

# Social Investment for Facing Migration Crisis

By Kristobal Miguel Meléndez Aguilar<sup>1</sup>

## Abstract

The new immigration policy of the United States could intensify deportations of undocumented migrants with an economic, social and political effect in Mexico. This problem could generate economic, political and social instability in some Mexican states then it is relevant to study how to diminish this effect. Social investment could reduce the impact of this situation and could reduce the reasons for those Mexicans that want to migrate. Social investment focuses on considering the migrant as an asset that could be incorporated into the labor market with government programs that stimulate intensive labor public investment, reduced violence, training and increased wages. By using multiple linear regressions and descriptive statistics, it is shown that the levels of education, economic growth, poverty, labor purchasing power, violence and unemployment have an effect on Mexican migration levels. In this way, it is shown that it is possible to reverse this problem with positive impacts on the Mexican economy.

*Keywords:* Migration, Social Investment, Intensive labor investment, Local income, Sustainable economic growth

## 1. Introduction

U.S. immigration policies are becoming more demanding not only for legal new migrants, also for those individuals who have lived illegally in United States for years. These new policies are inspired by political, economic and social factors. Mexican migrants have contributed economically to the development of the United States with cheap labor. Thousands of U.S. companies have been benefited from hiring illegal Mexican migrants at very low wages. However, some American workers have been losing money because many Mexican migrants who decide to go to work in the United States are well prepared<sup>1</sup> and provide high-quality, low-priced labor. These less competitive U.S. workers are pushing politically to limit the entry of more Mexican migrants through a wall and to expel those who are illegally. These measures would benefit thousands of U.S. workers to the detriment of U.S. companies.

Mexican government have done little to limit Mexican flows into the United States. Millions of Mexicans have chosen to leave their homelands because there are not enough sources of work, there is violence, wages are very low and the American dream encourages many people. Economically, the Mexican government benefits from migration. The expenditure budget is intended for fewer people, per capita, it is more money. Given the new immigration policies of the United States, Mexican government is concerned that with more population in Mexico, per capita, the expenditure budget will

---

<sup>1</sup>Consejo Nacional de Población (Conapo). (2010). Migrantes recientes y no migrantes por nivel educativo según entidad federativa, 2010. [Online] Available: [http://www.conapo.gob.mx/en/CONAPO/Migrantes\\_recientes\\_y\\_no\\_migrantes\\_por\\_nivel\\_educativo\\_segun\\_entidad\\_federativa\\_2010](http://www.conapo.gob.mx/en/CONAPO/Migrantes_recientes_y_no_migrantes_por_nivel_educativo_segun_entidad_federativa_2010) (March 10, 2017).

be lower. This situation could lead to social instability.

The point is that the Mexican government have considered migrants return as a possible extra expense that will generate problems. The aim of this study is that if Mexican government follows the strategy of U.S. companies that consider Mexican migrants as an important asset, instead of consider as an expense these migrants could become a significant asset that could boost the Mexican economy. The hypothesis of this work is based on that if Mexican government creates jobs for those prepared workers, the migration flows would diminish and this situation would benefit Mexico because its economy would be sustainable.

## 2. Methodology

A descriptive analysis is presented with the objective of identifying which Mexican states have more migration problems and in what situation they are in each of the analyzed variables. Also some statistical models with multiple linear regressions are included in order to corroborate the hypothesis. Migration is grouped into three types: without education, basic education and post basic education.

The independent variables that are analyzed are: Gini, overall poverty, labor income, unemployment, willful homicides per every hundred thousand people, local income, federalized income, economic growth, population without health services and workers with at least secondary education. The dependent variables are: post basic education migration, basic education migration, without education migration, post basic education non migration, basic education non migration, without education non migration. The sources that are used are: Conapo, Segob, Inegi, Coneval and SHCP.

## 3. Descriptive Analysis

As shown in Chart 1, Quintana Roo, Colima, Nayarit, Querétaro, Baja California and Hidalgo are states that more than 6% of their population had a recent migration process. In contrast, Durango, Tlaxcala, Puebla, Veracruz, Tamaulipas and Morelos are states that less than 1% of their population had a recent migration. The level of education of migrants is mainly basic, followed by post basic education and only few migrants have no education (see Chart 1).

