"To move or not to move (when one arguably has the social capital): the mediating effect of migrant family networks on migration aspirations and planned and unplanned Mexico – U.S. migration"

Fernando Riosmena
University of Colorado at Boulder (USA)

Mathew Creighton
Universitat Pompeu-Fabra (Spain)

ABSTRACT

Prior migrants with ties to migrants-to-be provide the latter with important information and assistance to move and find accommodations and work in destinations. Individuals with better access to migration-specific social capital are considerably more likely to aspire to and eventually migrate themselves. However, it is less understood why some individuals with access to migrant networks and the associated migration-specific social capital do not "make use" of this social capital and remain in their countries of origin. Among potential migrants, instances of leaving social capital dormant could manifest as behavior (i.e., no subsequent migration) or a change in aspirations (i.e., no longer seeing migration as a potential pathway). As such, they represent an interesting case for migration theory and a way to obtain some analytical leverage to better understand migration decisions. In this paper, we compare the U.S. migration intentions and behavior according to whether they have no, moderate, or larger access to migrant networks. We use two waves from the Mexican Family Life Survey (MxFLS), collected in 2002 and 2005, to assess the translation of migration networks and stated aspirations to migrate into subsequent migration behavior, taking into account baseline sociodemographic and socioeconomic characteristics, migrant networks and emigration aspirations. Among those that do not migrate, we distinguish those that remain and continue to aspire to a future move from those that no longer consider migration to be an option.

Keywords: international migration; migrant networks; social capital; social ties; Mexico; United States

1. INTRODUCTION

It is well-documented that individuals with better access to (migration-specific) social capital –such as having close relatives abroad or by virtue of being from sending communities with a higher proportion of people with international migration experience– are considerably more likely to eventually become migrants themselves (Massey & Aysa-Lastra, 2011; Massey & Espinosa, 1997a; Douglas S. Massey & Fernando Riosmena, 2010). The most cited mechanisms for these associations relate to the notion that prior migrants with (either closer or "weaker") ties to migrants-to-be provide the latter with important information and assistance to move and find accommodations and work in destinations (Flores-Yeffal, 2013; Menjívar, 2000; Sue, Lepree, & Riosmena, Unpublished). It is then not surprising that migrant networks tend to be among the most if not the most important predictor of international migration in the Latin American context (Clark, Hatton, & Williamson, 2004), particularly for unauthorized movement (Douglas S. Massey & Fernando Riosmena, 2010).[1]

Although there is considerable scholarship in the topic, it is less understood how social capital affects how migration decisions are made at a more micro level. For instance, even though scholarship points out to the relevance of aspirations to migrate as strong predictors of mobility (Creighton, 2013), research has also found that many migration decisions are more spontaneous and unplanned, oftentimes following the

[1] For instance, in the context of U.S. migration from several Latin American countries, Massey and Riosmena (2010) estimate that individuals with a parent and sibling in the United States have 2.0 and 2.4 times higher odds of migrating to the United States (without documents) than those without a migrant parent or sibling (Table 4) after controlling for several other characteristics, including border enforcement efforts. Likewise, Massey and Riosmena (2010) estimate that people living in sending communities with an additional 1% of individuals ages 15+ with prior U.S. experience have, on average, 21% higher odds of migrating to the United States (Table 4). These two associations are, by far, the strongest predictors of migration, relative to both relative income levels between the source country and the United States (see Clark et al. 2004: Table 8; Massey and Riosmena 2010: Table 4) as well as border enforcement and other forms of immigration enforcement in the interior United States (Massey and Riosmena 2010: Figure 1).

"activation" of social capital by re-encountering migrant relatives and acquaintances, e.g., during their visit or return to sending communities (Sue et al., Unpublished). As such, social capital could be having a different role in planned forms of mobility (and, thus, in migration aspirations) than in less planned movement. Further, despite the relevance of migrant networks, plenty of individuals with access to them do *not* "make use" of this social capital and remain in their countries of origin, some aspiring to migrate.[2]

In this paper, we compare U.S. migration intentions and behavior according to whether individuals have no to some (family) ties to migrants. We use longitudinal data from the Mexican Family Life Survey to measure inter-wave migration behavior and migration intentions at wave 2 according to individual sociodemographic and socioeconomic characteristics, migrant networks, and emigration intentions at baseline. Our analyses aim to contribute to the migration literature by better understanding how and when social capital is deployed, or *is not*, according to migration type. Moreover, we continue recent but relatively scarce work on understanding the relationship between migration intentions and behavior. Future versions of this paper will include a more detailed discussion of the literature we contribute to (summarized in this introduction). For now, let us introduce our modeling strategy and data.

