Part I

CANAMID project outlook
CANAMID: a Migration Dialogue

A dialogue about key migration issues involving the Central American population

• between
  – academia
  – government
  – civil society

• in 5 countries:
  – Guatemala
  – El Salvador
  – Honduras
  – Mexico
  – The United States
Objective & key features

• Objective
  To produce useful evidence that informs public policy tackling key problems of the Central-American migrant population

• Funded by MacArthur Foundation (2014-2016)

• Focus on migrant conditions at:
  – Origin
  – Transit
  – Destination (Mex. & U.S.)
  – Return
Participating institutions

• Centro de Investigaciones y Estudios Superiores en Antropología Social (CIESAS), México
• Institute for the Study of International Migration (ISIM), Georgetown University, U.S.
• Instituto de Investigaciones y Gerencia Política (INGEP), Universidad Rafael Landívar, Guatemala
• Instituto Tecnológico Autónomo de México (ITAM), México
• Universidad Iberoamericana, México
• Colegio de México
• Universidad Centroamericana Simeón Cañas (UCA), El Salvador
• Organización “Equipo de Reflexión, Investigación y Comunicación” (ERIC), Honduras

• Funding by MacArthur Foundation
Policy Brief Series

- CANAMID commissioned experts on different aspects of migration issues to write policy briefs
- A coordinator + peer review process
- CANAMID Policy Brief series [www.canamid.org](http://www.canamid.org)
Thematic areas and coordinators

**a) Population**
- Carla Pederzinni, Universidad Iberoamericana, México
- Claudia Masferrer, McGill University, Montreal, Canadá
- Fernando Riosmena, University of Denver, U.S.

**b) Education & Childhood**
- Silvia Giorguli, El Colegio de México, México
- Bryan Jensen, Brigham Young Univ., U.S.

**c) Health**
- Nelly Salgado, Secretaria de Salud, México

**d) Labor**
- Pia Orrenius, Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas, U.S.
- Phil Martin, University of California Davis, U.S.

**e) Governmentality and Security**
- Pablo Mateos, CIESAS

**Project Coordinators:**
- Pablo Mateos
- Agustín Escobar
Five types of collectives

- CENTRAL AMERICANS IN:
  1. Origin
  2. Transit
  3. U.S. as destination
  4. Mexico as destination
  5. Return
Part II

CA transit migration through Mexico
Apprehensions of C.A. in U.S. and Mex

- PB#14: Central American migrants in irregular transit through Mexico: New figures and trends. Ernesto Rodriguez
- Figures on C.A. apprehensions should be taken together Mex + U.S.
Transit migration estimates
Residual method

Diagram 1:
Flow of irregular Central American migrants on their way to the U.S. through Mexico based on indicators used to estimate their volume

1. Apprehended by the INM throughout Mexico
2. Apprehended by U.S. Border Patrol Southwest
3. They managed to reach the U.S.
Irregular CA transit thru Mex

- Ernesto Rodriguez developed a residual model to estimate transit migration (PB14)
- New peak in 2014-15
Flows of undoc CA migrants into the US

**Figure 4.**
Estimated number of Central American undocumented migrants who managed to settle in the U.S., 2000-2014

Source: Author’s estimates based on U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey (ACS) and Current Population Survey (CPS); U.S. DHS, Immigration Statistics y Border Patrol, Southwest Border.

Note: Trend with three-year moving average refers to the average figure for the year drawn from figures for the previous three years, making it possible to smooth annual fluctuations in the short term to approximate estimated residual data.
Main transit routes
C.A. transit migration: Main issues

• Corruption and impunity (PB#12 H. Rodriguez)
  – Violence from public agents
• Drug cartel control of migration routes
  – kidnappings, rapings, murder, other violence
• Health issues (mental & physical)
• Circular movement, settlement, families
• Lack of institutional coordination Mex / C.A.
• Civil society organizations -> drive action and set demands in policy agenda (PB#13 L. Calderón)
C.A. transit migration: Main PBs

- **PB#05** Access to Health Services for Central American Migrants in Transit through Mexico. René Leyva et al

- **PB#07** Consular Protection as State Policy to Protect Mexican and Central American Migrants, Jorge Schiavon

- **PB#11** Honduran Migrants in Mexico: From Transit to Settlement. Carmen Fernández & Teresa Rodríguez

- **PB#12** Governmentality and Violence towards Central American Migrants in the Gulf of Mexico. Hipólito Rodríguez

- **PB#13** Organized Civil Society in Response to Transit Migration through Mexico. Leticia Calderón Chelius.

- **PB#14** Central American migrants in irregular transit through Mexico: New figures and trends. Ernesto Rodriguez Chavez
Trapped in eternal transit

• PB#11 Hondurans in Mexico

For some, the idea of getting to the United States is more like a dream or desire rather than a concrete plan. In many cases, the thought of returning to where they are from is not an attractive option either, since migrants no longer feel part of the communities they left behind. Returning to Honduras implies starting over under difficult conditions.

—I wanted to go to the United States, but not anymore; now I’m not going anywhere. I’m not moving from here. I have my daughter! And the ranch is beautiful, everything is green with beautiful landscapes where you can breathe fresh air. You can walk around no problem, nobody bothers you. Everyone knows me and says hello. When there’s work, they call me, to cut the coffee plants, to sow, to put up a roof, a fence, whatever. I didn’t know how to do any of that kind of work. I grew up in San Pedro Sula, which is a city. It’s really huge!

—So, do you think you will stay indefinitely in El Naranjo?
—Yes, that’s what I want. My in-laws gave us some land at their house and I’m going to make a room. But I don’t have any money. On the ranch there isn’t any work and they pay 100 pesos a day. Can you imagine? What can that cover!