**Chart 1.** Migration by level of education

States	Percentage of migration	Without education migration	Basic education migration	Post basic education migration
Quintana Roo	12.6%	3.3%	55.5%	41.3%
Colima	7.3%	4.5%	59.7%	35.8%
Nayarit	6.6%	3.3%	64.3%	32.4%
Querétaro	5.9%	1.7%	44.3%	54.0%
Baja California	5.6%	4.7%	65.6%	29.7%
Hidalgo	5.2%	2.8%	64.2%	33.0%
Campeche	4.6%	3.9%	56.1%	40.0%
Estado de México	4.3%	2.6%	58.2%	39.3%
Agascalientes	4.0%	2.1%	51.3%	46.7%

Sonora	3.4%	3.7%	62.4%	34.0%
Nuevo León	3.3%	1.9%	53.3%	44.8%
Ciudad de México	3.0%	2.3%	45.9%	51.8%
Sinaloa	3.0%	3.7%	62.7%	33.7%
Yucatán	2.8%	1.9%	49.9%	48.1%
Coahuila	2.5%	2.0%	56.6%	41.4%
Oaxaca	2.5%	4.8%	66.9%	28.3%
San Luis Potosí	2.5%	3.0%	59.3%	37.8%
Jalisco	2.5%	2.8%	53.1%	44.1%
Zacatecas	2.4%	4.0%	65.9%	30.1%
Michoacán	2.1%	4.7%	60.9%	34.4%
Chihuahua	2.0%	4.9%	63.3%	31.8%
Tabasco	2.0%	4.0%	57.7%	38.4%
Guanajuato	1.9%	2.8%	52.8%	44.3%
Guerrero	1.8%	4.8%	61.5%	33.7%
Baja California Sur	1.5%	3.8%	61.7%	34.5%
Chiapas	1.2%	3.7%	60.0%	36.3%
Morelos	0.5%	4.0%	54.9%	41.1%
Tamaulipas	0.4%	3.1%	59.8%	37.1%
Veracruz	0.3%	3.7%	64.2%	32.2%
Puebla	0.3%	3.5%	59.2%	37.4%
Tlaxcala	0.0%	3.1%	62.7%	34.3%
Durango	0.0%	2.8%	65.7%	31.5%

*Source: Compiled by author based on Conapo.*

As seen in Charts 1 and 2, recent migration does not come from poor states. Chiapas, Oaxaca, Guerrero and Puebla, which have more than 60% of their population in poverty, less than 2.6% of their population had a recent migration. Only Ciudad de México and Hidalgo have a Gini greater than 0.5 and levels of recent migration of 3% or more of their population (see Charts 1 and 2). So, it is not clear that levels of poverty and inequality are the main cause of migration in Mexico. Colima that has the highest level of willful homicides per every hundred thousand people is also the second state with the highest level of recent migration (see Charts 1 and 2). This implies that violence could be an important factor for migration.

## Chart 2. Social factors

States	Overall poverty	Gini	Population without health services	Willful homicides per every hundred thousand people	Workers with at least secondary education
Chiapas	74.4%	0.5172	20.2%	0.86	48.0%
Oaxaca	65.9%	0.5125	19.7%	1.81	49.0%
Guerrero	64.5%	0.4889	19.0%	4.60	51.0%
Puebla	63.2%	0.5720	20.7%	0.86	57.0%
Michoacán	58.5%	0.4518	25.9%	2.53	53.0%
Tlaxcala	57.4%	0.4112	17.0%	0.54	68.0%
Veracruz	57.1%	0.4899	21.4%	1.26	55.0%
Hidalgo	53.1%	0.5041	16.9%	1.06	64.0%
Zacatecas	51.6%	0.5066	14.6%	2.89	60.0%
Morelos	51.1%	0.4668	16.3%	3.13	70.0%
Tabasco	48.5%	0.4561	16.6%	1.16	70.0%
Estado de México	48.2%	0.4611	19.1%	0.96	72.0%

