[*Note: This paper is the basis for our proposed presentation. We have not yet run models concerning earnings mobility, but they will be along the lines of the present paper. The discussion section will address in detail the differences in occupational and income mobility to provide a more complete context of work changes for migrants from Mexico to the U.S. and, after arrival in the U.S. from first to last U.S. job.***]**

The Occupational Mobility of Mexican Migrants in the United States

Gabriela Sánchez-Soto
Joachim Singelmann

The University of Texas at San Antonio

Abstract

This paper analyses the pre-to-post migration occupational mobility experience of Mexican heads of household and their spouses who migrated to the United States after 1965 (the end of the Bracero program). Building on recent work about occupational trajectories in Europe, we first provide an overview of the occupational distribution of migrants regarding their last occupation in Mexico and first occupation in the United States, and we review characteristics of migrants that were found to have influenced mobility in different contexts (e.g., age, education, documentation status, marital status). Given changes in Mexican states of origin and U.S. states of destination, we include information about key out- and in-migration states in our analysis. We further distinguish between the period after the end of the Bracero program (1965-1985) and the period after the passing of IRCA (1986-2012). Our data come from the Mexican Migration Project (MMP). We report our descriptive and analytical results separately for males and females and discuss differences between them. Overall, comparing both the last job in Mexico and the first job in the United States as well as the first U.S. job with the most recent job in the United States, relative to staying in the same occupational category, male migrants were far more likely to experience upward mobility than were females, but they were also slightly more likely to be downwardly mobile. Our models show substantial differences in the determinants of mobility for males and females. For example, regarding the transition from last Mexican to first U.S. job, college education decreased the chances for male downward mobility and for female upward mobility. Documentation status and state of destination are only significant for males. With regard to job change within the United States, being married reduced the likelihood of upward mobility for males. College education increased the odds for upward mobility for both males and females. The paper concludes with a discussion of context in which occupational mobility of migrants occurs.

Introduction

Previous research on the labor outcomes of Mexican migrants in the United States has focused on examining the use of migrant networks to aid international migration and the positive influence of migrant networks on earnings in the U.S. (Aguilera and Massey 2003; Amuedo-Dorantes and Mundra 2007; Kossoudji and Cobb-Clark 2000; Munshi 2003). However, more research is needed to understand the occupational attainment of Mexicans in the U.S., specifically on the role of previous occupational experience in Mexico on occupation in the U.S. In addition, little is known so far the occupation of migrants in the U.S. changes or remains the same overtime as immigrants assimilate and acquire U.S. labor market experience.

This paper analyzes the occupational mobility experience of Mexican heads of household and their spouses who migrated to the United States after 1965. Using data from 143 Mexican communities surveyed by the Mexican Migration Project, we compare the first occupation attained in the U.S. to the last occupation held in Mexico and estimate the determinants of attaining a lower or higher status occupation in the U.S. Then, we study whether the occupational status of Mexican migrants changes over time by comparing their first and last occupations in the U.S., and the determinants of occupational mobility post-migration, for migrants who had at least 5 years of accumulated experience in the U.S.

Recently arrived international migrants face challenges to their incorporation to the labor market in countries of destination. More specifically, Mexican migrants without documents, English language skills or appropriate local experience would have a more limited access to employment commensurate with their previous work experience when

they arrive in the U.S. Besides individual characteristics, other structural circumstances influence the incorporation of Mexican migrants to U.S. labor markets. On one hand, there is a segmented labor market where workers concentrate in certain areas of the economy according to their skills and qualifications and where migrant workers group into specific occupations–or "migrant jobs". On the other hand, migrant networks influence the information and labor opportunities that migrants have access to in the U.S. New migrants are likely to obtain employment in sectors of the economy where their social contacts, and other migrants, are already established. These two structural forces work together to create occupational niches for migrants defined by national origin or ethnicity (Bohon 2005; Massey et al. 1998; Munshi 2003). In addition, it is also important to consider the post-migration occupational trajectories of Mexican migrants. Specifically, do migrants' employment opportunities improve as they spend time in the U.S. and gain local work experience?

We build on recent work about occupational trajectories in the United States and Europe. For example, Helgertz (2013) found that immigrants to Sweden tended to have a lower return on their skills both in terms of occupational status and income. A study of occupational trajectory of Senegalese immigrants in Europe (Obućina 2013) showed that Senegalese men and women experienced occupational downward mobility upon arrival, and that their first job in Europe was a better predictor of their subsequent occupational trajectory than their past occupation in Senegal. Toussaint-Comeau's (2006) study of the occupational assimilation of Hispanic immigrants indicated that initially the wage costs of immigrants is greatest in the highest-status occupations, but that for all occupations that cost decreases with time in the United States. And in their study of immigrant

women in Spain, Vidal-Coso and Miret-Gamundi (2014) found that females were more likely than men to experience downward occupational mobility at the time of migration, with only a small proportion able to later leave such traditional jobs for female immigrants as house cleaning and domestic service.

The Determinants of the Occupational Status of Migrants

International migrant workers face important barriers to occupational attainment in the place of destination as the jobs available to them there do not necessarily depend on their educational attainment or previous work experience but also on the types of jobs where migrants concentrate locally, as well as on employment opportunities obtained through social networks (Amuedo-Dorantes and Mundra 2007; Rainer and Siedler 2009).

To understand the occupational opportunities of Mexicans in the U.S. we need to consider two important theoretical mechanisms. First, migrating and obtaining a job are closely related to the social networks a migrant has access to in the places of origin and destination. Second, the segmentation of labor markets in the place of destination is related to the concentration of migrants in specific sectors of the labor market, mainly in low-skilled jobs (Massey et al. 1998; Rooth and Ekberg 2006).

Since the process of labor market segmentation is closely related to the existence and spread of migrant networks, we assume these two theoretical perspectives to influence the occupational attainment of migrants jointly and not independently (Vono-de-Vilhena and Vidal-Coso 2012). Below we explain in more detail the mechanisms through which migrant networks and the segmented labor market are expected to influence the occupational status of Mexican migrants in the U.S.

