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GROWTH OF THE MEXICAN-BORN POPULATION IN THE USA

• The number of Mexican born living in the United States has increased steadily since the early 1970s, and especially in the latter 1990s.

• The total and Mexican unauthorized populations are at a record high.

• One LA survey finds that, at most, the US Census missed 10% of Mexicans. Estimates of 20 million undocumented persons have no demographic basis.

• About 80 percent of Mexican migration since the latter 1990s has been unauthorized.
Mexican Born Population in the United States, Millions

Origins of Estimated 10.3 Million Unauthorized Residents, 2004
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TRENDS IN THE FLOW AND RESPONSE TO ECONOMY

• Net flow estimates have increased since the 1970s.

• According to US data sources, net migration figures jump notably in the 1990s.

• Mexican data sources generate smaller net migration figures (reason unknown), but also show increasing numbers.

• Figures for net migration by period obscures yearly trends:
  
  – the yearly flow of migrants appears to respond to US job growth.
Average Annual Net Migration by Period

Source: Passel 2004, Zuniga 2004
Annual Average Mexico-US Migration

Source: Passel and Suro 2005
Annual Average Mexico-US Migration and US Employment Rates

Source: Passel and Suro 2005
CROSSING AT THE BORDER

• Mexican repatriation data indicate fewer cross-border attempts than US apprehension data.

• Both data sources show that border crossing attempts correlate well with changes in the economy.
  – an increase in attempted Mexico-US migration in the latter 1990s,
  – followed by a decrease since 9/11.

• Deaths at the border are a little more today (300-400) than they were in the 1980s. Leading causes of death are dehydration and exhaustion.

• Border-crossing crime is down in areas using new enforcement methods, although violent crime appears to be positively related with volume of movement.

• Conflicting findings on new enforcement methods and increases in coyote fees.
U.S. Apprehensions of Mexican Border Crossers and Mexican Statistics on Repatriations (Thousands)

Source: USDHS, Mexican
FUTURE FLOWS

- Divergent assumptions as to responsiveness of Mexican migration to economic forces:

- Mexican migration will increase thru the next century due to cumulative causation, versus

- Mexican migration will ultimately taper off due to slowing Mexican population growth and increased job opportunities.

- Official forecasts are for slowing by mid-century:
  - US Census and the UN are based on pure presumption
  - Mexico’s CONAPO is model based.

- Still, even if it were to slow, future migration numbers would remain substantial
Past and Future Estimates of Net Mexican Migration by the U.S. (Census Bureau), Mexico (CONAPO), and the United Nations

Source: Passel, see text
NEW MIGRATION PATTERNS

- Changing Circularity
- Dispersion to “new settlement” states
- Concentration or increased scale in traditional metros
- Emigration of better educated Mexicans
- Patterns of Female emigration
CHANGING CIRCULARITY

Four main reasons for lower return migration from historical levels:

• **urban employment** of migrants in year-round and permanent jobs;
• associated growth of Mexican communities in the United States;
• IRCA’s **legalization program and stronger family networks**; and
• to a smaller degree, **border enforcement** in the last decade.

– Research evidence strongly supports IRCA’s impact, but can only infer border interdiction as a reason for increased migration.

– Greatest drop in circulation in the 1970s outside of agriculture and one-year return rates were down to 25% return rates by 1992.

– Rates of return increased in the latter 1990s even as border enforcement expanded.

– Data show Mexican migration is highly responsive to US job demand.

DISPERSION

• Mexican migration has tended to flow to just four U.S. states, but that began to change in the late 1980s and especially in the 1990s.

• There outflow from California began before both San Diego’s hold the line and Prop 187; suggesting new economic demand started the non-traditional migration which now responds to a variety of rural and urban industries.

• Although Mexican migration tends to come from the same states, there is increased movement from new states. A slight shift at the national level can have dramatic impacts at the local level and the trend bears watching.

  – Over half of Mexicans reporting a migration to the United States, in three different samples over time, come from traditional states

  – There has been an increase in the share of Mexican migrants (9 to 13 percent) coming from southern and southeastern Mexican states over the past 15 years.
Mexican Born Population by U.S. State

Source: Passel 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>1990 %</th>
<th>2004 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Others</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of Total

1990 (4.5 Million) 2004 (10.6 Million)
Percent of Mexican Migrants to the United States by State of Origin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Zuniga 2004
Concentration

• A significant percent of Mexicans live in just a few U.S. metropolitan areas in traditional states
  
  – 50% of Mexicans live in just 12 metros (only one of which is a non-traditional state), compared with the 75 metros needed to capture 50% of the total US population.

