

INTERNAL MIGRATION IN GUATEMALA DURING THE PERIOD 1976-1981
BY ETHNICITY, SEX AND AGE.

Herman Schroeten

CELADE

Santiago de Chile, 1985

CELADE - SISTEMA REGIONAL
DOCUMENTACION
SOBRE MOVILIDAD
AMERICA LATINA

CELADE

Literature.

- Agricultura, Población y Empleo en Guatemala.
Consejo Nacional de Planificación Económica; Proyecto GUA/79/P03-DIT/FNUAP, Serie Resultados no.5. Guatemala, 1984.
- The minifundia economy and society of the Guatemalan Highland Indian.
By: Hill, George W. and Manuel Gollas; Report no. 30, July 1968 (research paper of the Land Tenure Centre at the University of Wisconsin).
- Modernización de la agricultura y pobreza en Guatemala.
By: Alberto Hintermeister; OIT; Abril 1982, Trabajo Ocasional/45.
- Agricultura de exportación, población y empleo en la Costa Sur.
Consejo Nacional de Planificación Económica: 1984; Guatemala.
- Guatemala: estacionalidad y subempleo en el sector agropecuario.
By: OIT/PREALC.
- Indicadores económicos tecnológicos para políticas de desarrollo industrial con objetivos de empleo.
Consejo Nacional...etc, 1978, Guatemala.
- La población de Guatemala.
By: Arias B., Jorge. C.I.C.R.E.D.-series, 1974.
- Dinámica poblacional y empleo en Guatemala: una síntesis.
1980, OIT/PREALC; documento de trabajo PREALC/204.
- Situation, principal problems and prospects of the economic development of Guatemala.
CEPCIES, 22-26 Sept. 1975, Wash. D.C.; OEA/ser.H/XIV, CEPCIES/73.
- Progreso económica y social en América Latina. Recursos naturales. Informe 1983.
By: Banco Interamericana de Desarrollo, pp.243-251.
- The role of migratory labor in the economic development of Guatemala.
By: Schmid, Lester J.; July 1967.
- The migration system of Guatemala City: spatial inputs.
By: Thomas, Robert N. In: Revista Geografica, no.75, Dec.1971, Rio de Janeiro Brasil, pp.73-84.
- Internal migration in Guatemala.
By: Arias B., Jorge; Univ. of San Carlos and Bureau of Statistics, Guatemala. IPU Conference 1961, paper no. 120.
- The role of disaster relief for long-term development in LDC's.
(with special reference to Guatemala after the 1976 earthquake).
By: Galo Abril-Ojeda, Institute of Latin American Studies; Monographs no.6, Stockholm 1982.

- Evaluación del censo de población de 1981: dinamica demografica en el periodo 1950-1981.
By: Gutierrez, Mario, Informe de su misión a Guatemala, 1983;
- OIT, Proyecto GUA/79/P03-OIT/FNUAP "Análisis de la situación de la población y el empleo en relación a la planificación económica".
- Guatemala: estimaciones y proyecciones de población 1950-2025.
CELADE/Dirección General de Estadística de Guatemala,
Fascículo F./GUAT.1, Enero 1985.
- Guatemala: las diferencias socioeconómicas de la fecundidad, 1959-1980.
CELADE/Dirección General de Estadística de Guatemala, Serie A. no. 1045.
Setiembre 1984.
- Guatemala: diferencias socioeconómicas de la mortalidad de los menores de dos años 1968-1976.
CELADE/Dirección General de Estadística de Guatemala, Serie A no. 1044,
Setiembre 1984.
- Effects of the hacienda and plantation systems on Guatemala's Indians.
By: Dessaint, Alain Y.
In: America Indígena, Vol. XXII, nº 4, October 1962; pp. 323 - 354.
- Estrategia de Desarrollo Regional de Guatemala (Propuesta).
SGCNPE, Guatemala, Noviembre 1979.
- Guatemala: Pobreza rural y crédito agrícola al campesino.
PREALC/266, Junio 1985.
- Guatemala: Características ocupacionales y educacionales de los migrantes interdepartamentales en el período 1976-1981.
By: Ordoñez F., Hermelinda; Nov. 1985, CELADE, Santiago.

Introduction.

The present analysis is part of the projekt IMIN which aims at in-depth investigations of internal migration in Latin American countries using intensively data from the last round of population censuses of these countries.

Analyses are intended to be executed in two phases, the first one being aimed at obtaining measures of internal migration for the distinct geographical units as defined by the respective countries with respect to volume and relative intensity and at determining the major streams. Moreover, selectivity of migration will be analysed using characteristics of migrants which have shown to be related with migration in the literature, such as sex, age, educational level, occupation, etc. This phase will be mainly descriptive. The second phase concerns explaining and where possible forecasting migration, according to the requirements of the respective countries.

In the underlying analysis the emphasis will be upon description of internal migration in Guatemala during the period 1976-1981; the data have been derived from the 1981 Population Census, using the question about the usual place of residence 5 years before the census date and have been aggregated at the departmental level - "Divisiones Administrativas Mayores", further called departments- and the regional level¹/. The population under study is the population born in Guatemala who lived in the country at the census date and 5 years before; accordingly, only persons of 5 years and older in 1981 have been included in the analysis. Migrants are persons whose usual department (region) of residence in 1981 differed from the one in 1976. Characteristics used in the analyse are ethnicity, sex and age.

The organization of this study is as follows.

In the first chapter the objectives of the analysis will be stated followed by a reference framework and some methodological remarks.

The second chapter contains background information about the (socio-)economic structure of Guatemala and some changes therein as it is believed that these are closely related with -changes in- the spatial distribution of the population. A section about the spatial distribution of the population will conclude this chapter.

Chapters 3, 4, 5 and 6 contain results of the analysis concerning respectively migration without using any characteristic, migration by ethnicity, migration by sex and migration by agegroup.

A map, tables and figures may be found in respectively annexes I, II and III. Unless mentioned otherwise, all data in tables and figures in chapter 3 and following chapters have as source the 1981 Population Census in Guatemala.

¹/Regional and departmental divisions as used by the Secretaría General del Consejo Nacional de Planificación Económica de Guatemala. (See for the location of the regions and the constituting departments the map and the explanation in annex I).

Chapter 1.

Objectives and reference frame of the analysis and some general remarks.

The objectives of this analysis are derived from those of the IMIN- project and may be described as:

"The in-depth study of the internal migration in Latin American countries by means of intensive use of data provided by national population censuses in order to provide the authorities responsible for the planning of the spatial distribution of the population with a solid base for their activities."

The underlying descriptive analysis tries to reach these objectives by means of the following:

- The study of volume and relative intensity of migration with respect to persons of five years and over (as of the census date) for each department in Guatemala as well as for regions and analysis of streams in order to identify the migration pattern.

Volume concerns identification of absolute numbers of immigrants, outmigrants and -as a summary measure- net migration.

Intensity refers to relative figures as percentages and rates.

- The use of the characteristics ethnicity, sex and age and combinations thereof in order to analyse selective and differential migration between migrants and non-migrants in this respect and to verify possible geographical differences with respect to these characteristics^{2/}.

A more or less generally accepted theory of internal migration does not exist as yet; therefore, in the following part broad ideas about characteristics of internal migration combined with general findings about internal migration in Latin America have been used to serve as "guidelines" to focus the analysis^{3/}.

Socio-economic diversification between areas and specialisation of persons tend to incur migration.

With respect to Guatemala this means that it may be expected that the most voluminous streams will occur between (north-)western and eastern parts of the country to the department of Guatemala and the Pacific coast and Izabal, the former being the most underdeveloped and the latter the most developed parts (albeit with a different economic structure).

The department of Guatemala will attract migrants from all over the country in the biggest numbers as the national capital is located in this department

^{2/}Selectivity of migration refers to comparisons between migrants and non-migrants in the area of origin and differential migration to corresponding comparisons in the area of destination. (See: the Introduction in: Elizaga, Juan C. and John J. Macisco Jr.: "Migraciones Internas, Teoría, Método y Factores Sociológicos"; CELADE, Santiago, 1975).

In a spatial sense the word difference(s) has been used here to indicate the preference of a migrant group for an area as contrasted with another group.

^{3/}see e.g.:-Elizaga, Juan C. and John J. Macisco Jr.: Migraciones Internas, op. cit., sections III and IV and Alberts, Joop: Migración hacia áreas metropolitanas de América Latina; un estudio comparativo; CELADE, Santiago, 1977, chapters I and II.

and its metropolitan area, being the most important political, administrative, industrial and commercial centre in the country.

Because of its sheer size it may be expected also that the number of outmigrants from this area will be considerable, amongst others because not all the immigrants will stay all their lives.

The Pacific coast, consisting of the departments Retalhuleu, Suchitepéquez, Escuintla and the lowland parts of the departments San Marcos, Quezaltenango, Santa Rosa and Jutiapa, has the most modern agricultural structure of the country and this is also the area of the big, export-oriented farms; Escuintla has also some industry and some ports.

The department of Izabal resembles in its agricultural structure that of the Pacific coast and, moreover, it has the most important port in the country. However, modernization in agriculture and the cultivation of less labour-intensive crops seems to have reduced the labour-demand^{4/}, so it may be doubted whether the migration saldo in this area will be high and/or positive.

As for streams, migration tends to occur in some well-defined streams (with each stream having its counterstream, e.g. because of returning migrants). Considering the statements above it may be expected that streams to and from a lesser extent- from Guatemala will be the most voluminous, followed by those directed towards the Pacific coast.

Taking into account the role of distance it may be expected that most of these streams concern movements between neighbouring departments.

With respect to the effectiveness of streams and counterstreams -measured as the ratio between netmigration and gross migration for pairs of regions/departments- we expect the abovementioned departments/regions to have the highest effectiveness whereas this will be less between departments of more or less equal socio-economic development.

With respect to selectivity of migration and differences between migrants and non-migrants in resp. the place of origin and destination, the following characteristics have been taken into account: ethnicity, sex and age.

Regarding sex, in accordance with migration studies in Latin American countries it may be expected that women dominate in migration (streams) towards the capital and men in migration (streams) to and between rural areas.

An often mentioned reason for this is that women often seek work in domestic and service activities, partly because other kinds of employment are not considered appropriate for them, partly because their educational level tends to be somewhat lower than that for men, forcing them into specific occupations as domestic activities (although this does not necessarily hold for the whole service sector). As most of these activities are to be found in the bigger cities women tend to migrate predominantly to the cities.

With regard to age, migrants tend to be disproportionately highly represented in the age of 15-35 years when compared to the agestructure of the non-migrants.

The rationale behind this may be psychological but refers also to the phase in the life-cycle: broadly spoken, with increasing age different roles are expected of persons and different needs exist. Young persons often have less fixed relations within their base community than the older ones, e.g. have

^{4/}see e.g.: Consejo Nacional de Planificación Económica: Agricultura de exportación y empleo en la Costa Sur. Guatemala, 1984.

not yet the responsibility for a family, a business, which allows them to try their luck at least temporarily elsewhere. Moreover, different expectations, norms and values exist between younger and older ages.

Female migration towards the big cities tends to occur at a somewhat younger age than male migration.

This may be explained by the nature of the jobs they can get (e.g. domestic jobs) which are not readily available in rural areas, whereas more jobs deemed suitable for men are available in the countryside. Besides, the earlier mentioned differences in educational attainment^{5/}, allowing women to migrate at a younger age than men may play a role; moreover, the type of employment deemed to be appropriate for women, often jobs in the service sector^{6/}, is to be found in big cities in particular.

With respect to ethnicity, studies concerning the Indigenous in Guatemala, in particular those of the Altiplano^{7/}, mention the low inclination to migrate for a longer time; i.e. although much temporal mobility exists towards the Pacific coast area during the harvest there, this kind of mobility does not last longer than two or three months a year.

Reasons for this difference may be the often low esteem in which the Indigenous are being held (thus not encouraging migration towards departments with a Non-Indigenous majority), their lack of knowledge of the official Spanish language, their often lower educational level (than the Non-Indigenous) which compels them to compete in an already overcrowded market for unskilled jobs and their culture and traditions which bind them more than the Non-Indigenous to their base community and land.

Some background information and methodological remarks.

The data source of this analysis is the 1981 Population and Housing Census in Guatemala. The reference date was 23 March 1981.

The census is of the "de jure" type, meaning that persons have been registered according to their place of usual residence on the reference date.

Although more questions about internal migration have been included (e.g. for lifetime migration), the data used here are derived from the question about place of usual residence 5 years before the reference date.

These data have been aggregated to the level of the "División Administrativa Mayor", further called "department" (and to the level of region).

The period concerned was not exactly 5 years but a little more: as a result of a strong earthquake the fourth of February 1976, this date was taken as reference date 5 years ago, as such an event undoubtedly will stick in the memory of many persons.

^{5/}Although a lower educational level of women is subject to time and place, findings for migration in Guatemala, period 1976-1981, indicate that female migrants have a lower educational level than male migrants.

See: Ordoñez P., Hermelinda: Guatemala: Características ocupacionales y educacionales de los migrantes interdepartamentales en el período 1976-1981; CELADE, Santiago, 1985.

^{6/}e.g. domestics jobs.

^{7/}e.g. Hill, George W. and Manuel Gollas: The minifundia economy and society of the Guatemalan Highland Indian. Univ. of Wisconsin, 1968.

Therefore, in this study an internal migrant is a person who has a different department (or region) of usual residence on the census date than on 4 February 1976; moreover, it concerns persons with the nationality of and present in Guatemala on both reference dates.

It will be clear that only persons of 5 years or older on 23 March 1981 (4 February 1981) can be a migrant on the basis of this question.

Many factors may have influenced the estimations of the number of internal migrants; four of these will be mentioned below, based upon information about the country and the census.

- the abovementioned earthquake -which especially affected the departments of Chimaltenango, El Progreso, Sacatepéquez and Guatemala- may have disturbed the usual migration flows between these departments and with respect to others;

- because of unrest in the north-west; in particular in the departments of San Marcos and Huehuetenango, the usual migration volume and pattern to and from these areas as well as the composition by sex and age may have been disturbed, amongst others because it seems that a number of persons have crossed the border with Mexico who might have been involved otherwise in the internal migration process.

- the way in which ethnicity has been established: the enumerator had to decide the ethnical group to which a person belonged, based on his own estimation of the social position of that person²/.
Further, the number of migrants in each ethnical group on the 1981 reference date may differ from that on the 1976 reference date as a person may change of ethnicity as he/she assimilates him/herself to the other group; this seems to occur mainly concerning changes from Indigeneous to Non-Indigeneous;

- omission appears to have been selective by sex and age. More men than women have been omitted and the men show the highest omission rates in the -migration important- ages of 15-34; women have more equal omission rates over the age groups²/.
The exact influence of the factors mentioned above is not known but they should be remembered when interpreting the data concerned.

In the analysis attention has been given in particular to in- and outmigration and not in the first place to net migration, because a certain saldo may be caused by quite different combinations of in - and outmigration. Moreover, characteristics of migrants are somewhat difficult to use and to interpret with respect to net migration as this is a synthetic measure. Besides attention for the thematic parts, i.e. characteristics of migrants, quite some attention has been given also to spatial part, i.e. differential preferences for the departments (and/or regions).

In order to analyse the migration data the volumes of in- and outmigration for the departments have been determined; based on these, percentages -to

²/IX Population Census 1981, Guatemala; Características Generales.

²/Gutiérrez, Mario: Evaluación de Censo de Población de 1981: Dinámica Demográfica en el período 1950-1981. Mission report of project GUA/79/P03-OIT/FNUAP.

It is clear, therefore, that the spatial distribution of public investments was and is rather skewed: in combination with the big spatial differences between the production structures and the underemployment situation, this will contribute to a concentration of internal migration upon the Metropolitan Area and the Pacific coast area.

In order to give an impression of the living conditions, the average number of years of education of the population of 16 years and over and the child mortality rate have been included in table 2.1 as broad indicators.

The position of Guatemala calls immediately for the attention in a positive sense; the situation in many departments of regions Altiplano and Oriental may be qualified as being worst. The total fertility rates^{17/} do not show much differences between the regions, except again for Guatemala.

^{17/}The average number of children that would be born per woman if all women lived to the end of their childbearing years and bore children according to a given set of "age-specific fertility rates".

From: UN, Manual X.

Chapter 3.

