
RESEARCH REPORTS AND NOTES

THE CHANGING PROFILE OF MEXICAN MIGRANTS TO THE UNITED STATES: New Evidence from California and Mexico*

Enrico A. Marcelli, University of Massachusetts, Boston

Wayne A. Cornelius, University of California, San Diego

Abstract: Using recent data from southern California and Mexico, we challenge the notion that the demographic profile of Mexican migrants to the United States since 1970 has remained constant. We find that more recent cohorts of migrants are more likely to settle permanently in the United States, to have higher proportions of females, to be younger, to have more education, to be increasingly likely to originate in southern Mexico and the Mexico City metropolitan area, and to be increasingly likely to depart from urban areas within Mexico. Although we find no direct evidence that the legalization programs mandated by the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 has led to a stronger propensity to settle permanently in the United States, logistic regression analyses demonstrate the importance of the other three main explanatory factors suggested by Wayne Cornelius in 1992: economic crisis in Mexico, the changing character of U.S. demand for labor, and social networks.

*This research note was written while the first author was a Research Fellow at the Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies, University of California, San Diego, and revised while he was a Visiting Scholar at Lewis Center for Regional Policy Studies, University of California, Los Angeles. Earlier drafts were presented to the Population Association of America, 25–27 Mar. 1999, in New York City, and to the UCLA Demographic Workshop on 3 May 2000. The authors gratefully acknowledge grants from the James Irvine Foundation, the John Randolph and Dora Haynes Foundation, and the U.S.-Mexico Science Foundation. The field research in Los Angeles County was undertaken jointly by the University of Southern California and El Colegio de la Frontera Norte. We are also indebted to Craig Cornelius and Rafael Vergara for

In reviewing the evidence in 1992 on the characteristics of Mexican migrants to the United States, Wayne Cornelius synthesized his data and those gathered by sixty-seven other U.S. and Mexican researchers in the 1970s and 1980s using a wide range of research methodologies and sites. Four trends were identified in the data. First, permanent settlement by Mexican migrants to the United States began to increase in the 1970s and accelerated during the 1980s. Second, the flow of Mexican migrants became more diverse geographically, originating more in nontraditional sending states and large cities, including the Mexico City metropolitan area. Third, the skill composition of the Mexican migrant flow began to improve. And fourth, the gender composition of Mexican migration shifted, becoming less male-dominated as more single women and whole families began to migrate.¹

Cornelius (1992) hypothesized that these changes in the profile of migrants from Mexico to the United States could be explained by four factors: the changing composition of U.S. demand for migrant labor, with non-agricultural, year-round employment opportunities increasing over short-term agricultural jobs; the economic crisis in Mexico during the 1980s, which forced Mexicans in nontraditional source areas to enter the U.S.-bound migratory flow; changes in U.S. immigration law, especially the legalization provisions of the 1986 Immigration and Control Act (IRCA), which increased migration by women and dependent children to reunite families; and the maturing of transnational migrant networks that altered the demographic composition of migration flows and strengthened incentives for permanent settlement in the United States. Frank Bean, Thomas Espenshade, Michael White, and Robert Dymowski agreed particularly with Cornelius's third hypothesis concerning undocumented Mexican immigration (1990, 114). They noted that IRCA employer sanctions were more likely to discourage potential adult Mexican male migrants, who were more likely than their female and minor counterparts to migrate in search of work.

Jorge Durand, using an "ethnosurvey technique" to investigate the characteristics of those migrating between Ameca, Jalisco, and the United States over the past three decades, also confirmed several of Cornelius's gen-

research assistance. Valuable comments on an initial draft were provided by Manuel García y Griego, David Heer, and Pascale Joassart. We also have benefited from conversations with Paul Ong, Robert Mare, Shannon McConville, Manuel Pastor Jr., and Rafael Alarcón as well as from suggestions provided by three anonymous *LARR* reviewers. The authors bear full responsibility for all interpretations and conclusions in this piece.

1. In a paper written more than a decade earlier using data from his field interviews with Mexican migrants residing in California and Illinois in 1978, Cornelius (1981) documented the beginnings of several of these changes in the profile of Mexican migration to the United States, especially the growing importance of the permanent-settler component and increased participation by women and children. Using INS apprehension data from the 1980s, Bean, Espenshade, White, and Dymowski (1990) also documented increasing proportions of women and children among undocumented immigrants along the Mexico-U.S. border.

eralizations (Durand 1998). But a study coauthored by Durand, Douglas Massey, and René Zenteno and published in this journal (2001) directly challenges Cornelius's generalizations. The new study argues instead that Mexican migration to the United States has become more cyclical (short-term); continues to originate primarily in west-central Mexico (and its increasing "urbanness" simply reflects the overall urbanization of the Mexican population); has become less selective in terms of educational attainment;² and remains dominated by working-age males. Using data from Mexico and the United States, Durand, Massey, and Zenteno characterize Mexican migration to the United States as an example of "remarkable continuity" over time (2001, 124).³

Our purpose here is to test this latest hypothesis of high continuity in the profile of Mexican migrants entering the United States by examining recent data from southern California and Mexico. We analyze trends since 1970 in gender composition, the ratio of sojourners to permanent settlers, age composition, educational attainment, regional origins, and the urban-rural composition of source regions. We also examine factors influencing recent increases in permanent settlement among Mexican migrants.

Although no specific theoretical framework is outlined in Durand, Massey, and Zenteno (2001), the continuity hypothesis falls most appropriately under the theory of cumulative causation (Myrdal 1957). From this perspective, each act of migration is assumed to alter the social context in which migration decisions are made so that future migratory movement becomes more likely regardless of whether conditions initiating migration remain over time (Massey 1990; Massey, Arango, Hugo, Kouaouci, Pellegrino, and Taylor 1999, 45–46). In short, more of the same can be expected. Cornelius (1992) also did not offer an explicit theory of Mexican migration to the United States, but his analysis generally conformed to what has become known as the migration-systems approach (Mabogunje 1970; Portes and Borocz 1989;

2. We note that because education levels in Mexico have been rising over time (albeit at a slower pace than in the United States), one would expect more recent cohorts of Mexican migrants to have higher levels of education than earlier ones. If a more recent migration cohort has a smaller proportion of migrants with at least a high-school education than an earlier cohort, then migration has become less selective with respect to education.

3. Curiously, the same researchers, in an earlier review of findings from thirty-two Mexican sending communities, attacked what they termed "the stereotype of Mexican migrants as males of working age" who were overwhelmingly sojourners in the United States (Durand and Massey 1992, 19–25). They also discussed the importance of many of the same sources of discontinuity in Mexican migration patterns that were emphasized by Cornelius (1992). Similarly, in a recent critique of U.S. immigration policy since 1994, Massey (1998) called attention to the expansion of social networks in response to North American economic integration, which puts U.S. jobs within easy reach of an increasing proportion of the Mexican population. He also argued that recent changes in U.S. immigration policy, especially stronger border enforcement, have lowered the odds of return migration to Mexico by increasing the costs and risks of repeated illegal entry.

Kritz, Lim, and Zlotnick 1992). While not denying the influence of cumulative causation, this approach places more explanatory weight on economic and political activity in labor-importing countries. Put simply, it holds that firms seeking to lower labor costs and increase investment returns can be expected to petition the government to implement domestic and foreign policies favorable to business interests and likely to create or reinforce international migration flows (Castles and Miller 1998; Rosenblum 2000; Sassen 1988). Immigration controls fail in the final analysis because the demand for immigrant labor has become structurally embedded in the political economies of receiving countries (Cornelius 1998b).

DATA AND METHODS

The primary data used in this research note come from four sample surveys implemented in southern California from 1994 to 1996. The two-part 1994 University of Southern California and El Colegio de la Frontera Norte (USC-COLEF) Household and Mobile Population Surveys was conducted in Los Angeles County. Two 1996 University of California, San Diego (UCSD) surveys were conducted in San Diego County. The first interviewed immigrant-dependent firms and their immigrant employees. The second focused on irregularly employed migrant workers (comparable with the USC-COLEF Mobile Population Survey). Supplementing these data is information obtained from the 1980 and 1990 U.S. Censuses and from two surveys conducted in Mexico: the Mexican Encuesta Nacional de Emigración a la Frontera Norte y Estados Unidos (ENEFNEU) in 1979 and the Mexican Encuesta Nacional de la Demográfica Dinámica (ENADID) in 1992.

