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Abstract: The exploration of the intentional dimensions of migration was the objective of this work. A non-experimental study was carried out with a non-probabilistic selection of 300 high school students. A factorial matrix was estimated that explained 32% of the total variance and a structural model was observed in which four dimensions that reflect 16 indicators prevail, but the research design limits the findings, suggesting the extension of the work and the inclusion of other factors such as expectations, entrepreneurship, selectivity and competitiveness.
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Resumen: La exploración de las dimensiones intencionales de la migración fue el objetivo de este trabajo. Se realizó un estudio no experimental con una selección no probabilística de 300 estudiantes de secundaria. Se estimó una matriz factorial que explicaba el 32% de la varianza total y se observó un modelo estructural en el que prevalecen cuatro dimensiones que reflejan 16 indicadores, pero el diseño de la investigación limita los hallazgos, lo que sugiere la extensión del trabajo y la inclusión de otros factores: expectativas, emprendimiento, selectividad y competitividad.
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1. INTRODUCTION

The aim of this study was to explore the structure of trajectories of dependency relationships among four factors that the literature highlights as preponderant in the explanation of migratory flows in general and in the intention to emigrate in particular, considering that it is a cognitive phenomenon focused on personal decision-making, even when group or collective processes frame such a question, being dimensioned by factors in which the unilateral election prevails (Alberti, 2012).

Migratory flows refer to those demographic processes that derive from a late demographic transition in Central America, whose impact in the United States affects Mexico as a transition country. It is a demographic bonus exposed to assimilation, adaptation, selection and identity related to their workforce, quality of life and subjective well-being (Busso, 2016).

Identity, hyperopia, helplessness and reliability are preponderant factors in four migratory theories alluding to selection, adaptation, identity and assimilation (Carreon, Hernández, Morales, García and Bustos, 2014).

Identity implies a choice of belonging to a group with which the potential migrant is identified in terms of status, disposition and capacity, but such variable is associated with the perception that there are significant differences between the sending and receiving countries. It is a farsightedness that warns of the economic, social and cultural effects of emigrating to the United States of America (USA) in the community of origin, but dismisses the influence of migratory flows on the economy and culture of the host country (Ferrer, Palacio, Hoyos and Madariaga, 2014).

In this scenario of biased choice, emerges the helplessness or despair that suggests the economic, social and cultural differences between the sending and receiving countries, but is accentuated even more by the prevalence of self-help or self-support of the chosen group in the receiving country (García, 2013).

It is about the reliability towards a chosen group in which the hope of protection and quality of life is placed, which contrasts with the situation of the migrant in his community of origin (García, Carreón, Hernández, Bustos and Aguilar, 2015).

Therefore, identity or election of migratory flow propitiated by the rupture with the place of origin; hyperopia or bias of risks and benefits in the crossing and stay with respect to the community of origin; helplessness or hopelessness in the face of differences between the receiving and expelling countries; as well as the reliability or confidence in the migratory flow explain the intention to migrate (Pardo and Dávila, 2017).
However, the measurement of these four factors has been developed in parallel since the instruments that measure the variables have not been processed with the aim of establishing associative relations and observe the emergence of a common factor that the literature identifies as an intention to emigrate (Paredes, Tovar, Ospina, Tovar, Andrade, 2016).

The scales that measure identity have centered their interest in the probability of carrying out migration based on economic, political, social, cultural or environmental reasons, but without considering the bias involved in decision-making, assuming that the recipient country is a risk-free scenario, or that the benefits outweigh the costs (Garcia, 2017a).

In this way the internal consistency of the instruments that measure these variables oscillate between 650 and 800 obtaining a range of 300 to 600 their factorial weight for their construct validity, avoiding collinearity in associations, but reducing the explanatory power of the models that aim to explain and predict identity and hyperopia (Garcia, 2017b).

In the case of helplessness and reliability, these have been associated as two variables that belong to a continuum of affectivity or emotionality, since the decision to emigrate suggests a sentimental state of abandonment of the community of origin and expectation of failure or success with respect to the receiving community (Garcia, 2014).

The instruments have registered an internal consistency of between, 700 and, 850 being the range of, 350 a, 550 for the factorial weights of the construct validity and the correlations between, 400 and, 600 that discard the collinearity between both variables (Valdés, Quintero and García, 2017).

2. METHOD

A non-experimental study was conducted with a nonrandom selection of 300 senior high students (M = 20.3 SD = 2.3 and M = age = 345.2 4’593,23 OF monthly household income) of a locality from the center of Mexico with low human development index. The short version of the Intention to Migrate Scale (EIE.16) was used, which includes four dimensions related to identity (“I would choose two or three jobs if I travel to the US”), hyperopia (“I would work in two or three jobs if you emigrate to the US “), helplessness (“I would work in two or three jobs, even if the payment is minimal “), reliability (“I would request the financial support of the first job if I can have another job “). All the reagents are met with one of the options ranging from 0 = “ not likely” to 5 = “ b probable”.