Internal migration without differentiation by characteristics.

This chapter gives the results of the analysis without using any characteristics in order to obtain an overview of the spatial distribution of migration and the relative intensities thereof. First, attention will be given to interregional and intraregional migration whereafter the most outstanding variations on the departmental level follow. Guatemala stands for department Guatemala (which is the same as region Guatemala) in this and the following chapters.

Maps, tables and figures may be found in the annexes.

Interregional Migration.

Table 3.1 shows the big attraction of region Guatemala, whose share in the total of the inmigrants is about twice as high as its share in the total population. It is followed at considerable distance, in absolute and relative sense, by regions Central and Norte of which the last one gains more as compared to its share in the total population. Continuing this kind of comparison it appears that region Altiplano followed by region Oriental are the least attractive.

In reversed order these two regions lose the most persons although in relation to its share in the total population region Oriental loses more, followed by region Oriente whereas region Altiplano loses relatively little. In fact region Altiplano together with regions Guatemala and Norte lose less than their shares in the total population.

Table 3.2 shows relative intensities. For immigration the earlier mentioned three regions rank highest again, but the differences are much smaller now. Of the regions with low impacts in particular region Altiplano shows little impact of inmigrants, due to its big population size as compared to its small number of inmigrants.

Regions Oriental and Oriente are clearly the biggest losers in this sense and region Altiplano the smallest one. This is also shown by the relative intensities for netmigration but now region Oriental is even more outstanding than Oriente. Regions Altiplano and Costera show the lowest net rates but it is clear that this has been arrived at in different ways. Of the three regions with a positive net rate region Central shows the same pattern as region Costera: high in- and outmigration rates, resulting in only a small net migration rate (although with different signs for both regions).

The final column in table 3.2 gives the indices of effectiveness^{1/} for

^{1/}Inmigration plus outmigration form the gross migration for an area, i.e. the total of all migratory movements with respect to an area. The index of effectiveness gives a measure of the proportion of the net migration of that area (i.e. inmigration minus outmigration) in the gross migration of that area. In other words, it gives a measure which part of all migratory movements for an area really accrues to an area.

The formula used is: $((I-O)/(I+O)) * 100$; if all migration between two areas is in one direction the value becomes +100 for one area and -100 for the

migration between a region and the rest of the country. Guatemala and Oriental have the highest values, the difference being that most of the migration with respect to Guatemala is directed to that region, whereas the reverse is true for Oriente. Almost no effectiveness show regions Central and Costera; from a different point of view this was shown by the impacts of net migration as well.

Table 3.3 gives a comparison between interregional and intraregional migration. Intraregional migration forms in general only a small part of the migration of a region; the highest shares for intraregional migration in both comparisons are reached in regions Oriente and Altiplano.

Interdepartmental migration.

See figures 3.1 and 3.2 ^{2/} and table 3.4 in the annex.

Three departments only -Guatemala, Escuintla and El Petén- account for 55% of all the immigrants. It is clear that Guatemala receives by far the highest number and that most of the departments have only little immigration.

The same group of three accounts for only 23% of all the outmigrants (of which about 50% originates from Guatemala, due to its population size), meaning that the number of outmigrants is more evenly spread over the departments than the immigrants.

Departments with a comparatively sizeable outmigration, besides Guatemala, are Escuintla and Izabal, Jutiapa and Santa Rosa (region Oriental), Quezaltenango and San Marcos (region Altiplano) and Suchitepéquez, of which only the first two also have some amount of immigration.

Considering the fact that it concerns a five-year period the figures are small in general and the same holds when we eliminate the influence of the population size^{3/}, obtaining rates. Only 5 departments have immigration rates higher than 10 % of which especially El Petén calls the attention, due to its small population size and its high immigration. Despite its very high number of immigrants, Guatemala experiences a small impact only, due to its population size. Departments with the lowest immigration rates are located in the regions Altiplano, Oriental and Oriente.

Regarding the outmigration rates, the departments in region Altiplano again rank very low -i.e. do not differ much from zero-, showing that this region experiences little influence from migration (Quezaltenango has the highest impacts for both in- and outmigration in this region which may be due to its regionally important city, ranking second in the country). This is not so for regions Oriental and Altiplano which have the highest outmigration rates together with departments Escuintla and Izabal -which thus experience high

other area; the index is 0 when migration is ineffective, that is when in- and outmigration for that area are equal. I= immigration, O= outmigration.

^{2/}Numbers 1-22 below the X-axis indicate the departments and the roman figures the regions.

^{3/}Although there is an association between population size and migration, Spearman's rank correlation coefficients showed low values only: 0.484 and 0.531 for resp. immigration and outmigration (with population size as independent variable).

immigration and outmigration impacts- and Baja Verapaz. The departments in region Costera rank medium high.

Net migration, finally, outranks in El Petén the rates of all the other departments and is negative for most of the departments, in particular for those in regions Oriental and Oriente (except Izabal) and Baja Verapaz (which is the only one in region Norte with a negative net migration rate). Only five departments have positive net migration (rates): El Petén, Guatemala, Escuintla, Sacatepéquez and Alta Verapaz. In particular Izabal and Sololá have rates of about zero, although this is a result of quite different in- and outmigration numbers.

The indices of effectiveness show that only with respect to Guatemala and El Petén migration is to a considerable degree "one-way", i.e. mainly directed towards these departments. The reverse holds for the departments in regions Oriente and Oriental. In the Altiplano Totonicapán shows a comparatively high negative effectiveness, whereas all the other departments in this region, especially Sololá, show in - and outgoing streams of more equal size.

Streams.

So far the departments have been analysed only with respect to migration to and from the rest of the country. In the following part the most important streams will be considered.

Of the possible 462 streams none is zero although many of them are very small. 7% (=32) of all the streams, with a range from 1911-8857 persons, account for 50% of all the migrants after which 46 streams are needed to account for the next 25%, meaning that the size of the streams drops sharply. Shown in another way, approximately 50% (224) of all the streams has less than 100 persons (over a five-year period).

As an indication of the degree of concentration of the streams upon one or some departments we use again the abovementioned 32 biggest streams. 17 of these, from all over the country, had Guatemala as destination; next highest but at a considerable distance and with a more regional attraction, ranked Escuintla and El Petén (resp. 5 and 4 times).

Regarding the departments as areas of origin the concentration is less: Guatemala appears 4 times, closely followed by Jutiapa (3 times) which has a much smaller population size and most of the departments appeared one time. Absent in this group were Sololá, Totonicapán, Baja Verapaz and El Petén, which is not only due to their population size as there are departments with a smaller population size which do appear nevertheless in this group.

Considering separately the departments as destinations most of them, except Guatemala and El Petén, receive 60% or more of their immigrants from five departments only; the origins differ per department although Guatemala and Escuintla are amongst them very often. The departments viewed as areas of origin show an even higher concentration: except Guatemala all of them see at least 70% (and for 16 departments 80%) of their outmigrants go to 5, departments only.

Table 3.5 shows for each department its main areas of origin and destination using the five biggest in- and outgoing streams per department, together with absolute and relative numbers.

Maps 3.1 and 3.2 visualize the size and directions of some in- and outmigration streams with respect to Guatemala; as may be seen, all streams

leaving Guatemala are counterstreams for that department⁴. Map 3.3 shows the 16 biggest streams in the country and it may be seen that most of them are directed towards Guatemala.

The following part gives an overview of the most important departments of attraction and repulsion in each region and the directions of their main streams. This has been done for intraregional and interregional migration. Most of the regions have one or more departments which attract or loose more migrants than the other departments belonging to that region. Not surprisingly, these departments often are the same for intra- and interregional migration.

Regarding intraregional migration, in region Central Chimaltenango loses most and gains less whereas Escuintla gains most (38.9%) of the intraregional migrants, 3/4 coming from Chimaltenango; outmigrants from Escuintla go in equal numbers to Sacatepéquez and Chimaltenango.

In region Oriental Jutiapa loses most (46.4%); 53% and 43% of its outmigrants go to resp. Santa Rosa and Jalapa. Santa Rosa receives most (36.7%) of the migrants and loses 70% of its outmigrants to Jutiapa.

In region Altiplano Quezaltenango is the main centre of attraction with 34.9% of the intraregional migrants and San Marcos the biggest loser (29%) although the differences with Quezaltenango and Huehuetenango are small. Quezaltenango receives more than 50% of the intraregional outmigrants from each of the southern Altiplano departments; Huehuetenango and Quiché are exceptions in that they exchange the majority of their intraregional migrants between themselves.

The two departments of region Costera have no clear centre, exchanging migrants in approximately equal numbers. In region Norte El Petén is the main centre of attraction (60.6%) but mainly for Alta Verapaz which loses 90% of its migrants to El Petén. The last one accounts for only 7.6% of the migrants in this region of which 83.4% go to Alta Verapaz. Baja Verapaz loses most (52.8%), equally divided over the other two departments in the region.

Region Oriente has Izabal as focal point (64.4%) of immigration, receiving about 80% of the outmigrants from both Zacapa and Chiquimula; its outmigrants go in about equal numbers to the other two departments. Chiquimula is the main department of expulsion (43.8%).

With respect to interregional migration the picture is the same.

Escuintla receives 3/4 of the inmigrants to this region; a proportion which is the same for each incoming stream in Central from all the departments except Guatemala and Sololá (resp. 60 and 38%). 58% of all the inmigrants in Escuintla come from surrounding departments, Guatemala, Jutiapa, Santa Rosa and Suchitepéquez. When Quiché is included this percentage increases to 70% (making Quiché from all the Altiplano departments the most important source (55%) of migrants to Escuintla).

The main areas of destination for migrants from Escuintla are Guatemala and Petén (resp. 34% and 7% of the migrants from region Central) and for the whole region Guatemala is also the main region of attraction (55% of the interregional outmigrants from Central).

⁴An area receiving migrants from another area loses migrants to that other area too, in general. The biggest of the streams for the area concerned is called stream and the smallest one is called counterstream.

In region Oriental one outspoken centre of attraction does not exist; however, Santa Rosa receives the highest number of the interregional inmigrants (35%), especially for migrants coming from regions Central, Altiplano and Guatemala (resp. 43%, 45% and 41% of the outmigrants from these regions to Oriental go to Santa Rosa). Jutiapa is the most important destination for migrants from the departments in regions Norte and Oriente.

Region Guatemala is the main destination of the interregional outmigrants from Oriental: it receives approximately 50% of those. Next in rank are Central (18.5%) and Norte (17%). Within the last two regions the main destinations are Escuintla and El Petén (with resp. 91% and 84% of the outmigrants from Oriental towards each region). In regions Costera and Oriente the main destinations are resp. Suchitepéquez and Izabal (resp. 75% and 59%); these regions, however, receive considerably fewer migrants from Oriental than the ones mentioned earlier. Contacts with region Altiplano are negligible.

Region Altiplano receives 37% of its inmigrants from Guatemala and 28% from Costera (equally divided from both departments). Quezaltenango is the main destination but the differences with San Marcos are often small. Outmigrants from Guatemala often choose these two departments; with respect to outmigrants from the Costera, in particular those from Retalhuleu, Quezaltenango is clearly the main choice. Quiché is the focus for migrants from the surrounding departments Chimaltenango, Baja and Alta Verapaz.

Guatemala is the main destination for the outmigrants from the Altiplano (55%), followed at considerable distance by regions Central and Costera (with resp. 20 and 14.5% of the outmigrants from the Altiplano). All departments have Guatemala as main destination with the exception of Quiché which has Escuintla as main destination. Region Central more than region Costera is the destination for outmigrants from the Altiplano departments (75% of them go to Escuintla) except for the outmigrants from Quezaltenango who prefer the Costera (especially Retalhuleu). Region Norte, usually a region of high attraction, receives surprisingly few migrants from the Altiplano departments, also from the neighbouring ones. Within region Norte, Alta Verapaz -and not El Petén- receives somewhat more of these outmigrants, mainly from Quiché. In- and outmigration to and from regions Oriental and Oriente is neglectable.

Region Costera receives most of its inmigrants from regions Altiplano and Central (resp. 40% and 21.5%); within these two regions the main departments of origin are Escuintla and Quezaltenango (with resp. 84% and 52% of the outmigrants from these regions towards Costera coming from these departments). Inmigrants from region Central settle for 75% in Suchitepéquez whereas those from the Altiplano appear to have a slight preference for Retalhuleu.

37% of the outmigrants from the Costera go to Guatemala and 26% to regions Central and Altiplano each, so the concentration upon Guatemala is less than in the case of regions Altiplano or Oriental. Within region Central, Escuintla is the main destination (86%, 3/4 of which arrive from Suchitepéquez); the concentration upon Quezaltenango in the Altiplano is less but still considerable: 47%, of which 3/5 come from Retalhuleu.

Region Norte receives most of its inmigrants from regions Oriente and Oriental (resp. 34% and 29%). Izabal and Jutiapa are the main areas of origin of these migrants with resp. 58% and 46% of the outmigrants from these regions with destination region Norte (and together 1/3 of the inmigrants in this region from all over the country).

El Petén is the outspoken centre of attraction, receiving in general 60% or

more of the various streams. Alta Verapaz only attracts the main part of in_migrants coming from Sacatepéquez, Sololá and Quiché.

Outmigration from region Norte concentrates somewhat more upon Guatemala than in the case above (41%) without big differences in numbers between the three departments of region Norte; next follows outmigration to region Oriente (20%) in which Izabal is the main destination for these outmigrants with 85%. Region Central is a relatively important destination for outmigrants from region Norte too (17%) and Escuintla is the main destination (88% of these inmigrants). Outmigrants towards Escuintla come in equal numbers from Baja Verapaz and El Petén whereas outmigrants from Alta Verapaz dominate in the streams towards Oriente (50%).

The main regions of origin of inmigrants of Oriente are Oriental, Guatemala and Norte (origin of resp. 32.5%, 27% and 20.5% of the inmigrants). In Oriental, departments Jutiapa and El Progreso are the main departments of origin in this respect (resp. 41% and 31% of the outmigrants from Oriental with direction Oriente come from these departments). The corresponding departments in Norte are Alta Verapaz (56%) and El Petén (31%). Region Izabal is the most important destination in region Norte: 64% of the inmigrants in this region choose Izabal and this percentage applies also to the separate departmental streams from the regions forementioned.

Outmigration from region Norte is mainly directed to the regions Guatemala and Norte (with resp. 40% and 38% of the outmigrants). As has been said, El Petén is the main destination in region Norte. Izabal, besides receiving most of the inmigrants in this region, also accounts for most of the outmigrants, in particular in the streams towards El Petén (relatively spoken, however, Zacapa and Chiquimula are the biggest losers).

Conclusion.

The dominating role of region/department Guatemala is immediately clear and is shown in all measures. The strong attraction of this region may be explained by the location of the national capital in this region/department with its political, administrative and economic functions which outrank in importance all similar ones in other parts of the country. Moreover, its living conditions are also higher than in the rest of the country. Outmigration is sizeable too, which may be expected considering its population size and the fact that a number of earlier inmigrants stay only for some time.

In the other regions which appear to be attractive -Norte and Central-migration is actually centred on one department, resp. El Petén and Escuintla. The attraction factors, however, are different from those in Guatemala: El Petén has the attention of the government because of its attempts to populate and develop this department, mainly as a new agricultural frontier. Escuintla has a relatively modern agricultural production structure and, next, possesses some industry. Region Costera and department Izabal have a similar economic structure as Escuintla and are relatively attractive as well; however, all of them, except El Petén and to a lesser extent Escuintla, lose approximately as many persons as they attract. It may well be that developments in the agricultural sector and their consequences for labour requirements making the work less labour-intensive) exert an equally repelling influence in these areas.

In the remaining regions and departments the traditional agricultural sector prevails with people often living at subsistence level and few opportunities

to find (higher remunerated) employment in other economic sectors within the same regions/departments, causing outmigration and a net loss of persons. Region Oriental and in particular departments Jutiapa and Santa Rosa is (are) the biggest loser(s). Outmigration from the departments in region Altiplano is in absolute and relative terms very small, which is surprising as the economic and living conditions in this region are the same or worse as in region Oriental and the other regions. It may be that social and cultural factors play at least as big a role as economic ones in region Altiplano, preventing large scale outmigration. Department Quezaltenango attracts more persons than the other departments in this region. This may be due to the location of the second biggest city of the country in this department and its role as regional centre; however, the differences with other departments (in and outside its region) are very small and its attraction is not comparable with the attraction of Guatemala.

