

**Elena Zhizhko***Autonomous University  
of Zacatecas  
Mexico**e-mail: eanatoli@yahoo.com***SOCIO-EDUCATIONAL  
PROGRAMS FOR MIGRANT  
FARM WORKERS IN MEXICO:  
MAIN FEATURES***Received: November, 2014  
1st Revision: January, 2015  
Accepted: March, 2015***DOI: 10.14254/2071-  
789X.2015/8-1/15**

**Abstract.** This paper presents the results of a scientific pedagogical research, which goal was to reveal the main features of the socio-educational programs for migrant farm workers in Mexico, studying the projects of the Mexican government to integrate the agricultural laborers into social and working life. The study showed that the socio-educational programs for migrant farm workers in Mexico are characterized by the following aspects: decentralization; budgets and government actions at national and local levels; educational cooperation with non-governmental organizations as well as private institutions and NGOs, both domestic and foreign; influence of civil organizations and their organization in networks; diversity of educational programs; creation of training programs for educators.

**Keywords:** socio-educational programs for migrant farm workers; Mexican educational system; adults' education; mechanisms for integration into social and working life; educational cooperation.

**JEL classification:** I24

**Introduction**

In Mexico, 15 million people each year migrate internally, from which, more than 2 million are agricultural laborers. Meanwhile, the potential population (agricultural laborers and their families) is quantified as 5.2 million people (53% are male and 47% female) (DOF-SEGOB, 2013). Men and women working as agricultural laborers in the Mexican states, form the so called "agricultural cycle of the Northwest". 90% of them work for large agricultural enterprises engaged in the export of products. These industries find in migrants a flexible workforce, that performs the arduous and exhausting work without any contract or labor rights (Palata Pérez, 2012, p.17). In general, the causes of migration of agricultural laborers are: financial need (absolute lack of job opportunities); poverty in their places of origin; family dependence; domestic violence; demand for labor; trafficking.

Three migratory patterns developed: pendulum (go and return to the communities of origin), swallow (moving in several regions); seated in work zones. It is important to note that on the issue of migrant farm workers, several sociological studies with different methodological and conceptual orientations have been performed. Many studies are interested in the health of laborers affected by the application of pesticides and agrochemicals in various crops (Palacios,

---

**RECENT ISSUES IN SOCIOLOGICAL RESEARCH**

---

2004; Seefoó, 2005; Olimon, 2005, among others). Several investigations are devoted to the experiences and living conditions of laborers in the fields and in their communities of origin, they record and display the fragile and intense exploitation conditions experienced by working agricultural laborers, adults and children; others address issues of gender relations, power and labor exploitation along with testimonials and pictures (Torres, 1997, Talavera, 2005; Galindo, Landa, 2007; Sánchez, Rodríguez, 2008; Paleta, 2011; Paleta, 2012, among others). Most research documented the difficulty for identifying agricultural laborers as being migrant groups with high spatial mobility and characterized them as heterogeneous groups with different ethnic affiliations and groups which demand educational and governmental attention.

On the other hand, the study of the problems of migrant farm workers, takes up the subject of marginalization. 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 (Adler-de-Lomnitz, Alonso, Attanacio, Beccaria, Boltvinik, Cabrera, Castel, Cavarozzi, Chambers, Cordera, Cortés, Cruz-Betancourt, Cuéllar, Damián, Del-Val, Diloretto, Dresser, Enríquez, Escudero, Filgueira, Furtado, Gordon, Grassi, Gregorio-Enríquez, Juárez-Bolaños, Kampbel, Katzman, Lechner, Lerner, Lomelí, López, Lustig, Mathus-Robles, Negretti, Osorio, Pacheco Silva, Pizarro, Quijano, Saraví, Schulze, Sen, Székely, Thomsen, Tovar, Urdaneta-Carruyo, Vinding, among others), one possible amendment is inclusive education for marginalized groups, including migrant farm workers.

In Latin American countries from the eighties of the twentieth century, several regional projects have been conducted related to education in general and in particular with the training for life and work: The Major Project of Education in Latin America and the Caribbean (PRELAC), 1980; Regional Education Project of Latin America and the Caribbean (PRELAC), 2001; Program for Promotion of Educational Reform in Latin America and the Caribbean (PREAL), 2005; Program “Eurososial Education”, 2006; “Goals 2021: the education we want. Bicentennial 2010”; Program “European Union Latin-Caribbean America”, 2010, etc.