The 1994 USC-COLEF Household Survey is a probability sample of census tracts in Los Angeles County in which a quarter or more of the total population were born in Mexico, according to the 1990 U.S. Census. The survey asked adults from 271 Los Angeles County households in which at least one person was born in Mexico a series of questions that produced detailed information about 661 persons on demographics, migration, legal status, and economics. A more detailed description of the survey can be found in Marcelli and Heer (1998). The 1994 USC-COLEF Mobile Population Survey provided valuable information on 670 foreign-born Mexicans who were interviewed at day-labor sites, commercial centers, lunch trucks, and soccer fields throughout Los Angeles County. While some interviewed in the USC-COLEF Household Survey might have been sojourners, those found in the Mobile Population Survey were less likely to be settlers than those interviewed in the Household Survey.

The 1996 UCSD survey built on two previous surveys of firms that hire immigrants in California, conducted in 1983–1984 and 1987–1988 by the Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies. Given the impossibility of sampling the entire universe of firms that depend on Mexican immigrant labor in Cali-

ifornia, these earlier surveys employed an eclectic set of sampling techniques using information obtained from raid lists of the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS), industry and telephone-directory lists, union officials, and other sources (Cornelius 1992, 190–95).

Twenty percent of the 112 firms represented in the 1996 UCSD survey were drawn from the 1980s samples. Employers in all firms participating in these earlier surveys that were still in business and operating in San Diego County in 1996 were reinterviewed. The remaining 80 percent of the 1996 sample firms were selected randomly from complete lists of businesses compiled by a market research firm. These firms were operating in the ten sectors of the San Diego County economy that depend most heavily on immigrant labor: agriculture and horticulture, high-tech manufacturing, low-tech manufacturing (except clothing), apparel, food processing, construction, hotels and motels, restaurants, landscape and building maintenance, and miscellaneous services (such as dry cleaners, car washes, laundries, and convalescent homes). Firms selected for possible study were contacted by telephone to determine the proportion of foreign-born employees in their workforce. Only those firms reporting that at least half of their production workers were immigrants were included in the final sample. Interviews with 501 immigrant workers employed in these firms were distributed evenly across the ten economic sectors listed. Five or six randomly chosen immigrant employees were interviewed per firm, away from the workplace.

Also interviewed were 116 “street-corner workers”—foreign-born persons who seek day labor in construction, landscaping, and other occupations by standing near public thoroughfares and shopping mall entrances. These irregularly employed workers were selected randomly from persons gathered at four different street-corner labor markets dispersed throughout San Diego County during the first half of 1996.

For the present analysis, we pooled the regularly and irregularly employed migrant workers of Mexican nationality (79 percent of the total sample) in the 1996 UCSD surveys. We then compared their demographic and socioeconomic characteristics with those of Mexican migrants interviewed in the 1994 USC-COLEF surveys to identify recent changes in the Mexican migrant profile.⁴

Finally, using data from the 1996 UCSD surveys, we have identified factors likely to influence the intention of Mexican migrants to remain in the United States permanently. Specifically, we used logistic regression analysis to estimate how well five sets of factors help explain variation in respon-

4. The 1980 and 1990 Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS) as well as the 1979 ENEFNEU and 1992 ENADID surveys are used mostly for comparative purposes in this research note. These surveys are described in detail elsewhere (Bean, Corona, Tuirán, and Woodrow-Lafield 1998).

dents' intentions to settle in the United States: certain demographic variables (like sex, age, years of schooling); the historical economic context of migration (such as whether one migrated to the United States during the Mexican economic crisis of 1982–1988); the opportunity to legalize one's status in the U.S. under the IRCA amnesty provisions; the availability of year-round employment in the United States; and membership in social networks that include friends born in the United States.

The model employed in this research note follows. Although we first regress one's intention to reside permanently in the United States on demographic variables only, we proceed in subsequent runs to include proxies for migration push factors (such as economic crisis in Mexico), U.S. immigration policy, the U.S. demand for labor, and social networks. The final model includes all variables shown in appendix 1, listed under the five explanatory categories.

RESULTS

Gender Composition

Durand, Massey, and Zenteno (2001) pooled data from the 1990 U.S. census 1 percent Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS) and ENADID in an effort to adjust for differences in selection probabilities between the two data sources and to simulate what the data on the U.S. side of the border would look like if persons on both sides of the border were asked the same questions. Specifically, they standardized the Mexican foreign-born population enumerated in the 1990 PUMS by age composition for all persons and by year of departure for those age twelve and older to control for the selective process of settlement.⁵ When using ENADID data only, Durand, Massey, and Zenteno (2001) found that Mexico-U.S. migration continues to be highly selective of males. In fact, the proportion of males appears to be rising. While 77 percent of all Mexican migrants who departed between 1970 and 1974 were male, 82 percent of those who left between 1985 and 1989 were male, and as were 87 percent of those who departed between 1990 and 1992. When using the pooled 1990 PUMS and 1992 ENADID data and controlling for selective U.S. settlement, males do not appear to be as dominant. But the increase in their representation has been slightly higher—from 58 percent for those who departed in the early 1970s to 68 percent among those who departed between 1985 and 1989 (table 1). In short, whether one looks at Mexican migration data from Mexico or from the United States, males appear to continue to dominate the flow.

5. This task was accomplished by reweighting the foreign-born Mexican population by age or all laborers age twelve and older by year of departure categories in the 1990 PUMS to reflect the percentages in the ENADID data.

TABLE 1 Percentage of Female Migrants among Mexico-U.S. Migrants, by Year of Departure

Data Source	Year of Departure				
	1970–1974 (%)	1975–1979 (%)	1980–1984 (%)	1985–1989 (%)	1990–1992 (%)
ENADID	42.0	38.6	35.5	31.9	
UCSD	25.0	35.3	32.0	30.2	43.5
USC-COLEF	46.9	41.6	40.7	46.5	56.2

Sources: 1992 Encuesta Nacional de la Demográfica Dinámica (ENADID); 1996 UCSD San Diego County Immigrant-Dependent Business Establishment Survey; and 1994 USC-COLEF Los Angeles County Household Survey.

Using more recent data from San Diego and Los Angeles counties (table 1) and comparing the 1970–1974 and 1990–1992 Mexico departure (or U.S. entry) cohorts, we find strong evidence of gender proportion convergence—not the slight divergence interpreted as continuity by Durand, Massey, and Zenteno (2001). Indeed, among foreign-born Mexicans headed for Los Angeles County in the early 1990s, females appear to have outnumbered males.

While 75 percent of those foreign-born Mexican migrants residing in San Diego County in 1996 who arrived between 1970 and 1974 were male, only 56.5 percent were male among those who arrived between 1990 and 1992. Similarly, 53.1 percent of those foreign-born Mexicans residing in Los Angeles County in 1994 who arrived as part of the 1970–1974 entry cohort were male. Despite a quick rise in the male proportion between 1975 and 1984 to 59.3 percent, the proportion was virtually unchanged at 53.5 percent for the 1985–1989 cohort. But after 1989, the proportion of males began to decline, and females actually became the majority (56.2 percent) in the 1990–1992 entry cohort. These results suggest a gradual feminization of the Mexican migrant flow, commencing in the early 1970s and accelerating sharply in the 1990s. A similar surge in female Mexican migration in the 1990s has been found in large and small cities in Georgia, with women outnumbering men in the most recent (1993–1998) cohort (Rees, Miller, and Arillo 1998; Hernández-León and Zúñiga 2000, 60). Ethnographic evidence suggests that migration by Mexican women to the United States since 1990 has been strongly mediated by kinship networks. Young single women often are encouraged to migrate by their older siblings to care for young children and do housework in households where both the father and mother are employed outside the home. Married women typically migrate to reunite with their husbands. Older women come to care for their grandchildren (Hirsch 1998; Malkin 1999).

