

### About the Survey

Fieldwork was conducted at Mexican consulates in Los Angeles, New York, Chicago, Atlanta, Dallas, Raleigh and Fresno from July 12, 2004, to Jan. 28, 2005. A total of 4,836 individuals responded to a 12-page questionnaire in Spanish. All respondents were in the process of applying for a *matricula consular*, an identity card issued by Mexican diplomatic missions. This was not a random survey but one designed to generate the maximum number of observations of Mexican migrants who were seeking further documentation of their identity in the United States. (For further details see the methodological appendix at the end of this report.)

The Pew Hispanic Center is an independent research organization, and it formulated the questionnaire and controlled all of the fieldwork and data preparation. The Center wishes to thank the Ministry of Foreign Relations of Mexico, the Institute for Mexicans Abroad and the Mexican consulates in the seven cities where the survey was conducted for permitting the fieldwork to take place on consular premises. The data and conclusions presented in this report are the exclusive responsibility of the Pew Hispanic Center and do not necessarily reflect the official views of either the foreign ministry or the government of Mexico.

## Attitudes about Immigration and Major Demographic Characteristics

By Roberto Suro  
Director, Pew Hispanic Center

### Executive Summary

A first-of-its-kind survey of nearly 5,000 Mexican migrants who were interviewed while applying for identity cards at Mexican consulates in the United States has found that most want to remain in this country indefinitely but would participate in a temporary worker program that granted them legal status for a time and eventually required them to return to Mexico.

Survey respondents said by a margin of 4-to-1 that they would participate in such a temporary worker program, the broad outlines of which have been proposed by President George W. Bush. A similarly lopsided majority of respondents said they would participate in a different kind of program advocated by some leading Democrats that could lead to permanent legal status in this country for many unauthorized migrants.

The Pew Hispanic Center's Survey of Mexican Migrants provides detailed information on the demographic characteristics, living arrangements, work experiences and attitudes toward immigration of 4,836 Mexican adults who completed a 12-page questionnaire as they were applying for a *matricula consular*, an identity document issued by Mexican diplomatic missions. Fieldwork was conducted in Los Angeles, New York, Chicago, Atlanta, Dallas, Raleigh, NC, and Fresno, CA, from July 12, 2004, to Jan. 28, 2005.

The sampling strategy for the survey was designed to generate the maximum number of observations of Mexicans living in the United States and seeking documentation of their identity at a Mexican consulate. Respondents were not asked directly to specify their immigration status. However, slightly more than half of the respondents (N=2,566) said that they did not have any form of photo ID issued by any government agency in the United States. The share of respondents saying they had no U.S.-issued identity documents was much higher among the more recently arrived—80 percent among those in the country for two years or less and 75 percent for those in the country for five years or less.

This is the first in a series of reports on the survey's findings. Subsequent reports will examine a variety of topics in detail, including the migrants' origins in Mexico, their employment and economic status, banking and remittances, and gender and family structure. The full dataset of survey responses will be made available to researchers on Sept. 1, 2005, through the Pew Hispanic Center Web site ([www.pewhispanic.org](http://www.pewhispanic.org)).

Major findings in this report include:

- When asked how long they expected to remain in the United States, a majority of respondents picked either “as long as I can” (42%) or “for the rest of my life” (17%). Meanwhile, 27 percent said they expected to stay for five years or less.
- By a 4-to-1 margin (71% vs. 18%), survey respondents said they would participate in a program that would allow them to work in the United States and cross the border legally on the condition that they eventually return to Mexico. Respondents who said they had no form of U.S.-issued photo ID were even more positive (79% vs. 16%).
- Among respondents who said they intended to stay in the United States for “as long as I can” or for “the rest of my life,” a clear majority—68 percent—said they would participate in a temporary immigration program that would require them to return to Mexico. Acceptance of the idea of a temporary program was even higher—80 percent—among those who stated an intention to return to Mexico within five years.
- By a margin of 72% to 17%, respondents said they would participate in a program that offered the prospect of permanent legalization for migrants who lived here for five years, continued working and had no problems with legal authorities. Respondents who said they had no U.S.-issued ID were even more positive (79% to 15%).
- The largest shares of positive responses to questions about both programs came from young, relatively recently arrived migrants, who comprised nearly half of the total sample.
- By wide margins, respondents in the overall sample (79% vs. 13%) and among those who said they had no U.S.-issued ID (82% vs. 12%) said that their friends and family in Mexico would be willing to participate in a temporary worker program that would eventually require them to return to Mexico.
- The survey captured a distinctively young and recently arrived segment of the Mexican-born population living in the United States. Nearly half of the sample (48%) was between 18 and 29 years old, and almost half (43%) had been in the country for five years or less.
- Respondents to the survey showed a higher level of educational achievement than the adult population of Mexico at large. The share of respondents whose education stopped at primary school is half of that in the Mexican adult population, and the share that went as far as high school is three times as large.
- Significant differences emerge in the characteristics of respondents in traditional settlement areas for Mexican migrants such as Los Angeles and Fresno compared with those in new areas such as Raleigh and New York. These differences are relevant to determining the impact of Mexican migration on host communities. For example, in traditional settlement areas as many as half of all the Mexican migrants surveyed have children in public schools, compared with a quarter in new settlement areas.

The Survey of Mexican Migrants was a purposive sample, in which any individual seeking an identity document on the days the survey was in progress could choose to participate. It was not a probability sample, in which researchers randomly select participants in a survey to avoid any self-selection bias. Moreover, the results have not been weighted to match the estimated parameters of a target population as is often the case with public opinion surveys. Instead the data are presented as raw counts.

Conducting a survey of *matrícula* applicants on the premises of Mexican consulates while they waited for paperwork to be processed permitted the execution of a lengthy questionnaire among a large number of individuals in the target population. No other survey on this scale has been attempted with Mexican migrants living in the United States.

The survey allows an extraordinary view of a population that by its very nature is exceptionally difficult to measure and study: Mexicans who live in the country without proper documentation and in particular those who have been in the country for only a few years. The survey data and other evidence suggest that a substantial share of the respondents, especially among those that are young and recently arrived, are not in the United States with legal immigrant status.

The *matrícula consular* is a laminated identity card that bears an individual’s photograph, name and home address in the United States and that attests that he or she is a citizen of Mexico. The card is issued by Mexican officials without inquiring as to the individual’s immigration status in the United States. As such, it cannot be used as proof of permission to reside or work in the country, and U.S. immigration authorities will not accept it as proof that the holder has the right to enter the country. However, the *matrícula* is accepted as an identity document that establishes the holder’s local address by many law enforcement agencies and local governments. The U.S. Treasury Department ruled in 2003 that the

*matrícula* can be used to open bank accounts. Two-thirds of the respondents in this survey—3,265 individuals—said one of the reasons they were applying for the *matrícula* was to use as an ID card in the United States.

For individuals returning to Mexico, the *matrícula* can be used in place of a Mexican passport to enter Mexico at those points of entry, primarily airports, where Mexican authorities conduct immigration checks. And, 43 percent of the respondents said one of their intended uses of the *matrícula* was for travel to Mexico. However, an individual who plans to return to the United States legally will need a valid Mexican passport and some kind of U.S.-issued visa to reenter the country except for short visits near the border.

The act of applying for a *matrícula consular* is not evidence that an individual is an unauthorized migrant. However, a permanent legal immigrant who has established a domicile in the United States and has been in the country for an extended period of time has access to other kinds of identity documents. Under normal circumstances, such an individual should be in possession of a U.S.-issued document attesting to his or her immigration status, and that document can be used to acquire a Social Security card, a driver's license or other forms of photo ID issued by government agencies in the United States.

Most tourists and business travelers are allowed to remain in the United States legally for no more than a year, and 90 percent of the survey respondents said they had been in the United States for a year or more. Temporary workers and others who are allowed to reside in the country for longer than a year on non-immigrant visas make up a very small share of the migrant flow from Mexico.

Over the past decade 80 percent or more of the Mexican migrants who have come to live in the United States on a long-term basis have added to the stock of the unauthorized population, according to estimates based on data collected by Mexican and U.S. government agencies. As a result of the substantial illegal flow in recent years, those estimates indicate that about half of the 10 million Mexican nationals living in the United States reside in the country without authorization.