In México, from the twenties of the twentieth century, the Cultural Missions have been launched, which provide different supports, including educational services in rural areas for migrant farm workers. 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), Fund Contributions for Social Infrastructure (FAIS), etc.

However, research on the results of these programs has shown that government projects not only have not resolved the problem of poverty, but they deepened it. This was primarily due not so much because the supports for rural zones were very symbolic, and many times these small amounts of money have failed to reach their recipients due to corruption, but also because these small amounts have been spent by farmers for various other purposes (move to USA, alcoholism, family parties, buying expensive items, etc.), except 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 because of floods and tropical storms, etc.) contribute in making farmer’s work very heavy and counterproductive. This adds to ensure that the work doesn’t provide 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; Juárez-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, in excess of the ones in the eighties (Damian, 2004, p. 150).

Therefore, it can be argued that social policies served a fragmented problem of designing social issues. This situation highlighted the exclusion of all those stakeholders who are not favored by these policies and also it is a considerable evidence of the denial of the rights inherent to all human beings.

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 Labor Organization (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 the 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 cases of indigenous workers in the south of Chihuahua, Culiacan, Navolato, Los Mochis, Angostura, Elota, Guasave, Las Palmas, La Cruz (Sinaloa), Nayarit, etc.) (Paleta Pérez, 2012).

So, although the law does not explicitly discriminate migrant farm workers, the absence of effective policies leaves them excluded and vulnerable (DFID, 2010). This magnifies the vulnerability of migrant farm workers by limiting the amount and quality of public services they receive. This marginal group is also more exposed to certain risks and has less capacity and intrinsic ability to cope with the crisis, they 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, is more likely to get sick and die, dominates a smaller vocabulary and has difficulty to express himself. He/she 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 (Chambers, 2006; Escudero, Diloretto, 2004).

The abuses of employers towards migrants are explained by, among other factors, the illiteracy, lack of basic education, ignorance of their rights, etc.: “[...] Many migrant farm workers don’t know their rights and exploitative employers abuse them. [...] They work 16 hours daily, with active participation of children as laborers, have poor quality of food provided to them, stay in extremely inappropriate sites”<sup>1</sup>.

Hence, the precarious situation of migrant farm workers requires an urgent scientific solution through the developing of mechanisms for their social integration, one of which is education. So, one of the initiatives of the Mexican government is betting on inclusive education for life and work of farm laborers, give them the tools for the rational use of natural resources and productive farming, through special socio-educational programs.

---

<sup>1</sup> Extracts from interviews with researchers of the Institute for Teaching and Ethnological Research of Zacatecas, Mexico (IDIEZ), applied in October, 2014.

The goal of this research is reveal the main features of socio-educational programs for migrant farm workers in Mexico, studying the projects of the Mexican government for integration of agricultural laborers into social and working life: the Human Development Program *Opportunities*, the Care Program of Demand of Adult Education and its variants, the Care Program for Migrant Farm Workers and Bilingual Indigenous Program.

Further, the research tasks are: put forward the quantitative and qualitative data about the present situation of migrant farm workers in Mexico; analyze general data of the Mexican inclusive education for marginalized groups; to let know the main features of the Mexican socio-educational programs for migrant farm workers.

This work was performed under the critical-dialectical approach, using research methods of analysis, synthesis, comparison and generalization that were necessary to study the original texts and official documents; organization of the studied material and its exposure. The empirical data presented in this paper were obtained through semi-structured qualitative interviews with open questions applied to key informants, and served to understand the perspective of subjects involved in socio-educational programs for migrant farm workers. Interviews were conducted in particular with the representatives of the Institute for Adult Education of Zacatecas, México (IZEA) (one person), specialists of the Institute for Teaching and Ethnological Research of Zacatecas, Mexico (IDIEZ) (two persons), migrant farm workers of agricultural camps of the state of Zacatecas, Mexico (five persons). The time period of the analysed data is January, 2014 – February, 2015. The wording of the questions (methodological tools) is presented in annexes. The positive methodological experience is that the interview method allowed to gain of respondents the trust and unpublished information, the real data about life situations and collected qualitative data that reveal the real state of affairs on the object of study; and the difficulties (or negative methodological experience) are that the interview is the method that requires the longer approach to the object of study; takes place after a considerable period of observations and choice of key informant; causes unpredictable organizational and methodical situations; requires that interviewer possess several specific skills: understand and know how to handle the psychology of an outcast, be patient, observant, etc. Finally, it is difficult to compare obtained empirical results with the data from other studies, because don't exist studies about implementation of the Care Program for Migrant Farm Workers and Bilingual Indigenous Program in the state of Zacatecas, Mexico.

