

Female Migration and Urban Informal Sector in Monterrey Metropolitan Region of Mexico

Arun Kumar Acharya* and Jose Juan Cervantes**

*Instituto de Investigaciones Sociales, Universidad Autónoma de Nuevo León
Biblioteca Universitaria “Raúl Rancel Frías”, Avenida Alfonso Reyes, 4000 Nte, C.P. 64440,
Monterrey, N.L*

**Telephone/Fax: (0052) 81 8329 4237, Email: acharya_77@yahoo.com*

***Telephone/Fax: (0052) 81 8329 4237*

ABSTRACT In

The objective of this paper is to analyze the migration pattern of Mexican women to urban informal sector particularly to Monterrey Metropolitan Region. Result indicates a constant flow of female migration to informal sector during 1995 to 2004. The socio-demographic profile reflects that majorities of these migrants are more than 20 years old, because there is still good opportunity for young women to insert in formal sector. When we compared these migrant women with their education and marital status it gives a clear picture that most of them have little education and are married. However, result indicates that women in informal sector are basically occupied as sellers, street vendor, craft women, working in manufacturing sector and domestic servants. Considering this, present paper also analyzes the inequality of income, condition of poverty and the economic and social suffering of female migrants.

Introduction

Recent globalization processes have changed significantly the conditions and features of female rural-to-urban migration in Mexico, particularly in terms of social networks and rural-urban interactions. The Mexican case is specifically interesting because the Mexican societal model is often said to support female migration better than other cultures (Arisa, 1995). Mexican female migrants encounter globalization, especially when they search for employment in the industries of Mexico City, Guadalajara, Monterrey, Ciudad Juarez and its vicinity, the site of condensing economic globalization (Arisa, 1995). The “*feminization of urban employment*” and the “*feminization of labor migration*” actually represent two sides of the same coin. Development in a globalize world comprises apparently contradictory trend, an encompassing networking at all levels on one side, and more rapid and unpredictable socio-economic changes, disconnections and disjuncture on the other. Likewise, the female migrant workers’ experiences are somewhat caught between their roles as cheap, flexible labor force; a new environment of urban modernity, consumerism and social grouping; and the traditional norms conveyed through relationships with their rural home. While moving between village and city, each migrant must negotiate shifts, not only in space but also in terms of personal identities and social relations: literally, the “*good daughter*” meets the “*modern woman*” (Cornwell, 2004).

Migration in general and rural to urban migration in particular is the process of rebalancing economic resources (human and physical ones) in order to set up a new stage of economic development. Industrialization always takes place in urban areas, and as soon as it starts, the labor force in urban areas becomes scarce, and it needs to be supplemented by labor from rural areas. Rural to urban migration although mainly caused by labor shortages in urban areas, the high population growth and, the inequality between urban and rural areas have in fact have triggered the migration so that the process becomes a problem and sometimes gets out of control.

Rural to urban migration has been an important determinant of the urbanization process that all third world countries experiencing since the middle of last century. Although there is no agreement on the estimates on the intensity of rural migration flows to urban sites, there is consensus on their large importance during the 1950's and 1960's and their declining role on the urban population growth rate thereafter (Flórez, 2000). Besides the importance of rural migration on urbanization rate, there is a lack of information on rural urban migration behavior during the last decades.

Migratory movements were as old as humankind, as people leave their place of origin in search of a better life or livelihood. Recent global trend of migration has emerged as feminization of migration. The percentage of women in the migrant population in both internal as well as international has been increasing during the last few decades. Thus, today globalization, feminization and migration evolved as intertwined issues.

Nowadays, women are increasingly migrating as the main economic providers, or "breadwinners" for their households. The growing number of female in migration process is an inevitable outcome of feminization of poverty and feminization of employment in labor market. The contributing factors to feminization of employment are female labor in cheap, flexible, unorganized, also women can be employed as piece rate, part time, home based work and female migrants can be forced to accept low waged, undervalued job in the informal sector. The "feminization of migration" had also produced specifically female forms of migration, such as the commercialized migration of domestic workers and caregivers, the migration and trafficking of women for the sex industry, and the organized migration of women for marriage.

Women migration in Mexico has become increasingly feminized since 1960 and early 70s especially to Monterrey (Arisa, 1995, Durin, et.al, 2007). Changes are evident not only in the increased volume, but also in the diversified patterns of migration. In recent decades, migration trends have seen an increasing feminization with the numbers of unskilled female migrants in some streams surpassing that of men. Most of these women works in urban informal sector as house maids, vegetable/fruit

sellers, road side stall (*ambulantes*), handicraft, labor in construction, entertainers and sex workers (Durin, et.al, 2007).

The Scope of Research

The principal aim of this paper is to examine the socio-demographic features of female migrants in Monterrey Metropolitan Region (MMR) and their type of employment absorption in urban informal sector.

Research Methodology

For the present research data has been obtained from secondary and primary sources. To analyze the feminization of migration in informal sector, the data has been taken from 1995-1999 ENEU (*Encuesta Nacional de Empleo Urbano*) data base and 2000-2004 ENE (*Encuesta Nacional de Empleo*) data set of INEGI (Instituto Nacional de Estadística Geografía e Informática).