The Survey of Mexican Migrants was conducted on the premises of the Mexican consulates in Los Angeles, New York, Dallas, Chicago, Fresno, Raleigh and Atlanta, but respondents were advised that this was not an official survey and that it would have no bearing on their business at the consulate. Mexican authorities cooperated with the fieldwork by allowing it to take place at the consulates. However, the design, development and execution of the survey, the compilation and analysis of the resulting data and the writing and editing of this report were under the full and exclusive control of the Pew Hispanic Center. Consulate personnel did not take part in any of the fieldwork, and all of the costs of conducting the survey were borne by the Pew Hispanic Center. Fieldwork was conducted by International Communications Research of Media, PA, and Einat Temkin, of the University of Southern California Annenberg School for Communications, who served as fieldwork coordinator. Respondents could complete the questionnaire themselves, seek the assistance of an interviewer for any part of it or have the entire questionnaire read to them by an interviewer. All of the fieldwork was conducted in Spanish.

The sites for the survey fieldwork were chosen with several objectives in mind. One was to cover the major concentrations of the Mexican migrant population; hence the choices of California, Illinois and Texas. There was also a desire to produce a mix of locations with well-established immigrant populations, such as Los Angeles, and relatively new immigrant populations, such as Raleigh. And the survey sought a mix of major metropolitan areas, smaller cities and at least one site where a sizeable share of the Mexican population works in agriculture (Fresno). Thus there are some significant variations in demographic characteristics among the samples generated in the various cities.

No researcher has attempted to conduct a survey of a nationally representative sample of the undocumented population that was drawn with the level of statistical certainty that is routine for large-scale public opinion polls, and this survey does not purport to present that kind of sample. Within limits inherent to the nature of the target population, however, the Survey of Mexican Migrants offers an opportunity to examine this population at a level of detail and with a level of confidence not available heretofore.

Neither the U.S. Census Bureau nor any other U.S. government agency conducts a count of unauthorized migrants or defines their demographic characteristics based on specific enumeration. There is, however, a widely accepted methodology for estimating the size and certain characteristics of the undocumented population based on census data. The survey respondents resemble the undocumented population of Mexican origins in recent estimates in their age and gender and the amount of time they have been in the United States.

For more information on how this survey was conducted and a comparison of the sample with estimates of the undocumented population, please see the appendix on methodology at the end of this report.

## Immigration Policy

The Survey of Mexican Migrants asked four questions designed to probe respondents' willingness to participate in immigration programs that would offer different types of legal status to those who are currently unauthorized. In particular, the questions attempted to gauge relative interest in a program of the sort proposed by President George W. Bush that would offer temporary legal status with a requirement to eventually return to the country of origin versus a program that would eventually offer permanent legal status, which is the alternative pressed by some leading Democrats.

The overall finding from the survey data is that both alternatives enjoy very broad support with little difference between temporary and permanent solutions. In the full sample, respondents said they would participate in either a temporary or permanent legalization program by margins of 4-to-1 (Tables 1 and 2). Majorities in favor of participation were evident in every geographic area and in every demographic subgroup with the exception of respondents over the age of 55, who comprised only 5 percent of the overall sample.

Table 1: A Temporary Program

¿Participaría usted en un programa que le permitiera trabajar legalmente en los Estados Unidos y cruzar la frontera con México legalmente múltiples veces y en cualquier momento, a condición de eventualmente regresar a México?  
 (WOULD YOU PARTICIPATE IN A PROGRAM THAT WOULD ALLOW YOU TO WORK LEGALLY IN THE U.S. AND LEGALLY CROSS THE MEXICAN BORDER MULTIPLE TIMES AND WHENEVER YOU WANTED, ON THE CONDITION THAT YOU WOULD EVENTUALLY RETURN TO MEXICO?)

	Yes	No	Already working in U.S. as resident/citizen	No answer
Los Angeles	69	23	1	7
New York	79	16	1	3
Dallas	76	12	4	8
Chicago	70	16	5	9
Fresno	52	24	13	11
Raleigh	76	16	4	4
Atlanta	77	14	2	6
TOTAL	71	18	4	7
Matrícula ID	76	16	2	6
No U.S. ID	79	16	1	5

NOTE: In Table 1 and in similar tables the results for the sample in each city where the survey was conducted are listed separately. These are followed by the results for the complete sample. Two additional tabulations show the results for respondents who said they were seeking the *matrícula consular* for use as an ID card in the United States (3,265 of 4,836 total respondents) and for those who said they did not have any form of photo ID issued by a government agency in the United States (2,566 of 4,836 total respondents). Figures in all columns are percentages. On the series of questions regarding immigration policy, respondents could answer “Yes” or “No” or they could mark a box indicating that they were already working in the United States as a resident or citizen.

Table 2: A Permanent Program

¿Participaría usted en un programa que requiera permanecer cinco años en los Estados Unidos, pero que le permitiera obtener su residencia permanente siempre y cuando siguiera empleado y no haya tenido ningún problema con las autoridades legales?

(WOULD YOU PARTICIPATE IN A PROGRAM THAT WOULD REQUIRE A FIVE-YEAR STAY IN THE UNITED STATES BUT WOULD ALLOW YOU TO OBTAIN PERMANENT RESIDENCY AS LONG AS YOU CONTINUED WORKING AND YOU DID NOT HAVE ANY PROBLEMS WITH LAW-ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITIES?)

	Yes	No	Already working in U.S. as resident/citizen	No answer
Los Angeles	70	21	1	8
New York	79	16	1	4
Dallas	77	12	3	7
Chicago	69	17	5	10
Fresno	53	21	12	13
Raleigh	77	15	4	4
Atlanta	78	13	1	7
TOTAL	72	17	3	8
Matrícula ID	79	14	1	6
No U.S. ID	79	15	1	6

On both the question about a temporary program and the one about a permanent program the highest levels of positive answers (79% on both questions) came from those who said they had no photo ID issued by a government agency in the United States. Similarly high levels of positive answers came from respondents in the 18-to-29-year-old age group (76% on both) as well as those who had been in the United States for five years or less (79% on both)—two overlapping subsamples that each comprise nearly half of the total sample.

On both questions the share of positive responses declined consistently along gradients for age and for the amount of time the respondent had been in the United States, with 42 percent of those over the age of 55 and 57 percent of those who had been in the United States for 15 years or more saying they would participate.

Differences in the findings across the seven cities appear driven primarily by the composition of each city sample by age and time of arrival.

Among respondents who said they intended to stay in the United States for “as long as I can” or for “the rest of my life,” a clear majority—68 percent—said they would participate in a temporary immigration program that would require them to return to Mexico. Acceptance of the idea of a temporary program was even higher—80 percent—among those who stated an intention to return to Mexico within five years.

Two additional questions further probed attitudes toward a temporary immigration program.

Asked whether family and friends in Mexico would participate in a temporary program, the respondents answered positively in similar measures as they did when asked about their own potential participation (Table 3).

Table 3: Friends and Family and a Temporary Program

Pensando en sus parientes y amigos en México, ¿cree usted que les interesaría venir legalmente a trabajar en los Estados Unidos mediante un programa de trabajo temporal a condición de regresar al cabo de algunos años?

(THINKING ABOUT YOUR FAMILY AND FRIENDS IN MEXICO, DO YOU THINK THEY WOULD BE INTERESTED IN WORKING IN THE U.S. LEGALLY THROUGH A PROGRAM THAT WOULD ALLOW THEM TO WORK HERE TEMPORARILY BUT WOULD REQUIRE THEM TO RETURN TO MEXICO WITHIN A CERTAIN NUMBER OF YEARS?)

	Yes	No	Already working in U.S. as resident/citizen	No answer
Los Angeles	78	16	1	5
New York	81	14	1	4
Dallas	82	9	2	7
Chicago	75	13	4	9
Fresno	68	16	8	8
Raleigh	82	11	4	3
Atlanta	87	7	1	5
TOTAL	79	13	2	6
Matrícula ID	81	12	1	5
No U.S. ID	82	12	1	5

Respondents were also asked whether they would participate in a savings program that could be drawn upon only if they returned to Mexico (Table 4). Such a program is a possible feature of a temporary immigration program, with the intent of encouraging migrants to return to their country of origin. Positive responses to this question were lower but followed the same demographic pattern as the others.

Table 4: A Savings Program for Temporary Workers

¿Estaría usted interesado en participar en un programa que le permitiera ahorrar dinero de sus ingresos laborales en una cuenta bancaria garantizada y percibir intereses sobre sus ahorros bancarios en los Estados Unidos, para poder disponer de estos ahorros únicamente si regresa a México?