[2] One can also add the case of individuals who have social connections to migrants but do not benefit from them while still migrating. This is a different case that we cannot study with the data at our disposal. In fact, we assume that all migrants with ties to a migrant directly or indirectly benefited from such tie and were able to migrate assisted by a migrant family member or *paisano*.

2. DATA AND METHODS

2.1.The Mexican Family Life Survey

The Mexican Family Life Survey (MxFLS) is a multi-purpose, longitudinal survey of individuals and their families in Mexico. MxFLS. The baseline survey, conducted in 2002 (MxFLS-1) with a multi-stage clustered sampling design, interviewed all adult members residing in over 8,440 households (Rubalcava & Teruel, 2006). This survey is representative at the national, urban-rural, and regional levels. Respondents in the baseline survey (MxFLS-1) were re-interviewed in 2005/6 (MxFLS-2). Because of the importance of migration for the Mexican population, MxFLS followed individuals who left their household of origin. Domestic migrants were tracked irrespective of destination, as were international migrants to the US. Of those sampled in MxFLS-1, more than 90% were located and interviewed again in MxFLS-2 (L. Rubalcava et al., 2008). Although a 3rd wave (MxFLS-3) has been collected, this analysis is based on the first two rounds of the survey as MxFLS-3 is not yet available. The analytic sample is created using case-wise deletion of missing values on covariates. The resulting sample includes 10,014 respondents across 80 municipalities. Subsequent models will consider multiple imputations to assess the sensitivity of results to missing values.

2.2.The model

We assess the role of individual-level social networks at baseline in determining future aspirations and migration behavior. Research in Mexico has consistently shown that context (i.e., community) matters (Curran & Rivero-Fuentes, 2003; Fussell & Massey, 2004; Massey et al., 1994; Massey & Espinosa, 1997b;

Massey, Hirschman, Kasinitz, & DeWind, 1999; D. S. Massey & F. Riosmena, 2010; Munshi, 2003; F. Riosmena, 2009). Many of these shared characteristics are unobserved in the available data, but we take into account their presence by estimating a multilevel random-intercept logistic model described by equation 1 (Rabe-Hesketh & Skrondal, 2008), which also adjusts standard errors for the clustering of individuals in communities given the MxFLS complex sampling design.

$$(1) \qquad \text{logit}\left\{\Pr\left(\frac{y_{im}=1,2}{y_{im}=0}\middle| x_{im}, z_m\right)\right\} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{im} + \beta_2 x_m + \mu_m z_m$$

The models is fit using the gllamm command in Stata 12 (StataCorp, 2009). The outcome is either that an individual aspires to migrate internationally at MxFLS-2 in 2006 $\left(y_{im}=0\right)$; that s/he migrated to the United States between MxFLS-1 in 2002 and MxFLS-2 $\left(y_{im}=1\right)$; or that s/he has no aspirations to migrate at MxFLS-2 $\left(y_{im}=2\right)$. Equation 1 includes random intercepts varying over municipalities $\left(z_m \sim N(0,1)\right)$, which are assumed to be independent across clusters. In addition to the random component of the model, which is introduced to take into account unobserved characteristics shared at the municipal level uncorrelated with the observed explanatory variables, the model includes a number of observed attributes of the individual and the household, explained next.

-TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE-

2.3. Measures

2.3.1 Aspirations and Migration Behavior

We construct a measure of migration status at MxFLS-2 using two distinct measures of behavior and attitudes. First we assess individual level aspirations toward a future migration using the following questions:

> Question 1: Have you thought about moving in the future, outside the locality/community where you currently live? / *¿Ha pensado usted en irse a vivir, en un futuro, fuera de la localidad/ colonia en la que vive actualmente?*
>
> Question 2: To where do you think you could move? / *¿A dónde ha pensado irse?*

