



УДК 373.5.015.311:613(73)

**СОЦІАЛЬНО-ПЕДАГОГІЧНИЙ АСПЕКТ ОСВІТНІХ
ПРОГРАМ ДЛЯ СІЛЬСЬКОГОСПОДАРСЬКИХ РОБІТНИКІВ-
МІГРАНТІВ У МЕКСИЦІ**

Олена Жижко

У статті представлено результати науково-педагогічного дослідження, метою якого було виявлення освітніх стратегій, що використовуються урядом Мексики як механізми для інтеграції сільськогосподарських робітників-мігрантів в трудове життя в нинішніх соціально-економічних умовах. Дослідження показало, що такими навчальними стратегіями є Програми Національної ради для життя і праці та Національного інституту освіти дорослих, Центри базової освіти для дорослих, Центри для шкільної освіти, Програма забезпечення освіти дорослих, Програма забезпечення освіти сільськогосподарських робітників-мігрантів, Програма «Можли-вості», культурні місії. Проекти уряду Мексики щодо освіти сільсько-господарських робітників-мігрантів є далекосяжними, проте статистика свідчить, що в 2012 році, число молоді та дорослих, які набули початкової та/або середньої освіти, було всього 4222 особи, що становило 13,69% від загальної чисельності неписьменного населення країни.

Ключові слова: освіта дорослих; освіта маргінальних груп населення; освітні програми для сільськогосподарських робітників-мігрантів в Мексиці; освітні стратегії мексиканського уряду; теорія маргінальності.

In the XXI century, in the so-called «knowledge society», with the development of science and technology, the concern about the social situation in which many people live is increasing. Concerned about the consequences that trigger reproduction of phenomena of exclusion, marginalization, vulnerability; numerous studies have been conducted to understand the underlying causes of these and propose solutions to the problem in question. Thus, for scholars (Boltvinik, Chambers, Cruz-Betancourt, Damián, Diloretto, Dresser, Escudero, Gordon, Juárez-Bolaños, Kampbel, Lerner, Lechner, Lustig, Negretti, Tovar, Schulze, Sen, Urdaneta-Carullo, Vinding, among others), one possible amendment is inclusive education for marginalized groups, including migrant farm workers.

As it is stated in the *Human Development Report 2014 «Sustaining Human Progress: reducing vulnerability and building resilience»* presented by the United Nations Development Program, 50% of the population of the Earth is still below the poverty line, of whom 15% lives in Latin America and the Caribbean; in 70 countries with more than one billion people, today's income is lower than 25 years ago. In these countries, life expectancy is below 50 years, the literacy rate is 60% less than in industrialized countries and infant mortality rate is eight times higher than in those countries. According to the Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI) in 104 developing



countries, 1,200 million people have a daily income of \$1.25 or less; 2,200 million people live with two or more deprivations (life expectancy, education, standard of living, etc.) [13, 5].

Additionally, there are currently about 200 million unemployed people in the world, global unemployment increased by almost 30 million between 2007 and 2009, and estimates about the current unemployment remain well above pre-crisis levels. Almost half of the working population of the world continues to be in a vulnerable employment (49.2%), trapped in insecure and low paid jobs. High rates of poverty among workers (12.3%) suggest that the income of the workforce remains below the level needed to ensure a decent standard of living [13].

In most developing countries vulnerable employment remains the norm. Wage employment in the formal sector is available to only a few, while the majority of the population has no paid work or self-employment (as subsistence agriculture and hawking), often at an increased vulnerability associated to crises.

One of the most vulnerable regions in the world is the Latin American region, where 204 million people live in poverty, 78 million of them in rural areas; one fifth of the population (350 million people) works the land with low productivity agricultural methods and lives in precarious economic situations. 15% of people with low income and 30% of people living in extreme poverty in rural areas are the indigenous people, who tend to have low levels of education, inequality of opportunities and inequality of access to land and other productive assets [10].

In Latin America, the average income of indigenous migrant farm workers is about half that of non-indigenous workers. Indigenous peoples tend to face greater obstacles, sometimes of legal nature, in the capacity building, decision making and claiming of their rights, support and protection in case of adverse events. And although the law does not explicitly discriminate, the absence of effective policies leaves them excluded and vulnerable. In general, group inequalities and exclusion limit the political influence of some groups, although they constitute the majority of the population, as the poor. Horizontal inequalities can lead to hoarding of policies by an elite that favors certain groups and not the whole society [6]. This magnifies the vulnerability of the excluded (particularly, of indigenous migrant farm workers) by limiting the amount and quality of public services they receive.

