Mexican Migration to the U.S.: Socio-economic success of movers and stayers

Preliminary and incomplete
Please do not cite or circulate

Andrea Velásquez
University of Colorado Denver

Gabriela Farfán
World Bank

Maria Genoni
World Bank

Duncan Thomas
Duke University

April 2018

Abstract

Uniquely rich longitudinal data from the Mexican Family Life Survey provide new evidence on the socio-economic success and assimilation of Mexicans who migrate to the U.S., comparing those who stay in the U.S. with those who return to Mexico. Comparisons in labor market outcomes are drawn between respondents interviewed at baseline in Mexico in 2002 who moved to the U.S. and were interviewed in either the first or second follow-up waves in the U.S. along with respondents who moved to the U.S. and returned to Mexico between the waves.

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 (Lopez and Patten, 2015). 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 (Passel et al., 2012).

Mexican migration to the U.S. has been extensively studied in the literature.[1] A large and active literature has examined the consequences of immigrant inflows on the labor market outcomes of natives.[2] Recent findings in this literature show that these effects depend on the skill composition of immigrant workers, and whether these skills substitute or complement those of native workers (Borjas, 2003; Ottaviano and Peri, 2012; Dustmann et al., 2017; Lee et al., 2017; East et al., 2018). These findings highlight the importance of providing rigorous evidence about the selectivity of migration.

A large body of the literature has examined the process of migration into the U.S. by Mexican citizens.[3] Despite this extensive literature, evidence on the characteristics that determine which migrants stay in the U.S. rather than return to Mexico is less well documented, and which are the determinants of their success in the U.S. labor market. This paper uses novel data to shed new light on these important subjects.

The paper makes important contributions to the literature through three main goals. First, we provide evidence on the characteristics that predict which Mexicans have chosen to migrate to the U.S. over the last decade.[4] By drawing on the same models specifications 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, return migration, and success in the new destination. Second, we estimate models that determine successful assimilation in the U.S. separately for

[1] For an excellent review of the literature, see Hanson (2006).
[2] For reviews of this literature see Friedberg and Hunt (1995), Longhi et al. (2005), and Longhi et al. (2006)
[3] See, for example, Borjas (1987), Donato, Durand, and Massey (1992), Durand, Kandel, Parrado and Massey (1996), Durand, Massey and Zenteno (2001), McKenzie and Rapoport. (2004), Orrenius and Zavodny (2005), Hanson, (2006), Hoefer, Rytina and Campbell (2006), Ibarraran and Lubotsky (2007), Fernández-Huertas Moraga (2011), Rendall, Brownell and Kups (2011), Kaestner and Malamud (2014).
[4] Kaestner and Malamud (2014) use the same data set to provide evidence on the selectivity of Mexican migration to the U.S. We build on these results to provide additional evidence about the process of return migration and assimilation in the U.S.

migrants that later stayed in the U.S. and for those that later returned to Mexico. 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. Third, we provide preliminary evidence of estimates of the returns to migration.

To provide scientific evidence on the selectivity of migrants, and their return to their country of origin, it is necessary to compare characteristics of migrants to those of non-migrants before the migration takes place, and to follow these migrants after the decision to migrate has taken place. 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.

We use data from the Mexican Family Life Survey (MxFLS). The 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. were 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. For the purpose of this paper we will focus on the sample of baseline respondents who migrated to the United States between 2002 and 2005 (774 migrants). 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 64% were still in the U.S. and the other 36% were found and interviewed back in 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 a 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 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 not migrated to live in the U.S. since 2002.

Our analysis on return migration and assimilation makes important contributions to previous findings in the literature. The results using pre-migration variables measured in Mexico, confirm previous evidence about the selectivity of Mexican migrants on human capital, household resources, and networks in the U.S. However, the same baseline characteristics that predict migration to the U.S. are not significant predictors of staying in the U.S. or returning to Mexico. The decision of staying seems to be driven more by variables that measure the migrants' level of success in the U.S.

Moreover, we find that these variables are important predictors of successful markers of assimilation in the U.S. labor market. But, their effect is different for migrants that later stayed in the U.S. and those who later returned to Mexico. For example, while human capital and networks in the U.S. have significant and positive returns on the stayers' earnings, the effect is not significant for returners. Moreover, when estimating the returns to migration, we find positive and significant returns to migration for migrants who are still living in the U.S., but negative (although insignificant) effects for return migrants.

The paper proceeds as follows. Section 2 describes the MxFLS dataset and provides descriptive statistics. Section 3 outlines the empirical models that predict return migration, assimilation, and returns to migration. Section 4 discusses the results, and we conclude in section 5.

2. Data

MxFLS is a large-scale population-representative longitudinal survey of Mexicans who were living in Mexico in 2002 when the baseline was conducted. The baseline survey, MxFLS-1, collected detailed information on 35,677 individuals living in 8,440 households in 150 communities spread across 16 states in Mexico (Rubalcava and Teruel, 2006a, 2006b).

The second wave, MxFLS-2, 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 considered "panel respondents." Over 89% of the panel respondents were re-interviewed in MxFLS-2. The third wave, MxFLS-3, started in 2009, and it achieved the same re-contact rates.

A novel feature of MxFLS, which is key for this research, is that it does not only follow panel members that had moved within Mexico but also follows 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, the MxFLS tracking is based on 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, all panel respondents that remain in Mexico, as well as, respondents who move to the U.S. are tracked and interviewed. 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, there was a 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.)[5]

The successful tracking experience of MxFLS-2 provided a strong foundation for the following of migrants in the second follow-up (MxFLS-3). Out of the total U.S. migrants successfully re-interviewed, near 64% were still in the U.S. and the other 36% were found and interviewed back in Mexico (Table 1). The re-contact rates for the entire sample and the sample of respondents older than 15 at baseline are very similar.[6] In the rest of the analysis we will focus on two different samples: respondents who were older than 15 at baseline (before migration to the U.S. takes place), and respondents older than 15 in the second wave (before return migration to Mexico takes place).[7] The first sample allows us to study baseline characteristics as predictors of selectivity into migration, return migration, and assimilation in the U.S. The second sample, allows us to test to which extent characteristics measured in U.S. during the second wave predict differently the selectivity into return migration, and the markers of assimilation in the U.S. for the sample of stayers.

Four features of the data are key for the analysis conducted in this paper. 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 the 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 in Mexican surveys. The latter concern is an increasingly common phenomenon among Mexican-origin migrants and is clearly documented in the MxFLS (Genoni 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, 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

[5] For a detailed description of the tracking methods used in the second wave see Genoni et al. (2017)
[6] 90.4 percent of panel respondents older than 15 at baseline were re-interviewed in the U.S.
[7] We make this choice because children are likely to move because of a migration decision made by their parents and it is their parents' characteristics most likely driving the selection.

information on the lives of respondents than has been used in prior analyses. This includes 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.

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 place of re-interview. We will describe in detail the migration categories used in our analysis.

Migration categories

The successful tracking of migrants in the U.S. in the second and third waves, allows us to determine the migration status of each panel respondent by their interview date in the third wave. In the third wave we interview migrants who were in U.S. in the second wave, both in Mexico and in the U.S. 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 and in the U.S. according to their migration experiences through the third wave.

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 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-U.S. movers", if they were not interviewed in the U.S. in MxFLS2; "moved to U.S. and returned", if they were interviewed in the U.S. in MxFLS2, 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 both the second and third wave.[8]

Baseline information

Along with a 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. We use this information to understand whether baseline characteristics predict: 1) migration to the U.S.; 2) return migration to Mexico; and, 3) success in the U.S. labor market.

[8] The MxFLS has migration history component that 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 future steps we will use this information to build our migration categories.

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. Kaestner and Malamud (2014) use this information from the MxFLS to predict migration to the U.S., and find that the number of relatives in the U.S. at baseline is a strong predictor of migration.

Table A.1 in the Appendix 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 A.1 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 A.1 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 A.2 in the Appendix 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 stayed in the U.S. ("stayers") 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.[9]

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

[9] The only exception is 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.

control for a broader group of characteristics measured at baseline both at the individual and household level.

Information collected in the U.S.

Even though the U.S. interviews in MxFLS-2, given their experimental nature, were shorter compared to those applied in Mexico, the U.S. component of MxFLS-2 still includes very rich information. A comprehensive set of modules follow those applied in Mexico in order to facilitate the comparison of information collected in Mexico and in the U.S., and specific changes are incorporated to the U.S. questionnaire to capture the relevant aspects of the life of Mexicans in the United States. In the third wave, MxFLS-3, the questionnaire was expanded, and we collected information on all the household members living with our panel respondent in the U.S.

We use information collected in the U.S. to predict the probability of return migration, and to provide evidence on whether certain observed characteristics of the lives of the migrants in the U.S. could predict their future success in either the U.S. labor market, if they stayed in the U.S., or in the Mexican labor market, if they returned to Mexico. Table 2 shows descriptive statistics based on information collected in the U.S. for both return migrants and stayers who were older than 15 during the MxFLS-2 interview.

Table 2 shows that stayers are more likely to be women. This could be driven by the fact that women are more likely to migrate to the U.S. to reunite with their families. In fact, stayers are more likely to live with their spouse and children in the U.S. Stayers are more likely to be younger and to have attained higher levels of education by the time of their U.S. interview. This might be explained by the fact that younger individuals are likely to continue their studies in the U.S., which can play a crucial role in their assimilation levels. Interestingly they are less likely to be working, but the lower labor force participation of women explains this result. While 92% of men report to have worked the week before, only 50% of women are active in the labor force. For men there are no differences between stayers and returners, but return female migrants are 5 percentage points more likely to be working. These statistics highlight the potential differences in the motivation to migrate to the U.S. and to return to Mexico between males and females.[10] Moreover, by their interview in MxFLS2, there were no significant differences in the levels of earnings of stayers and eventual returners.

