Preliminary and incomplete
Please do not quote

Selection and Assimilation of Mexican Migrants to the U.S.

Andrea Velásquez
University of Colorado Denver

Gabriela Farfán
World Bank

Maria Genoni
World Bank

Luis Rubalcava
CAMBS, Mexico City

Graciela Teruel
UIA, Mexico City

Duncan Thomas
Duke University

June 2015

Abstract

Rich longitudinal data from the Mexican Family Life Survey provides new evidence on selectivity and assimilation of recent migrants from Mexico to the United States. This data has the unique feature of interviewing subjects prior to the migration decision and then tracking and collecting data on these migrants post migration. Specifically, this research exploits the robust information collected on all respondents at baseline in 2002, as well as in two follow-up surveys conducted in 2005 and 2009. In this paper respondents interviewed at baseline in Mexico in 2002 that subsequently moved to the United States are contrasted with individuals who only moved within Mexico. Additionally, respondents that moved and stayed in the U.S. are compared to those who moved to the U.S. during this time but chose to return to Mexico. Finally, we will examine the characteristics of "stayers" that are related to successful assimilation in the U.S. Measures of labor market outcomes, per capita expenditure, use of English and living arrangements in the U.S. are used as the markers of successful assimilation.

1. Introduction

Mexican migration to the United States and the return of Mexican-born migrants to their country of origin are of substantial interest from both a policy and scientific point of view. Mexican-origin migrants are the largest Hispanic population in the U.S., accounting for nearly two-thirds of all Hispanic migrants. Moreover, Mexican migrants have traditionally followed two distinct patterns of migration; one fraction migrates to settle permanently in the U.S. while others are cyclical migrants moving frequently between the two countries. Recent evidence suggests that these patterns may be changing as migration from Mexico to the U.S. has declined sharply since the onset of the Great Recession and many of the migrants who were living in the U.S. have returned to Mexico. It is estimated that in the last few years, net migration from Mexico to the U.S. has fallen to zero.

This paper uses novel data to provide new evidence on the characteristics that predict which Mexicans have chosen to migrate to the U.S. over the last decade and, among those migrants, the attributes that predict whether they settle in the U.S. for the longer term or return to Mexico. Finally, evidence is presented that sheds light on which characteristics at baseline are markers of successful assimilation in the U.S.

A large and active literature has examined the process of migration into the U.S. by Mexican citizens (see, for example, Donato, Durand, and Massey (1992), Durand, Kandel, Parrado and Massey (1996), Durand, Massey and Zenteno (2001), Fernández-Huertas Moraga (2011), Hanson, (2006), Hoefer, Rytina and Campbell (2006), Ibarraran. and Lubotsky (2007), McKenzie and Rapoport. (2004), and Rendall, Brownell and Kups. (2011)). Despite this extensive literature, evidence on recent changes in the selectivity of migrants, as well as, analysis of the characteristics that determine which migrants stay in the U.S. rather than return to Mexico is less well documented. This project sheds new light on these important subjects.

To provide scientific evidence on the selectivity of migrants, it is necessary to compare characteristics of migrants to those of non-migrants before the migration takes place. However, the absence of pre-migration information has been a challenge for research in this field. One line of inquiry uses data collected by the U.S. government, such as the American Community Survey in combination with census data from the Mexican government. This necessarily involves a comparison of the characteristics of non-movers to the attributes of movers after the migration has already occurred. Using data collected in this way, it is difficult to draw firm conclusions about the roles of time-varying characteristics in migration decisions. Moreover, studies based on data collected by the U.S. government are limited by the fact that such surveys are known to undercount the undocumented and most mobile migrants including those who cycle often between the U.S. and Mexico.

A second line of inquiry has relied only on Mexican census or survey data collected in Mexico on individuals that have already migrated. An important limitation of these data sources is that they only include migrants that have returned to Mexico or have at least one household member still living in Mexico and information about migrants is obtained by proxy. By design, these surveys exclude complete households that have migrated to the U.S. who make up an increasing and substantial fraction of migrants

to the U.S. from Mexico. Both the selection and assimilation process of complete households that decided to migrate to the U.S. and never return to Mexico are likely to be quite different from the rest of the migrants and so studies based on these data sources are prone to biases due to the selection of those included in the study. An important, related source of data is the Mexican Migration Project (MMP) which is based on a sample of respondents in Mexico who have family in the U.S. While these data are supplemented by U.S. based snowball samples, the samples are also selected on having at least one family member remaining in Mexico and so these samples are also at risk of underrepresenting longer-term movers. Moreover, both types of surveys only contain information on movers after the migration event. The ideal source of data for a study of migrant selectivity would be a sample that is representative of the Mexican population prior to migration and proceeds to follow all respondents that migrate to the U.S., including those who stay for a short period and those who remain in the U.S. long-term. We designed and implemented an approach to study migrant selectivity using this methodology.

The Mexican Family Life Survey (MxFLS) is a longitudinal data set that is representative of the Mexican population at baseline (in 2002). The first follow-up started in 2005 and the second in 2009. In both follow-ups, movers to the U.S. have been tracked and interviewed in the U.S. The baseline respondents who are thought to have moved to the U.S. were found and interviewed at a rate of 90% in the first and second follow-up surveys. In the second follow-up we re-interviewed over 1,000 baseline respondents who moved to the U.S. after 2002 and are still in the U.S., as well as, 659 respondents who migrated to the U.S. after 2002 and subsequently returned to Mexico (Table 1).

The combination of successfully tracking and interviewing movers, including international movers, with detailed information on their labor market and migration experiences, families and resources of each respondent yields an uniquely rich set of data for investigating the nature of selectivity of migrants to the U.S. and the selectivity of those who remain in the U.S. over the longer haul. With these data, we will draw comparisons between those people who have migrated to the U.S. since 2002, and stayed, those who have migrated to the U.S. since 2002 and returned to Mexico and those who have only migrated within Mexico since 2002.

2. Data

MxFLS is an on-going large-scale population-representative longitudinal survey of Mexicans who were living in Mexico in 2002 when the baseline was conducted. The baseline survey, MxFLS1, collected detailed information on 35,677 individuals living in 8,440 households in 150 communities spread across 16 states in Mexico.

The second wave, MxFLS2, was conducted in 2005-2006. All baseline respondents and their biological children born after the 2002 baseline are eligible to be tracked in the follow-up surveys. They are our "panel respondents." Over 89% of the panel respondents were re-interviewed in MxFLS2.

A novel feature of MxFLS, which is key for this research, is that we decided to not only follow panel members that had moved within Mexico but also to follow respondents that had migrated to the U.S. Following movers is not straightforward. In the Mexican context, it poses special challenges because a

significant number of people move to the U.S. Moreover, Mexican migrants are generally very mobile and the great majority is undocumented, adding additional challenges to the tracking process. In the context of the MxFLS, following migrants to the U.S. is important not only because it allows us to have a representative sample of recent migrants to the U.S. but also because it is crucial to maintain the representativeness of the baseline sample. If migrants to the U.S. are not followed, not only would attrition rates be higher than otherwise, but attrition would also be selected on characteristics associated with migration to the U.S. Inferences about the evolution of many indicators of well-being of the Mexican population over the last decade would potentially be contaminated if domestic and international migrants were not followed.

As such, we designed and implemented an approach that allows us to have a representative sample of recent migrants to the U.S. for whom we have a rich set of characteristics measured at baseline, prior to migration. To achieve this, we follow all panel respondents that remain in Mexico, as well as, track respondents who move to the U.S. The MxFLS is the first population-representative large-scale longitudinal study that has attempted to follow migrants across an international border. Aware of the additional challenges this poses, we put substantial effort into developing and testing procedures to facilitate successfully interviewing migrants in the U.S. Those efforts have allowed us to maintain a very high re-contact rate: as shown in panel A of Table 1, in the second wave, 89.2% of the baseline respondents were re-interviewed. Moreover, we interviewed 91% of the 854 respondents believed to be in the U.S. (This includes anyone who was reported by an informant to have moved to the U.S. and was not interviewed in Mexico.) Furthermore, of the U.S moving panel respondents who were at least 15 years old at the time of the baseline, 90.4 percent were re-interviewed in the U.S. In the rest of the analysis we will focus on this age group. This choice is made because children are likely to move because of a migration decision made by their parents and it is their parents' characteristics that are most likely driving the selection.

Panel B of Table 1 show the re-contact rates of the third wave of the MxFLS (MxFLS3). The results for the entire sample show that over 90 percent of baseline respondents have been re-interviewed. From the sample of our panel members, 1,870 moved to the U.S. since baseline, and 90.8 percent were re-interviewed. Due to the transient part of the Mexican migrant population, it is important to not only follow migrants that moved from Mexico to the U.S. but also to track those that return to Mexico after having lived in U.S. at some point between the waves. Out of the total U.S. migrants successfully re-interviewed, near 61% were still in the U.S. and the other 39% were found and interviewed back in Mexico. The recontact rates for the entire sample and the sample of respondents older than 15 at baseline are very similar.

In order to examine the selection and assimilation of Mexican migrants we will first group each respondent into one of several migration categories. These categories are based on the respondent's migration history and place of re-interview. We will describe in detail the migration history component and the migration categories used in our analysis.

Migration and characteristics at baseline

The MxFLS collects a rich array of information about each respondent, this include a component about the migration histories of all respondents age 15 or older at the time of the survey. The 2002 migration history component of the MxFLS includes all long-term movements (more than one year) and temporal movements (between one and 12 months) that occurred after age 12. This allows us to determine who has moved to the U.S. and who has moved within Mexico prior to 2002. In MxFLS2 the migration component follows the same structure and updates the migration history by assessing both permanent and temporal migration movements between the two waves. This feature, in addition to the successful tracking of migrants in the U.S. in the second wave, allows us to determine the migration trends of the Mexican population between 2002 and 2005. In a similar way, MxFLS3 updates the migratory movements between the second and third wave. In addition, we tracked and interviewed respondents thought to be in the U.S. as well as those confirmed to be back in Mexico. This unique feature allows us to describe the recent migratory trends of the Mexican population both within Mexico and to the U.S. and allows us to compare different groups of the population on a rich set of characteristics measured at baseline according to their migration experiences through the third wave.

Our analytical sample includes all panel respondents age 15 or older in 2002. In order to explore the migration status (between baseline and the third wave) of each respondent we use data from the three waves of the MxFLS. Exploiting both the migration histories and the place of residence at the moment of each survey we can classify the migration status of each respondent in each wave. We classify the respondents as "non-movers", if they never moved from their locality of origin (the locality in which they were interviewed in 2002) for a period longer than a year; "movers within Mexico", if they moved out of their locality of origin but did not move to the U.S for a period longer than a year; "moved to U.S. and returned", if they moved to the U.S. for a period longer than a year but in the third wave were found and interviewed in Mexico; and "moved to the U.S. and stayed", if they were found and interviewed in the U.S. in the third wave. Table 2 shows the sample sizes in each group by gender for respondents of age 15 and older at baseline.

Along with the migration component, the MxFLS contains information about the economic, social and health status of each member of a surveyed household. The questionnaire for adults includes sections on education, labor supply and earnings, marriage and fertility history, health status, and use of health care. In addition, one member is interviewed about information at the household level. This questionnaire includes a complete household roster including basic socio-demographic characteristics of each household member, and information of household expenditure, and asset ownership.

Another useful section of the MxFLS is the assessment of the presence of relatives in the U.S. for all baseline respondents. An important variable for predicting migration is the presence of networks in the destination place. Specifically, the presence of networks in the U.S. could affect the decision to migrate through several different channels. For example, networks in the place of destination may reduce the initial costs of migration if the relatives help with living expenses. In addition, they can offer valuable information about available jobs or connect the recent migrant to job networks. Our measure of direct networks in the U.S. prior to migration will allow us to explore these hypotheses.