Chapter 4.

Internal migration by Ethnicity: Indigenous and Non-Indigenous.

In this chapter the population will be classified in two groups, Indigenous and Non-Indigenous, in order to see whether differences exist between these two groups with respect to volume, relative intensity and the spatial distribution of the respective migrants. Other studies^{1/} have noted differences in migration in these respects, attributed to differences in cultural and social characteristics between both groups: Indigenous internal migration was surprisingly small in comparison to Non-Indigenous, surprisingly considering the fact that the former often belong to the lowest and most deprived social class, a condition often mentioned to induce migration in search of better opportunities and living conditions elsewhere.

After a short introduction below, the same scheme will be followed here as in chapter 3; it will be extended by comparisons between both ethnical groups.

According to the "Conceptos y Definiciones" of the 1981 Census, the criterion for distinguishing between Indigenous and Non-Indigenous was: "the estimation of the social position of the person concerned in the place of enumeration". The estimation was done in general by the enumerator. Criteria of how to estimate the social position are not clear but, it seems that the mothertongue and the ability (willingness?) to speak Spanish played an important role in the estimation.

The Indigenous population in 1981 live mainly in the West and North: 53.5% of them live in region Altiplano and another 22% in regions Costera and Norte. With the exception of departments San Marcos, Retalhuleu and El Petén at least 50% of the population in all departments in these regions + in Chimaltenango is Indigenous. In San Marcos and Sacatepéquez this percentage is close to 50%. In the eastern part of the country plus in El Petén and Retalhuleu the shares of Indigenous in the departmental populations are low; departments Jalapa, Chiquimula and Retalhuleu have relatively high shares, between 31% and 35%.

Information about Indigenous outside the Altiplano region is scarce; as the majority of the Guatemalan population lives in rural areas and works full- or part-time in agriculture, as labourers or owners/tenants, on small or medium-sized family farms, it may be expected that this is true for Indigenous outside the Altiplano region as well. More information exists about the Indigenous of the Altiplano region. In the background information of chapter 2, living conditions in the Altiplano regions have been mentioned already; taking into account that most of the Altiplano departments have a sizeable-Indigenous majority, it is clear that especially the Indigenous live in dismal social-economic conditions. Attempts to get an extra income besides that earned from their own piece of land (if any) concentrate in general on work as artisan and/or on participation in temporal migration, i.e. migration during some months per year to the south where the big agricultural enterprises are which need extra hands during the harvest.

^{1/}e.g. Hill, George W. and Manuel Gollas: The minifundia economy and society of the Guatemalan Highland Indian. University of Wisconsin, 1968.

Finally a remark about differences between (sub)totals in this chapter and the foregoing one.

Adding the respective numbers of both ethnical groups should give the corresponding totals as shown in chapter 3. This, however, is not the case, but the totals in this chapter are somewhat smaller, due to the category "not stated" with respect to ethnicity. The difference for the country as a total is small: 1417 persons (0.6% of the total number of migrants). Differences for the separate departments are in general small too, less than 1%. Concerning immigration, only departments Huehuetenango, Alta Verapaz and Jalapa have somewhat higher differences (resp. 1.2, 3.7 and 1.3%). With respect to outmigration, departments with differences bigger than 1% are: Quiché (1.2%) and Baja Verapaz (1.2%).

As it was not possible to correct the differences the data used here concern the stated cases only.

Interregional migration.

Tables 4.1 and 4.2 show the absolute population and migrant numbers. For Non-Indigenous, Guatemala has clearly the biggest population, whereas Norte and Costera have the smallest populations. For Indigenous, the corresponding regions are resp. Altiplano and Oriental + Oriente. The absolute number of Non-Indigenous migrants is much bigger than that of Indigenous; in comparison with the shares in the total population (58.5% for Non-Indigenous and 41.5% for Indigenous) Non-Indigenous migrate also proportionally more than Indigenous (resp. 82.8% and 17.2%). Region Guatemala receives in both cases the highest number of immigrants, but its position is much more marked for Non-Indigenous than for Indigenous for whom region Central almost receives as much. Region Norte receives for Non-Indigenous only a clearly high number of immigrants. In the case of outmigration the differences between the regions are not so marked as for immigration of Non-Indigenous; region Oriental loses the biggest number. For Indigenous the opposite holds; considering its big population size it is not so surprising that region Altiplano loses the highest number. Regions with a positive net migration are for both ethnical groups Guatemala and Central, although the latter has a very small positive saldo for Non-Indigenous, also as compared to the Indigenous. Region Norte has for Non-Indigenous only a positive saldo. Oriental and Altiplano are the biggest losers for resp. Non-Indigenous and Indigenous.

In order to compare more easily the numbers of migrants of both ethnical groups, table 4.3 shows ethnicity ratios (see note at the bottom of the table). It may be concluded that the number of Non-Indigenous migrants is considerably higher than that of Indigenous migrants with respect to all regions, also in regions with an Indigenous majority.

Table 4.4 gives the migration rates per region, i.e. the impact that Indigenous, resp. Non-Indigenous immigration/outmigration has upon the average corresponding populations in the regions of destination/origin.

Indigenous immigration, as compared to the Non-Indigenous, has a high impact only in Guatemala; in all other regions their impacts are (much) lower. The outmigration impacts are in general higher than the immigration ones, except for Guatemala and Central, but are again much smaller than the ones for the Non-Indigenous. Region Altiplano shows for both ethnical groups the lowest in- and outmigration impacts, although the Non-Indigenous outmigration rates

considerably higher than those for the Indigenous. Region Norte clearly experiences much higher impacts of Non-Indigenous than Indigenous despite the presence of department El Petén in this region.

Net migration rates show that region Norte is the real region of attraction for Non-Indigenous, followed by Guatemala; the latter is the only real region of attraction for Indigenous. For both ethnical groups region Oriental is the biggest loser.

So, with respect to interregional level migration of Indigenous is considerably smaller than that of Non-Indigenous, in absolute and relative sense (although with respect to the latter, regions Guatemala and Central have somewhat higher net impacts for Indigenous than for Non-Indigenous).

The indices of effectiveness -table 4.3-, indicating the direction of the gross migration between areas^{2/}, show the dominating attraction of regions Guatemala (both ethnical groups), Norte (Non-Indigenous) and Central (Indigenous). Regions Oriental and Altiplano both see most of their gross migration going to other regions for both ethnical groups whereas only region Costera has about equally big incoming as outgoing streams for both ethnical groups.

Tables 4.1-4.3 also show data concerning intraregional migration. As for interregional migration, Non-Indigenous dominate but to a lesser extent. Although in region Norte and Altiplano the numbers of intraregional migrants of both ethnical groups are about the same in absolute size, considering the population size of the Indigenous in these regions they still are underrepresented. The only region where the share of Indigenous intraregional migration is considerably higher than their share in the total population is region Oriental.

So, also with respect to intraregional migration Indigenous migrate considerably less than Non-Indigenous.

Interdepartmental migration.

In this part information will be given for the separate departments in order to see which departments differ from the general regional findings.

Tables 4.5 and 4.6 show the basic population and migration data per department for both ethnical groups.

The proportion of Indigenous in the total departmental migration is 19% (as against a share of 41.5% in the total population) and thus slightly higher than their share in interregional migration, which fits the earlier observation that Indigenous participate comparatively more in intraregional than in interregional migration.

Inmigration is small for most departments and always bigger for Non-Indigenous than for Indigenous. Sololá and Totonicapán have the smallest number of Non-Indigenous immigrants and the departments of regions Oriental and Oriente (except department Izabal) numbers with respect to Indigenous.

Only departments Guatemala (in particular), Escuintla (region Central) and El Petén (region Norte) and Izabal (region Oriente), the last two for Non-Indigenous only, have sizeable numbers, far outranking the numbers for the

^{2/}gross migration: immigration plus outmigration for an area.

other departments. Outmigration is very small for Indigenous, with numbers from Guatemala and Quiché (region Altiplano) being the highest. Non-Indigenous have much higher outmigration too from every department, also those with an Indigenous majority (except El Quiché) with much higher differences between departments (in absolute terms). Taking as dividing line the number 10,000, we see that, besides Guatemala, especially the departments in region Oriente, Jutiapa and Santa Rosa in region Oriental and Escuintla in region Central call the attention. The departments in region Norte all score very low, as do those in region Altiplano, with the exception of departments Quezaltenango and San Marcos. Suchitepéquez in region Costera also loses a considerable number.

The net results are that most departments have negative net migration for both ethnical groups; in most cases the losses are small in absolute terms, but always bigger for Non-Indigenous than for Indigenous. Departments which really call the attention in this respect are Jutiapa and Santa Rosa, followed by those of region Oriente (except Izabal) for Non-Indigenous. Indigenous show the biggest net losses in Huehuetenango and El Quiché (Altiplano) and Baja and Alta Verapaz (region Norte).

Four of the five departments mentioned in the foregoing chapter have positive net migration for both ethnical groups: Guatemala, El Petén, Escuintla and Sacatepéquez. The positive net result for Alta Verapaz appears to be due to Non-Indigenous only and Izabal is (slightly) positive for Indigenous only. Although Escuintla has much bigger Non-Indigenous than Indigenous in migration, the netresult is much bigger for Indigenous, due to a high number of Non-Indigenous outmigrants.

Comparing in another way the numbers of Indigenous and Non-Indigenous migrants -table 4.7- we see that 9 departments have an Indigenous majority (which is very big in departments Sololá and Totonicapán). However, only these two departments and Quiché also have bigger Indigenous than Non-Indigenous in- and outmigration, and Alta Verapaz bigger Indigenous than Non-Indigenous outmigration.

Relative intensities (migration rates) per department.

Figures 4.1 and 4.2 show the rates for both groups, giving a measure of the impacts of migration upon the average populations of the departments of origin and destination. Non-Indigenous not only migrate more in absolute numbers, but their migration also has higher impacts in most of the departments than Indigenous migration. As for immigration, the departments of regions Central and Costera experience about the same impacts as the country average (12.7 pro mille), together with Guatemala and Quezaltenango plus El Quiché (Altiplano). Departments of regions Oriental and Oriente (except Izabal) all have lower impacts than the national average as have the Altiplano departments San Marcos and Huehuetenango and Baja Verapaz in region Norte. This region is the one with very high impacts, for El Petén and Alta Verapaz, despite a low absolute number for the latter; the same characteristic show the Altiplano departments Sololá and Totonicapán.

Inmigration impacts for Indigenous are almost all very low. The national average of 4.2 pro mille is only surpassed by Guatemala (for which both ethnical groups score equally high), Escuintla (much higher now than for Non-Indigenous whereas the rest of this region scores very low), El Petén (also the only department now in region Norte) and Izabal. All these departments,

in particular the first two, also have comparatively high absolute numbers; this, however, can not be said of El Progreso, Santa Rosa and Zacapa, which show high impacts as well.

Impacts for Indigenous outmigration are very low as well, in particular all departments of region Altiplano and most of region Norte. Almost all departments of region Oriental and to a lesser extent those of region Oriente score higher (i.e. more negative) than the national average, again with very high impacts for departments El Progreso, Santa Rosa and Zacapa. Escuintla also scores high and the impact is about the same as the one for Non-Indigenous. For both ethnical groups Guatemala has the same low outmigration impacts. Non-Indigenous also have much higher outmigration impacts than Indigenous in each department, except the ones mentioned above. For Non-Indigenous only Guatemala and adjacent Sacatepéquez, El Petén and the Altiplano departments San Marcos and Huehuetenango have lower impacts than the national average. As for inmigration, the Altiplano departments Sololá and Totonicapán show the highest and very high impacts (although not so extreme as in the case of the Indigenous for departments El Progreso and Zacapa).

The results of the above, impacts of net migration, show that both ethnical groups have some departments in common with a positive rate: Guatemala, two in region Central, Sacatepéquez and Escuintla (with very big differences between both groups and especially attractive for Indigenous), and one in region Norte: El Petén (with high rates for both groups); the last region is especially attractive for for Non-Indigenous as also Alta Verapaz has a high net rate, whereas Izabal in region Oriente has a small positive rate for Indigenous only. Departments of most other regions have negative net rates which are very close to zero for Indigenous, especially the Altiplano departments. Departments where Indigenous do not form the majority of the population often have higher negative net rates for this group than in departments where the opposite holds. This is particularly clear in departments in region Oriental and in Zacapa in region Oriente. It should be noted however that the absolute numbers concerned in El Progreso, Zacapa and Santa Rosa are very small, so that the influence of possible errors upon the rates is high. The same remark holds for the (net) rates for Non-Indigenous in departments Sololá and Totonicapán.

For Non-Indigenous the departments of region Oriental belong also to the group with the highest negative rates, joined this time by most of the departments of region Oriente. The Altiplano departments have higher negative impacts than for Indigenous.

The indices of effectiveness (tables) give a measure of the difference between the proportions of streams and the corresponding counterstreams^{3/} in the gross migration per department, i.e. they measure the extent to which gross migration is directed towards the area concerned.

Indigenous counterstreams for departments with a positive net migration for both ethnical groups often form proportionally smaller parts of the gross migration concerned than those for Non-Indigenous. For departments with a negative net migration a similar statement can not be made, except for departments of region Altiplano which have often proportionally smaller

^{3/}As has been said in chapter 3, the biggest of the two migration streams between an area and another area is called "stream" and the smallest one "counterstream".

Indigenous than Non-Indigenous counterstreams. Both ethnical groups have very small counterstreams with respect to El Petén.

The index of redistribution^{4/}, as a general measure of the spatial redistribution by means of migration, is 2.1 and 6.4 for resp. Indigenous and Non-Indigenous and the corresponding index for migration without differentiation (chapter 3) is 4.6. Considering the analysis above it is no surprise that the index is much lower for Indigenous than for Non-Indigenous.

Streams.

Regional level.

The position of Guatemala as destination in Indigenous migration is less dominant than in Non-Indigenous migration: migrants from the Altiplano region go almost as much to region Central as to Guatemala (resp. 34% and 40% of the Altiplano outmigrants); the traditional links between Altiplano and Costera still exist, but in number they are smaller than for the two regions forementioned. The main destinations for region Costera are the counterstream^{5/} to region Altiplano followed by the stream to region Central. The latter has only relatively small counterstreams to regions Altiplano and Costera as the main destination of its migrants is Guatemala which has, in its turn, its main counterstream to region Central followed by region Altiplano. Regions Norte and Oriente have their biggest streams and counterstreams between each other (resp. 34% and 52% of the resp. outmigrants). Region Oriental is, with Central, the only region which loses more than 50% of its outmigrants to Guatemala; other important streams go to regions Norte and Central, but the counterstreams from the last two towards region Oriental are very small only.

Region Guatemala is even more important as main destination for Non-Indigenous than for Indigenous. All regions have Guatemala as main destination and regions Central (as for Indigenous), Oriental and Altiplano lose more than 50% of their outmigrants to Guatemala. The position of Guatemala is approximated only in the case of region Norte and region Oriente where the first receives almost as many migrants from region Oriente as Guatemala (41% and 37% of the outmigrants from region Oriente go to resp. Guatemala and Norte; this situation is reversed for Indigenous, as we have seen). Guatemala has as main destinations region Central, followed by Altiplano and Oriental (all counterstreams). The main streams from region Altiplano go to Guatemala, followed by Costera and Central (for the last two regions the order is reversed as compared with the Indigenous). Region Costera has as main destinations regions Guatemala, Central and Altiplano, exactly the reversed order as for Indigenous. Only movements from region Costera to Altiplano form a

^{4/}(number of migrants in the (sub)population)/(average (sub)population) times unity (= 100). This index thus gives a summary measure of the movements within the population concerned by means of migration.

^{5/}A migration stream is usually a body of migrants having a common area of origin and a common area of destination*. A further distinction may be made between stream and counterstream with respect to an area: the word stream in the text is used to indicate the biggest of the two and counterstream to indicate the smallest of the two.

