
TOPICAL REVIEW

MIGRANT-NATIVE SOCIOECONOMIC DIFFERENCES IN LATIN AMERICAN CITIES: A STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS*

Jorge Balán, New York University

ALMOST WITHOUT EXCEPTION, LATIN AMERICAN COUNTRIES HAVE EXPERIENCED rapid urbanization during recent decades. The population living in urban areas, mainly that in large cities, has been growing much faster than the rural population. There is, of course, a wide range of variation between different countries. Venezuela's urban population grew during the fifties at a rate ten times that of the rural population while Costa Rica's rates of urban and rural growth were approximately equal.¹ Internal migration accounts for a large part of the increase in the urban population and especially for the difference between urban and rural rates of growth.²

The fast growth of the large cities in Latin America has been the object of extensive attention of social scientists and policy makers. Acute social problems have emerged from rapid population growth. A large proportion of the population in metropolitan areas lives in substandard housing, and there is a lack of essential facilities and services, chronic underemployment, and generalized poverty. Consequently, social researchers have focused their attention on those groups that suffer most keenly the consequences of rapid urbanization, that is, the shanty town dwellers. As Morse has pointed out, "for many observers urban shanty towns are the most spectacular visible hallmark of the social composition of a Latin American city."³ Studies of *favelas*, *callampas*,

* This is a revised version of a paper presented to the Conference on Human Mobility and Social Change in Latin America and Africa, University of Florida, Gainesville, December 1967. Thanks are due to Harley L. Browning and Elizabeth Jelin for help in the preparation of this paper, which was written while the author was with the Population Research Center of the University of Texas at Austin.

barriadas, *villas miserias*, and the like, have shed considerable light on our understanding of the socioeconomic and ecological origins of their populations, as well as on their social organization, cultural patterns, and political integration.⁴

The focus on shanty towns, however, has also contributed to a somewhat biased perspective on many problems related to the urbanization process and migration to the cities. Although in many cases the original investigators have been careful to point out that "the population of the 'villas miserias' should . . . be regarded as an extreme example of the 'social problems of urbanization',"⁵ there has been a tendency to overlook what is particular to these groups at the bottom of the urban stratification system and to generalize their characteristics to the larger urban context. Thus, the fact that rural migrants were found to predominate in many shanty towns⁶ was taken as an indication of the low overall position of all migrants in the urban stratification hierarchy. Some common assumptions are: 1) that migrants of rural origin predominate among the total migratory streams to large cities; 2) that a majority of migrants therefore are to be found at the bottom of the stratification system; and 3) that native migrant differences in socioeconomic status are pronounced.

A cursory inspection of the partial and limited available data for entire urban populations indicates that the above depiction is not so clear-cut. The category of migrants certainly is much more heterogeneous than is often portrayed and the relative position of migrants vis-a-vis urban natives is not always much inferior.

The impetus for this paper emerged from such an examination of data on several large Latin American cities. The relative position of migrants varies considerably from one city to another. Thus, while migrants are considerably overrepresented among the lower strata in Buenos Aires, their socioeconomic distribution in Santiago (Chile) is basically similar to that of the natives. Other cities (i.e., Mexico City) show an intermediate position in this respect.

The main purpose of this paper is to suggest an analytical framework to account for the inter-city variation in the relative position of migrants. Both ends of the migratory process, communities of origin and of destination, will be analyzed in search of explanations for migrant-native differences in cities of destination. It should be noted that this perspective is somewhat different from most studies of migration since the concern of this paper is not with identifying the characteristics of migrants and natives as such. Rather, it will be argued that if certain structural characteristics of the communities of origin and the communities of destination are known (and these characteristics shortly will be identified) one can successfully predict both the characteristics of persons making up the migratory streams and the degree of success of these

migrants in competing with the natives for positions once they have arrived in the large cities.

First the basic question, "Who migrates?" will be addressed. It seems evident that the higher the socioeconomic level of migrants attracted to a given large city, as compared with the socioeconomic levels of all potential migrants to it, the better will be their position vis-a-vis the natives in that city. The pattern and degree of migratory selectivity will be affected by two structural characteristics of the communities of origin: place within the rural-urban continuum and rate of economic development. Then, for those cases where migrants have an initial disadvantage vis-a-vis natives, the role this disadvantageous position plays in the economic adaptation of migrants in the city will be discussed. It will be argued that this role varies according to two structural characteristics of the recipient city: the rate of creation of new jobs in sectors of high productivity and the degree to which formal entry requirements are built into the city's occupational structure. Finally, the information available regarding native-migrant differences in several large cities will be presented as case material for the analytical framework.

Several limitations of this paper should be noted. Some of them derive from the data and the fact that the investigation must rely upon information gathered by others for different purposes. Thus, the cities and countries selected for consideration are those for which information was readily available. Several large Latin American cities will be considered. With only one exception (Monterrey, Mexico) they are the largest in their countries. All of them are national or regional capitals, attracting many migrants from the rest of the country. Although all the cities are "large," there is considerable variation in size, ranging from San Salvador with less than 400,000 inhabitants to Buenos Aires with some eight million. Other cities included are Santiago (Chile), São Paulo (Brazil), Mexico City, Monterrey (Mexico), and Guatemala City. Adequate data with respect to the origin of migrants is lacking in some cases. Migratory status is crudely dichotomized into migrants and natives, with both defined by place of birth.⁷

There are also limitations of scope. We will deal here with migrant-native differences among males because the variation we are trying to account for is not found among females. Rural-to-urban migration in Latin America is characterized by a high proportion of young females looking for jobs in domestic service in the cities. In all cases where comparisons could be made, native-migrant socio-economic differences were much larger among females than among males. It also should be noted that it is not the intention of this paper to consider the question of whether migrants, by moving to the city, are better off than those who remained in the communities of origin. Neither are we

interested in comparing directly the attainment of migrants of one city with that of migrants of another city.

COMMUNITIES OF ORIGIN: DETERMINANTS OF DIFFERENTIAL MIGRATION

Migrants to the large, capital cities are a very heterogeneous group in terms of their background. Since these cities have national influence, they attract migrants from all over the country and from all social strata. The question whether migrants tend to be positively selective (from the upper strata), negatively selective (from the lower strata), or simply not selective at all,⁸ has a direct bearing for their relative position vis-a-vis natives in the city. Probably there is no one pattern of selection; rather, it will vary according to certain conditions in the communities of origin. In what follows, four types of communities will be distinguished, and it will be argued that the proportion of migrants each of them represents in the total migratory stream to a given city will give us the first clue for the understanding of migrant-native socio-economic differences in the cities.

These four types of communities result from the cross-classification of two dichotomized variables. On the one hand communities can be classified as rural or urban. Although we are aware that there are serious problems in deciding the exact limit between rural and urban at a very general level it is possible to consider as rural those communities where the majority of the active population is engaged in agricultural production and as urban those where the majority is engaged in other types of production.⁹ On the other hand, both types of communities can be further classified according to their rates of economic development in two types, stagnant and developing communities. Thus, we obtain the fourfold typology as given in Figure 1.