The surveys were carried out in the facilities of the upper secondary schools, upon notification that the results of the study would not affect their academic status or school situation, which extended a guarantee of confidentiality and anonymity.
The information was processed in the statistical analysis package for social sciences (SPSS by its acronym in English, version 24.0). The parameters of reliability, validity and adjustment were estimated in order to contrast the null hypothesis of significant differences between the trajectories of theoretical relationships with respect to the model of structural equations.

3. RESULTS

Table 1 shows the descriptive values that indicate the normal distribution, adequacy, sphericity and construct validity of responses to reagents that converge in four factors: migratory identity, economic hypermetropia, expected hopelessness and labor reliability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>F2</th>
<th>F3</th>
<th>F4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R9</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R10</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R12</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R13</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R14</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R15</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R16</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R = Reactive, M = Mean, S = Standard Deviation, K = Kurtosis, A = Cronbach’s Alpha, removing the value of the item. Adequacy (KMO = 0.780), Sphericity \(X^2 = 24.3\) (34 gl) p < .01] Method: Main axes, Rotation: promax. F1 = Migratory identity (17% of the total variance explained), F2 = Economic Hyperopia (11% of the total variance explained), F3 = Expected Hopelessness (3% of the total variance explained), F4 = Labor Reliability (1% of the total variance explained).

Source: Prepared with the study data.

The factorial structure was complemented with the estimation of the matrix of relations between the established factors that explained 32 % of the total variance explained (see Table 2).
Table 2. Correlations and covariations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>F2</th>
<th>F3</th>
<th>F4</th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>F2</th>
<th>F3</th>
<th>F4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>45.67</td>
<td>15.49</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.659 ***</td>
<td>0.672 **</td>
<td>0.612 *</td>
<td>1.673</td>
<td>0.580</td>
<td>0.623</td>
<td>0.517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2</td>
<td>34.52</td>
<td>18.57</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.593 **</td>
<td>0.508 *</td>
<td>1.974</td>
<td>0.502</td>
<td>0.632</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3</td>
<td>48.31</td>
<td>13.09</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.632 ****</td>
<td>1.783</td>
<td>0.606</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4</td>
<td>40.53</td>
<td>17.31</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.803</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M = Mean, S = Standard Deviation: F1 = Migratory Identity, F2 = Economic Hyperopia, F3 = Expected Hopelessness, F4 = Labor Reliability: * p <, 01; ** p <0.001; *** p <, 0001

Source: Prepared with the study data.

The matrix of relations between the factors and the factorial structure allowed the estimation of the model of reflective trajectories of the four factors with respect to 16 indicators, as well as the theoretical emergence of a second-order factor that the literature identifies as migration intention (see Figure 1).

Figure 1. Structural Equation Modelling

The adjustment and residual parameters $\chi^2 = 67.2$ (63 gr) p <, 01; GFI =, 990; CFI =, 993; RMSEA =, 008 suggest the non-rejection of the null hypothesis relative to the significant differences between the reflective theoretical relationships and the structural model.
4. DISCUSSION

The contribution of the present work to the state of the question lies in the establishment of the reliability and validity of an instrument to demonstrate the factorial structure, the matrix of relations and the reflective model that explain the intention of migration, but the methodological design limits the findings to the public university scenario, suggesting the extension of the study to migrant communities.

Even the percentage of total variance explained suggests the inclusion of other factors that Sánchez, Juárez, Bustos and García (2018) identify as labor expectations to explain the intention to migrate.

In the present work, it has been shown that identity and hyperopia can be linked to expectations, since both variables refer to selection biases that would be associated with the sensation of waiting for a risk or a benefit.

García (2018) warns that one dimension of the intention to emigrate is the entrepreneurship that characterizes those who seek improvement and tend to choose a favorable scenario for the development of their skills, knowledge and expectations.

In the present work, a relationship between reliability and identity has been established. It is an associative process between trust and the choice of an occupation that would be linked to entrepreneurship in general and expectations in particular.

Delgado, García and Mejía (2018) specified a model in which migratory flows were integrated by entrepreneurship and identity, but associated with the selectivity and competitiveness that characterizes migrant intellectual capital.

In the present work it has been established that identity is a fundamental part of the intention to migrate, but the inclusion of expectations, selectivity, competitiveness and entrepreneurship would increase the percentage of total variance explained.
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