Settlement Patterns

The feminization of the Mexican migration flow is strongly related to the trend toward more permanent settlement in the United States. The latter trend is illustrated by our 1996 data from San Diego County. While 70 percent of the Mexican workers who entered in the early 1970s identified the United States as their main country of residence, 87.1 percent did so among the 1985–1989 cohort (table 2).

It might be argued that data from major urban regions of southern California, with their well-consolidated Mexican migrant networks and satellite communities of emigrants (Waldinger 1997; Cornelius 1998b), are more likely to capture the settler population, especially females, and may tend to miss those who continue to engage in short-term shuttle migration. With females being more likely than males to remain permanently in the United States, these results could be doubly biased toward settlers. But data gathered south of the border as well as pooled age-standardized U.S. and Mexican data may be biased toward sojourners. For example, the male percentage reported when using the ENADID or the Mexican Migration Project data in both the 1970–1974 and the 1985–1989 entry cohorts is substantially higher than in the standardized 1990 PUMS data. This finding is consistent with the common idea that males are more likely to move back and forth across the border. Yet even though the male proportion of the two departure cohorts has remained high (76.8 and 74.8 percent) according to the Mexican Migration Project data, the proportion has actually been declining since the early 1980s (Durand, Massey, and Zenteno 2001, 121).

A more robust method of determining whether the settler-sojourner composition of the Mexican population migrating to the United States has changed or remained constant over time is to estimate the relative growth of the sojourner and settler populations. This task can be done in two ways. First, one can assume that women and children are less internationally mobile than men and divide the number of women and children by the number of men over time to obtain a settler ratio. Pierrette Hondagneu-Sotelo, for instance, has argued that migration from Mexico to the United States transforms gender relations within households. In her view, immigrant women “advance settlement along three structural dimensions . . . : the construction of community-wide social ties; employment in relatively stable, year-round jobs; and the utilization of private and public institutional forms of assistance, including credit” (Hondagneu-Sotelo 1994, 99). In short, as men migrate, women “strengthen their own position in the family, further deepening their commitment to settlement” (1994, xxiv; see also Hondagneu-Sotelo 1997). Leo Chávez contended earlier that because female Mexican migrants tend to be married and have children (many of them born in the United States), they are more likely to become permanent settlers (Chávez 1988). Rafael Alarcón has supported such claims and suggested that both

TABLE 2 Percentage of Mexico-U.S. Migrants Identifying the United States as their Principal Country of Residence

Data Source	Year of Departure			
	1970–1974 (%)	1975–1979 (%)	1980–1984 (%)	1985–1989 (%)
ENADID	19.6	22.4	25.7	37.7
UCSD	70.0	83.5	84.2	87.1

Sources: 1992 Encuesta Nacional de la Demográfica Dinámica (ENADID); and 1996 UCSD San Diego County Immigrant-Dependent Business Establishment Survey.

U.S. and Mexican governments policies have helped create well-developed social networks that have led to increased settlement (Alarcón 1995a, 1995b).

Second, using representative national data from Mexico to compute the sojourner numerator and from the United States for the settler denominator, we can estimate a sojourner ratio. If the settler ratio has risen or the sojourner ratio has fallen over time, then it is more likely that more Mexican migrants have been settling over time. A proxy for the settler ratio may be deduced from tables 1 and 2, which show that the proportion of females among the Mexican migrant population and the percentage identifying the United States as their main country of residence have been rising. The method employed here to produce a sojourner ratio uses the Mexican Labor Ministry's ENEFNEU sample as a proxy for sojourners and the adjusted foreign-born Mexican population residing in the United States in 1980 (Warren and Passel 1987) as a proxy for settlers.⁶ Some 519,000 "absent workers" were reported by household members who were interviewed and 471,000 "returned workers" who were directly interviewed in 1979 in the ENEFNEU survey (García y Griego 1983). Dividing these 990,000 Mexican migrants by the 2,326,000 foreign-born Mexicans estimated to have been permanently residing in the United States. (according to the 1980 census) yields an estimated sojourner ratio of 43.6 percent. Using the 1,220,075 Mexican migrants reported to have returned to Mexico between 1988 and 1992 in the 1992 ENADID data (Bean, Corona, Tuirán, and Woodrow-Lafield 1998, 63) as a proxy for sojourners and the 4,298,000 foreign-born Mexicans enumerated in the 1990 PUMS as a proxy for settlers, we find that the estimated proportion of sojourners has fallen to 28.4 percent. In other words, Mexican migrants appear to be settling in the United States more often, even when we look at data from both sides of the border, a result that corroborates our findings from southern California.

A 1997 survey of Mexican immigrants in Texas who had filed naturalization applications with the INS yields further evidence of a settlement

6. The authors would like to thank Manuel García y Griego for suggesting this method.

pattern that is apparently not limited to southern California. When asked about their motivations for seeking naturalization, 83.9 percent of the respondents said that they planned to reside in the United States for the rest of their lives (Freeman, González-Baker, Orozco, and Plascencia 1999).

Age Composition

Using ENADID data, Durand, Massey, and Zenteno (2001) report that although the age distribution of the Mexican migrant population becomes progressively younger from earlier to later departure cohorts as measured by “age at survey,” it changes little when measured by “age at departure.” One would expect this to be the case. For example, migrants who left in the early 1970s have aged, and young persons are less likely to be found among their cohort in 1992 than among those who left in the subsequent two decades. This expectation is also consistent with the notion that people are more likely to migrate before or during their economically productive years than afterward. Thus it is more likely to find a “greening effect” when using the “age at survey” rather than the variable “age at departure.”

Using data (specifically, the variable age at departure) from the 1994 USC-COLEF and 1996 UCSD surveys, we find significant fluctuation in cohort age composition (table 3), contrary to the hypothesis of “high-continuity.” For example, while the share of those ages twelve to eighteen fell from 13.8 percent (1970–1974 cohort) to 8.9 percent (1990–1992 cohort) according to ENADID data,⁷ this group’s proportional representation rose from 15.2 to 39.0 percent in the USC-COLEF household survey. In San Diego County, however, the group from twelve to eighteen years old declined slightly from 23.5 to 21.4 percent according to the 1996 UCSD survey, and the proportion fell among the Los Angeles County sojourner population (those interviewed in the USC-COLEF Mobile Population Survey) from 24.0 to 22.6 percent. Although not shown in table 3, when extending the analysis to those who arrived after 1992, our data reveal an even larger drop to 15.8 percent in the Los Angeles County household survey, and 6.5 percent in the UCSD survey.

Compared with the small rise in the proportion ages nineteen to thirty-four in the ENADID data from the 1970–1974 cohort to that for 1990–1992, this group’s proportional representation among Mexican migrant workers appears to have risen moderately in San Diego County but to have fallen slightly or remained constant in Los Angeles County. In sum, we find little evidence of continuity in the age profile of successive Mexican migrant entry cohorts during the two decades beginning in the early 1970s.

7. We do not control for changes in age and settlement patterns, however.

TABLE 3 Percentage of Mexico-U.S. Migrants Leaving for the United States by Age at Departure and Year of Departure

Age at Departure	Year of Departure				
	1970–1974 (%)	1975–1979 (%)	1980–1984 (%)	1985–1989 (%)	1990–1992 (%)
ENADID					
12 to 18 years	13.8	11.2	14.6	11.7	8.9
19 to 34	55.9	60.7	60.6	63.3	56.8
35 to 54	28.7	24.4	22.4	22.0	30.2
55 and older	1.6	3.7	2.4	2.9	4.1
USC-COLEF Mobile Population Survey					
12 to 18 years	24.0	23.6	11.6	31.8	22.6
19 to 34	76.0	45.5	86.9	58.3	73.0
35 to 54	0.0	30.9	0.9	4.7	4.4
55 and older	0.0	0.0	0.6	5.2	0.0
USC-COLEF Household Survey					
12 to 18 years	15.2	22.2	51.2	41.5	39.0
19 to 34	66.3	69.2	35.7	50.7	53.5
35 to 54	17.4	5.6	8.6	5.7	5.9
55 and older	1.1	3.1	4.5	2.1	1.6
UCSD Immigrant- Dependent Business- Establishment Survey					
12 to 18 years	23.5	32.1	28.6	15.7	21.4
19 to 34	64.7	64.3	63.4	72.5	67.9
35 to 54	8.8	3.6	7.1	11.8	10.7
55 and older	2.9	0.0	0.9	0.0	0.0

Educational Attainment

A number of studies have noted the declining average educational attainment of Mexican migrants relative to members of other ethnoracial groups in recent decades (Borjas 1997; Durand, Massey, and Zenteno 2001). Some researchers have noted that newer Mexican migrants have higher levels of educational attainment than earlier entry cohorts (Myers 1998, 162, 176–78), but Durand, Massey, and Zenteno (2001) question this assertion. They suggest that despite rising educational levels in Mexico and after controlling for age composition and settlement selectivity, the Mexican migrant flow is becoming less selective in terms of educational attainment.