FIGURE 1
CLASSIFICATION OF COMMUNITIES OF ORIGIN

	Rural	Urban
Stagnant	I	III
Developing	II	IV

Migrants coming from urban communities tend to have higher socioeconomic status than rural migrants. In most Latin American countries differences between these types of communities in terms of per capita income, availability of educational facilities, and the distribution of the population in socioeconomic strata, are very important. Potential migrants in urban communities have on the average higher levels of education than potential migrants in rural ones. Thus, even if migration were to randomly affect the population of these communities, urban migrants would have higher socioeconomic levels than rural ones. Above and beyond these differences, it can be argued that migrants from urban places constitute a more selected category of the population in their places of origin.¹⁰ Small and medium-sized urban centers in Latin America tend to experience favorable net migration rates, largely by attracting migrants from neighboring rural areas. In turn, they provide a smaller and more selective number of migrants to the metropolitan centers. In these towns, unlike rural areas, there are middle-class groups aware of occupational and educational opportunities in metropolitan centers, and they are better prepared to take advantage of them than are the lower strata. For these groups out-migration tends to be related to the pursuit of occupational or educational careers, and often this means that the capital city is the destination, it being the only large city in the country.

The distinction between rural and urban communities of origin in itself is insufficient to explain rates of out-migration and the socioeconomic levels of the migrants. Rate of economic development has a direct bearing on these rates. Economically stagnant localities create conditions for large net migration losses, since they send migrants to the large centers without themselves attracting a significant number of people. Developing communities provide a smaller and more selective number of migrants to metropolitan centers, a loss that is more than compensated for by the streams of migrants to them.

Let us consider now briefly the characteristics of the four types presented in Figure 1. Rural and stagnant communities form potentially the largest pool of low status, poorly educated, migrants. In most Latin American countries (the more important exceptions being Argentina, Uruguay and Chile), these communities contain a large part of the total population of the country. Until recently, however, the rate of out-migration from them to large cities was relatively low.¹¹ Probably the migrants constituted a selected group when compared with the rest of the population of these areas, considering the risks involved in migration at that time.¹² Many such communities came out of relative isolation only with the extension of highways and railroad lines, that were followed by an expansion of services affecting directly health standards and thus mortality rates. These improvements, however, did very little for the betterment of economic conditions and the growth of occupational opportunities. With an in-

creased rate of natural growth due to lower mortality, combined with economic stagnation, and an improvement of transportation facilities, rates of out-migration have gone up, and the initial positive selectivity of the migrants disappeared.

Rural communities where the tempo of development has quickened (Type II) are few in number, for there are not many cases of new developments in rural areas. Large-scale irrigation projects, discovery of new natural resources, etc., may awaken some areas so as to induce in-migration from other areas and reduce out-migration rates. Their importance as provider of migrants to large capital cities is negligible. Some rural areas in northwestern Mexico or in southern Guatemala,¹³ for example, are attracting migratory streams—both seasonal and permanent—from other rural areas, while out-migrants are few in numbers and probably very selective.

Communities with the opposite characteristics, urban but stagnant (Type III), are much more dynamic as providers of migrants to the large, capital cities. Probably the best examples are the smaller towns and medium-sized cities that were prosperous decades ago but have not shared in the recent industrialization. In many cases the earlier migratory streams to the large cities originated predominantly in these centers, at a time when new opportunities were scarce but good communication with metropolitan centers was already established. Both higher levels of the base population and positive selectivity resulted in the migration of a good number of relatively well trained and ambitious people to the large cities.

Finally, urban and developing communities are regional centers of attraction. They may have a considerable interchange of high-level migrants with the national cities, but unless the distance is very short the total current of migration is still quite small. Actually, if we were to include the large capital cities in this typology, most of them would fit in Type IV.

In most cases the available data are too limited to determine conclusively what proportion of the total migrants to a given city is represented by each of the types described above. Some information will be presented subsequently. The proportion of migrants provided by each of these types of communities may also change in time, thus making it more difficult to gather the relevant information. It may, however, be suggested here that for at least a goodly number of cases, the predominant stream has shifted from Type III (urban, stagnant), to Type I (rural, stagnant), in such a way that in recent decades a larger proportion of lower-level migrants has been arriving in the metropolitan cities than before.

COMMUNITIES OF DESTINATION: DIFFERENTIAL OCCUPATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR MIGRANTS AND NATIVES.

Our attention is shifted now to some of the structural conditions in the

communities of destination, the large cities, that differentially may affect migrants and natives. The question to be addressed is, "What are the factors that influence the relative occupational success of migrants when compared to natives?" This question has a special relevance when migratory streams made up of people with low levels of education and training predominate, that is, when migrants have an initial handicap vis-a-vis natives.

The key factor for understanding the socioeconomic position of migrants once they are in the city, and their differential advancement over time, lies in the types and amounts of occupational opportunities open to them as compared to those open to the natives. It frequently has been pointed out that rapid demographic growth of many Latin American cities has not been accompanied by an equally rapid industrialization, the consequence being considerable underemployment and unemployment.¹⁴ Many adults find it difficult to obtain well paid and stable jobs. They flock into small business and services, or the construction industry, all characterized by low levels of productivity. And even when new occupational opportunities in other sectors of the economy, such as manufacturing, become available, one still must ask what are the conditions that differentially affect migrants and natives in securing these jobs.

The first variable to be considered is the rate of creation of new jobs in sectors of high productivity.¹⁵ In other words, is the demand for workers in relatively well paid, stable jobs, commensurate with the supply of new workers into the labor force? The second variable, to be considered jointly with the former, is the degree to which formal entry requirements are built into the city's occupational structure. The relevance of this variable derives from the handicaps experienced by migrants due to their relative inability to meet these formal entry requirements.

Of course the recruitment of personnel everywhere is carried out in some patterned way. Jobs in the urban occupational structure have more or less clear specifications as to the type of duties involved and the skills needed to perform these duties. Truck drivers have to know how to operate a vehicle, pressmen have to know how to run a press, and both are required to know how to read and write. But how does an employer determine if a candidate meets the requirements for a specific job or not? Frequently the decision is based upon formal requirements that become superimposed upon, or even replace, the functional requirements of the job.¹⁶ These formal requirements are of several kinds: school certificates, letters of recommendation or some other proof of previous experience, union membership, etc. These formal requirements may have little functional relationship to the actual tasks involved in the jobs. They are symbols of acceptability, or as Miller has called them, "credentials." Regarding American society today, Miller has stated,

We are a credential society. Many people cannot get jobs, not because they cannot do the work, but because they do not have the proper diplomas or certificates that consti-

tute qualifying credentials. Documents "proving" educational accomplishment have become more important than ability and performance.¹⁷

In the absence of a better term, we may call this tendency to rely on formal symbols or requirements "credentialism." Urban occupational structures rely more heavily on formal credentials than rural ones. However, cities vary considerably in the degree of "credentialism." This variable is of strategic importance in the present context, since migrants more often than natives lack the proper credentials. They may know how to read and write, but they lack the primary-school certificate. They may be hard workers, but they lack a letter testifying to this fact. They may be skilled in their jobs, but they find it difficult to become members of the union that controls the jobs. Therefore, the more important credentials become, the more handicapped migrants tend to be.

It should be stressed that the credentials requirement is to some extent independent of the skill requirement. Of course with industrialization there are more jobs that really do require specialized training. But independently of this, credentials may at times replace actual skill requirements. At the same level of industrialization there may be a wide range of formalization of recruitment procedures.