San Luis Potosí	48.1%	0.4766	10.5%	1.44	66.0%
Guanajuato	45.7%	0.4490	15.1%	1.52	63.0%
Yucatán	44.6%	0.5108	14.1%	0.33	61.0%
Durango	42.7%	0.4456	16.2%	0.95	72.0%
Campeche	42.3%	0.4999	12.1%	0.87	66.0%
Nayarit	39.1%	0.4712	15.7%	0.32	72.0%
Sinaloa	38.7%	0.4859	15.0%	3.85	69.0%
Tamaulipas	37.1%	0.4779	14.7%	1.25	72.0%
Jalisco	34.6%	0.4679	18.7%	1.26	70.0%
Quintana Roo	34.0%	0.4936	17.5%	0.80	74.0%
Aguascalientes	33.9%	0.4863	12.2%	0.38	73.0%
Chihuahua	33.7%	0.4581	14.3%	3.23	70.0%
Colima	33.2%	0.4569	12.3%	9.36	69.0%
Querétaro	33.2%	0.4881	15.4%	0.64	70.0%
Coahuila	29.5%	0.5029	15.2%	0.63	78.0%
Baja California Sur	28.6%	0.4543	13.5%	5.32	72.0%
Sonora	28.6%	0.4758	14.1%	2.15	78.0%
Ciudad de México	28.3%	0.5073	19.9%	1.10	83.0%
Baja California	27.8%	0.4336	18.8%	3.64	73.0%
Nuevo León	19.8%	0.4527	13.3%	0.85	81.0%

Source: Compiled by author based on Coneval and Segob.

As shown in Charts 1 and 3, Campeche and Colima with federalized incomes greater than 13,500 pesos per inhabitant, in those states more than 4.5% of their population had a recent migration. Tabasco with the highest level of unemployment, only 2% of its population had a recent migration (see Charts 1 and 3). Quintana Roo, Ciudad de México and Nuevo Leon are three states with the highest local income per capita and at least 3% of their population had a recent migration (see Charts 1 and 3).

#### 4. Statistical Models

As seen in Model 1, for those individuals who migrate without education, overall poverty and labor income are important. Individuals that have more studies, these variables are more important when they decide to migrate. For post basic education migration, economic factors such as unemployment and economic growth are also important. It emphasizes that in environments with higher labor income or higher economic growth, some individuals prefer to migrate.

Overall poverty, labor income and unemployment are important variables for those individuals that chose not to migrate when they have at least basic education. So, unemployment is not sufficient cause to migrate (see Model 2), many unemployed people prefer to wait to find a job within their country. In states with less prepared population is where there are less people that are looking to migrate (see Model 2).

#### Chart 3. Economic factors

States	Federalized income per capita	Local income per capita	Labor income per capita	Unemployment	Economic growth
Campeche	16,504	2,954	2,255	3.9%	-4.9%
Ciudad de México	15,370	5,972	3,094	4.3%	1.5%
Tabasco	14,671	977	1,839	7.6%	1.0%

Colima	13,636	1,944	2,731	3.5%	3.3%
Baja California Sur	13,459	2,374	3,496	4.2%	1.7%
Oaxaca	12,793	625	1,160	1.7%	2.2%
Aguascalientes	12,617	1,864	2,191	3.9%	7.5%
Guerrero	12,542	900	1,147	1.6%	2.7%
Chiapas	12,483	639	1,148	2.8%	-0.4%
Chihuahua	12,410	3,320	3,101	2.4%	3.5%
Zacatecas	12,310	1,271	1,619	2.0%	4.2%
Nayarit	12,209	1,198	2,288	3.6%	4.6%
Durango	11,876	1,236	1,992	3.5%	1.6%
Hidalgo	11,465	981	1,840	2.7%	3.6%
Sonora	11,463	2,174	2,633	4.2%	0.7%
Tlaxcala	11,243	732	1,655	3.6%	2.8%
San Luis Potosí	11,224	1,187	1,849	2.0%	3.4%
Tamaulipas	11,088	1,918	2,304	4.2%	2.6%
Sinaloa	10,854	2,181	2,389	2.8%	4.0%
Querétaro	10,823	2,729	2,159	4.7%	7.8%
Coahuila	10,779	2,255	2,737	3.9%	3.1%
Baja California	10,734	2,593	2,963	2.3%	3.5%
Nuevo León	10,607	3,524	2,861	4.1%	4.1%
Michoacán	10,595	861	1,874	2.4%	3.0%
Veracruz	10,588	957	1,541	3.5%	0.2%
Quintana Roo	10,563	4,103	2,991	3.7%	4.1%
Yucatán	10,544	1,317	2,177	1.8%	3.6%
Morelos	10,076	1,088	1,578	2.3%	1.2%
Jalisco	9,774	1,730	2,539	3.3%	4.0%
Puebla	9,645	1,031	1,696	2.8%	1.7%
Estado de México	9,448	1,263	2,128	4.8%	1.6%
Guanajuato	9,280	1,466	1,896	4.1%	6.5%

Source: Compiled by author based on SHCP and Inegi.

