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“I wanted to bind Texas and Mexico together like a raft strong enough to float out onto the ocean of time, with our past trailing in the wake behind us like a comet trail of memories.”

John Phillip Santos, 1999, p.5

Latino immigrants, like many other immigrants, experience to one degree or another, loss, grief and mourning. These experiences have been compared with the processes of grief and mourning precipitated by the death of loved ones. (Shuval, 1982; Warheit et al, 1985; Grinberg and Grinberg, 1989; Volkan and Zintl, 1993). Here, I will argue, however, that migration loss has special characteristics that distinguish it from other kinds of losses.

Unlike the clear-cut, inescapable fact of death, migration as loss is both larger and smaller. It is larger because migration brings with it losses of all kinds: gone are family members and friends who stay behind, gone is the native language, the customs and rituals, the land itself. The ripples of these losses touch the extended kin back home and reach into the future generations born in the new land.

Yet, migration loss is also smaller than death, because despite the grief and mourning of physical, cultural and social separation, the losses are not absolutely clear, complete and irretrievable. Everything is still alive but just not immediately reachable or present. Unlike the finality of death, after migration it is always possible to fantasize the eventual return or a forthcoming reunion. Furthermore, immigrants seldom migrate towards a social vacuum. A relative, friend or acquaintance usually waits on the other side to help with work, housing, and guidelines for the new life. A social community and ethnic neighborhood reproduces in pockets of remembrance, the sights, sounds, smells, and tastes of one’s country. All of these elements create a mix of emotions: sadness and elation, losses and restitution, absence and presence that make grieving incomplete, postponed, ambiguous.

In this paper, I attempt to integrate concepts from family systems theory (ambiguous loss, boundary ambiguity, relational resilience) with concepts from studies on migration, race and ethnicity (familism, biculturalism, double consciousness) to deepen our understanding of the risks and resiliences accompanying migration loss for Latinos. I propose that an inclusive, both/and approach, rather than an either/or choice, to the dilemmas of cultural and family continuity and change increases family resilience in the face of multiple migration losses. As we will see, however, there are risk situations when the experience of ambiguous loss becomes
unbearable and thwarts attempts at integrating continuity with change.

While Latinos share many similarities in the aspects of family coping with loss addressed in this paper, each family has a particular “ecological niche” created by combinations of nationality, ethnicity, class, education, religion or occupation, and by their individual personal histories. Other variables that mediate the experience of migration are the degree of choice about voluntary or forced migration, proximity and accessibility to the country of origin, gender, age and generation, family form, and the degree and level of social acceptance encountered in the new environment (Falicov, 1995, 1998).

**AMBIGUOUS LOSS & MIGRATION**

The concept of ambiguous loss proposed by Pauline Boss (1991; 1999) describes situations in which loss is unclear, incomplete or partial. Basing her thesis on stress theory, Boss describes two types of ambiguous loss -- one in which people are physically absent but psychologically present (the family with a soldier missing in action, the non-custodial parent in divorce, the migrating relative); and the second, in which family members are physically present but psychologically absent (the family living with an Alzheimer’s victim, the parent or spouse who is emotionally unavailable due to stress or depression).

Migration represents what Boss (1999) calls a “crossover”, in that it has elements of both types of ambiguous loss: while beloved people and places are left behind, they remain keenly present in the psyche of the immigrant; at the same time, homesickness and the stresses of adaptation may leave some family members emotionally unavailable to others. The very decision to migrate has at its core two ambiguous poles. Intense frustrations with economic or political conditions compel the move, but love of family and surroundings pull in another direction.

**Dealing with Ambiguous Loss**

Many internal conflicts, moods, and behaviors of immigrants can be more easily understood when seen through the lens of “ambiguous loss”.

*Visits to Country of Origin* close the gap between that which is psychologically present and physically absent. Phone calls, money remittances, gifts, messages and trips back home contribute to transnational lifestyles (Rouse, 1992) and a concomitantly psychological complex experience of presence and absence.
Leaving Family Members Behind. This practice has pragmatic and economic justifications, but it may also insure a powerful psychological link. It may symbolize that migration is provisional and experimental rather than permanent. A young child left with the immigrant’s own parents may assuage guilt about leaving and offer an emotional exchange for the help of shared parenting. 