Migration and Social Networks

The social ties connecting relatives, friends or community members in places of origin and destination provide important support for the movement of migrants, goods and information across borders (Massey et al. 1987). Previous research has found that migrant networks help mitigate the costs and risks of migrating and increase the economic benefits of migration. As new migrants arrive in places of destination, they have access to a reliable source of information and job search assistance through migrant networks (Durand 1994; Massey et al. 1998). These networks include members of the community with current or previous migration experience who can provide economic and logistical assistance to cross the border and then find an appropriate job. The participation of community members and relatives in the migration process can be quite extensive; it may go from covering the costs of travel and lodging or loaning migrants the money to pay for a smuggler, to providing information, references and assistance to obtain a job. Existing research has widely established that migrants with extensive social networks have access to better paying jobs, and that these positive effects are stronger for undocumented migrants (Aguilera and Massey 2003; Amuedo-Dorantes and Mundra 2007; Granberry and Marcelli 2011; Munshi 2003; Palloni et al. 2001).

Despite the positive effects of social capital and social networks on migration, other research has found that the use of migrant networks may result in the concentration of migrants in particular sectors of the labor market. If that is the case, the use of networks would have a negative impact on the probabilities of upward mobility and could increase the risk that migrants end up in lower-status occupations in ethnic-dominated

sectors of the economy (Portes and Sensenbrenner 1993; Vono-de-Vilhena and Vidal-Coso 2012). Since migrants tend to be disproportionately concentrated in low prestige occupations –in some cases in occupations labeled as "migrant jobs"–, getting a job through social networks is likely to result in lower-prestige employment for recent migrants, and in limited opportunities for occupational mobility (Mahuteau and Junankar 2008; Portes and Sensenbrenner 1993; Vono-de-Vilhena and Vidal-Coso 2012). As an example for these negative effects, previous research has found that the most disadvantaged migrants are women with higher human capital. Since employment of migrant women is so highly concentrated in care and domestic occupations, these are the jobs more easily obtained through migrant networks (Barone and Mocetti 2011; Vidal-Coso and Miret-Gamundi 2014).

Another important consideration is that the effects of migrant networks are likely to differ by documentation status (Aguilera and Massey 2003). Migrant networks may provide assistance with job search in the place of destination. Undocumented migrants have limited employment opportunities since not all employers are willing to hire them; using migrant networks may improve the types of jobs undocumented migrants have access to (Kossoudji and Cobb-Clark 2000; Munshi 2003). Besides employer preference and access to networks, the structure of the labor market, and the concentration of migrants in specific occupations are likely to influence occupational attainment. In the next section we discuss the role of segmented labor markets on the occupational mobility of immigrants.

Segmented Labor Markets

When used to understand labor migration processes, the segmented labor market theory posits that the structure of the economy and of the labor market in the place of destination are closely related to the kinds of jobs migrants have access to. Unlike local workers, Mexican migrants enter the U.S. labor market at a disadvantage. Some of these limitations are related to not having local work experience, lacking the necessary certifications or training, not having migration documents, and not speaking the local language. As a result, migrants tend to concentrate in secondary and tertiary sectors of the economy and in less stable and less prestigious jobs. At the same time, migrants are a good source of low-skilled work, and part of their migration strategy may relate to the ability to earn higher salaries –relative to their salaries in Mexico–in lower skilled occupations in the U.S., regardless of the loss of prestige and social status (Massey et al. 1998; Rooth and Ekberg 2006; Vono-de-Vilhena and Vidal-Coso 2012). This is particularly true for migrants who do not expect to move to the place of destination permanently and are working toward a specific economic goal.

Once a sizeable proportion of migrants form a country or ethnic group are employed in a particular type of job –for instance domestic work or agricultural work–, the migrants who follow them will be more likely to work in the same type of job. A consequence of this occupational concentration is that once an occupational "niche" has consolidated, new migrants will find it harder to obtain jobs in other occupations, and their social networks will likely place them in minority- or ethnicity- dominated jobs (Vidal-Coso and Miret-Gamundi 2014). As a result of a highly segmented labor market, migrant women and ethnic minorities are more likely to end up in low-prestige

occupations in developed countries like the U.S. (Reyneri and Fullin 2011; Rooth and Ekberg 2006).

Existing research has documented these limitations. For instance, research in Spain found that, even when taking into account sociodemographic characteristics and human capital, migrants experience great disadvantage in the labor market, particularly to obtain high skilled employment (Bernardi, Garrido, and Miyar 2011; Veira, Stanek, and Cachón 2007). This negative effect is especially pronounced for migrant women (and even worse for female undocumented migrants) who disproportionately hold jobs in domestic work and care activities, and who have very low probabilities of upward occupational mobility even when they have advanced degrees and training (Vidal-Coso and Miret-Gamundi 2014).

Given the expected effects of the segmented labor market and migrant networks, our first research question asks, what are the determinants of occupational mobility among Mexican migrants to the U.S.? According to the expectations from previous research, we hypothesize that, in general, recently arrived Mexican migrants to the U.S. are more likely to enter occupations of lower status than the ones they had in Mexico. On the other hand, upward mobility would be less likely for those who hold higher status occupations in the place of origin, and for those who end up in "migrant jobs" in the U.S. We also expect these negative effects to be more pronounced for females who, regardless of previous occupation or human capital, will concentrate in domestic work or services occupations. Men will be more likely to be concentrated in agricultural work, unskilled occupations or services.

It is difficult to disentangle the effects of migrant networks and the effects of a segmented labor market, since these two forces are likely highly intertwined. Even if migrants originating in a community with more developed migrant networks may be less likely to experience downward occupational mobility, in highly segmented labor markets, migrant networks may also result in a high concentration of migrants in certain occupations which would increase the probabilities for downward mobility.

Occupational Mobility after Migration

As we discussed above, recent migrants face important disadvantages in the labor market in destination countries, mostly due to the lack of opportunities to get employment commensurate with their previous work experience and skills. Previous work is consistent with a high prevalence of downward occupational mobility among recently arrived migrants. However, assimilation hypotheses expect this negative effect to fade, as migrants spend more time in the country of destination and adapt to the local labor market, or acquire the necessary skills or resources to get better jobs (Chiswick, Lee, and Miller 2005). Early in their migration career, migrants are more likely to experience downward mobility. But their occupational placement is expected to improve the more time they spend at their destination. This positive effect is particularly pronounced for migrants whose skills are easily transferrable to the local labor market (Akresh 2006, 2008; Chiswick et al. 2005; Vidal-Coso and Miret-Gamundi 2014). However, it is also possible that the negative impacts of a segmented labor market are more permanent, especially for undocumented workers and for workers in "migrant jobs," so that regardless of years of experience in the U.S. labor market, Mexican migrants will remain

in the occupational status they achieved upon arrival. Given these expectations, it is important to investigate whether assimilation to the labor market in the U.S. helps overcome the limitations of a segmented labor market or if migrants are stuck lower-level occupations. Our second research question therefore asks, what are the determinants of attaining post-migration occupational mobility?

