

# Migration and Development

April 2025

Bojos per l'Economia

Elisa Giannone

# Migration in Academia

Figure 2. Word cloud from the titles of 538 academic articles published in seven academic journals in 2015–2016



Note: Created using [www.wordclouds.com](http://www.wordclouds.com) and [www.wordle.net](http://www.wordle.net).

# Migration in Academia II

Number of academic publications on "immigration" or "emigration"

The figure below shows the search results of the query "immigration" or "emigration" in Scopus – the largest database of academic peer-reviewed literature. Journal articles constitute the largest share of publications, with a clear and constantly increasing trend peaking in 2015. The long-term trend suggests an increasing scholarly production on migration matters: is this just a reflection of the general expansion of academic literature production, or is migration research developing for specific reasons?



Source: [www.scopus.com](http://www.scopus.com).

**Note:** Querying the term "migration" alone returns figures that are more than 10 times higher. However, these include usage of the term "migration" in disciplines that are irrelevant to the current research, such as computer science (data migration), biology (cell migration), zoology (bird or fish migration) and many others. Using the Scopus advanced search, we excluded subject areas such as chemistry, physics, astronomy, neuroscience and so forth.

# What is Globalization?

What is globalization?

Globalization is a set of processes resulting in the growing breadth, intensity, speed and impact of worldwide interconnectedness as a result of:

- the stretching of social, political and economic activities across political frontiers, regions and continents;
- the intensification or increased magnitude of flows of trade, investment, finance, migration, culture and so on;
- the speeding up of global interactions and processes; and
- the deepening impacts of global interactions, such that the effects of distant events can become highly significant elsewhere, blurring the boundaries between domestic matters and global affairs.

*Source: Held et al., 1999.*


# Opportunities of Migration

## **Box 1: Opportunities of Migration – Four Key Areas**

- i) *Labour Demand and Supply* – fills gaps in demand for and supply of labour; efficiently allocates skilled and unskilled labour; cheap labour, disciplined and willingness to work.
- ii) *Remittances* – provides insurance against risks to households in the areas of origin; increases consumer expenditure and investment in health, education and assets formation.
- iii) *Return Migration* – brings knowledge, skills and innovation (these are known as social remittances).
- iv) *Skill Development* – migration is an informal process of skill development. It enhances knowledge and skills of migrants through exposure and interaction with the outside world. New skills are learnt from co-workers and friends at the place of destination.

Source: Bhagat 2014

# Migration Chain



# Today's Lecture

- Overall migration Patterns around the World and Time Trends
- Focus on:
  - US migration
    - Irregular Migration
    - Mexican-US migration
    - Crime Rates
  - India Migration Patterns
  - China Migration Patterns
- Question for you: What do you think about migrants? Tell me a bunch of facts!

# Migration Patterns

Table 1. International migrants, 1970–2015

Year	Number of migrants	Migrants as a % of world's population
1970	84,460,125	2.3%
1975	90,368,010	2.2%
1980	101,983,149	2.3%
1985	113,206,691	2.3%
1990	152,563,212	2.9%
1995	160,801,752	2.8%
2000	172,703,309	2.8%
2005	191,269,100	2.9%
2010	221,714,243	3.2%
2015	243,700,236	3.3%

Source: UN DESA, 2008 and 2015a.

Note: The number of entities (such as States, territories and administrative regions) for which data were made available in the 2015 UN DESA *Revision of International Migrant Stock* was 213. In 1970, the number of entities was 135.

---


26 Data are also provided to UN DESA by territories and administrative units. For a summary on UN DESA stock data sources, methodology and caveats, please see UN DESA, 2015b.

27 UN DESA, 1998.


28 UN DESA, 2008.



# Increase in International Migration




# How many people migrate per year?



# Who Migrate?


Figure 1. International migrants, by major region of residence, 2000 to 2015 (millions)



Source: UN DESA, 2015a. Datasets available from [www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/migration/data/estimates2/estimates15.shtml](http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/migration/data/estimates2/estimates15.shtml) (accessed 22 June 2017).

# Top Destinations

Figure 2. Top 20 destinations (left) and origins (right) of international migrants in 2015 (millions)



Source: UN DESA, 2015a. Datasets for the 2015 Revision available at [www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/migration/data/estimates2/estimates15.shtml](http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/migration/data/estimates2/estimates15.shtml).