*: UND: Manual VI: Methods of measuring internal migration. New York, 1970.

counterstream. Region Central is for most regions the second area of destination, except for migrants from Altiplano (for whom region Costera ranks higher, in contrast with Indigenous) and from region Oriente (for whom region Norte ranks higher, as for Indigenous). Outmigrants from Central have as main destinations regions Guatemala (stream), Norte (stream), Costera and Oriental (both counterstreams), so there are some differences in direction as compared to Indigenous outmigrants. Except for Guatemala, the main streams from region Oriental go to Central and Norte (which is reversed for Indigenous), but the counterstreams coming from these regions are relatively small (the biggest one coming from Guatemala).

Departmental level.

The intention of this part is to show the main migration pattern for the departmental level indicating the most important departments within each region; virtually no mention will be made of streams to and from Guatemala, because its dominant position is already known and the purpose here is to show patterns for the other departments.

It should be kept in mind that most streams are very small, especially considering that it concerns a five-year period. Indigenous have only 8 streams bigger than 1000 persons, the biggest one from Quiché to Escuintla (2503). The concentration in a few streams is high: only 28 streams (6.7% of 433)^{6/} account for 51% of all Indigenous migration.

For Non-Indigenous all possible streams exist; also here migration is concentrated in a few streams only: 27 streams account for 50% of all Non-Indigenous migration (5.8% of all 462 streams). 262 Streams (57%) are smaller than 100 persons; for Indigenous this figure is even higher: 338 (78%).

For Indigenous, the main destination of the Altiplano departments are Suchitepéquez (Costera) and Escuintla (Central); El Quiché (Altiplano) is mainly oriented upon Escuintla (even more than upon Guatemala). Quezaltenango is an important regional attraction centre for Altiplano migrants and has more contacts with Retalhuleu (mutually) than the other Altiplano departments. Departments Suchitepéquez and Escuintla, however, have their main orientations upon Guatemala and each other, although counterstreams also exist with the Altiplano departments.

Non-Indigenous from the Altiplano are not so much oriented upon the Costera departments but upon Escuintla. The main streams from the Costera and Escuintla are directed towards Guatemala, as for Indigenous. It is remarkable that El Petén (Norte) does not rank high as destination for none of the Altiplano departments with respect to Indigenous and with respect to Non-Indigenous only El Quiché. In region Norte, Indigenous from Baja and Alta Verapaz do have El Petén as an important destination (although outranked by Escuintla for Indigenous outmigrants from Baja Verapaz, but not for Non-Indigenous). El Petén is further an important destination for outmigrants from Escuintla and all departments from regions Oriental (especially from Jutiapa) and Oriente (especially from Izabal). Izabal (Oriente) itself seems to

^{6/}The maximum number of streams is 462. 39 Streams do not exist for Indigenous, about most of them concern streams between departments in regions Altiplano and Costera on one hand and departments of regions Oriental and Oriente on the other hand; the rest concerns missing streams between El Progreso, Jalapa, Santa Rosa and Zacapa in regions Oriental and Oriente (all departments with small numbers of Indigenous inhabitants).

be, like Quezaltenango in region Altiplano, a regional attraction centre for departments in regions Norte, Oriente (in particular from Chiquimula as Zacapa is already more oriented upon Guatemala) and Oriental; departments in Oriental have only small contacts with other departments in region Oriente. Between the ethnical groups exist in general small differences, except for Baja Verapaz whose Non-Indigenous only rank Izabal high and for Jutiapa for which the reverse holds. Region Oriental does not possess such a regional attraction centre, although Jutiapa and Santa Rosa have quite big incoming counterstreams because of the size of their streams. Non-Indigenous outmigrants from Santa Rosa and Jutiapa have as main destinations Guatemala and Escuintla, whereas Jalapa's outmigrants go relatively more to Izabal and El Petén, a characteristic which they have in common with Indigenous outmigrants from all departments in region Oriental. In region Central department Escuintla plays the dominant role. Inmigrants come from many departments as with respect to Guatemala, but the difference between both is that the numbers concerned are much smaller for Escuintla; a further difference is that the biggest contacts for Escuintla are with departments located nearby (Guatemala, Costera departments, Santa Rosa and Jutiapa), whereas Guatemala has big streams (and counterstreams) with virtually all departments. Outmigrants from Escuintla go mainly to Guatemala (both ethnical groups) and El Petén (mainly Non-Indigenous). El Petén shows the same differences with Guatemala but to a lesser extent than Escuintla.

Conclusion.

Interregional migration is dominated by Non-Indigenous in almost every aspect: absolute numbers, proportions of migrants as compared to their proportions in the total population and relative intensities. Only the impacts of Indigenous migration in region/department Guatemala and the impact of their net migration in region Central are bigger than for the Non-Indigenous. These two regions are the only ones with a positive migration saldo for Indigenous.

On the departmental level, only two departments have high positive rates for Indigenous: Escuintla (in particular) and El Petén; the rates in almost all other departments are much smaller than for Non-Indigenous who have their highest impacts in departments El Petén (especially) and Alta Verapaz. Guatemala has comparatively low rates for both ethnical groups, although its absolute numbers of migrants are the highest in the country for Non-Indigenous and second-highest for Indigenous for whom department Escuintla attracts somewhat more persons.

Migration intensities of Indigenous in departments of region Altiplano are often the lowest in the country.

Both ethnical groups are attracted and repelled by the same regions, albeit in different proportions and intensities. Why Indigenous migrate less than Non-Indigenous and why Altiplano Indigenous migrate often less than Indigenous from other regions/departments seems hard to explain by economical reasons only, as Indigenous and the Altiplano region/departments belong in general to resp. the poorest persons and areas. Part of the explanation may be found in differences in culture and traditions.

Chapter 5.

Migration by Sex.

In this chapter migrants will be classified by sex in order to see whether differences exist in migration volumes and relative intensities of both sexes and in their spatial (re)distribution; moreover, attention will be given to selectivity and differential migration with respect to migrants and non-migrants in the areas of origin and destination.

In the introductory part sources of possible differences in migration between the sexes have already been mentioned, e.g. differential omission (see chapter 2), as well as possible reasons for differences in their spatial distribution.

The numbers of both sexes combined do not add up completely to the totals mentioned in chapter 3, for the same reasons as given in chapter 4: as part of the present chapter involves analysis of migrants by sex and ethnicity, only those persons are part of the analysis who could be identified according to both variables.

This chapter has been organized in the same way as the foregoing ones: first will follow a section which gives some background information about the proportions of males and females in the time. Thereafter follow analyses of regional migration, departmental migration and a description of the main streams. In the part about departmental migration a section will be added treating migration by sex and ethnicity.

Some remarks about the proportions of males and females in time.

In the table below the sex ratios for some census years are given:

Year	sex ratios ¹	Total number of	
		males	females
1950 ²	102.2	1,419,522	1,388,511
1965 ²	102.4	2,224,098	2,171,679
1975 ²	100.3	2,703,633	2,695,476
1980 ²	99.3	2,973,799	2,991,939
1981 census ³	99.3	3,015,826	3,038,401
1981 census ⁴ (5 years and over)	98.7	2,449,776	2,481,753

1: number of males per 100 females.

2: source: Guatemala: estimaciones y proyecciones de población 1950-2025; CELADE, 1985. The numbers for the years 1950-1980 concern the mid-year populations of the resp. years, calculated from resp. the adjusted 1950, 1964, 1973 and 1991 census data.

3 and 4: source: results from the IX Population Census, Guatemala, 1981.

Over the 30-year period the sex ratios declined somewhat: a male surplus changed into a female surplus. Theoretically one may expect a ratio of 100 or somewhat more in a population without (sex differentials in) international migration and with a young age structure. It is difficult to say whether the change above is a real one or not: differential international migration, changes in the fertility structure and the mortality structure may cause

real changes in the proportions males-females, whereas differential omission in the enumeration of both sexes is the cause of distorted proportions. Whatever the real cause(s) is (are), the abovementioned 1985-publication mentions a 15.1% and a 12.4% censal omission in 1981 of resp. males and females, percentages which appeared to have increased as of the 1964-census.

Sex ratios for Guatemala City, the capital, according to the last two censuses are as follows:

Year	Sex ratio	
1973 ¹	88.5	(department Guatemala: 92.3)
1981 ²	88.8	(department Guatemala: 92.2)

1: source: Jorge Arias B.: La población de Guatemala. In: C.I.C.R.E.D.-series, 1976.

2: source: Results from the IX Population Census, Guatemala, 1981: the data concern the municipality of Guatemala and not the Guatemala metropolitan area.

The surplus of women in Guatemala City, and to a lesser extent in department Guatemala, is immediately clear. Although in the period 1976-1981 there was a female surplus with respect to outmigration, the female surplus is even bigger for immigration (see further in this chapter); a similar thing has happened in the period 1968-1973. As the weight of the population of Guatemala City in the total departmental is considerable, the sex ratio for the whole department is automatically low too.

Interregional Migration.

Tables 5.1 and 5.2 show data for the regions.

There are somewhat more female than male migrants. The share of each sex in the total migration of the country is 50.7% and 49.3% for resp. females and males; this corresponds closely with their shares in the total population, resp. 50.3% and 49.7%.

As in the foregoing chapters, regions Guatemala, Central and Norte attract most of the male and female immigrants, attracting 72.7% and 71.8% of resp. all female and male migrants. Region Guatemala alone attracts 44.9% and 36.3% of resp. all female and male migrants, confirming its dominant position as centre of attraction, especially with respect to females.

The forementioned regions rank lower with respect to outmigration, in particular region Norte; the highest ranking ones are regions Oriental, Altiplano and Guatemala, accounting for 58.4% and 58.3% of resp. all female and male outmigrants in the country, a much smaller percentage than in the case of immigration. Region Guatemala also loses relatively less: 15.7% and 15.5% of resp. all female and male outmigrants in the country. percentages which are more equal than for immigration.

Net migration, finally, gives the usual three regions having a positive saldo: Guatemala, Central and Norte. Guatemala, however, shows a considerable difference in this respect between males and females (much more females than males), whereas the situation is reversed for the other two regions, especially for Central. Region Costera shows saldos for both sexes which are closest to zero, in particular for males.

In order to have a closer look at differences between the sexes, see table 5.3 showing the sex ratios^{1/}.

In 1976 the biggest differences from 100 are found in regions Guatemala and Central, which may indicate that these regions already in the past had differential in- and outmigration for the sexes. Considering the sex ratios for migrants for the 5 years concerned, region Guatemala indeed attracts more women than men and the opposite occurs in region Central. Both regions lose more women than men, strengthening as a final result the male surplus in region Central and still resulting in a female surplus in region Guatemala. In short, in most regions the net result of the migration during the period is that the number of males increased in comparison to that of females, albeit by means of different compositions and sizes of the in- and outmigration streams; this is especially clear in regions Central and Norte. In region Guatemala the result was reversed and in regions Altiplano and Oriente migration caused no changes in this respect.

Rates.

The impacts of male and female migration upon the populations of origin and destination are shown in table 5.4. The three regions with the biggest absolute numbers of immigrants also have the highest impacts; this might have been expected of region Norte, having a small population, but also Guatemala has high rates. These regions also show the biggest differences between males and females: Guatemala clearly shows higher impacts for females, whereas Central and Norte have higher male impacts.

Outmigration rates for these three regions are much smaller than immigration rates and are more or less the same for both sexes, except for Central and in particular with respect to females. Outmigration of both sexes has the highest impact for region Oriental, followed by Oriente and Costera; this last region, however, has also comparatively high immigration rates for males, resulting in a male net migration of about zero, but somewhat higher for females. The latter have the highest impact in Guatemala (also higher than for males) but smaller ones in the other regions with a positive impact. In regions with a negative net migration the impacts for females are always somewhat higher for females; the only exception is region Altiplano (although the differences are very small).

The indices of effectiveness^{2/}, table 5.3, show that almost half of the total number of migrants concerning region Guatemala, especially females, remains in this region; approximately the same occurs for males in region Norte. Region Central shows almost no effectiveness for females and a very low one for males, a characteristic which is the same for region Costera. Region Oriental, on the other hand, loses more than half its total number of migrants and has the most effective migration, albeit negative. Although in terms of (negative) impact region Oriente ranks second, region Altiplano, with very small absolute numbers and impacts loses quite a number of its total migrants.

^{1/}The number of males per 100 females. Formula: (males/females)*100.

^{2/}see footnote on page 12, chapter 3.

Intraregional migration.

Tables 5.1 and 5.2 show absolute numbers of intraregional migrants and table 5.3 the sex ratios.

In regions Norte, Oriente and Altiplano the proportion of intraregional migration is the highest with respect to interregional migration, but it is still less than 50% in region Norte. The lowest proportions have Oriental and Central. Proportions of intraregional migration also are smaller than interregional immigration but they are higher than in the foregoing case for regions with a negative saldo, both types of migration almost being the same for regions Oriente and Altiplano; with respect to regions with a positive saldo the shares of intraregional migration are smaller than in the foregoing case.

The sex ratios show that intraregional migration is dominated by women, in contrast with interregional migration, except for region Norte which has a male surplus which is even bigger than for interregional migration.

Interregional migration streams.

All streams to Guatemala are female dominated, having in general sex ratios between 75 and 80; only the stream from region Norte shows more equal proportions (91.3). Streams from Guatemala are female dominated too, but less, with sex ratios often around 90 and for regions Central and Costera even between 95 and 100; the stream towards region Norte, however, is completely male dominated (130.5). Only 5 other streams, besides the 11 mentioned above, have a female surplus too: these concern the streams towards region Altiplano and coming from regions Costera and Central (sex ratios around 95), and streams towards region Oriental from regions Costera, Norte and Oriente (sex ratios between 85 and 90). Region Oriental as destination receives mostly female dominated streams, except from regions Central and Altiplano and its total immigration has a female surplus too; its outmigration streams all have a male surplus, except the stream towards Guatemala and this stream has such a weight that its total outmigration is also female dominated. Region Altiplano as destination resembles region Oriental somewhat, but the number of immigration streams with a female surplus is now the same as the one with a male surplus although its total immigration is female dominated. This is in contrast with the outmigration from this region: all streams have quite a male surplus, except the stream towards Guatemala, and its total outmigration also shows some male surplus. The rates for the various streams are very small in general; streams with a female surplus also have (somewhat) bigger impacts of females in the regions of destination and origin and vice versa.

Departmental migration.

As regions consist of several departments which do not always have the same characteristics for migration, it will be seen which departments within each region distinguish themselves with regard to male and female migration.

In the regions with the biggest absolute numbers of immigration, Central and Norte, departments Escuintla and El Petén clearly attract most of the immigrants of both sexes after region (= department) Guatemala; these three departments together account for 56% and 54% of resp. all male and female immigrants in the country. Department Guatemala alone receives a

considerable share, which is much higher for females than for males: resp. 37% and 30% of resp. all female and male immigrants in the country (the sex ratio is approximately 80). Departments Escuintla and to a lesser extent El Petén, on the other hand, receive more males than females (sex ratios resp. about 135 and 115). Escuintla is an exception in region Central with respect to the absolute number and sex composition of its immigrants because the other two departments attract more women than men but in much smaller numbers; Sacatepéquez resembles in this respect Guatemala with approximately the same sex ratio. In region Norte all departments have male dominated immigration, with sex ratios from 110 (Baja Verapaz) to 170 (Alta Verapaz, the highest ratio in the country) but the last two departments attract only small numbers in contrast with El Petén.

All departments in region Oriental receive small numbers of immigrants of both sexes; only Jutiapa has a male immigration surplus (about 110) whereas El Progreso and Jalapa have sex ratios comparable to that of Guatemala and Santa Rosa reaches almost a balance. With respect to absolute numbers the departments of region Altiplano resemble those of region Oriental; Quezaltenango has the highest number of immigrants of both sexes and in particular Sololá and Totonicapán receive almost no immigrants. As for the composition by sex the situation is more varied than in region Oriental: Totonicapán, Quezaltenango and Huehuetenango have a female immigration surplus, in particular the first two, with the sex ratio for Totonicapán being the lowest of all departments in the country (75)^{3/}. The other departments in this region have a male surplus of some kind; the highest ratio has El Quiché (almost 110).

Departments in region Costera attract equally a relatively big number of immigrants and both show a small male surplus. Department Izabal in region ranks fourth with respect to the absolute number of immigrants (both sexes) whereas the other departments in this region attract very small numbers only, resembling departments in regions Oriental and Altiplano. Regarding the composition by sex, Izabal and Zacapa have a male surplus (sex ratios resp. about 105 and 110), but Chiquimula has a very low sex ratio (80), comparable to the one of Guatemala.