Table 3.A provides descriptive statistics for the variables that measure the presence of U.S. familial networks and migration experience before 2002 of co-resident parents and siblings. Panel A shows the results for male and Panel B for female migrants. Table 3.A provides evidence that conditional on being a migrant, those that moved to the United States have more relatives in America at baseline than those that only moved within Mexico. Moreover, disaggregated by family relationships, U.S. movers are significantly more likely to have relatives of each relationship type in the U.S. with the exception of extended family members. When comparing the numbers between male and females we see that the number of relatives in U.S. is larger for the sample of females. U.S. female migrants are particularly more likely than U.S. men migrants to have their spouse in U.S. and their children in the U.S. In addition, the numbers in Table 3A shows that male respondents who have migrated to U.S. since baseline were more likely to live with parents and siblings who had migrated to the U.S. prior to baseline, particularly older and same gender siblings, relative to migrants who moved within Mexico. These results suggests than networks prior to migration have an important role in the subsequent decision to migrate.

In addition to influencing the initial decision to migrate, the presence of networks in the U.S. could affect the decision on the length of the migrants stay. Table 3.B shows the same variables for U.S. migrants, distinguishing between those who subsequently returned to Mexico and those who stayed in the U.S. The results show that the difference in the level of networks in the U.S is less significant when looking only at U.S. migrants. Even though male U.S migrant who are currently living in the U.S. are more likely to have relatives in the U.S. compared to return migrants, the presence of separate types of relatives is not significantly different between returners and stayers, with exception of siblings: current migrants are more likely to have siblings in US prior to migration and this result persist for the female sample. Moreover, the migration experience to the U.S. of co-resident parents and siblings at baseline is not significantly different between returners and stayers.

This preliminary evidence suggests that networks might be an important determinant for the migration decision but is not a strong predictor of the decision to stay in the U.S. In a later section, we will explore these relationships more rigorously in a regression framework that allows us to control for a broader group of characteristics measured at baseline both at the individual and household level.

Assimilation outcomes

A second goal of this paper is to determine the characteristics, prior to migration that have predictive power of the migrant's ability to assimilate in the U.S. For this analysis we will explore the sample of U.S. migrants interviewed in the U.S. in MxFLS2 and MxFLS3. In MxFLS2 we will use hourly earnings to explore the baseline characteristics associated with successful assimilation. Additionally, we will compare this for migrants that later stayed in the U.S. and for those that later returned to Mexico to see if baseline attributes had varying importance towards assimilation for these two groups.

Using MxFLS3 we explore, in addition to hourly wages, a broader group of markers of assimilation including: household per capita expenditure, knowledge of English, whether the migrant's spouse is in US conditional on being married, whether his/her children are in the U.S conditional on having children, and whether the migrants has sent remittances to Mexico in the last year.

For these analyses all panel members age 15 or older at the time of the interview in MxFLS3 form our sample. Table 4 shows basic statistics of the assimilation markers for our sample of respondents interviewed in U.S in the third wave.

3. Empirical specification

Selection

To calculate the probability of being a migrant we estimate two different models. We begin by estimating a multinomial logit to examine the probabilities of migration wthin Mexico and to the U.S. since 2002. The dependent variable measures the migration status of the respondent at the time of the MxFLS3 interview and takes three different values: 0 for never movers, 1 for respondents who migrated within Mexico for a period longer than one year since baseline, and 2 for those who migrate to the U.S. for a period longer than one year since baseline. The base outcome is never movers, therefore we are comparing those who have never migrated outside their locality of origin for a period longer than 12 months since 2002 with those who have moved within Mexico and those who have moved to the U.S. since baseline. This model can be summarized in the following regression framework:

$$mover_i = \beta_0 + x_i'\beta + \varepsilon_i \quad (1)$$

Where $mover_i$ is the migration status of individual *i* at the time of MxFLS3 and x_i' represents a rich set of controls measured at baseline, prior to any potential migration. It is important that the controls are measured at baseline, so that they are not a result of the respondents' future migration status. These models will shed light on the determinants of migration, both within Mexico and to the U.S.. Moreover, by comparing the coefficients between MX and U.S. migrants, we will explore whether the determinats of migration differ depending on the migrant's destination.

We complement this analysis with a logit model for the probability of staying in the U.S. conditional on being a U.S. migrant. This is a relevant analysis for the discussion of migratory policies, since the composition of Mexican migrants who decide to stay in the U.S. for the long term has implications for both countries. To shed light on the determinants of staying in the U.S. we estimate the following model:

$$(stay\ in\ US_i | U.S. migrant) = \alpha_0 + z_i'\alpha + \varepsilon_i \quad (2)$$

Where $(stay\ in\ US_i)$ is a dummy variable equal to 1 if the U.S. migrant is living in U.S. at the time of the MxFLS3 interview. In both models we use the same set of covariates measured at baseline. For the sake of clarity we only report the results that include all covariates simultaneosuly; however, we estimated each model including each set of variables one at a time and the coefficients that we report are robust to the inclusion of each new variable. The set of independent variables can be grouped in five main groups, which are chosen with the purpose of providing evidence on different hypotheses about migration currently posited in the migration literature. The first group of covariates are basic demographics including age and marital status. In the second group we add measures of human capital. While one strand of the literaure suggest that Mexican migrants are drwan from the lower tail of the income and education

distribution (negative selection hypothesis (Borjas, 1987)), another strand of the literature has found evidence of an inverted U-shape, where those at the bottom and the top of the distribution are the least likely to migrate (Chiquiar and Hanson, 2005; Fernández-Huertas Moraga (2011); Kaestner and Malamud, 2014; and Orrenius and Zavodny (2005)). Although previous studies have analyzied the composition of Mexican migrants living in the U.S., most of the analysis has been conducted using data measured after migration. This poses serious endogeneity challenges. By exploiting information measured at baseline we will make a contribution to this discussion in the literature.

An innovative feature of the MxFLS is that it collects information about social networks in the U.S. prior to migration. Migrating to the U.S. is costly and the presence of relatives in the U.S. can diminish the initial migration costs. Moreover, arriving to the U.S. with a social network can ease the assimilation process. Our third group of covariates includes variables for the number of relatives living in the U.S. prior to migration, and their relationship with our migrants.

We complement this set of covariates by adding a set of controls for household characteristics. In addition to the more standard variables like household size, we control for whether the respondent lives with a parent or sibling that has moved to the U.S. prior to the baseline. Prior experiences of co-resident relatives who return to Mexico might influence the decision to migrate to the U.S. In this group we also add variables that measure household resources. More assets at baseline can serve as an important resource to finance migration. Moreover, many studies have suggested that those with more assets in Mexico are more likely to keep ties with their home country and eventually return to Mexico. By adding this set of variables we will explore this hypothesis. Finally, we control for whether the respondent lives in a rural locality. The skills of rural farmers might be useful in agricultural and seasonal jobs in the U.S., which could make U.S. migration more appealing, profitable, and sustainable for these individuals.

Assimilation

The second part of the paper provides evidence about predictors of successful assimilation in the U.S. To do this we exploit information of U.S. migrants who were interviewed in U.S. during the second and/or the third waves of the MxFLS. The model follows a similar specification as equations 1 and 2, and other than education and height, all the covariates are measured at baseline.

Our markers of assimilation can be grouped into three main sets: first, economic markers of assimilation, where we include hourly earnings, household per capita expenditure, and remittances sent back to Mexico; second, assimilation into the American culture by looking at knowledge of English; and, third, household composition, by looking at whether the migrants lives with their children or spouse in the U.S.

4. Migration to the U.S.: Who migrates, who stays, and who returns to Mexico

The first goal of this paper is to explore the selectivity of both migration to the U.S. and return migration to Mexico. Four features of the data are key for these analyses.

First, we have detailed information about the lives of all the movers – and those who do not move – prior to the index international move (which occurred after 2002). Because of the design of MxFLS, these

analyses are not contaminated by undercounts of the most mobile migrants from Mexico in U.S. surveys or by the loss of complete households that move. The latter concern is an increasingly common phenomenon among Mexican-origin migrants and is clearly documented in MxFLS (Farfan et al, 2012.)

Second, we follow respondents who return to Mexico and have detailed information about their experiences in Mexico prior to moving, their experiences while in the U.S., and their experiences in Mexico once they return.

Third, detailed information about migration experiences, labor market outcomes, and human capital are recorded in every wave of the MxFLS. It is, therefore, possible to provide a rich description of the nature of selection of migrants into the U.S. relative to those who stayed in Mexico. Similarly, focusing on those respondents who moved to the U.S. during the hiatus between the baseline and first re-survey, we will describe the characteristics that distinguish those who subsequently return to Mexico with those who stay in the United States.

Fourth, whereas much of the information described above is recorded in surveys that have been used for analyses of selectivity of migrants, MxFLS contains a far richer array of information on the lives of respondents than has been used in prior analyses. This included information at baseline, before the migration event, not typically found in surveys used to analyze migration such as questions about own wealth and the wealth of household and family members, living arrangements, and the presence of networks in locations other than the baseline community.

Table 5 to 8 present preliminary results for males and females, respectively, age 15 and older at baseline in 2002. Tables 5 and 7 show the results of the multinomial logit for males and females respectively. For each sample we estimate two models that differ only on the measures used for the presence of networks in the U.S. The first model uses the number of relatives a respondent has in the U.S. at baseline as the measure of network presence while, in the second model, we disaggregate this variable by the relationship of the relative living in U.S. with our panel respondent. To highlight the role of individual and family factors in the selection process, these models include state fixed effects. Columns 3 and 6 show the level of significance of the coefficients that predict migration within Mexico and to the U.S. Moreover, in order to understand the factors that can affect staying in the U.S. for the longer haul, in tables 6 and 8 we show the results of a logit model that predicts permanence in the U.S. conditional on being an U.S. migrant for the sample of males and females respectively.

Results for males

Table 5 and 6 shows the results for males, both tables show odds ratios. There are four main results. First, young Mexicans are the most likely to move either within Mexico or to the U.S. and the effects of age is non-liner for both groups of movers, the older the respondent the less likely he will migrate. Moreover, the results in column 3 and 6 show that the effect of age is significantly different for the sample of movers within Mexico and U.S. migrants, as the youngest individuals are the most likely to move to the U.S. These patterns are unaffected by the choice of measure for networks in the U.S.

Second, human capital predicts migration both within Mexico and to the U.S., but the effects are different depending on the migrant's destination. For males, the odds of being a migrant within Mexico are 24% larger for those who have not completed high school relative to those with no education and the effect of education is non-linear, as those who have some college or more are the most likely to migrate within Mexico. Education predicts migration to the U.S. in a very different way. Males with primary complete or high school complete are between 39 to 44% more likely to to be U.S. migrants relative to those with no education. However, in stark contrast with migration within Mexico, those with some college or more are by far the least likely to move. This inverted U-shape has been established in many studies of migrants from Mexico to the United States.

We include additional dimensions of human capital in the models: parents' education, height and a non-verbal cognitive assessment (the Ravens Progressive Colored Matrices test). [1] We control for height in a non-linear way by adding dummy indicators for whether height falls in the second, third or fourth quartile of the distribution, with the first quartile category excluded. The results show that, while father's education positively affects the probability of migrating within Mexico, it decreases the likelihood of being a U.S. migrant. Interestingly, mother's education positively affects migration independently of the destination. Height, on the other hand, is not a significant predictor of within Mexico migration, but it does predict migration to the U.S. Finally, while respondents with higher cognitive scores are more likely to migrate within Mexico, this is not a significant predictor of migration to the U.S.