The second assesses the behavior of all baseline respondents between MxFLS-1 and MxFLS-2. As MxFLS is a prospective panel, the first wave (MxFLS-1) only consists of non-migrants and return migrants. All migration behavior is observed at wave 2 (MxFLS-2). We consider all migration to the US to be a migration event. This includes respondents who are resident in the US and those that migrated to the US for a period of time but were sampled in Mexico at MxFLS-2. We combine this behavioral information with the aspirational data above and construct a single outcome in which a respondent aspires to a future international migration, does not desire/aspire to migrate, or has migrated by MXFLS-2. As discussed in the outset, the goal of combining aspirations are behavior is to better understand whether people deploy social capital in different ways when aspiring to migrate or when doing more and less planned moves (i.e., those in which people had the intention to move at baseline from those in which people did not).

2.3.2. Household migration network normative distance

Family migration network closeness, a common proxy for social capital, significantly predicts of aspirations to migrate internationally and migration behavior (De Jong, 2000; Kandel & Massey, 2002). To account for these dynamics, we constructed a measure of whether an adult respondent has family members in the United States at baseline according to the "closeness" of the kinship tie between them (i.e., using normative and not actual social distance). We identify two types of network ties. "Close" ties include at least one of the following list of possible relations: spouse, mother, father, sister, brother, son, or daughter. "Extended" ties include in-law, grandparent, grandchildren, cousin, uncle, aunt, niece, nephew, or any other unspecified relation. Individuals were able to list a maximum of four contacts. If any one of the four is a close family member, the individual is considered to have a close network tie. Only individuals in households without a single close network tie are considered to have an "extended only" network.

Admittedly, our dichotomization of network type includes assumptions about the strength of interfamily relations. As with other work (Creighton, 2013), the intention was not to make a perfect continuum of network closeness or strength, but instead to acknowledge plausibly distinct levels of information and relatedness. The variable is included as a categorical measure at the household level with the category of "no network" as the reference. In this way coefficient estimates, in terms of level of network normative distance do not assume that the association between network strength and migration is linear.

2.3.3. Household migration history

The prior migration history of an individual as well as family members, another measure of migration-specific human and social capital, has been shown to significantly determine aspirations to migrate and subsequent behavior (Kandel & Massey, 2002). Measured at the household level in our analyses, it reflects the combined migration history of all household members before any observed migration in our data (i.e., prior to baseline). A respondent's household can be defined, in terms of migration history, in the following ways: no history, 1 trip, and 2+ trips to the United States. Admittedly crude, the measure does separate households with no migration exposure from those with a single event and from those who repeatedly exposed.

2.3.4. Baseline Migration Aspirations

Aspirations have been show to significantly predict domestic and international migration in Mexico (Creighton, 2013). To account for variation in attitudes toward a subsequent migration at MxFLS-1, we include a measure of aspirations, constructed from a MxFLS-1 question on aspirations worded in the same way as the MxFLS-2 measure used to construct the dependent variable described above. The inclusion of this measure permits us to interpret other covariates as net of baseline aspirations and any interactions allow us to isolate aspiring migrants and assess the role of social capital only among those that are oriented toward subsequent migration.

2.3.5. Socioeconomic and demographic characteristics

To account for differences in the socio-economic circumstances of respondents, four measures are included: gender, marital status, coresident children, educational level and occupational status of the respondent. Education is an important predictor of Mexico-US migration with research suggesting that domestic migration is favored by migrants with higher levels of education as their credentials may not be rewarded as greatly by available occupations in the US (Quinn & Rubb, 2005). The measure includes three categories of completed schooling distinguishing those with primary school or less from those with lower-secondary school or upper-secondary school or more. To account for the employment status at MxFLS-1, respondents' can be unemployed, enrolled in school, employed for a wage, or self-employed.

Research has also shown that gender is a significant factor in the migration process in Mexico (e.g., Cerrutti & Massey, 2001; Kana'iaupuni, 2000). Age and age squared are included to account for non-linearity in the age pattern of migration. Marital status and the number of coresident children are includes as marriage and childbearing, with some exception for older children, are negatively associated with migration behavior (for men, under specific socioeconomic circumstances, Fernando Riosmena, 2009), particularly for women (DaVanzo & Goldstein, 1979; Kanaiaupuni, 2000; Stier & Tienda, 1992).