—And that is why you are here in Xalapa?
—Yes, well, I’m going to be here for about 8 days. I have to get some money together to take back to the ranch.
From transit to settlement

- Qualitative evidence from PB#11 Fernandez & Rodriguez
Part III

CA migrants resident in the US & Mexico
Total stock of C.A. & Mex in the U.S.

Source: Pederzini, Masferrer, Riosmena & Molina (PB01) 2015
Stock of CA migrants in Mexico

- Migrants born in Guatemala, El Salvador and Honduras and their children.
- Residents in Mexico (Census and Inter-censal survey)
Settlement in México

Central Americans resident in Mexico by country of residence 5 years prior to the Census (1995->2000 and 2005->2010)

Source: Pederzini et al PB01
Age & Schooling (U.S. vs Mex)

Key socio-demographic characteristics of the stock of Central American Migrants resident in the U.S. and Mex. (1980-2012)

Mean Age

Source: Pederzini, Masferrer, Riosmena & Molina (PB01) 2015
### Table 2. Demographic characteristics of the NTC-born population living in the United States by Period, Country of Birth, and Duration of Stay in the United States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Vys. schooling</th>
<th>State of residence</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### II. 5 years or less in the United States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Vys. schooling</th>
<th>State of residence</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### III. More than 5 years in the United States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Vys. schooling</th>
<th>State of residence</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### IV. Earlier move: More than five years in Mexico

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Vys. schooling</th>
<th>State of residence</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author's calculations using data from INEGI (Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Geografía). Data from 2000 come from the complete set of records of the 2000 Mexican Population Census and data from 2010 come from the 10% analytic samples of the 2010 Mexican Population Census. Weighted estimates for 2010.
• Mexico, new destination from Honduras and El Salvador.
• Precarious work, except for some Salvadorans.
• Salvadorans better paid than Guatemalans, more urban, more scattered throughout Mex.
• Guatemalans concentrated in Chiapas, circular migration, legal temporary border workers card
• Guatemalan cross-border migration is not driving Mexican wages down

Main occupations by country of origin and gender
Liliana Meza (PB04)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>agricultural work</td>
<td>domestic service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvadorans and Hondurans</td>
<td>artisans or traders</td>
<td>commerce</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CA Workers in Mexico (PB04)

- Lack of good data sources
- EMIF-SUR used for cross-border flow
- Mexico -> Guatemala flow
- Male dominated
- Young population (71% < age 39)
- Low education (88% < 6 years education)
CA Workers in Mexico (PB04 & B09)

• Policy recommendations:
  1. Extend temporary work permits to other Mexican states
  2. Increase the Mexican social security coverage and coordinate with CA countries for pension entitlement
  3. Recognize education qualifications from CA in Mex.
  4. Extend some of Mexico’s social programs to CA
CA workers in the U.S. (PB#03)

- Pia Orrenius & Magdelaine Zavodny (PB#03)
- Positive effect of TPS in Salvadoreans
- Negative effect of e-Verify in all undoc CAs

Table 2: The effect of TPS on labor market outcomes of immigrants from El Salvador

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LESS-EDUCATED</th>
<th>MORE-EDUCATED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>-0.060*</td>
<td>0.173***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>0.060***</td>
<td>-0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In labor force</td>
<td>-0.0002</td>
<td>0.149***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usual weekly hours</td>
<td>0.346</td>
<td>5.564**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual weeks worked</td>
<td>0.905</td>
<td>7.485***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real weekly earnings</td>
<td>0.131***</td>
<td>0.033</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: The effect of E-Verify mandates on labor market outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unauthorized Central American Immigrants</th>
<th>Unauthorized Mexican Immigrants</th>
<th>Naturalized Hispanic Immigrants</th>
<th>U.S.-Born Hispanics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>-0.073***</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>-0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed, wage &amp; salary</td>
<td>-0.058</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.087***</td>
<td>-0.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td>-0.015</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
<td>-0.048**</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
<td>-0.029</td>
<td>0.047**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In labor force</td>
<td>-0.059**</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real hourly earnings</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>-0.075***</td>
<td>0.065***</td>
<td>0.090***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switched employers</td>
<td>-0.030**</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>-0.018*</td>
<td>0.008*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01.
Children & Education (PB#02 & PB#10)

• PB#10 Rodrigo Aguilar & Silvia Giorguli
• Some findings:
  – 2010 -> 2015 25% growth in 1.5 and 2.0 generation CAs in Mexico
  – Striking educational vulnerability of 1.5 generation of CAs in Mexico, esp. Guatemalans
  – Late entry to school, lack of enrollment, high participation rates of minors in the workforce
CA School attendance rates in Mex

Aguilar & Giorguli (PB#10)
C.A. children in the U.S. (PB#02)

- High School Graduation Rates (ages 18-24 yrs.)

Jensen & Bachmeier (PB#02)
Part IV

Origin conditions & return to CA
Origin & Return

- **PB#01** Pederzini et al (already mentioned)

- **PB#08 Welfare Regimes** in El Salvador, Honduras, and Guatemala: Exclusionary and Inadequate. - Ursula Roldan Andrade & Sindy Hernández Bonilla.

- **PB#06**: Deportation and mental health of CA migrants, Ietza Bojorquez

There is often the idea that those deported are criminals, and the deportation process by which migrants are detained, handcuffed and taken into custody, contributes to this perception.
Conclusion

• First attempt to study the Central American migrant population as a single collective in 5 countries
• Need to align concepts, methods, assumptions
• Mexico as a country of immigration
• Urgent policy implications for the U.S. & Mexico
• Binational migration dialogue opened in 1994
• More NAFTA not less!!
More information

- More information
  
  www.canamid.org
  
  info@canamid.org