Encouraging Relatives and Friends to Migrate eases the wrenching nostalgia of migration, -it is a way of saying “hello again” to some of the many good-byes. Social networks dismantled by migration may stand a chance to be partially reconstructed in the host country.

Recreating Cultural Spaces. Latino immigrants also reconstruct urban landscapes of open markets and ethnic neighborhoods that provide experiences with familiar foods, music, and language. These powerful actions reestablish links with the lost land, while helping to transform the receiving cultures into more syntonic spaces (Ainslie, 1998).

The long-lasting Dream of Returning Home reinforces the gap between physical absence and psychological presence. A family may remain in a provisional limbo, unable to make settlement decisions or take full advantage of existing opportunities, overtaken by a sort of frozen grief.

Family Polarizations ensue when ambiguities overwhelm, as it were, the immigrant family’s psyche. Spouses may come to represent each side of the conflict of leaving or staying, one idealizing and the other denigrating the country of origin or the “new” culture (Sluzki, 1979). When such polarizations exist they hint powerfully at denied or suppressed grief that may result in symptoms: depression or other emotional blocks to adaptation in adults; psychosomatic illness and selective mutism in children (Sluzki, 1979, 1983; Grinberg and Grinberg, 1989; Falicov, 1998).

Generational Legacies evolve when immigrant parents pass on their doubts, their nostalgia and ambiguities to their children who are sometimes recruited to one side or the other of the polarizations. Immigrant children may experience ambiguous loss themselves but the exposure to their parents’ mixed emotions may significantly increase their stress.

The Migration Story as a Magnet. The migration story itself can provide meaning and narrative coherence (Cohler,1991) to all life events. Experiences of success or of failure, the wife’s new-found assertiveness, the ungrateful adult child, all can be contained within an
explanation: “It is because we came here.” The question that will remain perennially unanswered is: “How much is it migration, or just life challenges that would have appeared anywhere?” (Troya and Rosenberg, 1999).

*The Construction of Bicultural Identities.* The flow of people and information in a two-home, two-country lifestyle may give rise to a sense of fitting in more than one place. Equally possible is the simultaneous experience of not belonging in either place.

These behaviors of immigrants demonstrate the ambiguous, conflictual nature of migration losses. Yet, they carry with them certain dynamic responses or “solutions” that demonstrate that people can learn to live with the ambiguity of never putting final closure to their loss. The adaptation depends on the contextual stresses families encounter. Some are so excruciatingly oppressive that they prompt the family to repatriate. Under better circumstances, mixed feelings may be counteracted in part by building on family, social supports and cultural strengths. Concepts from family systems theory and from acculturation studies help understand how ambiguous losses come to be tolerated and integrated in ways that strengthen families’ resilience and empower their activism against social marginalization and injustice.

**DUAL VISIONS OF CONTINUITY AND CHANGE**

From a family systems viewpoint, for a family to be successful in coping with family transitions, flexible attitudes towards change and flexible efforts to preserve continuity need to occur simultaneously (Hansen and Johnson, 1979; Melitto, 1985; Falicov, 1993). Most immigrant families manage to maintain contacts with their culture of origin and reinvent old family themes while carving out new lives. New acculturation theories reflect this dynamic balance of continuity and change, rather than the traditional either/or linear theory of abandoning one culture to embrace the other. Terms such as binationalism, bilingualism, biculturalism and cultural bifocality (see Levitt, this volume; Gonzalez-Baker, this volume for more detailed treatment of these concepts) describe dual visions, ways of maintaining familiar cultural practices while making new spaces manageable, and ways of alternating language or cultural codes according to the requirements of the social context at hand (La Framboise, Coleman, and Gerton, 1993; Rouse, 1992). While there are compelling adaptational reasons for
the acquisition of new language and cultural practices, there are equally compelling reasons for retention of cultural themes in the face of change, among them the attempt to preserve a sense of family coherence.

**RELATIONAL RESILIENCE TO LOSS**

The concept of a “family sense of coherence” developed by Antonovsky and Sourani, (1988) refers to the human struggle to perceive life as comprehensible, manageable and meaningful. This striving for a sense of coherence (and hopefulness) is one of the key ingredients of *relational resilience*, those processes by which families cope and attempt to surmount persistent stress (Walsh, 1998).