TABLE 4 Educational Attainment of Mexico-U.S. Migrants by Year of Departure, in Percentages

Years of Education	Year of Departure				
	1970–1974 (%)	1975–1979 (%)	1980–1984 (%)	1985–1989 (%)	1990–1992 (%)
ENADID					
0 years	7.1	9.8	11.2	10.7	
1 to 4 years	11.0	15.2	17.3	17.9	
5 to 9 years	29.9	39.8	43.5	44.8	
10 years or more	52.0	35.1	28.0	26.5	
USC-COLEF Mobile Population Survey					
0 years	4.7	7.1	3.8	5.8	1.5
1 to 4 years	24.5	7.4	5.4	5.4	15.9
5 to 9 years	45.5	56.1	60.9	32.3	33.4
10 years or more	25.4	29.5	30.0	56.6	49.2
USC-COLEF Household Survey					
0 years	0.0	0.7	0.1	0.2	3.8
1 to 4 years	84.6	71.9	61.2	68.5	57.1
5 to 9 years	12.3	11.9	35.0	27.7	22.9
10 or more years	3.1	15.5	4.0	3.6	16.2
UCSD Immigrant-Dependent Business-Establishment Survey					
0 years	5.0	2.4	2.0	3.7	4.4
1 to 4 years	15.0	12.9	15.8	5.9	6.5
5 to 9 years	35.0	50.6	51.5	50.7	41.3
10 years or more	45.0	34.1	30.7	39.7	47.8

Once again, they attempt to make this point by using both Mexican and standardized U.S. data.⁸

In contrast, our data from California reveal that the Mexican migrant flow, regardless of the ratio of settlers to sojourners, has become more selective with respect to education (table 4).⁹ In Los Angeles County, for instance, the proportion of Mexican migrant “settlers” (USC-COLEF Household Survey) who had at least ten years of education rose from approxi-

8. Controlling for age composition in the U.S. data will tend to bias the measured educational attainment of more recent entry cohorts downward, given Mexico’s general rise in educational attainment.

9. The more mobile component of the flow—irregularly employed day laborers—appears to be growing more selective in terms of education than migrants who are more settled in the United States.

mately 3 percent for the 1970–1974 migrant cohort to over 16 percent for the 1990–1992 cohort. Their sojourner counterparts (in the USC-COLEF Mobile Population Survey) increased from 25 percent to 49 percent. Evidence from the UCSD surveys in San Diego County also shows a rise in the educational attainment of more recent Mexican migrant cohorts. The proportion with more than ten years of education has been rising since the mid-1980s, and the share of migrants with more than four years of education has risen from 80 to approximately 89 percent. Meanwhile, the proportion of those having less than four years of schooling has been declining since 1970. These data contradict the dominant perception of declining Mexican educational attainment, as does a recent national-level analysis by Robert Smith (1998), based on U.S. Census data, showing that “the education deficit” between Mexican male immigrants and U.S.-born white males is declining across generations.

Evidence gathered in rural Mexican sending communities also indicates rising educational levels among U.S.-bound migrants. For example, in one high-emigration town in the state of Jalisco surveyed three times by Cornelius, mean years of education among recent male migrants to the United States rose from 3.09 in 1976, to 4.25 in 1988, and to 4.75 in 1995 (Cornelius 1976, 1991, 1998a). Moreover, in each of these surveys, migrants to the United States had higher levels of educational attainment than the community mean. Thus recent migrants to the United States appear to be more selective in terms of the educational levels of their communities of origin than they were twenty years ago.

Regional Origins

Available data show that four Mexican states sent an estimated 54.5 percent of all Mexican migrants to the United States in 1924: Jalisco, Michoacán, Guanajuato, and Coahuila. The first three of these and Zacatecas appear consistently in the top eight sending states from the 1920s through the 1980s. Thus the four Mexican states of Jalisco, Michoacán, Guanajuato, and Zacatecas can reasonably be considered the “historic” or “traditional” source regions for migrants to the United States.¹⁰ Consistent with data gathered for the *Mexico–United States Binational Migration Study* (U.S. Commission on Immigration Reform and Mexican Ministry of Foreign Relations 1997), Durand, Massey, and Zenteno (2001) show that relative to the 1970s, the geographical origins of the Mexican migrant flow had shifted in a southeasterly direction, toward the center of the country.

In 1992 Cornelius cited evidence indicating that from the early 1970s to the late 1980s, the Mexican migration flow became more diversified in

10. This historic region sent 54.3 percent in 1924, 47.7 in 1957, 38.7 percent in 1977, and 33.2 percent in 1984 (García y Griego 1989, 54).

terms of sending communities and regions (1992, 157–65). A survey of Mexicans employed in San Diego County in 1987–1988 found that about 38 percent had come from either Jalisco or Michoacán (historically, the top two sending states), but only 22 percent of those arriving since 1986 were from these two states. The same survey also showed an increasing share coming from the Mexico City metropolitan area (the Federal District and contiguous municipalities in the state of Mexico). Durand, Massey, and Zenteno (2001) also find that the proportion of migrants originating in Jalisco and Michoacán declined, from 22 to 18 percent, and that the share of migrants coming from what they define as “the historic region” of emigration to the United States (Aguascalientes, Colima, Durango, Guanajuato, Jalisco, Michoacán, Nayarit, San Luis Potosí, and Zacatecas) fell from 57 to 49 percent.¹¹ But when comparing more recent migrant cohorts with the pre-1975 entry cohort, Durand, Massey, and Zenteno (2001) find no clear temporal trend. Forty-nine percent of the 1990–1992 migrant cohort traveled from the historic region, while 48 percent of the 1970–1974 cohort had originated there.

Interpretations of longitudinal place-of-origin analyses depend on at least three factors. First, before 1979 no national representative sample of migrants to the United States had been taken in Mexico (García y Griego 1983). Thus comparisons using Mexican data before this point are based on data obtained from specific regions and cannot lead to firm conclusions about the entire migrant flow (García y Griego 1989, 53). Second, even if representative data existed for the period before 1979, conclusions about the changing regional origins of Mexican migrants depend on the period of reference chosen. For example, comparing the proportion of Mexican migrants coming from the historic region in the 1990–1992 arrival cohort (48.8 percent) with those who arrived between 1975 and 1979 (57.4 percent) versus those who arrived between 1970 and 1974 (47.8 percent) produces conflicting results. The former comparison supports what most research has shown; the latter, the notion of an unchanging profile of regional origins. Third, differences in the way in which source regions are defined may also contribute to contradictory findings. Applying Durand, Massey, and Zenteno’s regional definitions to the 1996 UCSD data and 1994 USC-COLEF Mobile Population data, we find significant shifts in the regional origins of Mexican migrants since 1970 (table 5).¹²

11. This trend is further confirmed by comparing data gathered in Mexico from undocumented Mexican workers deported from the United States in 1975 (Bustamante 1984, 16–20) with data from Mexican workers employed in California in 1987–1988 (Cornelius 1992). Using the seven Mexican states for which data exist for 1975 (all except Nayarit and Colima) and all Mexican migrants employed in the United States in 1987–1988, we find a 15.5 percentage point drop in “historic-region migrants,” from 65.9 to 50.4 percent. The 1987–1988 proportion is much lower (33.1 percent) when we sum the available data for undocumented Mexican immigrants born in six states (excluding Nayarit, Colima, and San Luis Potosí).