Data and Methods

We use life history data from the Mexican Migration Project (MMP) to analyze the determinants of occupational mobility for the first migration trip to the United States. The MMP collects information from 23,851 households in 143 communities throughout Mexico and the U.S. We select households where the head of household or their spouse had any migration experience to the U.S., and use their labor and migration histories to determine the type of occupation they had before migration, their occupation after their first U.S. migration trip and in the last year spent working in the U.S.

Our sample selects respondents who migrated to the U.S. for the first time after 1965. We chose this date because it represents the end of the Bracero Program under which immigrants were neither free to select a job nor to choose the state where they wanted to work. Rather, the Bracero Program assigned them to a specific job prior to coming to the U.S. We also select only those who migrated to the U.S. after age 15. The analysis further excludes individuals who were unemployed or out of the labor force before leaving Mexico, because there is no initial point of reference to compare their occupational attainment. Finally, we exclude cases with missing data in the variables of interest.

Dependent variables

Using the labor histories from the MMP, we identify the last occupation held in Mexico in the year before migration; for those not working in the year before migrating, we identify the latest occupation up to 5 years in the past. Those who have never been in the labor force in Mexico or who were unemployed in the 5 years prior to migration are excluded from the sample. Then, we identify the occupations in the first and last years spent in the U.S. These occupations are classified into the following eight categories:

> 1) Professional, managerial or technical; 2) Skilled worker; 3) Administrative worker; 4) Services worker; 5) Low-skilled worker; 6) Construction worker; 7) Agricultural worker; and 8) Domestic worker.

Using these eight occupational codes, we create two variables that compare the pre- and post-migration occupational status in three categories: 1) upward mobility, 2) lateral mobility (same occupational category in both countries), and 2) downward mobility. The first dependent variable compares the last occupation in Mexico to the first occupation in the U.S. The second dependent variable compares the first occupation in the U.S. to the last occupation in the U.S. for those migrants who stayed in the U.S more than 5 years.

Independent Variables

Individual characteristics: Our analysis takes into account individual characteristics such as age, level of education and union status in the year of reference for each analysis. We also control for household headship and occupation, and stratify the analysis by sex. We expect to find a positive relationship between age and occupational mobility. Older

migrants will show higher probabilities of upward occupational mobility. As this effect may diminish overtime, we include a quadratic term for age.

We control for the level of education achieved in the first and last years of U.S. migration for each analysis, respectively, to account for the effects of human capital attainment on the probabilities of having a better or worse job in the place of destination. The variable is classified in four categories: elementary school or less, middle school, high school, and college or more. Our expectations regarding the effects of education are two-fold. First, if the labor market in the place of destination is segmented, education will not have a significant effect on occupational mobility, especially for those who are downwardly mobile. Second, migrants with higher education will have higher probabilities of upward mobility as they spend more time in the U.S. and acquire the cultural and social capital necessary to obtain employment commensurate with their educational credentials and previous experience.

The union status variable indicates whether the respondent is in a marital or cohabiting union in the corresponding year. We also include a dummy variable control that indicates whether the respondent is the head of household. Finally, we control for the last occupation in Mexico (for the first analysis) and the first occupation in the U.S. (for the second analysis), using the same occupational classification described above.

Migration characteristics: the study also accounts for the characteristics of the migration trip, including documentation status, period of migration, region of origin in Mexico, state of destination in the U.S. and prevalence of migration in the community of origin. For the analysis that compares occupation in the first and last year in the U.S. we also control for the years of cumulative migration experience in the U.S. and the number

of trips to the U.S. for each respondent by the last year spent in the U.S. To control for documentation status, we use a dichotomous variable that equals 1 if the migrant was undocumented in the year covered by the analysis. Since undocumented migrants are more likely to obtain less prestigious jobs and are less likely to translate previous occupational experience into job opportunities in the U.S., we hypothesize that undocumented migrants will show a significantly higher risk of downward mobility at any point in time.

We classify period of migration into two categories following previous classifications (Durand and Massey 2003; Durand 1994), 1965-1985 for the period of "undocumented migration" immediately following the end of the Bracero Program, and 1986-2013 for the period after the passing of the Immigration Reform and Control Act (IRCA) to the present.

To control for the existence and diffusion of migrant networks in the community of origin, we use year- and community-specific rates of migration prevalence. We calculate the rates of migration prevalence following Lindstrom and López Ramírez's (2010) methodology and information on all individuals in the MMP sample. To calculate these rates we first excluded individuals and households interviewed in the U.S., we then calculated rates of migration experience in the community using information on the dates of first migration to the U.S. for individuals listed in the household roster for each household in the community. For this analysis we use rate of male migration prevalence, although we calculated and tested indices for both men and women.

The denominator for this index of migration prevalence is the number of live men in each year where information is available, and the numerator is the number of men 15

years old and older with migration experience in the corresponding year for each community. The calculations include a few restrictions: only years are included if 1) there were at least 50 people alive in the community; 2) at least 2 inhabitants with U.S. migration experience existed; 3) if migration prevalence is higher than 0.01 (Lindstrom and Lopez Ramirez 2010). In the years where these restrictions are not met, the migration prevalence rates are set at 0.

Next, we include a variable that accounts for the region of origin in Mexico, classified into the main U.S. migration regions of origin in Mexico:

1) *Historic region* including the states of: Durango, Nayarit, Zacatecas, Aguascalientes, San Luis Potosí, Guanajuato, Jalisco, Colima, and Michoacán;

2) *Central region*, including: Querétaro, Hidalgo, Estado de México, Distrito Federal, Tlaxcala, Morelos, Puebla, Guerrero, and Oaxaca;

3) *Border region*, including: Baja California Norte, Baja California Sur, Sonora, Sinaloa, Chihuahua, Coahuila, Nuevo León, and Tamaulipas; and

4) *Southeast region*, including: Veracruz, Tabasco, Chiapas, Campeche, Yucatán, and Quintana Roo.