2.3.6. Household expenditures

The expenditure measure is constructed from detailed questions describing the overall household economy. The measure is calculated by taking logarithm of the total amount spent over a month divided by the total number of household members (i.e. log

per capita household expenditure). This measure is intended to reflect the overall household economic wellbeing in a context where measures like income often fail to accurately describe individuals who are not receiving wages (Xu, Ravndal, Evans, & Carrin, 2009).

2.3.7. Neighborhood crime

Some work has shown that crime is related to migration within Mexico (Amuedo-Dorantes et al., 2007). Following the empirical work of Creighton (2013) and the theoretical contribution of De Jong (2000), this measure is intended to capture an individual's residential satisfaction. A respondent is asked, "Are there many robberies in the neighborhood?", and can respond as "yes" or "no". The question is posed to a single member of a given household and is, therefore, included as a household-level measure. Our assumption is that crime is positively predictive of subsequent migration or aspirations to a future migration.

2.3.8. Level of urbanization.

Research in Mexico has consistently pointed out that migration to the US has historically been dominated by flows from rural areas (Durand, Massey, & Parrado, 1999). Although the majority of Mexico – U.S. migrants now come from urban areas, rural areas are still over-represented (Riosmena & Massey, 2012). As such, we control for level of urbanization. Following the standard of the Mexican National Institute of Statistics and Geography (INEGI), we distinguish urban from rural communities, with rural communities having less than 2,500 residents.

-TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE-

3. PREMILINARY RESULTS

Table 1 shows results of our models predicting (a) aspirations to migrate relative to having no aspirations (i.e., unfulfilled aspirations); (b) migration relative to having aspirations to migrate (i.e., more planned migration); and (c) migration relative to having no aspirations to migrate (i.e., more unplanned migration). It is most striking that having a close relative in the United States at baseline (but not an extended only network) is strongly associated with the likelihood of aspiring to migrate internationally, but not with planned or unplanned movement (in fact, having a closer network is negatively associated with unplanned movement).

Interestingly, a close network does not differentiate those migrating from those merely aspiring. In contrast, the prior migration history of all household members (including the adult respondent being analyzed) is not associated with either intentions or planned or unplanned migration. As in the case of social networks, migration aspirations at baseline are strong predictors of migration intentions during follow-up and of inter-wave migration behavior relative to having no aspirations at follow-up.

Most of our other controls behave in the expected direction (though a few of them are not statistically significant). Most clearly, being a self-employed individual increases the likelihood of aspiring to migrate though it actually negatively predicts migration behavior, particularly unplanned one. People with higher schooling levels or living in households with higher incomes per capita are also less likely to engage in unplanned

migration. On the other hand, being the victim of a robbery is positively associated with both planned and unplanned migration, even though (a bit contrary to our expectations) it is associated with a lower propensity to aspire to migrate. Finally, urban residence is associated with lower migration intentions but higher planned and, especially, unplanned migration.

-TABLE 2a ABOUT HERE-

-TABLE 2b ABOUT HERE-

-TABLE 2c ABOUT HERE-

3.1. The role of social capital on unfulfilled migration aspirations

Tables 2a, 2b, and 2c show estimates of similar models to those presented in Table 1 stratified by level of migration-specific social capital available to people, i.e., none, extended family only, and at least one closer relative. Table 2a presents models predicting aspirations relative to having no aspirations to migrate to the United States during MxFLS-2. Among other results, individuals with an extended-only network are more likely to aspire to migrate if they are men, or have 2-3 children. People with an extended network who have been the victims of robbery are also less likely to aspire to emigrate relative to those with no network.[3] Likewise, individuals with a close network are more likely to aspire to emigrate to the U.S. when they live in households with 2+ migrations, 3 children, have upper secondary education, or live in urban areas (i.e.,

[3] We derived these conclusions from calculating the difference in the effect of, say, being a male on aspiring to migrate among those with, say, extended networks relative to those with no networks (i.e., 1.988 – 0.339 in Table 2a). We further calculated the standard error of the difference by taking the squared root of the sum of the squared standard errors of each coefficient, which we used to calculate t-statistics and p-values for these differences.

where the negative association between urban residence and migration aspirations is weaker). In addition, people with closer networks are less likely to aspire to emigrate than those with no networks if they aspired to emigrate at baseline, are male, or are enrolled in school. These results contradict notions that closer networks may motivate individuals with low schooling to migrate (by allowing them to substitute human with social capital) and that migration networks in general may lower individual educational aspirations.