Table 2 also shows important differences in the migration experience and expectations of stayers and return migrants. These are variables that are not available in most surveys and that could be particularly informative about the decision to return to Mexico. Stayers are less likely to be undocumented, although the proportion is still high, more likely to know people before coming to

[10] While in our sample for the main analysis we consider together men and women, a regression framework that controls by gender is more informative about whether these differences predict decisions to migrate or successful assimilation. In future steps, we will conduct the analysis separately for men and women.

the U.S., and more likely to have moved to reunite with their families. Furthermore, stayers are less likely to plan to return to Mexico (although the vast majority plans to return to Mexico at some point); they are more likely to think their live is better in the U.S. relative to their lives in Mexico and that U.S. has fulfilled their expectations. Stayers also show higher probabilities of speaking English frequently.

In addition to exploiting information collected in the second wave of the MxFLS, we will use information collected in MxLFS-3 both in Mexico and in the U.S. At this stage we focus on labor market outcomes, but we plan to explore 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.

3. Empirical specification

Selection into migration to the U.S.

Selection into migration to the U.S. has been widely studied. While one strand of the literaure suggests that Mexican migrants are drawn from the lower tail of the income and education distribution (negative selection hypothesis (Borjas, 1987)), another part 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 important endogeneity challenges. Exploiting information measured at baseline can sove this problem. Kaestner and Malamud (2014), also using the MxFLS data, find that although migrants are selected from the middle of the education distribution, they are negatively selected on earnings, which is explained by the differential returns to skills in the two countries.

Although,not the main focus of this paper, we believe it is informative to start our analysis following a similar model to the one developed by Kaestner and Malamud (2014). We show the results of a linear probability model (LPM) that predicts the probability of migration to the U.S. using baseline characteristcs for the sample of panel respondents age 15 and older at baseline. This model can be summarized in the following regression framework:

$$U.S.migrant_i = \beta_0 + x'_{iMxFLS1}\beta + \varepsilon_i \quad (1)$$

Where $U.S.migrant_i$ is a dummy variable, equal to one if the respondent was interviewed in U.S. during the MxFLS2 interview and zero if not, and x'_i represents a rich set of controls measured at

baseline, prior to any potential migration. For this model, it is important that the controls are measured at baseline, so that they are not a result of the respondents' future migration status.

Selection of return migration

We complement this analysis with a model for the probability of return migration conditional on being a U.S. migrant interviewed in the U.S. during the second wave of the MxFLS. 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:

$$(return\ to\ Mexico_i | U.S. migrant) = \alpha_0 + z_i'\alpha + e_i \quad (2)$$

Where $(return\ to\ Mexico_i)$ is a dummy variable equal to 1 if the U.S. migrant is living in Mexico at the time of the MxFLS-3 interview. To predict model (2) we follow two different specifications that allow us to test different sets of hypotheses. In the first version we use the same covariates as in model (1).[11] This set of independent variables can be grouped into five main catagories, which are chosen with the purpose of providing evidence on different hypotheses about migration currently posed in the migration literature.

The first group contains basic demographic information including age and marital status and the second group includes measures of human capital, like years of education and height. Leveraging an innovative feature of the MxFLS, 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. Specifically, the MxFLS collects information about social networks in the U.S. prior to migration, which we believe is important given the fact that 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.

Since many studies have suggested that migrants with more assets in Mexico are more likely to keep ties with their home country and eventually return to Mexico and more assets at baseline can serve as an important resource to finance migration (CITE), we explicitly explore household characteristics in our fourth set of covariates. In particular, we explore this hypothesis by including household size and household resources, measured with per capita expenditure, into the model. The final type of covarite we add is a control for whether the respondent lives in a rural locality. The

[11] 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.

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.[12]

In the second version of model (2), we use characteristics measured in the U.S. before the decision to return to Mexico has been made. For these analyses, all panel members living in the U.S. in MxFLS2 that are age 15 or older at the time of the MxFLS2 interview form our sample. Estimating these two models to predict return migration provides evidence on whether the most important predictors of the decision to stay in the U.S. for the long-haul or return to Mexico are respondent's characteristics determined before the first migration to the U.S. or characteristics determined while in the U.S.

Assimilation

The second part of the paper provides evidence about the 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. We estimate three different models. The first and second models predict labor market outcomes of U.S. migrants in MxFLS-2, and of U.S. stayers in MxFLS-3 respectively, using covariates measured at baseline. Since we use baseline covariates, the model is predicted for the sample of U.S. migrants older than 15 at baseline, for all U.S migrants, and separately for stayers and returners.

$$(U.S.\ln(Earnings)_{it}|U.S.migrant) = \gamma_0 = \delta_0 + x'_{iMxFLS1}\delta + \eta_{it}\ ,\ for\ t = MxFLS2{,}3 \qquad (3)$$

The third model we estimates uses variables measured in the U.S. during MxFLS2 to predict labor outcomes measured in MxFLS3. For returners they are measured in Mexico, and for stayers they are measured in the U.S. In both cases, since we are using variables measured in MxFLS2, we use the sample of respondents age 15 and older at the time of the MxFLS2 survey.

$$(U.S.\ln(Earnings)_{iMxFLS3}|U.S.migrant) = \gamma_0 + x'_{iMxFLS2}\gamma + v_{iMxFLS3} \qquad (4)$$

Returns to Migration

Our last set of analyses attempts to provide insight into the returns to migration. Since migrants to the U.S. are not randomly selected, and therefore cannot be easily compared to non-migrants, estimating the returns to migration is a very challenging task. We follow a standard approach of dealing with this endogeneity by using observed pre-migration characteristics as controls. This

[12] In addition to the more standard variables we added controls for whether the respondent lives with a parent or sibling that has moved to the U.S. prior to the baseline, since prior experiences of co-resident relatives who return to Mexico might influence the decision to migrate to the U.S. However, once we added the controls for networks in the U.S. these variables lost significance.

technique re-estimates models 3 and 4 while adding a dummy variable for migration status as follows:

$$U.S.\ln(Earnings)_{it} = \theta_0 + \theta_1 U.S.migrant + x'_{iMxFLS1}\theta + \omega_{it}\ ,\ for\ t = MxFLS2, 3 \qquad (5)$$

Where the estimate of θ_1 measures the returns to being a migrant. In this case, our sample is formed by all panel respondents age 15 and older at baseline who report being in the labor market by the time of the survey in MxLFS2 or MxFLS3. By including a rich set of characteristics measured at baseline to predict migration, the estimate of θ_1 deals with the observed component that predicts selection into migration.

Finally, we estimate the returns of staying in the U.S. among U.S. migrants in the following model:

$$(U.S.\ln(Earnings)_{iMxFLS3}|U.S.migrant) = \lambda_0 + \lambda_1 U.S.stayer + x'_{iMxFLS2}\lambda + \varrho_{it} \qquad (6)$$

The estimate of λ_1 measures the returns of being a migrant and staying in the U.S for the sample of U.S. migrants. In this case, our sample is formed of all panel respondents age 15 and older in MxFLS2, who were interviewed in the U.S. in MxFLS2, and who report being in the labor market by the time of the survey in MxLFS2 or MxFLS3.

We complement both analyses of regressions 5 and 6 by estimating propensity score matching models, but acknowledge that, although informative, all of these models are still subject to potential bias from selection on unobserved characteristics. In future steps, we will explore a sibling fixed effect model to control for unobserved heterogeneity at the household level.

4. Results

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 return migration to Mexico. 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.

We start our analysis showing evidence that confirms previous results about the selectivity of migration to the U.S. in Table A.3; and, in Tables A.4 and 3 present the evidence on the selectivity into return migration for the sample of U.S. migrants.

Table A.3 in the Appendix shows the results of equation (1), and these confirm the main results of Kaestner and Malamud (2014). For each sample (all, females, and males) 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.

The results in Table A.3 show four main results. First, young Mexicans are the most likely to move to the U.S.; second, human capital is an important predictor of migration to the U.S. The results for education suggest that those in the lowest end of the distribution of education are the least likely to move to the United States, but higher levels of education do not increase the probability of migrating to the U.S. This inverted U-shape corroborates previous findings on the relationship between education and migration from Mexico to the United States for males (Chiquiar and Hanson, 2005; Fernández-Huertas Moraga, 2011; Kaestner and Malamud, 2014; and Orrenius and Zavodny, 2005).

Similar to the males in our sample, 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. than those with no education. However, contrary to our findings for males, we do not see a U-shape effect of education in the prediction of U.S. migration. We also include height as an additional dimension of human capital in the models by adding dummy indicators for whether height falls in the second, third or fourth quartile of the distribution, with the first quartile category excluded. Height is a significant predictor of migration to the U.S. for both men and women. [13]

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 home 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. Our estimates on the relationship between migration and household resources allow us to provide evidence on these hypotheses.

The effects of the presence of networks in the U.S. prior to migration provide our third results of interest. In columns 3 and 5 we show that both male and female migrants are more likely to move to the U.S. if they have more relatives living in the U.S. Moreover, the presence of parents, son/daughters, siblings, and spouse for females, 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.

[13] We have also included a measure of a non-verbal cognitive assessment (the Ravens Progressive Colored Matrices test), but this is not a significant predictor of migration to the U.S. for either men or women.

The fourth result from this analysis is related to the covariates that measure household resources. While families with more wealth 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 with higher per capita expenditure (PCE) decreases the likelihood of migration to the U.S. for males. On the other hand, wealth does not seem to be a strong determinant of migration to the U.S. in the sample of females.