This variable helps us account for the different spread of migrant networks in different regions of the country. For instance, compared to the other regions, the historic region of migration has a longer tradition of U.S. migration, spanning over one hundred years, hence we may expect that migrants coming from this area are more likely to have access to a more sophisticated and established migrant network, compared to migrants from, for example, the southeast region, where migration has only been widespread in recent decades.

We also classify the state of destination according to how popular as a destination they are. The top migrant receiving states are: California, Texas and Illinois, a fourth category captures the remaining states. In the same way as networks are more likely to be widespread in some Mexican states, some destination states may also have a more developed migrant labor market and migrant networks, we expect that the more popular destination states will be those where migrants are more concentrated in ethnic niches and "migrant jobs," and as a result may be less likely to achieve upward occupational mobility.

To further account for the effect of migrant concentration in specific labor niches, models include a few dummy variables that indicate whether the migrant works in a "migrant job" in the U.S. (i.e. a job where Mexican migrants are highly concentrated). For males these two categories are agricultural work and services. For females the categories are domestic work and services. These indicators will help us estimate whether downward mobility and lateral mobility are associated to being employed in jobs stereotypically associated with Mexican migrants.

Method

As mentioned above, the first part of the analysis compares the last job in Mexico to the first job in the U.S. We first present descriptive statistics of the sample of study, the distribution of occupation categories, and of occupational mobility by sex. We also use two-way tables to compare the last occupation in Mexico and the first occupation in the U.S. for men and women. We then estimate a multinomial logistic regression to determine the relative probability of achieving upward or downward mobility, compared

to staying in the same occupational categories, controlling for the characteristics listed above. The models re also stratified by sex, and use Huber-White robust standard errors to account for clustering at the community level.

The second part of the analysis compares the first and last occupations in the U.S., among migrants who have spent more than 5 years of accumulated experience in the U.S. We use this cut-off point to exclude one-time and temporary migrants who may not be seeking to change jobs or improve their occupational status as they may not plan to work in the U.S. in the long term, this selection also excludes those migrants who may not yet be at risk of mobility as they have not spent a significant amount of time in the country. We believe that those with higher durations and less interrupted occupational trajectories in the U.S. (i.e. who have made fewer trips) are more likely to have achieved occupational mobility by the last year of observation. We also exclude those who did not get a job upon arrival in the U.S. because they have no initial point of comparison. The analysis presents descriptive statistics and the distribution of the variables of interest, as well as a two-way table to compare first and last U.S. occupations by sex. We estimate multinomial logistic regression models for the relative probability of upward or downward mobility, relative to lateral mobility. As in the first analysis, we account for the covariates presented above, though in this case we also control for cumulative years of experience in the U.S. and the number of U.S. trips for each respondent to account for the labor experience acquired in the U.S. The models are also stratified by sex and use robust standard errors.

Findings

Sample Characteristics

Table 1 presents the characteristics of the analysis samples. The first two columns pertain to the characteristics of the sample in the first year of U.S. migration by sex for 4,747 men and 486 women. Most of the males are heads of household, are 27 years old on average, and 37% are in a marital or cohabiting union in the year of first migration. Two-thirds have only an elementary school education, and only about 12 percent have more than a high school education. Female migrants are slightly older in their first year of migration (28.6 years old) and 42% are in a union in the time of migration. First-time female migrants are slightly more educated than their male counterparts; the difference is mostly driven by a higher proportion of females with more than a high school education.

At the time of first migration most of the men travelled without documents, while 69% of women did. The period of migration is split very evenly among men, about half migrated after 1986. In contrast 60% of females migrated after 1986. These two sex differences are consistent with previous literature on the patterns of migration by sex among Mexican migrants (Donato 1993; Kanaiaupuni 2000).

Over two thirds of migrants come from the Historic Region of migration in Mexico, and almost half of men and 59% of women travelled to California in their first trip, these migrants come from Mexican communities with a U.S. migration prevalence of 17% on average.

The right side of Table 1 presents the sample characteristics at the last year of U.S. migration; this group includes only migrants who have spent more than 5 years in the U.S., which results in a sample of 1,603 males and 273 females. The migrants in this

sample, on average, are 39 years old during their last year of U.S. migration. About 91% of the males are in a cohabiting or marital union, in contrast to 75% of females. This group has relatively low levels of education: 67% of males have only elementary school education or less, while another 20% have a middle school level of schooling. The sample of women has higher levels of education, about half has elementary school education, while 25% have middle school education and 21% have high school education.

At the time of their last year of migration, a large proportion of these migrants has obtained documentation—only 40% of the men and 36% of the women were undocumented—, which can be the result of legalization obtained through IRCA or family reunification. This change can also be a result of selectivity, as migrants with documents are more likely to have reached more than 5 years of migration experience. Migrants from the Historic Region of migration in Mexico are still the most prevalent, followed by those migrants from the Central Region. In the U.S., California remains the most popular state of destination. Men in this sample have about 12 accumulated years of migration experience in the U.S and about 5 U.S. trips; in contrast, women have almost 15 years of accumulated migration experience and close to 2 U.S. trips on average.

Occupational Mobility in the First U.S. Trip

Table 2 shows the occupational distribution for male and female migrants of their last job in Mexico and first job in the U.S. Almost half of all male migrants were agricultural laborers in Mexico, but only 30% worked in that occupation in the U.S. as their first job. Relatively more male migrants worked in construction and as unskilled laborers in their

first U.S. job than they did in their last job in Mexico. Close to half of all female migrants had a job as service or domestic worker in Mexico; while a similar proportion of female migrants were domestic workers in Mexico and the U.S., the main result for female migrants is that one third were either unemployed or dropped out of the labor force after their arrival in the United States.

Tables 3 (males) and 4 (females) show the flow from the last Mexican occupation to the first U.S. occupation. For males, migrants who remained in their occupation tended to make up the largest category (see the diagonal of Table 3). An example for this is agriculture. But the results also show that only 11.2% of all migrants who were professionals in Mexico were able to maintain that occupational status, whereas 26.3% worked in service occupations as their first U.S. job, and 36% as unskilled or agricultural workers. Female migrants, regardless of their occupation in Mexico, were most likely not working once they arrived in the U.S. (with the exception of those in construction work, which is a miniscule number of women). Women who entered the labor force in the U.S. tended to concentrate in domestic and services occupations, even when their jobs in Mexico were of higher status. Overall, slightly under 30% of both male and female migrants experienced downward occupational mobility from their last job in Mexico to their first job in the U.S. (Table 2). In contrast, 37% of males and 17.5% of females had upward occupational mobility as a result of migration. The lower occupational success of female migrants is largely due to their high proportion among those out of the labor force after their migration to the U.S.