(WOULD YOU BE INTERESTED IN PARTICIPATING IN A PROGRAM THAT WOULD ALLOW YOU TO SAVE YOUR INCOME IN A GUARANTEED U.S. BANK ACCOUNT THAT EARNS INTEREST ON YOUR SAVINGS BUT THAT YOU WOULD ONLY BE ABLE TO WITHDRAW IF YOU RETURN TO MEXICO?)

	Yes	No	Already working in U.S. as resident/citizen	No answer
Los Angeles	62	32	1	5
New York	63	29	2	7
Dallas	61	25	4	10
Chicago	59	26	5	10
Fresno	45	35	10	10
Raleigh	63	26	4	6
Atlanta	68	22	2	8
TOTAL	61	28	3	8
Matrícula ID	65	26	2	7
No U.S. ID	66	26	1	7

## Intention to Remain in the United States

The survey asked respondents how long they thought they would remain in the United States and presented them with a list of options running from the short term to the long term. (Table 5). The answer that was marked most often, by a substantial margin, was “*mientras pueda*” (as long as I can). Another large share answered “*toda la vida*” (all my life). Together, these views of living in the United States as an indefinite or permanent endeavor accounted for a majority or a near majority of the sample as a whole and in each city sample. While 59 percent of the total sample picked one of these two options, a sizeable share of respondents thought of themselves as comparatively short-term migrants, with 27 percent saying they thought they would remain in the United States for five years or less.

Table 5: Intention to Remain in the United States

¿Cuánto tiempo piensa quedarse en los Estados Unidos?

(HOW LONG DO YOU THINK YOU WILL REMAIN IN THE U.S.?)

	Los Angeles	New York	Dallas	Chicago	Fresno	Raleigh
1-6 months	2	3	5	6	3	7
6-11 months	2	3	4	4	3	3
1-2 years	6	13	12	11	6	17
3-5 years	7	16	10	10	6	15
6-10 years	3	7	3	5	2	6
10+ years	3	5	4	4	5	3
As long as I can	43	45	44	40	44	36
All my life	29	5	12	15	29	7
Other	*	*	*	1	1	1
No answer	4	3	6	5	3	5

	Atlanta	TOTAL	Matrícula ID	No U.S. ID
1-6 months	5	4	4	4
6-11 months	2	3	3	4
1-2 years	13	10	12	14
3-5 years	13	10	11	14
6-10 years	7	4	4	5
10+ years	3	4	3	3
As long as I can	38	42	44	41
All my life	11	17	13	10
Other	2	1	1	1
No answer	4	3	6	5

Stated intentions to remain follow some similar demographic patterns across the various cities.

Most notably, the long-term responses were favored by a greater share of women than men. So, in the total sample women picked “as long as I can” by a more than 2-to-1 margin over the options totaling five years or less while men were about evenly split.

Also, younger respondents and those who had arrived more recently were more likely to say they intended to return to Mexico in a few years than older migrants and those of longer tenure.

Apparently thinking of themselves as temporary migrants, a quarter (26%) of the respondents who had been in the United States for five years or less said they expected to be back in Mexico within two years compared with a tenth (9%) of those who had been in the United States for fifteen years or more. The intent to sojourn temporarily in the United States is most powerfully evident among the most recently arrived. Nearly half (44%) of respondents who had been in the country for six months or less said they intended to return within two years. Nonetheless, a significant fraction of these recent arrivals expressed an

intent to remain for the long term, with a quarter (27%) saying they intended to stay “as long as I can” or for “the rest of my life.”

A similar pattern emerges when respondents in the 18-to-29-year-old age range are compared with those who are 50 or older. Among the younger respondents about a third (34%) say they will stay five years or less, while only a fifth (19%) in the older part of the sample state the same intention. Meanwhile, three-quarters (73%) of the older respondents chose one of the long-term options, compared with half (53%) of the younger respondents.

The desire to stay for the rest of one’s life follows a clear gradient according to age. The share of respondents who stated that intention increases from the youngest (14% among those 18 to 29) to the oldest age groups (40% among those 55 and older). A similar gradient is also evident according to the amount of time the respondent has been in the United States, increasing from the more recently arrived (7% for those with five years’ residence or less) to those with longer tenure (33% with 15 years or more).

Table 6: Intention to Remain in the United States by Age

	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-54	55+
Less than 5 years	34	22	18	16	19
As long as I can	39	48	47	36	31
All my life	14	17	23	36	40

Table 7: Intention to Remain in the United States by Length of Time in the United States

	5 years ago or less	6-10 years ago	11-15 years ago	More than 15 years ago
Less than 5 years	44	19	10	14
As long as I can	37	53	54	39
All my life	7	14	26	33



## Major Demographic Characteristics

Although some significant differences are apparent from city to city, a general portrait emerges of a young, disproportionately male, sample that has recently arrived in the United States (Table 9). Compared with the adult population of Mexico, the sample is relatively well educated, but it fares poorly in comparison with the general level of educational achievement of the U.S. population.

In the full sample, 57 percent of the respondents were male and 40 percent were female. The largest age group was the 48 percent of respondents who were 18 to 29 years old. Of the total, 43 percent said they had been in the United States for five years or less (Table 9). By comparison, only 34 percent of the full Mexican-born population living in the United States falls into the 18-to-29-year-old age range, and only 29 percent has been in the country for five years or less. (See Appendix 1.)

Some differences emerged when examining respondents who said they had no U.S. government-issued photo ID and those who said they had been in the country for two years or less. Both of these groups were notably younger than the average for respondents as a whole, with larger shares in the 18-to-29-year-old age range (Table 9). Demographic portraits of the samples from each of the seven cities where the survey was taken can be found in Appendix 2.

The survey asked, “¿Cuál fue el último nivel de educación que usted aprobó?” (What was the last level of education that you completed?) and offered five responses that correspond to the structure of the Mexican educational system: *Nunca fui* (did not go to school), *Primaria* (equivalent to U.S. grades 1-6, primary school), *Secundaria/Técnica* (grades 7-9, either lower secondary school or vocational education), *Preparatoria/ Equivalente* (grades 10-12, college preparatory or advanced technical training), or *Universidad* (higher education).

Table 8: Completed Levels of Education Comparison Table

	Survey sample	Mexico	United States	All Mexicans in U.S.
Primary or less	32	73	5	40
Lower secondary/Voc. ed.	36	14	8	23
High school	22	7	49	23
College or more	6	5	38	14

Sources: for Mexico and the United States, OECD; for Mexicans in the U.S., Current Population Survey, March 2003

The survey respondents are better educated than the adult population of Mexico as a whole according to indicators compiled by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD 2004) (Table 8). The share of the sample that went as far as high school, for example, is three times as high as in the Mexican adult population. The sample is also somewhat better educated than the full population of Mexican-born adults living in the United States except at the high end of the scale. Compared with the migrant population, the Mexican population has a larger share of older adults who were of school age in the middle decades of the 20<sup>th</sup> century when educational achievement in Mexico was considerably lower than at the end of the century. And the survey sample is somewhat younger than the migrant population overall. The survey results are consistent with other evidence that the educational profile of Mexican immigrants has been improving in recent decades (Lowell and Suro 2002).

According to the OECD indicators, the share of the adult U.S. population that has completed high school or some form of higher education is three times as high as in the sample.