Tables A.4 and Table 3 show the estimates that predict the model of return migration for the sample of U.S. migrants. Table A.4 uses the same baseline covariates discussed to predict migration to the U.S., and Table 3 uses variables measured in the U.S. before return migration has occurred.

The results in Table A.4, as compared to Table A.3, provide evidence that selection into migration and, then, into laying down roots for the long haul at the destination 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. Table 3 provides additional information about this decision process by predicting return migration using characteristics measured while all the migrants are still in the U.S. Our sample consists of U.S. migrants of age 15 and older in MxFLS2. Each column in the table incorporates a new set of covariates to check the robustness of the results to the inclusion of each new set of controls.

The results show that female U.S. migrants are between 9-13 percentage points less likely to return to Mexico than males. This could be a function of female migrants being less likely to be seasonal workers in Mexico and in the U.S., or with being more likely to migrate with their children and thus hoping to stay in the U.S. for a longer term (CITE?). The first divergence between the predictors of migration and determinants of staying in the U.S. is seen with the results on age. While increasing age was a strong negative predictor of migrating, it is unrelated to returning aside from a positive relationship for respondents 35-49. For married individuals we had found they were less likely to migrate to begin with, and in Table 3 we see for those that did migrate, they are more likely to return. This relationship with returning for married migrants is expectedly attenuated, by between 40 and 55 percentage points, if the spouse is in the U.S. the probability of returning to Mexico. This result highlights how important it is for the migrant to be reunited with their families, either in the U.S. or in Mexico.

Similarly to what was found in Table A.4, education does not seem to be a significant predictor in the decision to return to Mexico. But, the sign of the coefficients suggest that, if there is any type of selection, it seems like the most educated migrants are the most likely to stay in the U.S. for a longer term. This suggestive evidence of positive selection on human capital is reinforced when looking at the effect of PCE on the decision to return. Migrants from households at the top quartiles of the PCE distribution in U.S. among our sample of migrants are less likely to return to Mexico.

Specifically, households in the third quartile are between 12 and 17 percentage points less likely to return.

While it seems intuitive that speaking English frequently might improve the assimilation of Mexican migrants in the U.S., which would decrease the probability of returning to Mexico, evidence suggests this might be the case, but the results are not precisely estimated. The results in column 7 show the results for the sample of workers, and again we see evidence of a positive selection on the decision to stay in the U.S. A 10% increase in hourly earnings decreases the probability of returning to Mexico by 0.7 percentage points.

Lastly, expectations play an important role in the decisions made by migrants. Respondents who had plans to return to Mexico are in fact more likely to go back, and those whose expectations about U.S. are fulfilled, are less likely to return by around 10 percentage points.

Taking the results in Tables A.3, A.4 and 3, as a whole we can conclude that first, the variables at baseline that predict migration to the U.S. are not necessarily the same predicting return migration. Second, what seems more relevant to predict return migration are variables that measure how successful the migrant has been in the U.S. relative to pre-migration variables. In the second part of the analysis we now focus on the model that predicts assimilation of migrants in the U.S. labor market.

Assimilation

The second goal of this research is to provide evidence about the markers for successful assimilation of Mexican migrants 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. A second analysis we have conducted uses baseline characteristics to predict assimilation outcomes measured in the third wave of MxFLS for stayers in the U.S. Finally, we predict to which extent variables measured in the U.S. in MxFLS2 predict outcomes of assimilation measured in the third wave in Mexico for returners, and in the U.S. for stayers. In this analysis, assimilation is measured as the individual level earnings in the U.S. Future work will complement this analysis looking also at 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 the model based on equation (3), we assess whether socio-economic and demographic characteristics measured at baseline are predictive of the extent of assimilation for the group of migrants who has stayed in the U.S. By drawing on the same specifications 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, return 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 4 provides the results of measuring assimilation using the log of hourly U.S earnings measured in MxFLS2 for individuals' age 15 or older at baseline. In the first two columns we show the estimates for the entire sample of migrants interviewed in the U.S. 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 4 show that female migrants earn around 45 percentage points less than males, and the wage gap seems to be larger for migrants who returned 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, and the effects of education are non-linear. However, education attained at baseline does not seem to have any effect on the level of earnings of migrants that subsequently returned 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, it is not evident that they will determine a more successful assimilation in the U.S. Having extended family in the U.S. prior to migration has a negative effect on the level of earnings and this effect holds only for return migrants. The presence of a spouse and siblings, on the other hand, has positive effects on the earnings of stayers. Spouses and siblings 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 5 provides estimates on what characteristics predict assimilation for our sample of stayers, the sample of U.S migrants who were found and interviewed in the third wave in the U.S. For this analysis we again use the sample of individuals age 15 or older at baseline. Table 5 shows the results for outcomes that measure economic assimilation: probability of labor force participation (columns 1 and 2), log(annual earnings)(columns 3 and 4), and log(hourly earnings (columns 5 and 6). 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 is less strong when looking at hourly earnings. The wage gap in total earnings might be driven by the different intensity of work of

men and women. The measures of human capital, both education and height, are important determinants of higher earnings, and the effects continue to show non-linearities. Surprisingly, though, the presence of a spouse or a parent in the U.S. now has negative effects on the level of earnings of the migrant.

Table 6 estimates the model laid out in equation (4). This specification predicts labor outcomes for returners in Mexico, and stayers in the U.S.in the third wave, using variables measured in the U.S. in MxFLS2. The idea of the model is to provide evidence on whether abilities developed while in the U.S. can help the assimilation process in the U.S. and whether they improve the labor outcomes of returners in Mexico.

The first three columns show the results for U.S. stayers, and the last three columns for returners. For each groups we show results for probability of labor force participation, log of total earnings and log of hourly earnings. For both stayers and returners there is evidence of persistence in the gender wage gap. In addition, attained education by MxFLS2 is a significant predictor of success in both labor markets. Household composition in the U.S. in MxFLS2 significantly impacts the markers of assimilation of migrants who stayed in the U.S., but they don't seem to affect those of return migrants. And, migrants living in household with a higher PCE do better in the U.S. labor market, but that does not translate in better outcomes in Mexico. Looking at these results together with the findings of Table 3, we see that the level of well-being of the household in the U.S. is an important determinant of returning to Mexico, and of the economic success of the migrant in the U.S. However, it does not seem that the wealth accumulated in Mexico can positively translate into better labor outcomes back in Mexico. On the other hand, speaking English is potentially an important ability that can positively affect labor outcome in both markets and the evidence in Table 6 suggests this is the case, but again the estimate is imprecisely estimated.

From the results in Tables 4 to 6 we can highlight three main results. First, while baseline characteristics are not significant predictors of the decision to stay or return to Mexico, they are significant determinants of markers of assimilation in the labor market outcomes of migrants in the U.S. Importantly, there is evidence of positive and significant returns of education at baseline, and contacts in the U.S. before migrating, but only for U.S. stayers. This result, together with the fact, that migrants with lower earnings are more likely to return, suggests that baseline characteristics might not influence directly the decision to return to Mexico or stay in the U.S. for a longer term, but through their effects on the migrant's success in the U.S. labor market. Second, while the positive returns to education persist through time for migrants who stayed in the U.S., the same cannot be said about the positive returns of networks in the U.S. While having extended family and siblings in the U.S. prior to migrate has a positive effect on the level of earnings of U.S. stayers in the last round of the MxFLS, having parents and a spouse in U.S. affects negatively the earnings of this group of migrants. It is possible that having parents 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 negative effect of a presence of a spouse, on the other hand, is more puzzling. Third, while the characteristics of the migrant living in U.S. during MxFLS-2 are significant predictors of labor market outcomes of stayers, it does not seem that they can affect labor market outcomes of the migrant in Mexico. In order to provide additional evidence on the returns to migration, in the next section we estimate a naïve model that shows preliminary evidence on this subject.

Returns to Migration

The third goal of the paper is to provide evidence on the economic returns to migrate from Mexico to the U.S. As showed in the previous sections migrants to the U.S. and return migrants to Mexico are significantly different in a large number of observed characteristics. Although, we can correct for this selectivity by adding these controls, this might still generate biased results if there are unobserved characteristics that predict migration. The results of this section account only for observed characteristics, and although we control for a rich set of variables, it is important to be cautious when interpreting these results.

Table 7 shows the results of equation (5). Columns 1 to 4 show the results for the sample of panel respondents age 15 and older at baseline, both U.S. migrants and non-U.S. migrants who report positive earnings in MxFLS2. Columns 1 and 2 estimate returns to migration by adding a dummy for U.S. migration. The models differ only by the measure of U.S. networks. Earnings in Mexico and in the U.S. are comparable by using the 2005 exchange rate. The results show that the returns of migration to the U.S. is around 178%[14]. Moreover, by MxFLS2, whether the migrant returned or stayed in Mexico does not have differential effects on these estimated returns to migration (columns 3 and 4). We complement this model by estimating a propensity score matching model. This is still not a perfect estimation since it cannot account for selection on unobserved variables. The estimate of the PSM model is still significant and of about 150%.

The results in columns 5 and 6 estimate the same model using earnings measured in MxFLS3, but only for the sample of non-U.S. migrants and return migrants. Therefore, these are earnings measured only in Mexico. The goal of this estimation is to provide evidence on whether the U.S. migration experience has significant returns in the Mexican labor market for return migrants. The results show that this is not the case. The coefficient is not only insignificant, but negative. These results are consistent with the findings in Table 6 for return migrants. It seems that the ability acquired in the U.S. or overall the U.S. experience does not train Mexican workers in a way that can be profitable for them in the Mexican labor market when they return.