We find very few differences in the determinants of migration aspirations of people with extended only vs. closer networks. People with closer networks are more likely to aspire to emigrate if they live in households with 2+ migrations, and among individuals with lower secondary schooling. People with closer networks are also less likely to aspire to emigrate than those with extended-only networks among those with 2 or 4+ children or who are enrolled in school. Again, this may qualify prior research conceptualizing closer ties as more isolated networks, though our measure certainly does not equate normative social distance between ties with network structure.

3.2. The role of social capital on more and less planned migrations

Tables 2b and 2c show similar results, on the likelihood of more and less planned migration, to those presented in Table 2a. Overall, we find few differences in the determinants of more planned migration among those with and without networks. People with an extended-only network enrolled in school or experiencing robbery are more likely to engage in this kind of mobility relative to those with no network. In addition, individuals with extended-only networks are less likely to be males or have 3 children.

Likewise, people with closer networks are less likely to do a planned migration relative to those with no networks who live in households with 2+ migrations and have 3 children. Distinguishing those with networks, males with closer ties to migrants are more likely to migrate than their male counterparts with extended-only networks. In contrast, individuals with closer networks suffering from a robbery are less likely to emigrate than those with extended-only networks.

Perhaps not surprisingly, we find even fewer differences in how social capital mediates unplanned migration processes. Our only statistically significant result suggests that gender differentials in unplanned migration are somewhat weaker among those with close ties. This is not surprising as unplanned migration responding to more pressing emergencies may not be as gendered as more planned movement.

4. WORKS CITED

Ajzen, I. (1991). The Theory of Planned Behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *50*(2), 179-211.

Azjen, I., & Fishbein, M. (1980). *Understanding Attitudes and Predicting Social Behavior*. Engelwood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Cerrutti, M., & Massey, D. S. (2001). On the Auspices of Female Migration From Mexico to the United States. *Demography, 38*(2), 187-200.

Clark, X., Hatton, T. J., & Williamson, J. G. (2004). What explains emigration out of Latin America? *World Development, 32*(11), 1871-1890.

Creighton, M. J. (2013). The role of aspirations in domestic and international migration. *The Social Science Journal, 50*(1), 79-88.

Curran, S. R., & Rivero-Fuentes, E. (2003). Engendering migrant networks: The case of Mexican migration. *Demography, 40*(2), 289-307.

De Jong, G. F. (2000). Expectations, Gender, and Norms in Migration Decision-Making. *Population Studies, 54*, 307-319.

Durand, J., Massey, D. S., & Parrado, E. A. (1999). The New Era of Mexican Migration to the United States. *The Journal of American History, 86*(2), 518-536.

Flores-Yeffal, N. Y. (2013). *Migration-Trust Networks: Social Cohesion in Mexican US-bound Emigration*. College Station: Texas A&M University Press.

Fussell, E., & Massey, D. S. (2004). The limits to cumulative causation: International migration from Mexican Urban Areas. *Demography, 41*(1), 151-171.

Kana'iaupuni, S. M. (2000). Reframing the migration question: An analysis of men, women, and gender in Mexico. *Social Forces, 78*(4), 1311-1347.

Kandel, W., & Massey, D. S. (2002). The Culture of Mexican Migration: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis. *Social Forces, 2002, 80, 3, Mar, 80*(3), 981-1004.

Massey, D. S., Arango, J., Hugo, G., Kouaouci, A., Pellegrino, A., & Taylor, J. E. (1994). An evaluation of international migration theory: The North American case. *Population and Development Review, 20*(4), 699-751.

Massey, D. S., & Aysa-Lastra, M. (2011). Social Capital and International Migration from Latin America. *International Journal of Population Research, 2011*, 1-18. doi: 10.1155/2011/834145

Massey, D. S., & Espinosa, K. E. (1997a). What's driving Mexico-U.S. migration? A theoretical, empirical, and policy analysis. *American Journal of Sociology, 102*(4), 939-999.

Massey, D. S., & Espinosa, K. E. (1997b). What's Driving Mexico-U.S. Migration? A Theoretical, Empirical, and Policy Analysis. *The American Journal of Sociology, 102*(4), 939-999.