In this section, I explore immigrant families’ attempts to restore meaning and purpose in life in the midst of multiple ambiguous losses. The aspects of relational resilience selected for this discussion are family connectedness, family rituals, awareness of social marginalization, and belief or spiritual systems.

**FAMILY CONNECTEDNESS**

Latinos ethnic narratives invariably stress familism, i.e. inclusiveness and interdependence. In family systems terms, family connectedness, the obligation to care and support one another is a defining feature of extended family life. This cultural tendency towards family connectedness seems to withstand migration and persist in some form for at least one or two or more generations (Suárez Orozco and Suárez Orozco, 1995; Sabogal et al, 1987). For immigrant families, familism may be manifest in the persistence of long-distance attachments and loyalties in the face of arduous social or economic conditions, in the attempts to migrate as a totality and live close to one another as well as by the desire to reunify when individuals have taken up the journey alone. The family members and the ideologies of these richly joined systems make their presence felt at a psychological and a physical level.

**The Psychological Presence of Extended Familism**

When extended family are far away, “la familia” may become the emotional container that holds both future dreams not yet realized and lost meanings that are no longer recoverable.
At its most concrete, immigrants send remittances back home in exchange for collective caretaking of remaining family members (children, elders), thus reinforcing a traditional system of emotional and economic interdependence. At a more abstract level, the idea itself of three-generational family can trigger other large existential meanings such as one’s lost national identity. A study of young adults (Troya & Rosenberg, 1999) who had migrated as children with parents seeking political refuge from South America to Mexico demonstrates the powerful psychological presence of absent relatives. When asked for their spontaneous images to the words “patria” (fatherland) or “tierra” (land), they associated these with the street or house where the grandmother or the aunt lived, reflecting or perhaps creating anew deep intergenerational bonds between country and family- a psychological familism.

Other studies show that as families acculturate (Rueschenberg and Buriel, 1989; Sabogal et al. 1987; Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 1995) they learn how to behave externally in a dominant culture that values assertiveness, independence and achievement. Yet, they do not abandon internally the connectedness and interpersonal controls of many collectivistic family systems.

The Physical Presence of Extended Family

When extended family members are physically present, they play a significant role in shoring up the immigrant family. Their familism drives a concern for one another’s lives, a pulling together to weather crises, a sociocentric child rearing (Harwood, Miller, & Irizarry, 1995), and a closeness among adult siblings (Chavez, 1985).

Multigenerational dwellings, particularly the presence of grandmothers, can be influential in terms of transfers of knowledge, cultural exposures, nurturance and instrumental help embedded in established sociocultural practices (Garcia Coll, et al, 1996) or even as a buffer against parental neglect or abuse (Gomez, 1999). However, family life is not always as rosy as it seems. The description of Latino family connectedness is sometimes brought to such heights that stereotypical pictures of picturesque family life dominate while tensions and disconnectedness among extended family members simmer below, ignored or discounted. Perhaps what matters, regardless of the particular positive or negative tone of the interactions, is the sense of being part of a family group and that in itself affords a sense of continuity in the
face of ruptured attachments and the disruptions of relocation.

**CULTURAL FAMILY RITUALS**

Another interesting avenue to study family resilience to ambiguous losses is through the transmission of family rituals that reaffirm family and cultural identity. Family systems theorists have long known about the power of rituals to restore continuity with a family’s heritage while reinforcing family bonds and community pride. (Bennett, Wolin, and McAvity, 1988; Imber-Black, Roberts and Whiting, 1988). A good example is a clinical case of mine.

A poor working class, Mexican-immigrant mother was very distressed over her daughter’s refusal to have quinceañera party. The intensity of the mother’s emotion surprised me since the party’s ritual affirmation of the girl’s virginity and future availability for dating hardly applied- everybody knew the girl was sexually involved with an older boyfriend. But for the mother, the quinceañera was the most unforgettable (“inolvidable”, she said) event in a woman’s life and a memory that all parents dream of bestowing upon a daughter, ever since the time of her birth. To abandon this valued ritual that lends coherence to a woman’s life-even when its original contents may have shifted or faded- would have represented too much cultural discontinuity for this mother.

The enactment of life cycle rituals in the midst of cultural transformation can be construed as reflecting dual lifestyles, being both ethnic and modern at the same time. Studies of immigrant families should include a close look at the persistence and the evolving new shapes of traditional family rituals from routine family interactions (dinners or prayers) to celebrations of birthdays, holidays, rites of passage or any gathering where a sense of family and national belonging is reaffirmed. Such study could help understand not only stable and shifting meanings of rituals but also their functions as metaphors for continuity and change.