Table 7: Selected Demographic Characteristics

	<b>Total sample</b>	<b>No U.S. ID</b>	<b>2 years or less in U.S.</b>
	N=4,836	N=2,566	N=854
<b>Gender</b>			
Male	57	57	62
Female	40	41	36
<b>Age</b>			
Under 18	2	2	4
18-29	48	60	64
30-39	29	25	19
40-49	13	7	7
50-54	3	1	1
55+	5	3	3
<b>Level of Education Completed</b>			
Did not attend school	2	2	2
Primary school	32	29	21
Lower secondary/Vocational school	36	40	43
High school	22	23	26
College or other postsecondary	6	5	7
<b>English Ability</b>			
A lot/Some	44	37	23
A little/No English	54	61	76
<b>Marital Status</b>			
Single	39	46	49
Married	46	36	36
Common law	10	12	10
Separated/Divorced/Widowed	5	4	4
<b>Children</b>			
Have children that do not live in U.S.	12	15	23
Have children that live in U.S.	54	45	26
Do not have children	26	31	39
<b>Years in U.S.</b>			
Less than 6 months	-	-	30
6 months to less than 12 months	-	-	29
12 months to less than 18 months	-	-	18
18 months to less than 2 years	-	-	23
5 years or less	43	60	-
6-10 years	18	18	-
11-15 years	12	9	-
15+ years	19	6	-
<b>Housing</b>			
Live with family/friends	12	15	23
Rent house/apartment	63	72	66
Own house/apartment	20	10	7
Other	3	3	3
<b>Earnings per Week</b>			
≤ \$100	4	5	5
\$100-\$199	10	13	13
\$200-\$299	27	29	30
\$300- \$399	21	22	22
\$400-\$499	11	9	6
\$500 +	9	5	3

## New Arrivals and New Settlement Areas

Recent research conducted in both the United States and Mexico has demonstrated that both the nature of the migrant stream coming north and its target destinations have been changing since the 1980s (Massey, Durand and Malone, 2002; Suárez-Orozco and Pérez, 2002; Bean and Stevens, 2003; Ascencio, 2004; Hill, 2004). In broad terms, more women have joined what has been a male-dominated flow and levels of education have increased, reflecting both better education in Mexico and a greater share of migrants from towns and cities rather than agricultural areas where educational achievement is lower. On the U.S. side of the border, new arrivals have continued to flow into traditional destinations such as Los Angeles even as other newcomers have headed to new settlement areas such as New York and Raleigh where the Mexican population had been relatively small. All of these trends appeared to accelerate in the late 1990s when Mexican migration surged in response to an economic crisis in Mexico and a booming economy in the United States.

This survey offers fresh insights into these trends by permitting comparisons among the samples drawn in various U.S. cities. These comparisons illustrate the manner in which differences in the nature of the migrant stream going to specific localities translate into differences in the impact on host communities.

At the most basic level, the differences in the migrant streams going to traditional versus new settlement areas are evident in the respondents' gender.

Table 8: Gender

Sexo

(GENDER)

	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>No answer</b>
Los Angeles	48	49	3
New York	65	31	3
Dallas	63	34	3
Chicago	57	41	2
Fresno	49	48	3
Raleigh	72	26	2
Atlanta	59	39	2

Los Angeles and Fresno are both longstanding destinations for Mexican migrants, although of different sorts: The first is a vast metropolis and the second is at the center of an agricultural region. In both, however, the shares of male and female respondents are roughly equal. Meanwhile, males are a disproportionately large share of the respondents in Raleigh and New York, which is typical of a newly developed labor migration. The sex ratios in these city samples correlate to the findings of recent studies that have differentiated among traditional and new settlement areas using data from decennial census counts (Suro and Singer 2002; Singer 2003). Sex ratios are not a measure of how recently individual migrants have arrived in the United States but rather they are an indication of the maturity of the migrant stream. In the case of a labor migration such as the flow from Mexico to the United States, men typically make up a highly disproportionate share of the initial settlers in a given location. This trend is highly evident in the data from this survey.

The share of the sample that reports living in the United States for five years or less varies significantly from one city to another. It is twice as high in Raleigh, the newest of the new settlement areas, as in Los Angeles, the most traditional of the traditional settlement areas.

Table 9: Length of Time in the United States

¿En qué año y mes comenzó su estancia actual en los Estados Unidos?

(IN WHAT YEAR AND MONTH DID YOU BEGIN YOUR PRESENT STAY IN THE U.S.?)

	<b>5 years ago or less</b>	<b>6-10 years ago</b>	<b>11-15 years ago</b>	<b>More than 15 years ago</b>	<b>No answer</b>
Los Angeles	31	15	16	29	9
New York	53	23	11	6	7
Dallas	50	19	9	14	7
Chicago	43	19	13	18	7
Fresno	24	16	15	39	6
Raleigh	63	16	10	8	3
Atlanta	54	25	7	9	5

The differences in migration patterns are also evident in the respondents' ages. As one would expect with more recent migrant inflows, larger shares of the samples in the new settlement areas fall into the youngest age range than in traditional settlement areas.

Table 10: Age

¿Cuántos años cumplidos tiene usted?

(AGE)

	<b>Under 18</b>	<b>18-29</b>	<b>30-39</b>	<b>40-49</b>	<b>50-54</b>	<b>55+</b>	<b>65+</b>	<b>No answer</b>
Los Angeles	1	39	31	15	4	7	2	3
New York	1	58	28	8	1	1	--	3
Dallas	2	57	24	11	2	2	--	2
Chicago	2	46	30	14	3	4	1	3
Fresno	1	32	32	23	5	6	1	2
Raleigh	3	57	28	8	1	--	--	2
Atlanta	1	53	34	7	1	1	--	3

Differences in the composition of a migrant stream can have important consequences for the host community. Larger shares of younger, more recently arrived migrants, for example, state intentions to return to Mexico in a matter of years rather than settle permanently in the United States. So, while 17 percent of the sample in Los Angeles stated an intent to return in five years or less, in Raleigh the comparable figure was 42 percent. Regardless of whether or not individuals actually carry out these plans, such intentions can affect decisions on employment, housing, community engagement and other matters.

A more tangible and immediate impact can be measured in the number of migrants who have children enrolled in U.S. public schools, and on this point the results vary significantly from the new to the traditional settlement areas. As would be expected, the more mature migrations produce a greater share of migrants with children being educated in the United States. Even in new settlement areas, however, a substantial fraction of the respondents reported having children in U.S. public schools.

Table 11: Children in U.S. Public Schools

¿Tiene usted hijos? ¿Cuántos?

(DO YOU HAVE CHILDREN? HOW MANY?)

Durante el pasado año escolar, ¿Cuántos hijos suyos asistieron una escuela pública en los Estados Unidos?

(DURING THE LAST SCHOOL YEAR, HOW MANY OF YOUR CHILDREN ATTENDED PUBLIC SCHOOL IN THE U.S.?)

**Combination Table; Base = Total Respondents**

	<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>New York</b>	<b>Dallas</b>	<b>Chicago</b>	<b>Fresno</b>
Have children (net)	71	57	63	70	78
Children attend school in U.S.	45	23	25	34	58
1	15	12	10	10	19
2	13	7	8	13	17
3	11	3	4	7	11
4	4	1	2	2	8
5	2	--	--	1	2
6+	1	--	--	1	2
Do not have children	25	32	29	24	18
No answer	4	11	8	6	4

	<b>Raleigh</b>	<b>Atlanta</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>Matrícula ID</b>	<b>No U.S. ID</b>
Have children (net)	61	70	68	65	61
Children attend school in U.S.	21	30	35	30	24
1	9	11	12	11	10
2	7	11	11	10	8
3	5	5	7	6	4
4	--	3	3	3	2
5	--	--	1	--	--
6+	--	--	1	--	--
Do not have children	31	22	26	27	31
No answer	8	8	6	7	8

## **Photo ID Issued by a Government Agency in the United States**

The share of survey respondents who reported that they had a photo ID issued by a government agency in the United States varied significantly from one city to another, apparently reflecting the composition of the migrant stream flowing to each of those cities. Younger and more recently arrived respondents were less likely to say they had identity documents issued here.

Table 12: U.S.-Issued Photo ID

Tiene usted un documento de identificación con fotografía emitido por alguna oficina de gobierno de los Estados Unidos?

(DO YOU HAVE A PHOTO ID ISSUED BY A GOVERNMENT AGENCY IN THE U.S.?)

	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No answer</b>
Los Angeles	50	47	2
New York	22	75	2
Dallas	41	54	5
Chicago	38	57	5
Fresno	65	32	3
Raleigh	52	45	3
Atlanta	38	59	4
TOTAL	43	53	4
Matrícula ID	32	65	3
No U.S. ID	--	100	--

Two-thirds (67%) of the survey respondents in the 18-to-29-year-old age range said they did not have a U.S.-issued photo ID compared with a fifth (20%) of those age 55 or older.

Responses to this question also follow a clear gradient on the amount of time an individual has been in the United States (Table 13).