Finally, the results in Table 8 show the returns to migration focusing only on the sample of U.S. migrants (both stayers and returners) in MxFLS3. Earnings in Mexico and in the U.S. are comparable by using the 2010 exchange rate. The returns of staying in the U.S. among U.S. migrants

[14] Hanson (2006) estimates returns of migration of between 200-400 percent.

is significant and positive, and of around 190%. The PSM estimation is still significant, but decreases to 178%.

5. Conclusion

This paper provides evidence on three main subjects. First, it complements previous research that studies the selectivity of Mexican migration to the U.S. by looking at the determinants that predict return migration. Second, 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. Third, it estimates a preliminary model for the returns of migration.

The paper's findings can be summarized in four main points. First, the baseline characteristics that significantly predict migration to the U.S. are not necessarily the same ones predicting return migration. In fact, baseline characteristics do not seem to be highly predictive of return migration, but what seems more important to predict return migration are variables collected in the U.S. measuring the level of success of the migrant in the U.S.

Second, human capital (as measured by education and height) are predictive not only of migration to the United States, but also of higher earnings in the U.S. labor market. As found previously in the literature we find that those who move to the United States are not likely to be drawn from the bottom or top of the education distribution. Moreover, conditional on moving to the United States, higher levels of education increase the migrant's earnings in the short term, and evidence suggests that education carries a premium in terms of earnings in the labor market.

Third, 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. However, the positive returns of networks are significant only for stayers in the short-term (MxFLS2), and they do not persist in the medium-term (MxFLS3).

Fourth, our results of the positive and significant returns to migration are consistent with previous findings in the literature (Hanson, 2006). However, we find no evidence of positive returns of the U.S. migration experience for return migrants who are back in Mexico.

6. 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.

Borjas, G. J. (2003) "The Labor Demand Curve is Downward Sloping: Reexamining the Impact of Immigration on the Labor Market," *The Quarterly Journal of Economics,* 118 (4), 1335:1374.

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.

Dustmann, C., U. Schonberg, and J. Stuhler, "LaborSupply Shocks, Native Wages, and The Adjustment of Local Employment," *The Quarterly Journal of Economics,* 2017, 132, 435:483.

East, C., P. Luck, H. Mansour and A. Velasquez (2018) "The Labor Market Effects of Immigration Enforcement." University of Colorado Denver

Genoni, M. Farfan, M., 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

Friedberg, R.., and J. Hunt, "The Impact of Immigrants on Host Country Wages, Employment and Growth," *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 1995, 9 (2), 23:44.

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

Lee, J., G. Peri, and V. Yasenov, (2017) "The Employment Effects of Mexican Repatriations: Evidence from the 1930's," Working Paper 23885, National Bureau of Economic Research September

Longhi, Simonetta, Peter Nijkamp, and Jacques Poot, "A Meta-Analytic Assessment of the Effect of Immigration on Wages," Journal of Economic Surveys, 2005, 19 (3), 451-477.

Longhi, Simonetta, Peter Nijkamp, and Jacques Poot, "The impact of immigration on the employment of natives in regional labour markets: A meta-analysis," Working Paper, IZA 2006.

Lopez, Gustavo, and Eileen Patten. "The impact of slowing immigration: foreign-born share falls among 14 largest US Hispanic origin groups." Pew Research Center, September 15 (2015).

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.

Ottaviano, Gianmarco and Giovanni Peri, \Rethinking the E
ect of Immigration on
Wages," Journal of the European Economic Association, 2012, 10 (1), 152{197.

Passel, Jeffrey S., Gonzalez-Barrera A. D'Vera Cohn, and Ana Gonzalez-Barrera. "Net migration from Mexico falls to zero--and perhaps less." Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center, 2012.

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.

Rubalcava, Luis N., and Graciela M. Teruel, "User's Guide for the Mexican Family Life Survey First Wave," (2006a), www.mxfls.uia.mx.

Rubalcava, Luis N., and Graciela M. Teruel, "Mexican Family Life Survey, Second Round," working paper (2006b), www.ennvih-mxfls.org.

7. Tables

Table 1. Sample sizes and recontact rates in MxFLS

Panel A. Recontact rates in MxFLS2

	Eligible for survey	Interviewed	% Interviewed
Total	35,134	31,338	89.20
In Mexico	34,280	30,564	89.16
In US	854	774	90.63

Panel B. Migration Status of US migrants by MxFLS3

	Interviewed	%
Stayer in US by MxFLS3	471	60.85
Returner to Mx by MxFLS3	268	34.63
Attrited by MxFLS3	35	4.52

Source: MxFLS

Note - Excluded panel respondents who died between waves

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics by Migration Status in MxFLS3

Respondents age 15 and older in MxFLS2

	Return Migrants		Stayers in US			
Variables measured in US in MxFLS2	Mean	Sd	Mean	Sd	Difference	p-value
Basic demographics						
(1) Female	0.277	0.448	0.429	0.496	-0.153	**0.000**
Age	29.067	12.222	27.088	10.357	1.979	**0.029**
(1) Married	0.512	0.501	0.534	0.500	-0.022	0.590
Years of education	7.448	3.299	7.941	3.135	-0.493	**0.060**
(1) Primary <5 Grade	0.163	0.370	0.109	0.312	0.054	**0.050**
(1) Primary 5 & 6 grades	0.235	0.425	0.269	0.444	-0.034	0.336
(1) High school incomplete	0.482	0.501	0.467	0.500	0.015	0.706
(1) High school complete	0.120	0.325	0.155	0.362	-0.035	0.216
Employment variables						
(1) Worked last week	0.819	0.386	0.738	0.440	0.081	**0.021**
(1) Wage worker	0.921	0.271	0.951	0.216	-0.031	0.153
(1) Self-employed	0.079	0.271	0.042	0.202	0.037	**0.074**
Log(Hourly Earnings)	1.858	0.633	1.915	0.530	-0.057	0.290
Log(Monthly Earnings)	7.074	0.600	7.083	0.545	-0.010	0.847
(1) Quartile 1 Log(Hourly Earnings)	0.234	0.425	0.261	0.440	-0.027	0.515
(1) Quartile 2 Log(Hourly Earnings)	0.309	0.463	0.296	0.458	0.012	0.781
(1) Quartile 3 Log(Hourly Earnings)	0.277	0.449	0.250	0.434	0.027	0.522
(1) Quartile 3 Log(Hourly Earnings)	0.181	0.386	0.193	0.395	-0.012	0.745
(1) Quartile 1 Log(Monthly Earnings)	0.326	0.470	0.339	0.474	-0.013	0.754
(1) Quartile 2 Log(Monthly Earnings)	0.200	0.401	0.202	0.402	-0.002	0.956
(1) Quartile 3 Log(Monthly Earnings)	0.260	0.440	0.254	0.436	0.006	0.870
(1) Quartile 3 Log(Monthly Earnings)	0.214	0.411	0.205	0.405	0.009	0.809
Household characteristics						
HH size	2.172	2.243	2.330	2.060	-0.157	0.378
(1) Spouse in US	0.098	0.298	0.197	0.399	-0.099	**0.001**
(1) Children in US	0.098	0.298	0.197	0.399	-0.099	**0.002**
Log(PCE)	5.519	0.871	5.631	0.835	-0.112	0.238
(1) Sent money to Mx	0.804	0.398	0.756	0.430	0.048	0.167
Sent money to how many people	1.967	3.336	1.774	1.220	0.193	0.395
Total transfers sent (dollars)	3,812	4,484	3,271	4,081	541	0.189
Migration						
Number of moves	1.490	1.642	1.497	2.213	-0.008	0.964
Year of arrival	2,001	6.247	2,001	6.131	0.104	0.839
(1) Undocumented	0.858	0.350	0.799	0.401	0.058	**0.073**
(1) Knew anybody before coming	0.767	0.424	0.827	0.379	-0.060	**0.070**
(1) Moved for work	0.785	0.412	0.692	0.462	0.093	**0.011**
(1) Moved to study	0.037	0.190	0.035	0.185	0.002	0.909
(1) Moved bc of family	0.112	0.315	0.188	0.391	-0.076	**0.011**
(1) Moved - other reason	0.066	0.249	0.084	0.278	-0.018	0.407
(1) Crossed by bus	0.239	0.428	0.190	0.393	0.049	0.160
(1) Crossed by airplane	0.060	0.238	0.060	0.239	-0.001	0.977
(1) Crossed walking	0.594	0.492	0.586	0.493	0.008	0.851
(1) Crossed other way	0.107	0.310	0.163	0.370	-0.056	**0.057**
(1) Paid trip own money	0.255	0.437	0.240	0.428	0.015	0.667
(1) Paid trip hh money	0.272	0.446	0.229	0.421	0.043	0.231
(1) Paid trip relatives money	0.440	0.497	0.512	0.501	-0.072	**0.082**
(1) Paid trip boss money	0.004	0.064	0.008	0.090	-0.004	0.544
(1) Paid trp community money	0.004	0.064	0.016	0.127	-0.012	0.165
(1) Paid trip other money	0.070	0.256	0.057	0.233	0.013	0.525
Expectations and English						
(1) Plan to return to Mexico	0.947	0.224	0.886	0.318	0.061	**0.022**
How long plan to stay in US (months)	26.664	28.384	33.133	48.362	-6.469	0.170
(1) Better to live in US	0.722	0.449	0.833	0.373	-0.111	**0.003**
(1) Felt depressed last 4 weeks	0.401	0.491	0.398	0.490	0.003	0.938
(1) USA fulfilled expectations	0.439	0.497	0.536	0.499	-0.098	**0.026**
(1) Plan to bring family and friends	0.289	0.454	0.327	0.470	-0.038	0.375
(1) Read English well, very well or average	0.332	0.472	0.393	0.489	-0.061	0.126
(1) Speaks English sometimes or frequently	0.446	0.498	0.538	0.499	-0.091	**0.028**