Region Norte is the only region in which all departments have a male immigration surplus; the other regions show much variation in this respect.

Outmigration in absolute numbers is more equally divided over the departments than immigration for both sexes. Guatemala loses the highest number; Jutiapa in region Oriental ranks second and also Santa Rosa loses many persons, whereas the other departments in this region lose considerably less. In region Central Escuintla is not only the most attractive department but it loses also many persons, much more than the rest of the region. Quezaltenango in region Altiplano together with San Marcos are the biggest losers, whereas the other departments lose very few people (especially Sololá and Totonicapán), fewer than the other departments in the country. a characteristic which is also applicable to the departments of region Norte, especially El Petén. The departments in region Oriente all lose more than their neighbours in Norte; Izabal loses most and shows for both sexes

^{3/}However, because of the very small absolute numbers concerned the influence of differential omission is very high. This applies not only to Totonicapán but to many other departments as well, e.g. those in regions Oriental and Altiplano.

approximately the same characteristics as Escuintla for females and Retalhuleu (Costera) for both sexes, i.e. in- and outmigration are approximately equal. Suchitepéquez is the biggest loser in region Costera. The sex composition of departmental outmigration is more balanced for most departments than that of immigration, i.e. the values of the sex ratios deviate less from 100. Guatemala and all departments of regions Central Oriental and Costera have to some extent female dominated outmigration (values of the sex ratios between 90 and 100); only Escuintla, Jutiapa and both the Costera departments have male dominated immigration and female dominated outmigration, whereas the other departments of this group always have female dominated migration. Departments Quezaltenango and San Marcos are the only departments in region Altiplano with a female outmigration surplus, especially the latter (sex ratio of approximately 80, the lowest in the country); on the other hand, El Quiché shows a very big male surplus, having a sex ratio of approximately 140 (also the highest in the country). Sololá and Totonicapán also have comparatively high sex ratios. El Quiché and Sololá have the same sex structure of their migrants as region Norte, Huehuetenango and Totonicapán have a male surplus for their outmigrants but a female one for their immigrants and the opposite occurs in San Marcos, whereas Quezaltenango has the same characteristics as Guatemala. In region Norte the sex structure also differs between the departments: both Baja Verapaz and El Petén have a male surplus (rather high for the former) whereas Alta Verapaz has a sex ratio of 100; in- and outmigration for all departments are male dominated (or have a balance between the sexes). Departments of region Oriente all have sex ratios for outmigration close to 100; Chiquimula resembles the departments of region Oriental for the sex structure of its in- and outmigrants, Zacapa resembles the one for region Norte and Izabal the one for Escuintla (but with less extreme differences).

Net migration, finally, is positive for both sexes in Guatemala, El Petén, Escuintla and Sacatepéquez; the biggest difference between the sexes occurs in Escuintla where the female saldo is much smaller than the male saldo. Alta Verapaz and Izabal have a small positive saldo for males only. All other departments have negative saldos which are very small, however; only Jutiapa has a high (= very negative) saldo for both sexes.

Sex ratios for the non-migrant populations in the departments are very close to 100, except in Guatemala (about 90) and El Petén (about 110); considering the part above, the departments have (quite some) differences between the sex structures of their non-migrants, immigrants and outmigrants.

Migration rates.

Figures 5.1 and 5.2 show the rates. The impacts per department are approximately the same for each sex. The biggest differences exist in the case immigration in Guatemala and Sacatepéquez, having somewhat higher female than male immigration rates whereas the opposite occurs in Escuintla and Alta Verapaz. With respect to outmigration, departments Escuintla and Santa Rosa have slightly bigger rates for females than for males and the reverse holds in Quiché and Baja Verapaz.

The same departments as before, notably El Petén and Escuintla, have the highest immigration rates for both sexes and the same departments, especially those in regions Oriental and Oriente, have for both sexes high outmigration rates. The result is that departments of both regions forementioned have the highest(negative) net migration impacts, with the

exception of Izabal which shows a net rate of about zero for both sexes, a characteristic which it shares with departments Sololá and Alta Verapaz (for the latter only for females), although as a result of quite different impacts for in- and outmigration. Department Escuintla, which is one of the departments of attraction, shows the most striking difference between males and females, i.e. it only has a -comparatively- high impact for males. The departments of region Altiplano all have low net impacts, all as a result of low in- and outmigration impacts. The net migration rate of Quezaltenango does not show any difference with the other Altiplano departments, despite the location of the second biggest city in the country in this department and its function as regional centre⁴; its in- and outmigration rates, however, are somewhat bigger than those in the other Altiplano departments.

The indices of effectiveness differ in size (and sign) between departments in the same region. As before, El Petén and Guatemala receive most of their gross migration, whereas Escuintla has a much lower index, especially for females. Departments which lose most of their gross migration are Jutiapa (both sexes), Baja Verapaz (females) and Chiquimula (males). Departments which show a kind of balance between in- and outmigration for both sexes are Sololá, Retalhuleu and Izabal; a similar department for males only is Sacatepéquez and for females Escuintla and Alta Verapaz.

Migration streams.

As was the case in the foregoing chapters, most streams for both sexes are small: 28 streams out of 462 streams (=6.1%) account for 50% of the total migration (for each sex). 63% of 291 streams and 65% of 298 streams (resp. for males and females) have less than 100 persons. For both sexes the stream from Escuintla to Guatemala is the biggest one (and bigger for females than for males). Guatemala is the destination of the biggest stream from almost every department; exceptions are mainly departments in the north (-east) of the country: the biggest stream, for both sexes, from Alta Verapaz and Izabal have El Petén as destination and Izabal is the destination for the biggest stream, both sexes, from Chiquimula. Men have, moreover, two departments whose biggest stream does not have Guatemala as destination: streams from El Quiché and Baja Verapaz have as destination resp. Escuintla and Alta Verapaz, so that not only the absolute number of women arriving in Guatemala is bigger than that of men but the attraction of Guatemala for women of virtually each department is also bigger than for men.

Escuintla and El Petén are the next departments in rank as destinations; the difference with Guatemala is, besides the size of the streams, that the dispersion of their inmigrants, males and females, is not as big as the one for Guatemala (attracting the biggest or second biggest streams from each department). Escuintla gets most of its inmigrants from the departments at the Pacific coast and the Altiplano region (besides those from Guatemala) and El Petén attracts most of its inmigrants from the neighbouring departments in region Norte and Oriente; El Petén is also for Jutiapa and Jalapa an important department of destination, next to Guatemala and Escuintla.

⁴/See: SGCNPE/PNUD: "Estrategia de Desarrollo Regional de Guatemala (propuesta)"; Guatemala 1979.

With respect to both sexes, each department receives the majority of its inmigrants from and sends the majority of its outmigrants to a few departments only: with the exception of Guatemala and El Petén, about 70% of the inmigrants to each department come from five departments only and the same number of departments accounts for about 80% of the outmigrants from each department. Often only 3 departments account for already 50% of the in- and outmigrants to/from each department; it will be no surprise that in general Guatemala, Escuintla and/or El Petén belong to this group, after which the size of other streams - of which the biggest ones in general concern surrounding departments- drops very quickly. Guatemala -in particular- and El Petén show somewhat more dispersion in the origins of their inmigrants: resp. almost 50% and 60% come from only 5 departments. With respect to outmigration, Guatemala shows the same picture, whereas El Petén and this time Escuintla too have a higher concentration (around 70% of their outmigrants go to five departments only) but still lower than the other departments.

Migration by Sex and Ethnicity.

Some remarks will be made now concerning differences in migration volume and relative intensity between 4 categories, obtained by classification according to sex and ethnicity, and differences in the spatial distribution of each category.

The table below gives data about the proportion of each category in the total population and in the migrants population (each column adds up to 100%).

	Proportion in the population 5 years and over.	Proportion in the migrant population.
Indigenous males	20.9%	10.2%
Indigenous females	20.7%	8.9%
Non-Indigenous males	28.8%	39.3%
Non-Indigenous females	29.6%	41.6%

Participation of Indigenous in migration is much lower than that of Non-Indigenous, especially of Indigenous women. Non-Indigenous women, on the other hand, participate most and more than Non-Indigenous men; both Non-Indigenous categories participate considerably more than according to their shares in the total population.

The numbers of males and females in each ethnical group within each department are in general equal. Departments which deviate from this pattern show often also corresponding differences with regard to the composition of their inmigrants. Most departments show some male dominated immigration; departments in which the sex differences are rather high are the departments forementioned; those with male dominated immigration in both ethnical groups are El Petén, Izabal and Zacapa, and Escuintla. Male Indigenous also migrate more to departments in region Oriental than female Indigenous, whereas the opposite occurs for Non-Indigenous. Migration to Guatemala, Sololá and Totonicapán is female dominated in both ethnical groups.

The sex ratios for outmigration differ from those for immigration in that the first occur in more equal proportions between the sexes per department. The selectivity by sex is bigger again for Indigenous than for Non-Indigenous. Most departments have a male Indigenous outmigration surplus; only departments in the zone San Marcos-Sacatepéquez have a female surplus in this group. The situation is reversed with respect to Non-Indigenous: now only departments Totonicapán, Sololá and those in the north(-west) -El Quiché, Baja Verapaz and El Petén- have a male surplus. So, both ethnical groups not only differ in selectivity by sex in the total migration, but also with respect to the separate departments, especially with respect to outmigration. The big attraction of Guatemala for both female groups is clear and so is the role of Escuintla and the northern departments with respect to males.

Rates.

Tables 5.5-5.8 show, amongst others, the migration rates for the four categories per department (arranged by region).

The impacts of Non-Indigenous migrants per department (both sexes) are in general bigger than those for Indigenous. Differences between Indigenous males and females are small and smaller than between Non-Indigenous. With respect to immigration the departments El Progreso, Santa Rosa and in particular Escuintla show very high rates which are, however, exceptions^{5/}. Escuintla experiences especially a high impact of Indigenous males. Departments in region Altiplano have the smallest immigration impacts for Indigenous (both sexes). However, Indigenous women have the highest rates in department Guatemala, even higher than Non-Indigenous women. The rates for both Non-Indigenous categories are also approximately the same per department, with the exception of Alta Verapaz which has much higher male than female impacts.

Outmigration rates per department are also bigger for the Non-Indigenous, except for El Progreso, Santa Rosa and Zacapa, the same departments as for immigration. Rates for both Non-Indigenous categories are high in all departments in regions Oriental and Oriente; this is not the case for Indigenous, except in two departments.

Net migration rates, finally, are also higher for both Non-Indigenous categories than those for the Indigenous ones. Actually one department only has high positive impacts for all four categories: El Petén. Guatemala ranks much lower (and about equal for all categories) and Escuintla ranks only high for Indigenous; the opposite is true for Alta Verapaz. In the last two departments mentioned males in particular reach high rates. Departments in the other regions show in general very small negative impacts for both Indigenous categories with very small differences between the sexes. Departments with very high rates and deviating from the general pattern are Escuintla (Central), El Petén (Norte), El Progreso (Oriental) and Zacapa (Oriente); only the first and the last departments of this group show some differences between males and females.

Both Non-Indigenous categories have especially low impacts in region Central. The remaining departments have higher rates, with only departments

^{5/}As has been mentioned in chapter 4, the numbers concerned in these departments -except Escuintla- are very small and even smaller now that 4 categories are used instead of 2, so that possible errors will have an even bigger influence now in the magnitude of the rates.

in region Norte, except in Baja Verapaz, and, of course in Guatemala having positive rates for one or both sexes. In region Altiplano department Totonicapán is an exception (for males) in a region in which the departments have in general low impacts (the absolute numbers concerned are very small, however).

Summarizing, the impacts of Non-Indigenous male and female migration in the regions and departments of origin and destination are in general higher than those of Indigenous male and female migration, except in departments Escuintla, El Progreso, Zacapa and Santa Rosa. Differences between the sexes are often very small in each ethnical group.

Streams.

In order to discover possible differences between the four categories with respect to preferences for departments and the composition of the streams by sex-ethnicity, we have used table 3.5 belonging to chapter 3 (see annex II) as source. This table shows for each department, amongst others, the five biggest in- and outmigration streams for migration without differentiation by any characteristic.

Out of the 220 streams thus shown only 31 have an Indigenous majority. Almost half of them (14) concern streams towards (at times from) departments with a Non-Indigenous majority, in particular department Escuintla, followed by Guatemala and the Costera departments.

Streams towards Guatemala -from the departments of region Altiplano- are in general dominated by Non-Indigenous, although the Indigenous constitute more than 50% of the population in the departments of this region. Only streams from Sololá and Totonicapán to Guatemala have an Indigenous majority as well as the counterstream^{6/} to Totonicapán. Indigenous streams to Guatemala are all female dominated -as for Non-Indigenous- except the one from Baja Verapaz, but Indigenous outmigration streams from Guatemala are in general male dominated, in contrast with the Non-Indigenous.

Streams to Escuintla are often male dominated, but more so for Indigenous than Non-Indigenous. Streams from surrounding departments towards Escuintla are in general less male dominated than streams from more distant departments, in particular for Non-Indigenous. Streams between Guatemala and Escuintla are male dominated for Indigenous, but not so for Non-Indigenous. Streams towards El Petén are male dominated, but less for Non-Indigenous than Indigenous (the situation is reversed, however, for migration from departments in region Oriente towards El Petén). Indigenous streams from El Petén are in general male dominated too, even those to Guatemala; for Non-Indigenous the stream to Guatemala is -as usual- female dominated, but the overall-picture shows male domination as well.

Departments in other regions have in general female dominated outmigration streams for Non-Indigenous, whereas the Indigenous have more male dominated outmigration streams. The situation for the departments in region Altiplano is more confused: the female dominated outmigration streams from half of the departments in this region are mostly caused by female dominated

^{6/}An immigration stream to an area, coming from another area, often has a "counterpart", i.e. an outmigration stream from that area to that other area. For the area concerned, the biggest of the two is called "stream" and the smaller one "counterstream" or "reverse stream".

outmigration to Guatemala and Quezaltenango, but those to other departments are often male dominated.

The situation for immigration does not show such a homogenous pattern as outmigration. Immigration streams to departments in regions Norte and Costera and to department Izabal - together with Escuintla regions in which the departments with the most modern agricultural production structure are located- are in general male dominated for both ethnical groups. The same is true for departments in region Oriental for Indigenous, but not for Non-Indigenous. The latter have also female dominated immigration streams to most departments in regions Central (mixed results for Indigenous) and Oriente (also for Indigenous). Both ethnical groups have in general also female dominated immigration streams for departments in region Altiplano, except for Sololá and Quezaltenango for Indigenous and for San Marcos for Non-Indigenous.

Conclusion.

Both sexes are about equally represented in migration in absolute numbers. However, spatially some differences exist: the net result of migration is that in all regions -except in Guatemala and Altiplano- the number of males increases, mainly as a result of bigger female than male outmigration - which is mainly directed at Guatemala- whereas immigration often is male dominated but with much smaller differences between the sexes.

The relative intensities show the same pattern: the biggest differences in net migration rates are shown in region Central, in which department Escuintla clearly attracts more males than females. In all other regions and departments the differences are much smaller.

Relative intensities per department between the sexes in each ethnical category do not differ much; it seems that selectivity is greater between the ethnical groups than between the sexes. Both Indigenous sexes reach lower impacts in virtually all departments than their Non-Indigenous colleagues; main exceptions are departments Escuintla El Progreso, Santa Rosa and Zacapa.

All four categories have positive net migration impacts in the three usual departments, but they are clearly much lower in Escuintla for both Non-Indigenous categories. In particular Non-Indigenous males show high impacts in department Alta Verapaz; Izabal has low positive impacts only for both Indigenous categories.

In absolute numbers, department Guatemala clearly attracts more women than men from both ethnical groups, but the differences are much smaller when considering the rates. The modern agricultural departments attract more men than women; in the development area El Petén -one of the main areas of attraction- the differences between the sexes in each ethnical group are very small only; this may be caused by bigger migration of couples than with respect to other departments.

Chapter 6.

Internal Migration by Age.

Selectivity of migration by age group and differences in the spatial distribution of the age groups will be the subject of this chapter. First, the migrants will be differentiated only by sex whereafter differentiation by ethnicity and by sex will follow. The geographical levels used are regions and departments. Data and figures may be found, as usual, in the annexes.