Massey, D. S., Hirschman, C., Kasinitz, P., & DeWind, J. (1999) *Why Does Immigration Occur? A Theoretical Synthesis*. New York, New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Massey, D. S., & Riosmena, F. (2010). Undocumented migration from Latin America in an era of rising U.S. enforcement. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 630*(1), 294-321.

Massey, D. S., & Riosmena, F. (2010). Undocumented Migration from Latin America in an Era of Rising U.S. Enforcement. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 630*, 294-321.

Menjívar, C. (2000). *Fragmented ties: Salvadoran immigrant networks in America*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Munshi, K. (2003). Networks in the modern economy: Mexican migrants in the US labor market. *Quarterly Journal of Economics, 118*, 549-599.

Quinn, M., & Rubb, S. (2005). The Importance of Education-Occupation Matching in Migration Decisions. *Demography, 42*(1).

Rabe-Hesketh, S., & Skrondal, A. (2008). *Multilevel and Longitudinal Modeling Using Stata* (2nd Edition ed.). College Station, Texas: Stata Press.

Riosmena, F. (2009). Socioeconomic context and the association between marriage and Mexico-U.S. migration. *Social Science Research, 38*(2), 324-337.

Riosmena, F. (2009). Socioeconomic context and the association between marriage and Mexico–U.S. migration. *Social Science Research, 38*(2), 324-337.

Riosmena, F., & Massey, D. (2012). Pathways to El Norte: Origins, Destinations, and Characteristics of Mexican Migrants to the United States. *International Migration Review, 46*(1), 3-36.

StataCorp. (2009). Stata Statistical Software: Release 11 (Version 10). College Station, TX: StataCorp LP.

Sue, C. A., Lepree, J., & Riosmena, F. (Unpublished). The Influence of Social Networks and Social Capital in the U.S. Destinations of Mexican Migrants. *Manuscript under review at International Migration Review and available upon request*.

Xu, K., Ravndal, F., Evans, D. B., & Carrin, G. (2009). Assessing the Reliability of Household Expenditure Data: Results of the World Health Survey. *Health Policy, 91*(3), 297-305.

Table 1. Coefficients and standard errors from multilevel multinomial logistic regression predicting migration intentions and behavior

	Unfulfilled			More planned			Less planned		
Outcome	A. No aspirations to migrate (2005/6) vs. aspirations to migrate (2005/6)			B. Migration (2002 to 2005/6) vs. aspirations to migrate (2005/6)			C. Migration (2002 to 2005/6) vs. no aspirations to migrate (2005/6)		
Migrant Networks in the US (Ref.=None)									
Extended Ties Only	0.095	(0.253)		0.311	(0.292)		0.406	(0.386)	
Some Closer Ties	1.038	(0.193)	***	0.381	(0.220)		-0.657	(0.293)	*
Household Migration History (Ref.=None									
1 Migration	0.242	(0.239)		-0.066	(0.277)		-0.308	(0.366)	
2+ Migrations	0.042	(0.251)		0.189	(0.283)		0.147	(0.378)	
Aspirations to Migrate at Baseline (2002)	1.641	(0.239)	***	-0.228	(0.270)		-1.869	(0.361)	***
Sex (Ref.=Female)	0.362	(0.193)		0.572	(0.225)	*	0.210	(0.296)	
Age	-0.022	(0.079)		-0.235	(0.089)	**	-0.213	(0.119)	*
Age-squared	0.000	(0.001)		0.003	(0.001)	*	0.003	(0.001)	*
Married	-0.196	(0.203)		0.101	(0.233)		0.297	(0.309)	
No. Children Under 15 (Ref.=None)									
1 Child	0.173	(0.230)		-0.269	(0.268)		-0.442	(0.353)	
2 Children	-0.106	(0.263)		0.136	(0.299)		0.242	(0.398)	
3 Children	0.230	(0.285)		-0.143	(0.328)		-0.373	(0.435)	
4+ Children	0.073	(0.359)		0.539	(0.393)		0.466	(0.532)	
Enrolled in School	-0.139	(0.395)		-0.484	(0.474)		-0.345	(0.617)	
Education (Ref.=Primary or less)									
Lower Secondary	0.012	(0.227)		-0.002	(0.255)		-0.014	(0.341)	
Upper Secondary or More	0.448	(0.237)		-0.502	(0.276)		-0.950	(0.364)	**
Employment (Ref.=Unemployed)									
Employed for Wage	-0.099	(0.234)		-0.117	(0.268)		-0.018	(0.356)	
Self-employed	0.543	(0.270)	*	-0.489	(0.313)		-1.032	(0.413)	**
Log per Capita Household Expenditure	0.111	(0.092)		-0.117	(0.105)		-0.228	(0.140)	†
Experienced Robbery	-0.609	(0.243)	*	0.639	(0.272)	*	1.248	(0.365)	***
Urban residence	-0.549	(0.214)	*	0.811	(0.236)	***	1.360	(0.319)	***
Individuals	10,012			10,012			10,012		
Municipalities	80			80			80		