Table 3. Prediction of return migration to Mexico since MxFLS2

Respondents Age 15 and older in MxFLS2
LPM - Probability of Return to Mx

Variables measured in US in MxFLS2	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Basic demographics							
(1) Female	-0.131***	-0.110**	-0.108**	-0.125***	-0.098**	-0.090*	-0.106**
	[0.040]	[0.044]	[0.044]	[0.045]	[0.046]	[0.049]	[0.053]
(1) Age: 25-34 Omitted 15-24	-0.027	-0.023	-0.024	-0.018	-0.011	-0.012	0.048
	[0.050]	[0.050]	[0.050]	[0.050]	[0.050]	[0.050]	[0.058]
(1) Age: 35-49	0.066	0.081	0.082	0.117*	0.133**	0.129**	0.187**
	[0.060]	[0.062]	[0.062]	[0.063]	[0.063]	[0.063]	[0.073]
(1) Age> 50	-0.009	0.068	0.059	0.113	0.104	0.101	0.1
	[0.101]	[0.098]	[0.101]	[0.117]	[0.119]	[0.119]	[0.136]
(1) Married	0.051	0.114**	0.117**	0.109*	0.104*	0.106*	0.206***
	[0.049]	[0.056]	[0.057]	[0.057]	[0.056]	[0.056]	[0.069]
Human Capital							
(1) Primary complete Omitted Primay incomplete	-0.11	-0.091	-0.09	-0.075	-0.084	-0.085	0.003
	[0.068]	[0.066]	[0.067]	[0.068]	[0.067]	[0.067]	[0.074]
(1) High school incomplete	-0.064	-0.058	-0.059	-0.038	-0.038	-0.037	0.051
	[0.066]	[0.064]	[0.065]	[0.066]	[0.066]	[0.066]	[0.072]
(1) High scool complete	-0.12	-0.101	-0.1	-0.05	-0.034	-0.036	0.052
	[0.078]	[0.078]	[0.078]	[0.083]	[0.082]	[0.082]	[0.094]
Household characteristics							
Household Size		0.007	0.007	0.007	0.008	0.008	0.009
		[0.011]	[0.011]	[0.011]	[0.011]	[0.011]	[0.012]
(1) Spouse in US (if married)		-0.431***	-0.437***	-0.405**	-0.441***	-0.439***	-0.545***
		[0.166]	[0.166]	[0.170]	[0.163]	[0.164]	[0.174]
(1) Children in US		0.138	0.138	0.122	0.157	0.153	0.098
		[0.154]	[0.154]	[0.158]	[0.149]	[0.151]	[0.158]
(1) Quartile 2 PCE		-0.022	-0.025	-0.034	-0.042	-0.042	-0.034
		[0.064]	[0.064]	[0.064]	[0.063]	[0.063]	[0.072]
(1) Quartile 3 PCE		-0.169***	-0.170***	-0.151**	-0.174***	-0.175***	-0.126*
		[0.063]	[0.063]	[0.064]	[0.064]	[0.064]	[0.072]
(1) Quartile 4 PCE		-0.027	-0.029	-0.02	-0.031	-0.031	-0.062
		[0.062]	[0.062]	[0.062]	[0.061]	[0.061]	[0.065]
(1) Sent Transfers to Mexico			-0.007	-0.012	-0.003	-0.008	-0.009
			[0.048]	[0.049]	[0.049]	[0.049]	[0.061]
Expectations and English							
(1) Speaks English sometimes or frequently				-0.065	-0.048	-0.049	-0.019
				[0.044]	[0.045]	[0.045]	[0.051]
Arrival year				0.004	0.002	0.002	0.009**
				[0.003]	[0.004]	[0.004]	[0.005]
(1) Undocumented				0.057	0.046	0.046	0.072
				[0.057]	[0.056]	[0.056]	[0.068]
(1) Knew anybody before coming					-0.042	-0.043	-0.041
					[0.051]	[0.051]	[0.060]
(1) Plan to return to Mexico					0.126*	0.119	0.131
					[0.072]	[0.073]	[0.101]
(1) USA fulfilled expectations					-0.101**	-0.101**	-0.017
					[0.042]	[0.042]	[0.049]
(1) Plan to bring family and friends					-0.025	-0.025	-0.013
					[0.046]	[0.047]	[0.051]
Employment variables							
(1) Worked last week						0.035	
						[0.061]	
(1) Log(Hourly Earnings)							-0.076*
							[0.041]
Sample size	**622**	**622**	**622**	**622**	**622**	**622**	**470**
Adjusted R-squared	0.047	0.072	0.07	0.08	0.101	0.098	0.105

Robust Standard errors in brackets
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1
Note: Includes State of residence in the US Fixed Effects

Table 4. Estimation of predictors of assimilation in U.S. - MxFLS2
Dependent variable US Ln(Hourly Earnings) measured in MxFLS2

Respondents15 and older at baseline

	All	All	Returner	Returner	Stayer	Stayer
Variables measured in Mexico at baseline	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Basic demographics						
(1) Female	-0.454***	-0.466***	-0.570***	-0.484***	-0.405***	-0.448***
	[0.064]	[0.080]	[0.124]	[0.123]	[0.087]	[0.109]
(1) Age: 20-24 Omitted 15-19	-0.022	-0.007	-0.096	-0.147	0.029	0.079
	[0.047]	[0.056]	[0.122]	[0.137]	[0.060]	[0.069]
(1) Age: 25-34	0.015	0.092	0.018	0.176	-0.001	0.003
	[0.066]	[0.073]	[0.144]	[0.206]	[0.069]	[0.065]
(1) Age: 35-49	-0.014	0.048	-0.068	0.029	0.037	0.022
	[0.111]	[0.129]	[0.212]	[0.317]	[0.150]	[0.155]
(1) Age> 50	-0.492*	-0.595*	-1.017**	-0.883	-0.016	-0.333
	[0.252]	[0.309]	[0.467]	[0.531]	[0.203]	[0.328]
(1) Married	0.013	-0.088	0.011	-0.099	0.001	-0.061
	[0.078]	[0.088]	[0.169]	[0.248]	[0.076]	[0.083]
Human Capital						
(1) Primary complete Omitted Primay incomplete	-0.043	-0.013	-0.113	-0.067	0.017	0.031
	[0.075]	[0.083]	[0.137]	[0.161]	[0.078]	[0.102]
(1) High school incomplete	0.138**	0.183***	0.021	0.073	0.196***	0.242***
	[0.060]	[0.062]	[0.115]	[0.126]	[0.066]	[0.074]
(1) High scool complete	0.155	0.07	-0.049	-0.059	0.265**	0.138
	[0.099]	[0.115]	[0.182]	[0.234]	[0.112]	[0.128]
(1) Some college or more	0.280**	0.214*	0.155	0.049	0.409***	0.441***
	[0.116]	[0.112]	[0.168]	[0.205]	[0.131]	[0.140]
(1) Quartile 2 height	-0.015	0.002	-0.034	0.053	0.036	0.076
	[0.104]	[0.106]	[0.213]	[0.215]	[0.123]	[0.100]
(1) Quartile 3 height	0.019	0.045	0.064	0.15	0	0.036
	[0.098]	[0.109]	[0.180]	[0.167]	[0.112]	[0.123]
(1) Quartile 4 height	0.042	0.08	-0.098	0.015	0.203*	0.239*
	[0.101]	[0.112]	[0.194]	[0.178]	[0.113]	[0.136]
Networks in the U.S.						
(1) One relative in US Omitted No relatives in US	0.03		-0.072		0.140*	
	[0.062]		[0.097]		[0.071]	
(1) Two relatives in US	-0.044		-0.071		0.005	
	[0.088]		[0.155]		[0.091]	
(1) Three or more relatives in US	0.005		-0.078		0.141*	
	[0.084]		[0.146]		[0.074]	
(1) Spouse in US		0.202		0.151		0.312*
		[0.143]		[0.261]		[0.173]
(1) Any parent in US		-0.105		0.006		-0.095
		[0.072]		[0.137]		[0.089]
(1) Daughter/Son in US		-0.129		-0.218		0.068
		[0.132]		[0.287]		[0.129]
(1) Siblings in US		0.044		-0.114		0.121*
		[0.052]		[0.101]		[0.072]
(1) Extended family in US		-0.205**		-0.396***		-0.057
		[0.090]		[0.134]		[0.111]
Household characteristics						
Household Size	0.003	0.004	0.001	-0.003	0.013	0.014
	[0.008]	[0.009]	[0.016]	[0.016]	[0.013]	[0.014]
(1) Quartile 2 PCE	0.033	-0.037	0.170**	0.02	-0.061	-0.108
	[0.055]	[0.056]	[0.076]	[0.073]	[0.081]	[0.091]
(1) Quartile 3 PCE	0.052	-0.008	0.151	0.175	-0.017	-0.075
	[0.069]	[0.081]	[0.104]	[0.135]	[0.087]	[0.104]
(1) Quartile 4 PCE	0.028	0.047	0.133	0.142	-0.036	-0.008
	[0.088]	[0.086]	[0.159]	[0.196]	[0.097]	[0.095]
Locality characteristics						
(1) Rural	-0.165***	-0.219***	-0.188*	-0.270**	-0.141**	-0.158*
	[0.061]	[0.067]	[0.106]	[0.117]	[0.061]	[0.080]
Sample size	**450**	**371**	**188**	**156**	**262**	**215**
Adjusted R-squared	0.205	0.253	0.146	0.217	0.268	0.295

Standard errors clustered at the municipality of origin level in brackets

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

Note: Includes State of origin Fixed Effects

Table 5. Estimation of predictors of assimilation in U.S. - MxFLS3
Dependent variable US Labor outcomes measured in MxFLS3

