# Female Labor Participation and Migration Family Strategies in Mexico <br> --El trabajo se reescribirá en Español, por favor no cite sin permiso de los autores -- 

## Introduction

Assuming that migration is a family decision linked with the availability of resources, the division of labor and the distribution of responsibilities within the household, our research analyze (1) if the female labor participation modifies the couple's probabilities of migrating and the type of migration (solo or couple) and (2) if the current migration status affects the female participation in economic activities (whether it stimulates to be in or out the labor force).

During the last three decades, two central social processes have taken place in Mexico: (1) a rapid increase of the female participation in the labor force and (2) the growth of migration to U.S., that incorporated new actors -like women. Both processes can be seen as families' strategies that potentiate the household's economic and social mobility or that ensure the household's economic maintenance in the short term.

Additionally, previous research have suggest that entry into the labor market changes woman position within the household and potentially allows her to participate more in making decisions within the household (such as the migration of one member of the family). Thus, our interest is to study both processes -husband or wife migration events decisions or female labor participation -as interconnected.

One of the paper contributions is that our methodological approximation allows us to link the individual histories of the couple and to hypothesize about how family decisions are made on international migration and female labor.

## Methodological Approach and Data Sources

The joint analysis of migration trajectories for both spouses and the labor history of the wife require a longitudinal approximation that show year by year the changes in the woman labor status (in or out of the labor market) and if a migration to U.S. or to Mexico occurred, depending on the residence place in a given year. For the analysis, we reconstruct the life histories of the couple using retrospective data from the Mexican Migration Project. This database retrieves the complete histories of the household head and spouse in 93 communities distributed in various states of Mexico ${ }^{1}$. The selected communities include regions with different experiences of migration (traditional migration communities and those recently incorporated in migration to the U.S.), different levels of urbanization and economic development (see Table 1). In most cases, the survey includes a sample of 200 households selected by simple sampling techniques. In the case of urban areas, the samples were taken in specific traditional or well-established neighborhoods characterized for having low incidence of migration from rural areas. To the sample of households in Mexico joins a nonrandom subsample of ten to twenty homes in the United States made up of migrants from the same community of origin. The interviews of the 93 communities included in the analysis were conducted between 1994 and 2009.
${ }^{1}$. The database has currently information of 128 communities. However, complete information about both spouses required for the analysis was only available for 93 communities -from the community 33 . The full description of the database can be consult in http://mmp.opr.princeton.edu.

## Changes in migration patterns base on the female labor participation

To explore the extent to which female labor participation influence migration decisions of the couple, we estimate three discrete-time models for the probability of migrating depending on the residence situation at the beginning of the person-year. The models are estimated only for the states of residence and migratory movements with sufficient observations (see Figure 1 and Table 3 for preliminary results of the models). To assess the influence of female employment variables three indicators were used: whether the woman had premarital labor experience, if she worked or not in the previous year and the post-marital cumulative labor experience. The models include sociodemographic variables and migration experience of both spouses, variables related to family life cycle, homogamy and community's characteristics (see Table 2 for descriptive statistics of the independent variables).

At the moment, we are analyzing these results and running models to estimate the probability that the wife changes her labor situation depending on the migration status of the couple.

Table 1. Characteristics of Mexican Communities sampled, Mexican Migration Project