*p<0.05 , **p<0.01 ,***p<0.001
Source: MxFLS-1 and MxFLS-2

Table 2a. Coefficients and standard errors from multilevel multinomial logistic regression predicting migration aspirations and behavior according to migrant networks available at baseline

Outcome	Unfulfilled aspirations		
	No aspirations to migrate (2005/6) vs. aspirations to migrate (2005/6)		
Migrant Network in the US	None	Extended Ties Only	Some Close Ties
	(1)	(2)	(3)
Household Migration History (Ref.=None)			
1 Migration	0.007 (0.399)	0.901 (0.572)	0.158 (0.384)
2+ Migrations	-0.657 (0.483)	-1.016 (1.087)	0.640 (0.338)
Aspirations to Migrate at Baseline (2002)	2.375 (0.389) ***	1.696 (0.644) **	1.251 (0.364) ***
Male	0.339 (0.279)	1.988 (0.636) **	-0.291 (0.333)
Age	0.001 (0.115)	0.036 (0.267)	-0.004 (0.131)
Age-squared	-0.001 (0.002)	-0.001 (0.004)	-0.001 (0.002)
Married	-0.008 (0.307)	-0.745 (0.633)	-0.177 (0.320)
No. Children Under 15 (Ref.=None)			
1 Child	0.004 (0.320)	0.973 (0.728)	0.072 (0.404)
2 Children	-0.354 (0.376)	1.568 (0.778) *	-0.475 (0.459)
3 Children	-1.528 (0.645) *	2.000 (0.829) *	0.614 (0.422)
4+ Children	-0.053 (0.487)	0.895 (1.229)	-0.374 (0.619)
Enrolled in School	0.567 (0.545)	-0.599 (0.927)	-1.450 (1.115)
Education (Ref.=Primary or less)			
Lower Secondary	-0.230 (0.349)	-0.158 (0.729)	0.344 (0.345)
Upper Secondary or More	0.076 (0.363)	0.647 (0.726)	0.932 (0.369) *
Employment (Ref.=Unemployed)			
Employed for Wage	0.084 (0.377)	-0.774 (0.626)	-0.068 (0.358)
Self Employed	1.070 (0.407) **	-60.81 (5517)	0.674 (0.405)
Log per Capita Household Expenditure	0.091 (0.139)	0.071 (0.260)	0.142 (0.146)
Experienced Robbery	-0.338 (0.327)	-2.724 (1.089) *	-0.417 (0.406)
Urban residence	-0.840 (0.329) *	-1.122 (0.693)	-0.231 (0.320)
Individuals	6,552	1,401	2,259
Municipalities	80	73	79

*p<0.05 , **p<0.01 ,***p<0.001
Source: MxFLS-1 and MxFLS-2

Table 2b. Coefficients and standard errors from multilevel multinomial logistic regression predicting migration aspirations and behavior according to migrant networks available at baseline