Table 5 presents the results of the multinomial logistic regression analysis. These results show important sex differences in the effects of the independent variables on

downward and upward mobility. While college education depressed the risk of *downward* mobility for male migrants, it depressed the likelihood of *upward* mobility for female migrants. As expected, having a "migrant" job in the U.S. increased the risk of downward mobility and lowered it for upward mobility for males (agriculture) and females (domestic). For those in service occupations, both males as well as females had increased risks for both downward and upward mobility. Undocumented status raised the likelihood of downward and upward mobility after migration for male migrants, but it had no effect for females. This effect is possibly driven by the transition of rural Mexicans entering urban occupations in the U.S. Compared to the period 1966-85, males who migrated after IRCA (1986-2012) were more likely to experience both downward and upward mobility; no effect of migration period was found for females.

The state of destination had a negative effect on downward mobility (Texas and other states) for male migrants, when compared to those who went to California, and persons moving to other states were more likely to experience upward mobility. State of destination had no effect on occupational mobility of female migrants. Finally, for migrants who originated in the Southeast of Mexico (as compared to the Historic region of origin), males and females were more likely to experience upward mobility, and males (but not females) also had lower risk of downward mobility. We find no significant effect of our social networks proxy, the prevalence of migration in the community of origin.

Occupational Mobility in the Last Year in the U.S.

We now turn to the analysis of occupational mobility between the first and the last occupation held by Mexican migrants with more than 5 years of accumulated experience

in the U.S. Table 6 shows the distribution of occupations in the first and last year of migration by sex. Close to four fifths of male migrants reported their first occupation in the U.S. as services, unskilled or agricultural worker. The main change at their last occupation was an increase of males working in skilled occupations and a decrease working as agricultural workers. Close to four fifths of female migrants were employed in three occupations –skilled, services, and domestic work– in their first job in the United States. At the time of their last reported job, 45% of female migrants worked in services and domestic occupations, but the main change in the distribution of occupations between the first and last year in the U.S. for females is that the third category with the most persons was "not working" with 22%. In comparison with the occupational mobility from the last job in Mexico to the U.S. first job, both males and females were more likely to remain in their occupational category between their first and last reported job in the United States (see the large diagonals in Tables 7 and 8). While only 34.3% of males migrants remained in their occupation after the move from Mexico to the United States, 65.3% did so from their first to their last job in the U.S. The corresponding figures for female migrants are 55.1% and 73.7%. During their work in the United States, male as well as female migrants had both less downward and upward mobility when compared to the occupational change between their last job in Mexico and first job in the United States.

We present the results of the multinomial logistic regression for first and last occupation in the United States in Table 9. For females, there is little change in the effects of the individual characteristics on the likelihood of mobility, when compared to the mobility from last Mexican job to first U.S. job. Only college education retains its

positive effect on upward occupational mobility. More changes in the model structure are observed for males. Education has no effect on downward mobility within the United States, but it favors the likelihood of upward mobility.

Having a "migrant job" (agriculture for males and domestic for females, services for both) greatly increases the risk of downward mobility and lowers it for upward mobility within the United States from first to last job. Being in a services occupation slightly lowers the chance of downward mobility for male migrants in the United States and increases the risk of both downward and upward mobility for female migrants.

Once in the United States, documentation status no longer has an effect on occupational mobility from first to last job for males, and it continues to have no effect for females. Similarly, period of migration no longer has much of an effect on occupational mobility, except that females who migrated post-IRCA are less likely to experience downward mobility. This last effect may be related to a higher likelihood attaining documented status in the later period.

For occupational mobility from first to last job in the United States, state of destination is not relevant, except that male migrants living in Texas have a slightly greater chance for upward mobility than those in California. It also makes no difference for within-U.S. occupational mobility of both male and female migrants if they came from the historic region of origin or from a region of more recent migrant origin.
Our results also show no effect of migration prevalence on occupational mobility, nor do the number of trips to the United States. However, as was anticipated, years of migration experience in the United States favors upward occupational mobility of both male and female migrants from their first to the last reported occupation.

References

Aguilera, Michael B., and Douglas S. Massey. 2003. "Social Capital and the Wages of Mexican Migrants: New Hypotheses and Tests." *Social Forces* 82(2):671–701.

Akresh, Ilana Redstone. 2006. "Occupational Mobility Among Legal Immigrants to the United States." *International Migration Review* 40(4):854–84.

Akresh, Ilana Redstone. 2008. "Occupational Trajectories of Legal US Immigrants: Downgrading and Recovery." *Population and Development Review* 34(3):435–56.

Amuedo-Dorantes, Catalina., and Kusum. Mundra. 2007. "Social Networks and Their Impact on the Earnings of Mexican Migrants." *Demography* 44(4):849–63.

Barone, Guglielmo, and Sauro Mocetti. 2011. "With a Little Help from Abroad: The Effect of Low-Skilled Immigration on the Female Labour Supply." *Labour Economics* 18(5):664–75.

Bernardi, Fabrizio, Luis Garrido, and Maria Miyar. 2011. "The Recent Fast Upsurge of Immigrants in Spain and Their Employment Patterns and Occupational Attainment." *International Migration* 49(1):148–87.

Bohon, Stephanie A. 2005. "Occupational Attainment of Latino Immigrants In the United States." *Geographical Review* 95(2):249–66.

Chiswick, Barry R., Yew Liang Lee, and Paul W. Miller. 2005. "A Longitudinal Analysis of Immigrant Occupational Mobility: A Test of the Immigrant Assimilation Hypothesis1." *International Migration Review* 39(2):332–53.

Donato, Katharine M. 1993. "Current Trends and Patterns of Female Migration: Evidence from Mexico." *International Migration Review* 24(4):748–71.

Durand, Jorge. 1994. *Más Allá de La Línea. Patrones Migratorios Entre México Y Estados Unidos*. Mexico: Consejo Nacional para la Cultura y las Artes.

Durand, Jorge, and Douglas S. Massey. 2003. *Clandestinos. Migración México-Estados Unidos En Los Albores Del Siglo XXI*. México: Universidad Autónoma de Zacatecas and Miguel Ángel Porrúa.