Migration: Background and Theory

Dual economy and the causes of rural to urban migration

Theoretically, migration is defined simply as a process of personal movement from one area to another. However, the nature of migration and the causes for it are complex, and there is no general agreement among researchers on the causes of migration. Arguments on the differences on migration causing factors exist not only among researchers from different disciplines, but also among researchers within one discipline. Economist consider rural to urban migration as a process of labor movement from less developed to more advanced areas. First, migration theory is based on the dual economy theory by Lewis (1954); subsistence areas referring to rural – the agricultural sector where the labor force is suffering from unemployment and underemployment, and modernized areas – the industrial sector where many employment opportunities are being generated and are also suffering from labor shortage.

Along the development course, the industrial sector is expanding and it requires more and more labor while the agricultural sector is stagnant with a labor surplus. Under these circumstances, the labor surplus in rural areas will supplement the labor shortage in urban areas, and in this way the rural to urban migration beings. In the subsistence sector the marginal productivity of labor is very low and workers are usually paid subsistence wages, hence wage rates in this sector barely exceed marginal products. Contract wages in the modern urban sector are much higher. Due to the differences in the wage rates migration occurs from the subsistence to the industrial sector. As long as the industrial process starts in urban areas the labor demand keeps rising, and therefore it triggers labor demand from

the subsistence sector. This process continues until the wage difference between subsistent and advanced areas become zero.

Although, the dual economy theory explains convincingly the cause of rural to urban migration as a result of wage rate differences, many other researchers have found it unsatisfactory because of a number of shortcomings (Todaro, 1976). First, although the wage rate differences are an important reason for person to move from a rural to an urban area, the movement of people from rural to urban areas should not to be seen simply a case of wage differences. There are many other reasons that force people to relocate. Second, many people believe that the assumption of zero marginal productivity and labor surplus in rural areas are not very realistic. Third, the assumption that the rate of job generation in urban areas is high enough to absorb the labor from rural areas is not true in many cases. In general, industrialization in urban areas creates a high demand for labor, but nowadays under the strong threat of competition, many firms have not employed labor intensity technology, but capital intensity instead, and therefore the demand for labor in urban areas is not always high enough to absorb labor from rural areas. Finally, some researches argue that migration from rural areas to urban areas, as observed from reality, does not always go to industrial sector as in Lewis's theory, but just comes to urban areas to work in low productivity and low wage sectors in the informal economy of the city for instance as street vendors, casual laborers or construction workers. All of these points indicate that while the neoclassical theory has explained the causes for a person to move from a rural to an urban area, it has oversimplified the causes of the migration. Lewis's model could explain well the model of the West, but it does not fully explain the rural to urban migration in the developing world nowadays. A special feature of the developing world today is the high population growth, and therefore the migration from rural to urban area is not only because of wage differences, and labor demand in urban areas.

Todaro's model of rural to urban migration

During the 1970s, Michael Todaro published a number of papers on migration related issues, and his papers have contributed greatly to the understanding of migration. The argument on the causes of rural to urban migration continues to exceed the rates of job creation and to surpass greatly the capacity of both industry and urban social services to absorb this labor effectively (Todaro, 1976). For Todaro, rural to urban migration nowadays in developing countries is not a process to equalize the wage rate differences between rural and urban areas, but on the contrary, migration today is being increasingly looked on as the major contributing factor to the ubiquitous phenomenon of urban surplus labor and as a force which continues to exacerbate already serious urban unemployment problems caused by growing economic and structural imbalances between urban and rural areas (Ayman, 2002). Todaro

suggests that the decision to migrate includes the perception on the part of potential migrants of a potentially higher urban income which will give them a better income, and therefore a better livelihood (Cornwell, 2004).

According to the Todaro approach, migration rates in excess of the growth of urban job opportunities are not only possible, but also rational and probable in the face of continued and expected large positive urban to rural income differentials. High levels of rural to urban migration can continue even when urban unemployment rates are high and are known to potential migrants. Todaro suggest that a migrant will move even if that migrant ends up being unemployed or receives a lower urban wage than a migrant will move even if that migrant ends up being unemployed or receives a lower urban wages than the rural wage. This happens because the migrants expect that they will end up with some kinds of job that gives them a good compensation, and therefore they are willing to be unemployed or underpaid and to wait for a better job opportunity in the future. This argument explains the high flow of migrants from rural to urban areas who come to urban areas but end up employed. A major weakness of Todaro's model is its assumption on expected incomes made by Todaro is also unrealistic in that the migrants are able to have enough information to project and to make a decision to move to urban area, and the Todaro's models do not take in account non-economic factors and abstract themselves from the structural aspects of the economy (Ayman, 2002).

Push and pull factors approach

To some extent, the pull and push factors approach to find the cause of rural to urban migration is a combination of neoclassical and Torado's approaches. Lee (1966) develops a general schema into which a variety of spatial movements can be placed, based on the arguments in which he divided the forces influencing migrant perceptions into push and pull factors (Ayman, 2002). The former are negative factors tending to force migrants to leave origin areas, while the latter are positive factors attracting migrant destination areas in the expectation of improving their standard of living.

