to visit the U.S. mainland while living with a group of Spanish people like myself.....			$\frac{1}{57}$
m. Because it is a way for me to do farmwork when I am not doing farmwork in Puerto Rico.....			$\frac{1}{58}$
n. Because I wanted to make some money to buy myself a farm in Puerto Rico.....			$\frac{1}{59}$
o. Because I wanted to make some money to go to school.....			$\frac{1}{60}$
p. Because I wanted to make some money to start a business.....			$\frac{1}{61}$
q. Because I needed to work more to get social security.....			$\frac{1}{62}$
r. Because my father was a farmworker.....			$\frac{1}{63}$
s. Because I wanted to learn English.....			$\frac{1}{64}$

26. Do you own your own home, or do you rent, or do you live with your parents?

- Own.....[]
- Rent.....[]
- Live with parents.....[]
- Other.....[]

$\frac{1}{65}$

Other: _____

27. Is your home a farm?

- Yes.....[]
- Yes, a government parcela....[]
- No.....[]

$\frac{1}{66}$

[IF YES ask:] 27A. Do you farm your land?

- Yes.....[]
- No.....[]

$\frac{1}{67}$

28. When you came to the camp to work, did you come with a group of workers?

- Yes.....[]
- No.....[]

$\frac{1}{68}$

[IF YES ask:] 28A. How many men were in the group?

$\frac{1}{69}$

28B. How many of the men were you acquainted with?

$\frac{1}{71}$

28C. How many of the men were your relatives?

$\frac{1}{73}$

29. Would you prefer to work as a farmworker or in something else?

- As a farmworker.....[]
- In something else.....[]
- No difference.....[]
- Don't know.....[]

$\frac{1}{74}$

30. Have you ever done work other than farmwork?

- Yes.....[]
- No.....[]

$\frac{1}{75}$

[IF YES ask:] 30A. What kind of work?

$\frac{1}{76}$

31. Are you: /
 Never married.....[] 78
 Common-law-marriage.....[]
 Separated.....[]
 Widowed.....[]
 Divorced.....[]
 Married.....[]
32. How many children do you have? /
[_____] 79 /
8
- [IF NONE: Skip to Question #34]
33. How many of your children depend on you for support? /
[_____] 8 /
9
34. Are there any other people who depend on you for support?
 Yes.....[] /
 No.....[] 10
- [IF YES ask:] 34A. How many others depend on you for support?
[_____] /
11 /
- 34B. What is their relationship?
 _____ /
 _____ 13 /
 _____ 1
35. What is your religion? /
 Catholic.....[] 15
 Protestant.....[]
 Pentecostal.....[]
 Other.....[]
 None.....[]
- Other: _____
36. Did you get your ticket to the U.S. mainland from, or were you recruited by: /
 A relative.....[] 16
 The Puerto Rican Department
 of Labor.....[]
 The company for which you
 are now working.....[]
 The farmer.....[]
 A person who works for the
 farmer and who
 traveled with you.....[]
 On your own[]

37. Do you know the names of any groups, organizations, or agencies which help the Puerto Rican migrant farmworkers?

Yes.....[]
No.....[]

/ 17

[IF YES ask:] 37A. Which ones?

/ 18

37B. How did you hear about them?

/ 19

37C. Did they ever help you?

Yes.....[]
No.....[]

/ 20

[IF YES ask:] 37D. How did they help you?

1.) _____

/ 21

2.) _____

/ 23

38. Do you think there ought to be more organizations to help the Puerto Rican migrant farmworkers?

- Yes.....[]
- No.....[]
- Makes no difference.....[]
- Don't know.....[]

1
25

[IF YES ask:] 38A. Should there be more organizations on the Island or on the U.S. mainland, or on both?

- Island.....[]
- U.S. mainland.....[]
- Both.....[]

1
26

39. What are some of the things organizations should do for farmworkers?

1.)

1 / 1
27 2.

2.)

1 / 1
29 3

[DO NOT WRITE IN THIS SPACE]

/ 1
/ 2
/ 4

0. Camp: _____ 41. Interviewer: _____

42. Date: _____

43. Time: _____

4. INTERVIEWER COMMENTS: _____

Multiple horizontal lines for writing interviewer comments.

A P P E N D I X C

SPANISH QUESTIONNAIRE

Encuesta de Trabajadores de Finca Migrantes
Puertorriqueños

Frank Llamas
School of Education
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, Massachusetts

INTRODUCCIÓN A LOS TRABAJADORES:

Buenas tardes. Yo soy _____ de la
Universidad. Estamos interesados en conocer el pensamiento de los
puertorriqueños que vienen aquí a trabajar. Primero, me gustaría saber:
¿Es Ud. puertorriqueño?

Si(Vaya a la página siguiente)...

No(Término de la entrevista).....