**Model 1.** Effect of economic factors on migration

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs = 32			
Model	46130.2681	4	11532.567	F( 4, 28) = 286.12			
Residual	1128.60075	28	40.3071695	Prob > F = 0.0000			
				R-squared = 0.9761			
				Adj R-squared = 0.9727			
Total	47258.8689	32	1476.83965	Root MSE = 6.3488			

  

Post basic education migration	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
Labor income	.0065124	.0015586	4.18	0.000	.0033198	.009705
Unemployment	2.541369	.96396	2.64	0.014	.5667862	4.515951
Economic growth	118.7798	48.59202	2.44	0.021	19.24358	218.316
Overall poverty	26.64304	5.162561	5.16	0.000	16.06802	37.21807

Source: Compiled by author based on Conapo, Inegi, Coneval and SHCP

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs = 32			
Model	110379.608	4	27594.902	F( 4, 28) = 755.50			
Residual	1022.70989	28	36.5253532	Prob > F = 0.0000			
				R-squared = 0.9908			
				Adj R-squared = 0.9895			
Total	111402.318	32	3481.32243	Root MSE = 6.0436			

  

Basic education migration	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
Labor income	.0128515	.0014837	8.66	0.000	.0098123	.0158907
Unemployment	-2978548	.9176247	-0.32	0.748	-2.177524	1.581814
Economic growth	10.97378	46.25631	0.24	0.814	-83.77798	105.7255
Overall poverty	71.51623	4.914409	14.55	0.000	61.44952	81.58294

Source: Compiled by author based on Conapo, Inegi, Coneval and SHCP

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs = 32			
Model	372.038896	4	93.009724	F( 4, 28)	=	141.85	
Residual	18.3594073	28	.655693119	Prob > F	=	0.0000	
				R-squared	=	0.9530	
				Adj R-squared	=	0.9463	
Total	390.398303	32	12.199947	Root MSE	=	.80975	

  

Without education migration	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
Labor income	.000931	.0001988	4.68	0.000	.0005238	.0013382
Unemployment	-.2008593	.1229471	-1.63	0.114	-.452705	.0509863
Economic growth	-9.932035	6.197608	-1.60	0.120	-22.62726	2.763189
Overall poverty	5.248134	.6584524	7.97	0.000	3.899356	6.596913

**Source: Compiled by author based on Conapo, Inegi, Coneval and SHCP**

### Model 2. Effect of economic factors on non migration

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs = 32			
Model	24656.2024	4	6164.0506	F( 4, 28)	=	494.23	
Residual	349.217805	28	12.4720645	Prob > F	=	0.0000	
				R-squared	=	0.9860	
				Adj R-squared	=	0.9840	
Total	25005.4202	32	781.419381	Root MSE	=	3.5316	

  

Post basic education non migration	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
Labor income	.0089626	.000867	10.34	0.000	.0071867	.0107385
Unemployment	1.202869	.5362126	2.24	0.033	.1044868	2.30125
Economic growth	-11.92359	27.02981	-0.44	0.663	-67.29164	43.44446
Overall poverty	9.22172	2.871728	3.21	0.003	3.339253	15.10419

**Source: Compiled by author based on Conapo, Inegi, Coneval and SHCP**

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs = 32			
Model	141852.501	4	35463.1254	F( 4, 28)	=	1543.14	
Residual	643.471631	28	22.9811297	Prob > F	=	0.0000	
				R-squared	=	0.9955	
				Adj R-squared	=	0.9948	
Total	142495.973	32	4452.99916	Root MSE	=	4.7939	

  

Basic education non migration	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
Labor income	.011513	.0011769	9.78	0.000	.0091023	.0139237
Unemployment	1.152105	.7278695	1.58	0.125	-.3388678	2.643079
Economic growth	130.8606	36.69099	3.57	0.001	55.70246	206.0186
Overall poverty	77.28586	3.898161	19.83	0.000	69.30084	85.27088

**Source: Compiled by author based on Conapo, Inegi, Coneval and SHCP**

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs = 32			
Model	1328.08593	4	332.021483	F( 4, 28)	=	143.69	
Residual	64.7006646	28	2.31073802	Prob > F	=	0.0000	
				R-squared	=	0.9535	
				Adj R-squared	=	0.9469	
Total	1392.78659	32	43.5245811	Root MSE	=	1.5201	

  