These results suggest that those in the lowest end of the distribution of education are the least likely to move to the United States, but having at least complete primary is enough to increase the likelihood of migrating to the U.S. However, the effect of education is non-linear and higher levels of education do not increase the probability of migrating and in fact being in the highest level of the education distribution (college or more) significantly diminishes the probability of migrating to the U.S. These results hold when we estimate a specification that does not include height and the Ravens score. If the expected income of individuals with higher levels of education is greater in Mexico than in the U.S., it is reasonable to find that better educated individuals are more likely to stay in their country. Expected income at home and abroad plays an important role in the migration decision, but does not explain the whole picture. The migration of an individual can be understood as the decision of the whole household to economically support the migration costs. In addition, networks at the destination place can decrease the expected costs of migration (initial living expenses, information costs) and therefore, play a crucial role in the migration process. This will be explored in our next set of results.

The effects of the presence of networks in U.S. prior to migration provide our third results of interest. Table 5 establishes that the presence of networks in the U.S. is a powerful predictor of migration. Results in column 2 show that male migrants are more likely to move to the U.S. the higher the number of relatives they have in the U.S. Moreover, the presence of parents, son/daughters, or siblings in the U.S increases the likelihood of moving to the U.S. These results make a clear statement that the presence of networks in the destination place is important for making the decision to move to the U.S.

[1] In this version of the model we include parent's education and cognitive score in a linear way because we do not find evidence of non-linear effects when controlling for disaggregated education levels.

The fourth main result is that living in a rural place at baseline has a different effect depending on whether the migrant is choosing to move within Mexico versus to the U.S. While living in rural places decreases the odds of migrating within Mexico for males, males living in rural areas are 46% more likely to migrate to the U.S. than male respondents who live in urban areas.

In addition to the covariates already discussed, the models control for a set of household characteristics that include household composition and household assets. These factors are relatively modest predictors of migration, with the exception of business ownership by the household at baseline and household wealth per capita at baseline. While having assets can help to provide the resources necessary to finance migration, it can also be a measure of a higher willingness to set roots in the place of origin. For our sample of male migrants we find evidence that supports the latter statement. Living in a household that owns a farm-business or a home reduces the likelihood of migrating independently of the destination; and, consistent with these results, we find that households in the highest percentiles of the wealth distribution are less likely to migrate within Mexico. On the other hand, wealth does not seem to be a strong determinant of migration to the U.S. in the sample of males.

While migration patterns to the U.S. have been characterized previously in the literature, the determinants of whom among U.S. migrants, stays in the U.S. for the longer haul has not been fully explored. Table 6 provides these estimates for the sample of male U.S. migrants. Contrary to the results discussed in the previous paragraphs, we find that age is not a predictor of whether a male migrant remains in the U.S over the longer term. Second, although education is a strong predictor of migration to the U.S., it does not have a significant effect on the probability of staying in the U.S. However, although the effects are not significant, we can see that among the Mexican males who move to the United States, those with some college education are also the least likely to remain in the United States for the longer term. Third, as in the previous model, the presence of networks in the U.S. is of significant importance. The more relatives in the U.S. the higher the probability the migrant stays, and having only one relative is enough to increase this probability. It is interesting to highlight that the presence of a spouse in U.S. at baseline does not increase the probability of staying for the sample of male migrants, which is consistent with the fact that a small percentage of males' spouses had migrated before them to U.S. Finally, we find that those with more assets in Mexico are less likely to migrate in the first place to the U.S., but once migration takes place they are more likely to stay. The availability of these resources might help to finance a longer-term stay in the destination country.

Results for females

Table 7 shows the results of the multinomial logit and table 8 the results of the logit model for the sample of females. The main results show that, first, similarly to what we found for males, young women are the most likely to migrate but age does not differentially affect the likelihood to migrate within Mexico or to the U.S. in this case.

Second, education is a significant predictor of migration independently of the migrant's destination. As for males, we find that female migrants with levels of education in the middle of the distribution (primary complete, and high school incomplete and complete) are more likely to migrate to the U.S. However,

contrary to males, we don't see a U-shape effect of education in the prediction of U.S. migration. The higher the education level the higher the probability of migration to the U.S. and females with complete high school have the highest odds of migrating to the U.S. Moreover, although having some college or more is not a significant predictor of migration to the U.S., its sign is positive in stark contrast to what was found for males. Height is also a significant predictor of migration: taller women are more likely to migrate and more likely to migrate to the U.S. On the other hand, the cognitive raven's score does not have predictive power for migration to the U.S. for women.

Third, as for males, the presence of networks in the U.S. also plays an important role in the migration process for females. Having relatives in the U.S. increases the probability of moving to the U.S. but, as expected, it does not affect within Mexico migration. Interestingly the effect sizes are considerably larger on these characteristics for women than for men.

Fourth, although there is suggestive evidence that coming from a rural locality increases the likelihood of migration to the U.S. for females, the effect is not significant in this case. Finally, owning a farm business increases the odds of migrating to the U.S. These results, together with what was found for males, suggest that having assets in Mexico help as a financial resource to facilitate the migration decision, rather than creating ties with the place of origin that are hard to break.

The results in table 8 provide the determinants of remaining in the U.S. for the sample of U.S. female migrants. Similar to what was found for males, the oldest women are the least likely to migrate to the U.S. in the first place and among migrants they are the least likely to remain in the country. Second, similarly to what was found for males, education does have a significant effect on the probability of staying for the longer term. Third, the presence of networks in the U.S. is of great importance. Particularly relevant for women's decision to stay in the U.S. is the presence of their spouse in the U.S. Finally, the results for the effect of wealth at the household level at baseline are very similar to what we found for males: being at the top of the distribution of wealth increases the odds of staying in the U.S.

These results provide evidence that selection into migration and, then, into laying down roots for the long haul are dissimilar processes determined by different characteristics and that longer term-migrants are not the same as those who migrate to the U.S. for the short term. These results raise questions about what characteristics, if any, are predictive of success in the labor market in the U.S. The next section addresses this question.

5. Assimilation

The second goal of this research is to provide evidence about predictors of markers for successful assimilation in the U.S. For this analysis we will exploit information collected in U.S. during the second and third waves of MxFLS. First, information collected in the second wave allows us to compare return migrants to those that stayed in the U.S. to determine whether characteristics at baseline predicted a more successful assimilation for either group. In this analysis, assimilation is measured as the individual level of earnings in the U.S. A second analysis we have conducted uses data from the third wave of MxFLS in which we measure assimilation outcomes for stayers whom we find and interview in the U.S.

Assimilation is measured with four different markers: the earnings of the migrant, the per capita expenditure in the U.S., whether the migrant has sent transfers to Mexico, knowledge of English, whether the migrants' spouse (conditional on being married) lives in U.S. and whether his/her children live in the U.S. (conditional on having children alive).

For each of these outcomes, we assess whether socio-economic and demographic characteristics measured at baseline are predictive of the extent of assimilation for the select group of migrants who have stayed in the U.S. By drawing on the same models that are used in the analyses of selectivity of migrants, we provide a comprehensive picture of those characteristics that are predictive of both selection into migration and success in the new destination. Further, comparing the extent of assimilation in these dimensions of those who continue to stay in the U.S. with those who return to Mexico provides insights into the likely mechanisms that underlie decisions to set down roots for the longer haul.

Table 9 shows the results of assimilation using the log of hourly U.S earnings measured in MxFLS2 for individuals age 15 or older at the time of the interview in U.S. as the outcome. In the first two columns we show the results for the entire sample of migrants interviewed in US in MxFLS2 who report positive earnings, the following two columns show the same estimations for the subset of migrants who subsequently returned to Mexico and the last two columns show the results for the group of migrants who stayed in the U.S. For each sample, we show two different estimation models as in the previous tables: the first one includes networks in U.S. measured as the number of relatives and the last one measures networks as the relationship of the migrants to their connections in the U.S. We focus the analysis on the results for education and networks in the U.S.

The results in Table 9 show that female migrants earn on average 30 percent less than males, and the coefficient is very similar for migrants who stayed in the U.S. or return to Mexico. Education levels achieved at baseline are significant only for the sample of stayers: migrants whom had some years of high school or completed college earn higher hourly earnings than those in the lowest category of education. However, education attained at baseline does not seem to have any effect on the level of earnings of migrants that subsequently returned back to Mexico.

The results for the variables that measure networks in US suggest that, even though their presence in the U.S. is an important predictor of migration, is not evident that they will determine a more successful assimilation in the U.S. Having extended family in the U.S. prior to migrate has a negative effect on the level of earnings and this effect holds only for return migrants, but the negative effect of having children living in U.S. affects migrants who are currently living in the U.S. It is possible that having children in U.S. affects the amount of time available to work, which could affect the improvement of the quality of jobs the migrant can get over time. The presence of a spouse, on the other hand, has positive effects on the earnings of the migrant. Spouses that have previously lived in U.S. may have the necessary contacts and the right incentives to improve the labor market networks of their partners.

Table 10 shows the results on what characteristics predict assimilation for the sample of U.S migrants who were found and interviewed in the third wave in the U.S., our sample of stayers. For this analysis we use the sample of individuals age 15 or older at the time of the interview in U.S. in MxFLS3. Table 10

shows the results for outcomes that measure economic assimilation: hourly earnings (columns 1 and 2), per capita expenditure (columns 3 and 4) and whether the individual sent transfers to Mexico (columns 5 and 6). Columns 1 and 2 show the results for the log of hourly earnings, and as in previous tables we estimate two models that differ by the measure of networks in U.S.

These results suggest that the gender wage gap that existed between migrants in the previous wave is still present in the most recent wave of the data; although, the gap reduced from around 30 to 20%. The measures of human capital show that education is an important determinant of higher earnings; but, its effect seems to be very linear.

Looking together at the results for the selection models and assimilation for stayers in Table 9, the results in Table 10 for networks in U.S. suggest that they not only predict migration to the U.S. but also affect how well the migrant does in the U.S. The results in Table 9 and Table 10 would together suggest that, the presence of relatives in the U.S. might have a positive effect on the level of earnings but, as suggested by Table 9, the effect is not immediate. The results using MxFLS3 show that the presence of two relatives in the U.S. increases earnings by 20 percent and in particular, siblings and the extended family are having a positive impact on the level of earnings.

Following the models for selection we control the assimilation estimates for household characteristics and, as in the previous models, these variables have a modest effect on the outcome of interest. However, a surprising result is the negative effect that being in the third quartile of the per capita wealth distribution in 2002 has on earnings. In future work we will explore non-parametric relationships to better understand these effects.

The results using the log of per capita expenditure PCE (columns 3 and 4) as the measure of assimilation confirm some of the results for earnings. In this analysis we keep only one observation per household and we keep the observation of the household head. A female household has a negative effect on the level of PCE and if the household head was married at baseline their current PCE is lower. A possible explanation put forth for this relationship is that these married household heads are spending less in the U.S. in order to send remittances to their families in Mexico; however, the results for transfers do not suggest that married individuals at baseline are more likely to send transfers. The education of the household is an important determinant of the level of expenditure of the household. Household heads in the top of the distribution of education have on average a higher PCE.

Networks once again are an interesting part of the assimilation story. While individuals with more relatives in the U.S. do better in terms of earnings they spend less in the U.S. As with married household heads, one potential explanation is that migrants with a larger network in the U.S may also have a larger network in Mexico and thus sends more transfers. However, the results for the likelihood of sending transfers do not show higher probabilities of sending transfers for migrants with a larger network in the U.S. In future stages of this work we will complement this analysis by looking at the savings of the household in U.S. in order to understand whether households with lower PCE are those with higher savings.