A remark with respect to ages: the ages (age groups) used here are the ages at the time of enumeration; the actual ages at the time of migration will have been 2.5 years less on the average, assuming that migration occurred equally distributed during the period.

Interregional migration.

Tables 6.1-6.8 show the basic data by age group for each region.

Figures 6.1-6.2 show the age selectivity of interregional migrants: the three youngest age groups always are highly represented in in- and outmigration, much higher than the older age groups^{1/}; in particular in Guatemala the share of age group 15-24 is striking (50.1% of all the immigrants in Guatemala falls in this age group)^{2/}.

As for outmigration, age group 15-24 clearly dominates in all regions except Guatemala and much more so than in the case of immigration.

The high immigration shares of age group 5-14 in most of the regions may be an indication that immigration occurs often in the form of family migration whereas outmigration from most of the regions seems to occur more in the form of single persons (assuming that most of the persons in age group 15-24 are not married yet). Region Altiplano has a relatively low percentage of outmigrants in the age group 5-14, maybe because the outmigration to culturally different regions is still a recent phenomenon for this region so that it still has some kind of pioneer-nature in which the young and single persons go first.

The low proportion of outmigrants from Guatemala in age group 15-24 (as contrasted with its immigration) may be caused by the fact that many of its young immigrants stay for quite some time and/or the fact that persons first finish schooling and acquire some work-experience before leaving.

The share of the older age groups is low for all regions and about equal.

Intraregional migrants (figure 6.3) show the same age selectivity as the interregional migrants with this time a particularly high concentration in age group 15-24 in region Oriental; together with its high concentration in this age group for its interregional outmigrants it seems that in the departments of this region, which have absolutely and relatively the highest

^{1/}In order to avoid confusion because of too many lines the shares for the two oldest age groups are not shown in the figures; however, they are lower than the shares for age group 45-54.

^{2/}The figures concern the relative age distribution of migrants within each region, calculated row-wise from tables 6.5-6.8.

number of outmigrants in the country, especially many young adults are "on the move".

Comparisons in age structure between migrants and non-migrants.

In order to compare differences in age structure between interregional migrants, intraregional migrants and non-migrants, proportions have been calculated for each region and age group^{3/} (figures 6.4-6.8; for Guatemala region this comparison was not possible as usual because the data do not permit to calculate intraregional migrants for this region).

Proportions of age groups 15-24 and 25-34 for all three migrant groups are higher than those for the non-migrant group; the older ages and the youngest one are in all cases underrepresented. This shows that migration is an age selective and differential process with respect to non-migrants. Interregional inmigrants in age group 25-34 are relatively higher represented than those in age group 15-24; for the interregional outmigrants the picture is reversed (in region Guatemala the situation is reversed). Interregional outmigrants in age group 15-24 from region Altiplano are higher represented in the total outmigration from this region than in other regions with respect to non-migrants.

Comparing the selectivity per age group of interregional and intraregional migrants (figures 6.7 and 6.8)^{4/} it appears that the differences are much smaller than in the comparison with the non-migrants (as might be expected). Proportionally, age group 15-24 is higher represented in intraregional migration than in interregional immigration, whereas the opposite applies to age groups 25-34 and 35-44. On the other hand, age group 15-24 is higher represented in interregional outmigration than in intraregional migration and the other age groups relatively underrepresented. This means that the three "types" of migrations, although all selective by age for the same age groups, have a somewhat different behaviour with respect to the selectivity by age: the younger age groups are relatively somewhat higher represented in migration within their regions than in immigration towards their regions, probably because of their low attraction for the young adults, whereas the situation is reversed with respect to outmigration from the regions (often directed towards region Guatemala).

In order to get an impression of the ages of migrants per region the median ages have been calculated^{5/}; the ages are in general between 21 and 22.5 years

The median ages are 1) somewhat higher for interregional migrants than for intraregional migrants (except in region Norte) and

^{3/}Figures obtained by dividing each migrant age group by the corresponding non-migrant age group, both terms expressed as percentage of the resp. totals within each region.

^{4/}see footnote 3, but now with the percentages of interregional inmigrants, resp. outmigrants, per region divided by the percentages of intraregional migrants (for the same age group and in the same region).

^{5/}Median age: age which 50% of a population has not reached yet.

2) somewhat higher for interregional immigrants than for interregional outmigrants (except, as expected, in region Guatemala with resp. median ages of 21.5 and almost 23.5 years).

The first means that people move at younger ages within most regions than between different regions: the distance may play a role here as well as differences in cultural and economical circumstances between regions.

The second means that the regions, with the exception of Guatemala, receive older persons than they lose, being not so attractive for young persons as e.g. Guatemala; with respect to region Norte which certainly does not possess the attraction of a big city the immigration probably occurs in the form of family immigration.

Rates.

Figures 6.9-6.11 show the rates for immigration, outmigration and net migration. Immigrants have the highest impacts in age group 25-34 in all regions, except Guatemala which experiences a very high impact in age group 15-24; however, the differences between the rates for age groups 15-24 and 25-34 are small. Impacts in regions Oriental and Altiplano are especially low for age group 25-34.

Outmigrants show the highest (most negative) rates in age group 15-24. Rates for age group 25-34 are high as well, but the differences with those for age group 15-24 are bigger now than in the case of immigration. All other age groups show much lower rates. Region Altiplano still has the lowest impacts, but there is a difference when compared with immigration: rates for ages 15-34 are much bigger now, whereas those for the other age groups remain very small. In region Norte the impact of outmigration for ages 15-34 reaches approximately the same values as those of immigration, but remains much lower for other age groups. Region Guatemala has the smallest rates for age group 15-24 and is the only region where this rate is smaller than for age group 25-34.

Three regions show net migration rates which are positive for all age groups; however, regions Central and Norte show the lowest rates for ages 15-34 in contrast with region Guatemala which experiences a high impact for age group 15-24 in particular. The remaining four regions have negative impacts for all age groups, but close to zero for all age groups except 15-24 (and in regions Oriental and Oriente also age group 25-34).

The indices of effectiveness, finally, show that age group 15-24 generally has the highest value except, for regions Central and Norte. The former region shows very little effectiveness for this age group as for all the age groups; the nearness of region Guatemala may play a role here, attracting especially persons in this age group. Region Norte, the agricultural frontier, is able to keep the young adults only to a limited extent too, as compared to the other age groups for which its effectiveness is rather high. Regions Oriental, Oriente and Altiplano show quite high negative values, especially Oriental. Region Altiplano, although it has low values of migration in absolute terms, loses quite heavily too, because most of its gross migration is directed outwardly. Region Guatemala shows again the effects of "delayed" outmigration, i.e. the indices for age groups 25-34 and especially 35-44 are much lower than the other ones. This is also caused by smaller immigration but outmigration in this age groups is bigger too.

Departmental immigration by age.

Tables 6.9-6.16 in the annex show the basic data.

The numbers concerned are often rather small because of the many cells which are used, a number which will increase when the characteristics sex, ethnicity and a combination thereof will be used. Accordingly, possible errors may exert a big influence, bigger than in the foregoing chapters.

Selectivity of immigrants by Age.

The same concentration of immigrants occurs in the three youngest age groups -and especially in age group 15-24- as in the foregoing part, for all departments. In some departments the difference between the share of the 15-24 agegroup and the next highest is quite big, in particular in Guatemala and in some departments of region Altiplano, Sololá, Totonicapán and Quezaltenango.

Department Guatemala has almost half of its immigrants in age group 15-24, as expected as it is the metropolitan area; the relatively high attraction of young people in Quezaltenango might partially have the same origin as the city of Quezaltenango is the second important urban centre in Guatemala (although of much smaller significance than Guatemala City); why the other departments mentioned show such relatively high differences is not clear.

The remainder of the departments has values of about 30% for age group 15-24; this still is somewhat higher than the share of this age group in the total population of each department, indicating the selectivity of migration for this age group.

Starting with age group 15-24 the shares decrease considerably with age although there is also a big difference between the proportions of age group 25-34 and the older ages. As the age increases the proportions tend to become more equal for all departments.

Age-selectivity of immigrants differentiated by ethnicity.

Both ethnical groups show a concentration of immigrants in age group 15-24, with again for some departments a somewhat higher concentration in age group 5-14, and declining shares^{1/} as age increases. The shares of each age group are in general the same as those shown in figure 6.12 for both ethnical groups.

Indigenous have in many departments a somewhat higher concentration of immigrants in age group 15-24 than the Non-Indigenous; this is especially clear in Guatemala (48 and 57% of resp. all Non-Indigenous and Indigenous immigrants belong to age group 15-24) and Jutiapa (resp. 35 and 50%). The other departments in regions Oriental and Oriente, on the other hand, show higher shares for Non-Indigenous immigrants in this age group.

Non-Indigenous show higher shares for age group 25-34, in general; combined with the abovementioned it appears that Non-Indigenous migrate at a somewhat older age than the Indigenous.

Quite some differences exist sometimes between departments of the same region, for both ethnical groups but in particular for Indigenous with respect to the shares of especially age groups 5-14 and 15-24 in the total

^{1/}Shares for each department calculated as the percentage of immigrants in each age group in the total number of immigrants in the same department.

number of immigrants. This occurs in general in departments where the number of immigrants is very small, so that the influence of chance factors may be involved.

Age-selectivity of immigrants differentiated by sex.

Age group 15-24 shows again a concentration of immigrants in age group 15-24 in all departments for both sexes. However, women tend to migrate more in age group 15-24 than men, with the exception of Jutiapa and Zacapa; for both sexes but especially so for women the attraction of Guatemala for this age group is clear. Shares decline as age increases as of age group 15-24.

In many departments the share of age group 5-14 is higher for men than the corresponding share for women and this also is true for the other age groups. This may mean that boys of -say- 12-15 migrate more unaccompanied to departments where it is expected to find work not suitable for women in this age group than girls (e.g. in agriculture); the reverse may hold in the case of the department of Guatemala with relatively much more domestic jobs. Shares for 25-34 years old immigrants are in virtually all departments somewhat higher for males than for females, especially in departments Alta and Baja Verapaz. Male immigrants in age group 35-44 are also higher represented in all departments than female immigrants. Differences between the sexes for older age groups are negligible.

Age-selectivity of immigrants differentiated by sex and ethnicity.

In general, the shares of the age groups fluctuate more over the departments for both Indigenous sexes than for both Non-Indigenous sexes.

Shares of age group 15-24 are higher for both Indigenous sexes than for the Non-Indigenous; the shares for females are higher than for males in both ethnical groups. On the other hand, shares for age groups 25-34, 35-44 and 45-54 are in general somewhat higher for males than female in both ethnical groups.

Department Guatemala has much higher shares of its 15-24 years old immigrants than all other departments, for all four categories. Non-Indigenous males have the lowest share for this age group (approximately 44%); Indigenous, both sexes, in this age group have higher shares than Non-Indigenous (resp. approximately 55% and 59% for Indigenous males and females) and females of both ethnical groups have always higher shares than males. Department Jutiapa is an exception to the above because the share of its 15-24 years old male Indigenous immigrants is even higher than the one in Guatemala (59%); the forementioned high share of this age group for Indigenous is only due to Indigenous males. To a smaller degree, also Solola and Escuintla (the last one with a much higher absolute number of immigrants than the first two ones) show high shares of this age group for male Indigenous immigrants. Indigenous female immigrants in this age group show high shares in departments Totonicapán and Sacatepéquez.

Non-Indigenous male immigrants in agegroup 15-24 are relatively highly represented in Quezaltenango and Zacapa and females in Quezaltenango (even higher than males, resp. approximately 41% and 31%), Totonicapán and Jalapa. Only 15-24 years old Non-Indigenous immigrants are higher represented in the total number of immigrants in Quezaltenango than in other departments -except Guatemala-; this special attraction does not exist for Indigenous males and females.

Median Ages.

The median age of immigrants for both ethnical groups for the total country is the same: 21.7 years.

In most of the departments Indigenous often have somewhat lower median ages than Non-Indigenous. In particular in Sololá and Totonicapán the differences between Indigenous and Non-Indigenous are big (and to a lesser extent for Escuintla, Santa Rosa, Baja and Alta Verapaz).

The departments in region Oriental have the lowest median ages (both ethnical groups) except Santa Rosa, where especially the Indigenous have a high median age; Izabal is to a smaller extent an exception in region Oriente and Escuintla in region Central (only for Indigenous). In region Altiplano Guezaltenango has a relatively high median age, but only for Indigenous whereas the reverse is true for Non-Indigenous. El Petén has the lowest median age (both ethnical groups) in region Norte.

Department Guatemala has a rather low median age for both ethnical groups as well, which is about the same age as for the total country; this is not surprising considering the weight of this department in the migration in the country.

It should be noted, however, that in most of the departments with a high median age of the immigrants the number of persons involved is very small, e.g. in Santa Rosa and Baja Verapaz for Indigenous and in Sololá and Baja Verapaz for the Non-Indigenous. As has been said earlier, possible errors will have big consequences in these cases.

This remark is equally applicable to the analysis with differentiation by sex, in the part below, and especially when the immigrants are differentiated by ethnicity and sex.

Considering differentiation by sex, all departments have a higher median age for male than for female immigrants, as could already have been concluded from the data in the foregoing part. For the total country the median ages are 22.4 and 21.1 years for men and women respectively.

Differences per department between the sexes are more marked than in the case of differentiation by ethnicity. Especially departments Baja and Alta Verapaz show big differences (Baja Verapaz has a median age for males of 26.1 years), but also Escuintla, Santa Rosa, the Costera departments and Izabal show sizeable differences. All these departments have agriculture as their main economic base, of the modern, export-oriented type; these economic activities do not suit the picture of attracting many young female-migrants, so it might be that many of these women accompany their husbands and are, on the average, somewhat younger than their spouses.

Regions Oriental, again with the exception of Santa Rosa, and Oriente, again except Izabal, show the lowest median ages for both sexes joined by departments El Petén and Quiché.

Department Guatemala has a median age for females equal to that of the total country, whereas for males it is somewhat less, reflecting the somewhat bigger weight of this department for female than for male immigrants.

Median ages of (in)migrants in the total country, differentiated by sex and ethnicity are as follows:

Indigenous		Non-Indigenous	
males	females	males	females

22.5 yrs. 21.0 yrs. 22.4 yrs. 21.1 yrs.

Males of both ethnical groups migrate at a somewhat later age than the females whereas within each ethnical group there are no differences between the sexes.

This is in general is true also in the departments separately. Only with respect to Jutiapa and Izabal are the median ages for Indigenous males somewhat lower than for the respective females; Indigenous male immigrants in Sololá and Totonicapán are somewhat younger than Non-Indigenous females. In all cases, however, it concerns small absolute numbers.

Median ages for both male groups, but in particular for Indigenous male immigrants, in Escuintla and Santa Rosa are high as compared to those in other departments and to both female groups. Indigenous male immigrants further have high median ages (about 24.5 years) in Quezaltenango and Alta Verapaz (as opposed to Indigenous females). Non-Indigenous male immigrants show the highest ages (25.5 years and more) in departments Baja and Alta Verapaz and Sololá; in the last department Non-Indigenous women also have the highest ages but, as in all cases, much lower than for the respective men. Immigrants of both male categories thus have high - and in general higher than in the other departments- median ages in departments Escuintla, Santa Rosa and one or more departments in region Norte (always with the exception of El Petén); median ages for both female immigrant categories in these departments are much lower and do not deviate (much) from the average median age. Departments in region Oriente and in Jalapa and Jutiapa (region Oriental) have lower median ages than the other departments for their immigrants, in all four categories

Of the departments with the biggest number of immigrants -Guatemala, El Petén, Escuintla and Izabal- the first two show the smallest differences between the median ages for the four categories; in the last two departments the differences are greater and caused by the males (who have the highest median ages).

Immigration Rates.

Tables 6.11-6.13 show the rates.

The majority of the departments has only small impacts, especially for ages 35 and over. Impacts for age group 25-34 are slightly higher than for age group 15-24, in spite of the higher shares for the latter; exceptions occur in departments in the east of the country and, clearly, in Guatemala. Impacts for age group 5-14 are very low, although the shares of this age group often were as high as for age group 15-24.