**AWARENESS OF MARGINALIZATION**

While the notion of “dual vision” characterizes the incorporation of culture in the inner workings of many immigrant families, it also captures the nature of their interaction with larger external and institutional systems of the host country. The concept of “double consciousness”, first described by Dubois (1903) for African Americans, is useful here because it encompasses a
perception of who one really is as a person within one’s own group, and a perception of who one is in the attributions of the larger society’s story towards the same group. The relevance and contemporary impact of the concept of “double consciousness” for Latinos is expanded by Jose David Saldivar’s chapter in this volume. Racial, ethnic, and class discriminations plague the individual stories of many Latino and Latina immigrant adults and children. One case of mine illustrates the painful awareness a Mexican family had of the gross, racist preconceptions of Latino immigrants by whites.

This family, a married couple with six children arrived from Oaxaca seven years ago, and consulted me because a white upper-class neighbor had accused their nine-year-old son of “molesting” her four-year-old daughter. As the Mexican’s boy story unfolded I understood that several children had been playing together in the fields when the little girl said she needed to urinate. The boy quickly pulled her panties down and held her in the upright position, but the girl ran crying home. Racism was undoubtedly part of the reaction to the boy’s behavior. I offered to the parents the alternative explanation to the “molest” but the father responded “I thank you but we want you to tell ‘them’ (the white family) that you think ‘our son is cured and this will never happen again.” When asked why should I do this, he said, “Because, when they look at us, they think ‘these Mexicans are good people, le hacen la lucha (they struggle hard), but if something goes wrong they suddenly see in us the faces of rapists and abusers. I promise you I will keep an eye on this boy, but please do not question their story, ‘no vale la pena’ (it is not worth it). It could cost us everything we worked for.”

Here again is the ambiguity of gains, losses and dual visions of immigrants. Striving for the dream of stability in a new land is riddled with pressures to assimilate the dominant culture’s story which negatively judges dark-skinned, poor immigrants and deprives them of legal resources to fight unfair accusations. The social climate of structural exclusion and psychological violence suffered by immigrants and their children is not only detrimental to their participation in the opportunity structure but it also affects the immigrant children’s sense of self, through a process of what Carola Suarez-Orozco (in press) aptly calls “social mirroring”.

Indeed, most immigrants and their children are aware of the hostilities and prejudice towards them. From a psychological viewpoint this awareness may be debilitating when internalized or denied, but it may be empowering when it helps stimulate strategic social justice
activism. Proponents of critical pedagogy underline that awareness of one’s own marginal status is the first step towards empowerment (Trueba, 1999). Thus, it seems possible that awareness of social injustices may create a measure of family resilience against assaults on identity.

**LONGHELD BELIEFS AND SPIRITUAL SYSTEMS**

The belief system, or meaning people make of their lives and experience, is a narrative construct that helps understand a family’s ability to deal with adversity (Walsh, 1998; Wright, Watson, and Bell, 1996). A family’s tolerance for loss and ambiguity is related to their culture’s tolerance for ambiguity; fatalistic and optimistic stances are likewise embedded in, culturally-based systems of meaning (Boss, 1999).

Some Latino cultural narratives and spiritual beliefs promote acceptance of life adversities, tempering the need to find answers and definitive solutions to losses (Falicov, 1998). Roman Catholic beliefs value acceptance of suffering, destiny and God’s will. A belief that little in life is under one’s control is also related to conditions of poverty and decreased agency (Garza and Ames, 1972; Comas-Díaz, 1989). These beliefs should not be misconstrued as passivity, however, but as forms of combining active initiative to solve what can be solved and accept what cannot be changed – a sort of mastery of the possible.

Like other cultural and ritual practices, the old religion often takes new forms and functions in the new land. Church participation may actually help inscribe various Latino groups in dual, evolving transnational spaces. As Peggy Levitt so cogently describes in her chapter in this volume, immigrants’ church attendance can allow a double membership that crosses border arenas in the homeland while it grounds them locally through host country participation and even civic engagement. This balance of continuity and change may be at the core of resilient adaptations to ambiguous loss. Yet, these dual visions are not always obtainable, nor is it always possible to make positive meaning out of the experience of migration. In the next sections, I describe situations where attempts to restore a sense of family coherence fail in the midst of intense loss and irreparable ambiguity.