The last outcome of interest is whether the migrant sent transfers to Mexico in the last 12 months. An individual with deeper connections at home may have a more difficult time assimilating than an individual that does not leave as deep of roots in Mexico. Individuals that send transfers to Mexico might do it to keep savings back in Mexico or to invest in a business suggesting that the migrant has a plan to return to Mexico. Moreover, sending transfers to relatives as a financial help suggests that the migrant keeps deep roots in Mexico, which would affect their plans to stay in the U.S. permanently. When looking at transfers as an outcome we find very interesting results.

We find that individuals that are attending school in the U.S. are less likely to send remittances to Mexico by 28 percent. This may indicate that individuals that invest in their education in the U.S. have lower expectations of going back to Mexico; therefore, investing in maintaining relationships at home or investing at home is less necessary. Moreover, individuals with parents that are in the U.S. prior to migration are less likely to send remittances. Finally, the more recently the migrant has arrived to the U.S., the more likely he/she is to send remittances to Mexico. This result may suggest that the first few years after migration are the most important in terms of maintaining connections and thus a potential safety net back in Mexico.

Another important variable for measuring assimilation in the U.S. is the level of English that the migrant speaks. The higher the level of English the migrant possesses the easier it is for him/her to build a network outside the Mexican circle. Moreover, speaking English well can help the migrant attain better and more permanent employment. Table 11 shows the results for assimilation measured by how well the migrant speaks English. The measure for how well the respondent speaks English is self-reported and he/she must assess whether he/she speaks Very Good, Good, Fair, Bad, very Bad or does not speak English. We build an index variable equal to one if the migrant self-reports that he/she speaks Fair, Good or very Good English. The results in Table 11 show that human capital measures are an important determinant of the level of English that the migrant speaks. The higher the education attained by the time of MxFLS3 the better the English spoken by the migrant. Further, this effect is non-linear, the higher the education attained the higher its impact on the respondent's English. Moreover, if the migrant attended school in the U.S. they, as expected, speak better English. Another measure of human capital is also an important determinant of this measure of assimilation as a higher cognitive score has a positive relationship to English proficiency. In addition, the earlier the migrant arrived to the U.S. the better his/her knowledge of the foreign language. Interestingly, the presence of networks in U.S. does not seem to have a positive or negative effect on the respondent's level of English assimilation.

Finally, we analyze living arrangements in the U.S. as a proxy for assimilation (whether the migrant's spouse or children live in the U.S.). Table 12 shows the results for whether the migrant's spouse lives in the U.S. conditional on him/her being married and for whether the migrant's children live in the U.S. conditional on him/her having children alive. We show these results disaggregated by gender.

Interesting results are found for the presence of networks in the U.S. on this measure of assimilation. For instance, while the number of relatives in the U.S. at baseline is predictive of whether males' children are in the U.S. in the third wave, this does not matter for women. Although the network size is not significant for females, whether her parents were in the U.S. prior to migration increases the likelihood of her

children being with her in the U.S. at the time of the MxFLS3 survey. In terms of having one's spouse in the U.S. in the third wave we find that baseline characteristics do not have predictive power for females. For males, on the other hand, there are some noteworthy results.

First, owning a farm business at baseline increases the likelihood of having a spouse in U.S. in the third wave, while being in the second quartile of the per capita wealth distribution decreases this probability. Second, the later the arrival date of the migrant the less likely that his spouse is with him at follow-up, which could suggest that a male migrant arrives alone first with a possible reunion with his spouse once a secure foundation has been established by the migrant.

6. Discussion and Future Work

In summary, the analyses presented in this research provide new insights into the mechanisms that underlie the selectivity of migrants within Mexico, how they differ from migrants who move from Mexico to the United States and how those who return differ from those migrants who remain in the United States over the longer haul. By estimating parallel models of multiple markers of assimilation in the United States, we can draw conclusions about the predictors of both selection into migration and the predictors of success in the destination among those who move and stay.

Human capital (as measured by education and cognitive skills) are predictive of migration within Mexico and to the United States. Those who move to the United States are not likely to be drawn from the bottom or top of the education distribution. Moreover, migrants in the middle of the education distribution are not only the most likely to migrate to the U.S. but once migration takes place they are also the most likely to stay. Moreover, conditional on moving to the United States, having a level of education higher than high school incomplete increases the migrant's earnings in the short term, but in the long run there is little evidence that education carries a premium in terms of earnings in the labor market. This is in sharp contrast with results for natives in the United States.

In contrast, having relatives in the United States is not only a powerful predictor of migration to the United States but it is also predictive of success in the labor market. Specifically, males are more likely to move to the United States if their spouse, a parent, child or sibling was living in the United States. The presence of a child or sibling is predictive of staying in the United States (at least for males), and having siblings or extended family in the U.S. prior to migration is predictive of elevated earnings.

7. References

Borjas, G.J., (1987). "Self-selection and the earnings of immigrants." *American Economic Review* 77, 531–553.

Chiquiar, D., and G.H. Hanson, (2005). "International migration, self-selection, and the distribution of wages: evidence from Mexico and the United States." Journal of Political Economy, Vol. 113, No. 2, pp. 239-281.

Donato, K. M., Durand, J., Massey, D. S. (1992). "Stemming the Tide? Assessing the Deterrent Effects of the Immigration Reform and Control Act," *Demography*, Vol. 29, No. 2, pp. 139–157.

Durand, J., W. Kandel, E. Parrado and D. Massey. (1996). International migration and development in Mexican communities, *Demography*, 33.2:249-64.

Durand, J., D. Massey, and R. Zenteno. (2001). "Mexican migration to the United States: Continuities and Changes", *Latin American Research Review*, 36.1:107-27.

Farfan, M., M. Genoni, L. Rubalcava, G. Teruel, D. Thomas and A. Velasquez. (2012). Mexicans in America. Mimeo.

Fernández-Huertas Moraga, J. (2011). New Evidence on Emigrant Selection. *The Review of Economics and Statistics,* 93(1):72-96

Hanson, G.H. (2006). Illegal Migration from Mexico to the United States. *Journal of Economic Literature,* 44(4), 869-924

Hoefer, M., Rytina, N., and C. Campbell (2006). Estimates of the Unauthorized Immigrant Population Residing in the United States: January 2005. Washington, DC: Office of Immigration Statistics, Policy Directorate, U.S. Department of Homeland Security.

Ibarraran, P. and D. Lubotsky (2007) .Mexican Immigration and Self-Selection: New Evidence from the 2000 Mexican census. In G. J. Borjas (ed) *Mexican Immigration to the United States.* University of Chicago Press.

Kaestner, R. and O. Malamud (2014). "Self-Selection and International Migration: New Evidence from Mexico" *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 96(1): 78–91

Massey, D. S., R. Alarcon, J. Durand, H. Gonzalez. (1990). *Return to Aztlan: The Social Process of International Migration from Western Mexico,* University of California Press.

Massey, D. and A. Singer. (1995). New estimates of undocumented Mexican migration and the probability of apprehension. *Demography*, 32.2:203-13.

McKenzie, D and H. Rapoport. (2004). Network effects and the dynamics of migration and inequality: Theory and evidence from Mexico.

Orrenius, P. M., and M. Zavodny, (2005) ''Self-Selection among Undocumented Immigrants from Mexico,'' *Journal of Development Economics* 78:1, 215–240.

Rendall, M., P Brownell and S. Kups. (2011). Declining return migration from the United States to Mexico in the late 2000s Recession. *Demography.* 48.3:1049-58.

Table 1. Sample sizes and recontact rates in MxFLS

Panel A. Recontact rates in MxFLS2

	All			Age in 2002>=15		
	Eligible for survey	Interviewed	% Interviewed	Eligible for survey	Interviewed	% Interviewed
Total	35,134	31,338	89.20	23,222	20,612	88.76
In Mexico	34,280	30,564	89.16	22,606	20,055	88.72
In US	854	774	90.63	616	557	90.42

Source: MxFLS

Note - Excluded panel respondents who died between waves

Panel B. Recontact rates in MxFLS3

	All			Age in 2002>=15		
	Eligible for survey	Interviewed	% Interviewed	Eligible for survey	Interviewed	% Interviewed
Total	34,365	30,834	89.73	22,492	19,966	88.77
In Mexico	32,495	29,136	89.66	21,254	18,841	88.65
In US	1,870	1,698	90.80	1,238	1,125	90.87
US sample ivw in MX		659			494	
US sample ivw in US		1,039			631	

Source: MxFLS

Note - Excluded panel respondents who died between waves

Table 2. Migration between baseline and MxFLS3
Respondents Age>=15 at baseline (2002)

	MALE	FEMALE	Total
0.Non movers	7,008	8,360	15,368
since 2002	*79.08*	*81.92*	*80.6*
1.Movers within Mexico	1,101	1,364	2,465
since 2002	*12.42*	*13.37*	*12.93*
2.Moved to U.S.	397	188	585
and returned	*4.48*	*1.84*	*3.07*
3.Moved to U.S.	356	293	649
and stayed	*4.02*	*2.87*	*3.4*
Total	8,862	10,205	19,067
col%	*100*	*100*	*100*

Table 3.A U.S. Networks reported at baseline by migration status and migration status before 2002 of other household members

Panel A

	MALE				
	MX mover		US Mover		P-value
Variables measured at baseline	mean	sd	mean	sd	Diff
% Has relatives in US	45.45	49.82	69.89	45.90	0.00
# of relatives in US	0.75	1.05	1.37	1.29	0.00
% Spouse in US	0.09	3.02	0.40	6.30	0.16
% Parents in US	1.29	11.31	5.11	22.04	0.00
% Daughter/son in US	1.31	11.37	5.85	23.49	0.00
% Siblings in US	12.65	33.26	27.30	44.59	0.00
% Extended family in US	16.42	37.08	20.92	40.71	0.04
% Parents migrated within MX before 2002	14.08	34.80	19.92	39.97	0.00
% Parents migrated to US before 2002	0.27	5.22	1.73	13.03	0.00
% Siblings migrated within MX before 2002	3.45	18.26	4.12	19.88	0.46
% Siblings migrated to US before 2002	0.64	7.95	1.33	11.45	0.12
% Older sibling migrated within MX before 2002	0.00	0.00	1.20	10.87	0.00
% Older sibling migrated to US before 2002	0.00	0.00	0.80	8.90	0.00
% Same gender sibling migrated within MX before 2002	2.27	14.90	1.20	10.87	0.09
% Same gender sibling migrated to US before 2002	0.27	5.22	1.33	11.45	0.01

Panel B

	FEMALE				
	MX Mover		US Mover		P-value
Variables measured at baseline	mean	sd	mean	sd	Diff
% Has relatives in US	50.16	50.02	78.04	41.44	0.00
# of relatives in US	0.88	1.12	1.69	1.37	0.00
% Spouse in US	1.48	12.08	9.39	29.21	0.00
% Parents in US	3.19	17.59	8.78	28.33	0.00
% Daughter/son in US	2.04	14.16	10.00	30.04	0.00
% Siblings in US	15.80	36.49	37.56	48.49	0.00
% Extended family in US	16.54	37.17	17.32	37.89	0.72
% Parents migrated within MX before 2002	16.13	36.79	16.63	37.28	0.80
% Parents migrated to US before 2002	1.03	10.08	1.66	12.80	0.27
% Siblings migrated within MX before 2002	3.01	17.08	2.29	14.96	0.41
% Siblings migrated to US before 2002	0.59	7.64	0.83	9.09	0.57
% Older sibling migrated within MX before 2002	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
% Older sibling migrated to US before 2002	0.00	0.00	0.21	4.56	0.09
% Same gender sibling migrated within MX before 2002	1.69	12.88	1.25	11.11	0.51
% Same gender sibling migrated to US before 2002	0.37	6.05	0.42	6.44	0.88

Table 3.B U.S. Networks reported at baseline by migration status and migration status before 2002 of other household members