According to Lee the push factor could be more important than the pull factor, which the difficulties in rural areas, such as poverty, unemployment, land shortages are driving forces that urge the farmers to leave their native area the homeland to find a new place to settle and to work. These push factors are basic factors which produce migration. The pull factors refer to job or income opportunities outside the farmers' homeland that are so attractive that people cannot stay where they are. By these means, the job and income opportunities in urban areas or advanced sectors are pulling factors that pull the people to the urban areas to settle and to work. Although migration can be produced either by push or pull factors, according to Lee migration mostly is a result of a combination

of both push and pull factors that are associated with the areas of origin, destination and are also governed by personal factors which affect individual threshold and facilitate or retard migration (Lee, 1966).

Rural to Urban Migration in Mexico

In Mexico until the 1990s, labor emigration was a resource only resorted to by the most needy country people who lacked the resources to ensure family survival. That is, there was a profile of migrant families. Migration was concentrated in nearby areas in which the father, head of the family, controlled what the children would do: he decided *who would go, when to go and when to come back*. This control over the offspring was based on the father's capability to ensure their future, first on the family farm or else in the neighborhood or region. There were, therefore, particular family or local-regional conditions that sustained this functioning of the family. Migration was integrated in the families as part of their reproduction strategies, which mainly revolved around agricultural and land production. It was, thus, *a territorialized family organization*.

However, with the "rural de-agriculturization" process begun in the 1980s, emigration came to be the center of reproduction strategies for the greater part of the regional rural sector. Under current agricultural conditions, labor emigration for these rural groups is no longer an option but rather a necessity. Even for those rural groups in better conditions, emigration to the northern markets is becoming a central focus, not so much for guaranteeing their reproduction, but rather for the options it offers for capitalizing their farms.

Currently, the migratory flow is very heterogeneous, according to the *destinations* (with movement towards the regional-traditional markets and towards the "emerging" markets in the north, the border and the United States), the *objectives* (the situation of need of some families is combined with the possibilities in others), the different *families* affected (as regards the diversity of agricultural property), the *economic sectors* to which they belong, the diversity of the *migrants* (according to age, sex, education or marital status) and the periods of absence.

During the last 50 years, the structure of the Mexican population has changed significantly. Faced with fewer opportunities in the rural economy, Mexican workers have immigrated to urban areas and to the United States over the last 100 years; Mexico has experienced a transition from a rural to an urban economy. Consistent with the trend, nowadays less than 23 percent of the population lives in rural areas. However, poverty is more endemic to rural areas, where the worst cases of impoverished population is found, thus increasing migration.

Rural to urban migration in Mexico has been an ongoing process. However, during the past 30 years it has grown. In particular, migration grew 182 percent from 1980 to 1994 and 352 percent between 1980 and 2002. Basically the rural to urban migration started grows since 1990s. During 1970s there were 58.7 percent urban population in the country and it grew to 71.3 percent in 1990 and in 2005 to 76.4 percent.

The major destinations of migrants are Mexico City, Guadalajara, Monterrey and Ciudad Juarez. The main reason for migration is the income differential between rural and urban sectors in the country as well as high employment opportunity. Also rural population is relatively young and less educated, and labor force works mostly in agricultural activities.

The agricultural sector is dominated by small communities of farmers working on collective lands called “*ejidos*” that produce maize and other basic crops. Ejidos account for almost 90 per cent of all rural producers and for more than half of all arable land in the country. Of the 25 million rural habitants, little more than 3 million individuals called “*ejidatarios*” have rights over the 105.1 million rural hectares of ejidal land. The ejidal census of 2001 reported that ejidatarios are old, working parcels 8.5 hectares on average (SAGAR)¹. But currently due to lack of governmental support each day the agricultural crisis is more in Mexico. People are no longer interest to invest them in this sector and try to escape from such crisis. Many of them intend to migrate to *other side of the border* (to USA) and some migrate to urban areas. This crisis has affected severely to female as many of their family economy depend directly or indirectly on agriculture. This crisis leads unemployment in the country by putting them in high family pressure. Without having any other opportunity, they prefer to migrate to urban center in search of job. Once they reach the urban area, it make them difficult to compete in urban labor market due to their less preparation in term of education for which they enter to urban informal sector.