The section “The main research material” contains information about research findings; the section “Conclusions and research perspectives” concludes about the research material and presents implications for a future research, and the section “References” comprehends the major bibliographic sources which have been used.

### **The main research**

One of the most vulnerable regions in the world is Latin America, where 204 million people live in poverty, 78 million of them in rural areas; one fifth of the population 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 (PNUD, 2014).

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, the support and protection in case of adverse events.

## RECENT ISSUES IN SOCIOLOGICAL RESEARCH

In Mexico, the use of cheap labor of indigenous migrant farm workers 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 5.2 million of laborers, of whom 70% are indigenous people of Chiapas, Guerrero, Hidalgo, Oaxaca, Sierra de Nayarit, Veracruz (Paleta Pérez, 2012, p.17).

The migrant indigenous farmworkers represent heterogeneous groups with different ethnic affiliations: Cora, Huichol, Zapotec, Mixtec, Triqui, Mazatec, Mixe, Chinantec, Amuzgo, Chatino, Wixarika, Tepehuan. 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 the places where they stay there's no basic services like electricity, water and drainage; they live in overcrowded and unsanitary conditions (Sánchez, Rodríguez, 2008) (table 1).

Table 1. Characterization of agricultural workers using criteria of multidimensional poverty measurement.

Populations (multi-dimensional 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
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>

Source: Prepared by National Survey of Agricultural Workers of the Ministry of Social Development of Mexico (DOF-SEGOB, 2013).

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 and food: “[...] The caciques-entrepreneurs take buses to the states of Veracruz, Guerrero and Oaxaca promising higher wages for farmers, but with the condition that they move with the whole family and then forcing women and children from 4 years work in the fields, intensifying exploitation. [...] They live in illegality, where is practiced only cacique’s law. [...] There are no rules, schedules, rights, human dignity and fewer guarantees”<sup>2</sup>.

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

<sup>2</sup> Extracts from interviews with researchers of IDIEZ, applied in October, 2014.

## RECENT ISSUES IN SOCIOLOGICAL RESEARCH

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): “[...] We work seven days a week, more than 12 hours daily during peak season. [...] our work is paid by the piece, in the case of tomato is paid for collected buck [approx. 15 kilos/bucket; to reach the minimum are needed 13 buckets per hour]”. “We work with temperatures of 40° in the shade [...]”<sup>3</sup>.

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<sup>4</sup> daily (Sanchez, Rodríguez, 2008): “[...] We live in tunnels of chilies dryers, for which we pay a rent of 10 pesos a day”<sup>5</sup>.

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:* Prepared by National Survey of Agricultural Workers of the Ministry of Social Development of Mexico (DOF-SEGOB, 2013).

The working conditions of migrant farm 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 agreed wages and they lack of the most basic labor rights: “[...] We charge until the cut ends, and it can be the contract price or one which decides to end the pattern”. “In the cane, they pay us 10 pesos for “fist cut cane” and 20 or 25 pesos per ton [bowl, grate, safety, fist, etc. are measures that determine the payment]”. “[...] every morning we cut lemon or tomato. [...] Sometimes we make 50 pesos and when we hurry, almost reach 100 pesos. [...] For each box of tomatoes we fill, they give us 10 pesos”. “[...] We make as 120 pesos a day, started work at

<sup>3</sup> Extracts from interviews with indigenous wixarika coming from Veracruz (Martínez de la Torre) and Huasteca (Río Verde) and tepehuanes coming from Durango to the camps of Jerez, Jalpa, Juchipila, Tlaltenango, Fresnillo, Calera, Loreto, Villa de Cos (Zacatecas), applied in May, 2014.

<sup>4</sup> 15-16 Mexican pesos equals \$ 1 USA dollar.

<sup>5</sup> Extracts from interviews with indigenous wixarika and tepehuanes, applied in May, 2014.