Some groups (such as indigenous) can also be more exposed to certain risks and have less capacity and intrinsic ability to cope with the crisis. The exposure of these groups and the way society treats their inherent characteristics produces negative results. Adverse circumstances also create new vulnerabilities. The indigenous are themselves isolated in their misery and have become much poorer.

This situation involves aspects or dimensions that exceed the economic indicators. So, someone who is poor is also someone psychologically vulnerable, with less hope for the future, who is more likely to get sick and die, dominating a smaller vocabulary and having difficulty to express himself. He is someone whose life is uncertain and unpredictable; whose children have a later physical and psychomotor development, poor nutrition and inadequate health and labor conditions.

Therefore, the precarious situation of indigenous migrant farm workers requires developing mechanisms for their integration into the working life, one of



which is education.

The aim of this research is to reveal the educational strategies used by the Mexican Government as mechanisms for integration of indigenous migrant farm workers into the working life in the current socio-economic conditions.

In Mexico, the use of cheap labor of indigenous migrant farmworkers is a common practice. Transnational agribusiness (crop and cut snuff, cane, beans, chili, vegetables, etc.), hire them in inhumane conditions, in both places: within agricultural fields and settlements outside these. In the fields of Nayarit, Michoacán, Sonora, Baja California Sur, Zacatecas arrive annually 5.5 million of laborers, of whom 70% are indigenous people of Chiapas, Guerrero, Hidalgo, Oaxaca, Sierra de Nayarit, Veracruz [11, p. 17].

The migrant indigenous farmworkers represent heterogeneous group with different ethnic affiliations: Cora, Huichol, Zapotec, Mixtec, Triqui, Mazatec, Mixe, Chinantec, Amuzgo, Chatino. Often whole families are moved. In agricultural fields they are completely outside of social benefits: without job security, living in homes without services and being subject to human rights abuses. In places where they stay there's no basic services like electricity, water and drainage; they live in overcrowded and unsanitary conditions [14] (table 1).

Table 1

Characterization of agricultural workers using criteria of multidimensional poverty measurement

Populations (multidimensional poverty measurement)	Total potential population (%)	Local potential population (%)	Migrant potential population (%)
Under the LBE with less than 3 deprivations	14.82	14.31	17.04
Under the LBE with 3 or more deprivations	63.46	61.78	70.86
Social Vulnerable (Income above LBE - some deprivations)	21.06	23.18	11.77
Vulnerable income (income below LBE - no deprivations)	0.29	0.28	0.29
Not poor and not vulnerable (income above the LBE - no deprivations)	0.37	0.45	0.04
Total	100	100	100

Source: Prepared by National Survey of Agricultural Workers of the Ministry of Social Development of Mexico (ENJO), 2009.

The power structure in agricultural fields is a pyramid having atop the owner of the land, beneath him is the foreman contractor responsible for recruiting gang workers and his duties include often providing housing, food and beverages thereto. At the base of the pyramid are workers or farm laborers, who have only their labor and have more social disadvantages as well as all other policies. They have no right



to organize unions and sometimes they are not employed throughout the year or are outsourced; if there is an oversupply of labor, they have to work longer hours without rest; they are not remunerated for the overtime, they suffer from pesticides and do not have health institutions, they lack of paid vacation and do not have a pension (table 2). The housing situation is deplorable: they live in reed huts and wood (8-10 people) or wine (for 60 people), with no minimum sanitation, always saturated paying rent of 10-40 Mexican pesos [14].

Table 2

The incidence of social deprivation among agricultural laborers

Indicators of social deprivation	Population	Percentage
Educational backwardness	626,968	30.73
Lack of access to health services	819,326	40.15
Lack of access to social security	1,699,487	83.29
Lack of quality and living spaces	984,761	48.26
Lack of access to basic services at home	1,775,851	87.03
Lack of access to food	883,904	43.32
Population with income below the wellbeing	1,603,075	78.57
Population with at least one social deprivation	2,026,988	99.34
Population with at least three social deprivations	1,587,900	77.82
Population with income below the line of rural welfare and at least one social deprivation	1,597,250	78.28

Source: by National Survey of Agricultural Workers of the Ministry of Social Development of Mexico (ENJO), 2009. Prepared

The working conditions of indigenous laborers are deplorable, considering that there is no job security, they face days of strenuous work without protection of their health and safety and a misuse of agrochemicals, without training or proper equipment, they cannot ban out of the agricultural fields without the authorization of the caciques-entrepreneurs, they are not paid the wages and they lack of the most basic labor rights. Agricultural laborers, in addition to low wages, suffer humiliation and abuse in everyday life; they are discriminated against because of race and poverty, not only for their direct employers, contractors, but also by locals.