Panel A

	MALE				
	US Returner		US Stayer		P-value
Variables measured at baseline	mean	sd	mean	sd	Diff
% Has relatives in US	66.23	47.35	73.93	43.97	0.02
# of relatives in US	1.27	1.26	1.48	1.31	0.03
% Spouse in US	0.25	5.02	0.56	7.48	0.50
% Parents in US	4.31	20.33	5.98	23.75	0.34
% Daughter/son in US	5.15	22.15	6.59	24.86	0.47
% Siblings in US	21.99	41.49	32.97	47.10	0.00
% Extended family in US	20.27	40.27	21.61	41.24	0.70
% Parents migrated within MX before 2002	21.16	40.89	18.54	38.92	0.37
% Parents migrated to US before 2002	1.26	11.17	2.25	14.84	0.30
% Siblings migrated within MX before 2002	3.27	17.82	5.06	21.94	0.22
% Siblings migrated to US before 2002	1.76	13.18	0.84	9.15	0.27
% Older sibling migrated within MX before 2002	0.50	7.09	1.97	13.90	0.07
% Older sibling migrated to US before 2002	0.76	8.67	0.84	9.15	0.89
% Same gender sibling migrated within MX before 2002	1.01	10.00	1.40	11.78	0.62
% Same gender sibling migrated to US before 2002	1.76	13.18	0.84	9.15	0.27

Panel B

	FEMALE				
	US Returner		US Stayer		P-value
Variables measured at baseline	mean	sd	mean	sd	Diff
% Has relatives in US	74.16	43.90	80.50	39.69	0.11
# of relatives in US	1.52	1.35	1.79	1.38	0.04
% Spouse in US	5.35	22.56	11.99	32.54	0.02
% Parents in US	5.95	23.73	10.57	30.80	0.10
% Daughter/son in US	12.50	33.18	8.40	27.79	0.18
% Siblings in US	23.75	42.69	46.40	49.97	0.00
% Extended family in US	20.63	40.59	15.20	35.97	0.16
% Parents migrated within MX before 2002	16.49	37.21	16.72	37.38	0.95
% Parents migrated to US before 2002	0.53	7.29	2.39	15.30	0.12
% Siblings migrated within MX before 2002	1.06	10.29	3.07	17.28	0.15
% Siblings migrated to US before 2002	0.00	0.00	1.37	11.62	0.11
% Older sibling migrated within MX before 2002	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
% Older sibling migrated to US before 2002	0.00	0.00	0.34	5.84	0.42
% Same gender sibling migrated within MX before 2002	1.06	10.29	1.37	11.62	0.77
% Same gender sibling migrated to US before 2002	0.00	0.00	0.68	8.25	0.26

Table 4. Characteristics current U.S. migrants - Panel members age>=15 in MxFLS3

Variables measured in MxFLS3	mean	sd
Age in MxFLS3	30.35	12.46
% Female	41.25	49.25
Years of education	8.51	3.45
Height (cm)	161.43	10.11
Household size	3.10	1.74
% Married - conditional on age>=12	56.78	49.57
% Spouse in HH - conditional on married	82.70	37.87
% Has children alive	60.66	62.72
% Has children in US - conditional on having ch alive	82.12	38.36
% Worked last week	74.33	43.71
Ln(Hourly earnings)	2.00	0.72
% Speaks English Fair - Good or Very Good	44.64	49.74
% Has sent transfers to Mexico	67.06	47.02
Sample size	943	

Table 5. Prediction of migration within Mexico and to the US since baseline 2002 - MALES

Respondents Age>=15 at baseline

Multinomial Logit - Base Outcome: never migrated since baseline

	Model 1			Model 2		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Variables measured at baseline	Moved within Mexico since 2002	Moved to US since 2002	Difference	Moved within Mexico since 2002	Moved to US since 2002	Difference
Basic demographics						
(1) Age: 20- 24 Omitted 15-19	1.074	0.798*	**	1.113	0.844	**
	[0.137]	[0.106]		[0.142]	[0.112]	
(1) Age: 25-34	0.782+	0.491***	***	0.762**	0.475***	***
	[0.106]	[0.073]		[0.104]	[0.071]	
(1) Age: 35-49	0.531***	0.264***	***	0.504***	0.246***	***
	[0.081]	[0.045]		[0.078]	[0.042]	
(1) Age> 50	0.373***	0.101***	***	0.426***	0.094***	***
	[0.066]	[0.023]		[0.075]	[0.022]	
(1) Married	1.331***	0.927	***	1.316**	0.854	**
	[0.142]	[0.108]		[0.143]	[0.102]	
Human Capital						
Respondent's Education						
(1) Primary complete Omitted Primay incomplete	0.954	1.392**	**	0.899	1.389**	**
	[0.112]	[0.185]		[0.105]	[0.186]	
(1) High school incomplete	1.240*	1.378**		1.151	1.364**	
	[0.143]	[0.190]		[0.132]	[0.188]	
(1) High scool complete	1.276	1.436*		1.197	1.402	
	[0.218]	[0.298]		[0.204]	[0.292]	
(1) Some college or more	2.006***	0.833	***	1.847***	0.848	***
	[0.296]	[0.181]		[0.272]	[0.185]	
Father's Education	0.99	0.962**		0.991	0.968**	*
	[0.012]	[0.015]		[0.012]	[0.015]	
Mother's Education	1.034**	1.031*		1.034**	1.037**	
	[0.014]	[0.017]		[0.014]	[0.017]	
(1) Quartile 2 height	0.786	2.267**	***	0.722	2.243**	**
	[0.183]	[0.864]		[0.166]	[0.856]	
(1) Quartile 3 height	0.803	2.050*	**	0.745	2.046*	**
	[0.173]	[0.752]		[0.158]	[0.751]	
(1) Quartile 4 height	0.783	1.887*	**	0.715	1.869*	**
	[0.169]	[0.690]		[0.152]	[0.683]	
Z score Raven's Score	1.110**	0.985		1.116**	0.992	
	[0.053]	[0.055]		[0.054]	[0.055]	

Continue on next page

Table 5. Prediction of migration within Mexico and to the US since baseline 2002 - MALES

Respondents Age>=15 at baseline

Multinomial Logit - Base Outcome: never migrated since baseline

	Model 1			Model 2		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Variables measuredat baseline	Moved within Mexico since 2002	Moved to US since 2002	Difference	Moved within Mexico since 2002	Moved to US since 2002	Difference
Networks in the U.S.						
(1) One relative in US Omitted No relatives in US	0.956	1.850**	***			
	[0.080]	[0.199]				
(1) Two relatives in US	0.904	1.949**	***			
	[0.108]	[0.258]				
(1) Three or more relatives in US	0.846	2.547**	***			
	[0.116]	[0.333]				
(1) Spouse in US				1.283	5.252**	
				[1.280]	[3.867]	
(1) Any parent in US				0.856	1.849**	**
				[0.297]	[0.465]	
(1) Daughter/Son in US				0.346***	2.877***	***
				[0.120]	[0.654]	
(1) Siblings in US				0.97	2.060***	***
				[0.121]	[0.241]	
(1) Extended family in US				0.885	1.148	
				[0.103]	[0.143]	
Household characteristics						
Household size	0.978	1.032	***	0.966*	1.043*	**
	[0.020]	[0.023]		[0.020]	[0.023]	
# of siblings (co-resident and non co-resident)	1.059	1.018		1.090**	1.02	
	[0.038]	[0.038]		[0.040]	[0.038]	
(1) Co-resident sibling moved to U.S. before 20(	3.762***	2.197*		3.825***	2.053	
	[1.780]	[0.969]		[1.804]	[0.939]	
(1) Co-resident parent moved to U.S. before 200	0.364	0.962		0.350*	1.038	
	[0.229]	[0.316]		[0.217]	[0.340]	
(1) HH own farm business	0.736***	1.163	***	0.757**	1.182	***
	[0.081]	[0.123]		[0.083]	[0.125]	
(1) HH own a house	0.659***	0.753***		0.664***	0.736***	
	[0.050]	[0.069]		[0.050]	[0.067]	
(1) HH own a non-farm business	0.936	1.187	**	0.931	1.247*	*
	[0.093]	[0.138]		[0.093]	[0.145]	
(1) Quartile 2 wealth per capita	0.98	1.119		1	1.148	
	[0.097]	[0.129]		[0.100]	[0.133]	
(1) Quartile 3 wealth per capita	0.756***	1.061	**	0.782**	1.098	**
	[0.080]	[0.134]		[0.083]	[0.139]	
(1) Quartile 4 wealth per capita	0.682***	0.968	*	0.701***	0.991	*
	[0.081]	[0.145]		[0.084]	[0.148]	
Locality characteristics						
(1) Rural	0.779***	1.460***	***	0.807***	1.434***	***
	[0.064]	[0.148]		[0.067]	[0.147]	
Constant	0.192***	0.020***		0.220***	0.023***	
	[0.059]	[0.010]		[0.067]	[0.011]	
Sample size	**8,872**	**8,872**		**8,872**	**8,872**	
R-squared	0.123	0.123		0.132	0.132	

Robust standard errors in brackets

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Note: Includes State of origin Fixed Effects

Table 6. Prediction of staying in the U.S.
conditional on have migrated to U.S. since baseline 2002 - MALES

Logit estimated for respondents Age>=15 at baseline

	Stayed in U.S. =1	
Variables measuredat baseline	(1)	(2)
Basic demographics		
(1) Age: 20- 24 Omitted 15-19	0.673	0.692
	[0.164]	[0.171]
(1) Age: 25-34	0.795	0.77
	[0.222]	[0.217]
(1) Age: 35-49	1.058	1.002
	[0.352]	[0.339]
(1) Age> 50	0.561	0.444
	[0.263]	[0.228]
(1) Married	0.874	0.873
	[0.219]	[0.225]
Human Capital		
Respondent's Education		
(1) Primary complete Omitted Primay incomplete	1.155	1.13
	[0.206]	[0.202]
(1) High school incomplete	1.116	1.123
	[0.165]	[0.168]
(1) High scool complete	1.224	1.208
	[0.310]	[0.306]
(1) Some college or more	0.637	0.66
	[0.193]	[0.202]
Father's Education	1.009	1.008
	[0.030]	[0.030]
Mother's Education	1.011	1.012
	[0.032]	[0.032]
(1) Quartile 2 height	0.874	0.892
	[0.182]	[0.188]
(1) Quartile 3 height	1.25	1.217
	[0.184]	[0.182]
(1) Quartile 4 wealth height	0.88	0.878
	[0.131]	[0.133]
Z score Raven's Score	0.904	0.893
	[0.090]	[0.090]
Networks in the U.S.		
(1) One relative in US Omitted No relatives in US	1.539*	
	[0.323]	
(1) Two relatives in US	1.3	
	[0.330]	
(1) Three or more relatives in US	1.550+	
	[0.384]	
(1) Spouse in US		1.636
		[2.110]
(1) Any parent in US		1.212
		[0.461]
(1) Daughter/Son in US		2.138+
		[0.966]
(1) Siblings in US		1.824**
		[0.401]
(1) Extended family in US		1.421
		[0.346]

Continue on next page

Table 6. Prediction of staying in the U.S. conditional on have migrated to U.S. since baseline 2002 - MALES