Table 13: U.S. ID by Time in Country

	2 years or less	5 years or less	6-10 years	11-15 years	15 years or more
Yes	17	23	45	58	69
No	80	74	52	40	26
No answer	3	3	4	1	5

## Family Networks

Large-scale Mexican migration to the United States has been underway for several decades and, as noted above, gained fresh momentum in the second half of the 1990s. One measure of the maturity of this migrant stream is the extent to which individual immigrants are part of an extended network of family members living in the United States. It has long been known that family networks play an important role in facilitating contemporary immigration by helping newcomers overcome logistical, legal and cultural hurdles (Suro 1998; Portes and Rumbaut 1990; Bean and Stevens 2003). The data from this survey, however, demonstrate that today's Mexican migrants can count on large and extensive networks even when they are recently arrived and even when they are arriving in cities where Mexican migration is a fairly recent phenomenon.

Only 13 percent of the respondents said they did *not* have any relatives other than a spouse or children in the United States, and the result was about the same (15%) for those who had been in the United States five years or less and for those who said they had no U.S.-issued photo ID. Conversely, nearly half (44%) said they had six or more relatives living in the country and a quarter said the number was 10 or more. These results varied from city to city in one regard. Smaller shares of migrants in new settlement areas reported having many relatives in the United States than those in the traditional areas, but nonetheless the number who counted no relatives at all was similar. In other words, Mexican migrants in the new settlement areas may have fewer relatives in the United States, but the vast majority, just as in the traditional settlement areas, do have some.

Table 14: Family Networks

¿Tiene usted parientes, más allá de sus hijos o su esposo(a), que viven en los EE.UU.?  
 (DO YOU HAVE RELATIVES, OTHER THAN YOUR CHILDREN OR YOUR SPOUSE, WHO LIVE IN THE U.S.?)  
 ¿Cuántos?  
 (HOW MANY?)

**Combination Table; Base = Total Respondents**

	Los Angeles	New York	Dallas	Chicago	Fresno	Raleigh
Have relatives living in U.S.	83	83	83	81	85	82
1-5	24	39	29	25	21	40
6-10	19	17	20	19	19	15
More than 10	32	12	21	27	36	20
Do not have relatives living in U.S.	13	13	11	13	11	13
No answer	4	4	5	6	4	5

	Atlanta	TOTAL	Matrícula ID	No U.S. ID
Have relatives living in U.S.	78	82	81	80
1-5	31	28	30	31
6-10	20	19	19	19
More than 10	17	25	23	20
Do not have relatives living in the U.S.	13	13	13	15
No answer	8	5	6	6

These family networks tend to be concentrated geographically. Two-thirds of the full sample said they had relatives living in the same town or city or the United States, and these results were substantially consistent across all of the city samples. Nearly a third of the respondents in the full sample said they had six or more relatives living in the same city.

## Language

Most of the survey respondents (54%) said they spoke little or no English. This appears to reflect the large share of recently arrived migrants in the sample. The survey findings suggest that a significant level of English acquisition takes place within a few years for many newcomers but that nonetheless substantial numbers of migrants have very limited English skills even after spending several years in the United States.

Table 13: Ability to Speak English

¿Qué tanto inglés habla usted?

(HOW MUCH ENGLISH DO YOU SPEAK?)

	A lot	Some	A little	None	No answer
Los Angeles	19	31	32	16	2
New York	9	33	39	17	1
Dallas	9	27	40	24	--
Chicago	15	35	32	16	1
Fresno	14	27	27	31	1
Raleigh	8	27	42	21	2
Atlanta	11	37	35	17	1
TOTAL	13	31	35	19	1
Matrícula ID	11	31	36	21	1
No U.S. ID	9	28	37	24	1

A larger share of male respondents (48%) than females (41%) said they could speak either “a lot” (*mucho*) or “some” (*algo*) English. Younger respondents reported greater English abilities than their elders. Among respondents ages 18 to 29 nearly half said they could speak a lot or some English, compared with a quarter (25%) of the respondents at least 55 years old. Not surprisingly, language ability reflected levels of education. Among respondents who have a primary school education or less, 30 percent said they could speak English at this level. Among those who completed junior high, vocational school or high school, 51 percent said they spoke a lot of English or some English. Among the small number that finished college, 74 percent said they spoke this level of English.

In the survey, English language abilities increased notably with the amount of time the respondent had spent in the United States. For example, fewer than a third (31%) of respondents who had been in the country for five years or less said they could speak a lot of English or some English compared with more than half (54%) of those who had been in the country for six to ten years. This contrast is significant because these two groups have roughly similar educational characteristics. Respondents who have been in the country 11 to 15 years have the same education profile, and 59 percent of them said they spoke a lot of English or some English. This suggests that most of the gain in English ability occurs early in the respondent’s tenure in the United States.

As the discussion above would suggest, a substantial share of the respondents reported very limited ability in English even after they had been in the country for a decade or more. Among respondents who had been in the United States for longer than a decade 30 percent said they could speak only “a little” (*poco*) English and 14 percent said they could speak “none” (*nada*).

Table 14: English Speaking Ability by Time in U.S.

	5 years or less N=2,065	6 to 10 years N= 892	11-15 years N= 599	15+ years N=1,280
A lot	5	14	26	21
Some	26	40	33	33
A little	40	32	28	31
None	28	13	13	14
No answer	1	1	1	1



## Employment

Nearly half (47%) of all respondents and nearly two-thirds (61%) of male respondents said they were employed in three industries—hospitality, construction and manufacturing—that play a central role in the U.S. economy.

The extent to which individuals could count on proper identity documents does not appear relevant to the kinds of industries in which respondents found work. Respondents who said they do not have a photo ID issued by a U.S. government agency had roughly the same overall distribution across industries as those who said that they do.

Significant differences are apparent by geography, reflecting the local economies in the seven cities where the survey was conducted. For example, the largest share of respondents employed in the hospitality industry (hotel, restaurants and bars) was in New York City, the share employed in manufacturing was highest in Chicago, and construction was highest in three fast-growing cities, Dallas, Raleigh and Atlanta. Not surprisingly, the Fresno sample produced the one very substantial share of agricultural workers.

A few significant differences emerged in the demographic characteristics of the respondents employed in various industries. Those employed in construction are almost all (95%) male and are younger than the sample overall. Construction workers were also better paid than respondents in other industries, with 35 percent earning \$400 a week or more compared with just 17% of those employed in manufacturing and 19% in hospitality. Agricultural workers tended to be older and less educated and a disproportionately large share had been living in the country for more than 15 years. Among those working in domestic service 80 percent were women.

Table 15 Major Industries of Employment

¿En qué industria trabaja principalmente usted ahora aquí en los EE.UU.?

(WHAT IS THE MAIN TYPE OF INDUSTRY YOU NOW WORK AT IN THE U.S.?)

	Los Angeles	New York	Dallas	Chicago
Agriculture	3	5	5	4
Hospitality	13	26	16	17
Construction	9	15	26	12
Manufacturing	19	11	13	23
Janitorial and landscaping	9	9	11	9
Domestic service	6	8	2	2
Commerce/sales	10	8	4	7
Installation, maintenance and repair	3	2	3	3
Transportation and warehousing	3	2	1	3

	Fresno	Raleigh	Atlanta	TOTAL	Matrícula ID	No U.S. ID
Agriculture	52	10	5	8	7	6
Hospitality	6	10	16	15	17	18
Construction	5	37	26	16	17	17
Manufacturing	5	17	19	16	17	16
Janitorial and landscaping	4	10	8	9	9	10
Domestic service	3	2	2	4	4	4
Commerce/sales	5	2	4	7	7	7
Installation, maintenance and repair	1	4	1	3	2	2
Transportation and warehousing	3	*	1	2	1	1

One-third of the survey respondents reported experiencing a period of unemployment that lasted a month or longer over the past year. Not surprisingly this was a greater problem for those earning very low incomes than for those with comparatively higher earnings. More than half (55%) of those making less than \$200 a week reported problems with unemployment compared with less than a fifth (19%) of those earning \$400 or more a week. No significant differences in this regard were evident by age or by time in the country. Respondents who said they lacked a U.S.-issued photo ID did not report higher levels of unemployment than those who said they had such documents.

Despite these difficulties, the survey respondents have very high levels of participation in the labor market. Only 10 percent of the respondents said they did not work in the United States, and in this regard there were significant differences by gender—3 percent for males and 21 percent for females.