| Migration <br> Region/Type of community | Number of communities sampled | Number of households sampled | Proportion with U.S. migration experience Men Women |  | Proportion of women employed (15-64) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Historical |  |  |  |  |  |
| Metropolitan area | 7 | 1,470 | 12.82 | 4.15 | 34.83 |
| City | 9 | 1,683 | 37.68 | 11.90 | 32.12 |
| Town | 11 | 2,054 | 28.30 | 6.08 | 30.68 |
| Rural | 14 | 1,520 | 47.80 | 11.84 | 22.69 |
| Border |  |  |  |  |  |
| Metropolitan area | 10 | 1,633 | 14.23 | 6.60 | 37.05 |
| City | 2 | 348 | 29.18 | 6.36 | 27.50 |
| Town | 4 | 618 | 16.21 | 6.94 | 29.10 |
| Rural | 1 | 100 | 24.29 | 2.33 | 23.53 |
| Central |  |  |  |  |  |
| Metropolitan area | 4 | 808 | 5.62 | 1.93 | 31.48 |
| City | 4 | 809 | 20.06 | 4.29 | 32.62 |
| Town | 7 | 1,106 | 17.40 | 3.02 | 28.38 |
| Rural | 8 | 1,156 | 22.43 | 4.50 | 28.20 |
| Southeast |  |  |  |  |  |
| Metropolitan area | 1 | 222 | 11.53 | 2.60 | 39.62 |
| City | 1 | 201 | 17.36 | 2.81 | 29.74 |
| Town | 5 | 694 | 14.09 | 0.64 | 31.29 |
| Rural | 5 | 639 | 19.31 | 2.08 | 21.33 |
| Total sample size | 93 | 15,061 |  |  |  |

Source: Authors' estimations based on the Mexican Migration Project, communities 33 to 128.

Figure 1. Distribution of migration events (transitions) across couple-states in the lifeyear histories of married Mexican couples


Source: Authors' estimations based on the Mexican Migration Project, communities 33 to 128.

Table 2. Descriptive estatistics for selected variables, Mexican married couples, Mexican Migration Project

| Variable | Mean or distribution |
| :---: | :---: |
| Husband's and wife's characteristics: |  |
| Husband's years of schooling | 7.2 |
| Wife's years of schooling | 7.0 |
| Husband's occupation ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |
| Not working | 1.8\% |
| Agriculture | 29.9\% |
| Unskilled | 16.3\% |
| Skilled | 26.0\% |
| Professional | 6.9\% |
| Land or business owner | 19.0\% |
| Wife's premarital labor experience | 44.0\% |
| Female labor participation the year before ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 20.2\% |
| Post-marital cumulative months of female labor participation ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 148.8 |
| Couple's migration experience |  |
| Husband premarital U.S. experience | 15.6\% |
| Husband post-marital cumulative months U.S. experience ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 8.7 |
| Wife premarital U.S. experience | 2.8\% |
| Wife post-marital cumulative months U.S. experience ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 2.6 |
| Couple's characteristics |  |
| Age difference between spouses | 3.6 |
| At least one son born in U.S. ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 2.4\% |
| At least one son under twelve years old in the household ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 77.4\% |
| Communities' characteristics |  |
| Urbanization level |  |
| Metropolitan area | 26.9\% |
| City | 20.2\% |
| Town | 30.2\% |
| Rural | 22.7\% |
| Migration Region |  |
| Historical | 46.1\% |
| Border | 17.6\% |
| Central | 23.7\% |
| Southeast | 12.7\% |
| Male migration prevalence to U.S. ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 0.21 |
| Prevalence of female migration to U.S. ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 0.06 |
| Proportion of employed women ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 0.20 |
| Period (categorical) ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |
| Before 1987 | 36.4\% |
| 1987-1996 | 38.2\% |
| 1997-2009 | 25.3\% |

Source: Authors' estimations based on the Mexican Migration Project, communities 33 to 128.
${ }^{\mathrm{a}}$ Time varying variables, all other variables are time-invariant

Figure 2. Proportion of women employed by migration experience and age group. Mexico