Living in crowds and at the same time, alone, away from their family, people and culture, coupled with the constant risk status at work (pesticide poisonings, bites of poisonous animals, respiratory and gastrointestinal illnesses caused by climate change, etc.), working up to 16 hours a day, having poor quality food offered, featuring extremely inappropriate sites to stay, all of these provoke the migrants frustration and distrust of others.

The precarious situation of this group of marginalized, requires a development of mechanisms for their integration into productive life, one of which is education. In the case of Latin America, government structures are in the stage of development of mechanisms for integration of indigenous to productive life. Since the seventies of the twentieth century, governments of Latin American countries have implemented special programs to support native peoples (with material



resources, species, supporting their health, education, housing, etc.).

In Mexico, from the twenties of the twentieth century, the Cultural Missions have been launched, which provide different supports, including educational services in rural areas. Moreover, since the seventies of the twentieth century, the Mexican government has implemented special programs to support underserved rural and urban areas (material resources, support for health, education, housing, etc.): Public Investment Program for Rural Development (PIDER), General Coordination of the National Plan for Depressed Zones and Marginal Groups (COPLAMAR), Mexican Food System (SAM), National Solidarity Program (PRONASOL), Program of Education, Health and Nutrition (PROGRESA), Opportunities Program, Fund Contributions for Social Infrastructure (FAIS), etc.

However, researches on the results of these programs have shown that government projects not only do not solve the problem of poverty, but many times deepen it. This is primarily due not so much because the supports for rural zones are very symbolic, but because many times these small amounts of money do not even make it to their recipients due to corruption, and they are spent by farmers for various other purposes (move to USA, alcoholism, family parties, buying expensive items, etc.), not the indicated: investment in field production. In addition, adverse weather conditions (especially in the semi-desert areas and high drought-prone regions and on the coast by the floods and tropical storms, etc.) contribute to a very heavy and counterproductive work of the farmer. This adds to ensure that the work doesn't give the elemental level of life and renders it meaningless. Therefore, people seek employment outside their communities (Adler de Lomnitz, 1993; Attanacio, Székely, 1999; Filgueira, 2001; Katzman, 2001; Boltvinik, Damian, 2004; Juarez-Bolaños, 2005, Alonso, 2007, among others).

As Damian (2004) points out, Mexico has been for decades an experimental laboratory for programs imposed by international agencies like the International Monetary Fund and World Bank, both in economic and social matters for structural adjustment. These programs emerged as a mechanism to offset adjustment costs that the implementation of the enabling neoliberal model had. However, history has shown that its results have been disastrous. This has resulted in poverty rates in Mexico in the early twenty-first century, which were in excess of the ones in the eighties [4, p. 150].

It can be argued therefore that social policies serve a fragmented problem of designing social issues. This situation highlights the exclusion of all those stakeholders who are not favored by these policies and also it is a considerable evidence for a denial of the rights inherent to all human beings. To resolve this situation, one of the initiatives of Mexican government is betting on inclusive education, training marginalized for work, give them the tools for the rational use of natural resources and productive farming.

Actually, the Mexican system of inclusive education for marginalized groups consists of programs, centers and short courses aimed at improving household economy, with content linked to domestic life, domestic consumption and paid work, which are offered through the Cultural Missions, Centers for Adult Basic Education (CEBAS) and the Centers for School Education (CEDEX), with the support of civil



society organizations, trade unions, chambers, secretaries of state, private training agencies. It is supported by the National Council for Life and Work (CONEVyT), National Institute for Adult Education (INEA), National Council for Educational Development (CONAFE), Secretariat of Labor and Social Welfare (STyPS), Training System for Work (SICAT), National Training and Technical Assistance for Rural Integration (SINACATRI), National College of Professional Technical Education (CONALEP), Training Center for Industry (CECATI), Board Standardization and Certification of Competency (CONOCER), Modernization Program and Technical Training (PMETyC), Distance Education for Adults, Comprehensive Training Program and Modernization (CIMO), Scholarship Program for Training Workers (PROBECAT), College of Bachelors, National Institute for Youth (IMJUVE), Latin American Institute for Educational Communication (ILCE), Training Institutes for the Work of States, Community Cultural Development Centers, State Employment Services (ESS), Federal Electricity Commission (CFE), Centers for Social Security (IMSS), Education Departments of States (SEE), among others.