Without education non migration	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
Labor income	-.0001821	.0003732	-0.49	0.629	-.0009465	.0005824
Unemployment	-.3130887	.2308039	-1.36	0.186	-.7858691	.1596918
Economic growth	.9456342	11.63454	0.08	0.936	-22.88664	24.7779
Overall poverty	16.90356	1.236088	13.68	0.000	14.37155	19.43557

**Source: Compiled by author based on Conapo, Inegi, Coneval and SHCP**

As seen in Models 3 and 4, in environments with higher federalized income, the highest levels of migration are occurring. However, if states are having higher local incomes, individuals prefer not to migrate. This effect is greater in states with higher levels of education. The effect of federalized income is greater on non migration and the effect of local income is higher on migration (see Models 3 and 4).

**Model 3.** Effect of government revenues on migration

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs = 32		
Model	45199.76	2	22599.88	F( 2, 30)	=	329.27
Residual	2059.10884	30	68.6369614	Prob > F	=	0.0000
				R-squared	=	0.9564
				Adj R-squared	=	0.9535
Total	47258.8689	32	1476.83965	Root MSE	=	8.2847

  

Post basic education migration	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
Federalized income	.0027724	.0002467	11.24	0.000	.0022685	.0032763
Local income	.0025338	.0013336	1.90	0.067	-.0001898	.0052574

**Source: Compiled by author based on Conapo and SHCP**

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs = 32		
Model	366.544513	2	183.272257	F( 2, 30)	=	230.49
Residual	23.8537901	30	.795126335	Prob > F	=	0.0000
				R-squared	=	0.9389
				Adj R-squared	=	0.9348
Total	390.398303	32	12.199947	Root MSE	=	.8917

  

Without education migration	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
Federalized income	.0003339	.0000266	12.57	0.000	.0002797	.0003881
Local income	-.0003025	.0001435	-2.11	0.044	-.0005957	-.9.37e-06

**Source: Compiled by author based on Conapo and SHCP**

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs = 32		
Model	108609.245	2	54304.6223	F( 2, 30)	=	583.28
Residual	2793.07326	30	93.1024419	Prob > F	=	0.0000
				R-squared	=	0.9749
				Adj R-squared	=	0.9733
Total	111402.318	32	3481.32243	Root MSE	=	9.649

  

Basic education migration	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
Federalized income	.0054438	.0002874	18.94	0.000	.0048569	.0060307
Local income	-.0032136	.0015532	-2.07	0.047	-.0063856	-.0000416

**Source: Compiled by author based on Conapo and SHCP****Model 4.** Effect of government revenues on non migration

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs = 32		
Model	24315.922	2	12157.961	F( 2, 30)	=	528.99
Residual	689.498217	30	22.9832739	Prob > F	=	0.0000
				R-squared	=	0.9724
				Adj R-squared	=	0.9706
Total	25005.4202	32	781.419381	Root MSE	=	4.7941

  

Post basic education non migration	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
Federalized income	.0017657	.0001428	12.37	0.000	.0014741	.0020573
Local income	.0034357	.0007717	4.45	0.000	.0018597	.0050117

**Source: Compiled by author based on Conapo and SHCP**

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs = 32		
Model	138860.378	2	69430.1892	F( 2, 30)	=	572.92
Residual	3635.59461	30	121.186487	Prob > F	=	0.0000
				R-squared	=	0.9745
				Adj R-squared	=	0.9728
Total	142495.973	32	4452.99916	Root MSE	=	11.008

  

Basic education non migration	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
Federalized income	.006031	.0003278	18.40	0.000	.0053614	.0067005
Local income	-.00283	.001772	-1.60	0.121	-.006449	.0007889

**Source: Compiled by author based on Conapo and SHCP**

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs = 32				
Model	1207.44474	2	603.722368	F( 2, 30) = 97.72				
Residual	185.341858	30	6.17806194	Prob > F = 0.0000				
				R-squared = 0.8669				
				Adj R-squared = 0.8581				
				Root MSE = 2.4856				
Without education non migration				Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]
Federalized income				.0007532	.000074	10.18	0.000	.000602 .0009044
Local income				-.0015879	.0004001	-3.97	0.000	-.002405 -.0007707

Source: Compiled by author based on Conapo and SHCP

As seen in Model 5, lack of health services, high levels of inequality and violence generate migration of individuals that have basic education or less. In states that have lower levels of education, the individuals that have more education tend to migrate. As seen in Model 6, levels of violence generate greater migration of individuals that are more prepared.