Granberry, Phillip J., and Enrico A. Marcelli. 2011. "Social Capital Is Associated with Earnings among Foreign-Born Mexican Men but Not Women in Los Angeles County." *International Migration* 49(6):113–28.

Helgertz, Jonas. 2013. “Pre- to Post-Migration Occupational Mobility of First Generation Immigrants to Sweden from 1970–1990: Examining the Influence of Linguistic Distance.” *Population Research and Policy Review* 32(3):437–67.

Kanaiaupuni, Shawn Malia. 2000. “Reframing the Migration Question: An Analysis of Men, Women, and Gender in Mexico.” *Social forces* 78:1311–48.

Kossoudji, Sherrie A., and Deborah A. Cobb-Clark. 2000. “IRCA’s Impact on the Occupational Concentration and Mobility of Newly-Legalized Mexican Men.” *Journal of Population Economics* 13(1):81–98.

Lindstrom, David P., and Adriana Lopez Ramirez. 2010. “Pioneers and Followers: Migrant Selectivity and the Development of U.S. Migration Streams in Latin America.” *The ANNALS of the American Acadamy of Political and Social Science* 630(July):53–77.

Mahuteau, Stéphane, and P. N. (RAJA) (Raja) Junankar. 2008. “Do Migrants Get Good Jobs in Australia? The Role of Ethnic Networks in Job Search.” *Economic Record* 84:S115–30.

Massey, Douglas S. et al. 1998. *Worlds in Motion: Understanding International Migration at the End of the Millennium*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Massey, Douglas S., Rafael Alarcon, Jorge Durand, and Humberto Gonzalez. 1987. *Return to Aztlan: The Social Process of International Migration from Western Mexico*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Munshi, Kaivan. 2003. “Networks in the Modern Economy: Mexican Migrants in the U. S. Labor Market.” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 118(2):549–59. Retrieved December 19, 2014 (http://www.jstor.org/stable/25053914).

Obućina, Ognjen. 2013. “Occupational Trajectories and Occupational Cost among Senegalese Immigrants in Europe.” *Demographic Research* 28(19):547–80.

Palloni, Alberto, Douglas S. Massey, Miguel Ceballos, Kristin Espinosa, and Michael Spittel. 2001. “Social Capital and International Migration: A Test Using Information on Family Networks.” *American Journal of Sociology* 106(5):1262–98.

Portes, Alejandro, and Julia Sensenbrenner. 1993. “Embeddedness and Immigration: Notes on the Social Determinants of Economic Action.” *American Journal of Sociology* 98(6):1320–50.

Rainer, Helmut, and Thomas Siedler. 2009. “The Role of Social Networks in Determining Migration and Labour Market Outcomes. Evidence from German Reunification.” *Economics of Transition* 17(4):739–67.

Reyneri, Emilio, and Giovanna Fullin. 2011. “Labour Market Penalties of New Immigrants in New and Old Receiving West European Countries.” *International Migration* 49(1):31–57.

Rooth, Dan-Olof, and Jan Ekberg. 2006. “Occupational Mobility for Immigrants in Sweden.” *International Migration* 44(2):57–77.

Toussaint-Comeau, Maude. 2006. “The Occupational Assimilation of Hispanic Evidence from Panel Data.” *International Migration* 40(3):508–36.

Veira, Alberto, Mikolaj Stanek, and Lorenzo Cachón. 2007. “Los Determinantes de La Concentración Étnica En El Mercado Laboral Español.” *Revista Internacional de Sociología* 69(m1):219–42.

Vidal-Coso, Elena, and Pau Miret-Gamundi. 2014. “The Labour Trajectories of Immigrant Women in Spain: Are There Signs of Upward Social Mobility?” *Demographic Research* 31(13):337–80.

Vono-de-Vilhena, Daniela, and Elena Vidal-Coso. 2012. “The Impact of Informal Networks on Labour Mobility: Immigrants’ First Job in Spain.” *Migration Letters* 9(3):237–47.

Tables and Figures

Table 1. Individual Characteristics at the First and Last Year of U.S. Migration, by Sex, MMP

	First year of U.S. Migration		Last year of U.S. Migration [a]	
	Males	Females	Males	Females
	%	%	%	%
Individual Characteristics				
Household head	99.6	34.5	99.2	34.8
Age, mean (SD) [b]	27.0 (0.13)	28.6 (0.52)	39.2 (0.25)	39.5 (0.92)
In marital or cohabitation [b]	36.6	42.4	91.4	74.6
Educational Attainment [b]				
Elementary or less	66.9	56.2	67.4	47.5
Middle school	20.7	21.4	20.6	24.6
High school	7.9	15.4	8.2	21.2
College or higher	4.4	7.0	3.8	6.8
Characteristics of U.S. Migration				
Documentation status				
Undocumented	85.9	69.1	39.7	35.6
Period of migration				
1966-1985	53.7	39.9	70.2	47.5
1986-2012	46.4	60.1	29.8	52.5
Region of origin in Mexico				
Historic	67.5	67.5	70.4	68.6
Central	17.5	14.0	15.6	15.3
Border	7.9	13.8	8.0	10.2
Southeast	7.1	4.7	6.1	5.9
State of Destination in the U.S.				
California	52.4	59.3	54.8	64.4
Texas	14.3	13.2	10.1	6.8
Illinois	8.9	10.9	11.0	16.1
Other States	24.4	16.7	24.2	12.7
Prevalence of migration in the community, mean (SD)	16.8 (0.01)	17.4 (0.01)	10.1 (0.01)	8.1 (0.01)

Total number of U.S. trips, mean (SD)	--	--	4.9 (0.25)	1.9 (0.22)
Total years of migration experience in the U.S. mean (SD)	--	--	12.5 (0.16)	14.7 (0.74)
N	4,747	486	1,603	273

[a] Among those who spent longer than 5 years in the United States.
[b] In the year of reference
Source: Mexican Migration Project (MMP 143 LIFE, SPOUSE and HOUSE files)

Table 2. Occupation Distribution and Occupational Mobility before Migration and in the First Year of U.S. Migration, by Sex, MMP