Logit estimated for respondents Age>=15 at baseline

	Stayed in U.S. =1	
Variables measuredat baseline	(1)	(2)
Household characteristics		
Household size	0.932	0.939
	[0.045]	[0.046]
# of siblings (co-resident and non co-resident)	1.042	1.026
	[0.073]	[0.075]
(1) Co-resident sibling moved to U.S. before 2002	0.392	0.303+
	[0.262]	[0.197]
(1) Co-resident parent moved to U.S. before 2002	1.592	1.611
	[1.001]	[1.006]
(1) HH own farm business	1.191	1.124
	[0.251]	[0.234]
(1) HH own a house	0.924	0.923
	[0.169]	[0.170]
(1) HH own a non-farm business	1.154	1.081
	[0.247]	[0.234]
(1) Quartile 2 wealth per capita	1.071	1.024
	[0.238]	[0.232]
(1) Quartile 3 wealth per capita	1.355	1.312
	[0.332]	[0.326]
(1) Quartile 4 wealth per capita	2.568**	2.416**
	[0.751]	[0.715]
Locality characteristics		
(1) Rural	1.283	1.292
	[0.245]	[0.250]
Constant	0.369+	0.403+
	[0.199]	[0.220]
Sample size	**755**	**755**
R-squared	0.061	0.067

Robust standard errors in brackets

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Note: Includes State of origin Fixed Effects

Table 7. Prediction of migration within Mexico and to the US since baseline 2002 - FEMALES

Respondents Age>=15 at baseline

Multinomial Logit - Base Outcome: never migrated since baseline

	Model 1			Model 2		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Variables measured at baseline	Moved within Mexico since 2002	Moved to US since 2002	Difference	Moved within Mexico since 2002	Moved to US since 2002	Difference
Basic demographics						
(1) Age: 20- 24 Omitted 15-19	1.048	1.288*		1.05	1.248	
	[0.115]	[0.194]		[0.115]	[0.193]	
(1) Age: 25-34	0.658***	0.699**		0.648***	0.603***	
	[0.074]	[0.119]		[0.074]	[0.107]	
(1) Age: 35-49	0.379***	0.416***		0.366***	0.345***	
	[0.048]	[0.084]		[0.047]	[0.073]	
(1) Age> 50	0.363***	0.237***		0.366***	0.221***	
	[0.055]	[0.062]		[0.056]	[0.058]	
(1) Married	0.963	0.699***	**	1.023	0.593***	***
	[0.085]	[0.092]		[0.090]	[0.084]	
Human Capital						
Respondent's Education						
(1) Primary complete Omitted Primay incomplete	1.285**	1.378*		1.222*	1.426**	
	[0.131]	[0.241]		[0.126]	[0.257]	
(1) High school incomplete	1.263**	1.860***	**	1.198*	1.920***	**
	[0.137]	[0.337]		[0.131]	[0.358]	
(1) High scool complete	1.483***	2.276***	*	1.387**	2.477***	**
	[0.224]	[0.552]		[0.210]	[0.607]	
(1) Some college or more	1.917***	1.277		1.783***	1.429	
	[0.272]	[0.343]		[0.255]	[0.390]	
Father's Education	0.986	0.971		0.99	0.977	
	[0.011]	[0.017]		[0.011]	[0.018]	
Mother's Education	1.015	0.989		1.017	0.994	
	[0.012]	[0.020]		[0.012]	[0.021]	
(1) Quartile 2 height	1.053	1.017		1.05	1.052	
	[0.088]	[0.138]		[0.088]	[0.146]	
(1) Quartile 3 height	1.108	1.197		1.089	1.304*	
	[0.110]	[0.179]		[0.109]	[0.197]	
(1) Quartile 4 height	1.327*	1.950***	*	1.289	2.076***	*
	[0.227]	[0.454]		[0.222]	[0.494]	
Z score Raven's Score	1.116***	1.077		1.107**	1.071	
	[0.045]	[0.066]		[0.045]	[0.068]	

Continued on next page

Table 7. Prediction of migration within Mexico and to the US since baseline 2002 - FEMALES

Respondents Age>=15 at baseline

Multinomial Logit - Base Outcome: never migrated since baseline

	Model 1			Model 2		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Variables measuredat baseline	Moved within Mexico since 2002	Moved to US since 2002	Difference	Moved within Mexico since 2002	Moved to US since 2002	Difference
Networks in the U.S.						
(1) One relative in US Omitted No relatives in US	0.931	2.257***	***			
	[0.072]	[0.303]				
(1) Two relatives in US	1.106	2.929***	***			
	[0.114]	[0.474]				
(1) Three or more relatives in US	0.983	4.416***	***			
	[0.112]	[0.669]				
(1) Spouse in US				0.851	5.888***	***
				[0.211]	[1.254]	
(1) Any parent in US				1.514*	3.462***	***
				[0.313]	[0.737]	
(1) Daughter/Son in US				0.569*	5.282***	***
				[0.130]	[1.149]	
(1) Siblings in US				1.003	2.939***	***
				[0.097]	[0.368]	
(1) Extended family in US				0.994	1.479***	**
				[0.097]	[0.216]	
Household characteristics						
Household size	1.012	0.940*	**	1	0.965	
	[0.018]	[0.030]		[0.018]	[0.031]	
# of siblings (co-resident and non co-resident)	1.03	1.086*		1.062*	1.093*	
	[0.034]	[0.053]		[0.036]	[0.054]	
(1) Co-resident sibling moved to U.S. before 200	2.510*	1.254		2.237	1.282	
	[1.251]	[0.804]		[1.097]	[0.819]	
(1) Co-resident parent moved to U.S. before 200	1.619	1.469		1.619	1.522	
	[0.603]	[0.642]		[0.603]	[0.679]	
(1) HH own farm business	0.679***	1.328**	***	0.691***	1.393**	***
	[0.068]	[0.169]		[0.069]	[0.180]	
(1) HH own a house	0.553***	0.87	***	0.568***	0.834	***
	[0.038]	[0.098]		[0.040]	[0.096]	
(1) HH own a non-farm business	0.963	1.054		0.961	1.102	
	[0.087]	[0.145]		[0.087]	[0.154]	
(1) Quartile 2 wealth per capita	1.097	0.844	*	1.104	0.827	
	[0.099]	[0.128]		[0.100]	[0.127]	
(1) Quartile 3 wealth per capita	0.914	0.864		0.915	0.826	
	[0.089]	[0.136]		[0.090]	[0.131]	
(1) Quartile 4 wealth per capita	0.935	0.962		0.928	0.938	
	[0.102]	[0.163]		[0.103]	[0.162]	
Locality characteristics						
(1) Rural	0.856**	1.191	***	0.867*	1.038	*
	[0.063]	[0.139]		[0.065]	[0.127]	
Constant	0.197***	0.019***		0.203***	0.022***	
	[0.044]	[0.008]		[0.046]	[0.009]	
Sample size	**10,195**	**10,195**		**10,195**	**10,195**	
R-squared	0.113	0.113		0.131	0.131	

Robust standard errors in brackets

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Note: Includes State of origin Fixed Effects

Table 8. Prediction of staying in the U.S.
conditional on have migrated to U.S. since baseline 2002 - FEMALES

Logit estimated for respondents Age>=15 at baseline

	Stayed in U.S. =1	
Variables measuredat baseline	(1)	(2)
Basic demographics		
(1) Age: 20- 24 Omitted 15-19	1.174	1.145
	[0.407]	[0.403]
(1) Age: 25-34	1.054	0.891
	[0.405]	[0.354]
(1) Age: 35-49	0.352*	0.323*
	[0.156]	[0.149]
(1) Age> 50	0.130**	0.155**
	[0.077]	[0.100]
(1) Married	1.364	1.324
	[0.441]	[0.465]
Human Capital		
Respondent's Education		
(1) Primary complete Omitted Primay incomplete	1	0.967
	[0.246]	[0.240]
(1) High school incomplete	0.911	0.893
	[0.180]	[0.184]
(1) High scool complete	1.335	1.336
	[0.404]	[0.405]
(1) Some college or more	0.839	0.912
	[0.306]	[0.347]
Father's Education	0.933	0.941
	[0.043]	[0.043]
Mother's Education	1.002	0.997
	[0.044]	[0.043]
(1) Quartile 2 height	0.987	0.946
	[0.202]	[0.198]
(1) Quartile 3 height	0.881	0.896
	[0.206]	[0.215]
(1) Quartile 4 height	1.12	1.148
	[0.333]	[0.337]
Z score Raven's Score	0.919	0.88
	[0.131]	[0.126]
Networks in the U.S.		
(1) One relative in US Omitted No relatives in US	1.067	
	[0.346]	
(1) Two relatives in US	1.036	
	[0.393]	
(1) Three or more relatives in US	1.278	
	[0.478]	
(1) Spouse in US		2.536*
		[1.204]
(1) Any parent in US		1.34
		[0.569]
(1) Daughter/Son in US		1.763
		[0.910]
(1) Siblings in US		2.412**
		[0.673]
(1) Extended family in US		1.393
		[0.491]

Continue on next page

Table 8. Prediction of staying in the U.S. conditional on have migrated to U.S. since baseline 2002 - FEMALES

Logit estimated for respondents Age>=15 at baseline

	Stayed in U.S. =1	
Variables measuredat baseline	(1)	(2)
Household characteristics		
Household size	0.924	0.927
	[0.062]	[0.066]
# of siblings (co-resident and non co-resident)	0.946	0.965
	[0.089]	[0.096]
(1) Co-resident sibling moved to U.S. before 2002		
(1) Co-resident parent moved to U.S. before 2002	2.539	2.681
	[2.802]	[3.066]
(1) HH own farm business	1.337	1.327
	[0.436]	[0.443]
(1) HH own a house	1.128	1.123
	[0.287]	[0.307]
(1) HH own a non-farm business	1.178	1.261
	[0.375]	[0.425]
(1) Quartile 2 wealth per capita	1.264	1.334
	[0.401]	[0.437]
(1) Quartile 3 wealth per capita	1.41	1.291
	[0.464]	[0.448]
(1) Quartile 4 wealth per capita	4.183**	4.232**
	[1.811]	[1.863]
Locality characteristics		
(1) Rural	1.527	1.477
	[0.455]	[0.445]
Constant	0.682	0.521
	[0.474]	[0.368]
Sample size	**475**	**475**
R-squared	0.152	0.178

Robust standard errors in brackets

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Note: Includes State of origin Fixed Effects

Table 9. Estimation of predictors of assimilation in U.S. - MxFLS2
Dependent variable US Ln(Hourly Earnings) measured in MxFLS2

	All		Returners		Stayers	
Variables measured at baseline	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Basic demographics						
(1) Age: 15-19 Omiited Age<15	0.21*	0.17	0.18	0.08	0.2	0.1
	[0.107]	[0.137]	[0.169]	[0.224]	[0.146]	[0.196]
(1) Age: 20-24	0.27**	0.23	0.33	0.27	0.24	0.14
	[0.124]	[0.146]	[0.222]	[0.272]	[0.159]	[0.195]
(1) Age: 25-34	0.33**	0.28*	0.31	0.23	0.3	0.2
	[0.140]	[0.165]	[0.215]	[0.289]	[0.193]	[0.220]
(1) Age: 35-49	0.27	0.29	0.17	0.24	0.32	0.29
	[0.167]	[0.187]	[0.269]	[0.310]	[0.232]	[0.262]
(1) Age: >50	-0.21	-0.12	-1.11	-0.96	0.66*	0.59*
	[0.405]	[0.363]	[0.714]	[0.646]	[0.348]	[0.337]
(1) Female	-0.30***	-0.33***	-0.34**	-0.38**	-0.30***	-0.32***
	[0.082]	[0.088]	[0.152]	[0.168]	[0.095]	[0.102]
(1) Married	0.01	-0.02	0.09	-0.02	0.04	0.02
	[0.085]	[0.087]	[0.165]	[0.183]	[0.092]	[0.095]
Human capital						
Respondent's Education						
(1) Primary complete Omitted Primay incomplete	-0.03	-0.04	-0.12	-0.04	0.06	0.04
	[0.083]	[0.079]	[0.143]	[0.133]	[0.100]	[0.103]
(1) High school incomplete	0.08	0.08	-0.03	0.03	0.20**	0.21**
	[0.079]	[0.079]	[0.150]	[0.150]	[0.094]	[0.093]
(1) High scool complete	-0.05	-0.06	-0.22	-0.23	0.1	0.07
	[0.108]	[0.109]	[0.232]	[0.221]	[0.140]	[0.145]
(1) Some college or more	0.18	0.17	-0.01	-0.02	0.39*	0.40**
	[0.141]	[0.134]	[0.204]	[0.207]	[0.201]	[0.190]
Father's years of education	-0.01	-0.01	-0.03*	-0.03*	0	0
	[0.009]	[0.008]	[0.015]	[0.015]	[0.013]	[0.012]
Mother's years of education	0.02**	0.02**	0.05**	0.05**	0.01	0.01
	[0.009]	[0.009]	[0.019]	[0.020]	[0.013]	[0.012]
(1) Quartile 2 height	-0.21	-0.13	0.04	0.01	-0.26	-0.22
	[0.140]	[0.129]	[0.108]	[0.115]	[0.186]	[0.160]
(1) Quartile 3 height	-0.25	-0.17	0.11	0.11	-0.38*	-0.35**
	[0.161]	[0.143]	[0.077]	[0.081]	[0.199]	[0.169]
(1) Quartile 4 height	-0.31*	-0.21	-0.12	-0.09	-0.28	-0.24
	[0.174]	[0.156]	[0.084]	[0.086]	[0.223]	[0.199]
Z score Raven's Score	0.02	0.01	0.12*	0.10*	-0.04	-0.05
	[0.030]	[0.030]	[0.061]	[0.058]	[0.039]	[0.038]