Conceptualization of the urban informal sector

The concept of the informal sector has been debated since its “discovery” in Africa in the early 1970s. Nevertheless, it has continued to be used by many policy makers, labor advocates, and researchers because the reality it seeks to capture – the large share of the global workforce that remains outside the world of full-time, stable, and protected employment – continues to be important and probably has been increasing over time. At present, there is renewed interest in informal work arrangements. This current interest stems from the fact that informal work arrangements have not only persisted and

¹ Secretaria de Agricultura, www.sagar.gob.mx

expanded but have also emerged in new guises and unexpected places. In recent years, some policy makers, activists, and researchers - both within and outside the ILO – have started to use the term “informal economy” for a broader concept that incorporates certain types of informal employment that were not included in the 1993 international statistical definition of the “informal sector”. They seek to incorporate in this concept the whole of informality - including both enterprise and employment relations - as manifested in industrialized, transition, and developing economies. This shift toward an expanded concept of the “informal economy” reflects a rethinking of some of the key assumptions regarding the so-called “informal sector”. Those involved in the current rethinking, both within and outside the ILO, seek to incorporate the real world dynamics in labor markets today – particularly the employment arrangements of low-income workers. The Resolution concerning Statistics of Employment in the Informal Sector, adopted by the Fifteenth International Conference of Labor Statisticians in 1993, defined the informal sector as follows:

1. The informal sector is regarded as a group of household enterprises or unincorporated enterprises owned by households that includes:
 - Informal own-account enterprises, which may employ contributing family workers and employees on an occasional basis; and
 - Enterprises of informal employers, which employ one or more employees on a continuous basis.
2. The enterprise of informal employers must fulfill one or both of the following criteria: size of unit below a specified level of employment, and non-registration of the enterprise or its employees.

This framework proposed by the ICLS Resolution allows countries to adapt the basic operational definition and criteria to their specific circumstances. In particular, flexibility is allowed with respect to the upper limit on the size of employment; the introduction of additional criteria such as non-registration of either the enterprise or its employees; the inclusion or exclusion of professionals or domestic employees; and the inclusion or exclusion of agriculture (ILO, 2002).

On the other hand, Keith Hart developed the concept of informal economy in the early 1970s as a result of a research project for the International Labor Organization (ILO) on urban labor market in Africa (Portes, 1994, Tokman, 1992). However, after almost thirty years of research on informal activities, there is still no consensus on its definition. The term informal economy covers a set of heterogeneous activities, from unpaid labor to any number of unregulated salaried jobs. This broad range of activities has made it difficult for analysts of the informal sector to agree on its definition. The differences in conceptualization of the informal sector rely largely on four key elements: state

regulation, size of the firm, dynamism and integration. The first two elements affect the size of the urban informal sector, whereas the last two are related to its function. Three main approaches can actually be identified: dualistic, excessive regulated and structural articulation (table 1). State regulation is a common feature in all three approaches, suggesting an implicit consensus that the informal sector refers to activities taking place outside established institutional rules. However, the reasons for the existence of unregulated activities differ because of survival strategies, functional requirements, inadequate regulatory system, or inefficiencies of the labor market regulations, and then their function in the labor market and the implications in terms of labor policies also differ. Table 1 summarizes the view of each approach in relation to each of the key elements.

First, in the dualistic approach the informal sector is considered as the disadvantaged sector of a dualistic or segmented labor market not linked to formal activities. In fact, it views the informal economy as the collection of marginal enterprises characterized by: low entry barriers in terms of skills, capital, and organizations; family ownership enterprises; small scale of operation; labor intensive production with outdated technology; unregulated and competitive markets; low levels of productivity; low levels of capacity for accumulations (Portes, 1994; Tokman, 1992).

Table 1: Conceptualization of the urban informal sector by approach

Second, the excessive regulated economy approach sees informality as the response to the rigidities and limitations of the mercantilist (De Soto, 1989, cited in Portes and Schauffler, 1993). Third, the structural articulation approach (Castells and Portes, 1989) characterizes the informal economy as income earning activities unregulated by the state but closely interlinked with activities in the formal sector. The basic distinction between formal and informal activities relies entirely on the character of production and distribution processes, namely degree of compliance with the terms of the laws². Given the heterogeneity of the informal sector, at least two sub sectors can be identified under this approach with different goals and roles in labor market: informal activities with direct subsistence goals (subsistence informal sector); and dynamic activities with decreasing labor costs and capital accumulation goals (salaried workers of large and small firms, and owners of small firms). The former is a disadvantaged sector with a counter cyclical behavior, and the latter one is integrated to the formal sector showing a pro-cyclical behavior (Flórez, 2002).

² This view clearly differentiates criminal activities from informal activities. The first ones specialize in the production of goods and services socially defined as illicit (like drug), whereas informal activities refer to unregulated (illicit) production and distribution of otherwise licit goods and service (Castells and Portes, 1989).

In the case of Mexico 1990s were a period of great economic change in the country. Restructuring programmes early in the 1990s resulted in more liberal financial policy and greater privatization of the economy. In 1994 the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) was signed. A financial crisis occurred at the end of 1994 and GDP fell 6.2 percent for the year –the largest drop during the century. A quick economic recovery followed with sustained economic growth for the latter half of the decade. At the end of the decade the informal economy continued to be important to both employment and the GDP of Mexico. In 2005 informal employment accounted for 70 per cent of total employment in Mexico (INEGI, 2006). In terms of absolute numbers, in the year 2005, 17.7 million men compared to 12.3 million women were employed in informal economy. With respect to GDP, the informal economy contributes 25 per cent of Mexico’s GDP (INEGI, 2006).