	Males		Females	
Occupational categories	**Last occupation in Mexico [a] (%)**	**First occupation in the U.S. (%)**	**Last occupation in Mexico [a] (%)**	**First occupation in the U.S. (%)**
Managerial/Professional/Technical	3.2	0.6	9.3	1.4
Skilled	15.8	15.4	15.0	11.5
Administrative	2.8	1.0	9.9	2.1
Services	11.2	21.5	29.6	17.9
Unskilled	19.4	23.1	8.6	9.9
Construction	2.5	6.0	0.2	0.4
Agriculture	45.0	30.1	11.9	7.4
Domestic	0.1	0.3	15.4	16.1
Unemployed/out of the labor force	-	2.1	-	33.3
Occupational mobility status				
Downward mobility	28.7		27.4	
Lateral mobility	34.3		55.1	
Upward mobility	37.0		17.5	

[a] In the 5 years prior to U.S. migration

Source: Mexican Migration Project (MMP 143 LIFE, SPOUSE and HOUSE files)

Table 3. Percentage Distribution of Last Occupation in Mexico and First Occupation in the U.S., Males, MMP

	First occupation in the U.S.									
Last occupation in Mexico	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9[a]**	**Total**
1. Managerial/Professional/Technical	11.2	12.5	1.3	**26.3**	21.7	3.3	14.5	0.0	9.2	100
2. Skilled	0.1	**25.3**	1.3	20.7	24.1	7.5	19.9	0.1	0.9	100
3. Administrative	1.5	14.8	6.7	**26.7**	24.4	5.2	14.1	0.7	5.9	100
4. Services	0.4	14.3	0.6	**27.8**	25.2	6.1	23.0	0.5	1.8	100
5. Unskilled	0.3	15.2	1.1	23.5	**28.5**	6.1	23.0	0.5	1.8	100
6. Construction	0.9	10.2	0.9	27.1	12.7	22.9	**24.6**	0.0	0.9	100
7. Agriculture	0.1	12.8	0.5	18.5	20.6	4.6	**41.0**	0.1	1.8	100
8. Domestic	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	**33.3**	**33.3**	**33.3**	100
Total	0.6	15.4	1.0	21.5	23.1	6.0	**30.1**	0.3	2.1	100

[a] Unemployed or out of the labor force
Modal categories for each row in **bold**
Source: Mexican Migration Project (MMP 143 LIFE, SPOUSE and HOUSE files)

Table 4. Percentage Distribution of Last Occupation in Mexico and First Occupation in the U.S., Females, MMP

	First occupation in the U.S.									
Last occupation in Mexico	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9[a]**	**Total**
1. Managerial/Professional/Technical	8.9	11.1	2.2	15.6	8.9	0.0	6.7	4.4	**42.2**	100
2. Skilled	1.4	21.9	1.4	21.9	9.6	0.0	6.9	6.9	**30.1**	100
3. Administrative	0.0	12.5	12.5	8.3	10.4	0.0	2.1	12.5	**41.7**	100
4. Services	1.4	9.7	1.4	20.8	9.7	0.0	4.2	19.4	**33.3**	100
5. Unskilled	0.0	7.1	0.0	16.7	23.8	0.0	0.0	21.4	**31.0**	100
6. Construction	0.0	**100.0**	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100
7. Agriculture	0.0	10.3	0.0	15.5	6.9	1.7	27.6	6.9	**31.0**	100
8. Domestic	0.0	6.7	0.0	18.7	5.3	1.3	6.7	**32.0**	29.3	100
Total	1.4	11.5	2.1	17.9	9.9	0.4	7.4	16.1	**33.3**	100

[a] Unemployed or out of the labor force
Top two modal categories for each row in **bold**
Source: Mexican Migration Project (MMP 143 LIFE, SPOUSE and HOUSE files)

Table 5. Multinomial Logistic Regression to Estimate Labor Mobility among First Time Migrants to the U.S., MMP

	Males				Females			
	Downward mobility		**Upward mobility**		**Downward mobility**		**Upward mobility**	
	vs. Lateral mobility				vs. Lateral mobility			
	B		**β**		**β**		**β**	
Individual Characteristics								
Household head	-0.460		-0.042		0.136		0.350	
Age [a]	0.007		0.034		0.076		0.133	
Age squared [a]	-0.001		-0.001	*	-0.001		-0.003	†
In marital or cohabiting union [a]	0.115		0.148		-0.452		-0.459	
Educational attainment [a]								
Elementary or less (ref.)								
Middle school	-0.173		0.235		-0.301		0.448	
High school diploma	-0.202		0.082		-0.279		0.210	
College or higher	-0.530	*	-0.318		-0.071		-15.578	***
Occupation in Mexico before migration								
Agriculture (ref.)	-		-					
Managerial/Professional/Technical	13.898	***	-21.317	***	18.763	***	-18.138	***
Skilled	13.009	***	-9.199	***	18.426	***	-3.858	**
Administrative	14.131	***	-3.377	***	18.126	***	-0.942	
Services	12.364	***	-4.516	***	17.243	***	-1.300	**
Unskilled	10.704	***	-3.315	***	0.517		-0.419	
Construction	8.967	***	-2.839	***	17.665	***	22.783	***
Domestic	-11.281	***	-1.011		-35.316	***	0.661	†
Characteristics of U.S. Migration								
Has a "migrant job" in U.S.								
Agriculture	6.548	***	-9.869	***	-		-	
Services	0.319	**	1.557	***	1.364	***	1.274	**

Domestic	-			-			35.682	***		-18.965	***
Documentation status											
Undocumented	0.535	***		0.577	**		0.648			0.611	
Period of migration											
1966-1985 (ref.)											
1986-2012	0.316	**		0.225	†		-0.207			-0.303	
State of destination in the U.S.											
California											
Texas	-0.577	**		-0.104			-0.594			-0.593	
Illinois	-0.019			0.124			-0.540			0.074	
Other States	-0.573	*		0.631	**		-0.760			0.091	
Region of origin											
Historic (ref.)											
Central	-0.067			0.369			-0.080			0.549	
Border	0.156			0.152			0.309	†		0.049	
Southeast	-0.822	**		1.439	***		-0.903			2.420	**
Prevalence of migration	0.065			0.283			0.182			0.159	
-LL			-5189.45						-481.212		
N			4,747						486		

† p<0.1 * p<0.05 ** p<0.01 *** p<0.001.

[a] In the year of reference.