12. We did not use the USC-COLEF Household Survey for this analysis because it contains no question that permits the regional breakdown used in table 5.

TABLE 5 Percentages of Mexico-U.S. Migrants by Regional Origin and Year of Departure

Region	Year of Departure				
	1970–1974 (%)	1975–1979 (%)	1980–1984 (%)	1985–1989 (%)	1990–1992 (%)
ENADID					
Historic region	47.8	57.4	56.1	49.5	48.8
Border	33.7	26.3	27.4	24.8	29.7
Center	17.0	13.8	15.2	24.6	19.8
Periphery	1.5	2.4	1.3	1.1	1.7
USC-COLEF Mobile Population Survey					
Historic region	33.9	32.5	21.2	21.2	19.0
Border	61.0	66.0	74.7	54.6	35.5
Center	5.2	0.6	4.1	23.9	43.2
Periphery	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.3	2.3
UCSD Immigrant- Dependent Business- Establishment Survey					
Historic region	20.6	37.0	33.3	29.6	22.9
Border	67.7	46.6	34.5	29.6	25.7
Center	11.8	16.4	29.9	39.1	51.4
Periphery	0.0	0.0	2.3	1.7	0.0

The San Diego data show that the proportion coming from the nine states used to define the historic region declined steadily from the 1975–1979 migrant cohort to the 1990–1992 cohort. The share of those originating in Mexico's border region fell even more sharply, from 67.7 to 25.7 percent, while the proportion of those from the center and periphery regions combined rose from 11.8 to 51.4 percent during the same period. A similar trend can be seen in the 1994 Los Angeles County mobile population survey data. From the 1970–1974 migrant cohort to the 1990–1992 cohort, the proportion coming from the historic region declined, while the share of migrants from the center and peripheral regions increased sharply, and those coming from the border region plummeted. Both data sets are consistent with the idea of a relatively constant (but declining) flow emanating from the historic region. But they also suggest a considerable southeasterly shift in the regional sources of migration from Mexico to the United States.

Applying alternate definitions of regional origin that further divide the center and peripheral regions to the Los Angeles and San Diego County data reveals similar results (table 6). Again, because we are using exactly the same definitions for the historic and border regions as in table 5, we find a gradually declining proportion of Mexican migrants originating from the

TABLE 6 Percentage of Mexico-U.S. Migrants by Regional Origin and Year of Departure

Region	Year of Departure				
	1970–1974 (%)	1975–1979 (%)	1980–1984 (%)	1985–1989 (%)	1990–1992 (%)
USC-COLEF Mobile Population Survey					
Historic region	33.9	32.5	21.2	21.2	19.0
Border	61.0	66.1	74.7	54.6	35.5
Center	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	1.6
Mexico City/ Metro Area	5.2	0.0	3.7	14.3	39.4
Periphery	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2
South	0.0	1.4	0.2	9.8	4.2
UCSD Immigrant- Dependent Business- Establishment Survey					
Historic region	20.6	37.0	33.3	29.6	22.9
Border	67.7	46.6	34.5	29.6	25.7
Center	2.9	5.5	9.2	12.2	22.9
Mexico City/ Metro Area	5.9	4.1	5.8	17.4	14.3
Periphery	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.0
South	2.9	6.9	17.2	10.4	14.3

historic region and a rapid decline in the proportion of migrants from the border region. What a more detailed breakdown of the center and periphery regions illustrates, then, is that an increasingly important role is being played by Mexico's southern region (especially the states of Guerrero, Oaxaca, and Chiapas) and by the Mexico City metropolitan area. In both San Diego and Los Angeles counties, the shift in origins away from the border and historic regions is being led by migrants born in southern Mexico and the Mexico City metropolitan area.

Urban-Rural Composition

Urbanization in Mexico, whether resulting from a diffused geographical process of modernization or led by the Mexico City megalopolis (Ward 1998), has occurred rapidly since the 1960s. If defining urban places as those having a population of five thousand or more, then less than 40 percent of Mexico's population lived in urban areas in the late nineteenth century. The pace of urbanization continued to be moderate until just before World War II. By 1970, some 60 percent of Mexicans were living in urban areas, and by 1990, approximately 70 percent were urban-dwellers (Easterlin 1996, 35). By

TABLE 7 Percentage of Mexico-U.S. Migrants by Size and Type of Birthplace and Year of Departure

Birthplace	Year of Departure				
	1970-1974 (%)	1975-1979 (%)	1980-1984 (%)	1985-1989 (%)	1990-1992 (%)
UCSD Immigrant- Dependent Business- Establishment Survey					
10,000 or more	53.1	56.2	57.1	65.2	71.4
Less than 10,000	46.9	43.8	42.9	34.8	28.6
USC-COLEF Mobile Population Survey					
Urban	77.9	56.9	58.9	78.3	80.5
Rural	22.1	43.1	41.2	21.7	19.5

the mid-1990s, more than half of all Mexicans were living in cities of more than a hundred thousand inhabitants.

Controlling for age composition, Durand, Massey, and Zenteno (2001) report that while 53.6 percent of Mexican labor migrants who left Mexico between 1970 and 1974 were born in a city of more than fifteen thousand persons, only 43.1 percent of those departing between 1985 and 1990 were.¹³ They therefore argue that the Mexico-to-U.S. migration flow is not becoming more dominated by urban-dwellers, contrary to Cornelius's (1992) analysis. This claim is contradicted by more recent data from southern California, however.

While the results are not perfectly comparable due to a small difference in the rural-urban threshold used in coding the data, 53.1 percent of Mexicans in the 1996 UCSD surveys who entered the United States between 1970 and 1974 were born in a locality of more than ten thousand inhabitants (table 7). This figure rose to 71.4 percent for those who entered in the 1990-1992 cohort. The trend toward urban origins has been even stronger among Mexican migrants to Los Angeles County. More than 80 percent of the 1990-1992 entry cohort in the USC-COLEF mobile population survey had migrated from an urban area.¹⁴ In sum, our data from Los Angeles and San Diego suggest that both migrant settlers and sojourners, although they reflect con-

13. Durand, Massey, and Zenteno (2001) found that the proportion born in towns larger than fifteen thousand did not change at all from the 1970-1974 to the 1990-1993 migrant cohort, when using ENADID data alone.

14. The USC-COLEF data are not perfectly comparable with either the UCSD data or the Mexico data in table 7 because the USC-COLEF data focus on where one "had migrated from" versus "place of birth."

tinuing urbanization in Mexico, tend to come more from urban rather than rural areas of Mexico.

Predicting Permanent Settlement

As discussed, the intention to settle permanently in the United States and the feminization of the Mexican migrant flow are positively related. To test more fully Cornelius's (1992) hypotheses about what factors explain the changing demographic profile of Mexican migrants to the United States, we ran six logistic regressions using data from the 1996 surveys in San Diego County.¹⁵

The results suggest that only two demographic variables are consistently and significantly related to reported intention to settle in the United States: being female and length of residence in the United States. Specifically, an individual was found to be 35 percent more likely to reside permanently in the United States on average if female, and 2 percent more likely with each additional year of having lived in the United States.

Moreover, when controlling for all demographic variables of Cornelius's (1992) four hypothesized explanations for a changing Mexican migrant profile (regardless of whether they are included separately or collectively), only the IRCA amnesty provision appears not to have had a significant effect on individual migrants' intentions to settle in the United States. Rather, significant explanations of intention to settle in the United States having migrated during the Mexican economic crisis of the 1980s, year-round employer demand for labor (holding a nonseasonal job that provides steady employment), and belonging to a social network that includes U.S.-born friends. Specifically, a person who migrated to the United States during a period of economic crisis in Mexico was found to be 19 percent more likely to reside permanently in the United States on average and those with a close U.S.-born friend were 23 percent more likely. A paucity of work opportunities, however, reduced one's likelihood of residing permanently by 15 percent on average.