# Irregular Migration

Table 2. Estimates of irregular migrant populations in selected countries and regions


Country/region	Year	Estimated population (stock)	Source
Australia	2011	58,400	(a)
European Union	2008	1.9–3.8 million	(b)
	2008	8 million	(c)
Germany	2014	180,000–520,000	(d)
Greece	2011	390,000	(e)
Israel	2015	150,000	(f)
Italy	2008	279,000–461,000	(b)
Russian Federation*	2011	5–6 million	(g)
South Africa	2010	3–6 million	(h)
Spain	2008	354,000	(i)
United Kingdom	2007	417,000–863,000	(j)
United States	2014	11.1 million	(k)
	2016	11.3 million	(k)

\* Estimate refers to irregular migrant workers.

Source: (a) ANAO, 2013; (b) Clandestino Research Project, 2009a; (c) Frontex, 2010; (d) Clandestino Research Project, 2015; (e) Clandestino Research Project, 2012; (f) Fleischman et al., 2015; (g) OECD, 2012a; (h) South African Police Service, 2010; (i) Clandestino Research Project, 2009b; (j) Gordon et al., 2009; (k) Krogstad, Passel and Cohn, 2017.

# Who goes where?

Figure 3. Estimated regional migration flows, 2010–2015




*Source:* UN DESA, 2015a. Datasets for the 2015 revision of International migration flows to and from selected countries available from [www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/migration/data/empirical2/migration\\_flows.shtml](http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/migration/data/empirical2/migration_flows.shtml).

*Note:* The direction of the flow is indicated by the arrowhead. The size of the flow is determined by the width of the arrow at its base. Numbers on the outer sector axis, used to read the size of migration flows, are in millions. So, for example, between 2010 and 2015, there was an increase of around 4 million people in Northern America who were born in Asia.

# Inflows to OECD

Figure 4. Inflows of foreign nationals into OECD countries, permanent migration, 2000–2015 (millions)




Source: OECD, 2015.

Note 1: Data are not standardized and therefore differ from statistics on permanent migration inflows into selected countries contained in OECD's International Migration Outlook 2016 (OECD, 2016a and 2016b).

Note 2: The 35 countries typically included in OECD statistics are the following: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Chile, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Republic of Korea, Latvia, Luxembourg, Mexico, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, United Kingdom and United States. In some years, data for particular countries are not made available: data were made available for 31 countries in 2000, and 33 countries in 2015. Notably, data for Greece have not been reported since 2012 and data for Turkey have not been reported since 2010.

# Dead and Missing Migrants

Recorded migrant deaths and missing migrants worldwide, 2016



Source: IOM, n.d.i.

Note: Figures correspond to deaths that occurred during the process of migration. All numbers reflect only those incidents about which IOM is aware. An unknown number of deaths remain unreported and therefore, these data comprise minimum estimates. Figures include both bodies found and migrants who are missing and presumed dead. Names and boundaries indicated on this map do not imply official endorsement or acceptance by IOM.



# Migrants by sex and income level


Table 3. Migrant workers, by sex and income level of destination countries (2013)

	Low income			Lower middle income			Upper middle income			High income			Global Total		
	M	F	Total	M	F	Total	M	F	Total	M	F	Total	M	F	Total
Migrant workers (millions)	1.8	1.8	3.5	9.4	7.5	16.9	10.4	7.2	17.5	62.1	50.1	112.3	83.7	66.6	150.3
As a proportion of all migrant workers (%)	1.2	1.2	2.4	6.3	5.0	11.2	6.9	4.8	11.6	41.3	33.3	74.7	55.7	44.3	100

Source: Based on ILO, 2015.

# Migrants by sex and income level

Figure 5. Migrant domestic workers by destination country income level and sex as of 2013 (millions)



Source: ILO, 2015.