Origin of female migrants in Monterrey Metropolitan Region

In this section we have analyze the places of origin of female migrants in informal labor market. The table 2 shows the result of proportion of female migrants during 1995 to 2004 with comparison to male migrants in the same sector. The table indicates a continuous fluctuation in the flow of both male ad female migrants to sector informal of Monterrey Metropolitan Region, though in 2004 the female migrants in informal sector reach to its highest level (36 percent). This is due to no positive out come of economic reform brought by the ex-President Vicente Fox.

Table 2: Total number of migrants in informal labor sector in MMR during 1995-2004

As it is stated earlier there are four important employment zones in Mexico i.e. Mexico City, Guadalajara, Monterrey and Ciudad Juarez, but Monterrey remains a greater pole of attraction for female migrants after the decades 60s due to its high industrial growth as well as opportunity available in domestic services (Zenteno and Solis, 2006, Durin et.al, 2007). Women from neighboring states including central and southern part of Mexico migrate to Monterrey Metropolitan Region in search of employment. To know the origin of the migrants, we have categorized the places of origin into three broad groups; i.e. Northern zone, Central zone and Southern zone. The northern zone includes the states Tamaulipas, Coahuila, Chihuahua, Sonora, Sinaloa, Zacatecas, San Luis Potosi, Durango, whereas we have includes the Puebla, Hidalgo, Estado de Mexico, Mexico City, Guanajuato, Jalisco, Aguascalientes, Veracruz, Colima, Nayarit, Tlaxcala, Morelos and Michoacán in central zone. The other states such as Guerrero, Oaxaca, Chiapas, Tabasco, Campeche, Yucatan and Quintana Roo are included in southern zone (see map 1). Result indicates that more than seventy percent of migrants

come from the states of northern zone followed by central and southern zones (see table 3). Among the northern zone majority of migrants arrived from the states of San Luis Potosi (31.1 percent), Tamaulipas (21.7 percent), Coahuila (16 percent), Zacatecas (11 percent) and Durango (10.1 percent). It is obvious that for the migrants from central and southern zones still Mexico City is a major pole of attraction, but the table indicates an increasing tendency of female migrants during the last years towards the Monterrey Metropolitan Region. This reflects a gradual shifting on wave of migration from center to northern city of Mexico.

Map 1: Political map of Mexico

Table 3: Place of origin of female migrants during 1995-2004

The socio-demographic characteristic of female migrant in Monterrey Metropolitan Region

The present section analyzes the socio-demographic characteristics of female migrants in Monterrey Metropolitan Region. The age distribution of migrants shows that little higher than 90 percent of female migrants are elder than 21 years old. However, data indicates that female migrants less than 20 years are only 7 percent. The main reason why the female migrants are elder in ages is due to probably high family economic pressure. In Mexico as a whole the cost of living in the last 20 years has increase 70 percent and this increment has badly affect the population of middle and lower income groups (Hernandez and Velazquez, 2003). Thus, it is not possible to maintain the family in one source of income, for which now the Mexican female are becoming the pillar for the family economic survival. This leads to women to migrate to urban area. Moreover, most of these women do not posses good educational preparation; it is difficult for them to get an employment in formal sector. Majority of them educated up to primary and secondary level (see table 4).

On the other hand, women who migrate to Monterrey Metropolitan Region are predominantly married. This shows that there is a family economic burden which pushes them in search of employment. A significant percentage of migrants belong to unmarried women group. They move to city's informal sector seeking employment or seeking better employment (18 percent in 2004). There are women who are widowed, divorced or separated and they moved to city's informal sector to seeking employment due to family related reasons. The table also shows that majority of women belongs to belongs to a nuclear family. Whereas, we have calculated the number of children has in the family to see the size of the family. It is seen that some women do not have child as they are unmarried,

but interestingly majority of women have more than 3 children in the family. This gives a probable reason that high family pressure is a major cause of migration for the women to informal sector.

Table 4: Socio-demographic characteristics of female migrants in MMR

Employment conditions

In this part we have examined the employment conditions of female migrants in informal sector. The micro level perspective on the impact of migration is wholly explained from migrants view, irrespective of objective economic forces such as inflation, salary and wage conditions.

To know the detail of employment as well as occupational status and daily income, we have categorized the employment status of female migrants into four board groups, such as women working in small scale manufacturing industry, women employed in shops, restaurants and hotels, the third group is women work in transport, storage and communication and the last group is women employed in communal, social and personal services. The analysis find out that during 1995-2004, twenty percent of women employed in the manufacturing sectors, whilst majority of migrants (68.7 percent) employed in shops, restaurants and hotels. Nearly 11 percent of migrants are working in communal service sector as well as in social and personal sector and very few migrants (0.3 percent) are working in transport, storage and communication sector (see table 5).

Table 5: Percentage distribution of female migrants by occupation during 1995-2004 in MMR

On the other hand, though the earlier table shows the absorption of women in different occupational sector, but to know the actual employment of female migrants it is necessary to disintegrates the *sectoral* occupational to define into actual employment status of migrants. The table 6 presents the results occupational structure, it can be observe that nearly 21 percent of migrants are working as craft women, manufacturer and working in reparation center. Majority of female migrants (42.5 percent) working as seller in different kind of shops, whereas 12.4 percent women are street vendor and 11 percent working in personal business. Also some migrant women work as secretary, domestic servant, machine operator, helper in factory and artist and sport women.