## **The Matrícula Consular**

A number of nations issue some form of identity document to their citizens who are living abroad through diplomatic missions. On March 6, 2002, Mexico began issuing a new form of the *matrícula consular* at its consulates in the United States. Formally known as the *Matrícula Consular de Alta Seguridad* or the High-Security Consular Registration Card, this new document features several of the anti-forgery features found commonly in photo ID cards issued by government agencies in the United States, such as embedded text and graphics, special seals and ultraviolet logos. Some 2.8 million of the new cards had been issued as of February, 2005. As of July 2004 the Mexican Foreign Ministry said it had issued 2.2 million of the new cards and counted 377 cities, 163 counties and 33 states, as well as 1,180 police departments and 178 financial institutions as accepting the new *matrícula* as a valid form of photo ID (IME 2004).

An August 2004 report by the U.S. Government Accountability Office concluded, “Federal agencies hold different and, in some cases, conflicting views on the usage and acceptance of CID [consular identity] cards, and no executive branch guidance is yet available.” (GAO 2004) Most notably, the Treasury Department issued a regulation in 2003 which, in effect, permits the use of *matrículas* to open bank accounts, while the FBI has warned that the cards can be obtained fraudulently and used to support false identities, according to the GAO report. As of January 2005, ten states accepted the *matrícula consular* as a form of photo ID for persons seeking a driver’s license, according to the National Immigration Law Center (NILC 2005). They are Idaho, Indiana, Michigan, Nebraska, New Mexico, Oregon, Texas, Utah, Washington and Wisconsin.

An applicant for a *matrícula consular* must fulfill four basic requirements:

1. Present proof of Mexican nationality with a document such as a birth certificate or similar document issued by the Mexican government.
2. Present proof of identity with a Mexican or U.S. document such as an electoral ID or a driver’s license.
3. Present proof of residence with a utility bill, a receipt for rent payments or another such document.
4. Payment of a \$26 fee.

The survey presented respondents with six possible uses for the *matrícula consular* and offered them the opportunity to write in others. Respondents were asked to mark all of the uses they contemplated. Use of the *matrícula* as an ID card in the United States was cited most often overall in the full sample, and use of the document to travel to Mexico was next. The responses differed significantly according to the amount of time the respondents had been in the United States. Nearly 8 in 10 (79%) of respondents in the country for five years or less mentioned an intention to use the card as an ID in the United States, versus fewer than 5 in 10 (45%) of those who had been in the country for 15 years or more. In contrast, those who had been in the country longest marked use of the card for travel to Mexico by a 2-to-1 margin (63% vs. 31%) over those more recently arrived.

Table 16: Uses of the Matrícula Consular

¿Cuáles son los usos principales que usted le dará a su matrícula consular?

(WHAT ARE THE MAIN THINGS FOR WHICH YOU’LL USE YOUR *MATRÍCULA CONSULAR*?)

	<b>7/25/04 Los Angeles</b>	<b>9/24/04 New York</b>	<b>10/29/04 Dallas</b>	<b>11/19/04 Chicago</b>	<b>12/3/04 Fresno</b>
As an ID card in the U.S.	63	73	72	70	48
To cash checks in the U.S.	33	26	37	29	21
To mail money to Mexico from the U.S.	25	28	32	25	16
To open a bank account in the U.S.	41	46	43	39	21
To get a driver’s license in the U.S.	18	22	22	15	11
To travel to Mexico from the U.S.	47	28	39	44	63

	12/10/04 Raleigh	1/28/05 Atlanta	TOTAL	Matrícula ID	No U.S. ID
As an ID card in the U.S.	68	77	68	100	83
To cash checks in the U.S.	28	29	31	41	38
To mail money to Mexico from the U.S.	18	25	25	34	30
To open a bank account in the U.S.	32	40	39	48	47
To get a drivers license in the U.S.	31	24	19	24	22
To travel to Mexico from the U.S.	44	36	43	34	29

The act of applying for a *matrícula consular* is not evidence that an individual is an unauthorized migrant. However, a permanent legal immigrant who has established a domicile in the United States and has been in the country for an extended period of time has access to other forms of identification that are more widely accepted here. Under normal circumstances, such an individual should be in possession of a valid Mexican passport as well as a U.S.-issued document attesting to his or her immigration status, and that document can be used to acquire a Social Security card, a driver's license or other forms of photo ID issued by government agencies in the United States.

Non-immigrants, including tourists, students and temporary workers who are legally authorized to be in the United States for various lengths of time, normally must hold a valid Mexican passport with a U.S. visa affixed to it when they enter the country. They are then typically issued a Form I-94, which notes how long they are permitted to stay and which they must surrender on departure. Individuals living legally in the United States for extended periods under non-immigrant status are a small share of the migrant flow from Mexico.

According to a recent study by the Mexican government statistical agency (INEGI 2004), about 16 percent of the Mexicans who migrated permanently between 1997 and 2002 went to the United States with non-immigrant papers. While such individuals may enter the country legally, many become illegal residents by staying longer than authorized. In the Survey of Mexican Migrants, 90 percent of the respondents said they had been in the country for a year or more, which is beyond the expiration time of most non-immigrant visas.

Non-immigrants who overstay the terms of their original authorization join a migrant flow that is mostly unauthorized to start with. The same study by the Mexican government statistical agency estimated that 73 percent of recent migrants had no U.S. documents of any kind when they set off to live in the United States and another 8 percent came to reside with tourist visas which only permit short-term stays. Studies based on U.S. Census Bureau data estimate that 80 percent to 85 percent of the migrants who have come from Mexico to reside in the United States since the mid-1990s have added to the stock of the unauthorized population, either because they entered the country illegally or because they overstayed visas (Passel 2004; Bean, VanHook and Woodrow-Lafield, 2001).

# Appendix 1

## Methodology

Data collection was conducted at Mexican consulates in Los Angeles, New York, Chicago, Atlanta, Dallas, Raleigh, and Fresno from July 12, 2004, to Jan. 28, 2005. In each location, data collection was conducted for five or 10 business days, depending on the estimated size of the target population in each city. In most cases, applicants for a *matricula consular* are guided through a series of stations, where documents are examined, applications are submitted, photos are taken, etc. Depending on the number of applicants, the efficiency of the work flow and conditions at the consulate, the applicants could spend anywhere from 20 minutes to four hours at the consulate during their visit. In some locations, the *matricula* applicants were concentrated in one room or area, while in other locations applicants for all types of documents were in one line or area. Therefore, recruiting only those who were applying for the *matricula consular* was a primary concern. This was usually achieved by asking potential participants to identify themselves as *matricula* applicants. Only respondents who replied affirmatively to the first question on the survey, asking if they were applying for a *matricula consular* that day, were included in the survey data. Respondents were not asked for their names or any other identifying information at any point in the process.

Potential respondents were informed that they were eligible to participate in the survey using public announcements (with or without microphone, depending on the facilities) and individual recruitment. They were asked to fill out the survey while waiting in line to conduct their transaction or while waiting to pick up their newly obtained identity card. The participants received a verbal explanation regarding the survey, its content, the nature of the questions and the length of time needed to fill out the survey, as well as a detailed explanation of the anonymity and confidentiality of their responses. In addition, they were verbally informed that upon completion of the survey, they would receive a phone card which could be used to telephone Mexico as a token of gratitude for their time and patience. Potential participants were also given a detailed information sheet that explained more fully the purpose and implications of the survey. Both during the recruitment process and on the information sheet potential participants were advised that their dealings with the consulate would not be affected in any way by their decision whether to take the survey or not or by their responses.

Those who expressed an interest in participating in the survey and were of age had the choice of self-administering the survey independently or having an interviewer read out the questions and fill in the questionnaire for them. Because the targeted sample is characterized by a high rate of illiteracy, special attention was paid to the potentially illiterate or semi-literate people in the sample by emphasizing that reading and writing was not a prerequisite to participation and that interviewers were available to provide assistance and to conduct as much of the survey as necessary.

Participants were then given a copy of the survey, a pencil and a clipboard. They were told to take as long as needed and to come back to any of the interviewers if they had any doubts or questions. Those participants who opted to have an interview conducted were usually interviewed in line or by the interviewers' table. When completed, the survey was returned to an interviewer. It was then checked to assess whether the participant had completed the survey. While participants could skip questions if they so desired, there were some cases in which the participant had stopped marking responses entirely. In these cases, an effort was made to have the participant complete, as much as possible, the remainder of the survey. Interviewers offered to conduct the rest of the survey in an interview by reading questions and marking the answers. If the participant refused to complete the survey, either independently or through an interview, their survey was marked noncomplete.