INTRODUCCIÓN A LA ENTREVISTA

Estamos interesados en saber cómo se sienten las personas que vienen a trabajar a las fincas, acerca de aspectos importantes que afectan su trabajo. Primero, nos gustaría saber:

1. ¿Nació Ud. en Puerto Rico, en los Estados Unidos o en un país extranjero?

Puerto Rico
 Estados Unidos
 Extranjero

 9

(nombre del estado o país)

2. ¿Qué edad tiene Ud.?

(años)

 10 11

3. ¿Puede Ud. decirme algunas razones por las que decidió venir a trabajar a las fincas este año?

 12 13

4. ¿Cuál fué el último grado escolar que completó en la escuela?

(número 1 a 16)

 14 15

	SI	NO	NO S	
5. ¿Ha vivido Ud. alguna vez en Puerto Rico?.....				/
6. ¿Mantiene Ud. ahora su hogar en Puerto Rico?.....				/
7. ¿Cuántas veces ha trabajado en fincas en los Estados Unidos? _____				/ /
8. ¿Ha trabajado alguna vez en fincas en Puerto Rico?.....				/
9. (Si la pregunta #8 es afirmativa:) ¿Por Cuántos años? _____ (años)				/ /
10. ¿Trabajó su padre alguna vez en una finca en Puerto Rico?...				/
11. ¿Trabajó su padre alguna vez en una finca en los Estados Unidos?.....				/
12. ¿Fué su padre alguna vez dueño de una finca en Puerto Rico?..				/
13. ¿Es Ud. un veterano del ejército?.....				/
14. ¿Cree Ud. que puede ser entrenado para un trabajo distinto de la agricultura?.....				/
15. ¿Está Ud. trabajando bajo un contrato con el Departamento del Trabajo de Puerto Rico?.....				/
16. (Si la pregunta #15 es afirmativa:) ¿Cuántas semanas dura su contrato? _____ (semanas)				/ /

	de acuerdo	en desacuerdo	
17. Dígame por favor si Ud. está de acuerdo o en desacuerdo con las afirmaciones siguientes:			
17A. La mayoría de los programas de educación para adultos son una pérdida de tiempo.....			/
17B. Los adultos que regresan a la escuela probablemente van a obtener mejores empleos.....			/
17C. La escuela es para los jóvenes; un hombre debe trabajar.....			/
17D. Una de las razones por las cuales muchos trabajadores de finca no progresan es porque no tienen suficiente escuela (educación).....			/

18. ¿Se quedaría Ud. en los Estados Unidos todo el año si pudiera tener un trabajo permanente?				
Sí.....	<input type="checkbox"/>			/
No.....	<input type="checkbox"/>			35
Quizás.....	<input type="checkbox"/>			
No lo sé.....	<input type="checkbox"/>			

19. ¿Consideraría Ud. el asistir a un programa de entrenamiento vocacional o a una escuela?

- Sí.....
- No.....
- Quizás.....
- No lo sé.....

$\frac{1}{36}$

20. ¿Ha asistido Ud. alguna vez a una escuela vocacional, a una escuela comercial o a otra escuela especializada de este tipo?

- Sí.....
- No.....

$\frac{1}{37}$

(Si afirmativo:)

A. ¿Qué escuelas? _____

$\frac{1}{38} \frac{1}{39}$

21. ¿Consideraría Ud. asistir a un programa de entrenamiento vocacional o escuela, si se le pagara lo suficiente como para mantenerlo mientras está en dicho programa?

- Sí.....
- No.....
- Quizás.....
- No sé.....

$\frac{1}{40}$

(Si afirmativo:)

A. Si Ud. decidiera asistir a un programa de entrenamiento o escuela, ¿qué tipo de entrenamiento o escuela elegiría?

$\frac{1}{41} \frac{1}{42}$

	Isla	Estados Unidos	Ninguna Diferencia	No sé
22. Si pudiera escoger, ¿preferiría <u>trabajar</u> en la Isla o en los Estados Unidos?.....				
23. Si Ud. tuviera la seguridad de un trabajo, preferiría <u>vivir</u> en la Isla o en los Estados Unidos?.....				
24. ¿Cree Ud. que el trabajador de finca migrante está en mejor situación en la Isla, en los Estados Unidos o que da lo mismo donde esté?.....				