Table 3. Parameter estimates from multinomial discrit-time hazard models predictig U.S. migration and return migration form U.S. to Mexico,
Mexican Migration Project

| Variables | Model 1 Both in Mexico |  | Model 2 <br> Husband in U.S. |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Model 3 } \\ \text { Both in U.S. } \end{gathered}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Husband U.S. migrant | Couple U.S. migrants | Husband returns to Mexico | Wife joins husband in U.S. | Couple returns to Mexico | Wife returns to Mexico |
|  | Estimation | Estimation | Estimation | Estimation | Estimation | Estimation |
| Husband's and wife's characteristics: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Husband's years of schooling | -0.009 | 0.056 ** | -0.032 ** | -0.010 | $-0.058{ }^{* *}$ | 0.006 |
| Wife's years of schooling | -0.013 | -0.022 | 0.005 | 0.029 | -0.049 | 0.035 |
| Husband's occupation ${ }^{\text {ab }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Not working | 0.050 | 1.220 ** | 1.059 ** | 0.429 | -0.483 | 0.695 |
| Unskilled | $1.265{ }^{* * *}$ | $1.551^{* * *}$ | $-1.544^{* * *}$ | 0.315 * | $-2.241^{* * *}$ | -0.139 |
| Skilled | $0.396{ }^{\text {*** }}$ | $0.886^{* * *}$ | -0.802 *** | 0.263 | -1.550 *** | -0.055 |
| Professional | $-1.745^{* *}$ | $-2.867^{* *}$ | 0.523 * | 0.321 | 1.005 * | 0.529 |
| Land or business owner | 0.076 | 0.235 | -0.179 * | -0.376 | -0.481 | 0.465 |
| Wife's premarital labor experience ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | -0.064 | -0.144 | -0.118 * | -0.026 | -0.352 | -0.360 |
| Female labor participation the year before ${ }^{\text {ad }}$ | $-0.138{ }^{* *}$ | -0.103 | -0.043 | 0.236 | -0.243 | -0.167 |
| Post-marital cumulative months of female labor participation ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | $0.002^{* * *}$ | -0.001 | $0.002^{* * *}$ | -0.004 *** | 0.003 | 0.002 |
| Cohort ${ }^{\text {e }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1940-1950 | 0.135 | -0.075 | 0.302 | 0.831 | -1.304 | -0.348 |
| 1950-1960 | 0.249 | 0.434 | 0.156 | 0.494 | -0.655 | -0.022 |
| 1960-1970 | 0.427 ** | 0.626 | 0.267 | 0.707 | -0.546 | 0.143 |
| After 1970 | 0.495 ** | 0.488 | 0.144 | 0.794 | -0.198 | 0.566 |
| Spell | -0.188*** | -0.161*** | -0.456 *** | -0.131 *** | -0.122 | 0.869 ** |
| Spell ${ }^{2}$ | 0.003 *** | $0.004^{* * *}$ | 0.013 *** | 0.003 ** | $0.010^{* * *}$ | $0.009{ }^{* * *}$ |
| Couple's migration experience |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Husband premarital U.S. experience ${ }^{\text {f }}$ | $0.525^{* * *}$ | 0.920 *** | -0.062 | $0.443^{* * *}$ | -0.579 ** | -0.376 |
| Husband post-marital cumulative months U.S. experience ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | $0.011^{* * *}$ | $0.012{ }^{* * *}$ | -0.006 *** | 0.004 ** | -0.008 ** | $0.009{ }^{* * *}$ |
| Wife premarital U.S. experience ${ }^{\text {f }}$ | 0.188 | 0.593 * | -0.183 | -0.145 | 0.128 | 0.222 |
| Wife post-marital cumulative months U.S. experience ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | $-0.015^{* * *}$ | 0.002 | -0.009 ** | $0.005^{* *}$ | -0.009 | -0.108 *** |