---

**RECENT ISSUES IN SOCIOLOGICAL RESEARCH**

---

04:00 in the morning and ended as at 01:00 pm or later [...]”. “We form teams of 10 each one and plant in every hectare between 35 and 50 thousand seedlings of chili or red tomato [...]”<sup>6</sup>.

Agricultural laborers, in addition to low wages, suffer humiliation and abuse in everyday life; they are discriminated because of race and poverty, not only by 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: “They live in poor conditions in camps without running water, so drink water contaminated with pesticides, lack of sanitation and adequate medical service. [...] There are constantly pesticide poisonings, although patterns give vouchers to laborers to being seen doctor. However, social security hospitals usually don’t have drugs and don’t addressing serious illnesses or operations. [...] There is common poisoning, sometimes fatal, for the use of agrochemicals without control, and the participation of thousands of children in farming”<sup>7</sup>.

The precarious situation of this group of marginalized, requires a development of mechanisms for their integration into productive life. So, the Mexican government improves the system of education for life and work for marginalized groups including farm laborers. It 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), 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.

It’s important to note, that the education of migrant agricultural laborers, as well as the whole adults’ educational sector, has a marginal character in the Mexican educational system

---

<sup>6</sup> Extracts from interviews with indigenous wixarika and tepehuanes, applied in May, 2014.

<sup>7</sup> Extracts from interviews with researchers of IDIEZ, applied in October, 2014.

(this is seen through their budgets: 0,92% of the whole educational budget); but despite this, it has developed various actions. Another problem is that the participation of government agencies in educational activities is shrinking. As a counterpart, civil society organizations develop actions, mainly non-formal and oriented to impoverished urban, rural and indigenous areas. An important player is also the private sector, which has a policy of job training for their workers. In the 2012-2013 school year, the total number of adults who received educational services, has reached 76.8% of public sector institutions and 23.2% private agencies (SEP, 2014).

The socio-educational programs for marginalized, encourage investment in capacity building by expanding opportunities for families in poverty to succeed through their own efforts, raise education for life and work considering the multiethnic population. One of these is Human Development Program *Opportunities*, an instrument of the Federal Government to combat poverty developing intersectional actions for education, health and nutrition, which was created in 2002.

The objective of this project is to expand access of families living in poverty, through a cash transfer and food supplements conditional on the attendance of children to school and monitoring their health, also contributing to reduce extreme poverty; create equal opportunities for the poor and vulnerable groups; support the development of skills of people in poverty; strengthen the social fabric and promoting participation and community development. In 2002-2007 *Opportunities* benefited 5 million families. Approximately 30% of the families were in the states of Veracruz, Chiapas and Oaxaca (major states which export labor of migrant farm workers) (SEDESOL, 2007).

From the perspective of the National Education Program, *Opportunities* is part of the objectives of: moving towards equity in education; provide quality education suited to the needs of all Mexicans; promote social participation in education. The design of *Opportunities* breaks the diagnosis that the vicious circle of poverty becomes a complex web of factors that traps preventing individuals to improve their skills or access structured equal opportunities regarding the rest of the population. This vicious circle is determined by the perverse interaction between low education and low income (SEDESOL, 2007).

*Opportunities'* objective population is all the households living below the poverty line. The program has a National Coordination where are the efforts of the Ministries of Social Development, Health, Education and the Mexican Social Security Institute.

Another Mexican government's action to promote education of vulnerable groups was the incorporation in the National Education Program 2000-2006, of a subsector program *Education for Life and Work*. Being both: an approach and a policy, it is proposed to give an education that not only compensates for the delays caused by inequity in access to school education, but also provides a quality education considering various areas of the lives of people and not just academic (SEP, 2013).

As a condition for the implementation of the approach of education for life and work and access to education for disadvantaged sectors are considered actions around lifelong learning. One of the key strategies for the proper functioning of *Education for life and work* was the creation of the National Council for Life and Work (CONEVyT) and National Institute for Adult Education (INEA) as coordination mechanisms with reasonable base resources and sufficient management capacity.

The CONEVyT's objectives are to support and coordinate activities among the various agencies that offer this service, promote the implementation of new programs and define national policies in this area by promoting social participation through the use of technology and telecommunications allocating resources to priority programs.