Respondents 15 and older at baseline	Stayers					
	Worked last week	**Worked last week**	**Ln(Annual Earnings)**	**Ln(Annual Earnings)**	**Ln(Hourly Earnings)**	**Ln(Hourly Earnings)**
Variables measured in Mx at baseline	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Basic demographics						
(1) Female	-0.412***	-0.412***	-0.683***	-0.587***	-0.007	0.007
	[0.067]	[0.076]	[0.135]	[0.124]	[0.128]	[0.105]
(1) Age: 20-24 Omitted 15-19	-0.033	-0.029	0.233	0.243	-0.02	-0.081
	[0.064]	[0.077]	[0.142]	[0.154]	[0.116]	[0.120]
(1) Age: 25-34	0.03	0.057	0.194	0.135	0.132	0.052
	[0.071]	[0.106]	[0.162]	[0.221]	[0.142]	[0.176]
(1) Age: 35-49	0.158*	0.119	0.191	0.109	0.063	-0.017
	[0.088]	[0.108]	[0.237]	[0.251]	[0.213]	[0.219]
(1) Age> 50	-0.157	-0.178	-0.172	-0.287	0.049	-0.07
	[0.113]	[0.150]	[0.293]	[0.436]	[0.247]	[0.305]
(1) Married	-0.108	-0.035	-0.075	-0.033	-0.055	0.092
	[0.074]	[0.086]	[0.151]	[0.197]	[0.176]	[0.188]
Human Capital						
(1) Primary complete Omitted Primay incomplete	-0.135*	-0.092	-0.097	0.013	0.175	0.353*
	[0.072]	[0.073]	[0.138]	[0.184]	[0.241]	[0.211]
(1) High school incomplete	-0.098	-0.09	0.017	0.109	0.194	0.411*
	[0.071]	[0.069]	[0.178]	[0.185]	[0.247]	[0.214]
(1) High scool complete	-0.127	-0.202*	0.557***	0.464*	0.381	0.552**
	[0.083]	[0.114]	[0.207]	[0.268]	[0.238]	[0.209]
(1) Some college or more	-0.033	-0.068	-0.03	0.048	0.342	0.599**
	[0.134]	[0.139]	[0.270]	[0.331]	[0.303]	[0.290]
(1) Quartile 2 height	0.019	0.029	0.734**	0.755**	0.692***	0.720***
	[0.132]	[0.134]	[0.351]	[0.334]	[0.219]	[0.193]
(1) Quartile 3 height	0.024	0.032	0.828**	0.807***	0.687***	0.648***
	[0.118]	[0.119]	[0.314]	[0.298]	[0.227]	[0.180]
(1) Quartile 4 height	-0.012	-0.014	0.879***	0.821**	0.856***	0.778***
	[0.127]	[0.137]	[0.324]	[0.327]	[0.241]	[0.196]
Networks in the U.S.						
(1) One relative in US Omitted No relatives in US	-0.003		0.015		0.016	
	[0.045]		[0.107]		[0.128]	
(1) Two relatives in US	-0.114		-0.317		-0.02	
	[0.078]		[0.259]		[0.201]	
(1) Three or more relatives in US	0.027		-0.067		0.089	
	[0.060]		[0.152]		[0.121]	
(1) Spouse in US		-0.199		-0.753*		-0.537**
		[0.147]		[0.433]		[0.238]
(1) Any parent in US		0.098		-0.358**		-0.113
		[0.079]		[0.175]		[0.121]
(1) Daughter/Son in US		-0.115		-0.018		-0.081
		[0.143]		[0.253]		[0.228]
(1) Siblings in US		0.024		0.106		0.177**
		[0.065]		[0.152]		[0.087]
(1) Extended family in US		0.03		-0.017		0.286**
		[0.061]		[0.133]		[0.120]
Household characteristics						
Household Size	-0.009	-0.011	0.035	0.026	0.017	-0.006
	[0.012]	[0.014]	[0.027]	[0.031]	[0.020]	[0.020]
(1) Quartile 2 PCE	0.065	0.072	-0.033	-0.044	-0.015	-0.122
	[0.080]	[0.085]	[0.203]	[0.239]	[0.166]	[0.170]
(1) Quartile 3 PCE	0.022	0.032	0.041	0.088	0.049	-0.01
	[0.060]	[0.067]	[0.091]	[0.128]	[0.123]	[0.122]
(1) Quartile 4 PCE	-0.039	-0.023	0.071	0.022	0.059	-0.029
	[0.071]	[0.088]	[0.144]	[0.151]	[0.188]	[0.171]
Locality characteristics						
(1) Rural	-0.013	-0.057	-0.223*	-0.254**	-0.036	-0.022
	[0.050]	[0.060]	[0.116]	[0.126]	[0.107]	[0.090]
Sample size	**309**	**257**	**236**	**192**	**234**	**190**
Adjusted R-squared	0.236	0.212	0.197	0.24	0.011	0.116

Standard errors clustered at the municipality of origin level in brackets
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1
Note: Includes State of origin Fixed Effects and Year of arrival to the US

Table 6. Labor outcomes in Mexico and in the US - MxFLS3
Predictors from US data in MxFLS2

Respondents Age 15 and older in MxFLS2	Stayers - Outcomes in US			Return Migrants - Outcomes in Mx		
	Worked last week	**Ln(Annual Earnings)**	**Ln(Hourly Earnings)**	**Worked last week**	**Ln(Annual Earnings)**	**Ln(Hourly Earnings)**
Basic demographics						
(1) Female	-0.314***	-0.655***	-0.13	-0.517***	-0.326	-0.191
	[0.056]	[0.135]	[0.116]	[0.077]	[0.344]	[0.409]
(1) Age: 25-34 Omitted 15-24	-0.008	0.360***	0.09	0.102	0.196	0.2
	[0.052]	[0.120]	[0.111]	[0.065]	[0.267]	[0.362]
(1) Age: 35-49	0.05	0.342**	0.069	0.183**	0.118	-0.248
	[0.070]	[0.154]	[0.161]	[0.083]	[0.408]	[0.436]
(1) Age> 50	-0.166	0.121	0.08	0.124	0.909	0.038
	[0.143]	[0.257]	[0.237]	[0.103]	[0.594]	[0.672]
(1) Married	-0.037	0.045	-0.01	-0.052	-0.152	-0.31
	[0.062]	[0.134]	[0.130]	[0.065]	[0.270]	[0.307]
Human Capital						
(1) Primary complete Omitted Primay incomplete	-0.061	0.058	0.377***	0.09	0.776**	1.022**
	[0.063]	[0.151]	[0.142]	[0.098]	[0.383]	[0.401]
(1) High school incomplete	-0.022	0.146	0.275*	0.104	0.32	0.691*
	[0.059]	[0.141]	[0.143]	[0.096]	[0.355]	[0.351]
(1) High scool complete	-0.025	0.313*	0.341**	0.165	1.074**	1.095*
	[0.078]	[0.188]	[0.159]	[0.115]	[0.509]	[0.600]
Household characteristics						
Household Size	-0.007	-0.111***	-0.084***	-0.002	0.044	0.007
	[0.012]	[0.030]	[0.026]	[0.014]	[0.051]	[0.066]
(1) Spouse in US (if married)	0.115	-0.847***	-0.401*	0.098	-0.023	-0.01
	[0.170]	[0.268]	[0.213]	[0.215]	[0.580]	[0.797]
(1) Children in US	-0.112	0.898***	0.539***	-0.234	0.201	-0.35
	[0.158]	[0.233]	[0.163]	[0.160]	[0.408]	[0.633]
(1) Quartile 2 PCE	0.034	-0.021	0.189	0.054	-0.457*	-0.354
	[0.071]	[0.157]	[0.167]	[0.077]	[0.267]	[0.314]
(1) Quartile 3 PCE	0.06	0.261*	0.312***	-0.031	0.36	0.184
	[0.074]	[0.156]	[0.118]	[0.127]	[0.311]	[0.401]
(1) Quartile 4 PCE	0.054	0.413***	0.254**	-0.024	-0.467	-0.265
	[0.055]	[0.137]	[0.128]	[0.081]	[0.292]	[0.332]
(1) Sent Transfers to Mexico	0.096	0.121	-0.045	0.067	0.006	-0.097
	[0.061]	[0.146]	[0.157]	[0.079]	[0.269]	[0.408]
Expectations and English						
(1) Speaks English sometimes or frequently	0.04	0.035	-0.039	0.051	0.296	0.103
	[0.045]	[0.109]	[0.099]	[0.047]	[0.228]	[0.272]
Arrival year	-0.002	-0.005	-0.011	0.008	0.011	-0.014
	[0.004]	[0.011]	[0.009]	[0.006]	[0.023]	[0.029]
(1) Undocumented	0.048	-0.03	0.066	-0.012	-0.051	0.042
	[0.059]	[0.133]	[0.116]	[0.070]	[0.342]	[0.373]
(1) Knew anybody before coming	-0.047	0.121	0.074	0.056	0.122	0.459
	[0.049]	[0.137]	[0.115]	[0.055]	[0.220]	[0.317]
(1) Plan to return to Mexico	0.008	-0.131	-0.023	0.171	1.611***	0.603
	[0.080]	[0.198]	[0.170]	[0.140]	[0.555]	[1.156]
(1) USA fulfilled expectations	-0.022	-0.033	-0.045	-0.121**	0.201	0.004
	[0.044]	[0.095]	[0.090]	[0.051]	[0.205]	[0.261]
(1) Plan to bring family and friends	-0.012	-0.056	-0.025	0.088	-0.268	0.201
	[0.047]	[0.109]	[0.088]	[0.059]	[0.222]	[0.311]
Employment variables						
(1) Worked last week	0.113	0.01	-0.036	-0.023	-0.002	0.026
	[0.081]	[0.182]	[0.146]	[0.095]	[0.477]	[0.438]
Sample size	**372**	**279**	**276**	**248**	**136**	**135**
Adjusted R-squared	0.278	0.309	0.03	0.38	0.423	0.313