## (Continued).

| Couple's characteristics |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age difference between spouses | -0.050 *** | -0.043 *** | -0.015 * | -0.016 | 0.011 | -0.007 |
| At least one son born in U.S. ${ }^{\text {ag }}$ |  |  |  |  | -0.450 ** | -0.516 ** |
| At least one son under twelve years old in the household ${ }^{\text {ag }}$ | $0.585{ }^{* *}$ | $-0.547^{* * *}$ |  | -0.783 *** | 0.269 | 0.693 ** |
| Communities' characteristics |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urbanization level ${ }^{\text {h }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Metropolitan area | $-0.807^{* * *}$ | -0.110 | -0.409 *** | -0.308 | -0.287 | 1.888 *** |
| City | -0.253 *** | -0.096 | 0.127 | 0.245 | 0.159 | 0.122 |
| Town | -0.371 *** | -0.332 | $0.316^{* * *}$ | 0.454 ** | -0.057 | -0.351 |
| Male migration prevalence to U.S. ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | $3.455^{* * *}$ | 2.093 *** | $-1.578{ }^{* * *}$ | $-1.397^{* * *}$ | -0.354 | 2.872 ** |
| Prevalence of female migration to U.S. ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | $-2.833^{* * *}$ | $2.346{ }^{* * *}$ | $2.506{ }^{* * *}$ | $5.587{ }^{* * *}$ | -1.883 | -2.234 |
| Proportion of employed women ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | -1.338*** | -1.012 | $0.945 * *$ | 0.538 | 1.881 * | -4.297**** |
| Period ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1987-1996 | 0.011 | 0.315 | -0.084 | 0.123 | -0.281 | -0.479 |
| 1997-2009 | 0.463 *** | -0.311 | 0.013 | -0.276 | 0.394 | -0.198 |
| Constant | -22.5*** | $-7.041^{* * *}$ | $0.964^{* * *}$ | -3.694*** | 1.438 | $-2.747^{* * *}$ |
| Wald Chi-Square | 3905.16 |  | 1664.34 |  | 440.35 |  |
| Pseudo ${ }^{2}$ | 0.188 |  | 0.204 |  | 0.217 |  |
| Number of couple-years | 166713 |  | 10361 |  | 3773 |  |

Source: Authors' estimations based on the Mexican Migration Project, communities 33 to 128.
Significance level: ${ }^{*} \mathrm{p}<0.10,{ }^{* *} \mathrm{p}<0.05,{ }^{* * *} \mathrm{p}<0.01$
${ }^{\mathrm{a}}$ Time varying variables, all other variables are time-invariant
${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ Reference category: Agriculture
${ }^{c}$ Reference category: Without experience
${ }^{\mathrm{d}}$ Reference category: Not working
${ }^{e}$ Reference category: Before 1940
${ }^{\mathrm{f}}$ Reference category: Without experience
${ }^{\mathrm{g}}$ Reference category: Without a son under twelve years old in the household
${ }^{h}$ Reference category: Rural
${ }^{\text {i }}$ Reference category: Before 1987

| Both in Mexico |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Husband U.S. migrant$\mathrm{n}=3,311$ |  | Couple U.S. migrants $\mathrm{n}=253$ |  |
| Labor status previous year: |  |  |  |
| Not working | gr 2.7 |  | 46.0 |
|  | (83.3) | (80.9) |  |
| Working | 10.6 |  | 43.8 |
|  | (16.7) | (19.1) |  |
| Husband in U.S. <br> Husband returns to Mexico Wife joins Husband in U.S. $\mathrm{n}=3,084$ $\mathrm{n}=272$ |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Labor status previous year: |  |  |  |
| Not working | gr 2.3 |  | 37.6 |
|  | (81.9) | (74.2) |  |
| Working | 14.0 |  | 55.1 |
|  | (18.1) | (25.8) |  |
| Both in U.S. |  |  |  |
|  | Couple returns to Mexico  <br> $\mathrm{n}=205$ Wife returns to Mexico <br> $\mathrm{n}=137$ |  |  |
| Labor status previous year: |  |  |  |
| Not working | gr 14.7 |  | 8.8 |
|  | (58.4) | (53.2) |  |
| Working | 85.3 |  | 70.2 |
|  | (41.6) | (46.8) |  |

Note: Numbers in parenthesis indicate women distribution by participation in economic activities (working and not working) in the year of migration event.