$\frac{1}{43}$

$\frac{1}{44}$

$\frac{1}{45}$

25. Voy a leerle ahora ciertas razones que han dado personas para venir a trabajar a las fincas. Dígame, por favor si cada una de ellas fué una razón por la que Ud. vino aquí, o si no fué una razón para venir.

	una razón	ninguna razón	
a. Porque venían muchos de mis amigos.....			/ 46
b. Porque quería ganar dinero para ayudar a mis padres..			/ 47
c. Porque pensé que podía ganar más dinero en los Estados Unidos.....			/ 48
d. Porque no había trabajo para mí en Puerto Rico.....			/ 49
e. Porque me daba la oportunidad de hacer algo diferente.....			/ 50
f. Porque pensaba irme a vivir a los Estados Unidos y quería ver por mi mismo cómo era.....			/ 51
g. Porque era una manera de visitar a mis amigos y familiares en los Estados Unidos.....			/ 52
h. Porque era una manera de obtener dinero para comprar un carro.....			/ 53
i. Porque era una manera de conocer parte del mundo.....			/ 54
j. Porque quería estar separado por un tiempo, de mi familia.....			/ 55
k. Porque pensé que podría obtener un mejor trabajo en los Estados Unidos que en Puerto Rico.....			/ 56
l. Porque me daba la oportunidad de visitar los Estados Unidos mientras vivía con un grupo de hispanos como yo.....			/ 57
m. Porque me permite trabajar en una finca cuando yo no trabajo en fincas en Puerto Rico.....			/ 58
n. Porque quería ganar dinero para comprarme una finca en Puerto Rico.....			/ 59
o. Porque quería ganar dinero para ir a la escuela.....			/ 60
p. Porque quería ganar dinero para comenzar un negocio..			/ 61
q. Porque necesitaba trabajar más para conseguir los beneficios del seguro social.....			/ 62
r. Porque mi padre era un trabajador de finca.....			/ 63
s. Porque quería aprender inglés.....			/ 64

26. ¿Es Ud. dueño de su casa, alquila o vive con sus padres?

- Dueño.....
 Alquila.....
 Vive con sus padres.....
 Otro.....

$\frac{1}{65}$

Otro: _____

27. ¿Es su hogar una finca?

- Sí.....
 Sí, una parcela del gobierno.....
 No.....

$\frac{1}{66}$

(Si afirmativo:)

A. ¿Ud. trabaja su tierra?

- Sí.....
 No.....

$\frac{1}{67}$

28. Cuando Ud. vino al campamento a trabajar, ¿vino con un grupo de trabajadores?

- Sí.....
 No.....

$\frac{1}{68}$

(Si afirmativo:)

A. ¿Cuántos hombres venían en el grupo?

$\frac{1}{69} \frac{1}{70}$

B. ¿Cuántos eran conocidos suyos?

$\frac{1}{71} \frac{1}{72}$

C. ¿Cuántos eran parientes suyos?

$\frac{1}{73}$

29. ¿Preferiría trabajar Ud. como trabajador agrícola o en otra cosa?

- Como trabajador agrícola.....
 En otra cosa.....
 Ninguna diferencia.....
 No sé.....

$\frac{1}{74}$

30. ¿Ha trabajado Ud. alguna vez en otra cosa que no sea la agricultura?

- Sí.....
 No.....

$\frac{1}{75}$

(Si afirmativo:)

A. ¿Qué tipo de trabajo? _____

$\frac{1}{76} \frac{1}{77}$

31. Es Ud.
- Soltero.....
 - Vive con una mujer sin estar casado...
 - Separado.....
 - Viudo.....
 - Divorciado.....
 - Casado.....

78

32. ¿Cuántos hijos tiene Ud.?

(número de niños)

79 80

(Si ninguno: vaya a la pregunta #34)

33. ¿Cuántos de sus niños dependen de Ud. para su mantención?

(número)

8 9

34. ¿Hay otras personas que dependan de Ud. para su mantención?

- Sí.....
- No.....

10

(Si afirmativo:)

A. ¿Cuántos dependen?

11 12

B. ¿Cuál es su relación con ellas?

13 14

35. ¿Cuál es su religión?

- Católico.....
- Protestante.....
- Pentecostal.....
- Otra.....
- Ninguna.....

15

(otra religión)

36. Obtuvo Ud. su pasaje para venir a los Estados Unidos o fue reclutado a través:

- De un pariente.....
- Del Departamento del Trabajo de Puerto Rico.....
- De la compañía para la cual trabaja ahora.....
- Del 'farmer'.....
- De una persona que trabaja para el 'farmer' y que viajó con Ud.....
- Lo pagué yo.....

16

37. ¿Conoce Ud. el nombre de grupos, organizaciones o agencias que ayudan a los trabajadores de finca migrantes Puertorriqueños?

Sí.....

No.....

(Si afirmativo:)

A. ¿Cuáles? _____

$\frac{1}{17}$

$\frac{1}{18}$

B. ¿Cómo oyó de ellas? _____

$\frac{1}{19}$

C. ¿Le han ayudado alguna vez?

Sí.....

No.....

(Si afirmativo:)

D. ¿Cómo le ayudaron? _____

$\frac{1}{20}$

1.) _____

$\frac{1}{21}$ $\frac{1}{22}$

2.) _____

$\frac{1}{23}$ $\frac{1}{24}$

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

Al-Khazraji, Majid and Emilie. Lowell's Spanish-speaking Migrants: Transients or Settlers?, Community Team-work, Inc., and Spanish American Center, Lowell, Massachusetts, December 1971.