The combination of the rate of creation of new jobs in sectors of high productivity and the degree to which credentials play a role in labor recruitment patterns may help to explain the relative success of migrants in the city. We will consider four ideal types resulting from the dichotomization of each of them (see Figure 2).

We may start with Type II, that is, cities with a low degree of credentialism and a high rate of creation of jobs in sectors of high productivity. In this

FIGURE 2
CLASSIFICATION OF COMMUNITIES OF DESTINATION

		Credentialism	
		Low	High
Rate of creation of jobs in sectors of high productivity	Low	I	III
	High	II	IV

case differences between migrants and natives should be small, because if the economy is generating a considerable demand for semi-skilled, skilled and technical positions, migrants will not experience a great handicap even though they may have on the average a poorer educational background and fewer other credentials than natives. In this situation there is generally a scarcity of trained people in the total population, and if the push for industrialization is strong demand-supply "bottlenecks" tend to appear. These bottlenecks can be solved, in part, through rapid on-the-job training so that formal requirements need not be very strict. The demand for skilled operatives in industry, for example, can be satisfied by persons of low education and little previous experience if they can be trained in the factory situation. Since formal requirements are relatively unimportant, the disadvantages in terms of formal education (not necessarily actual training), proper recommendations, etc., do not result in a differential availability of jobs for migrants when compared with natives.

The situation is different for cities of Type IV, with a higher degree of credentialism. In this case the higher levels of education and of industrial experience of natives are more important due to the relevance of school diplomas and other symbols. However, if a high rate of industrialization persists combined with a relative scarcity of trained people, migrants will have good opportunities to move up, or at least their children can move up. Length of residence in the city becomes here a key variable in distinguishing among migrants. If the migratory streams from rural areas continue, migrant-native socioeconomic differences will persist, but second-generation urbanites will not differ greatly from older residents in the city.¹⁸

A combination of high degree of credentialism with a shortage of new jobs (cities in Type III) leads us to expect a maximum differential between migrants and natives. The former not only will tend to occupy low occupational positions upon their arrival, concentrating in services, petty commerce, and construction industry; they also will find it difficult to move up with time. Migrants will experience more downward and less upward occupational mobility than natives. The more desirable positions in the occupational structure will grow very slowly and will tend to be kept by natives and migrants from urban areas, while rural-origin migrants will find it difficult to move up. Of course, a good number of natives may also be located at the bottom levels of the system, but the important point is that, on the whole, rather large differences will exist and persist for long periods.

Finally, for Type I cities, the extent of occupational differences between migrants and natives is due mainly to the type of migrants the city attracts. As we will see later, a highly selective migration pattern is not incompatible with this situation. If this happens, migrants in the city will not differ greatly from the native population. The opposite situation, an overrepresentation of rural

migrants with a poor background, will produce differences. In either case, there is little change by length of residence in the city (unless the migrant selectivity changes). That is, the original differences between migrants and natives, or the lack of them, will tend to remain.

In summary, the schema presented in Figures 1 and 2, taken jointly, suggest the sources and ways through which migrants will or will not have a relative handicap in large cities. Their relative situation is more disadvantageous when: 1) a larger proportion of them come from rural areas; 2) their lack of credentials handicaps them in occupational structures that place a high value on credentials; and 3) a fast rate of population growth is not matched by an equally fast rate of creation of desirable jobs. When, as in highly industrialized and urbanized societies, most internal migration takes place between urban areas, migrants actually have higher levels of achievement than natives.¹⁹ If, however, rural-to-urban migration predominates, the relative handicap of these kinds of migrants entering the urban labor force will depend mainly on the role played by credentials in the patterns of occupational recruitment, the assumption being that minor differences in background can easily be overcome if opportunities are open, but that these differences increase when formal entry requirements are important. Finally, whatever the previous situation, a rapidly growing economy able to absorb the new inputs of labor will make it possible for the initial disadvantages of migrants to diminish with length of residence in the city. The schema, therefore, suggests that the joint action of these structural variables is useful in predicting the relative position of migrants as an aggregate.

THE SCHEMA APPLIED

What follows is a preliminary evaluation of the schema through a description of several cases of internal migration to large Latin American cities for which information on migrant-native socioeconomic differences is available. It is hoped that the schema presented above will become more clear when applied to specific cases. By and large the data are restricted to migrant-native differences. What we know about the origins of migrants is quite limited. Differential migration is almost unexplored, in part because there are many methodological difficulties in measuring it. Furthermore, the structural variables depicted above must be considered in an impressionistic way. Measurement problems regarding them will be discussed more extensively in a later section of this paper. The reader should bear in mind that no attempt has been made to check the accuracy of the original studies, and he is referred to the original publications for information about procedures, reliability of the data, and other relevant information.²⁰

1. *Buenos Aires*. When internal migration became massive in Argentina, by the mid-thirties, Buenos Aires already was a large and sophisticated metropolis. The agricultural revolution and the great international immigration after 1880, together with an incipient industrialization, had resulted in the formation of a relatively large middle class in the city. Natives to the city, a large proportion of them of foreign parentage, plus immigrants, formed most of the population. Germani has estimated that internal migrants represented only 12 percent of the total population in Greater Buenos Aires in 1936.²¹ From then on, the proportion of migrants in the city increased considerably, reaching an estimated 37 percent of the total by 1957. Between 1936 and 1943 an average of 72,000 migrants came yearly to Buenos Aires, and between 1943 and 1947 an average of 117,000. These figures are for net migration.²²

This increase in the migration flow to Buenos Aires probably was accompanied by a shift in the composition of migrants. In the early stages (before 1935) migrants from more urbanized and developed regions near the city predominated. Since then, migrants coming from less developed provinces and rural areas (particularly northeastern and northwestern provinces) became more numerous, constituting a large percentage of the inhabitants of *villas miserias*.²³ Of course during the same period migrants from other regions kept flowing into Buenos Aires, but their relative weight was less than before. In summary, three stages in the growth of modern Buenos Aires can be distinguished: 1) up to 1914, when immigrants provided the main source of population growth; 2) between the two world wars, when international immigration was considerably smaller, population growth was slower and primarily due to natural increase and in-migration from areas surrounding Buenos Aires (many being immigrants that have settled in places other than Buenos Aires or their children); 3) from 1940 to the present the city's population grew at a faster rate (but still more slowly than in the first period). Internal migration became massive while immigration was negligible, with the exception of some post-war European immigration (with high rates of return) and immigrants from neighboring countries.

Between the mid-thirties and 1950 there was a fast process of industrialization, characterized by relatively labor-intensive technology.²⁴ Unemployment was practically nonexistent and the types of underemployment characteristic of other Latin American cities were quite uncommon in Buenos Aires. Thus, it can be assumed that a rapid rate of creation of jobs in sectors of relatively high productivity was taking place. Due in part to previous developments in urbanization and industrialization, a relatively structured urban labor market existed. Credentialism may be assumed to have been relatively high. Thus, Buenos Aires in the period when internal migration became massive can be placed in Type IV of our second typology (Figure 2). The new waves of migrants found

jobs, as had the foreign immigrants previously, but unlike the latter they had to compete for the best ones from a disadvantageous position, since credentials were now more important and many of them did not have any.