These institutions work following the policies of the regional organizations conducting the training for life and work: the Organization of American States (OEA), the Organization of Ibero-American States for Education, Science and Culture (OEI), Information System of Educational Trends in Latin America (SITEAL), Education Network of Youth and Adult People (EPJA), Latin American Institute for Educational Communication (ILCE), Regional Center of Fundamental Education in Latin America (CREFAL), Center for Adult Education in Latin America (CEAAL), among others.

Furthermore, regardless of the existence at international and national levels of a broad and advanced legal framework aimed at protecting the rights of migrant workers (International Convention on the Rights of Migrant Workers, Convention 169 of the International Labour Organisation (ILO), Convention 182 of the ILO (about the prohibition of the worst forms of labor); General Constitution (Article 4, last paragraph); Federal Labor Law (Title V bis, Articles 173-180), General Law of Health, etc.), in many parts of movements of agricultural workers the responsibilities are circumvented by the Care Laborers Program of the Ministry of Social Development of Mexico (infrastructure and basic services to improve working conditions) and the recommendation of the ECHR, which seeks to end the discrimination and mistreatment of workers; economic, social and cultural rights are violated, the labor contract that marks the benefits to which they are entitled, is not respected (for example, the case of indigenous workers in the south of Chihuahua, Culiacan, Navolato, Los Mochis, Angostura, Elota, Guasave, Las Palmas, La Cruz (Sinaloa), Nayarit, etc.) [11].

The abuses of employers towards migrants are explained by, among other factors, the illiteracy, lack of basic education, ignorance of their rights, etc. To solve these problems, one of the initiatives of the Mexican government is for special socio-educational programs to meet the needs of literacy and vocational training for farm laborers. So, one of these projects is the Program for Care of Demand of Adult Education with Education Model for Life and Work (MEVyT) directed by the National Council for Life and Work and operated by the National Institute of Adult



Education through the State Institutes for Adult Education and delegations of INEA in the states, and one of its variants, the Program of Care for Migrant Farm Workers [7].

The Mexican socio-educational programs for migrant farm workers are based in the theory of marginality. Marginality is a social phenomenon that has flourished in the twenty-first century world, however, is the subject of numerous international studies since the early twentieth century.

Negretti and Tovar (1987) argue that the concept of marginality appears in sociological literature associated with the interest in studying the problems of adaptation of migrants and ethnic minorities in American society. The term «marginality» was first used by Robert Park, in his article «Human Migration and the Marginal Man», published in 1928. His interest was focused on the role of migration in social change. Park was also the first to speak of marginalization as a synonymous of marginality [9].

According to Park (1928), migration creates a situation that places the individual at the alternative of trying to live according to the guidance of two different cultural groups. The effect is to produce an unstable character, a personality type with characteristic forms of behavior. This is the marginal man [12].

The idea of Park's marginal man, «who is placed in the margins of two worlds and does not belong to any», beats the reading of poverty as a lack of resources, because, although included, it is a conception that identifies the problem as of high-order in functional terms. From this perspective, participation in different areas would be the possibility of full integration and not only in reference to the economic sphere. Nor will the distribution of wealth or inequity or injustice or basic resources, but the involvement that in accordance to a normative scheme must perform an individual or group. The identification of the marginal man as a man who must «promote himself», achieve the desired participation, also supposes that he must «evolve» his patterns, his traditional culture in order to achieve a redefinition of the roles [15].

In Latin America, the term «marginality» was created with the urban ecology of the sixties of the twentieth century and attempts to describe the inhabitants of large Third World cities that are located in outlying areas occupying poor, underserved households and almost always raised on illegally occupied land. Systematic studies of marginality are initiated from the second post-war to the accelerated urbanization process, which resulted in large settlements on the outskirts of large cities. Among the researchers that found organic sense are Nun (1969), Quijano (1970), Turner¹ (1966). The term «marginal» was designated in this approach to housing within the edge of cities and the lacking of a certain minimum comfort [9, p 23-24].

Meanwhile, the United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC), considered marginal individuals the ones who are not directly incorporated into the national basic institutions [2].

¹ Turner conducted studies about marginal and underdeveloped populations from different Latin American countries [9].