. The Puerto Ricans of New Bedford, Massachusetts: Social Conditions and Social Needs, Onboard, Inc., Migrants, Inc., New Bedford, December, 1970.

. Worcester's Spanish-speaking Residents: Dimensions in Social Adjustment, Worcester: Worcester Community Data Center, College of the Holy Cross, 1969.

Allen, Steve. The Ground is Our Table, New York: Doubleday, 1966.

"An Evaluation of the New England Farm Workers Council, Inc., Springfield, Massachusetts." Submitted to the Office of Economic Opportunity, Migrant Division, under contract #BIC-5275; SBA 0958-8(a)71. Washington D.C.: Development Associates, Inc., July 1972.

An Insight into Social Problems Facing Spanish-speaking American Residents of Bridgeport; Proceedings of the Conference on Spanish-speaking American Services, Bridgeport: Bridgeport Inter-Group Council, 1957.

A Profile of Boston's Spanish-speaking Community, Action for Boston Community Development, Boston: ABCD Planning and Evaluation Department, 1969.

"A Survey of 317 Migrant Workers on Thirty Farms," in Massachusetts Migrant Health Project, Annual Progress Report, 1965.

A Survey of the Public Educational System of Puerto Rico. The International Institute of Teachers College, Columbia University, Teachers College, New York Bureau of Publications, 1926.

"A Survey of Puerto Rican Migrant Workers in Western Massachusetts." Massachusetts Migrant Health Project, Evaluating the Radio Program Que Tal Amigos, 1969.

Babín, María Teresa. The Puerto Ricans' Spirit, New York: Collier Books, 1971.

- Baer, Werner. The Puerto Rican Economy and United States Economic Fluctuations, Rio Piedras: University of Puerto Rico, Social Science Research Center, 1962.
- Bauder, Ward W., et.al. Impact of Extension of Unemployment Insurance to Agriculture, prepared in conjunction with: Regional Research Project NE-58 of the Northeast Agricultural Experiment Stations, submitted to the U.S. Department of Labor, October 31, 1972.
- Bauder, Ward W. "Puerto Rican Hired Agricultural Workers in the United States." A report presented to a Special Commission of the Senate of Puerto Rico (Senate Resolution 283, 1971). Prepared under the auspices of the Northeastern Technical Committee on Farm Labor, NE-58. Ithaca, New York, January 27, 1972. (Mimeographed.)
- Bishop, Charles E., ed. Farm Labor in the United States, New York: Columbia University Press, 1967.
- Bourne, Dorothy Dulles and James R. Thirty Years of Change in Puerto Rico: A Case Study of Ten Selected Rural Areas, New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Publishers, 1966.
- Brameld, Theodore. The Remaking of a Culture: Life and Education in Puerto Rico, New York, 1959.
- Bustelo, Manuel A. "Migrant Workers--the Last Harvest," The San Juan Star, October 5, 1975.
- Carleton, R.O. "New Aspects of Puerto Rican Migration," Monthly Labor Review, Vol. 83, February 1960.
- Castañeda, Rolando. "Considerations Relevant to the Proposed, Non-Profit, Migrant Services Corporation for the Connecticut Valley," Harvard University, April 7, 1971. (Mimeographed.)
- "Characteristics of Passengers who Travel by Air Between Puerto Rico and the United States," Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1956.
- Chenault, Lawrence. The Puerto Rican Migrant in New York City, Columbia University Press, 1938. Reissued with a New Foreword by F. Cordasco, New York: Russell & Russell, 1970.

- "Chicago's Puerto Ricans." New Republic, Vol. 130, February 22, 1954.
- Clark, Victor S. Puerto Rico and its Problems, Washington D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1930.
- Collier, Jane A. "A Profile of Puerto Rican Values," Appendix to an Essay in the Definition of a Puerto Rican National Culture, Status of Puerto Rico: Selected Background Studies, Washington D.C., 1964.
- Collins, Henry Hill. America's Own Refugees: Our 4,000,000 Homeless Migrants, Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1941.
- "Conditions of Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts." Tufts University, Department of Political Science, 1971. (Mimeographed.)
- Cordasco, Francesco, et.al. Puerto Rican Americans: A Sourcebook on Mainland Experience, Littlefield, 1972.
- Cordasco, Francesco and Eugene Buccioni. Puerto Rican Children in Mainland Schools, New Jersey: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1968.
- Cordasco, Francesco with Eugene Buccioni and Diego Castellanos. Puerto Ricans on the United States Mainland: A Bibliography of Reports, Texts, Critical Studies and Related Materials, New Jersey: Rowman and Littlefield, 1972.
- Cordasco, Frank. "The Puerto Rican Family and the Anthropologist--Oscar Lewis' "la Vida" and the Culture of Poverty," Review Article, 1967, "Urban Education," Vol. 3, #1, 1967. ERIC ED 017565.
- Crossman, Bradford. "Economics of Extending Unemployment Insurance to Agricultural Workers in Massachusetts," University of Massachusetts Department of Agricultural and Food Economics, College of Agriculture and Natural Resources, Report #1 (revised), Amherst, October 1972.
- Donchian, Daniel, "A Study of Migratory Puerto Rican Agricultural Workers on Farms and Nurseries in the New Haven Area," New Haven, Connecticut, Human Relations Council of Greater New Haven, 1958. (Mimeographed.)
- Dossick, Jesse. "Doctoral Research on Puerto Rico and Puerto Ricans," New York: New York University School of Education, 1967.