Continued on next page

Table 9. Estimation of predictors of assimilation in U.S. - MxFLS2
Dependent variable US Ln(Hourly Earnings) measured in MxFLS2

	All		Returners		Stayers	
Variables at baseline	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Networks in US						
(1) One relative in US [Omitted No relatives in US]	-0.02		-0.03		0.1	
	[0.068]		[0.130]		[0.080]	
(1) Two relatives in US	-0.08		-0.19		0	
	[0.086]		[0.148]		[0.111]	
(1) Three or more relatives in US	-0.05		-0.12		0.04	
	[0.083]		[0.158]		[0.098]	
(1) Spouse in US		0.30**		0.04		0.37**
		[0.146]		[0.259]		[0.187]
(1) Any parent in US		-0.06		0.01		-0.15
		[0.083]		[0.168]		[0.102]
(1) Daughter/Son in US		-0.39*		-0.43		-0.31*
		[0.224]		[0.487]		[0.189]
(1) Siblings in US		-0.01		-0.16		0.04
		[0.067]		[0.136]		[0.084]
(1) Extended family in US		-0.20**		-0.39**		-0.11
		[0.103]		[0.180]		[0.116]
Year of arrival to US	0.01	0.01	0	0	0.02**	0.02**
	[0.009]	[0.008]	[0.015]	[0.014]	[0.008]	[0.008]
HH characteristics						
(1) Quartile 2 wealth per capita	-0.08	-0.09	-0.14	-0.15	-0.11	-0.09
	[0.058]	[0.060]	[0.113]	[0.113]	[0.079]	[0.082]
(1) Quartile 3 wealth per capita	-0.14*	-0.15*	-0.43***	-0.46***	0	0.01
	[0.082]	[0.083]	[0.145]	[0.147]	[0.107]	[0.105]
(1) Quartile 4 wealth per capita	-0.05	-0.08	-0.01	-0.09	-0.1	-0.12
	[0.074]	[0.076]	[0.156]	[0.168]	[0.096]	[0.096]
HH size	0	0	-0.01	-0.01	0.01	0
	[0.010]	[0.011]	[0.018]	[0.018]	[0.014]	[0.015]
Locality characteristics						
(1) Rural	-11.44	-12.42	12.43	12.69	-32.44*	-36.58**
	[18.526]	[17.157]	[31.001]	[28.703]	[16.705]	[15.799]
Constant	2.05	0.82	22.7	22.84	-18.11	-21.73
	[16.138]	[14.603]	[28.931]	[23.125]	[15.028]	[13.976]
Observations	**485**	**485**	**195**	**195**	**290**	**290**
R-squared	0.18	0.206	0.371	0.407	0.223	0.249

Robust standard errors in brackets
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1
Note: Includes State of origin Fixed Effects

Table 10. Assimilation of current US migrants - Economic Variables -MxFLS3

	Ln(Hourly Earnings)		Ln(PCE)		Sent Transfers to MX=100	
Variables measured at baseline	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Basic demographics						
(1) Age: 15-19 Omiited Age<15	0.19	0.15	0.13	0.18	9.9	9.35
	[0.155]	[0.160]	[0.143]	[0.156]	[8.135]	[8.426]
(1) Age: 20-24	0.25	0.2	0.29*	0.34**	10.91	9.74
	[0.172]	[0.174]	[0.152]	[0.164]	[8.809]	[9.090]
(1) Age: 25-34	0.36**	0.32*	0.1	0.16	16.85*	15.54
	[0.183]	[0.182]	[0.162]	[0.166]	[9.376]	[9.570]
(1) Age: 35-49	0.21	0.13	0.36*	0.42**	24.73**	23.00**
	[0.213]	[0.216]	[0.192]	[0.199]	[10.545]	[10.715]
(1) Age: >50	0.27	0.13	0.08	0.19	-4.09	-4.51
	[0.235]	[0.254]	[0.252]	[0.255]	[12.918]	[13.934]
(1) Female	-0.19**	-0.17**	-0.39***	-0.40***	-13.77***	-12.59***
	[0.079]	[0.081]	[0.059]	[0.059]	[3.303]	[3.370]
(1) Married	0.01	0.04	-0.20**	-0.24**	-4.5	-3.33
	[0.111]	[0.119]	[0.090]	[0.097]	[5.499]	[5.708]
Human capital						
Respondent's Education						
(1) Primary complete Omitted Primay inco	0.25**	0.30***	0.03	0.04	0.1	-0.02
	[0.105]	[0.108]	[0.099]	[0.100]	[5.827]	[5.855]
(1) High school incomplete	0.26**	0.29**	0.08	0.09	8.46	9.11
	[0.111]	[0.113]	[0.096]	[0.097]	[5.753]	[5.792]
(1) High scool complete	0.26*	0.30**	0.27**	0.29**	2.91	3.81
	[0.135]	[0.136]	[0.119]	[0.121]	[7.480]	[7.429]
(1) Some college or more	0.14	0.18	0.22	0.23*	4.15	5.01
	[0.153]	[0.156]	[0.138]	[0.138]	[7.860]	[7.862]
(1) Attended school in US	0.03	0.03	-0.09	-0.1	-28.10***	-28.36***
	[0.138]	[0.137]	[0.121]	[0.119]	[6.372]	[6.419]
Father's years of education	0.01	0.01	0	0	0.62	0.73
	[0.012]	[0.012]	[0.011]	[0.011]	[0.549]	[0.552]
Mother's years of education	0.01	0.01	0	0	-1.18**	-1.15**
	[0.013]	[0.013]	[0.011]	[0.010]	[0.562]	[0.568]
(1) Quartile 2 height	-0.16	-0.16	-0.04	-0.04	15.54**	15.54**
	[0.157]	[0.157]	[0.109]	[0.107]	[6.712]	[6.695]
(1) Quartile 3 height	-0.1	-0.1	0.11	0.09	16.43**	16.25**
	[0.182]	[0.184]	[0.118]	[0.115]	[7.603]	[7.576]
(1) Quartile 4 height	0.06	0.03	-0.05	-0.08	18.42**	17.87**
	[0.182]	[0.184]	[0.123]	[0.123]	[7.888]	[7.868]
Z score Raven's Score	0.04	0.04	0	0	0.57	0.3
	[0.036]	[0.035]	[0.036]	[0.036]	[1.832]	[1.817]

Continue on next page

Table 10. Assimilation of current US migrants - Economic Variables -MxFLS3

	Ln(Hourly Earnings)		Ln(PCE)		Sent Transfers to	
Variables measured at baseline	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Networks in US						
(1) One relative in US [Omitted No relatives]	-0.02		-0.22***		-5.81	
	[0.084]		[0.080]		[4.156]	
(1) Two relatives in US	0.21*		-0.07		-5.33	
	[0.106]		[0.085]		[4.735]	
(1) Three or more relatives in US	0.13		-0.16*		-1.83	
	[0.089]		[0.085]		[4.602]	
(1) Spouse in US		-0.13		0.16		-10.44
		[0.187]		[0.148]		[9.002]
(1) Any parent in US		-0.03		-0.21*		-14.59*
		[0.115]		[0.108]		[8.211]
(1) Daughter/Son in US		0.25		-0.13		-6.11
		[0.167]		[0.180]		[9.852]
(1) Siblings in US		0.13*		-0.04		-1.4
		[0.078]		[0.076]		[4.375]
(1) Extended family in US		0.30***		-0.09		-7.67
		[0.110]		[0.093]		[5.476]
Year of arrival to US	0	0.01	0	0	0.51**	0.50*
	[0.006]	[0.006]	[0.005]	[0.005]	[0.257]	[0.264]
(1) First year of arrival before 2002	0.11	0.08	-0.24	-0.23	-8.72	-7.16
	[0.125]	[0.121]	[0.157]	[0.157]	[9.347]	[9.022]
HH characteristics						
HH size	0.02	0.01	-0.01	-0.01	0.69	0.52
	[0.014]	[0.015]	[0.014]	[0.014]	[0.749]	[0.755]
(1) HH own farm business	-0.07	-0.04	-0.07	-0.05	-4.9	-4.57
	[0.084]	[0.084]	[0.066]	[0.067]	[3.674]	[3.698]
(1) HH own a house	0.02	0.04	-0.01	-0.02	-2.08	-2.01
	[0.069]	[0.071]	[0.057]	[0.058]	[3.216]	[3.236]
(1) HH own a non-farm business	0	-0.02	-0.01	-0.01	-0.18	-0.17
	[0.081]	[0.082]	[0.068]	[0.068]	[4.198]	[4.250]
(1) Quartile 2 wealth per capita	-0.13	-0.12	-0.03	-0.05	1.82	2.18
	[0.089]	[0.089]	[0.080]	[0.081]	[4.214]	[4.166]
(1) Quartile 3 wealth per capita	-0.32***	-0.31***	0.1	0.09	0.21	0.25
	[0.102]	[0.103]	[0.076]	[0.076]	[4.658]	[4.597]
(1) Quartile 4 wealth per capita	-0.09	-0.08	0.09	0.08	-3.93	-3.81
	[0.105]	[0.106]	[0.091]	[0.092]	[5.489]	[5.389]
Locality characteristics						
(1) Rural	0.09	0.06	-0.02	-0.03	2.46	2.91
	[0.087]	[0.086]	[0.070]	[0.070]	[3.870]	[3.868]
Constant	-8.02	-8.64	8.36	10.08	-959.05*	-941.46*
	[12.687]	[12.507]	[10.695]	[10.912]	[517.191]	[531.045]
Sample Size	**612**	**612**	**596**	**596**	**920**	**920**
R-Squared	0.115	0.118	0.214	0.222	0.207	0.214

Robust standard errors in brackets

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Note: Includes State of origin Fixed Effects