Since 1950 the pace of industrialization, although it has not halted, has slowed down considerably. Unemployment and underemployment began to rise, first slowly and then more rapidly.²⁵ The better occupational opportunities became proportionally more scarce, while migration rates continued to be high. Thus, Buenos Aires for the most recent period can be placed in Type III, one of high credentialism and low rate of creation of jobs in sectors of high productivity. In this situation migrant-native socioeconomic differences should be high.

The available data indicate this quite clearly. A sample survey²⁶ conducted in Greater Buenos Aires in 1960 shows that over half of the migrants belong to the lower "popular" strata, while only 28 percent of the natives do (see Table 1, upper panel). There is no clear standard of comparison to enable us to conclude if this difference is large or not, but at least it seems to be larger than in other cities for which information is available. Furthermore, for every 100 respondents whose fathers had manual occupations, 23 of the internal migrants have moved to nonmanual categories, whereas for the natives 48 of every 100 had switched. Conversely, for each 100 respondents whose fathers had nonmanual occupations, 51 percent of the migrants had dropped to manual positions whereas the comparable figure for natives was only 19 (see Table 1, lower panel). Internal migrants of foreign parentage (who came mainly from the richer and more urbanized provinces), moved up more frequently and down less frequently than internal migrants of native parentage.

2. *São Paulo*. The case of Argentina and internal migration to Buenos Aires is rather atypical in Latin America. However, São Paulo in Brazil may be quite comparable, since it also experienced a two-stage pattern of migration (first international and then internal) leading to urban growth, and a two-stage pattern of economic development. Another similarity is that São Paulo also is surrounded by relatively more developed regions that provided the first waves of internal migration, while later on a larger proportion of migrants came from the underdeveloped northeast.²⁷

São Paulo can be classified in Type IV of our second typology. Rapid industrialization has led to the creation of new jobs in sectors of high productivity, enough to absorb a large proportion of the growth in the labor force, while credentialism may be assumed to be relatively high. However, the case of this city is somewhat different, if only because the process of industrialization never experienced as severe a slowdown as happened in Buenos Aires. This pattern probably resulted in important initial socioeconomic differences between migrants and natives, since migrants arrive with lower levels of formal

MIGRANT-NATIVE SOCIOECONOMIC DIFFERENCES

TABLE 1

Buenos Aires: Socioeconomic Differences between Native, Internal Migrant and Immigrant Heads of Households, 1960–1961

SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS ^a	PLACE OF BIRTH		
	Buenos Aires	Argentina, Not in B.A.	Foreign
1 (lower)	1.0	6.1	6.2
2	27.1	45.8	42.1
3	29.8	24.1	29.5
4	22.7	15.5	15.3
5	11.6	6.2	4.8
6	7.6	2.3	2.1
Total	99.8%	100.0%	100.0%
For each 100 respondents whose fathers had "manual" occupation, moved to "nonmanual":			
Father foreign born	45.5	38.4	31.7
Father native	47.8	23.3	---
For each 100 respondents whose fathers had "nonmanual" occupation, moved to "manual":			
Father foreign born	19.8	37.9	46.5
Father native	18.6	50.8	---

^a Index combining education, occupation, income and housing.

Source: Gino Germani, "La movilidad social en la Argentina," appendix to Seymour M. Lipset and Reinhard Bendix, *Movilidad social en la sociedad industrial*. Buenos Aires, Eudeba, 1963, pp. 341–343.

education than natives at a moment when school certificates and other credentials are important. These differences, however, might have tended to narrow with extended residence in the city, due to the continuous expansion of its economy.

The study by Hutchinson, conducted in 1956, serves to support these impressions, although the published results do not allow for a full comparison between natives and migrants.²⁸ Hutchinson notes that immigrants from abroad took advantage of the rapid process of industrialization in its early stages, when trained people were scarce, while the internal migrants—mainly the more recent arrivals—encountered stiffer competition.²⁹

3. *Santiago, Chile*. Data are available for a third major city in southern South America, Santiago. Like Argentina, Chile shows a pattern of high primacy. About three out of ten Chileans live in the capital city which has a

predominant role in the country. Its geographically central position, in the midst of the more densely populated region of the country, has certainly contributed to its ability to attract migrants. Probably the most striking characteristic of migrants to Santiago is their high degree of selectivity. While the population living in localities of over 5,000 inhabitants in 1952 constituted 32 percent of the total population outside Santiago, migrants from these localities represented 68 percent of all migrants to the capital city.³⁰ These localities, with the exception of the two next largest cities in the country (Valparaiso and Concepcion) experienced net migration gains as large or even larger proportionally than Santiago itself. This indicates the presence of a stage pattern of migration: minor urban centers attract considerable migration from rural areas, and they in turn provide large migratory streams to the capital city.³¹ This pattern, according to the previously presented scheme, is associated with a highly selective migration. Therefore, one would expect migrants to differ very little from natives, even at the time of their arrival in the city. Coming with a similar background, their opportunities will not be worse than those of natives. The relative stagnation of the city's economy and the corresponding scarcity of new jobs will affect the whole population, but the migrant-native distinction will have little relevance.

As Herrick indicates, in Santiago “. . . the average young male migrant was not likely to be educationally handicapped in his job search. The natives who were his competitors for available positions did not have a statistically significant edge over him in educational attainment.”³² The data reproduced in the upper panel of Table 2 indicate this point quite clearly. Although some fluctuations are present, they do not follow any specific pattern and may very well be attributable to sampling error. Given the initial parity of situations for migrants and natives, represented by similar educational levels, one would expect that whatever the rate of creation of jobs and the role of formalized recruitment patterns in the city (since the basic credential is generally set in terms of formal education), natives and migrants should not differ markedly in their occupational achievements. The occupational distribution according to migratory status, presented in the lower panel of Table 2, shows an almost complete absence of differences. If anything, a larger proportion of migrants than of natives belongs to the upper occupational categories.

4. *Mexico City and Monterrey.* Mexico City offers a great contrast with Buenos Aires and São Paulo. To begin with, Mexico did not early experience any sort of agricultural revolution directed to foreign markets such as occurred in the two other countries. On the contrary, the agricultural hinterland of Mexico City has been, and still is, technologically and socially backward, with a high population density. Second, it did not experience any important immigration from abroad, and urbanization until the forties was relatively slow.

MIGRANT-NATIVE SOCIOECONOMIC DIFFERENCES

TABLE 2

Greater Santiago (Chile): Socioeconomic Differences between Native and Migrant Males, 1958 and 1963^a

EDUCATIONAL LEVEL	STATUS	AGE			
		15-24	25-44	45-64	Total*
Without education	Native	2.0%	2.3%	5.3%	2.7%
	Migrant	2.6	4.0	8.8	5.5
Primary education	Native	58.4	51.5	45.7	52.5
	Migrant	58.6	53.5	44.1	51.6
Technical & special education	Native	8.7	4.9	8.2	6.5
	Migrant	4.6	6.5	6.7	6.2
Secondary education	Native	29.5	34.2	32.2	32.4
	Migrant	29.6	28.1	31.8	29.0
University education	Native	1.4	7.1	8.7	5.8
	Migrant	4.6	8.0	8.6	7.7
Total	Native	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Migrant	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

* Total includes those people over 65.

Source: Unpublished data from the labor force survey of the Institute of Economics for June 1958.