Robust Standard errors in brackets
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1
Note: Includes State of residence in the US Fixed Effects

Table 7. Returns to Migration
Earnings Measured in MxFLS2 and MxFLS3

Respondents Age 15 and older at baseline

	Ln(Monthly Earnings) in MxFLS2				Ln(Monthly Earnings) in MxFLS3 only in Mexico	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Migration Status						
(1) Migrant to the US	1.772***	1.785***			-0.033	-0.052
	[0.055]	[0.058]			[0.117]	[0.130]
(1) Returner			1.714***	1.716***		
			[0.065]	[0.071]		
(1) Stayer			1.815***	1.836***		
			[0.061]	[0.065]		
Basic demographics						
(1) Female	-0.356***	-0.359***	-0.357***	-0.359***	-0.414***	-0.414***
	[0.029]	[0.029]	[0.030]	[0.030]	[0.038]	[0.039]
(1) Age: 20-24 Omitted 15-19	0.104***	0.094***	0.105***	0.095***	-0.046	-0.047
	[0.031]	[0.033]	[0.031]	[0.033]	[0.047]	[0.054]
(1) Age: 25-34	0.143***	0.133***	0.144***	0.134***	0.05	0.05
	[0.039]	[0.043]	[0.038]	[0.043]	[0.045]	[0.048]
(1) Age: 35-49	0.157***	0.136***	0.158***	0.138***	0.066	0.072
	[0.037]	[0.042]	[0.037]	[0.042]	[0.046]	[0.050]
(1) Age> 50	-0.095*	-0.082	-0.094*	-0.081	-0.133**	-0.142**
	[0.048]	[0.053]	[0.048]	[0.053]	[0.057]	[0.064]
(1) Married	0.037	0.044	0.037	0.044	-0.012	-0.007
	[0.025]	[0.029]	[0.025]	[0.029]	[0.033]	[0.036]
Human Capital						
(1) Primary complete Omitted Primay inco	0.189***	0.171***	0.188***	0.170***	0.222***	0.212***
	[0.033]	[0.037]	[0.033]	[0.036]	[0.041]	[0.044]
(1) High school incomplete	0.364***	0.350***	0.363***	0.350***	0.429***	0.415***
	[0.035]	[0.038]	[0.035]	[0.038]	[0.049]	[0.051]
(1) High scool complete	0.522***	0.518***	0.521***	0.517***	0.646***	0.627***
	[0.053]	[0.057]	[0.053]	[0.056]	[0.058]	[0.060]
(1) Some college or more	0.915***	0.915***	0.915***	0.914***	1.000***	0.972***
	[0.053]	[0.056]	[0.053]	[0.056]	[0.057]	[0.061]
(1) Quartile 2 height	0.027	0.016	0.028	0.017	0.089	0.043
	[0.032]	[0.033]	[0.032]	[0.033]	[0.208]	[0.206]
(1) Quartile 3 height	0.133***	0.119***	0.133***	0.119***	0.191	0.129
	[0.039]	[0.039]	[0.039]	[0.039]	[0.220]	[0.213]
(1) Quartile 4 height	0.125***	0.117***	0.126***	0.118***	0.278	0.219
	[0.042]	[0.042]	[0.042]	[0.042]	[0.218]	[0.210]
Household characteristics						
Household Size	0.022***	0.024***	0.023***	0.024***	0.015**	0.013
	[0.005]	[0.006]	[0.005]	[0.006]	[0.007]	[0.008]
(1) Quartile 2 PCE	0.138***	0.125***	0.137***	0.124***	0.193***	0.193***
	[0.026]	[0.029]	[0.026]	[0.029]	[0.040]	[0.044]
(1) Quartile 3 PCE	0.201***	0.188***	0.201***	0.188***	0.266***	0.276***
	[0.026]	[0.029]	[0.026]	[0.029]	[0.042]	[0.044]
(1) Quartile 4 PCE	0.401***	0.392***	0.400***	0.392***	0.460***	0.478***
	[0.036]	[0.043]	[0.036]	[0.043]	[0.046]	[0.054]
Networks in the U.S.						
(1) One relative in US Omitted No relative	0.008		0.008		0.016	
	[0.024]		[0.024]		[0.030]	
(1) Two relatives in US	-0.007		-0.007		0.001	
	[0.031]		[0.031]		[0.051]	
(1) Three or more relatives in US	-0.05		-0.05		-0.08	
	[0.037]		[0.037]		[0.062]	
(1) Spouse in US		-0.138		-0.14		-0.415**
		[0.103]		[0.103]		[0.205]
(1) Any parent in US		-0.131**		-0.134**		-0.022
		[0.062]		[0.062]		[0.083]
(1) Daughter/Son in US		-0.175**		-0.176**		-0.105
		[0.072]		[0.072]		[0.093]
(1) Siblings in US		0.04		0.038		-0.039
		[0.030]		[0.030]		[0.042]
(1) Extended family in US		0.01		0.011		0.089**
		[0.032]		[0.032]		[0.037]
Locality characteristics						
(1) Rural	-0.221***	-0.229***	-0.222***	-0.230***	-0.302***	-0.291***
	[0.035]	[0.035]	[0.035]	[0.035]	[0.046]	[0.047]
Sample size	8973	7802	8973	7802	7941	7020
Adjusted R-squared	0.351	0.35	0.351	0.35	0.211	0.213

Standard errors clustered at the municipality of origin level in brackets

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

Note: Includes State of origin Fixed Effects

Table 8. Returns to Migration
Earnings Measured in MxFLS3

Respondents Age 15 and older in MxFLS2

	Ln(Monthly Earnings)				
	(1)	**(2)**	**(3)**	**(4)**	**(5)**
Migration Status					
(1) Stayer	1.919***	1.919***	1.901***	1.872***	1.899***
	[0.110]	[0.113]	[0.125]	[0.132]	[0.150]
Basic demographics					
(1) Female	-0.630***	-0.645***	-0.634***	-0.646***	-0.627***
	[0.127]	[0.126]	[0.132]	[0.132]	[0.149]
(1) Age: 25-34 Omitted 15-24	0.270*	0.271*	0.296**	0.282**	0.344**
	[0.140]	[0.138]	[0.140]	[0.141]	[0.162]
(1) Age: 35-49	0.135	0.109	0.136	0.121	0.238
	[0.149]	[0.152]	[0.161]	[0.161]	[0.189]
(1) Age> 50	0.302	0.3	0.377	0.398	0.159
	[0.267]	[0.256]	[0.292]	[0.307]	[0.375]
(1) Married	-0.07	-0.023	0.001	-0.02	-0.085
	[0.143]	[0.143]	[0.146]	[0.146]	[0.153]
Human Capital					
(1) Primary complete Omitted Primay incom	0.267	0.259	0.251	0.259	0.343
	[0.189]	[0.189]	[0.202]	[0.205]	[0.232]
(1) High school incomplete	0.315*	0.307*	0.299	0.278	0.269
	[0.185]	[0.186]	[0.206]	[0.210]	[0.227]
(1) High scool complete	0.651***	0.662***	0.670**	0.626**	0.623**
	[0.208]	[0.210]	[0.261]	[0.270]	[0.313]
Household characteristics					
Household Size	-0.057*	-0.047	-0.044	-0.038	-0.042
	[0.031]	[0.031]	[0.031]	[0.030]	[0.032]
(1) Spouse in US (if married)	-0.297	-0.31	-0.294	-0.265	-0.071
	[0.403]	[0.426]	[0.414]	[0.373]	[0.462]
(1) Children in US	0.45	0.432	0.406	0.389	0.173
	[0.373]	[0.398]	[0.381]	[0.341]	[0.412]
(1) Quartile 2 PCE		-0.118	-0.099	-0.089	0.019
		[0.142]	[0.139]	[0.140]	[0.160]
(1) Quartile 3 PCE		0.178	0.191	0.215	0.333*
		[0.128]	[0.137]	[0.142]	[0.176]
(1) Quartile 4 PCE		0.275**	0.282**	0.256*	0.352**
		[0.132]	[0.140]	[0.136]	[0.155]
(1) Sent Transfers to Mexico			0.082	0.051	0.231
			[0.128]	[0.138]	[0.154]
Expectations and English					
(1) Speaks English sometimes or frequently			0.077	0.101	0.007
			[0.110]	[0.110]	[0.129]
Arrival year			0.003	0.002	0.001
			[0.010]	[0.011]	[0.015]
(1) Undocumented			-0.013	0.007	-0.043
			[0.151]	[0.156]	[0.212]
(1) Knew anybody before coming			0.269*	0.251*	0.305*
			[0.143]	[0.142]	[0.176]
(1) Plan to return to Mexico			0.18	0.214	0.105
			[0.202]	[0.197]	[0.275]
(1) USA fulfilled expectations			0.002	0.032	0.049
			[0.102]	[0.107]	[0.129]
(1) Plan to bring family and friends			-0.117	-0.124	-0.057
			[0.109]	[0.109]	[0.118]
Employment variables					
(1) Worked last week	0.193	0.017	-0.01	-0.014	
	[0.168]	[0.165]	[0.170]	[0.168]	
(1) Log(Hourly Earnings)					-0.142
					[0.159]
Sample size	417	417	417	417	348
Adjusted R-squared	0.478	0.487	0.485	0.488	0.455

Robust Standard errors in brackets

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

Note: Includes State of residence in the US Fixed Effects

.