In Latin America, for the first attempt at theorizing on marginality, to move from the descriptive to the explanatory flat plane, was established in 1965 the Center for Economic and Social Development of Latin America (DESAL). This was considered necessary by analyzing the historical and cultural development of Latin America, in order to determine what are the specific traits of Latin American marginality and thus locate the genetic roots of the phenomenon [3].

The historical origin of the societies of Latin America since the beginning, marks the emergence of a dichotomous parallelism, resulting from the overlap of cultures that occurred from the duality of values, social structures and political and administrative systems. Hence for DESAL, the term «marginal» refers to social groups, that even though are members of a society in a country, fail to penetrate the intimacy of their structures. This means that society is seen in two different sectors: the built and marginalized. Thus, marginalization extends to the whole of the human person and all aspects of the lives of the marginalized sectors. However, its effects impact the entire society, it should not be seen as a phenomenon of the third world (although here it is much deeper), since it is a global problem [5].

The increase in poverty worldwide, getting to be considered as one of the main problems of the twentieth and the present century, gives rise to the emergence of slums in both poor countries and rich countries. The relationship between poverty, exclusion, marginalization, inequality and exclusion is irrefutable. The economic situation is the basis of social problems, but there are cultural problems that exacerbate the social and cultural problems that society is facing.

The spread between marginal groups of the attributes of modern life creates expectations that they cannot channel properly in their current condition, leading to the generation of tensions and conflicts that form a potentially explosive situation.

The marginality and marginalization are frequently referenced for the same meaning. Several authors have treated these terminologies in their research. So, Cortes (2006) believes, that the concept of alienation in its most abstract version tries to account for differential access of the population to enjoy the benefits of development. The measure focuses on the needs of the population of the towns to access to basic goods and services, captured in three dimensions: education, housing and income. For him, marginalization is a phenomenon affecting localities and not necessarily the people who live there [3].

Seen this way, a locality may have high poverty and this does not mean that there are people there with living conditions and level of income sufficient to not be considered poor. Following Cortés, marginality is a concept that lies within the modernization theory, according to which the underdeveloped societies are characterized by the coexistence of a traditional segment and a modern one, the main obstacle being first to achieve economic growth and social self-sustaining. The notion of marginal, at its most abstract conception, refers to areas which have not yet penetrated the norms, values and ways of being modern men [3].

In turn, Juarez Bolaños (2005) considers that the marginalization is understood as a social phenomenon in which members of different social groups are struggling to improve their quality of life because of their location in a system of positions nested in terms of power relations [8].



So, for Cortés, marginalization has to do with access to the benefits of development, related to gaps and affecting communities, and for Juarez it is a social phenomenon in which members of social groups are struggling to improve their lifestyle for their place in the system related to power relations. Juarez also considers that the conceptual development of the term «marginalization» is a contribution of Latin American sociology, which has generated much discussion, especially since the decade of the sixties of the twentieth century, when the term was used to explain certain social phenomena originating from rapid urbanization, lived in this part of the planet [8].

However, there are other views as that of Botto, Fenoglio and Moulia (2002) who in their work «Marginalization and social exclusion by unemployment», understand the process by which a society refuses to particular individuals, from simple indifference to repression and imprisonment. It is also the case of those who, not consistent with the values and norms of a given society, marginalize themselves [1]. Here marginalization appears as a process in which society rejects certain persons and it expresses identification between marginalization and exclusion. In this work, it is identified a specific feature of marginalization: deprivation or normal difficulty by satisfaction of secondary needs. This phenomenon can occur either by following the ideals of the community or when society responds to the interests of a powerful minority group.

The authors emphasize that social exclusion is a process, not a condition. Therefore, if social exclusion is the same as social marginalization, the latter is not obligatory and boundaries change, and who is now excluded/marginalized, tomorrow can be included/installed depending on education, demographics, social prejudice, business practices, public policies, etc. [1].

So, the term «marginalization» is related to social exclusion and is a structural phenomenon that begins in the form, style, or pattern of development. Marginalization comprises the entire population, as it applies to their areas of residence. It is a social phenomenon that affects humans, men in their personal, psychological, professional and social development; reproduces and aggravates, undermining human development.

Summarizing, it can be stated that the educational strategies used by Mexican government as mechanisms for integration of migrant farm workers into working life in the current socio-economic conditions (Programs of National Council for Life and Work, National Institute for Adult Education, Centers for Adult Basic Education, Centers for School Education, Program for Care of Demand of Adult Education, Program of Care for Migrant Farm Workers, Opportunities Program, Cultural Missions), have succeeded. The scope of the purpose of migrant farm workers education in Mexico is far-reaching and is represented in three major areas: encourage self-responsibility and the process of self-realization of the individual, appropriate cultural and vocational training; promote and raise the cultural, professional and social status of the population; training to enable higher levels of efficient production and increase the corresponding income to raise the standard of living and a fair distribution of goods. The study showed that it is also worth noting the diversity of educational opportunities for migrant farm workers.