OCCUPATION	Natives	Migrants
Professionals & technicians	8.0%	10.3%
Owners & managers	9.3	14.5
Office workers	11.4	11.6
Salesmen	12.1	9.7
Farmers and miners	1.3	2.1
Drivers & deliverymen	7.5	5.0
Artisans & operatives	35.1	29.5
Unskilled manual workers	4.6	4.8
Personal service workers	7.9	11.3
Unclassified	1.6	0.9
Seeking work for the first time	1.2	0.3
Total	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Unpublished data from the employment survey of the Institute of Economics, 1963

^a Reproduced from Bruce H. Herrick, *Urban Migration and Economic Development in Chile*. Cambridge: The M.I.T. Press, 1965, pp. 80 and 86.

Finally, internal migration had become numerically important *before* the real push of industrialization. As a consequence of the Revolution of 1910, a significant proportion of the population moved, including a sizable emigration to the United States.³³

Numerically important and continuing streams of migration to the cities are a more recent phenomenon. During the last generation Mexico has experienced a great increase in her urban population, due largely to migration from rural areas.³⁴ This increase has been concentrated in urban areas such as Mexico City, Monterrey, Guadalajara, and the U.S.-Mexican border cities.

We know little about the degree of selectivity of migrants to Mexico City. Undoubtedly, the surrounding backward rural areas provide a majority of the migrants to the city. But there is probably also a considerable number of urban migrants. As the national capital, Mexico City has attracted many people from the middle and upper sectors of urban centers throughout the country. Furthermore, many urban centers within its direct sphere of influence have experienced a very slow rate of economic development, and some have been stagnant. These centers may have served as intermediate migration stages, attracting rural migrants and providing a more select group of people to the capital city. This movement probably started with the Revolution, when the middle and upper sectors felt more secure in the capital city.³⁵

In terms of its structural characteristics Mexico City can be placed in Type II. Rapid industrialization since the late thirties resulted in a large demand for semi-skilled, skilled and technical workers which, despite the rapid population growth, has provided occupational opportunities for both natives and migrants. Due in part to the disruptions caused by the Revolution, the absence of any consolidation of the stratification system before the forties, and the scarcity of trained people, the degree of credentialism until recently has been relatively low.

In Mexico City migrants represent about half of the total population, and an even larger proportion of the economically active. Although migrants have lower levels of education than natives,³⁶ the occupational distribution of the 1.5 percent census sample of all males in the labor force in 1960 shows very few differences between migrants and natives (see Table 3). There is perhaps a slightly higher proportion of natives in the categories of professional and office workers (except among older men), and an overrepresentation of migrants in the categories of unskilled and service workers. The overall picture, however, is quite different from that of Buenos Aires. Some recent trends lead us to believe that in the near future larger migrant-native differences will show up: a less selective migratory stream, together with a stiffening of entry requirements. These trends will be discussed below, but before doing so, the case of Monterrey, a large industrial city in northern Mexico, will be discussed.

We have more detailed information for Monterrey, the regional capital of northeastern Mexico, a city of about one million inhabitants. The data were obtained through a sample survey conducted in 1965.³⁷ Migrants constitute over two-thirds of all adult males in the city. They come primarily from the

MIGRANT-NATIVE SOCIOECONOMIC DIFFERENCES

TABLE 3

Mexico City: Distribution of the Economically Active Males According to Occupation, by Migratory Status and Age, 1960

		OCCUPATION						
AGE	STATUS	Profes- sional	Office Workers	Sales	Production Workers	Non- Production Workers	Service	Total
15-29	Native	6.3	20.4	10.6	47.8	10.2	4.7	100.0%
	Migrant	5.8	17.4	10.6	44.8	11.1	10.6	100.3%
30-44	Native	7.2	18.1	15.8	48.8	5.8	6.1	99.8%
	Migrant	6.7	15.9	15.9	43.4	10.1	7.9	99.9%
45-60	Native	8.0	19.1	16.7	42.3	8.8	5.0	99.9%
	Migrant	7.7	17.0	18.7	39.9	8.5	8.2	100.0%
60+	Native	8.6	15.7	24.9	33.5	9.6	7.6	99.9%
	Migrant	8.7	20.6	24.5	27.3	8.7	10.2	100.0%

Source: 1.5 percent Census sample of the Distrito Federal.

surrounding areas, some very backward and others relatively developed. Migrants are about equally divided between richer and poorer areas of origin. Sixty-two percent of all migrants were born in localities of less than 5,000 inhabitants. However, only 42 percent were living in localities of this size immediately before migrating to Monterrey. Ongoing analysis indicates a higher degree of selectivity, compared to the base population of origin, among early arrivals than among recent migrants.³⁸

There is little doubt that Monterrey can be classified among cities with a high rate of creation of jobs in sectors of high productivity. Rapid industrialization has characterized the city for the last three decades.³⁹ At least until recently it could have been placed among cities with a low degree of credentialism. Thus, in terms of our typology the city is classified in Type II. But here too, as with Mexico City, we have some recent indications that credentials are becoming more important. The large plants characteristic of Monterrey are adopting stricter recruitment rules by requiring a primary-school certificate of any new worker, whatever the skill level of his job. Union membership has become obligatory prior to entrance in many enterprises due to union pressure, while entrance into some unions is becoming more strict. Of course, these higher formal requirements have been made possible due to the tremendous growth of the labor force, mainly at the unskilled levels.

Marked differences in education exist between migrants and natives taken as a whole (see Table 4, upper panel). Considering migrants according to size of place of birth, those born in towns of 20,000 and over show a distribution very similar to that of natives, with both groups having much higher levels

TABLE 4

Monterrey (Mexico): Socioeconomic Differences Between Natives and Migrants, Males 21 to 60, 1965

EDUCATION	NATIVES		MIGRANTS BY SIZE OF PLACE OF BIRTH			
		Total	Up to 5,000	5,000 to 20,000	20,000 and more	
Less than primary school completed	30.2	58.7	67.1	52.1	38.0	
Primary school completed	30.1	20.6	17.4	25.3	25.6	
Secondary education	26.8	14.7	11.3	16.9	23.7	
University education	12.9	6.0	4.2	5.8	12.7	
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.1%	100.0%	
OCCUPATION						
Unskilled manual	28.4	37.2	42.9	31.7	24.2	
Skilled manual	40.5	43.8	40.9	50.0	46.8	
White-collar	21.2	13.4	12.2	12.1	19.3	
Prof., managerial	9.9	5.5	4.0	6.2	9.6	
Total	100.0%	99.9%	100.0%	100.0%	99.9%	
OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY						
SON'S OCCUPATION & MIGRATORY STATUS		FATHER'S OCCUPATION				
		Unskilled Manual	Skilled Manual	Nonmanual		
Unskilled Manual	a) Natives	42.0	24.0	7.5		
	b) Migrants	49.3	23.1	3.6		
Skilled Manual	a) Natives	45.0	49.0	17.7		
	b) Migrants	41.7	48.0	26.1		
Nonmanual	a) Natives	13.0	27.1	74.8		
	b) Migrants	9.0	28.9	70.3		
Total	a) Natives	100.0%	100.1%	100.0%		
	b) Migrants	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		

Source: Unpublished data from the Monterrey Mobility Study, Population Research Center, The University of Texas at Austin.

than migrants from smaller localities. Differences in occupational status are considerably smaller (Table 4, middle panel). The lowest occupational category includes 28.4 percent of all native adult males, while 37.2 percent of all migrant males are in this category (the corresponding percentages for the

lowest category of education are 30.2 and 58.7 percent, respectively). Thus, the educational handicap has not resulted in an equally important occupational handicap. Furthermore, the rates of upward and downward mobility are very similar for natives and migrants (see Table 4, lower panel). Relatively low rates of upward and downward mobility predominate among both groups, but the migrant-native distinction makes little difference.⁴⁰

In summary, the data for these two cities indicate cases where internal migrants shape the urban pattern by their sheer numbers, assimilating occupationally rather quickly to the city. In part this is a result of migration becoming numerically important when the occupational structure of these cities placed little emphasis on credentials. Of undeniable importance too has been the rapid and sustained industrialization experienced by them. The economy is generating a considerable number of positions in sectors of high productivity, while until recently there has been a scarcity of trained people to fill these positions. If we are right in predicting a change in migrant selectivity and rigidification of credential requirements (both observable in Monterrey today), migrant-native socioeconomic differences will increase.