---

**RECENT ISSUES IN SOCIOLOGICAL RESEARCH**

---

Finally, it is proposed that, as a short-term policy, the CONEVyT achieves joint actions on education and training for work with various entities through a national system. Hence, it is considered necessary to achieve the articulation of institutions that provide education for youth and adults through CONEVyT to form a national system; advance the care of the lag with a quality education; and improve equity of Mexicans through education and training aimed at the population in poverty. The priority subjects of education for life and work are: young people (15-24 years without basic education), Indians (five million), workers (three and a half million), workers requiring recognition of labor skills (fifteen million). Importantly, to propose evaluation as an action that takes the CONEVyT, assuming the importance of monitoring and balancing processes to improve the political orientations (CONEVyT, 2005).

The CONEVyT's projects are operated by the National Institute of Adult Education (INEA) through the State Institutes for Adult Education and delegations of INEA in the states. Considering the education of vulnerable groups, INEA developed the Care Program for Demand of Adult Education with Education Model for Life and Work (MEVyT). Its variants are the Care Program for Migrant Farm Workers and Bilingual Indigenous Program.

The Care Program for Migrant Farm Workers develops from a consideration about the migrant agricultural day laborers as a disadvantaged group. It also provides resources for training, updating and gratifying service providers in camps, hostels, informal settlements and communities of origin of the ejector locations in this population. It is a project that performs actions with the support of other agencies through the project Foster and Improve Intercultural Education for Migrants which began operations in 2003. It uses the pedagogical model MEVyT and is accompanied by actions for teaching Spanish as a second language (INEA, 2013).

The Care Program for Migrant Farm Workers relies on other projects of educational and social development: The Basic Education Program for Children of Migrant Agricultural Laborers' Families (PRONIM), Program for Agricultural Workers (PAJA), Undersecretary for Prospective Planning and Evaluation of Ministry of Social Development of Mexico (SEDESOL), Sub Job Mobility (SUMLI), Temporary Employment Program (PET) of the Ministry of Agricultural Development (SEDAGRO), Programs of the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (SAGAR), Programs of Department of Integral Family Development (DIF): Assistance Food Program for Social Vulnerable Subjects (PASASV), School Breakfast Program (PRODES), Spaces Program for Food, Meeting and Development (EAEyD), Mobile Network Promoting Rural Opportunities Program, Life Insurance Heads of Household, etc.

Another variation of MEVyT serving to migrant farm workers, who speak an indigenous language, whether in the home communities or agricultural or urban concentration, is the Bilingual Indigenous Program (MIB). Since it is possible that the agricultural or urban concentrations don't count with speaker advisors specific for the languages required, regular educational consultants can improve care by incorporating beside the figure of an interpreter a solidarity auxiliary indigenous language speaker and in the localities of origin they can support learning assistants with an interpreter who speaks fluent Spanish (INEA, 2013, p. 43).

The Bilingual Indigenous Program addresses populations speaking different indigenous languages, taking into account the linguistic characteristics of learners, especially for literacy or initial educational level. The MIB is characterized by performing literacy in the mother tongue, in order to make it easier to transfer that ability, and promotes a bilingual learning considering Spanish as a second language. Therefore, there are the educational services performed by local bilingual counselors, from literacy to high school. As the population of indigenous origin may have various linguistic characteristics in relation to its handling of Spanish (monolingual or receptive bilingualism, incipient or coordinated bilingualism), at the start of training, applicants apply an initial interview. Subsequently, the person registers indicating its linguistic situation

---

**RECENT ISSUES IN SOCIOLOGICAL RESEARCH**

---

and specific native language, based on the catalog of National Registration System (SASA). This allows having an electronic control of incorporation, accreditation, academic progress and certification of adults (INEA, 2013, p. 42).

Both aforementioned socio-educational programs use the Model of Education for Life and Work (MEVyT), which is based in the postulates of Jomtien, agreements of CONFINTEA V, the Regional Framework for Adult Education, resumes constructivism and cognitivism and promotes flexible, diversified and open learning.