The only department showing a high impact for all age groups is El Petén, due to its high absolute number of immigrants and low average population during the period. Next follow Escuintla and Izabal, in particular for age groups 15-24 and 25-34; Guatemala shows a high impact only for age group 15-24 and the Costera departments occupy an intermediate position but only for age groups 15-24 and 25-34.

Departments of region Altiplano show low impacts; in this region the department of Quezaltenango scores highest. Almost equally low impacts are shown in the departments of regions Oriental and Oriente, with the exception of Izabal.

Inmigration rates by ethnicity (figures 6.12 and 6.13).

In most of the departments inmigration of Non-Indigenous is also relatively higher than that of Indigenous, for all age groups. In both cases age groups 15-24 and 25-34 have again the highest impacts but the difference with the other age groups is bigger for Non-Indigenous than for Indigenous and the former also show bigger differences between the impacts of age groups 15-24 and 25-34. For both ethnical groups the impact of the 5-14 years old is smaller than their share in the total inmigration per department would indicate.

Indigenous inmigration has its highest impact in departments Escuintla and El Petén (also in El Progreso and Santa Rosa, but here it concerns very small absolute numbers only).

Departments in regions Altiplano, Oriental and in department Chiquimula have very small inmigration rates for Indigenous.

The Non-Indigenous show a more fluctuating pattern over the departments, age group 25-34 having a bigger impact than age group 15-24, in contrast with the Indigenous.

Rates in El Petén are high for both ethnical groups and for all age groups but higher for Non-Indigenous; the reverse holds for Escuintla.

In Alta Verapaz, and the departments of regions Costera and Altiplano the rates for Non-Indigenous are higher than for Indigenous for all age groups.

In Guatemala, finally, Indigenous have the highest impact as far as age groups 15-24 and 25-34 are concerned; for the other age groups the impacts are the same.

Inmigration rates by sex (figures 6.14 and 6.15).

The rates show small differences between the sexes over the departments and age groups.

For males the impact of age group 25-34 is somewhat bigger than the impact of the 15-24 age group; for females the impacts of these age groups is about the same or slightly higher for the 15-24 age group.

Department Guatemala shows the biggest differences between the impacts of age group 15-24 and the other ones, especially for females.

El Petén and Escuintla show even higher impacts for both sexes and for all age groups than Guatemala, especially El Petén; Escuintla experiences much higher impacts of males than of females, probably because of its agricultural character and the nearness of Guatemala, which may attract many females. El Petén has high impacts for all ages; this is primarily due to the small average population and the relatively - and for Guatemala country also absolutely - high number of inmigrants in all age groups.

Izabal shows remarkably constant rates for all age groups and both sexes (and at the same time relatively high ones); in all other departments age groups 15-24 and 25-34 show by far the highest impacts whereafter they rapidly get smaller.

Inmigration rates by sex and ethnicity.

Age groups 15-24 and 25-34 show the highest impacts for the sexes in both ethnical groups with both male groups having in general higher impacts for age group 25-34 than for age group 15-24, whereas the females show smaller differences between both (and often in the advantage of age group 15-24).

Age group 5-14 shows higher impacts than those of ages 35 and older for females, in particular the Non-Indigenous, but not so for males. This confirms the earlier findings that women migrate at younger ages and in bigger numbers than men.

Indigenous immigration seems to concentrate upon a few departments in contrast with the Non-Indigenous. All four groups have high impacts upon departments El Petén and Escuintla. Guatemala has high rates for age group 15-24 only, especially for females.

Departmental outmigration by age.

The same sequence as in the foregoing section has been used, i.e. first the selectivity of outmigrants by age will be treated, followed by a part about the median ages and outmigration rates.

Tables 6.9-6.10 and 6.12 and 6.15 give the basic figures.

Selectivity of outmigrants by age.

The three youngest age groups and especially of age group 15-24 play the same dominant role as for immigrants. The share of age group 15-24 outranks the shares of the other age groups; departments with positive net migration and/or a sizeable immigration show relatively low shares for this age group (departments Guatemala, El Petén, Alta Verapaz, Izabal and Escuintla; Sacatepéquez is lacking in this group).

With increasing age the shares decrease progressively; the exception again is agegroup 5-14 which shares rank second.

Shares of the 15-24 age group are higher for outmigrants than for immigrants, with the forementioned exceptions; moreover, differences between the share of age group 15-24 on one hand and of 5-14 and 25-34 on the other hand are bigger for outmigrants than for immigrants, stressing the domination of the 15-24 years old in especially outmigration in most of the departments.

Shares for 5-14 years old outmigrants are in general somewhat lower than for immigrants in the departments; the same is true for age group 25-34 with the exception of department Guatemala and the departments in the (north-) east.

The shares of the other age groups are about the same for in- and outmigrants.

The above may be explained by the fact that many of the 15-24 years old outmigrants, presumably travelling without family, have Guatemala as destination, thus diminishing the number of immigrants in this age group in other departments so that the shares of the immigrants in age groups 5-14 and 25-34 in these other departments can increase.

Some marked deviations from the general pictures are that in Guatemala age groups 5-14 and 25-34, as compared with age group 15-24, have high shares. Persons in the youngest age group probably consist of persons who outmigrate with their families whereas the dominance of age group 25-34 probably is caused by former immigrants who outmigrate at a later age and persons who outmigrate for the first time after having finished their education and/or after having worked some time. Compared to the shares in the other departments, age group 25-34 has the highest share in Guatemala.

In Escuintla, El Petén, Izabal and Alta Verapaz only age group 5-14 shows a share which is clearly higher than the corresponding ones in all other departments whereas the share for age group 25-34 is the same or only slightly higher than in the remaining departments which have a much higher share for the 15-24 age group. This may mean that older families with small children outmigrate or that older persons in age group 5-14 outmigrate by themselves, e.g. to Guatemala.

Very high percentages for age group 15-24 are reached in departments Sololá, Totonicapán and San Marcos, explaining the lower values for the shares of the remaining age groups as compared to those for the other departments.

Age-selectivity of outmigrants differentiated by ethnicity.

The roles of the various age groups of both ethnical groups are essentially the same as the ones forementioned.

Age group 15-24 dominates in both ethnical groups and the same three (or four, including Izabal) departments show comparatively low shares for this age group. Although the average share of this age group over all departments is about the same for both ethnical groups (about 40%), the variation between departments is higher for Indigenous than for Non-Indigenous (e.g. Sacatepéquez, Sololá and Totonicapán have high shares of about 50%).

With the exception of Jutiapa, the departments show in general high or low shares of this age group for both ethnical groups. This is much less the case with respect to immigration where the differences within each department are much bigger in this respect between Indigenous and Non-Indigenous.

The findings for the other age groups are the same for both ethnical groups, with shares for age group 5-14 and those older than 25 years much smaller and progressively declining with age. Jutiapa shows for both ethnical groups comparatively high in- and outmigration shares for age group 15-24 and differs in this respect from the neighbouring departments.

Age-selectivity of outmigrants differentiated by sex.

Shares of age group 15-24 are again the highest ones for both sexes but higher for females than for males. In general, departments with a high (or low) share for males also have a high (or low) one for females.

Shares for age group 5-14 are about the same for both sexes although the Altiplano departments deviate somewhat in this respect.

For the other age groups the shares for females are somewhat lower than those for males. Thus, it might be suspected that male outmigrants will have a somewhat higher age than the female outmigrants.

Once again the shares of the 15-24 years old are clearly lower in departments with a positive saldo and/or relatively high immigration, especially for males in Guatemala and El Petén. To a lesser extent this also is true for the Costera departments.

In department Guatemala the low share of age group 15-24 is striking in particular, especially for males. It seems that many persons stay a long time in this department before they move (again) or that they outmigrate for the first time at a relatively high age. The higher share for females in this case may mean that women outmigrate again after having arrived at a younger age than men (although the total duration may be the same for both sexes) and/or that women after having been married accompany their somewhat older husbands towards another destination.

It appears that relatively more young women than men outmigrate; only at older ages are the roles reversed (e.g. age group 35-44).

Age-selectivity of outmigrants differentiated by sex and ethnicity.

Non-Indigenous males have in most of the departments an equal or somewhat lower share of agegroup 5-14 than Indigenous males.

Indigenous have higher shares in regions Central (except Escuintla), Oriental and Oriente for age group 15-24. In region Altiplano the picture is not so uniform. Especially in the former regions the Indigenous form a

minority and the numbers involved in outmigration are often very small, so it is doubtful whether the findings are representative.

Male outmigrants from Sacatepéquez and San Marcos are relatively much older than females (both ethnical groups); the same holds for Sololá and Totonicapán, but only for Indigenous. Male and female Indigenous have high shares of age group 15-24 in Jutiapa, in contrast with immigration where only male Indigenous showed this characteristic. Shares of outmigrants in age group 15-24 in Quezaltenango are higher for females than for males; only Indigenous females have high shares in this department, whereas the other three categories have low shares, compared with the other Altiplano departments as well as with departments in other regions.

Shares for the other age groups do not differ much between the ethnical groups although some differences exist in departments separately, e.g. in Sacatepéquez, Escuintla, El Quiché and El Petén.

Females have higher shares for age group 15-24 than males and the opposite is true for age group 25-34; the shares for age group 5-14 are about the same for both male and female groups; this indicates that both female categories outmigrate at a younger age than males.

Indigenous females show greater variation in the shares per age group over the departments than the Non-Indigenous females and thus resemble the Indigenous males.

The earlier mentioned departments Guatemala, Escuintla, El Petén and Izabal have for each of the four categories relatively low shares for age group 15-24. Sacatepéquez has relatively low shares for this age group only for Non-Indigenous (and high ones for Indigenous) and in Alta Verapaz Non-Indigenous males are somewhat of an exception in this respect.

Also the Costera departments lose relatively few people in age group 15-24. Non-Indigenous females outmigrate relatively less than their Indigenous counterparts from Guatemala in age group 15-14 but the reverse is true for the other departments mentioned.

Non-Indigenous females and males have higher outmigration shares in age group 15-24 in the eastern departments than Indigenous females; their shares are more similar to the ones for Indigenous males in this respect. Indigenous females, on the other hand, outmigrate relatively more in age group 5-14 from these departments. Whether this means that they outmigrate more in the young adolescent ages or in the very young ages, accompanied by their families, is not clear. As has been said before, because of the small numbers involved for the Indigenous, the results and differences should be viewed with caution.

Departments with high shares of outmigrants in age group 15-24 are more or less the same within each ethnical group. For Non-Indigenous these are El Progreso, Sololá and Totonicapán. For the Indigenous the corresponding departments are Sacatepéquez, Chimaltenango, (again) Sololá and Totonicapán, and San Marcos with the last department losing especially relatively more females than males in this age group (also Non-Indigenous females).

Median Ages.

The median age for all (out)migrants in the country is, as shown earlier, 21.7 years. For outmigration without differentiation only Guatemala deviates somewhat (23.3 years). The department with the lowest median age is Izabal (20.8 years): this department has a relatively sizeable number of outmigrants but, at the same time, an almost equal number of immigrants who are, however, somewhat older when they arrive.

The other departments have median ages for their outmigrants which are close to the median age for (out)migrants with respect to the total country. The median ages for outmigrants by ethnicity (also 21.7 years for the total of each group) show that in most of the departments Indigenous and Non-Indigenous outmigrants have about the same age. The biggest differences between the ethnical groups exist in departments Sacatepéquez and Chimaltenango (Non-Indigeneous older than Indigeneous); the age of the Indigenous outmigrants is higher than that of the Non-Indigenous in departments Escuintla and El Quiche. For Escuintla the same reasoning may be applied as in the case of Guatemala, i.e. a number of inmigrants will outmigrate at a later date but will then be, of necessity, somewhat older (and Escuintla attracts many Indigenous inmigrants). Why El Quiche has such a relatively high median age for its Indigenous outmigrants is not clear, as many of the other departments in the Altiplano have much lower median ages.

Guatemala attracts the attention because of its high median age; reasons for this have been given earlier.

Median ages of outmigrants differentiated by sex are 22.4 and 21.1 years for respectively males and females in the total country, confirming the earlier results that females migrate at a somewhat younger age than males. This also holds for each department separately.

The biggest differences exist in the case of Guatemala (3 years) and El Petén (2.5 years): in both cases males outmigrate at a relatively high age and females at much younger ages, although in Guatemala their age also is higher than in all the other departments. Izabal shows the lowest median ages for both sexes. El Petén and Escuintla have low median ages for females too, but this is not the case for males; the greater availability of suitable work for the latter may be involved here.

The table below gives some data for the median ages of outmigrants classified by sex and ethnicity.

Category	median age	Range	Deptos concerned in range	
Non-Ind.males	22.4 yrs.	25.1 - 21.6 yrs.	Guat.	Izabal
Indig. males	22.5 yrs.	25.0 - 21.4 yrs.	Guat.	Toton.
Non-Ind.females	21.1 yrs.	22.4 - 20.2 yrs.	Sacat.	Izabal
Indig. females	21.0 yrs.	22.0 - 20.2 yrs.	Guat.	Izabal

Both male groups migrate at an older age than both female groups; this is true in all the departments too, except in Sacatepéquez where Non-Indigenous females outmigrate at a somewhat older age than Indigenous males.

The overall median age is the same for both male groups but in the departments separately some differences exist. Leaving Guatemala aside), median ages of Non-Indigenous males show less variation over the departments (between 21.5 and 23.0 years) than those of Indigenous males. The latter show relatively high median ages in departments Escuintla, El Quiche and El Petén (23.5 years and higher) and relatively low ones in Tonicapán, Jutiapa and Izabal (between 20.5 and 21.5 years). Guatemala has for both male groups the highest age: 25.0 years).

Non-Indigenous males have also the lowest median age in Izabal and it seems that the weight of especially Guatemala and El Petén have raised the overall

median age as most of the departments show lower values than the overall-one of 22.4 years.

Females have the same overall median age too, but in most of the departments Indigenous females have a slightly younger age than Non-Indigenous females. The biggest differences between both female groups exist in departments of region Central and in departments Sololá and Totonicapán.

The lowest median ages are reached -for both female groups- in Izabal, whereas the median ages for Sololá and Totonicapán also are very low for the Indigenous women and in Escuintla and El Petén for Non-Indigenous women. For all four categories the high median age for outmigrants from Guatemala attracts the attention, especially in the case of the males.

Possible reasons for this phenomenon have been given earlier in the text.

Outmigration Rates.

The rates for outmigrants without differentiation are shown in table 6.12.

The impact of outmigration upon the population of the departments is small for most of the age groups, as was the case with immigration, but is somewhat bigger than in the case of immigration.

Rates decline as from age group 15-24 with increasing age. The youngest age group -in spite of their big share in the migrant population- has very small impacts upon the corresponding age group, because the average population of this age group is big too.

Impacts of age group 15-24, followed by those of age group 25-34, are clearly higher than impacts of the other age groups in all departments but especially in the departments of regions Oriental and Oriente.

The lowest rates for all age groups are shown by the Altiplano departments.

A major department of immigration, Escuintla, shows quite high outmigration rates of about the same order as the Costera departments. So, departments with a relatively modern, export-oriented agricultural structure -Retalhuleu, Suchitepéquez, Escuintla, Santa Rosa and Izabal- not only have high to quite high immigration rates (except Santa Rosa) but also high to quite high outmigration rates.

El Petén, the new agricultural frontier, still has a low outmigration impact as well as Alta Verapaz. Guatemala, exerting a strong attraction and having a big population, also has low outmigration impacts for all age groups.

Outmigration rates by ethnicity.

Figures 6.16 and 6.17 show that Indigenous have lower rates for all ages and departments than Non-Indigenous except in El Progreso, Zacapa and Santa Rosa (as said before, the numbers concerned in these departments are very small; the same is true for Totonicapán, Sololá, El Quiché and Baja Verapaz for Non-Indigenous).

Department Guatemala shows for both ethnical groups low rates for all ages and so does El Petén, although the rate for age groups 15-24 and 25-34 deviates somewhat. Escuintla shows relatively high rates for Indigenous but not for Non-Indigenous. The low rate in Alta Verapaz (figure 6.23) is caused by Indigenous; Non-Indigenous show much higher impacts, especially for age groups 15-24 and 25-34.

The rates in the Altiplano departments are very low for Indigenous. Between rates for age groups 15-24 and 25-34 and those for the other age groups exists quite a difference, especially for Non-Indigenous. The latter seem to outmigrate mainly in the young adult ages; for Indigenous the differences

between the age groups are much smaller. The same can be said for most of the other departments.