The survey was conducted under the auspices of the University of Southern California Annenberg School for Communication and was subject to the university's regulations on human subject research. Respondents were advised of their rights under these regulations and were given phone numbers where they could call to register complaints or note any concerns about the conduct of the survey.

Completed survey forms were marked as such and numbered per day. In addition, all completed surveys were checked in the field for any open-ended comments. Responses and all other handwritten text were translated into English for future coding and data entry. The translations were written underneath or in proximity to the original handwritten comment and placed in parentheses to distinguish the translation from the subject's comments.

Each day's completed survey forms were then sent to the offices of International Communications Research (ICR) in Media, PA, where data entry was conducted and a database established. The completed surveys are stored at ICR using procedures that accord with university regulations for maintaining the confidentiality and security of the data.

## Sample Comparisons

Neither the U.S. Census Bureau nor any other U.S. government agency conducts a count of unauthorized migrants or defines their demographic characteristics based on specific enumeration. There is, however, a widely accepted methodology for estimating the size and certain characteristics, such as age and gender, of the undocumented population based on census and survey data. This methodology essentially subtracts the estimated legal-immigrant population from the total foreign-born population and treats the residual as a source of data on the unauthorized migrant population (Passel et al. 2004; Lowell and Suro 2002; Bean 2001).

Using this methodology, Jeffrey S. Passel, a veteran demographer and a senior research associate at the Pew Hispanic Center, has developed estimates based on the March supplement of Current Population Survey (CPS) in 2003, the U.S. Census Bureau's annual effort to measure the foreign-born population and provide detailed information on its characteristics. Comparing the sample from the Survey of Mexican Migrants with these estimates demonstrates significant similarities with the estimated characteristics of the undocumented population.

Overall the survey sample has the same preponderance of males as the full Mexican-born population from the CPS. However, a greater share of the sample respondents are concentrated in the younger age ranges than in the Mexican-born population as a whole; and in this respect, the survey sample resembles the estimated characteristics of the undocumented population, with the share under 40 being identical. A greater share of the survey respondents are recently arrived in the country (five years or less) than in the full Mexican population, and again this resembles the undocumented population. In terms of education, the share of survey respondents that went as far as high schools is the same as that in the estimates of the undocumented population and the Mexican-born population as a whole. Differences emerge at the high and low ends of the educational profile.

<b>Comparison of Survey of Mexican Migrants with Mexican-Born Population by Legal Status from the March 2003 Current Population Survey</b>					
Variable & Category	Survey of Mexican Migrants*	Undocumented**		Mexican-Born**	
		Percent	Difference	Percent	Difference
<b>Sex</b>					
Male	57%	57%	0%	56%	1%
Female	40%	43%	-3%	44%	-4%
<b>Age Group</b>					
18-29	48%	44%	4%	34%	14%
30-39	29%	35%	-6%	33%	-4%
40-49	13%	15%	-2%	19%	-6%
50-54	3%	3%	0%	6%	-3%
55+	5%	3%	2%	7%	-2%
<b>Years in U.S.</b>					
5 or less	43%	36%	7%	24%	19%
6-10 yrs	18%	26%	-8%	20%	-2%
11-15 yrs	12%	18%	-6%	15%	-3%
>15 yrs	19%	20%	-1%	41%	-22%
<b>Education</b>					
Primary or less	34%	41%	-6%	40%	-6%
Lower sec./voc. ed	36%	25%	11%	23%	13%
High school	23%	23%	-1%	23%	0%
College+	7%	11%	-4%	14%	-7%

\* Composite estimate for sample from all seven sites. "No answer" responses omitted in computing distributions.

\*\* CPS universe for comparison is the Mexican-born population classified by legal status using assignment methods developed by Passel and Clark (1998) at Urban Institute. For undocumented migrants, all ages 18 and over are used; for the entire Mexican-born population, only ages 18-64 are used from the CPS. Undocumented migrants are included in Mexican-born groups.

## Appendix 2: Demographic Characteristics by City

### Selected Demographic Characteristics of Mexican Nationals Seeking Matrículas: Los Angeles, CA

	Total sample N=1,327	No U.S. ID N=628
<b>Gender</b>		
Male	48	48
Female	49	50
<b>Age</b>		
Under 18	1	1
18-29	39	57
30-39	31	26
40-49	15	7
50-54	4	2
55+	9	5
<b>Education</b>		
Did not attend school	2	2
Primary school	28	23
Jr. High/Vocational school	33	36
H.S. graduate	27	30
College or more	8	8
<b>English Ability</b>		
A lot/Some	50	45
A little/No English	48	53
<b>Marital Status</b>		
Single	45	57
Married	47	37
Common law	1	1
Separated/Divorced/Widowed	6	5
<b>Children</b>		
No children in U.S.	9	13
Children in U.S.	60	50
Does not have children	25	31
<b>Years in the U.S.</b>		
5 years or less	31	49
6-10 years	15	21
11-15 years	16	12
15+ years	29	9
<b>Housing</b>		
Lives with family/friends	13	16
Rents house/apartment	62	72
Owns house/apartment	21	9
Other	2	2
<b>Earnings per Week</b>		
≤ \$100	6	6
\$100-\$199	12	14
\$200-\$299	28	33
\$300- \$399	18	18
\$400-\$499	10	8
\$500 +	9	5

**Selected Demographic Characteristics of Mexican Nationals Seeking Matriculas: New York, NY**

	Total sample N=521	No U.S. ID N= 393
<b>Gender</b>		
Male	65	66
Female	31	31
<b>Age</b>		
Under 18	1	1
18-29	58	61
30-39	28	27
40-49	8	7
50-54	1	-
55+	1	1
<b>Education</b>		
Did not attend school	2	3
Primary school	31	34
Jr. high/vocational school	41	39
H.S. graduate	20	19
College or more	3	3
<b>English Ability</b>		
A lot/Some	42	41
A little/No English	56	58
<b>Marital Status</b>		
Single	49	51
Married	27	26
Common law	17	18
Separated/Divorced/Widowed	3	4
<b>Children</b>		
No children in U.S.	12	13
Children in U.S.	44	39
Does not have children	32	34
<b>Years in the U.S.</b>		
5 years or less	53	58
6-10 years	23	22
11-15 years	11	10
15+ years	6	4
<b>Housing</b>		
Lives with family/friends	10	9
Rents house/apartment	84	85
Owns house/apartment	4	4
Other	1	1
<b>Earnings per Week</b>		
≤ \$100	2	3
\$100-\$199	13	14
\$200-\$299	29	28
\$300- \$399	24	26
\$400-\$499	11	11
\$500 +	8	6



Selected Demographic Characteristics of Mexican Nationals Seeking Matrículas: Chicago, IL

	Total sample N=942	No U.S. ID N=535
<b>Gender</b>		
Male	57	56
Female	41	42
<b>Age</b>		
Under 18	2	2
18-29	46	56
30-39	30	27
40-49	14	8
50-54	3	2
55+	5	1
<b>Education</b>		
Did not attend school	1	1
Primary school	29	27
Jr. high/vocational school	35	39
H.S. graduate	25	26
College or more	9	7
<b>English Ability</b>		
A lot/Some	50	43
A little/No English	48	55
<b>Marital Status</b>		
Single	32	39
Married	49	41
Common law	12	14
Separated/Divorced/Widowed	2	2
<b>Children</b>		
No children in U.S.	13	16
Children in U.S.	56	49
Does not have children	24	27
<b>Years in the U.S.</b>		
5 years or less	43	55
6-10 years	19	21
11-15 years	13	11
15+ years	18	6
<b>Housing</b>		
Lives with family/friends	15	17
Rents house/apartment	57	65
Owns house/apartment	25	14
Other	1	1
<b>Earnings per Week</b>		
≤ \$100	3	4
\$100-\$199	11	15
\$200-\$299	25	30
\$300- \$399	17	17
\$400-\$499	11	8
\$500 +	11	5

Selected Demographic Characteristics of Mexican Nationals Seeking Matrículas: Fresno, CA