Table 6: Percentage distribution of female migrants by occupation during 1995-2004 in MMR

The table 7 indicates the number of employment women has during the last one year. This table gives an idea how many job a women had as the same time. It can be observe that during 1995 to 2004,

majority of migrants had only one job, where as there are some migrants who had two or more than two jobs and some migrants didn't give response about their job status. This means majority of migrants were happy as well as their interest to stay in the same job is very high as well as their income is sufficient for which they didn't opt for the second or third job.

Table 7: Number of jobs during the last one year in MMR

The table 8 explains the time period work in a particular job. It is very interesting to observe that more than 90 percent of migrants were work through out the year in the same job, whereas there were also women who worked for few months and days in the same job. The figure indicates that the employment is good for the migrants.

Table 8: Time period work in a particular job during 1995-2004 in MMR

Employment and income are the two important aspects to understand the urban informal sector. The table 9 presents the average daily income interm of pesos real of migrants during 1995 to 2004 as well as their income per hour. In 1995 the average daily income of migrants was 62.85 pesos, where as at the same year the average income per hours was 10.35 pesos. After the year 1995 the average daily income of migrants reflects an increasing trend including their per hour income. In 2004 the average earning of migrant was 65.35 pesos whereas in the same year they were earning 11 pesos per hour. From the table it is clearly observe that the daily income of migrant in the informal maintain a more or less stable income with some positive growth.

Table 9: Percentage distribution of female migrants by their daily income and income per hours during 1995-2004 in MMR

On the other hand, the years of experiences of migrants in the informal sector indicates that majority of women have years of experience in sector informal. This is mainly due to good income in sector informal as well as availability of little opportunities in sector formal as well as their lack of preparation to enter to formal sector.

Table 10: Percentage distribution of female migrants by their years of experiences in sector informal during 1995-2004 in MMR

Summary and conclusion

Using data from 1995-1999 ENEU (Encuesta Nacional de Empleo Urbano) data base and 2000-2004 ENE (Encuesta Nacional de Empleo) data set of INEGI, this paper analyzed the profile of the female migrants to informal sector of Monterrey Metropolitan Region of Mexico during the last 10 years. Rural to urban migration in Mexico have been more pronounced, indicating the current dominance in flow towards the Monterrey Metropolitan Region, as this city has identified itself as an industrial capital of the country. The availability of job both in sector formal and informal has attracted the migrants from different corner of the country. The paper found a constant high flow of female migration to informal sector, though there was a decline trend during 2002 and 2001, but after that it again starts increasing significantly. It is because of no clear development signs in Mexican economic reform.

Whereas the socio-demographic profile of these migrants states that they are elder in age that is to say they are more than 20 years. Whereas very few women found less than 20 years in informal sector, this may be due to as they are young, so still they have good chances to get employment in sector formal. Moreover young populations do not have any economic pressure to sustain the family livelihood. When we compared these migrant women with their education and marital status it gives a clear picture that most of them who are occupied in informal sector are have little education and are married. However, result indicates that women in sector informal basically occupied in sellers, street vendor, craft women, working in manufacturing sector and domestic servants.

The social and economic conditions indicate that migrants felt that employment, income and social and cultural life styles are significantly better after migration. One of the most important finding

of this study is that there is measure change in the well being of migrants after the migration, though they work in informal sector.

Internal migration and more specifically rural to urban migration is continuing a strong and dynamic force in Mexico because, from migrant's perspective, there are gains to be made from migration. Migration is perceived to improve one's income and lifestyle.

REFERENCES

Arisa Patricia 1995. La Migración femenina en dos modelos de desarrollo: 1940-1997 y 1980-1992. *Relaciones de género y transformación agrarias*. González y Salles. V (Coords.), El Colegio de México, Mexico.

Ayman G Zohry 2002. Rural to Urban Labor Migration: A study of Upper Egyptian Laborers in Cairo. *DPhil thesis (Unpublished)*. University of Sussex.

Castells M, A. Portes 1989. Work Underneath: The Origins, Dynamics, and Effects of the Informal Economy. In *The Informal Economy: Studies in Advanced and Less Developed Countries*. A. Portes, M. Castells and L. Benton (Eds.), Johns Hopkins University Press, USA.

Cornwell, Katy 2004. Migration and Unemployment in South Africa: When Motivtion Supasses the Theory. Monash University.

Durin Severin, Rebeca Moreno, Cecilia Sheridan 2007. Perfil socio-demográfico de las mujeres indígenas en Monterrey. *Trayectorias*. Vol.IX (23), Instituto de Investigaciones Sociales, Universidad Autónoma de Nuevo León, Monterrey, Mexico.

Instituto Nacional de Estadística, Geografía e Informática (INEGI) 2000. Encuesta Nacional de Empleo Urbano-1995-1999, Mexico.