8. Appendix

Table A.1 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 A.2. 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 A.3. Prediction of migration to the US since baseline 2002

Respondents Age 15 and older at baseline
LPM - Probability of Migration to the US

	All	All	Male	Male	Female	Female
Variables measured in Mexico at baseline	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Basic demographics						
(1) Age: 20-24 Omitted 15-19	0.001	-0.002	-0.004	-0.007	0.006	0.003
	[0.006]	[0.007]	[0.010]	[0.011]	[0.006]	[0.006]
(1) Age: 25-34	-0.015**	-0.020***	-0.028***	-0.035***	-0.005	-0.01
	[0.007]	[0.007]	[0.011]	[0.011]	[0.006]	[0.007]
(1) Age: 35-49	-0.023***	-0.026***	-0.040***	-0.044***	-0.012**	-0.014**
	[0.008]	[0.008]	[0.012]	[0.013]	[0.006]	[0.006]
(1) Age> 50	-0.029***	-0.029***	-0.052***	-0.056***	-0.012**	-0.011*
	[0.008]	[0.008]	[0.014]	[0.014]	[0.006]	[0.006]
(1) Married	-0.009**	-0.013***	-0.005	-0.01	-0.008*	-0.011**
	[0.004]	[0.004]	[0.006]	[0.007]	[0.004]	[0.004]
Human Capital						
(1) Primary complete Omitted Primay incomplete	0.012**	0.008*	0.016**	0.012	0.010**	0.007*
	[0.005]	[0.005]	[0.008]	[0.008]	[0.004]	[0.004]
(1) High school incomplete	0.012**	0.006	0.012	0.003	0.012***	0.010**
	[0.005]	[0.005]	[0.008]	[0.009]	[0.005]	[0.004]
(1) High scool complete	0.007	0.001	0.004	-0.007	0.011*	0.01
	[0.005]	[0.006]	[0.008]	[0.010]	[0.006]	[0.006]
(1) Some college or more	-0.003	-0.006	-0.002	-0.008	0	0.001
	[0.005]	[0.005]	[0.008]	[0.009]	[0.005]	[0.005]
(1) Quartile 2 height	0.006	0.007*	0.029**	0.030**	-0.001	-0.001
	[0.004]	[0.004]	[0.012]	[0.012]	[0.004]	[0.004]
(1) Quartile 3 height	0.015***	0.018***	0.027**	0.028**	0.008**	0.009**
	[0.004]	[0.004]	[0.011]	[0.011]	[0.004]	[0.004]
(1) Quartile 4 height	0.018***	0.022***	0.029***	0.031***	0.017*	0.019**
	[0.004]	[0.005]	[0.010]	[0.011]	[0.010]	[0.010]
Networks in the U.S.						
(1) One relative in US Omitted No relatives in US	0.013***		0.020***		0.008***	
	[0.003]		[0.006]		[0.003]	
(1) Two relatives in US	0.021***		0.020**		0.022***	
	[0.006]		[0.008]		[0.007]	
(1) Three or more relatives in US	0.048***		0.054***		0.044***	
	[0.008]		[0.012]		[0.008]	
(1) Spouse in US		0.070***		0.026		0.079***
		[0.020]		[0.063]		[0.020]
(1) Any parent in US		0.064***		0.065***		0.064***
		[0.016]		[0.024]		[0.021]
(1) Daughter/Son in US		0.014**		0.017		0.012*
		[0.007]		[0.011]		[0.007]
(1) Siblings in US		0.036***		0.039***		0.035***
		[0.006]		[0.010]		[0.006]
(1) Extended family in US		0.006		0.007		0.005
		[0.004]		[0.007]		[0.004]
Household characteristics						
Household Size	0.001*	0.002***	0.002	0.003**	0.001	0.002*
	[0.001]	[0.001]	[0.001]	[0.001]	[0.001]	[0.001]
(1) Quartile 2 PCE	-0.009**	-0.006	-0.018***	-0.014*	0	-0.001
	[0.004]	[0.004]	[0.007]	[0.008]	[0.004]	[0.004]
(1) Quartile 3 PCE	-0.009**	-0.006	-0.016**	-0.011	-0.002	-0.001
	[0.004]	[0.004]	[0.008]	[0.009]	[0.004]	[0.004]
(1) Quartile 4 PCE	-0.008*	-0.004	-0.017**	-0.01	0	0
	[0.005]	[0.005]	[0.007]	[0.009]	[0.005]	[0.005]
Locality characteristics						
(1) Rural	0.019***	0.015***	0.024***	0.019**	0.014***	0.012***
	[0.005]	[0.005]	[0.007]	[0.007]	[0.004]	[0.004]
Sample size	**20,358**	**17,844**	**9,598**	**7,855**	**10,760**	**9,989**
Adjusted R-squared	0.043	0.048	0.053	0.054	0.034	0.048

Standard errors clustered at the municipality of origin level in brackets

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

Note: Includes State of origin Fixed Effects

Table A.4. Prediction of return migration to Mexico since MxFLS2

Respondents Age 15 and older at baseline
LPM - Probability of Return to Mx

	All	All	Male	Male	Female	Female
Variables measured in Mexico at baseline	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Basic demographics						
(1) Age: 20-24 Omitted 15-19	0.006	0.042	0.053	0.119	-0.107	-0.109
	[0.055]	[0.058]	[0.077]	[0.087]	[0.085]	[0.088]
(1) Age: 25-34	-0.02	0.007	0.088	0.141	-0.187*	-0.229**
	[0.074]	[0.096]	[0.096]	[0.124]	[0.104]	[0.113]
(1) Age: 35-49	0.128	0.12	0.12	0.131	0.1	0.02
	[0.104]	[0.115]	[0.127]	[0.136]	[0.146]	[0.164]
(1) Age> 50	0.078	0.094	0.018	0.136	0.155	-0.001
	[0.158]	[0.187]	[0.206]	[0.320]	[0.224]	[0.247]
(1) Married	0.029	0.039	0.072	0.081	-0.061	-0.019
	[0.067]	[0.084]	[0.088]	[0.111]	[0.093]	[0.109]
Human Capital						
(1) Primary complete Omitted Primay incomplete	-0.097	-0.079	-0.076	-0.027	-0.055	-0.01
	[0.081]	[0.091]	[0.105]	[0.125]	[0.119]	[0.142]
(1) High school incomplete	-0.13	-0.104	-0.07	0.008	-0.141	-0.113
	[0.088]	[0.103]	[0.111]	[0.133]	[0.123]	[0.157]
(1) High scool complete	-0.273**	-0.201	-0.081	0.102	-0.360**	-0.292*
	[0.109]	[0.138]	[0.135]	[0.192]	[0.139]	[0.175]
(1) Some college or more	-0.043	-0.015	0.201	0.182	-0.342*	-0.232
	[0.146]	[0.162]	[0.183]	[0.215]	[0.182]	[0.230]
(1) Quartile 2 height	0.155**	0.16**	0.194	0.251	0.07	0.089
	[0.077]	[0.080]	[0.242]	[0.277]	[0.088]	[0.091]
(1) Quartile 3 height	0.176**	0.165**	0.118	0.146	0.089	0.084
	[0.069]	[0.073]	[0.249]	[0.290]	[0.081]	[0.087]
(1) Quartile 4 height	0.248***	0.218***	0.135	0.168	0.085	0.077
	[0.065]	[0.072]	[0.249]	[0.288]	[0.194]	[0.200]
Networks in the U.S.						
(1) One relative in US Omitted No relatives in US	0.002		-0.016		0.091	
	[0.063]		[0.075]		[0.111]	
(1) Two relatives in US	0.018		0.003		0.167	
	[0.082]		[0.100]		[0.141]	
(1) Three or more relatives in US	-0.028		-0.084		0.143	
	[0.067]		[0.086]		[0.134]	
(1) Spouse in US		-0.128		-0.41		0.027
		[0.103]		[0.340]		[0.121]
(1) Any parent in US		-0.027		0.064		-0.068
		[0.066]		[0.112]		[0.103]
(1) Daughter/Son in US		-0.047		-0.068		0.103
		[0.120]		[0.163]		[0.163]
(1) Siblings in US		-0.069		-0.053		-0.015
		[0.059]		[0.083]		[0.091]
(1) Extended family in US		0.056		0.035		0.11
		[0.063]		[0.073]		[0.110]
Household characteristics						
Household Size	0.035***	0.029**	0.041***	0.029*	0.030**	0.027*
	[0.010]	[0.011]	[0.012]	[0.016]	[0.015]	[0.016]
(1) Quartile 2 PCE	-0.02	-0.022	-0.062	-0.099	0.106	0.091
	[0.053]	[0.060]	[0.069]	[0.081]	[0.105]	[0.114]
(1) Quartile 3 PCE	-0.052	-0.032	-0.075	-0.069	0.005	0.034
	[0.071]	[0.070]	[0.096]	[0.102]	[0.125]	[0.120]
(1) Quartile 4 PCE	-0.111	-0.128	-0.136	-0.209*	-0.002	0.028
	[0.075]	[0.083]	[0.101]	[0.112]	[0.122]	[0.131]
Locality characteristics						
(1) Rural	-0.024	-0.029	-0.03	-0.035	-0.129	-0.12
	[0.057]	[0.061]	[0.077]	[0.090]	[0.091]	[0.096]
Sample size	**522**	**435**	**330**	**260**	**192**	**175**
Adjusted R-squared	0.075	0.059	0.029	0.016	0.093	0.074

Standard errors clustered at the municipality of origin level in brackets
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1
Note: Includes State of origin Fixed Effects