**Model 5.** Effect of social factors on migration

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs = 32				
Model	46368.2807	4	11592.0702	F( 4, 28) = 364.45				
Residual	890.588169	28	31.8067203	Prob > F = 0.0000				
				R-squared = 0.9812				
				Adj R-squared = 0.9785				
				Root MSE = 5.6397				
Post basic education migration				Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]
Gini				47.27956	18.66326	2.53	0.017	9.049599 85.50952
Willful homicides				-.9617533	.532169	-1.81	0.081	-2.051852 .1283455
Population without health services				-14.08901	31.53928	-0.45	0.659	-78.6943 50.51627
Workers with at least secondary education				28.92179	9.270159	3.12	0.004	9.932729 47.91085

Source: Compiled by author based on Conapo, Coneval and Segob

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs = 32				
Model	110171.509	4	27542.8772	F( 4, 28) = 626.58				
Residual	1230.80919	28	43.957471	Prob > F = 0.0000				
				R-squared = 0.9890				
				Adj R-squared = 0.9874				
				Root MSE = 6.63				
Basic education migration				Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]
Gini				73.84303	21.9404	3.37	0.002	28.90016 118.7859
Willful homicides				1.493636	.625614	2.39	0.024	.2121237 2.775148
Population without health services				69.96907	37.07735	1.89	0.070	-5.980435 145.9186
Workers with at least secondary education				13.14742	10.89793	1.21	0.238	-9.175986 35.47082

Source: Compiled by author based on Conapo, Coneval and Segob

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs = 32				
Model	377.144457	4	94.2861142	F( 4, 28) = 199.19				
Residual	13.2538465	28	.47335166	Prob > F = 0.0000				
				R-squared = 0.9661				
				Adj R-squared = 0.9612				
				Root MSE = .68801				
Without education migration				Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]
Gini				4.068665	2.276775	1.79	0.085	-.5950966 8.732427
Willful homicides				.3465002	.0649205	5.34	0.000	.2135165 .4794839
Population without health services				9.956978	3.84755	2.59	0.015	2.075629 17.83833
Workers with at least secondary education				-1.332374	1.130888	-1.18	0.249	-3.648894 .9841453

Source: Compiled by author based on Conapo, Coneval and Segob

**Model 6.** Effect of social factors on non migration

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs = 32			
Model	24771.5462	4	6192.88656	F( 4, 28) = 741.43			
Residual	233.873955	28	8.35264125	Prob > F = 0.0000			
				R-squared = 0.9906			
				Adj R-squared = 0.9893			
				Root MSE = 2.8901			
-----							
Post basic education non migration			Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]
-----							
Gini			-14.87525	9.564011	-1.56	0.131	-34.46624 4.715741
Willful homicides			.4384791	.2727106	1.61	0.119	-.1201433 .9971015
Population without health services			8.449195	16.16234	0.52	0.605	-24.65786 41.55625
Workers with at least secondary education			48.21097	4.750504	10.15	0.000	38.48 57.94193

Source: Compiled by author based on Conapo, Coneval and Segob

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs = 32			
Model	141610.111	4	35402.5277	F( 4, 28) = 1118.99			
Residual	885.862175	28	31.6379348	Prob > F = 0.0000			
				R-squared = 0.9938			
				Adj R-squared = 0.9929			
				Root MSE = 5.6248			
-----							
Basic education non migration			Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]
-----							
Gini			107.168	18.61368	5.76	0.000	69.03965 145.2964
Willful homicides			.3003067	.5307551	0.57	0.576	-.7868959 1.387509
Population without health services			39.02924	31.45548	1.24	0.225	-25.4044 103.4629
Workers with at least secondary education			12.07655	9.24553	1.31	0.202	-6.862059 31.01516

Source: Compiled by author based on Conapo, Coneval and Segob

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs = 32			
Model	1331.6549	4	332.913724	F( 4, 28) = 152.48			
Residual	61.1316968	28	2.18327488	Prob > F = 0.0000			
				R-squared = 0.9561			
				Adj R-squared = 0.9498			
				Root MSE = 1.4776			
-----							
Without education non migration			Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]
-----							
Gini			32.89169	4.889702	6.73	0.000	22.87559 42.90779
Willful homicides			.1406434	.1394262	1.01	0.322	-.1449582 .426245
Population without health services			18.38843	8.263167	2.23	0.034	1.462104 35.31476
Workers with at least secondary education			-19.55943	2.428745	-8.05	0.000	-24.53449 -14.58437

Source: Compiled by author based on Conapo, Coneval and Segob

## 5. Social Investment

After analyzing the descriptive statistics and the statistical models, it could be inferred that the profile of the recent migrants are individuals who come from states with greater economic growth environments and where poverty and unemployment levels persist. This situation is because investment is being intensive in the use of technology, displacing people with capacity and who are contracted in the United States mainly, where they appreciate their abilities.