5. *San Salvador and Guatemala City.* We now consider two cities in Central America, San Salvador and Guatemala City. Both are capital cities of small and underdeveloped countries. Being the only important urban centers as well as the political capitals, these cities contain the bulk of services and incipient manufacturing. They actually are the *sole loci* of an "urban way of life" in their respective countries. This fact is by no means irrelevant for our analysis. These cities constitute the natural place of residence for the largest part of the country's middle and upper sectors, mainly since recent improvements in communications have made accessible virtually all regions of the country. Until recent decades both cities had grown quite slowly, only recently becoming the recipients of important migratory streams.

Both cities can be placed in Type I of our schema, that is, with a low rate of creation of jobs in sectors of high productivity and a low degree of credentialism. Some industrial development has taken place since the end of the war, but this has not affected greatly the local economy.⁴¹ Credentials, on the other hand, cannot play an important role when the formal industrial labor market is almost nonexistent. Thus, in these cases the patterns of differential migration will provide us with the main key to interpret native-migrant socioeconomic differences. As mentioned, the geographical, political and economic central location of both cities leads us to expect a relatively high degree of selectivity.

A sample survey conducted in San Salvador in 1960 provides some useful information regarding migrant-native differences. However, the report does not give us data to evaluate the kind of migrants arriving to the city.⁴² If anything, it can be inferred that there is an overrepresentation of urban migrants.

Migrants constitute 31.3 percent of all males. The rate of population growth has been considerably higher than that of the whole country and of the other urban areas. This has been so despite the lack of any real industrial development.

The results of the survey show very small educational differences between natives and migrants (see Table 5, upper panel). There is a slight overrepresentation of migrants at both ends of the scale, in the categories "no education" and "university education." The report explains this anomaly by suggesting that one would expect more migrants to have no education than the natives, schools being more scarce in the rest of the country than in San Salvador. However, it is precisely because the higher educational facilities and opportunities for employment for university-trained people are concentrated in that city, that many people migrate to San Salvador to pursue their education or, if they have completed it, to get a job for which they have the necessary training.⁴³ The occupational distribution of migrant and native males is also very similar (see Table 5, lower panel). There is only a larger concentration of

TABLE 5
*San Salvador: Socioeconomic Differences Between Migrant
and Non-Migrant Males, 1960*

EDUCATION	Non-Migrant	Migrants
None	4.7	9.5
Primary Incomplete	38.5	36.1
Primary Complete	24.6	20.1
Secondary	28.0	24.3
University	4.2	10.0
Total	99.9%	100.0%
OCCUPATION		
Professionals	11.4	10.6
Managers	1.5	2.0
Office Workers	11.9	13.0
Salesmen	6.7	12.0
Farmers	1.7	2.9
Transportation Workers	8.7	13.3
Production Workers	49.3	35.5
Service Workers	6.7	8.4
Others	2.2	2.4
Total	100.1%	100.1%

Source: Naciones Unidas, CEPAL, *Aspectos demográficos y socioeconómicos del Area Metropolitana de San Salvador: Resultados de una encuesta*. (E/NC12/CCE/333), 1966, mimeo. Calculated from tables 15 and 22.

natives in the category of industrial workers, while migrants are more heavily represented in the categories of salesmen and transportation workers.

The Guatemalan case is quite similar to that of San Salvador, although the country is somewhat larger and the capital city is not the only area of attraction of internal migrants.⁴⁴ The one-percent census sample (1964) can be used to describe the socioeconomic differentials according to migratory status⁴⁵ (see Table 6). It seems that natives have higher levels of education than migrants, although differences are important only for the lowest category. The occupational distribution (Table 6, lower panel) shows no important difference, the more striking result being that exactly the same proportion of migrants and natives are placed in the four upper categories. Among the manual occupations, natives are more concentrated in the "skilled" category, while migrants are overrepresented in the "unskilled" and "service" categories.

These two cases suggest that the key point in understanding migrant-native socioeconomic differences lies in the characteristics of the migrants attracted to the city, or their degree of selectivity. In situations where urban employment in sectors of high productivity is so limited and grows so slowly, credentials can play only a minor role.

DISCUSSION

The impetus for this investigation originated in the observation that for some large cities in Latin America the socioeconomic gap between natives and migrants is large, while in others it is quite small or nonexistent. This observation seemed to contradict common assumptions about migratory streams to metropolitan areas in these countries. Confronted with the data, it became clear that any attempt to explain inter-city variation of migrant-native differences had to consider structural, rather than individual, characteristics. While the literature dealing with internal migration has dealt extensively with characteristics of migrants such as their motivations, adaptation to the urban environment, social participation, and the like, and with migrant-native differences in the realm of norms, values and behavior, it has seldom paid enough attention to the structural conditions attending migration, that is, the characteristics of the *communities* of origin or destination, rather than of individuals, that will help explain migrant-native socioeconomic differences.

This paper is intended only to suggest a useful analytical framework based upon the structural characteristics of communities, rather than providing a definitive test of it. Such a test will be possible only with further research yielding much more data than are presently available. This in turn will depend upon an improvement in the measurement of structural variables, that had to be handled here in a largely impressionistic fashion.

TABLE 6
*Guatemala City: Socioeconomic Differences Between
 Migrant and Native Males, 1964*

AGE	STATUS	GRADE COMPLETED			Total
		None	1-6	7 and over	
15-24	Native	6.8	61.3	31.9	100.0%
	Migrant	17.3	56.9	25.8	100.0%
25-34	Native	8.7	54.7	36.5	99.9%
	Migrant	16.5	57.3	26.2	100.0%
35-44	Native	8.4	64.7	26.9	100.0%
	Migrant	19.3	62.7	18.0	100.0%
45-54	Native	16.4	60.0	23.6	100.0%
	Migrant	20.2	66.9	12.9	100.0%
55-64	Native	23.1	56.4	20.5	100.0%
	Migrant	33.9	41.9	24.3	100.1%
65+	Native	20.0	53.3	26.6	99.9%
	Migrant	43.8	31.3	25.1	100.2%

OCCUPATION	Natives	Migrants
Professionals	7.8	7.8
Administrators	5.7	5.3
Office Workers	8.3	8.6
Sales Persons	7.6	7.3
Transportation Workers	7.9	10.1
Skilled Workers	46.2	33.2
Unskilled Workers	5.5	8.4
Service Workers	1.9	10.7
Agricultural Workers	4.8	5.6
Mining Workers	0.2	0.3
Unknown	4.2	2.6
Total	100.0%	99.9%

Source: Deanne Lanoix Termini, *Socio-Economic and Demographic Characteristics of the Population of Guatemala City with Special Reference to Migrant-Non-Migrant Differences*. Austin: University of Texas, unpublished M.A. thesis, 1968, pp. 66 and 85. Based upon one percent census sample of the municipio of Guatemala.