# Remittances Sent

Top countries sending remittances							
2000		2005		2010		2015	
United States of America	34.40	United States of America	47.25	United States of America	50.78	United States of America	61.38
Saudi Arabia	15.40	Saudi Arabia	14.32	Saudi Arabia	27.07	Saudi Arabia	38.79
Germany	9.04	Germany	12.71	Russian Federation	21.45	Switzerland	24.38
Switzerland	7.59	Switzerland	9.99	Switzerland	16.88	China	20.42
France	3.77	United Kingdom	9.64	Germany	14.68	Russian Federation	19.70
United Arab Emirates	3.68	France	9.48	Italy	12.89	Germany	18.56
Republic of Korea	3.65	Italy	7.55	France	12.03	Kuwait	15.20
Israel	3.26	Russian Federation	6.83	Kuwait	11.86	France	12.68
Japan	3.17	Luxembourg	6.70	Luxembourg	10.64	Qatar	12.19
Netherlands, the	3.13	Republic of Korea	6.67	United Arab Emirates	10.57	Luxembourg	11.35

Source: World Bank, n.d.b. (accessed May 2017).

Note: All numbers are in current (nominal) USD billion.

# Remittances Received

Table 4. Top countries receiving/sending remittances (2000–2015) (current USD billions)

Top countries receiving remittances							
2000		2005		2010		2015	
India	12.84	China	23.63	India	53.48	India	68.91
France	8.61	Mexico	22.74	China	52.46	China	63.94
Mexico	7.52	India	22.13	Mexico	22.08	Philippines, the	28.48
Philippines	6.96	Nigeria	14.64	Philippines, the	20.56	Mexico	26.23
Republic of Korea	4.86	France	14.21	France	19.90	France	23.35
Spain	4.86	Philippines, the	13.73	Nigeria	19.75	Nigeria	18.96
Turkey	4.56	Belgium	6.89	Germany	12.79	Pakistan	19.85
United States of America	4.40	Germany	6.87	Egypt	12.45	Egypt	16.58
Germany	3.64	Spain	6.66	Bangladesh	10.85	Bangladesh	15.38
United Kingdom	3.61	Poland	6.47	Belgium	10.35	Germany	15.36


52 See *ibid.*, for example.

53 See, for example, OECD, n.d.c, which also contains data on ODA. There is a growing body of work exploring the developmental, economic and social impacts of this trend.

54 Breakdowns for 2016 were unavailable at the time of publication.

# Refugees by Origin Country

Figure 6. Number of refugees by major countries of origin as of 2016 (millions)




Source: UNHCR, n.d. (accessed on 18 July 2017).

Note: Lines indicate five-year trends and crosses indicate a single year's data. South Sudan became a country in 2011.

# Refugees by Host Country

Figure 7. Number of refugees by major host countries as of 2016 (millions)




Source: UNHCR, n.d. (accessed on 18 July 2017).

Note: Lines indicate five-year trends and crosses indicate a single year's data.

# Refugees resettled by country


Figure 8. Number of refugees resettled by major resettlement countries in 2000–2016 (thousands)



Source: UNHCR, n.d. (accessed on 23 June 2017).

# Displaced

Figure 9. Newly displaced IDPs (millions)



Source: IDMC, n.d. (accessed on 23 June 2017).



# History of Immigration to the US

- In 1850 there were 2.2 million immigrants, representing nearly 10 percent of the U.S. population.
- Between 1860 and 1920, the immigrant share of the overall population fluctuated between 13 percent and almost 15 percent, peaking at 14.8 percent in 1890, mainly due to high levels of immigration from Europe.
- Restrictive immigration laws in 1921 and 1924, coupled with the Great Depression and World War II, led to a sharp drop in new arrivals.

# Immigration to the US

Table 1. Size and Share of the Foreign-Born Population in the United States, 1970-2016

Year	Size of Immigrant Population (Millions)	Immigrant Share of Total U.S. Population
1970	9.6	4.7%
1980	14.1	6.2%
1990	19.8	7.9%
2000	31.1	11.1%
2010	40.0	12.9%
2016	43.7	13.5%

00 decennial Census data.


# Which countries go the US the most?




Sending Country	Estimate	Percentage
Mexico	11.7 million	29
China (inc. Hong Kong)	1.9 million	5
India	1.9 million	5
Philippines	1.8 million	4
El Salvador	1.3 million	3
Vietnam	1.3 million	3
Cuba	1.1 million	3
Korea	1.1 million	3
Dominican Republic	900,000	2
Guatemala	851,000	

<sup>2</sup>Source: MPI Data Hub, available online.