Instituto Nacional de Estadística, Geografía e Informática (INEGI) 2005. Encuesta Nacional de Empleo-2000-2004, México.

Instituto Nacional de Estadística, Geografía e Informática (INEGI) 2006. Encuesta Nacional de Ocupación y Empleo-2005, México.

Hernandez Laos Enrique, Jorge Velazquez Roa 2003. Globalización, desigualdad y pobreza: lecciones de la experiencia mexicana. UAM-Plaza y Valdés, Mexico.

International Labor Organization (ILO) 2002. Men and Women in the informal Economy: A statistical Picture, International Labor Office, Geneva, ISBN. 92-2-113103-3

Lewis Arthur W 1954. Economic Development with Unlimited supplies of Labor, *The Manchester School*, 22(2).

Todaro Michael P 1969. A Model of Labor Migration and Urban Unemployment in Less Developed Countries. *American Economic Review*, 59(1).

Flórez Carmen Elisa 2000. Las Transformaciones Sociodemográficas en Colombia durante el Siglo XX. Economía Siglo XX, Banco de la Republica, Tercer Mundo Editores.

Flórez Carmen Elisa 2002. The function of the Urban Informal Sector in Employment: Evidence from Colombia 1984-2000. *Document CEDE No. 2002-04*, April, University of Los Andes.

Portes Alejandro 1994. The Informal Economy and Its Paradox. In *The Handbook of Economic Sociology*. Neil J. Smelser and Richard Swedberg (Eds.), Princeton University Press, USA.

Portes, Alejandro, R. Schauffler 1993. Competing Perspectives on the Latin American Informal Sector. *Population and Development Review*, vol. 19(1), March.

Tokman Victor E 1992. The Informal Sector in Latin America: From Underground to Legality, In *Beyond Regulation, The Informal Economy in Latin America*. Tokman V (Ed.), Lynne Rinner Publishers.

Todaro, Michael. P 1976. Internal Migration in Developing Countries. International Labour Office, Geneva.

Zenteno Rene, Patricio Solis 2006. Continuidades y Discontinuidades de la movilidad ocupacional en Mexico. *Estudios Demográficos y Urbanos*. Vol.21(3), Colegio de Mexico, Mexico.

Table 1: Conceptualization of the urban informal sector by approach

	Approach		
	Dualistic	Excessive Regulated	Structural Articulation
State regulation	Unregulated	Unregulated	Unregulated
Size of the firm	Small	Any	Any
Integration	None	None	High
Dynamism	Low	Any	High

Source: Flórez, 2002

Table 2: Total number of migrants in informal labor sector in MMR during 1995-2004

Sex	Years									
	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Male	62646 (65.4%)	60021 (62.3%)	63915 (64.7%)	54703 (64.7%)	62033 (65.2%)	49221 (65.2%)	58635 (72.0%)	541659 (72%)	48132 (66.5%)	53835 (63.9%)
Female	33092 (34.6%)	36296 (37.7%)	34804 (35.3%)	29885 (35.3%)	27430 (30.7%)	26321 (34.8%)	22783 (28.0%)	20720 (27.7%)	24252 (33.5%)	30430 (36.1%)

Map 1: Political map of Mexico



SOURCE: www.tatfoundation.org/mexico.htm

Table 3: Place of origin of female migrants during 1995-2004

Years

Sex	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
North	27646 (83.5%)	29447 (81.1%)	27576 (79.2%)	22465 (75.2%)	19509 (71.1%)	20659 (78.5%)	16407 (72%)	15857 (76.5%)	18047 (74.4%)	23202 (77.2%)
Center	5159 (15.6%)	6582 (18.1%)	6679 (19.2%)	6482 (21.7%)	7773 (28.3%)	5662 (21.5%)	5901 (25.9%)	4408 (21.3%)	6205 (25.6%)	61159 (21.4%)
South	187 (0.9%)	267 (0.7%)	549 (1.6%)	938 (3.1%)	148 (0.5%)	0 (0)	475 (2.1%)	455 (2.2%)	0 (0)	4039 (1.4%)