To reverse these migratory flows, Mexican government has to implement a social investment policy that considers the migrant as an asset that provides skilled labor and not only as an expense in case of their repatriation. This social investment consists in focusing public investment on work-intensive projects rather than on technology as it has been doing.

Social investment must be accompanied by better social conditions such as reducing levels of violence and inequality and providing greater health services. Also better wages. Higher local income could be useful to redistribute resources and generate a less unequal environment that benefits the entire population.

## Conclusions

Recent migration has occurred in environments with higher levels of economic growth, but individuals with relatively greater training have been unable to find employment because of the prioritization of investment in technology. If government focuses on increasing jobs for those prepared workers, migration flows would decrease benefiting Mexico; making its economy sustainable. This is possible through a social investment model.

Lower levels of inequality, violence and people without health services would be needed to generate a sustainable social investment environment. Local income could be an important source of extra income that allows a redistribution of resources that promotes better conditions to implement social investment. In this way, massive deportations could be assimilated into a strategy of greater sustainable economic growth.

## References

- Consejo Nacional de Evaluación de la Política de Desarrollo Social (Coneval). (2017). Índice de la tendencia laboral de la pobreza. [Online] Available: [http://www.coneval.org.mx/Medicion/Paginas/Indice-de-la-tendencia-laboral-de-la-pobreza-\(ITLP\).aspx](http://www.coneval.org.mx/Medicion/Paginas/Indice-de-la-tendencia-laboral-de-la-pobreza-(ITLP).aspx) (March 10, 2017).
- Consejo Nacional de Evaluación de la Política de Desarrollo Social (Coneval). (2015). Medición de la pobreza. [Online] Available: <http://www.CONEVAL.org.mx/Medicion/Paginas/PobrezaInicio.aspx> (March 10, 2017).
- Consejo Nacional de Población (Conapo). (2010). Migrantes recientes y no migrantes por nivel educativo según entidad federativa, 2010. [Online] Available: [http://www.conapo.gob.mx/en/CONAPO/Migrantes\\_recientes\\_y\\_no\\_migrantes\\_por\\_nivel\\_educativo\\_segun\\_entidad\\_federativa\\_2010](http://www.conapo.gob.mx/en/CONAPO/Migrantes_recientes_y_no_migrantes_por_nivel_educativo_segun_entidad_federativa_2010) (March 10, 2017).
- Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Geografía (Inegi). (2017). Desocupación. [Online] Available: <http://www.inegi.org.mx/sistemas/bie/cuadrosestadisticos/GeneraCuadro.aspx?s=est&nc=624&c=25462> (March 10, 2017).
- Secretaría de Gobernación (Segob). (2017). Incidencia delictiva del fuero común [Online] Available: <http://secretariadoejecutivo.gob.mx/incidencia-delictiva/incidencia-delictiva-fuero-comun.php> (March 10, 2017).
- Secretaría de Hacienda y Crédito Público (SHCP). (2017). Acuerdo por el cual se da a conocer el calendario de entrega, porcentaje, fórmulas y variables utilizadas, así como los montos estimados que recibirá cada entidad federativa del Fondo General de Participaciones y del Fondo de Fomento Municipal, por el ejercicio fiscal de 2017. [Online] Available: [http://www.dof.gob.mx/nota\\_detalle.php?codigo=5470303&fecha=30/01/2017](http://www.dof.gob.mx/nota_detalle.php?codigo=5470303&fecha=30/01/2017) (March 10, 2017).
- Secretaría de Hacienda y Crédito Público (SHCP). (2016). Obligaciones financieras de entidades federativas, municipios y organismos, serie histórica. [Online] Available: [http://disciplinafinanciera.hacienda.gob.mx/es/OBLIGACIONES\\_ENTIDADES/2016](http://disciplinafinanciera.hacienda.gob.mx/es/OBLIGACIONES_ENTIDADES/2016) (February 21, 2017).