	More planned movement					
Outcome	Migration (2002 to 2005/6) vs. aspirations to migrate (2005/6)					
Migrant Network in the US	None		Extended Ties Only		Some Close Ties	
	(1)		(2)		(3)	
Household Migration History (Ref.=None)						
1 Migration	0.161	(0.480)	-0.654	(0.664)	0.070	(0.427)
2+ Migrations	0.792	(0.539)	0.682	(1.169)	-0.158	(0.377)
Aspirations to Migrate at Baseline (2002)	-0.632	(0.476)	-0.705	(0.729)	0.133	(0.393)
Male	1.164	(0.354) **	-0.818	(0.705)	0.721	(0.369)
Age	-0.213	(0.134)	-0.096	(0.295)	-0.344	(0.142) *
Age-squared	0.003	(0.002)	0.001	(0.005)	0.005	(0.002) *
Married	-0.160	(0.363)	0.665	(0.703)	0.150	(0.359)
No. Children Under 15 (Ref.=None)						
1 Child	0.077	(0.391)	-0.635	(0.824)	-0.454	(0.448)
2 Children	0.425	(0.448)	-0.703	(0.869)	0.175	(0.499)
3 Children	1.483	(0.706) *	-0.792	(0.928)	-0.747	(0.475)
4+ Children	0.634	(0.556)	0.621	(1.296)	0.739	(0.655)
Enrolled in School	-1.515	(0.725) *	0.973	(1.060)	0.511	(1.188)
Education (Ref.=Primary or less)						
Lower Secondary	0.176	(0.400)	-0.340	(0.787)	-0.143	(0.380)
Upper Secondary or More	-0.337	(0.434)	-1.094	(0.805)	-0.639	(0.419)
Employment (Ref.=Unemployed)						
Employed for Wage	-0.385	(0.447)	0.648	(0.713)	-0.195	(0.399)
Self Employed	-1.052	(0.497) *	60.52	(5517)	-0.544	(0.455)
Log per Capita Household Expenditure	-0.048	(0.163)	-0.131	(0.296)	-0.172	(0.162)
Experienced Robbery	0.199	(0.389)	2.543	(1.132) *	0.705	(0.441)
Urban residence	0.998	(0.369) **	1.461	(0.741) *	0.551	(0.351)
Individuals	6,552		1,401		2,259	
Municipalities	80		73		79	

*p<0.05 , **p<0.01 ,***p<0.001
Source: MxFLS-1 and MxFLS-2

Table 2c. Coefficients and standard errors from multilevel multinomial logistic regression predicting migration aspirations and behavior according to migrant networks available at baseline

	Less planned movement					
Outcome	Migration (2002 to 2005/6) vs. no aspirations to migrate (2005/6)					
Migrant Network in the US	None		Extended Ties Only		Some Close Ties	
	(1)		(2)		(3)	
Household Migration History (Ref.=None)						
1 Migration	0.168	(0.624)	0.247	(0.876)	0.228	(0.574)
2+ Migrations	0.135	(0.724)	-0.334	(1.596)	0.482	(0.506)
Aspirations to Migrate at Baseline (2002)	1.743	(0.615) **	0.991	(0.973)	1.384	(0.536) **
Male	1.503	(0.451) ***	1.170	(0.949)	0.430	(0.497)
Age	-0.212	(0.177)	-0.060	(0.398)	-0.348	(0.193) *
Age-squared	0.002	(0.003)	0.000	(0.006)	0.004	(0.003) †
Married	-0.168	(0.475)	-0.080	(0.946)	-0.027	(0.481)
No. Children Under 15 (Ref.=None)						
1 Child	0.081	(0.505)	0.338	(1.100)	-0.382	(0.603)
2 Children	0.071	(0.585)	0.865	(1.166)	-0.300	(0.678)
3 Children	-0.045	(0.956)	1.208	(1.244)	-0.133	(0.635)
4+ Children	0.581	(0.739)	1.516	(1.786)	0.365	(0.901)
Enrolled in School	-0.948	(0.907)	0.374	(1.408)	-0.939	(1.629)
Education (Ref.=Primary or less)						
Lower Secondary	-0.054	(0.531)	-0.498	(1.073)	0.201	(0.513)
Upper Secondary or More	-0.261	(0.566)	-0.447	(1.084)	0.293	(0.558)
Employment (Ref.=Unemployed)						
Employed for Wage	-0.301	(0.585)	-0.126	(0.949)	-0.263	(0.536)
Self Employed	0.018	(0.642)	-0.287	(7802)	0.130	(0.609)
Log per Capita Household Expenditure	0.043	(0.214)	-0.060	(0.394)	-0.030	(0.218)
Experienced Robbery	-0.139	(0.508)	-0.181	(1.571)	0.288	(0.599)
Urban residence	0.158	(0.494)	0.339	(1.015)	0.320	(0.475)
Individuals	6,552		1,401		2,259	
Municipalities	80		73		79	

*p<0.05 , **p<0.01 ,***p<0.001
Source: MxFLS-1 and MxFLS-2