Three of the four structural dimensions presented are relatively familiar ones. Of course, the rural-urban continuum (here dichotomized) is widely used but, as considered here, it is intended more to reflect community characteristics such as degree of social differentiation, interdependence and ease of

communication than population size or density as such. Thus, some "rural" communities in terms of population size or density or in terms of predominance of agricultural activities, may have "urban" characteristics in the sense of a well developed differentiation, easy communication with large urban centers, and the like. It may be advisable simply to drop the "rural-urban" terminology and handle the differentiation among communities with another term. The second variable used to characterize communities of origin, rate of economic development, also is quite familiar. Conceptually, there are no major problems but it is rare to find the requisite data at the community level. When available this information is limited to regional or national levels.

One of the variables used to characterize cities of destination, rate of creation of jobs in sectors of high productivity, presents some problems in the definition of productivity (many of the difficulties in defining underemployment show up here) but again the lack of any sort of data gathered at the community level is a great handicap. Economists in Latin America seem to have been more interested in measuring levels of employment and unemployment, than in dealing with creation of new jobs (demand) in relation to the number of entrants in the labor force (supply).

Finally, the second variable used in the typology of cities of destination needs further comment. It is the contention of this author that "credentialism," although it had to be handled in this article impressionistically, is susceptible to measurement. Three techniques will be suggested here as means of obtaining crude estimates of the degree of credentialism: 1) Select a sample of enterprises of different size and type of production. In each of them examine the recent job openings at various hierarchical levels. Determine for each case what credentials were required of the entrant and how the decision to hire or not to hire was arrived at. Special attention should be given to existence or not of trial periods and other means of measuring the actual performance of the candidate. The more rigid the formal requirements imposed (certificates, letters, curriculum), and the fewer the other elements bearing upon the decision to hire, the higher the degree of credentialism. 2) When a relatively formalized labor market exists a simple technique is the content analysis of want ads in newspapers or other media, and their degree of specification of formal requirements for different jobs. 3) If collective labor contracts are used between unions and enterprises, an analysis of such contracts may indicate how important some requirements are for entrance into the enterprise: union membership (how one becomes a member can then be investigated), age, school certificates, etc. Then the requirements that are set for advancement from one category to the next can be studied (seniority rules, trial periods, competition, etc.)

Finally, the integration of the two schema, a task that was not fully accomplished here, can be brought about as a result of improvements in the data.

The systematic linking of determinants of differential migration, on the one hand, and determinants of differential opportunities in the cities, on the other hand, now depends upon a greater availability of data within a national or regional context. It is doubtless Utopian to expect that even within the most advanced countries these data can be gathered for all communities. However, a carefully designed study of a sample of communities at various levels, together with basic information about the migratory streams, could provide a good test of the schema.

Editor's Note: This article was sent for critical commentary to scholars in the fields of sociology, anthropology, economics, and planning. Replies received at press time are included on pages 31–51 in alphabetical order.

NOTES

1. See Carmen A. Miró, "The Population of Latin America," *Demography*, 1, 1964, pp. 15–41; John D. Durand and César A. Peláez, "Patterns of Urbanization in Latin America," *Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly*, 43, Number 4, Part 2, October, 1965, pp. 166–191; Eduardo E. Arriaga, "Components of City Growth in Selected Latin American Countries," *Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly*, 46, Number 2, Part 1, April, 1968, pp. 237–252; and Harley L. Browning, "Recent Trends in Latin American Urbanization," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 316, March, 1958, pp. 111–120.
2. Juan C. Elizaga, "Internal Migrations in Latin America," *Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly*, 43, Number 4, Part 2, October, 1965, pp. 144–161; Louis J. Ducoff, "The Role of Migration in the Demographic Development of Latin America," *Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly*, 43, Number 4, Part 2, October, 1965, pp. 197–210.
3. Richard M. Morse, "Recent Research on Latin American Urbanization: A Selective Survey with Commentary," *Latin American Research Review*, I, 1, Fall, 1965, p. 48.
4. See, for example, the articles by J. Matos Mar, Andrew Pearse, and Gino Germani, in Philip M. Hauser (ed.), *Urbanization in Latin America*. Paris: Unesco, 1961; William P. Mangin, "The Role of Regional Associations in the Adaptation of Rural Population in Perú," *Sociologist*, 9, 1, 1959, pp. 21–36; and especially Mangin's recent review in "Latin American Squatter Settlements: A Problem and a Solution," *Latin American Research Review*, II, 3, Summer, 1967, pp. 65–98.
5. Gino Germani, "The Process of Urbanization in Argentina," paper presented to the Seminar on Urbanization Problems in Latin America, Unesco, Santiago, 1958 (mimeo), p. 44.
6. This "fact" is subject to considerable debate. Mangin includes in his list of standard myths one stating that "the squatter settlements are formed by rural people (Indians where possible) coming directly from 'their' farms." (Mangin, "Latin American Squatter Settlements . . ." *op. cit.* p. 66.
7. This crude definition has several limitations: 1) return migration is left out completely, although in some cases it may be quite important numerically; 2) place of residence during the formative years (5–15) may be more relevant than place of birth, since many migrants are