However, statistics show that of the entire population with potential educational backwardness (30 849.893 people), according to budget targets Expenditures of the Federation (PEF) of 2012, only 19 494.929 people were attended. Even less is the number of youth and adults who concluded primary and/or secondary school: only 4222.663 people, representing 13.69%.

Список використаних джерел:

1. Botto, J., Fenoglio, M., Moulia, L. *Marginación y desocupación. Programa de la asignatura «Análisis de situaciones sociales».* Madrid: Universidad Complutense de Madrid, 2002. - [Електронний ресурс] – Режим доступу: <http://pendientedemigracion.ucm.es/centros/cont/descargas/documento5198>.
2. CEPAL. *Panorama social de América Latina.* CEPAL, 2008.
3. Cortés, F. *Consideraciones sobre la marginalidad, marginación, pobreza y desigualdades en la distribución del ingreso // Papeles de Población, Vol. 12, No. 47, enero-marzo, 2006, Universidad Autónoma del Estado de México, Toluca, México. – pp. 71–84.*
4. Damian A. *Panorama de la pobreza en América latina y México. // Boltvinik J., Damián A. (coordinadores). La pobreza en México y el mundo: realidades y desafíos. México: Siglo veintiuno editores, 2004 – pp. 146–162*
5. DESAL. *La marginalidad en América Latina: un ensayo de diagnóstico.* Barcelona: Herder. – 1969.
6. DFID (Departamento de Desarrollo Internacional del Reino Unido). *Building Peaceful States and Societies // ADFID Practice Paper.* Londres, 2010. – [Електронний ресурс] – Режим доступу: www.gsdrc.org/docs/open/CON75.pdf.
7. Instituto Nacional para la Educación de los Adultos, INEA. *Acuerdo número 662 por el que se emiten las Reglas de Operación de los Programas de Atención a la Demanda de Educación para Adultos (INEA) y Modelo de Educación para la Vida y el Trabajo (INEA), 2013.* - [Електронний ресурс] – Режим доступу: http://www.inea.gob.mx/transparencia/pdf/marco_normativo/Acuerdo_662
8. Juárez Bolaños D. *Marginación y políticas públicas en el medio rural. El caso de la Sierra de Tequila, Jalisco. Tesis doctoral. El Colegio de Michoacán, A. C. Centro de Estudios Rurales. Zamora, Michoacán, 2005. – 210 p.*
9. Negretti D., Tovar A. *El concepto de marginalidad. Aplicación en el contexto latinoamericano, Universidad Central de Venezuela, 1987. – P. 23–24.*
10. ONU DAES (Departamento de Asuntos Económicos y Sociales de las Naciones Unidas). 2009. *La Situación de los Pueblos Indígenas del Mundo.* New York, 2009. – [Електронний ресурс] – Режим доступу: www.onu.daes
11. Paleta Pérez, G. *Territorios y ruralidades: Jornaleros agrícolas en el cultivo de zarzamora en el valle de los Reyes, Michoacán, México // Revista de Antropología Experimental, No. 12, 2012, Texto 2. – pp. 17–28, Universidad de Jaén (España) (UNAM. Sede la Ciénega. Jiquilpan de Juárez, Michoacán (México).*
12. PNUD (Programa de las Naciones Unidas para el Desarrollo). *Informe sobre Desarrollo Humano 2014 «Sostener el Progreso Humano: reducir vulnerabilidades y construir resiliencia», Naciones Unidas. - 2014.* - [Електронний ресурс] – Режим доступу: <http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate>
13. Park R. *Human migration and the marginal man // American Journal of Sociology. Chicago, Vol. 33, № 6, 1928. – P. 881–893.*
14. Sánchez, P., Rodríguez, R. *La migración de los oaxaqueños en el siglo XX. Oaxaca: CIIDIR-IPN. – 2008.*
15. Schulze, M. *El legado histórico de la categoría analítica de marginalidad en América Latina, // ISEES, No. 13, julio-diciembre 2013, pp. 89–105.* - [Електронний ресурс] – Режим доступу: <http://www.isees.org/file.aspx?id=7609>.