* Note2: Educationand height refer to attained education and height in MxFLS3

Table 11. Linear Probability Model: Use of English - MxFLS3

Dept variable = 100 if speaks English Fair, Good or Very Good		
Variables measured at baseline	(1)	(2)
Basic demographics		
(1) Age: 15-19 [Omiited Age<15]	-5.55	-6.61
	[7.925]	[8.364]
(1) Age: 20-24	-12.51	-12.68
	[8.755]	[9.207]
(1) Age: 25-34	-6.86	-7.6
	[9.095]	[9.354]
(1) Age: 35-49	-23.13**	-25.20**
	[10.077]	[10.364]
(1) Age: >50	-36.16***	-39.26***
	[10.948]	[11.733]
(1) Female	-4.49	-4.35
	[3.236]	[3.287]
(1) Married	0	0.04
	[5.366]	[5.584]
Human capital		
Respondent's Education		
(1) Primary complete [Omitted Primay incomplete]	3.33	3.74
	[5.166]	[5.283]
(1) High school incomplete	12.70**	13.04**
	[5.305]	[5.428]
(1) High scool complete	19.61***	20.74***
	[6.840]	[6.937]
(1) Some college or more	29.73***	30.62***
	[7.215]	[7.368]
(1) Attended school in US	41.41***	40.30***
	[5.035]	[5.001]
Father's years of education	0.47	0.58
	[0.562]	[0.574]
Mother's years of education	1.49***	1.51***
	[0.559]	[0.564]
(1) Quartile 2 height	-11.31**	-11.38**
	[5.319]	[5.392]
(1) Quartile 3 height	-14.58**	-14.36**
	[6.539]	[6.599]
(1) Quartile 4 height	0.47	0.73
	[7.067]	[7.122]
Z score Raven's Score	3.50*	3.70*
	[1.920]	[1.927]

Continued on next page

Table 11. Linear Probability Model: Use of English - MxFLS3

Dept variable = 100 if speaks English Fair, Good or Very Good		
Variables measured at baseline	(1)	(2)
Networks in US		
(1) One relative in US [Omitted No relatives in US]	-1.28	
	[4.280]	
(1) Two relatives in US	4.38	
	[5.005]	
(1) Three or more relatives in US	0.42	
	[4.690]	
(1) Spouse in US		-3.68
		[7.039]
(1) Any parent in US		8.17
		[8.038]
(1) Daughter/Son in US		5.78
		[8.142]
(1) Siblings in US		0.73
		[4.509]
(1) Extended family in US		-6.82
		[5.729]
Year of arrival to US	-0.70***	-0.70***
	[0.222]	[0.223]
(1) First year of arrival before 2002	15.77	16.68*
	[9.585]	[9.384]
HH characteristics		
HH size	-0.93	-0.76
	[0.754]	[0.761]
(1) HH own farm business	-8.20**	-8.01**
	[3.953]	[3.979]
(1) HH own a house	2.92	2.08
	[3.290]	[3.297]
(1) HH own a non-farm business	-6.85*	-7.36*
	[3.827]	[3.807]
(1) Quartile 2 wealth per capita	-4.95	-5.12
	[4.628]	[4.617]
(1) Quartile 3 wealth per capita	-1.49	-1.15
	[4.532]	[4.511]
(1) Quartile 4 wealth per capita	-0.3	-0.47
	[5.428]	[5.309]
Locality characteristics		
(1) Rural	-1.68	-2.45
	[3.903]	[3.888]
Constant	1,455.08***	1,439.93***
	[447.024]	[448.825]
Sample Size	**924**	**924**
R-Squared	0.34	0.342

Robust standard errors in brackets

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Note: Includes State of origin Fixed Effects

* Note2: Educationand height refer to attained education and height in MxFLS3

Table 12. Assimilation of current US migrants - Household Composition in US

	MALES				FEMALES			
	IN HH Spouse		Children in US		IN HH Spouse		Children in US	
Variables measured at baseline	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Basic demographics								
(1) Age: 15-19 Omiited Age<15	0.11	-6.8	-19.24	-27.08	-2.29	-2.81	-7.35	-2.16
	[26.620]	[27.186]	[21.373]	[22.074]	[4.179]	[3.573]	[9.913]	[8.540]
(1) Age: 20-24	-5.78	-11.91	-22.75	-30.11	-3.87	-4.78	-15.93	-10.61
	[27.193]	[27.617]	[22.859]	[23.257]	[5.692]	[4.884]	[10.921]	[9.702]
(1) Age: 25-34	-11.42	-18.46	-7.85	-17.79	-6.29	-6.88	-1.96	1.12
	[26.855]	[27.518]	[24.100]	[24.407]	[5.436]	[6.017]	[11.821]	[10.482]
(1) Age: 35-49	-39.64	-43.77	-16.49	-22.29	-6.03	-5.66	-13.32	-7.38
	[29.003]	[29.349]	[25.799]	[26.089]	[4.749]	[4.598]	[13.554]	[12.014]
(1) Age: >50	-14.11	-18.36	12.51	5.97	2	6.38	-5.62	0.8
	[28.942]	[29.788]	[27.082]	[27.934]	[6.874]	[9.077]	[12.870]	[11.866]
(1) Married	-14.85	-16.33	-11.68	-11.5	-2.64	-2.6	-8.67*	-9.14*
	[11.839]	[11.861]	[11.589]	[11.843]	[2.897]	[3.154]	[5.233]	[5.319]
Human capital								
(1) *Primary complete Omitted Primay incomplete	10.72	9.61	19.67*	17.42	1.48	0.67	-1.14	-2.58
	[12.282]	[12.160]	[10.630]	[10.977]	[4.788]	[4.129]	[5.751]	[5.622]
(1) High school incomplete	9.32	10	12.39	13.59	2.41	1.7	-5.76	-7.19
	[11.360]	[11.425]	[10.551]	[10.777]	[4.875]	[3.851]	[6.210]	[6.000]
(1) High scool complete	-4.58	-3.84	8.79	8.27	-1.1	-2.55	-3.2	-4.3
	[16.807]	[16.780]	[15.801]	[15.604]	[5.811]	[5.075]	[6.498]	[6.520]
(1) Some college or more	-3.92	-4.96	14.77	13.55	3.13	1.9	-11.67	-13.37
	[17.002]	[17.203]	[13.752]	[14.216]	[6.013]	[4.336]	[9.502]	[9.436]
(1) Attended school in US	-11.13	-9.66	-4.12	-3.21	4.83	5.35	-1.66	0.33
	[16.122]	[17.535]	[11.908]	[13.402]	[4.375]	[4.506]	[4.698]	[4.428]
Father's years of education	1.2	1.15	0.58	0.47	-0.43	-0.44	0.39	0.45
	[1.304]	[1.311]	[1.064]	[1.072]	[0.317]	[0.320]	[0.493]	[0.497]
Mother's years of education	-0.94	-0.74	0.18	0.3	0.26	0.42	-0.67	-0.64
	[1.081]	[1.148]	[1.110]	[1.146]	[0.324]	[0.341]	[0.635]	[0.649]
(1) Quartile 2 height	-46.83***	-41.90**	-44.99**	-42.28**	-3.13	-3	1.19	-5.35
	[17.631]	[18.968]	[19.830]	[19.213]	[4.977]	[4.358]	[7.910]	[7.206]
(1) Quartile 3 height	-67.58***	-64.50***	-45.44*	-45.47*	-1.35	-1.08	-4.61	-9.52
	[18.925]	[20.998]	[24.401]	[24.480]	[3.246]	[3.014]	[8.838]	[8.021]
(1) Quartile 4 height	-61.83***	-55.81**	-46.80*	-43.21*	-5.73	-4.52	3.64	-0.51
	[19.568]	[21.908]	[24.530]	[24.465]	[5.499]	[4.735]	[9.177]	[8.129]
Z score Raven's Score	1.21	0.96	1.53	2.67	-0.8	-0.91	0.78	0.39
	[4.643]	[4.768]	[3.848]	[3.991]	[0.759]	[0.824]	[1.734]	[1.684]

Continued on next page

Table 12. Assimilation of current US migrants - Household Composition in US

	MALES				FEMALES			
	IN HH Spouse		Children in US		IN HH Spouse		Children in US	
Variables measured at baseline	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)
Networks in US								
(1) One relative in US [Omitted No relatives in US]	4.17		17.50**		-0.02		2.64	
	[8.637]		[8.180]		[2.843]		[5.088]	
(1) Two relatives in US	-1.04		11.58		-1.95		-3.72	
	[11.518]		[11.234]		[3.413]		[6.547]	
(1) Three or more relatives in US	12.97		24.94**		-1.68		1.22	
	[9.601]		[9.734]		[1.919]		[5.463]	
(1) Spouse in US				17.09				2.62
				[19.823]				[3.483]
(1) Any parent in Us		-0.93		-0.63		-0.33		1.12*
		[1.423]		[1.299]		[0.531]		[0.631]
(1) Daughter/Son in US		-4.22				-3.65		
		[13.963]				[5.579]		
(1) Siblings in US		10.71		15.15*		4.37		4.44
		[10.580]		[8.378]		[2.697]		[3.163]
(1) Extended family in US		-2.75		8.28		-0.97		-5.05
		[11.870]		[10.396]		[4.239]		[3.389]
Year of arrival to US	-0.97*	-0.87	-0.56	-0.44	0.26	0.29	-0.17	-0.12
	[0.578]	[0.559]	[0.394]	[0.412]	[0.332]	[0.350]	[0.320]	[0.318]
(1) First year of arrival before 2002	19.1	20.53	-1.66	-3.52	-1.4	0.97	6.75	6.74
	[13.687]	[14.054]	[9.205]	[10.200]	[8.487]	[11.378]	[4.496]	[5.212]
HH characteristics								
HH size	1.49	1.68	1.66	1.43	0.46	0.51	-0.45	-0.43
	[2.232]	[2.218]	[1.817]	[1.927]	[0.636]	[0.599]	[0.951]	[0.932]
(1) HH own farm business	16.09*	15.30*	19.52***	17.25**	-5.84	-6.56	5.88	3.43
	[9.632]	[9.097]	[7.127]	[7.298]	[4.464]	[4.126]	[4.085]	[4.138]
(1) HH own a house	8.31	8.05	0.9	3	-1.34	-1.97	2.55	2.75
	[8.049]	[8.400]	[6.884]	[6.780]	[3.443]	[3.196]	[3.383]	[3.295]
(1) HH own a non-farm business	-6.76	-8.1	-1.84	-2.29	1.33	0.39	0.47	0.26
	[8.783]	[9.437]	[8.279]	[8.650]	[2.138]	[1.873]	[4.452]	[4.392]
(1) Quartile 2 wealth per capita	-15.79	-15.01	-16.82*	-16.43*	-1.43	-1.03	3.17	2.49
	[10.348]	[10.351]	[9.140]	[9.051]	[4.172]	[4.067]	[4.477]	[4.493]
(1) Quartile 3 wealth per capita	-13.7	-14.42	-12.81	-13.65	6.6	7.13	4.58	4.94
	[10.492]	[10.516]	[9.900]	[10.217]	[4.331]	[4.660]	[4.016]	[4.120]
(1) Quartile 4 wealth per capita	17.43	17.4	6.24	4.86	7.96*	8.03*	-0.97	-1.16
	[12.589]	[12.554]	[10.739]	[11.205]	[4.701]	[4.780]	[4.326]	[4.514]
Locality characteristics								
(1) Rural	-7.57	-5.87	-6.5	-2.01	4.97	5.32	-2.06	-1.31
	[8.179]	[8.270]	[8.445]	[8.696]	[4.508]	[4.530]	[4.165]	[4.133]
Constant	2,077.39*	1,893.16*	1245.12	1009.68	-411.95	-472.72	453.31	359.04
	[1,159.995]	[1,120.438]	[790.837]	[824.285]	[670.217]	[704.192]	[647.732]	[643.706]
Observations	**208**	**208**	**254**	**254**	**230**	**230**	**288**	**288**
R-squared	0.396	0.394	0.299	0.284	0.36	0.377	0.265	0.279

Robust standard errors in brackets

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Note: Includes State of origin Fixed Effects

* Note2: Education is attained education in MxFLS3