These findings are consistent with the argument made by Bryan Roberts et al.: "the current economic situation in both rural and urban Mexico is promoting a permanent migration system. Scarcities of jobs and declines in real income for the rural population and for the poorest 40 percent of the urban population make it increasingly difficult to find a stable subsistence base in either countryside or city. . . . The [growing] demand in the U.S. for year-round, low-skilled labor in construction, urban services, and 'sweat-shop' manufacturing create the complementary basis for a permanent migration system" (Roberts, Frank, and Lozano-Asencio 1999, 243).

15. Those wishing to see the results of the six regression analyses may obtain them from the lead author at <enrico.marcelli@ucla.edu>.

DISCUSSION AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS

The distinction between an immigrant sojourner and a settler was first elaborated by labor economist Michael Piore in *Birds of Passage: Migrant Labor and Industrial Societies* (1979). He defined sojourners as those who, after accumulating a certain amount of money, return to their country of origin, while settlers intend to remain in the destination country. This distinction remains essential for understanding the effects of immigration and what kinds of U.S. immigration and immigrant policies are more likely to succeed (Fix and Passel 1994; Mameesh and Reyes 1998). The distinction has also gained importance in light of increased U.S. immigration over the past three decades, given that “the consequences of net immigration to society are much more important than the consequences of immigration per se” (Heer 1996, 112). Clearly, migrants who settle in the United States are more likely to affect the U.S. political economy than are return migrants (Cornelius 1981; García y Griego 1983).

The proportion of migrants settling in the United States is only part of the story, however. Thoughtful discussions of settlement patterns tend to focus on the demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of newcomers who are likely to become long-term residents of the United States. This broader picture or profile of more recent immigrants is essential for accurately estimating their likely socioeconomic impacts on the receiving areas. For example, the *Mexico–United States Binational Migration Study* (the first migration research project sponsored by the two governments, conducted by a team of ten Mexican and ten U.S. immigration experts) began with an important caveat. Although much of the recent debate concerning Mexican migration to the United States centers on the difficult task of obtaining reliable stock and flow estimates of the number of Mexican migrants, they are not a homogenous group, and recognition of their internal differences is essential for a responsible evaluation of the impacts on source and destination societies (Bean, Corona, Tuirán and Woodrow-Lafield 1998, 1–2).

The importance of both quantity and quality to the contemporary debate over U.S. immigration cannot be overstated. One to two hundred thousand undocumented immigrants a year entered and settled in California during the 1980s and early 1990s (Marcelli n.d.). And between 1992 and 1996, an average of 275,000 immigrated nationally (Warren 1997). The foreign-born Mexican portion of the total net migrant flow into the United States almost doubled, from about 12 percent during the 1950s to approximately 23 percent during the 1980s (Borjas 1997). By comparison, Mexicans constituted about 28 percent of all those who have entered the United States and settled in the 1990s.¹⁶ These contributions to population growth resulted in

16. This figure was computed by the authors using the March 1997 Current Population Survey.

slightly more than seven million foreign-born Mexicans residing in the United States by 1997, representing 2.7 percent of the total population (up from 1.7 percent in 1990 and 1.0 percent in 1980).

The fact that Mexican immigrants remain such a small component of the total U.S. population suggests that their characteristics and geographic concentration are what have generated concern about their numbers. Perhaps the most telling indication has been the disproportionate concern about the socioeconomic impact of low-skilled and poor immigrants versus high-skilled and wealthier immigrants. For example, George Borjas (1997, 1998) has argued that recent cohorts of Mexican immigrants possess comparatively meager human-capital endowments (such as educational attainment, useful work experience, and English-language skills), have adversely affected the earnings of similarly skilled U.S.-born workers, and exhibit a relatively high rate of welfare use. Yet evidence to the contrary is mounting on the effects of unauthorized Mexican immigrants on the employment and wages of U.S.-born residents (Hanson, Robertson, and Spilimbergo n.d.; Marcelli 1999; Marcelli, Pastor, and Joassart 1999; Marcelli and Heer 1997) and on welfare expenditures (Marcelli and Heer 1998).¹⁷ For purposes of the present analysis, the key issue is not which set of findings on fiscal and labor-market impact is more accurate. The debate is now focusing not simply on how many Mexicans migrate north but more on the endowments in human capital that they bring with them across the border, their rate of permanent settlement, and their economic effects on other segments of the U.S. population (Smith and Edmonston 1997, 1998; Hamermesh and Bean 1998).

The passage of both California's restrictive immigration ballot initiative (Proposition 187) in 1994 and the federal Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act (IIRIRA) of 1996 owes much to the widely held notion that unauthorized Mexican immigrants impose excessive socioeconomic costs because of their fewer labor-market skills and putative negative economic effects on schools, social services, welfare assistance, and the earnings of similarly skilled U.S. citizens (MacDonald and Cain 1998). William Clark (1998) has taken the argument a step further by highlighting the disproportionate effects on birth and population density that persons of Mexican origin already residing in the United States are likely to have well into the future. The implication is that because earlier Mexican migrant cohorts contributed significantly to the higher fertility rates of the current resident U.S. Mexican origin population, one may reasonably expect newer cohorts to have the same effect.

Another leading indicator that migrant characteristics matter as much or more than sheer numbers is that the U.S. immigration policy debate has

17. The focus on Mexican migrants' relatively lower levels of human capital transcends considerations of legal status, but the two concerns are closely related.

focused increasingly on specific skill groups. For instance, soon after passage of IIRIRA in September 1996, proposals were introduced in Congress to increase the importation of both high-skilled (H-1B visa) and low-skilled (H-2A) foreign-born workers.¹⁸ Agribusiness interests pushed unsuccessfully for a new, modestly scaled nonimmigrant guestworker program that would have raised the number of workers permitted to enter the United States each year to harvest crops from approximately 15,000 (in fiscal year 1996) to 20,000. Meanwhile, high-technology firms successfully sought legislation increasing the number of visas from 65,000 to 115,000 per year for computer programmers and other technologically skilled workers. Claims of actual or impending shortages of both “high-end” computer industry workers and “low-end” agricultural labor were immediately challenged by groups advocating immigration restriction and by U.S. government researchers (U.S. GAO 1997).

Of immediate concern, however, is not whether a shortage of lower- or higher-skilled labor will develop in the near future that international migration might ameliorate but that the characteristics of Mexican migrants have become central to the ongoing immigration debate. Researchers are more certain about the estimated number of unauthorized and legal Mexican immigrants residing in the United States than about their individual characteristics and economic impact on native-born residents (Bean, Corona, Tuirán, and Woodrow-Lafield 1998). But the second set of concerns has come to dominate public discourse on U.S. immigration policy (K. Lee 1998; Marcelli, Pastor, and Joassart 1999).

The immigration policy debate is also complicated by continuing academic debates over empirical questions, as demonstrated by the major inconsistencies in research findings on the demographic profile of Mexican migrants to the United States highlighted in this research note. While Durand, Massey, and Zenteno (2001) provide evidence suggesting that more recent Mexican migrant cohorts are similar to past cohorts in gender, age, educational composition, propensity to settle permanently in the United States, and regional origin, we show the exact opposite. The discrepancy may be explained partly by the fact that the two teams use different data, but it may also be influenced by underlying theoretical perspectives. We have highlighted two theoretical orientations: cumulative causation and a migration-systems approach. Durand, Massey, and Zenteno’s (2001) evidence seems to support a cumulative causation framework, but we have found that both theories have some explanatory merit. The likelihood of

18. No similar clamor has been heard for expanding immigration of moderately skilled manual-craft workers, despite recent survey evidence showing that a growing shortage of such skilled workers throughout southern California is limiting the growth of many small businesses, especially in the manufacturing sector. See Don Lee, “Labor Supply Falling Short: Small Business Survey,” *Los Angeles Times*, 23 Sept. 1998, pp. D1, D6.