	Total sample N=398	No U.S. ID n= 129
<b>Gender</b>		
Male	49	51
Female	48	48
<b>Age</b>		
Under 18	1	2
18-29	32	52
30-39	32	33
40-49	23	11
50-54	5	1
55+	7	2
<b>Education</b>		
Did not attend school	5	5
Primary school	50	53
Jr. high/vocational school	25	25
H.S. graduate	13	16
College or more	4	2
<b>English Ability</b>		
A lot/Some	41	22
A little/No English	58	78
<b>Marital Status</b>		
Single	26	39
Married	60	43
Common law	8	13
Separated/Divorced/Widowed	5	5
<b>Children</b>		
No children in U.S.	4	9
Children in U.S.	74	57
Does not have children	18	26
<b>Years in the U.S.</b>		
5 years or less	24	54
6-10 years	16	14
11-15 years	15	12
15+ years	39	12
<b>Housing</b>		
Lives with family/friends	8	12
Rents house/apartment	48	69
Owns house/apartment	34	12
Other	6	5
<b>Earnings per Week</b>		
≤ \$100	7	9
\$100-\$199	8	8
\$200-\$299	33	40
\$300- \$399	18	16
\$400-\$499	6	5
\$500 +	8	2

Selected Demographic Characteristics Mexican Nationals Seeking Matrículas: Atlanta, GA

	Total Sample N=371	No US ID n=218
<b>Gender</b>		
Male	59	56
Female	39	41
<b>Age</b>		
Under 18	1	-
18-29	53	61
30-39	34	30
40-49	7	5
50-54	1	1
55+	1	-
<b>Education</b>		
Did not attend school	1	1
Primary School	24	26
Jr. High/Vocational School	44	48
HS Graduate	21	18
College or More	7	6
<b>English Ability</b>		
A lot/Some	48	39
A little/No English	52	60
<b>Marital Status</b>		
Single	31	35
Married	47	41
Common Law	17	20
Separated/Divorced/widowed	3	3
<b>Children</b>		
No Children in US	13	15
Children in the US	55	50
Does not Have Children	22	24
<b>Years in the US</b>		
5 years or less	54	68
6-10 years	25	17
11-15 years	7	6
15+ years	9	5
<b>Housing</b>		
Live with family/friends	11	12
Rent house/apartment	62	69
Own house/apartment	19	12
Other	6	4
<b>Earnings per Week</b>		
≤ \$100	3	4
\$100-\$199	8	10
\$200-\$299	25	26
\$300- \$399	26	26
\$400-\$499	10	10
\$500 +	11	7

Selected Demographic Characteristics of Mexican Nationals Seeking Matriculas: Dallas, TX

	Total sample N=977	No U.S. ID N=527
<b>Gender</b>		
Male	63	62
Female	34	36
<b>Age</b>		
Under 18	2	4
18-29	57	69
30-39	24	18
40-49	11	6
50-54	2	1
55+	2	1
<b>Education</b>		
Did not attend school	2	1
Primary school	34	30
Jr. high/vocational school	39	45
HS Graduate	19	19
College or More	3	3
<b>English Ability</b>		
A lot/Some	36	27
A little/No English	64	72
<b>Marital Status</b>		
Single	38	43
Married	45	36
Common law	13	17
Separated/Divorced/Widowed	3	2
<b>Children</b>		
No children in U.S.	14	16
Children in U.S.	47	41
Does not have children	29	33
<b>Years in the U.S.</b>		
5 years or less	50	72
6-10 years	19	12
11-15 years	9	6
15+ years	14	3
<b>Housing</b>		
Lives with family/friends	14	16
Rents house/apartment	62	71
Owns house/apartment	19	10
Other	4	4
<b>Earnings per Week</b>		
≤ \$100	4	6
\$100-\$199	9	10
\$200-\$299	23	24
\$300- \$399	25	27
\$400-\$499	13	10
\$500 +	8	5

Selected Demographic Characteristics of Mexican Nationals Seeking Matrículas: Raleigh, NC

	Total sample N=300	No U.S. ID N=136
<b>Gender</b>		
Male	72	67
Female	26	30
<b>Age</b>		
Under 18	3	4
18-29	57	65
30-39	28	21
40-49	8	6
50-54	1	1
55+	-	-
<b>Education</b>		
Did not attend school	-	-
Primary school	33	34
Jr. high/vocational school	43	43
H.S. graduate	17	18
College or more	5	4
<b>English Ability</b>		
A lot/Some	35	20
A little/No English	63	78
<b>Marital Status</b>		
Single	42	49
Married	42	31
Common law	10	15
Separated/Divorced/Widowed	5	3
<b>Children</b>		
No children in U.S.	21	26
Children in U.S.	39	27
Does not have children	31	36
<b>Years in the U.S.</b>		
5 years or less	63	77
6-10 years	16	10
11-15 years	10	7
15+ years	8	3
<b>Housing</b>		
Lives with family/friends	11	16
Rents house/apartment	66	68
Owns house/apartment	13	4
Other	9	6
<b>Earnings per Week</b>		
≤ \$100	4	3
\$100-\$199	9	15
\$200-\$299	30	32
\$300- \$399	25	28
\$400-\$499	11	7
\$500 +	9	4

## References

- Instituto de los Mexicanos en el Exterior (IME), *Most Frequently Asked Questions Regarding the Matrícula Consular*. Mexico City, 2004  
<http://portal.sre.gob.mx/ime/pdf/PMCASING.pdf>
- Instituto Nacional de Estadística, Geografía e Informática (INEGI) *Módulo sobre Migración 2002 Encuesta Nacional de Empleo*, Aguascalientes, Mx., 2004  
[http://www.inegi.gob.mx/prod\\_serv/contenidos/espanol/bvinegi/productos/encuestas/hogares/ene/migracion/2002/migracion2002.pdf](http://www.inegi.gob.mx/prod_serv/contenidos/espanol/bvinegi/productos/encuestas/hogares/ene/migracion/2002/migracion2002.pdf)
- Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), *Education at a Glance: OECD Indicators 2004*, Paris, 2004  
[http://www.oecd.org/document/7/0,2340,en\\_2649\\_37455\\_33712135\\_1\\_1\\_1\\_37455.00.html](http://www.oecd.org/document/7/0,2340,en_2649_37455_33712135_1_1_1_37455.00.html)
- National Immigration Law Center, *Overview of States' Driver's License Requirements*, Washington, DC, 2005
- U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO), *Border Security: Consular Identification Cards Accepted within United States, but Consistent Federal Guidance Needed*. GAO-04-881. Washington, 2004
- Ascencio, Fernando L. *Migration Strategies in Urban Contexts: Labor Migration from Mexico City to the United States*. vol. 2, num. 3. Tijuana: Migraciones Internacionales, 2004
- Bean, Frank D. and Stevens, Gillian. *America's Newcomers and the Dynamics of Diversity* (The American Sociological Association's Rose series in sociology). New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 2003
- Bean, Frank D; VanHook, Jennifer; and Woodrow-Lafield, Karen. *2001 Estimates of Numbers of Unauthorized Migrants Residing In the United States: The Total, Mexican, and Non-Mexican Central American Unauthorized Populations in Mid-2001*. Washington: Pew Hispanic Center. 2001
- Hill, Laura E. *Connections between U.S. Female Migration and Family Formation and Dissolution*. vol. 2, num. 3. Tijuana: Migraciones Internacionales, 2004
- Lowell, Lindsay and Suro, Roberto. *How Many Undocumented: The Numbers Behind the U.S.—Mexico Migration Talks*. Washington: Pew Hispanic Center, 2002.
- Lowell, Lindsay and Suro, Roberto. *The Improving Educational Profile of Latino Immigrants*. Washington: Pew Hispanic Center, 2002.
- Passel, Jeffrey S. *The Demographic Impact of Mexican Migration to the United States*. Mexico City: Presentation to Seminar on Mexican-U.S. Migration, Consejo Nacional de Población, 2004.  
[www.conapo.gob.mx/semmig/index.html](http://www.conapo.gob.mx/semmig/index.html)
- Passel, Jeffrey S; Capps, Randy; Fix, Michael. *Undocumented Immigrants: Facts and Figures*, Washington: The Urban Institute, 2004
- Suárez-Orozco, Marcelo M., and Pérez, Mariela M., eds., *Latinos, Remaking America*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2002
- Massey, Douglas S.; Durand, Jorge and Malone, Nolan J. *Beyond Smoke and Mirrors*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 2002.
- Singer, Audrey. *The Rise of New Immigrant Gateways*. Washington: The Brookings Institution, 2004
- Suro, Roberto and Singer, Audrey. *Latino Growth in Metropolitan America: Changing Patterns, New Locations*. Washington: Pew Hispanic Center/ Brookings Institution, 2002.