- El Espuelazo. Consejo de Trabajadores de Finca de Nueva Inglaterra, Springfield, Massachusetts, 1973, Vol. II, No. 4-9. (5 papers.)
- "English Program for Agricultural Workers, Class Manual." Puerto Rico Department of Education, Adult Education Program and Department of Labor, Migrant Division. ERIC ED 022588.
- Falcón, Luis Nieves. Maleta'nd Go: Puerto Rican Seasonal Migration, (unpublished manuscript).
- Fitzpatrick, J. "Puerto Ricans in Perspective: The Meaning of Migration to the Mainland," International Migration Review, II, Spring, 1968.
- Fitzpatrick, Joseph P. Puerto Rican Americans: The Meaning of Migration to the Mainland, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1971.
- Fleischer, Belton M. "Some Economic Aspects of Puerto Rican Migration to the U.S." Review of Economics and Statistics, Vol. 45, August, 1963.
- Friedlander, Stanley L. Labor Migration and Economic Growth: A Case Study of Puerto Rico, Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 1965.
- Furts, Philip W. Puerto Ricans in New York City, Puerto Rican Social Services, Inc., New York City, March, 1963.
- Gernes, Arthur C. "Implications of Puerto Rican Migration to the Continent Outside New York City," address before the Ninth Annual Convention on Social Orientation, University of Puerto Rico, December 10, 1955.
- Glazer, Nathan and Daniel P. Moynihan. "The Puerto Ricans," in Beyond the Melting Pot: the Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Jews, Italians and Irish of New York City, Cambridge: MIT and Harvard University Press, 2nd. ed., 1970.
- Golub, Fryd T. The Puerto Rican Worker in Perth Amboy, New Jersey, New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University, Institute of Management and Labor Relations, 1956.
- Gordon, Maxine W. Cultural Aspects of Puerto Rico's Race Problem, "American Sociological Review," Vol. 15, June, 1950.

- Grieser, Normal. "Airborne from San Juan," New Republic, Vol. 117, November 3, 1947.
- Handlin, Oscar. The Newcomers: Negroes and Puerto Ricans in a Changing Metropolis, Harvard University Press, 1959.
- Hanson, Earl Parker. Puerto Rico: Ally for Progress, Princeton: Van Nostrand, 1962.
- Hanson, Millard and Henry Wells (editors). Puerto Rico: A Study in Democratic Development, The Annals of American Academy of Political and Social Science, 285, January, 1953.
- Hartford Y Usted: Un Guía. Hartford, Connecticut: Greater Hartford Council of Churches.
- Healion, James V. "Migrant Farm Laborers Hit out at Tobacco Growers," Naugatuck News, Connecticut, September 6, 1972.
- _____. "Puerto Rican Migrant Workers May Form Their Own Union," Naugatuck News, Connecticut, September 8, 1972.
- Heaps, Willard A. Wandering Workers: the Story of American Migrant Farmworkers and Their Problems, Barnes and Noble, 1967.
- Hernández, Alvarez José. Return Migration to Puerto Rico, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968. Population Monograph Series, No.1.
- _____. "The Movement and Settlement of Puerto Rican Migrants Within the United States, 1950-1960," The International Migration Review, Vol. 2, Spring, 1968, New York.
- Hernández, Joseph William. The Sociological Implications of Return Migration in Puerto Rico: An Exploratory Study, Doctoral Dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1964.
- Hernández, Dr. Martín Ramírez, Consultor Económico. "Estudio de Viabilidad Económica y Social para Establecer una Cooperativa de Ahorro y Crédito Entre los Migrantes Agrícolas Puertorriqueños en Nueva Inglaterra," Administración de Fomento Cooperativo Estado Libre Asociado de Puerto Rico en Colaboración con el Consejo de Trabajadores de Finca de Nueva Inglaterra, 1974.