**WHEN AMBIGUOUS LOSS BECOMES UNBEARABLE**

There are many migration circumstances that can lead to overwhelmingly problematic physical and emotional disconnections among family members. Two of these circumstances are
addressed here: one refers to the overlap of the consequences of migration with the impact of other life cycle transitions at any point in the life of an immigrant; the other focuses on the short and long term effects of migration separations and reunifications among all family members. Both situations can be understood better by utilizing the concept of boundary ambiguity.

**THE CONSTRUCT OF BOUNDARY AMBIGUITY**

Ambiguous loss may become problematic when it generates confusion about who is in and who is out of the family. Boss (1991) labeled this phenomenon “boundary ambiguity”, a concept increasingly used in family research to describe effects of family membership loss over time (Boss, Greenberg, and Pearce-McCall, 1990) and may be very helpful in understanding the particularities of losses in migration. This construct encompasses the rules and definitions of family subsystems (parental, marital, sibling and other subgroups) and how they are perceived by each family group.

Life Cycle Transitions pile-up: non-ambiguous loss added to ambiguous loss.

When non-ambiguous, irretrievable losses occur in the life cycle of an immigrant family -- perhaps the death of a relative back home -- the uncertain, provisional and ambiguous quality of the old good-byes accentuates the loss and creates confusions about where one belongs or what constitutes the definition of one’s family. For example,

A 36 year old woman consulted me for depression after her father died suddenly in Argentina. Overwhelmed by sadness and guilt at not having made the effort to see him more often and by the unbearable loneliness at not being able to participate in communal grieving, this woman asked to have a separation from her Anglo-American husband. He was the one who had brought her to this country and whom she felt to be a much less loving man than her father. Asked about her adoring father’s reaction when she had left her country 12 years ago to get married, she promptly said: “Everybody told me that day was like “el velorio del angelito” for him”(the wake of his little angel). Now she experienced a great deal of confusion as to where she belonged. Her husband and children, who hardly knew her father, provided little comfort. She needed the support of her family of origin who had lived their lives face-to-face, yet her own shared history with them had been truncated long ago. This case illustrates the rippling effects of ambiguous loss for the immigrant, for their children and for the family of origin left behind. This woman’s 8-year-old daughter was having behavior and school difficulties parallel to the
mother’s depression.

In addition to separations between extended and nuclear family, Latino immigrants increasingly experience separations between parents and children. Frequently, a father or a mother migrates first, leaving children behind with plans for later reunification. Such separations, complicate experiences of loss, raise issues of inclusion/exclusion and set the stage for boundary ambiguity.

**Calling Two Women “Mami”**

When a father or a mother migrates first, leaving the family to be reunited later, the confusion may be mild and temporary or intense and prolonged. If sufficient time passes, a family in which the father migrated first, may reorganize into a single-parent household, with mother as head and substitutes replacing the parental functions left vacant. Reunification is often stressful as family boundaries need to change again to allow for reentry of the absent member.

Increasingly today, mothers recruited for work make the journey north alone, living the children with other women in the family or social network. It is only after several years that they are joined by their children, who often travel unaccompanied. Sociologist Pierrette Hondagneu-Sotelo’s incisive analysis (this volume) of the changing labor demands driving these emergent transnational family forms and the possible new meanings of family and motherhood, provides a historical, economic and social context for these complex and often traumatic separations and equally traumatic reunifications between mothers and children. Children are left behind with grandparents or other relatives so that an immigrant parent can face the dangers of illegal passage, the economic hardships, and the lack of adequate caretaking in the new country without the added worry of having youngsters under wing. Over time, the costs of these arrangements are significant.

The adjustments to partings and the adjustments at subsequent reunion places not only mother and child, but all the subsystems of a three-generational family, including siblings that stayed in the sending culture and those born in the receiving country at risk for developing boundary ambiguities and concomitant individual and relational problems. A common presentation in clinical practice is an immigrant child calling two women “Mami”. We know very little about the meaning of this behavior. Does this point to an attempt to deal with
ambiguous loss by accepting two mothers, one here and one there? Could it represent a fluid
definition of family that reflects multiple attachments where “Mami” is just a generic term for
significant others? Of more concern, does it signify boundary ambiguity and the beginning of
divided loyalties as to who is the real mother? What makes for a successful separation and
reunion? What are the consequences of separation at different ages and for various lengths of
time? What transforms ambiguous loss into conflictual boundary ambiguity?