Mexican migrants settling permanently in southern California was found to be influenced significantly by economic crisis in Mexico and the U.S. demand for Mexican migrant labor (a migration-systems approach) as well as by having a U.S.-born friend (cumulative causation). That we did not find greater social network effects indicates that our results are more consistent with a migration-systems theoretical perspective in general.¹⁹

We suspect that these findings, based on data gathered in southern California and Mexico, may apply throughout California and the United States—especially given their consistency with the results of survey and ethnographic studies in the U.S. South, the New York City area (R. Smith 1998), and other regions. But we cannot confidently make such an assertion based on the present analysis. Has the demographic profile of Mexican migrants throughout California and the nation actually changed as our results suggest for southern California, in ways that affect the magnitude and distribution of costs and benefits associated with this migratory movement? Further research on both sides of the U.S.-Mexico border using more sophisticated longitudinal research designs is clearly needed to answer this basic question.

19. A recent paper by Heer (2000) argues that the importance of cumulative causation may be waning due to saturation of the Latino immigrant labor market in the United States.

APPENDIX 1 INDEPENDENT VARIABLES USED IN PERMANENT SETTLEMENT LOGISTIC REGRESSIONS

Demographic Variables

Female	Female (Sex = 1)
Age 25 or younger	Person of age no older than 25 years
Age 26–35	Person of ages 26 to 35
Age 36–45	Person of ages 36 to 45
Age 55–65	Person of ages 55 to 65 (excluded from regressions)
Educ	Years of schooling completed
English	English comprehension (none = 1, some = 2, much = 3)
Yrs—res	Years since first arriving in the United States (= 1996 - arrival year)
Expct—US—yrs	Residing in U.S. longer than expected (yes = 1, no = 0)
Legal	Legal U.S. resident (yes = 1, no = 0)

Economic Crisis in Mexico

EconCris	Migrated to the U.S. between 1982 and 1987 (yes = 1, no = 0)
----------	--

IRCA Amnesty Provisions

SAW	Legal resident who migrated to U.S. before 1987 and with first job in agriculture (yes = 1, no = 0)
Cont—Res72	Legal resident who migrated to U.S. before 1983 and has lived at least 9 months per year in U.S. on average (yes = 1, no = 0)

U.S. Demand for Labor

LittleWork	Are there months when there is little work? (yes = 1, no = 0)
------------	---

Social Networks

Spouse—US	Respondent resides with a spouse in the United States (yes = 1, no = 0)
Child—6to18	Respondent resides with at least one child 6 to 18 years (yes = 1, no = 0)
USB—Friend	Respondent has friends born in the United States with whom he or she can speak when experiencing problems (yes = 1, no = 0)

Note: Permanent settlement is defined as the intention to reside in the United States.

REFERENCES

ALARCON, RAFAEL

1995a "Immigrants or Transnational Workers? The Settlement Process among Mexicans in Rural California." Davis: California Institute for Rural Studies.

1995b "Transnational Communities, Regional Development, and the Future of Mexican Immigration." *Berkeley Planning Journal* 10:36–54.

BEAN, FRANK D., RODOLFO CORONA, RODOLPHO TUIRAN, AND KAREN A. WOODROW-LAFIELD

1998 "The Quantification of Migration between Mexico and the United States." In *Migration between Mexico and the United States: Binational Study*, 1:1–89. Mexico City and Washington, D.C.: Mexican Ministry of Foreign Affairs and U.S. Commission on Immigration Reform.

BEAN, FRANK D., THOMAS J. ESPENSHADE, MICHAEL J. WHITE, AND ROBERT F. DYMOWSKI

1990 "Post-IRCA Changes in the Volume and Composition of Undocumented Migration to the United States: An Assessment Based on Apprehensions Data." In *Undocumented Migration to the United States: IRCA and the Experience of the 1980s*, edited by Frank D. Bean, Barry Edmonston, and Jeffrey S. Passel, 111–58. Santa Monica, Calif., and Washington, D.C.: Rand Corporation and the Urban Institute.

BORJAS, GEORGE J.

1997 "The Economic Impact of Mexican Immigration." In *Coming Together? Mexico–United States Relations*, edited by Barry Bosworth, Susan M. Collins, and Nora Claudia Lustig, 155–86. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.

1998 "Immigration and Welfare: A Review of the Evidence." In *The Debate in the United States over Immigration*, edited by Peter Duignan and L. H. Gann, 121–44. Stanford, Calif.: Hoover Institution Press.

BUSTAMANTE, JORGE A.

1984 "Changing Patterns of Undocumented Migration from Mexican States in Recent Years." In *Patterns of Undocumented Migration: Mexico and the United States*, edited by Richard C. Jones, 15–32. Totowa, N.J.: Rowman and Allanheld.

CASTLES, STEPHEN, AND MARK J. MILLER

1998 *The Age of Migration: International Population Movements in the Modern World*. New York: Guilford.

CHAVEZ, LEO R.

1988 "Settlers and Sojourners: The Case of Mexicans in the United States." *Human Organization* 47, no. 2:95–198.

CLARK, WILLIAM A. V.

1998 *The California Cauldron: Immigration and the Fortunes of Local Communities*. New York: Guilford.

CORNELIUS, WAYNE A.

1976 "Outmigration from Rural Mexican Communities." In *The Dynamics of Migration: International Migration*, 1–40. Occasional Monograph Series, vol. 2, no. 5. Washington, D.C.: Interdisciplinary Communications Program, Smithsonian Institution.

1981 *The Future of Mexican Immigrants in California: A New Perspective for Public Policy*. La Jolla, Calif.: Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies, University of California, San Diego.

1991 "Labor Migration to the United States: Development Outcomes and Alternatives in Mexican Sending Communities." In *Regional and Sectoral Development in Mexico as Alternatives to Migration*, edited by Sergio Díaz-Briquets and Sidney Weintraub, 89–131. Boulder, Colo.: Westview.

1992 "From Sojourners to Settlers: The Changing Profile of Mexican Immigration to the United States." In *U.S.-Mexico Relations: Labor Market Interdependence*, edited by Jorge A. Bustamante, Clark W. Reynolds, and Raúl Hinojosa-Ojeda, 155–95. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.

1998a "Ejido Reform: Stimulus or Alternative to Migration." In *The Transformation of Rural Mexico: Reforming the Ejido Sector*, edited by Wayne A. Cornelius and David Myhre, 229–46. La Jolla, Calif.: Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies, University of California, San Diego.

1998b "The Structural Embeddedness of Demand for Mexican Immigrant Labor: New Evidence from California." In SUAREZ-OROZCO 1998, 113–44.