Table 4: Socio-demographic characteristics of female migrants in MMR

Years

	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Age of Migrants										
Less than 20	7.16	6.29	8.69	4.78	5.17	6.68	16.15	15.71	10.59	7.16
21-39	40.88	37.68	29.22	40.91	39.87	36.83	38.16	33.12	33.13	33.23
40 and more	51.50	56.03	62.10	54.31	54.96	56.50	45.69	51.17	56.28	59.61
Educational status										
Illiterate	8.05	6.97	4.45	8.13	1.61	0	0	0	0	0
Primary	69.21	65.96	58.87	53.72	64.81	54.52	54.87	48.77	55.05	59.12
Secondary	16.07	15.79	20.45	28.59	23.35	26.41	24.54	38.46	24.83	24.58
More than secondary	6.67	11.28	16.23	9.56	10.22	19.07	20.59	12.77	20.12	16.29
Marital status										
Unmarried	15.7	16.5	17.0	15.1	15.7	16.3	21.9	24.1	17.2	18.2
Married	66.2	64.3	69.8	64.4	65.3	55.2	49.9	53.3	64.2	57.9
Free Union	3.8	5.1	1.2	4.8	2.9	3.3	8.3	8.6	4.0	8.7
Divorced	3.2	1.4	1.0	2.1	3.9	4.9	7.0	0	4.7	2.9
Separated	5.2	3.6	4.9	4.3	4.1	10.3	7.0	3.6	1.4	2.0
Widow	5.9	9.1	6.1	9.4	8.0	10.0	5.9	10.3	8.5	10.3
Type of family										
Nuclear	99.2	99.2	99.2	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
No-nuclear	0.8	0.8	0.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Number of children										
No child	10.5	18.4	14.8	12.4	15.1	14.7	25.1	21.6	16.8	17.7
1 – 2 child	20.2	21.2	28.1	28.3	29.1	31.8	27.3	23.4	32.3	29.9
3 – 4 child	35.7	30.8	30.3	30.7	30.3	30.8	27.5	28.6	25.0	24.2
5 and more	33.6	29.6	26.8	28.5	25.5	22.	20.1	26.3	25.9	28.2

Table 5: Percentage distribution of female migrants by occupation during 1995-2004 in MMR

Years

	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Manufacture Industry	13.6	18.6	26.8	19.3	23.0	22.0	22.2	18.4	16.7	21.5
Occupation in shop, restaurant and hotel	60.0	71.6	64.2	74.6	68.3	60.8	70.8	78.5	75.6	67.6
Communal service, social and personal	1.0	0.8	1.2	0	1.1	0.6	0	0	0	0.7
Transport, storage, communication	25.3	9.0	7.9	6.0	7.5	14.8	7.0	3.1	7.7	10.9

Table 6: Percentage distribution of female migrants by occupation during 1995-2004 in MMR

Years

	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Technicians	3.5	0	0	2.0	1.7	5.4	1.4	1.1	1.9	3.9
Artist and sport	0	0.7	0.2	0.7	0.7	1.6	0	0	1.8	1.0
Craftswoman, manufacturer, and working in reparation center	14.3	22.0	29.3	15.4	29.7	21.1	17.5	22.4	13.6	19.3
Machine operator	0	0	0	0.2	0.9	1.7	0	2.7	1.9	1.0
Helper in factory	0	1.3	1.8	2.7	1.2	3.5	5.0	0	4.0	0
Secretary	4.0	9.1	5.0	4.3	1.6	5.8	2.3	0.4	5.0	0.6
Seller in shop	35.6	44.2	49.0	58.4	45.9	41.0	42.5	31.0	33.6	38.2
Street vendor	7.4	8.0	3.3	5.7	12.6	6.5	23.3	21.4	26.3	19.8
Work in personal business	17.1	13.0	10.0	7.7	5.0	12.5	4.3	20.0	11.0	10.1
Domestic worker	15.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Others	2.0	1.7	1.7	2.7	0.6	0.7	3.5	0.8	0.6	6.7

Table 7 Number of jobs during the last one year in MMR

Years										
	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
One job	80.0	77.0	88.3	90.8	86.2	90.0	87.3	95.5	90.0	84.0
Two or more than two jobs	5.9	5.0	1.2	2.6	4.5	2.4	3.6	1.05	1.6	5.5
No response	14.1	18	10.5	6.6	9.3	7.6	9.1	3.5	8.4	10.5

Table 8 Time period work in a particular job during 1995-2004 in MMR

Years										
-------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Through out the year	91.5	92.0	94.4	96.8	98.9	97.0	98.0	98.0	97.0	93.0
Some months	2.7	5.3	4.7	2.3	0.5	1.3	2.0	2.0	1.5	6.0
Some days	5.8	2.7	0.9	0.9	0.6	1.7	0	0	1.5	1.0

Table 9: Percentage distribution of female migrants by their daily income and income per hours (pesos reales) during 1995-2004 in MMR

Years	Daily income	Income per hours
1995	62.85	10.35
1996	42.61	7.36
1997	34.57	7.29
1998	35.81	7.99
1999	61.38	9.79
2000	74.73	11.45
2001	67.68	10.62
2002	54.66	10.16
2003	70.20	11.29
2004	65.35	11.02

Table 10: Percentage distribution of female migrants by their years of experiences in sector informal during 1995-2004 in MMR

Years

	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
0 to 10 years	6.8	9.2	8.8	4.9	5.9	7.2	20.5	15.8	10.6	11.2
11 to 20 years	15.0	11.0	8.0	11.0	16.0	23.0	17.0	13.0	16.0	14.0
21 to 30 years	22.2	19.0	23.9	24.0	23.1	17.8	21.8	28.0	20.4	13.5
31 to 40 years	29.7	28.4	21.6	31.0	28.3	16.3	20.7	14.2	24.7	24.5
41 to 50 years	21.0	27.2	32.7	22.7	21.5	28.5	16.8	18.6	20.2	33.9
51 and more years	5.6	5.0	5.1	6.6	5.6	7.4	3.4	10.1	7.6	2.8