A recent international furor over the fate of one young Cuban immigrant highlights an
extreme case of boundary ambiguity. Elián Gonzalez, a Cuban 6 year-old shipwreck survivor
was fiercely fought over by his deceased mother’s relatives in Miami and by his father and
grandmothers in Cuba, each side of the family (the immigrants and the non-immigrants) claiming
rights to where Elián truly belongs (Cooper Ramo, 2000). At the political level, the boundary
ambiguity could not be resolved because it represents the long-standing political tensions
between Little Havana in Miami and Havana in Cuba. Yet, the symbolism of belonging goes
beyond the political. At the level of migration loss, it is a dispute in the territory of the heart of
immigrants who have remained in perpetual mourning for the total loss of the Cuba they once
knew. It is tempting to speculate that it is precisely the prohibition to visit that creates the
impossibility of living dual lives, recharging emotional batteries and becoming binational or
bicultural. Their ambiguous losses solidify in a rigid migration narrative confined to an
idealization of the island’s past, recreated exclusively in the space, of Little Havana. The conflict
over Elian Gonzalez’s future is magnified by these historical factors, but it illustrates what may
happen in families that polarize over keeping a child close to each side of their existential
predicament.

Clinicians encounter many families from Mexico, Central America and the Caribbean
who have undergone separation and reunion with children of all ages. After a period of time
following reunification, mothers often request professional help with behavior problems and
defiance of their authority. Many social and psychological factors contribute to mother-child
disconnections and the development of conflict. From a family systems view we can speculate
on the family interactions that may contribute to pernicious family boundary ambiguities. One
factor seems to be each family member’s positive or negative perceptions of the decision to
migrate, i.e. how much approval or disapproval there is among the adults (the biological mother
and the caretaker, for example) about the decision to separate temporarily. A related outcome is
the quality of the relationship between the migrating parent/s and the temporary caretakers, and
their efforts to be cooperative and inclusive at long distance.

Ongoing studies will help us learn more about how to help families strengthen their
resilience to the many individual and relational risks inherent in these separations, yet the
separations themselves, especially if prolonged, may carry nearly insurmountable risks. Studies
of the nature of the ruptured attachments among family members, the loss of shared histories and
the effects of persistent economic stress on family life may yield an emergent understanding of
the problematic “costs of transnationalism” (see Gonzalez-Baker this volume) for immigrant families.

**DIRECTIONS FOR RESEARCH**

Family systems theorists and family therapists have become increasingly aware of the
need to integrate findings from studies of migration, race and ethnicity to develop culturally and
socially responsible family systems frameworks and practices. Likewise, researchers of
migration, race and ethnicity issues would enhance their work by expanding their studies of
individuals to encompass three-generational immigrant family units as social systems in cultural
transition.

The constructs of *ambiguous loss* and *boundary ambiguity* can be applied to studies of
migration, and its intersection with life cycle transitions including the separations and reunions
among all the generations and subsystems of immigrant families. Integrating these concepts may
contribute to a better theoretical understanding of risks and resiliences for different families in
the trajectory of migration. Likewise, the idea of *family resilience* helps identify key relational
processes that enable families to succeed and make some order and meaning out of the many
stresses they encounter.

Narrative approaches and concepts, such as belief systems, incorporate a meaning-
making lens that allows people to tell their stories and express their local knowledge about their
unique experiences of loss, hardship and resilience. It is difficult to capture the rich texture of
migration via quantitative work only. The addition of other approaches -- qualitative interviews,
ethnographic texts, diaries and case studies -- may tap the nuances of multiple and unique
outcomes. Small scale comparative and longitudinal qualitative studies, such as following up a
small group of nuclear families that have undergone separations and reunifications and those who have migrated as a nuclear unit may greatly enrich our understanding of the many dimensions involved in these experiences.

Concepts that belong to the domain of family systems studies have a powerful potential to enhance the themes and findings generated in the domains of immigration research. An integration of the two streams of work would be mutually invigorating and further develop the complex subject matter of the impact of migration on Latino families.
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