- Hill, Marnesba D., comp. "Bibliography of Puerto Rican History and Literature," City University of New York, New York, Herbert H. Lehman College, June 1972. ERIC ED 068099.
- Hoadley, Kenneth L. "The Connecticut Valley Shade Tobacco Industry," Agribusiness Research Report, Harvard University, April 1973.
- Hoffman, J. and R. Seltzer. "Migrant Farm Labor in Upstate New York," Columbia Journal of Law and Social Problems, Vol. 4, 1968.
- "Issues of Concern to Puerto Ricans in Boston and Springfield," Massachusetts Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Boston, February 1972. ERIC ED 069823.
- Kirschner, Madeline, Comp. Puerto Rico - A Bibliography: Serving the Spanish Community, Chicago: American Library Association, 1969.
- "Labor Force Experience of the Puerto Rican Worker." U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Regional Report #9, Middle Atlantic Region, 341 Ninth Avenue, New York, New York, June 1968.
- Landy, David. Tropical Childhood: Cultural Transmission and Learning in a Rural Puerto Rican Village, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1959.
- Larson, Olaf. "Migratory Agricultural Workers in the Eastern Seaboard States," Rural Poverty in the United States, Washington D.C.: President's National Advisory Committee on Rural Poverty, Government Printing Office, 1968.
- LaRuffa, Anthony L. San Cipriano: Life in a Puerto Rican Community, New York: Gordon and Breach Science Publishers, 1971.
- Leavitt, Ruby Rohrlich, The Puerto Ricans: Culture Change and Language Deviance, The University of Arizona Press, 1974.
- Lefkowich, Stuart, and William Paraclas, "Migrant Health in Connecticut: an Interim Report," Hartford: Connecticut State Department of Community Affairs, 1974. (Mimeographed.)

- Levine, Barry B., and De Cintron, Celia F., "Who are the Poor in Puerto Rico?" University of Puerto Rico, Rio Piedras, August 30, 1971, 21 pps., ERIC ED 059309.
- Lewis, Gordon K. Puerto Rico: Freedom and Power in the Caribbean, New York: Monthly Review Press, 1963.
- Lewis, Oscar. La Vida: A Puerto Rican Family in the Culture of Poverty - San Juan and New York, New York: Random House, 1966.
- Llamas, Frank. Sources and Demographic Characteristics of Migrant and Seasonal Farm Labor in Massachusetts, Institute for Governmental Services, University of Massachusetts/Amherst, 1973.
- Lopez, Adalberto, and James Petras (eds.). Puerto Rico and Puerto Ricans, New York: Schenkman Publishing Company, John Wiley & Sons, 1974.
- Lopez, Alfredo. The Puerto Rican Papers, New York: Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1973.
- Macisco, John J., Jr. "Assimilation of the Puerto Rican on the Mainland. A Socio-Demographic Approach," International Migration Review, Spring, 1968.
- Maldonado-Denis, Manuel. Puerto Rico: A Socio-Historic Interpretation, New York: Random House, 1972.
- _____. "Puerto Rico: an American Showcase for Latin America," in Latin American Radicalism, Horowitz, Castro and Gerassi, editors, New York: Random House, 1969.
- Maldonado, A.W. "The Migration Reverses," The Nation, Vol. 198, March 16, 1964.
- Marzloff, Wayne W. "Changes in New York State Agriculture," Cornell University Agricultural Extension Bulletin, #439, 1966.
- Maslow, Jonathon. "Migrants of Massachusetts - Slavery in the Suburbs," The Boston Phoenix, Vol. 1, No. 4, August 22, 1972.
- McWilliams, Carey. Factories in the Field, The Story of Migratory Farm Labor in California, Hamden, Connecticut: Anchor Books, 1969 (1942).

- McWilliams, Carey. Ill Fares the Land: Migrants and Migratory Labor in the United States, Barnes and Noble, 1967.
- Metzler, William H. "Migratory Workers in the Atlantic Coast Stream," U.S. Department of Agriculture Publication #966, 1955.
- Meyers, George C., and George Masnick. "The Migration Experience of New York Puerto Ricans: A Perspective on Return," The International Migration Review, Vol. 2, Number 2, Spring 1968.
- Mills, C. Wright, Clarence Senior, and Rose Goldsen. The Puerto Rican Journey: New York's Newest Migrants, Harper, 1950. Reissued, New York: Russell & Russell, 1967.
- Mintz, Sidney W. "Cañamelar: The Subculture of a Rural Sugar Plantation Proletariat," in Julian Steward, ed., The People of Puerto Rico, (University of Illinois Press and Social Sciences Research Center, University of Puerto Rico, 1949).
- _____. Worker in the Cane: A Puerto Rican Life History, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960.
- Monserrat, Joseph. Background and General Information on Puerto Rico and the Puerto Rican Migrant, New York: Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Department of Labor, Migration Division, 1963.
- Montero, Anne. Migratory Labor in New York State. Washington D.C.: National Consumer's Committee for Research and Education, 1966.
- Moore, Truman E. Slaves We Rent, Randon, 1965.
- Morrison, J. Cayce, ed. The Puerto Rican Study, Nineteen-Fifty-Three to Nineteen Fifty-Seven, Text Edition, (Oriole Editions, 1972.)
- Morton, C. Manley. Isle of Enchantment: Stories and People of Puerto Rico, Bethany Press, 1970.
- Nash, James A. Migrant Farmworkers in Massachusetts: A Report with Recommendations, The Strategy and Action Commission of the Massachusetts Council of Churches, 1974.