- DURAND, JORGE**
1998 "Migration and Integration: Inter marriages among Mexicans and Non-Mexicans in the United States." In SUAREZ-OROZCO 1998, 209–21.
- DURAND, JORGE, AND DOUGLAS S. MASSEY**
1992 "Mexican Migration to the United States: A Critical Review." *LARR* 27, no. 2:3–42.
- DURAND, JORGE, DOUGLAS S. MASSEY, AND RENE M. ZENTENO**
2001 "Mexican Immigration to the United States: Continuities and Changes." *LARR* 36, no. 1:107–26.
- EASTERLIN, RICHARD A.**
1996 *Growth Triumphant: The Twenty-First Century in Historical Perspective*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- FIX, MICHAEL, AND JEFFREY S. PASSEL**
1994 *Immigration and Immigrants: Setting the Record Straight*. Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute.
- FREEMAN, GARY P., SUSAN GONZALEZ-BAKER, MANUEL OROZCO, AND LUIS F. B. PLASCENCIA**
1999 "The Making of Americans: Results of the Texas Naturalization Survey." In-house report, Public Policy Clinic, Department of Government, University of Texas–Austin.
- GARCIA Y GRIEGO, MANUEL**
1983 "Comments on Bustamante and Sanderson Papers and on Research Project ENEFNEU." In *U.S.-Mexico Relations: Economic and Social Aspects*, edited by Clark W. Reynolds and Carlos Tello, 299–314. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.
1989 "The Mexican Labor Supply, 1990–2010." In *Mexican Migration to the United States: Origins, Consequences, and Policy Options*, edited by Wayne A. Cornelius and Jorge A. Bustamante, 49–93. La Jolla: Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies, University of California, San Diego.
- HAMERMESH, DANIEL S., AND FRANK D. BEAN, EDS.**
1998 *Help or Hindrance: The Economic Implications of Immigration for African Americans*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- HANSON, GORDON H., RAYMOND ROBERTSON, AND ANTONIO SPILIMBERGO**
n.d. "Does Border Enforcement Protect U.S. Workers from Illegal Immigration?" *Review of Economics and Statistics*, forthcoming.
- HEER, DAVID M.**
1996 *Immigration in America's Future: Social Science Findings and the Policy Debate*. Boulder, Colo.: Westview.
2000 "When Cumulative Causation Conflicts with Saturation of Economic Opportunity: Recent Change in the Hispanic Population of the United States by State." Paper presented to the Population Association of America, 24 Mar., Los Angeles.
- HERNANDEZ-LEON, RUBEN, AND VICTOR ZUÑIGA**
2000 "Making Carpet by the Mile: The Emergence of a Mexican Immigrant Community in an Industrial Region of the U.S. Historic South." *Social Science Quarterly* 81, no. 1 (Mar.):49–66.
- HIRSCH, JENNIFER S.**
1998 "En el norte la mujer manda: Gender, Generation, and Geography in a Mexican Transnational Community." Paper presented to the Latin American Studies Association, 24–26 Sept., Chicago.
- HONDAGNEU-SOTELO, PIERRETTE**
1994 *Gendered Transitions: Mexican Experiences of Immigration*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
1997 "The History of Mexican Undocumented Settlement in the United States." In *Fronteras: Structuring Latina and Latino Lives in the U.S.*, edited by Mary Romero, Pierrette Hondagneu-Sotelo, and Vilma Ortiz. New York: Routledge.
- JOHNSON, HANS**
1996 *Undocumented Immigration to California, 1980–1993*. San Francisco: Public Policy Institute of California.
- KRITZ, MARY M., LIN LEAN LIM, AND HANIA ZLOTNIK**
1992 *International Migration Systems: A Global Approach*. Oxford: Clarendon.

LEE, KENNETH E.

- 1998 *Huddled Masses, Muddled Laws: Why Contemporary Immigration Policy Fails to Reflect Public Opinion*. Westport, Conn.: Praeger.

MABOGUNJE, A. L.

- 1970 "A Systems Approach to a Theory of Rural-Urban Migration." *Geographic Analysis* 2:1–18.

MACDONALD, KARIN, AND BRUCE E. CAIN

- 1998 "Nativism, Partisanship, and Immigration: An Analysis of Prop. 187." In *Racial and Ethnic Politics in California*, edited by Michael B. Preston, Bruce E. Cain, and Sandra Bass, 2:277–304. Berkeley: Institute of Governmental Studies, University of California.

MALKIN, VICTORIA

- 1999 "La reproducción de relaciones de género en la comunidad de migrantes mexicanos en New Rochelle, Nueva York." In *Fronteras fragmentadas*, edited by Gail Mummert, 475–96. Zamora and Morelia: Colegio de Michoacán and Centro de Investigación y Desarrollo del Estado de Michoacán.

MAMEESH, LAURA, AND BELINDA I. REYES

- 1998 *Regional Variation of Mexican Immigration and Settlement*. San Francisco, Calif.: Public Policy Institute of California.

MARCELLI, ENRICO A.

- 1999 "Undocumented Latino Immigrant Workers: The Los Angeles Experience." In *Illegal Immigration in America: A Reference Handbook*, edited by David W. Haines and Karen E. Rosenblum, 193–231. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood.

n.d. *California in Denial: A Political Economy of Unauthorized Mexican Immigration*. Boulder, Colo.: Westview, forthcoming.

MARCELLI, ENRICO A., AND DAVID M. HEER

- 1997 "Unauthorized Mexican Workers in the 1990 Los Angeles County Labour Force." *International Migration* 35, no. 1:59–83.

- 1998 "The Unauthorized Mexican Immigrant Population and Welfare in Los Angeles County: A Comparative Statistical Analysis." *Sociological Perspectives* 41, no. 2:279–302.

MARCELLI, ENRICO A., MANUEL PASTOR JR., AND PASCALE M. JOASSART

- 1999 "Estimating the Effects of Informal Economic Activity: Evidence from Los Angeles County." *Journal of Economic Issues* 33, no. 3:579–607.

MASSEY, DOUGLAS S.

- 1990 "Social Structure, Household Strategies, and the Cumulative Causation of Migration." *Population Index* 56:3–26.

- 1998 "March of Folly: U.S. Immigration Policy after NAFTA." *The American Prospect* 9, no. 37 (Mar.–Apr.):22–33.

MASSEY, DOUGLAS S., JOAQUIN ARANGO, GRAEME HUGO, ALI KOUAOUCI, ADELA

PELLEGRINO, AND J. EDWARD TAYLOR

- 1999 *Worlds in Motion: Understanding International Migration at the End of the Millennium*. Oxford: Clarendon.

MYERS, DOWELL

- 1998 "Dimensions of Economic Adaptation by Mexican-Origin Men." In SUAREZ-OROZCO 1998, 159–200.

MYRDAL, GUNNAR

- 1957 *Rich Lands and Poor: The Road to World Prosperity*. New York: Harper and Brothers.

PIORE, MICHAEL

- 1979 *Birds of Passage: Labor Migration and Industrial Societies*. London: Cambridge University Press.

PORTES, ALEJANDRO, AND JOSEF BOROCZ

- 1989 "Contemporary Immigration: Theoretical Perspectives on Its Determinants and Modes of Incorporation." *International Migration Review* 23:606–30.

REES, MARTHA W., T. D. MILLER, AND MARIPOSA ARILLO

- 1998 "Latina Households and Work in Atlanta." Paper presented to the Latin American Studies Association, 24–26 Sept., Chicago.

- ROBERTS, BRYAN R., REANNE FRANK, AND FERNANDO LOZANO-ASCENCIO**
 1999 "Transnational Migrant Communities and Mexican Migration to the United States." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 22, no. 2:240–66.
- ROSENBLUM, MARC R.**
 2000 "At Home and Abroad: The Foreign and Domestic Sources of U.S. Immigration Policy." Ph.D. diss., University of California, San Diego.
- SASSEN, SASKIA**
 1988 *The Mobility of Labor and Capital: A Study in International Investment and Labor Flow*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- SMITH, JAMES P.**
 1998 "Progress across the Generations." Paper presented to the American Economic Association, 3–5 Jan., Chicago.
- SMITH, JAMES P., AND BARRY EDMONSTON, EDS.**
 1997 *The New Americans: Economic, Demographic, and Fiscal Effects of Immigration*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.
 1998 *The Immigration Debate: Studies on the Economic, Demographic, and Fiscal Effects of Immigration*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.
- SMITH, ROBERT**
 1998 "Commentary." In SUAREZ-OROZCO 1998, 145–55.
- SUAREZ-OROZCO, MARCELO M., ED.**
 1998 *Crossings: Mexican Immigration in Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- U.S. COMMISSION ON IMMIGRATION REFORM AND MEXICAN MINISTRY OF FOREIGN RELATIONS**
 1997 *Binational Study of Migration between Mexico and the United States: Final Report*. Washington, D.C., and Mexico City: U.S. Commission on Immigration Reform and the Mexican Ministry of Foreign Relations.
- U.S. GAO (UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTING OFFICE)**
 1997 *H-2A Agricultural Guestworker Program: Changes Could Improve Services to Employers and Better Protect Workers*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. GAO.
- WALDINGER, ROGER**
 1997 "Social Capital or Social Closure? Immigrant Networks in the Labor Market." Working Paper no. 6. Los Angeles: Lewis Center for Regional Policy Studies, University of California.
- WARD, PETER M.**
 1998 *Mexico City*. Revised second edition. Chichester and New York: John Wiley.
- WARREN, ROBERT**
 1997 *Estimates of the Undocumented Immigrant Population Residing in the United States, October 1996*. Washington, D.C.: Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice.
- WARREN, ROBERT, AND JEFFREY S. PASSEL**
 1987 "A Count of the Uncountable: Estimates of Undocumented Aliens Counted in the 1980 United States Census." *Demography* 24, no. 3:375–93.