# Foreign Born Population by Region, 2011



# Refugees Population by Region of Origin




# US-Mexican Migration

- Approximately 11.6 million Mexican immigrants resided in the United States in 2016, according to the ACS
- Mexicans accounted for 26% of all U.S. immigrants, down from the peak of 30% in 2000

# Share of Mexican Migrants over Time

Number of Mexican Immigrants and Their Share of the Total U.S. Immigrant Population, 1850-2016



Migration Policy Institute (MPI) Data Hub  
<http://migrationpolicy.org/programs/data-hub>



# Jobs Mexican Hold in the US

Table 3. Employed Workers in the Civilian Labor Force (ages 16 and older) by Nativity and Occupation, 2016


Occupation	Foreign-Born Workers	Native-Born Workers
<b>Civilian Employed Adults</b>	<b>26,191,800</b>	<b>126,379,200</b>
<i>By Occupational Group</i>		
Management, Business, Science, and Arts	31.6%	38.8%
Service	24.1%	16.8%
Sales and Office	16.6%	24.7%
Natural Resources, Construction, and Maintenance	12.9%	8.0%
Production, Transportation, and Material Moving	14.9%	11.6%



# The Myth of Crime from Migrants




# The Myth of Crime from Migrants



# Facts on Irregular Migration to the US

- An estimated 11.4 million unauthorized immigrants resided in the United States as of January 2012
  - The top five countries of birth for unauthorized immigrants were Mexico (56 percent), Guatemala (7 percent), El Salvador (4 percent), Honduras (3 percent), and China (2 percent).
- There were an estimated 445,000 removals and returns in 2016, a decline of roughly 10,000 from 456,000 in 2015.

# Unauthorized Migrants



# Migration in India

# Number of Migrants by Last Place of Residence

Category	Migrations by Place of birth	Percentage	
A.	Total Population	1,028,610,328	
B.	Total Migrations	314,541,350	30.6
B.1	Migrants within the state of enumeration	268,219,260	85.3
B.11	Migrants from within the districts	193,592,938	72.2
B.12	Migrants from other districts of the state	74,626,322	17.8
B.2	Migrants from other states in India	41,166,265	13.1
B.3	Migrants from other countries	5,155,423	1.6

# Reason for Migration

Reason for migrations	Number of Migrants			Percentage to Migrants		
	Persons	Males	Females	Persons	Males	Females
Total migrants	98,301,342	32,896,986	65,404,356	100.0	100.0	100.0
Reason for migration : Work / Employment	14,446,224	12,373,333	2,072,891	14.7	37.6	3.2
Business	1,136,372	950,245	186,127	1.2	2.9	0.3
Education	2,915,189	2,038,675	876,514	3.0	6.2	1.3
Marriage	43,100,911	679,852	42,421,059	43.8	2.1	64.9
Moved after birth	6,577,380	3,428,673	3,148,707	6.7	10.4	4.8
Moved with households	20,608,105	8,262,143	12,345,962	21.0	25.1	18.9
Other	9,517,161	5,164,065	4,353,096	9.7	15.7	6.7

**Source: Table D3, Census of India 2001**

# Characteristics of Urban Migrants

**Table II.3: Characteristics of Urban Migrants 2001**

	Duration	All durations			10 years and more		
	Origin	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female
Share of urban population in 2011	<b>Rural</b>	<b>21.9%</b>	<b>19.3%</b>	<b>24.7%</b>	<b>8.5%</b>	<b>7.7%</b>	<b>9.4%</b>
	<b>Urban</b>	<b>21.0%</b>	<b>18.4%</b>	<b>23.9%</b>	<b>8.7%</b>	<b>7.7%</b>	<b>9.9%</b>
Share of urban population in 2001 of which	<b>Rural</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>9.9%</b>	<b>8.6%</b>	<b>11.5%</b>
	<b>Urban</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>6.3%</b>	<b>5.2%</b>	<b>7.6%</b>
<i>Within district</i>	Rural	37%	31%	43%	37%	29%	44%
	Urban	30%	29%	30%	26%	25%	27%
<i>Other districts within State</i>	Rural	33%	33%	34%	34%	34%	33%
	Urban	41%	39%	42%	42%	41%	43%
<i>Inter-State</i>	Rural	30%	36%	24%	30%	37%	23%
	Urban	29%	33%	27%	31%	34%	29%

Source: Census of India 2001 (D-3 tables) and 2011 (provisional D-5 tables). In 2001, the urban population was 286.1 million and in 2011 it was 377.1 million.