- New England Farm Workers Council, Inc. Migrant Health Grant, Submitted to: Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Region I, May 1972, Springfield, Massachusetts, 1972. (Mimeographed.)
- _____. "What is the Council?" Springfield, Massachusetts, 1973.
- News, Department of Labor, Migration Division, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, 1976. (Mimeographed.)
- Nelkin, Dorothy. On the Season: Aspects of the Migrant Labor Stream, Cornell University Press, New York School of Industrial Relations, 1970.
- _____. "Response to Marginality: Case of Migrant Farm Workers," British Journal of Sociology, December 1969.
- Nelson, Lowry. Migratory Workers: the Mobile Tenth of American Agriculture, Washington D.C.: National Planning Association, 1953.
- Norcross, R.E. "Past and Future of Harvest Labor," Massachusetts Fruit Growers' Association Report No. 72, 1966.
- Ortiz, Carlos Buitrago. Esperanza: An Ethnographic Study of a Peasant Community in Puerto Rico, Arizona: University of Arizona Press, 1973.
- "Overview of the Problems Encountered by New England's Spanish-speaking Population," New England Regional Council, July 7, 1970. (Mimeographed.)
- Owens, James M. "These are Puerto Ricans," Hartford Courant, March 15-22, 1959, (series of eight articles), Hartford, Connecticut.
- Packard, Walter E. "The Land Authority and Democratic Processes in Puerto Rico," Inter-American Economic Affairs, Summer 1948.
- Padilla, Seda Elena. "Norcora: The Subculture of Workers in a Government-owned Sugar Plantation," in Julian Steward, ed., The People of Puerto Rico.
- _____. Up From Puerto Rico, New York: Columbia University Press, 1958.
- Perloff, Harvey S. Puerto Rico's Economic Future: a Study in Planned Development, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1950.

- Piore, Michael J. Puerto Rican Migration and Labor Market Institutions, a working paper prepared for the Office of Research and Development of the Manpower Administration of the Department of Labor for a conference, May 1973.
- Puerta, Ricardo. "El Puertorriqueño Invisible," La Escalera, May 1972.
- Puerto Rico: Annual Farm Labor Report 1969-1975, San Juan: Department of Labor Bureau of Employment Security, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.
- Puerto Rican Community Development Project, Puerto Rican Forum, New York, 1964.
- "Puerto Rican Experience on the United States Mainland," International Migration Review, Vol. II, Spring 1968.
- Puerto Rican Farm Workers in Florida, United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Employment Security, Washington D.C.: Department of Labor, February 1955.
- Puerto Rican Farm Workers in the Middle Atlantic States, United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Employment Security, Washington D.C.: Department of Labor, 1954.
- Puerto Rican Farmworkers: Research Report, Puerto Rican Congress of New Jersey, 1972.
- "Puerto Ricans in the United States," United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Final Report PC (2) - 1D, U.S. Census of Population: 1960, July 1963.
- Puerto Rican Migrants on the Mainland of the United States, Information Retrieval Center on the Disadvantaged, Bulletin, Vol. 4, #1, New York, 1968.
- Puerto Rican Population of New York City, New York: Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University, 1954.
- Rand, Christopher. The Puerto Ricans, Oxford University Press, 1958.
- "Report of Contract Migrant Workers in Connecticut," Migrant Division Staff, State Department of Community Affairs, Connecticut, December 1974. (Mimeographed.)
- Report on the Investigation of the Migration Division and Conditions of Work and Living of the Migrant Farmworker, Senate of Puerto Rico, April 1972.

"Report Relative to Migratory Labor," Massachusetts Legislative Research Council, 1967.

Review of the Rural Manpower Service, Special Review Staff, Manpower Administration of the U.S. Department of Labor, Washington: U.S. Department of Labor, 1972.

Ribes Tovar, Federico. Handbook of the Puerto Rican Community, New York: El Libro Puertorriqueño, 1968.

Roberts, Lydia J., and Rosa L. Stefani. Patterns of Living in Puerto Rican Families, Rio Piedras: University of Puerto Rico, 1949.

Rook, Keerock. "Hispanic-American Study," Western Massachusetts Cooperative Area Manpower Planning Systems, April 1970.

Rosenthal, Simon. Evaluation of the Migrant Division, Puerto Rico Legal Services, Office of Economic Opportunity, the Quincy Company, Washington D.C., 1975.

Rushing, William A. Class, Culture and Alienation: a Study of Farmers and Farm Workers, Lexington, Massachusetts: Lexington Books, 1972.