Source: Mexican Migration Project (MMP 143 LIFE, SPOUSE and HOUSE files)

Table 6. Occupation Distribution and Occupational Mobility between the First and Last Year in the U.S., by Sex, MMP

	Males		Females	
Occupational categories	**First occupation in the U.S. (%)**	**Last occupation in the U.S. [a] (%)**	**First occupation in the U.S. (%)**	**Last occupation in the U.S. [a] (%)**
Managerial/Professional/Technical	0.4	1.0	1.7	1.7
Skilled	15.7	20.2	23.7	10.2
Administrative	1.0	2.2	2.5	5.9
Services	22.9	21.5	32.2	31.4
Unskilled	26.2	25.6	10.2	7.6
Construction	4.9	6.7	1.7	2.5
Agriculture	28.6	21.1	5.9	4.2
Domestic	0.4	0.2	22.0	14.4
Unemployed/out of the labor force	-	1.6	-	22.0
Occupational mobility status				
Downward mobility	12.2		11.9	
Lateral mobility	65.3		73.7	
Upward mobility	22.5		14.4	

[a] For those with more than 5 years of U.S. migration experience
Source: Mexican Migration Project (MMP 143 LIFE, SPOUSE and HOUSE files)

Table 7. Percentage Distribution of Occupations in the First and Last Year in the U.S., Males, MMP

	Last occupation in the U.S.									
First occupation in the U.S.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9[a]**	**Total**
1. Managerial/Professional/Technical	**50.0**	0.0	0.0	33.3	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100
2. Skilled	0.4	**69.7**	1.5	6.9	10.7	3.1	5.4	0.0	2.3	100
3. Administrative	0.0	6.3	**62.5**	12.5	18.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100
4. Services	1.5	14.4	2.8	**59.9**	12.3	3.9	3.9	0.3	1.0	100
5. Unskilled	0.7	13.0	1.8	10.3	**62.8**	2.1	7.1	0.0	2.3	100
6. Construction	0.0	7.4	0.0	7.4	4.9	**74.1**	6.2	0.0	0.0	100
7. Agriculture	0.8	9.0	1.3	10.3	14.5	4.0	**58.5**	0.0	1.7	100
8. Domestic	0.0	**33.3**	16.7	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	**33.3**	0.0	100
Total	1.0	20.7	2.4	21.3	**25.6**	6.6	20.6	0.2	1.7	100

[a] Unemployed or out of the labor force
Modal categories for each row in **bold**
Source: Mexican Migration Project (MMP 143 LIFE, SPOUSE and HOUSE files)

Table 8. Percentage Distribution of Occupations in the First and Last Year in the U.S., Females, MMP

	Last occupation in the U.S.									
First occupation in the U.S.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9[a]**	**Total**
1. Managerial/Professional/Technical	**80.0**	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100
2. Skilled	0.0	**53.5**	1.7	8.6	1.7	0.0	1.7	1.7	31.0	100
3. Administrative	11.8	5.9	**47.1**	17.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	17.7	100
4. Services	0.0	0.0	4.2	**58.3**	4.2	0.0	1.4	2.8	29.2	100
5. Unskilled	0.0	7.5	2.5	12.5	**42.5**	2.5	2.5	5.0	25.0	100
6. Construction	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	**100.0**	0.0	0.0	0.0	100
7. Agriculture	0.0	0.0	4.0	8.0	0.0	0.0	**68.0**	0.0	20.0	100
8. Domestic	4.4	4.4	4.4	21.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	**52.2**	13.0	100
Total	3.02	13.96	6.42	**25.28**	7.92	1.13	7.55	10.94	23.77	100

[a] Unemployed or out of the labor force
Modal categories for each row in **bold**
Source: Mexican Migration Project (MMP 143 LIFE, SPOUSE and HOUSE files)

Table 9. Multinomial Logistic Regression to Estimate Labor Mobility between the First and Last Year in the U.S., MMP

	Males				Females			
	Downward mobility		Upward mobility		Downward mobility		Upward mobility	
	vs. Lateral mobility				vs. Lateral mobility			
	β		β		β		β	
Individual Characteristics								
Household head	1.443	**	1.189	**	1.027		0.407	
Age [a]	0.080		-0.107		-0.311		0.007	
Age squared [a]	-0.003		0.001		0.005		-0.001	
In marital or cohabiting union [a]	0.060		0.564	**	-0.737		-0.076	
Educational attainment [a]								
Elementary or less (ref.)								
Middle school	0.304		0.191		-0.612		0.979	
High school diploma	0.314		0.908	**	-0.602		1.438	†
College or higher	-0.486		1.260	**	-0.102		2.783	**
Occupation in the first year in the U.S.								
Agriculture (ref.)								
Managerial/Professional/Technical	3.809	**	-21.269	***	3.728		-21.894	***
Skilled	2.650	***	-4.160	***	2.294		-19.946	***
Administrative	3.285	***	-1.458		2.508	†	-1.759	*
Services	3.088	***	-0.386		-0.899		-4.514	*
Unskilled	-14.290	***	-0.125		-16.929	***	-18.285	***
Construction	-50.592	***	4.284	***	-17.977	***	-0.455	
Domestic	-15.652	***	1.063	**	-41.753	***	2.170	**
Characteristics of U.S. Migration								
Has a "migrant job" in U.S.								
Agriculture	34.616	***	-22.525	***	--		--	
Services	-1.381	**	0.167		2.860	**	2.968	**

Domestic	--		--		23.502	***	-21.067	***
Documentation status								
Undocumented	-0.191		0.094		-1.021		-0.347	
Period of migration								
1966-1985 (ref.)								
1986-2012	-0.556		0.101		-1.958	**	0.417	
State of destination in the U.S.								
California								
Texas	-0.212		0.096	**	0.769		-1.043	
Illinois	-0.431		0.476		0.323		0.799	
Other States	-0.701		-0.019		1.174		-0.462	
Region of origin								
Historic (ref.)								
Central	-0.547		-0.631		1.868		0.556	
Border	0.644		-0.405		-0.105		1.133	
Southeast	-0.871		0.345		0.143		2.169	
Prevalence of migration in the community	-0.178		0.793	†	0.530		-0.816	
Years of migration experience in the U.S.	0.008		0.055	**	-0.056		0.097	*
Number of U.S. trips	-0.010		-0.009		0.270		-0.209	
-LL		-1391.235				-178.313		
N		1,603				273		

† p<0.1 * p<0.05 ** p<0.01 *** p<0.001.

[a] In the year of reference.

Source: Mexican Migration Project (MMP 143 LIFE, SPOUSE and HOUSE files)