# Share of Migrants by Sector

**Table II.4: Share of Migrant Workers in Total Workers by Major Sectors**

Sector*	Rural		Urban	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
Primary	4%	75%	20%	65%
Manufacturing	13%	59%	38%	51%
Public Services	16%	69%	40%	56%
Construction	8%	73%	32%	67%
Traditional Services	10%	65%	29%	55%
Modern Services	16%	66%	40%	52%
<b>Total</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>73%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>56%</b>


# Migration in China

# Migration rates in China: the Great Internal Migration

- China's economic boom has drawn rural Chinese to cities in search of higher incomes;
- rural migrant worker population has expanded significantly, increasing from roughly 30 million in 1989 to more than **140 million in 2008**


# Migration Rates

Figure 1. Migration Rate in Rural China: (a) Migration Rate in Rural China, 2003–2012 and  
(b) Migration Rate over Age, 2003–2012



# Migration Rates by Age


(b)



Source: Authors' calculation based on data from the Rural Household Survey 2003–2012.

# Time Allocation of Migrants by Cohort


Figure 4. Time Allocation of Migrants by Birth Cohort



Source: Authors' calculation based on data from Rural Household Survey 2003–2012.

# Years of Schooling by Cohort

Figure 5. Average Years of Schooling of Migrants by Birth Cohort



Source: Authors' calculation based on data from Rural Household Survey 2003–2012.

# Migrants' Jobs over Time

Table 2. Employment of the Two Generations of Migrant Workers by Industry


Employment industry	All (%)	First generation (%)	New generation (%)
Manufacturing	33.81	25.52	41.92
Construction	19.63	28.92	10.55
Transportation, logistics and post	4.09	4.91	3.29
Wholesale and retailing	5.32	4.59	6.04
Guest house and catering	6.44	4.51	8.32
Service to residents, and other services	10.06	8.56	11.54
Others	20.64	23.00	18.34
Number of observations	248,313	122,789	125,524

Source: Authors' calculation based on data from Rural Household Survey 2003–2012.



# Migration Duration Over Time

Figure 11. Cohort Trend in Migration Duration




Source: Based on data from Rural Household Survey 2003–2012.

Notes: Each point on the solid line represents the coefficient on the corresponding birth cohort dummy from the estimation of Equation (1), with the 1940–1949 cohort being the omitted group. The dashed lines indicate the 95-percent confidence intervals for the regression coefficient of the birth cohort.

# Consumption and Remittances Patterns


Figure 14. Cohort Trend in Consumption and Remittance: (a) Consumption in Urban Areas and (b) Share of Remittance in Earnings of Migrants



<sup>11</sup>The new economics of labor migration implies that migration is a family strategy to overcome market failure and to minimize risks/uncertainties. When a family sends a migrant to work in a city, the household makes an investment that will receive a return when remittances are sent back.

# Inter-provincial Marriages trends

Figure 15. Cohort Trend in the Occurrence of Inter-provincial Marriage



Source: Based on National Migrant Dynamics Monitoring Survey 2011–2015.

Notes: Each point on the solid line represents the coefficient on the corresponding birth cohort dummy from the estimation of Equation (1), with the 1950–1959 cohort being the omitted group. The dashed lines indicate the 95-percent confidence intervals for the regression coefficient of the birth cohort.

# The consequences of Migration

Bojos per L'economia

Elisa Giannone April

2025

# What are the consequences of people moving?

- More Crime?
  - Decision of the residents to to leave the neighborhood?
  - Voting Decision?
- 
- We will explore some of them in details here!

# What is the relationship between migration and crime?

- So far, there is not much evidence that the relationship between migration and crime is strong


- Evidence is mixed and weak overall

## Paper on large Migration waves to the UK titled “CRIME AND IMMIGRATION: EVIDENCE FROM LARGE IMMIGRANT WAVES”

- Overall findings:
  - There was **no effect on violent crime**;
  - arrest rates were **not different**,
  - changes in crime cannot be ascribed to **crimes against immigrants**.
- The findings are consistent with the notion that differences in labor market opportunities of different migrant groups shape their potential impact on crime.