MEVyT is aimed at adults who have not started or completed their basic education or want to continue learning and allows people to recognize and integrate the experiences and knowledge they already have; enrich their knowledge with new elements that are useful and meaningful to their development; improve their ability to search and manage the information to keep learning; strengthen basic skills of reading, writing, numeracy, oral expression and understanding of the natural and social environment around them; explain in their own words the social and natural phenomena; participate responsibly in the democratic life of the country; strengthen the skills, attitudes and values that enhance and transform their life and their community in a framework of legality, respect and responsibility; take reasoned and responsible decisions, based on their creativity, learning, and application of scientific methods and logical procedures.

This educational model operates through Meeting Points and Community Places (Pl@zas Comunitarias). First, are places provided by the community, including schools, churches, ejido houses, etc., where people gather, form study groups and obtain a comprehensive education service. The Meeting Points are coordinated by a headline who incorporates voluntary consultants and organizes educational attention for learners.

The Community Places are an operating strategy of MEVyT and a program in itself. As a strategy, they are defined as educational spaces open to the community, have computers and collections of printed materials, videos, CDs and other learning resources. In fact, they represent the space in which it is assumed as relevant the use of new technologies by the vulnerable population.

Notwithstanding the existence of several socio-educational programs for migrant farm workers allegedly implemented by the government since 2005 in all states of the republic, empirical data obtained through qualitative interviews show some inconsistencies. So, the interview with the deputy technical director of Institute for Adult Education of Zacatecas (IZEA), which, according to the Agreement number 662 emitted Rules for Operation Care Programs Demand for Adult Education and Model of Education for Life and Work, since 2005 operates Care Program for Migrant Farm Workers (INEA, 2013), revealed that in reality this Program is not implemented in the state:

**Interviewer:** How IZEA learns the needs of adult education that exist in the state? Have any studies conducted?

**Interviewee:** We rely on data from INEGI [National Institute of Statistics, Geography and Informatics] also INEA sends us every year forecasts and suggestions. From there are drawn each year goals to follow.

**Interviewer:** So what INEA programs operating in this year in Zacatecas?

**Interviewee:** Programs for children (10-15 years), adult literacy and primary and secondary adult high school program through IZEA Convention with the College of Bachelors of Mexico.

**Interviewer:** There is implemented in Zacatecas the Care Program for Migrant Farm Workers or Bilingual Indigenous Program in this year?

**Interviewee:** Not.

**Interviewer:** In some of these programs that you mentioned, have participated migrant farm workers?

**Interviewee:** We don't have this information, we usually have statistics by age, municipalities, etc., but not for vulnerable groups. If it's necessary, we can make this study, we can also study their needs; and if required, we will request that implement the Care Program for Migrant Farm Workers<sup>8</sup>.

So the first approach to the problem of education of migrant farm workers in the state of Zacatecas, showed that they are not attended by the Care Program for Migrant Farm Workers operated by the National Institute of Adult Education, is not implemented by the Institute for Adult Education of Zacatecas.

Furthermore, although the educational authorities of Mexico have made an attempt to develop special education programs for migrant farm workers, however, they have not taken into account all cultural characteristics of this group of marginalized, have not been addressed to national experts who master this topic. This is confirmed by data obtained through interview with the expert in Indigenous studies of the Autonomous University of Zacatecas.

**Interviewer:** In your opinion, for representatives from the Nahuatl culture, once embedded in the national education system, must be applied the same teaching methods as for other students?

**Interviewee:** In short, no. These people need pedagogical methods very different from "regular" education.

**Interviewer:** Do you know the Care Program for Migrant Farm Workers or Bilingual Indigenous Program operated by the National Institute of Adult Education through the Institute for Adult Education of Zacatecas?

**Interviewee:** I've heard, but do not know thoroughly.

**Interviewer:** You have participated in the development of these programs? Were you invited as an expert in indigenous studies to assess the development of these programs?

**Interviewee:** No<sup>9</sup>.

Finally, the workers themselves don't see the sense in the study, either for them or for their children. They claim that labor is the main thing: "For us, the first is the job and after the study [...]. When we come to work, our children are with us and help us, they don't go to school. [...] We don't have time for this [study], we have to work"<sup>10</sup>. It can be assumed in this case that it's requiring the development of a system of incentives by the socio-educational programs to attract laborers to conclude basic education.