• The number of Mexicans concentrating in Los Angeles doubled during the 1990s to 1.5 million.

• Concentration has implications for integration and impact.
U.S. Metropolitan Areas with Fifty Percent of All Mexican Born Residents, 2000

- Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA: 1,525,000
- Chicago-Gary-Lake, IL: 582,000
- Houston-Brazoria, TX: 434,000
- Orange County, CA: 375,000
- Dallas-Fort Worth, TX: 337,000
- San Diego, CA: 315,000
- Riverside-San Bernadino, CA: 311,000
- Phoenix, AZ: 234,000
- El Paso, TX: 176,000
- McAllen-Edinburg-Pharr-Mission, TX: 169,000
- New York-Northeastern NJ: 152,000
- Oakland, CA: 145,000

Source: Tabulations of Census 2000 microdata
EDUCATION & GENDER

• Mexican born migrants either in Mexico or the United States typically have low levels of education.
  
  – Females in Mexico are less educated than males.
  – Females in the US are slightly better educated than males.

• Mexican migration is highly selective, the best educated are the most likely to out migrate.

• A significant percentage of Mexico’s graduate-educated population resides in the US and women with graduate degrees are disproportionately likely to emigrate.

• Mexicans with graduate degrees emigrated in increasing numbers in the latter 1990s, perhaps reflecting the peso devaluation and stress on Mexico’s middle class.
Mexican Adults in Mexico by Level of Completed Education, 2000

Source: Mexican Census microdata
Mexican Born Adults in the United States by Level of Completed Education, 2000

- Primary or Less
- Middle School (Secundaria)
- High School (Preparatoria)
- Bachelor or better

Source: U.S. Census microdata
Percent of All Mexican Born Adults Residing in the United States by Level of Completed Education, 2000

Source: Mexican and U.S. Census microdata
MEXICAN FEMALE MIGRATION
MALE DOMINANCE

• Historically males have been dominant in the Mexico-US migration.
• Employers’ recruitment practices favored males.
• Male absence conformed to the gender roles, but it has been thought to be changing.
• Females did appear to be more prevalent in the migration flow following IRCA
• Apparent discrepancy between Mexican and US data.
Percent Female of Mexican Migrants to the United States

Source: Authors' tabulations, see text
FACTORS EXPLAINING DIFFERENCES

– Mexican sources capture information only for households still in Mexico. Males are more likely to be counted since they dominate circular flows.

– Women migrants are more likely to stay in the US.

– Women are the last ones to leave the household. Once they leave, the whole household disappears.
NON TEMPORARY-MIGRANTS BY LENGTH OF STAY

Composition of Non-temporary Migrants by Length of Stay and Sex

- **Male**
  - Less than 12 months: 6%
  - 12-18 Months: 29%
  - More than 18 months: 6%
  - Not returned: 13%
- **Female**
  - Less than 12 months: 7%
  - 12-18 Months: 22%
  - More than 18 months: 5%
  - Not returned: 66%

Source: Own estimations based on ENE Migration module, 2002.
DIVERGENT TRENDS

• Females have been relatively less likely to migrate from Mexico; females who do migrate to the United States have a greater tendency to remain.
CHARACTERISTICS OF FEMALE MIGRANTS

• Women tend to migrate at young ages: ca. half of migrant women are 15-24 vs. only 40% of men.

• Women are more dependent on networks & family
  – 7% of women vs. 29% of male migrants are household heads
  – 51% of women vs. 92% of male migrants report they migrated to the United States to seek a job
WOMEN ARE LESS LIKELY TO MIGRATE UNDOCUMENTED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>79,8%</td>
<td>62,0%</td>
<td>75,8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>79,0%</td>
<td>72,5%</td>
<td>77,7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>82,8%</td>
<td>60,6%</td>
<td>77,8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>76,3%</td>
<td>57,7%</td>
<td>73,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>70,6%</td>
<td>54,2%</td>
<td>68,2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>76,0%</td>
<td>60,6%</td>
<td>73,1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ENE 2002 migration module