Schuh, G. Edward. "Changes in the Farm Labor Market," Farm Policy Forum, Vol. 19, No. 3, 1966-67.

Seasonal Farmworkers in the State of New Jersey, The Governor's Migrant Labor Task Force, March 1968.

Segalman, Ralph. "Army of Dispair: the Migrant Worker Stream," ERIC, 1968, Educational Systems Corporation, Washington D.C., ERIC ED 021671.

Senior, Clarence, "Migration and Puerto Rico's Population Problem," The Annals, Vol. 285, January 1953.

_____. Our Citizens from the Caribbean, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965.

_____. "Puerto Rican Dispersion in the United States," Social Problems, Vol. 2, October 1954.

_____. Puerto Rican Migration, University of Puerto Rico, Social Science Center, 1947.

_____. "Research on the Puerto Rican Family in the United States," Marriage and Family Living, Vol. 19, February 1957.

- The Puerto Ricans: Strangers - Then Neighbors, Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1965.
- Senior, Clarence, and Donald Watkins. "Toward a Balance Sheet of Puerto Rican Migration," ERIC, 1966, ED 016720.
- Sexton, Patricia. Spanish Harlem: Anatomy of Poverty, Harper & Row, 1965.
- Shannon, Lyle W., and Elaine M. Krass. "The Economic Absorption of In-Migrant Laborers in a Northern Industrial Community," American Journal of Economics and Sociology, Vol. 23, January 1964.
- Shapleigh, Alexander. "Need for Migrant Education Services in New Bedford," mimeographed, 1971.
- Shotwell, Louisa R. The Harvesters: The Story of the Migrant People, Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1961.
- Siegel, Arthur, Harold Orlans, and Loyal Greer, Puerto Ricans in Philadelphia: A Study of Their Demographic Characteristics, Problems and Attitudes, Philadelphia Commission on Human Relations, April 1954.
- Silen, Juan A. We, the Puerto Rican People: A Story of Oppression and Resistance, New York: Monthly Review Press, 1971.
- "Spanish-speaking Americans: Their Manpower Problems and Opportunities," Reprint, Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor, 1973.
- Status of Puerto Rico: Selected Background Studies for the United States - Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico, Washington D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1966.
- Stewart, Judith. "An Examination of the Social Boundaries of the Migrant Labor System of the Atlantic Coast Stream," Unpublished thesis, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, 1968.
- Steward, Julian H. The People of Puerto Rico: A Study in Social Anthropology, Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1956.
- Su Guía a New Haven, New Haven, Connecticut: New Haven Human Relations Council, 1959.

The Puerto Rican Experience on the United States Mainland: The International Migration Review, Vol. 2, Spring 1968.

Thomas, Piri. Down These Mean Streets, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1967.

Tobin, Richard L. "One Million Migrants: the Revolution is Not Coming. It is Here," Saturday Review, August 17, 1968.

Tumin, Melvin, and Arnold S. Feldman. Social Class and Social Change in Puerto Rico, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961.

United States Congress. House of Representatives, Committee on Education and Labor; "Seminar on Farm Labor Problems"; Hearings before the Subcommittee on Agricultural Labor on H.R. 5010 and Related Bills: Public Regulation of Working Conditions in Agriculture, 92nd Congress, 1st session, Hearings held June 2, 3, and 10, 1971. Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1971.

_____. House of Representatives, Committee on Education and Labor; Subcommittee on Agricultural Labor; Hearings before; Agricultural Child Labor Act of 1971. Hearings on H.R. 10499 and H.R. 1597: Bill to Ban Oppressive Child Labor in Agriculture and for Other Purposes; 92nd Congress, 1st session, hearings held September 16, 21, 22, 23, and 29, 1971. Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1971.

_____. Senate, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; The Migratory Farm Labor Problem in the United States: 1968 Report; made by its Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, Report No. 1006, 90th Congress, 2nd session, 1968.

Wagenheim, Kal, and Olga Jiménez de Wagenheim. The Puerto Ricans: A Documentary History, New York: Praeger Publishers, 1973.

Wakefield, Dan. Island in the City: Puerto Ricans in New York, Houghton Mifflin, 1959.

Wells, Henry. Modernization of Puerto Rico: A Political Study of Changing Values and Institutions, Harvard University Press, 1969.

- Wright, Dale. They Harvest Despair: the Migrant Farm Worker, Boston: Beacon Press, 1965.
- Yates, D. "Summer Programs in Spanish Communities, the Problem of the Second Minority," unpublished paper, Yale University Department of Political Science, 1969.
- Young, Bruce. "The New England Farmworkers' Council: Case Study of a Community Service Organization," Doctoral Dissertation, University of Massachusetts/Amherst, 1975.
- Zayas Alvarado, Eustaquio. Worker in the Cane: A Puerto Rican Life History, New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University, 1960.