Outmigration rates by sex (figures 6.18 and 6.19).

The rates for age groups 15-24 and 25-34 are again markedly higher than those for the other age groups. Females have clearly higher rates for age group 15-24 (except in Baja Verapaz) than males with relatively big differences between the rate for this age group and the one for age group 25-34; for males the differences between these age groups are small but in contrast with immigration rates the rates for outmigration are almost without exception higher for age group 15-24 than for age group 25-34.

The rate for age group 15-24 is markedly higher for females than for males in departments Santa Rosa, Escuintla and Jutiapa. The reverse is true in department Baja Verapaz.

Department Guatemala loses relatively few persons in all age groups for both sexes and so does Alta Verapaz. El Petén shows somewhat higher impacts, in particular in the young adult ages, but the impacts are still low; in Escuintla, on the other hand, the impacts of age groups 15-24 and 25-34 are much higher, especially for females.

Outmigration rates by sex and ethnicity.

Rates are in most of the departments higher for Non-Indigenous males and females than the rates in the corresponding age groups for the Indigenous.

Exceptions are departments El Progreso, Santa Rosa and Zacapa.

Departments with very high rates for Non-Indigenous males and females, in particular for age groups 15-24 and 25-34, are El Progreso (although lower than for Indigenous), Chimaltenango, Sololá, Totonicapán, El Quiché and Baja Verapaz. Most departments of regions Oriental and Oriente have somewhat lower rates in this age groups for males (both ethnical groups) than in other departments, but for females (both ethnical groups) such differences do not exist.

Males and females within each ethnical category have in general in the same departments high or low rates.

The highest rates occur in all four categories in age groups 15-24 and 25-34, but especially for the Non-Indigenous the differences between these age groups and the remaining ones is big. The females of both ethnical groups -and in particular the Non-Indigenous ones- show bigger differences between the rates for age groups 15-24 and 25-34 than the males. Non-Indigenous women have in general higher rates in age group 15-24 than the corresponding males (exceptions are Guatemala and Baja Verapaz), but the situation is reversed for Indigenous. Rates in age group 25-34 are always higher for males of both ethnical groups than for females.

For all four categories departments Guatemala and El Petén have the lowest rates in age groups 15-24 and 25-34 and also rank very low or lowest in the other age groups; the former, however, has low rates in spite of sizeable outmigration (in absolute numbers) because of big average populations in the age groups, whereas the latter has considerably smaller numbers of outmigrants.

Departments with an Indigenous majority show the lowest impacts (and also immigration impacts, as we have seen) for their Indigenous population component (Suchitepéquez, Baja Verapaz and El Quiché (for males) have relatively high rates in this respect), whereas the rates for Non-Indigenous

in these departments -and also in departments with a Non-Indigenous majority- often have higher outmigration rates than Indigenous.

Net migration and Indices of redistribution.

Net migration rates (tables 6.9-6.10, 6.13 and 6.16).

Age group 15-24 and to a lesser extent 25-34 cause the highest impacts; the impacts diminish as age progresses as from age 15-24 (with rates for age group 5-14 of the same order as those for age group 35-44 in general). Except Guatemala, all departments with a positive rate for age groups 15-24 and 25-34 show higher rates for the older age group, stressing the big attraction of Guatemala in age group 15-24 as contrasted to the other departments (this is especially clear in the case of Izabal).

Departments in regions Oriental and Oriente (except Izabal) appear to be the biggest losers for all age groups; in region Norte it is in particular El Petén which is the big winner. Regions Costera and Altiplano both show low rates, all negative (except Sololá) with the distinction that the saldos for the Costera are the result of much higher interaction than those of the Altiplano. In region Central, finally, Chimaltenango loses in general, whereas Sacatepéquez and especially Escuintla win in all age groups.

Net migration rates differentiated by age and ethnicity (figures 6.20 and 6.21).

Both ethnical groups have always the highest impacts in age groups 15-24 and 25-34. In departments with a positive saldo age group 24-35 has the highest impacts -except in Guatemala- and age group 15-24 in departments with a negative impact. Impacts for the other age groups are in general very low and equal.

Non-Indigenous have in most departments with a negative saldo much higher impacts of age group 15-24 than Indigenous and, moreover, the differences with the impacts of age group 25-34 are much bigger than for Indigenous (this is very clear in most departments in regions Oriental and Altiplano). Impacts of the other age groups, although low, are often higher for Non-Indigenous than Indigenous too.

Geographically, some differences between both groups are that the rates for Izabal are positive for Indigenous but often not for Non-Indigenous; Sololá has positive impacts of all Non-Indigenous age groups except 15-24 years and (slightly) negative ones for Indigenous. Alta Verapaz has reversed signs for both groups in all age groups. Guatemala has a higher positive impact of Indigenous in the young adult age groups, due to the small Indigenous population component in Guatemala. Escuintla has higher positive rates for Indigenous than for Non-Indigenous for all age groups, confirming the earlier findings of the attraction of this department for Indigenous. On the other hand, Non-Indigenous show much higher positive rates Alta Verapaz and El Petén. Departments in regions Oriental and Oriente have all negative impacts for all age groups; El Progreso and Zacapa lose relatively much more Indigenous whereas the situation for the other departments is reversed.

Region Altiplano shows higher net losses for Non-Indigenous and region Costera too, in particular Suchitepéquez.

Net migration rates differentiated by sex and age (figures 6.22 and 6.23).

Again, the age pattern is the same: age groups 15-24 and 25-34 have the highest impacts with somewhat higher impacts of age group 25-34 in departments with a positive saldo -again with the exception of Guatemala- and higher impacts of age group 15-24 in departments with a negative impact; in the latter, differences between impacts of age groups 15-24 and 25-34 are bigger for females than for males. In general, within a department the age groups show the same sign for the rates; exceptions occur in Sacatepéquez (for males), Sololá and Izabal (for both sexes). These departments all experience negative impacts of age group 15-24 and positive ones for all or some of the other age groups. Impacts for both sexes have the same sign in the same age groups and departments, with the exception of departments Sacatepéquez and Alta Verapaz, as may be seen. Guatemala shows higher impacts for females in the two youngest age groups than males, as a result of higher attraction for young females than for young males. Only in age group 25-34 males show a higher net rate than females. This pattern is reversed for -in particular- Escuintla, Alta Verapaz and El Petén (for the last one only in the younger age groups). Although net rates for the other departments have about the same values for both sexes, females often show somewhat higher negative rates in age group 15-24 than males, whereas the reverse is true for age group 25-34, indicating that women move earlier (and in bigger numbers) than men in age group 15-24 from these departments, but less in age group 25-34 (or return more than men in this age group to their departments of origin).

Net migration rates differentiated by ethnicity, sex and age.

Age group 15-24 have in general also the highest impacts (positive or negative), followed by those for the surrounding age groups for all four categories. However, this is especially the case for the females of both groups; the differences between male rates for age groups 15-24 and 25-34 are smaller.

As for the departments, Indigenous females show the highest net rates with respect to Guatemala in age group 15-24 and 25-34, followed by the Indigenous males; Non-Indigenous males have the lowest rates. Both male groups have much lower rates for age group 5-14 than the females.

Escuintla has for all age groups high net rates, especially for Indigenous males; Non-Indigenous women show the lowest values over all age groups with even a negative value for age group 15-24.

Alta Verapaz appears to be especially attractive for Non-Indigenous males, having for the younger and most numerous age groups about the same impacts as department El Petén; the impact of Non-Indigenous females is smaller but still rather high and positive over the age groups whereas both Indigenous groups show negative impacts over all age groups in Alta Verapaz. The impacts for El Petén are the highest in the country for all four categories over all age groups, but they are higher for Non-Indigenous than Indigenous.

Sacatepéquez has a positive rate of some size only for Non-Indigenous women in age group 15-24; the corresponding values for the men are negative.

Izabal shows higher impacts in the youngest and oldest ages for Indigenous women than for Indigenous men whereas for both Non-Indigenous groups most of the rates are negative, especially so for the women.

The Costera departments shows slightly negative impacts for Non-Indigenous with those for women more negative than for men and impacts in Suchitepéquez more negative than in Retalhuleu; Retalhuleu, on the other hand, has somewhat higher negative impacts for both Indigenous groups. In all cases age group 15-24 shows negative rates and also age group 25-34, except for Non-Indigenous males.

With respect to the Altiplano departments, all four categories show negative rates for most age groups in all departments; these are higher (more negative) for Non-Indigenous than Indigenous. Sololá is an exception in this respect for Non-Indigenous males.

Departments in the regions with the highest net losses, Oriental and Oriente, the rates for Non-Indigenous -especially for females- are often higher in each age group than for Indigenous. Exceptions are departments El Progreso where male Indigenous in particular show very high net migration rates for all age groups. As has been said, numbers of migrants and the average population per age group in these regions and departments are very small for the Indigenous and the same can be said of the Non-Indigenous in Sololá and Totonicapán, so that errors might have exerted a big influence.

What is clear from this part and the foregoing ones is that male and female Indigenous net migration has much smaller impacts than male and female Non-Indigenous net migration upon the average populations of the corresponding age groups in the departments, except in Guatemala and Escuintla. This is a result of bigger saldos for the Non-Indigenous, but also of a smaller disposition to migrate of the Indigenous, for both sexes and in all age groups, as may be seen from the small in- and outmigration streams for Indigenous, in particular those of the Altiplano.

Remarks about some streams.

Streams, differentiated by sex and age, to departments Guatemala, Sacatepéquez, Escuintla, Alta Verapaz, El Petén, Izabal and Quezaltenango have been chosen because these departments have relatively big inmigration streams and/or have a positive migration saldo; Quezaltenango has been included in an attempt to compare it with Guatemala because its contains the second biggest city in the country^{1/}.

The attraction of Guatemala for young females (5-14 and 15-24 years) shows itself in all streams towards Guatemala (sexratios of resp. 82.2 and 69.7). The female surplus in the streams of age group 5-14 is probably caused by the fact that relatively many of them migrate without their families (in which case a more equal number of males and female might have been expected) in the second half of this age group. The number of streams for age groups 25-34 and 35-44 with a female surplus is considerably smaller and the average sex ratios for these age groups are close to 100; thereafter female domination increases again. Streams from El Petén,

^{1/}If it may be accepted that most inmigrants in Guatemala go to the capital (which contains 88% of the total urban population and 58% of the total population in this department), the assumption is more dubious in the case of Quezaltenango, having percentages of resp. approximately 13 and 4. However, the city of Quezaltenango is an important regional centre, reason why the comparison has been made.

Izabal and Escuintla often have sex ratios bigger than 100 for age groups 25-34 and older.

Streams towards Sacatepéquez, Quezaltenango and Izabal resemble those towards Guatemala for age groups 15-24 and 65+; streams from the northern departments are often male dominated. In the other age groups at least half of the streams have some male surplus.

The remaining three departments differ from the pattern for Guatemala: most streams for age group 15-24 and higher are male dominated and for age group 5-14 the results are more or less in balance. Streams towards El Petén in age group 15-24, however, show a near balance between males and females; most of the streams with a female surplus have their origins in the eastern part of the country.

Indices of redistribution.

The figures in table 6.13 give an overall measure of the extent of the role of internal migration in the redistribution of the various population categories in the country.

Taking the values from column "Total" as dividers we see that values for age groups 15-24 and 25-34 for each category are above and values for the other age groups below the former values, with the indices for age group 15-24 equal or greater than the ones for age group 25-34 as could be suspected from the foregoing.

Non-Indigenous have indices above the country-values whereas the Indigenous have indices for each age group below these values; the difference between both ethnical groups is considerable for all age groups. As for differences between the sexes, females show greater mobility than males but only in age group 15-24 (and not for all departments).

Differentiation by sex and ethnicity shows that it are the Non-Indigenous females who clearly have the higher mobility in age group 15-24 whereas the Indigenous females have the lowest mobility in this and all other age groups.

Non-Indigenous males have the highest mobility in all age groups older than 15-24 and Indigenous males have a mobility lower than both Non-Indigenous groups but higher than the Indigenous females, also with respect to age group 15-24 (although not, e.g., for the department of Guatemala).

Conclusion.

Migration is age-selective, occurring to a high extent in the three youngest age groups and especially in age group 15-24. When compared to the age structure of the non-migrant populations in regions/departments of origin and destination, selectivity and differentials by age also occur: migrants are higher represented in age groups 15-24 and 25-34 than non-migrants.

Outmigrants from regions/departments are higher represented in age group 15-24 than inmigrants, a characteristic which is manifested also when considering the migration rates. An exception is Guatemala: being the capital, it attracts especially persons in age group 15-24 from all over the country, whereas its outmigrants are somewhat older (which is clear also in the median ages), probably because a number of them are return migrants who are, by necessity, somewhat older than inmigrants. As the other regions/departments, where agricultural activities dominate and with

worse living conditions, lack the attraction of the capital they receive fewer young migrants, automatically raising the proportions of the other age groups.

Most departments/regions have net migration which is positive or negative for all age groups; in areas where age groups have different signs, net migration (rates) for age group 15-24 is in general negative. This applies to classification of migrants by ethnicity as well as by sex.

Proportions of migrants in age group 15-24 are often higher for Indigenous than for Non-Indigenous, especially in (departments of) regions Altiplano, Norte and departments of the Pacific coast. The impacts of migration in the various departments/regions, however, are often higher for Non-Indigenous than for Indigenous in all age groups (except in department Escuintla).

Female migration occurs relatively more in age group 15-24 than male migration, in particular with respect to migration to and from Guatemala. Male immigration impacts in the areas are highest for age group 25-34, whereas those for females reach their highest values in age group 15-24. Again, Guatemala is an exception, having the highest impacts for both sexes in age group 15-24. Outmigration impacts for both sexes are highest in age group 15-24.

Chapter 7.

General conclusions.

Results (condensed in the conclusions at the end of each chapter) and the statements with the expected characteristics of internal migration in Guatemala will be compared here.

-Guatemala, Escuintla and El Petén attract the major part of the migrants, the first department because of its functions as capital and the only big city in the country, the second department because of its modern agricultural structure and some industry, and the last department because it receives special attention of the government for its development. Departments as Izabal, Suchitepéquez and Retalhuleu attract relatively big numbers of migrants too, especially Izabal, but they also lose the same numbers or more. These departments have an agricultural production structure similar to the one in Escuintla, but they obviously are not able to keep their people. A tentative conclusion for this may be a more modernized agricultural production structure which, although attracting some better trained persons, expells even more persons who do not possess the required labour qualities.

Quezaltenango, a department of which the capital is the second biggest city of the country and a regional centre, is not comparable with Guatemala with respect to attraction (or expulsion) of migrants. Although it shows -with El Quiché- a somewhat higher mobility than the other departments in region Altiplano, it actually has the same migration characteristics as these departments, i.e. very low small numbers of in- and outmigrants and very small relative intensities. Only with respect to differentiation by sex and age some similarities with Guatemala exist: female in- and outmigration of age groups 15-24 and 25-34 is bigger -absolutely and relatively- than for the corresponding males, as is the case for Guatemala.

-Females clearly have Guatemala as main destination and this applies to both ethnical groups. Males, on the other hand, tend to migrate more to the other departments mentioned above, although El Petén attracts an almost equal number of females, especially in the younger age groups; this may indicate that this department receives relatively more couples than the other two (this may be confirmed by the high proportion of children -age group 5-14- in the inmigrants to El Petén, a proportion which is higher than for the other two departments).

-Migration is selective by age and the highest numbers/proportions and relative intensities in each region/department belong to age groups 15-24 (in particular) and 25-34. Outmigrants have higher proportions and rates in age group 15-24 than inmigrants in all regions/departments, except in Guatemala.

Females migrate at a somewhat younger age than males, as shown by means of the median ages, especially with respect to migration towards Guatemala. At least part of the explanation for this may be sought in occupational and educational differences between female and male migrants and the spatial distribution of the jobs.

-Non-Indigenous migrate more than Indigenous, in absolute and relative terms, also when analyzed separately over the regions and departments. Migration of Indigenous is bigger for males than for females, in contrast with the Non-Indigenous. As social-economic conditions for many Indigenous are at least as bad as for Non-Indigenous, factors as norms, values and culture are probably as important as economic ones for Indigenous in the decision to migrate.