- so classified only because of the accident of birth, having migrated to the city at very young ages; and 3) the direction of migration cannot be fully assessed knowing only place of birth and place of residence. These limitations are discussed more extensively in Harley L. Browning and Waltraut Feindt, "Patrones de migración a Monterrey," in Jorge Balán, Harley Browning and Elizabeth Jelin de Balán (eds.), *Movilidad social, migración y fecundidad en Monterrey Metropolitano*, Monterrey: Centro de Investigaciones Económicas, 1967, Chapter 2.
8. Differential migration according to other variables, mainly age and sex, has been studied more extensively than differentials according to socioeconomic status. Clearly, we have better standards of measurement—sex ratios, age structures—for the former than for the latter. For a general discussion of differential migration, see Donald J. Bogue, "Internal Migration," in Philip M. Hauser and Otis Dudley Duncan (eds.), *The Study of Population*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1959, pp. 486–509, and his "Techniques and Hypotheses for the Study of Differential Migration: Some Notes from an Experiment with U. S. Data," in *International Population Conference, New York, 1961*, London: Union internationale pour l'étude scientifique de la population, 1963, Volume 1, pp. 405–411. For data on Latin American countries, see Elizaga, *op. cit.*
 9. The literature dealing with the definition of "urban" is very large. Since in this paper a relatively crude approach to measurement will be used, we need not discuss extensively problems in defining "urban" and "rural." For an introduction to problems of definition, see Jack P. Gibbs (ed.), *Urban Research Methods*, Princeton: D. Van Nostrand, 1961, Chapter 13.
 10. The relatively high degree of selectivity of urban-to-urban migrants does not seem to be peculiar to the Latin American countries. It was found in the United States, where after a careful examination of a national sample Blau and Duncan concluded that ". . . urban migration is selective of men with greater potentialities for occupational success, although farm-to-farm migration does not exhibit such a process of selection." See Peter M. Blau and Otis Dudley Duncan, *The American Occupational Structure*, New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1967, p. 258.
 11. Interregional migration between rural areas has been common before rural-to-urban migration became massive. Thus, Germani points out the existence of migratory streams between provinces in Argentina (Germani, *op. cit.*, p. 23), and migration from the highlands to the lowlands in southern Mexico and Guatemala have been investigated by several authors (see Richard N. Adams, "Rural Labor," in John J. Johnson (ed.), *Continuity and Change in Latin America*, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1964, pp. 49–78).
 12. The distinction between "pioneer" and "mass" migration points out precisely the correlation between the difficulty and rarity of migration, on the one hand, and its high selectivity on the other. See William Peterson, *Population*, New York: The Macmillan Company, 1961, Chapter 20.
 13. See Alvan O. Zarate, *Principales patrones de migración interna en Guatemala, 1964*. Guatemala: Seminario de Integración Social Guatemalteca, 1967; Robert G. Burnight, "Internal Migration in Mexico," *Estadística*, 16, Number 58, March, 1958, pp. 65–77.
 14. See, for example, E.C.L.A.'s statement in "Creation of Employment Opportunities in Relation to Labour Supply," in Philip M. Hauser (ed.), *op. cit.*, pp. 118–148.
 15. Creation of these job opportunities cannot be equated simply with the increase in total employment, since this would include a good number of underemployed people. Thus, the ex-

Latin American Research Review

- pression "sectors of high productivity" stands for sectors without underemployment, manufacturing being generally the best example. The counter examples are petty commerce, domestic services and home industries. For some ways of measuring creation of jobs in sectors of high productivity, see "Structural Changes in Employment Within the Context of Latin American Economic Development," *Economic Bulletin for Latin America*, 10, Number 2, October, 1965, pp. 165–168.
16. Of course, kinship and friendship ties also play a considerable role in the way in which people obtain jobs, but this factor will not be brought into the analytic schema.
 17. S. M. Miller, "The Credential Society," *Trans-action*, 5, 2, December, 1967, p. 2.
 18. The problem here is that the sons of migrants are, technically, natives. But theoretically, assimilation of migrants to the occupational structure is only completed when migrant origin has no influence at all upon the occupational achievement of people. Thus, "migrant" origin refers to the individual being a migrant, or his ancestors.
 19. See Blau and Duncan, *op. cit.*, Chapter 7.
 20. One city, Lima, for which information is available was not considered in this paper, since some of the results were judged to be questionable and there was not time to check the accuracy of the information with the authors of the study.
 21. Gino Germani, *Estructura social de la Argentina*. Buenos Aires: Raigal, 1955, pp. 75–77. The estimates were corrected in a later publication (Germani, "The Process of Urbanization in Argentina," *op. cit.*) from which they are taken.
 22. Germani, *Estructura social . . .*, *op. cit.*
 23. The difference between recent migrants and other groups, based on their low levels of education, concentration in *villas miserias*, and ethnic characteristics, was made relevant due to the support many of them provided to the Peronist movement. See, for instance, Robert J. Alexander, *The Peron Era*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1951.
 24. See Aldo Ferrer, *The Argentine Economy*, translated by Marjory M. Urquidi. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1967, Parts 4 and 5.
 25. *Idem.*
 26. Gino Germani, "La movilidad social en la Argentina," Appendix to Seymour Martin Lipset and Reinhard Bendix, *Movilidad social en la sociedad industrial*. Buenos Aires: Eudeba, 1963, pp. 317–365.
 27. See José Fabio Barbosa Da Silva, *A Sociological Analysis of Internal Migration in Brazil*. Gainesville: University of Florida, unpublished doctoral dissertation, 1964; also Jacques Lambert, *Os Dois Brasís*. Rio de Janeiro: Centro Brasileiro de Pesquisas Educacionais, 1959.
 28. Bertram Hutchinson *et al.*, *Mobilidade e trabalho: um estudo na cidade de São Paulo*. Rio de Janeiro: Centro Brasileiro de Pesquisas Educacionais, 1960.
 29. Bertram Hutchinson, "Structural and Exchange Mobility in the Assimilation of Immigrants to Brazil," *Population Studies*, 12, November, 1958, pp. 111–120.
 30. Juan C. Elizaga, "A Study of Migration to Greater Santiago (Chile)," *Demography*, 3, 2, 1966, pp. 352–377.
 31. Patterns of migration to Santiago are discussed in Bruce H. Herrick, *Urban Migration and Economic Development in Chile*, Cambridge: The M.I.T. Press, 1965, and by Elizaga, *op. cit.*, pp. 359–362. Arriaga, *op. cit.*, gives estimates of natural increase and net migration for urban centers classified in size-classes.

32. Herrick, *op. cit.*, p. 80.
33. See Robert Gordon Greer, *The Demographic Impact of the Mexican Revolution, 1910–1921*, Austin: The University of Texas, unpublished M. A. thesis, 1966.
34. See Harley L. Browning, *Urbanization in Mexico*, Berkeley: University of California, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, 1962.
35. *Idem*, pp. 197–200.
36. The educational distribution of all migrants and natives is not available at this time. For a partial examination of the 1.5 percent census sample, see Donald Reed Case, *Differentiation Among Manual Workers in Mexico City*, Austin: The University of Texas, unpublished M.A. thesis, 1967.
37. See Balán, Browning and Jelin de Balán (eds.), *op. cit.*
38. Harley L. Browning and Waltraut Feindt, "Diferencias entre la población nativa y la migrante en Monterrey," *Demografía y Economía*, II, 2, 1968, pp. 183–204.
39. A summary discussion of Monterrey's industrialization is given in Jorge Balán, *The Process of Stratification in an Industrializing Society: The Case of Monterrey, Mexico*. Austin: The University of Texas unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, 1968, Chapter 2.
40. The effects of size-class of the community of origin on social mobility are analyzed in Jorge Balán, "Are Farmers' Sons Handicapped in the City?" *Rural Sociology*, 33, 2, June 1968, pp. 160–174.
41. See Louis J. Ducoff, *Los recursos humanos de Centroamérica, Panamá, y México en 1950–1980 y sus relaciones con algunos aspectos del desarrollo económico*. United Nations, 1960.
42. Naciones Unidas, CEPAL, *Aspectos demográficos y socioeconómicos del Area Metropolitana de San Salvador (resultados de una encuesta)*, 1966, mimeo (Document number E/CN.12/CCE/333/TAO/LAT). A summary of the results is given in Louis J. Ducoff, "The Migrant Population of a Metropolitan Area in a Developing Country: A Preliminary Report on a Case Study of San Salvador," in *International Population Conference, op. cit.*, pp. 428–435.
43. Naciones Unidas, *op. cit.*, p. 42.
44. See Alvan O. Zarate, *op. cit.*
45. The data are analyzed in Deanne Lannoix Termini, *Socio-Economic and Demographic Characteristics of the Population of Guatemala City With Special Reference to Migrant-Non-migrant Differences*. Austin: The University of Texas, unpublished M.A. thesis, 1968.