# Immigration and Crime trends in the UK

FIGURE 1.—IMMIGRATION STOCK AND CRIME TRENDS, ENGLAND AND WALES, 1997–2009





# Immigration to the United Kingdom since 1997: A Tale of Two Waves


- First: large rise in the number of asylum seekers arriving in the United Kingdom. Asylum flows to industrialized countries rose in the 1990s and early 2000s, with peaks in 1992 and 2001 (Hatton, 2009).
  - The first peak was associated with the fall of the Berlin Wall and civil war in the former Yugoslavia; and Germany was the principal destination country.
  - The second peak, which we focus on in this paper (as flows to the United Kingdom were much larger), was associated with wars and country break-downs such as in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Somalia.

# Immigration to the United Kingdom since 1997: A Tale of Two Waves

- Second: This big inflow occurred because of the opening up of the U.K. labor market to citizens of eight countries that joined the EU in 2004.
  - These accession countries (the so-called A8) were Poland, Hungary, Czech Republic, Slovakia, Slovenia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia.


# Asylum Applications and worker registration scheme

FIGURE 2.—ASYLUM APPLICATIONS AND WORKER REGISTRATION SCHEME REGISTRATIONS, 1993–2008




# Where are Asylum Seekers and Migrants?

FIGURE 3.—DISTRIBUTION OF MIGRANTS ACROSS ENGLAND AND WALES



# Incarceration rates

FIGURE 4.—INCARCERATION RATES, 1993–2008



# Victimization

- data from both the British Crime Surveys from 2004 to 2008
- data from the New Deal for Communities Surveys from 2002 and 2004

# Results victimization

- the results seem to suggest that differential changes in crime rates during the immigrant waves cannot be ascribed to crimes against immigrants.
- There is **little empirical work** on the factors affecting rates of crime and victimization against immigrants.

# Conclusion 1

- crime rates are significantly higher in areas in which asylum seekers are located but that they are lower for the A8 wave
  - conclusion robust when control for the endogeneity of location choice and for local crime trends within the police force area
- find no significant relationship between immigrants and violent crime
- results are hard to explain on the basis that the rise in crime may be a result of crime against immigrants.
- victimization rates are in fact lower against the two waves than for natives in general.
- find consistently positive effects from the asylum wave on property crime, the average size of the effect is not substantial



## Conclusion 2

- **Policy recommendations:**
  - focusing on improving the limited labor market opportunities of asylum seekers has scope to generate crime reductions
  - Since we are (rightly) obliged to consider all applications for asylum, it makes sense to allow applicants to seek work while their applications are being considered, particularly given the long duration that final decisions on such applications can take
  - job training and language courses are likely to be particularly beneficial for such migrants

# Tipping point and the Dynamics of Segregation

- There is a very famous paper by David Card and coauthors finding that: *extreme segregation can arise from social interactions in white preferences: once the minority share in a neighborhood exceeds a “tipping point,” all the whites leave.*




FIGURE I  
Neighborhood Change in Chicago, 1970-1980

Notes. Dots show mean of the change in the tract-level non-Hispanic white population between 1970 and 1980 as a percentage of the total tract population in 1970, grouping tracts into cells of width 1% by the 1970 minority (Hispanic and/or nonwhite) share. The horizontal line depicts the unconditional mean. Also shown is a local linear regression fit to the tract-level data, using an Epanechnikov kernel and a bandwidth of 3.5 and estimated separately on each side of 5.7%. This point is chosen using a search procedure and a 2/3 sample of Chicago tracts. Only the remaining 1/3 subsample is used for the series depicted here. See text for details.

# Migration and Implications on Voting and Schooling Decisions

- schooling system may be impacted by the number and skill type of immigrants:
  - When the number of low-skilled immigrants is large, the education regime tends to become segregated.
  - Wealthy locals are more likely to choose private schools and vote for a lower tax rate to finance public education.
  - high-skilled immigrants tend to reinforce the public system. The optimal immigration policy is highly skill-biased.
  - The admission of high-skilled immigrants expedites redistribution toward the less-skilled local households through both a stronger fiscal support for public education and a reduction in the skill wage premium.

*I would support [19th century-style unlimited immigration] if we lived in the 19th century world where government spending was tiny. But governments now spend huge amounts on medical care, retirement, education, and other benefits and entitlements.*

[Gary S. Becker, in “Sell the right to immigrate” (2005) [\[1\]](#).]

# Migration and Development is very actual topic!!!

You see it everywhere with all the refugee crisis!

We need your contributions to understand more! THANKS!!!