## Conclusions and research perspectives

Summarizing, it can be stated that the socio-educational programs for migrant farm workers in Mexico are components of both: education system, as well as social development. After unsuccessful attempts to reduce poverty through compensatory programs in the seventies, eighties and nineties of the twentieth century, social policy sought in the early twenty-first century to create conditions for the population through education incorporated in successful labor markets, and begin to trigger virtuous circles for more training, higher incomes and poverty alleviation.

---

<sup>8</sup> Extracts from interview with the deputy technical director of Institute for Adult Education of Zacatecas, applied in November, 2014.

<sup>9</sup> Extracts from interview with the expert in indigenous studies, applied in February, 2015.

<sup>10</sup> Extracts from interviews with indigenous wixarika and tepehuanes, applied in May, 2014.

In the first decade of the XXI century, Mexican government undertook the following actions for the development of socio-educational programs for migrant agricultural laborers: created the Human Development Program *Opportunities*, the subsectorial educational program *Education for Life and Work*, the National Council for Life and Work, the National Institute for Adult Education, the Care Program for Demand of Adult Education with Education Model for Life and Work, the Care Program for Migrant Farm Workers and the Bilingual Indigenous Program.

In general, the socio-educational programs for migrant farm workers in Mexico are characterized by the following aspects: decentralization; budgets and government actions at national and local levels; educational cooperation with non-governmental organizations as well as private institutions and NGOs, both domestic and foreign; influence of civil organizations and their organization in networks; diversity of educational programs; creation of training programs for educators.

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 marginalized 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.

However, the socio-educational programs for migrant farm workers have three negative characteristic features: it cares less for the most vulnerable population in terms of their productive insertion; farm workers with less schooling appear as an underserved group; the participation of government agencies in educational activities is shrinking. In addition, these programs don't have full coverage in all states of Mexico, so if the person began his/her studies at the place of his/her residence, he/she can't continue in agricultural camps. The programs are designed without taking into account specific needs of laborers, most of whom are representatives of various indigenous ethnic groups; it haven't a system of convincing stimuli that were to spur workers to obtain basic education.

It is considered appropriate to devote future research about the socio-educational programs for migrant farm workers, to quantitative and qualitative empirical study of the actual situation in the education of this group of socio-economically marginalized.

### **Acknowledgements**

This paper was partly supported by the Project "Education of marginal groups" (UAZ-2013-36414) of the Autonomous University of Zacatecas, Mexico. Research Institutions and Researchers: Elena Zhizhko (Autonomous University of Zacatecas, Mexico), Delfina De la Cruz (The Institute for Teaching and Ethnological Research of Zacatecas, Mexico (IDIEZ)), Abelardo De la Cruz (The Institute for Teaching and Ethnological Research of Zacatecas, Mexico (IDIEZ)), Martín Beltrán Saucedo (Autonomous University of San Luis Potosí, Mexico), Larisa Balakhadze (Institute of Pedagogical Education and Adult Education of the National Academy of Pedagogical Sciences of Ukraine, Kiev, Ukraine).

### **References**

- CONEVyT (Consejo Nacional de Educación para la Vida y el Trabajo) (2005), Acuerdo por el que se modifica el diverso mediante el cual se crea el consejo nacional de educación para la vida y el trabajo// <http://www.conevyt.org.mx> (referred on 09/03/2014).
- Chambers, R. (2006), Vulnerability, Coping and Policy (Editorial Introduction), *IDS Bulletin*, Vol. 4, no. 7, pp. 33-40.

---

**RECENT ISSUES IN SOCIOLOGICAL RESEARCH**

---

- Damián, A. (2004), 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 XXI.
- DFID (Departamento de Desarrollo Internacional del Reino Unido) (2010), Building Peaceful States and Societies // [www.gsdrc.org/docs/open/CON75.pdf](http://www.gsdrc.org/docs/open/CON75.pdf) (referred on 14/05/2014).
- DOF-SEGOB (2013), *Acuerdo por el que se emiten las Reglas de Operación del Programa de Atención a Jornaleros Agrícolas, para el ejercicio fiscal 2014*, México: SEGOB.
- Escudero, J., Diloretto, M. (2004), Números de la pobreza, *Revista Conciencia Social*, Año IV, no. 6, Diciembre de 2004, pp. 136-135.
- INEA (Instituto Nacional de Educación de Adultos) (2013), 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) // [http://www.inea.gob.mx/transparencia/pdf/marco\\_normativo/Acuerdo\\_662\\_ROPINEA\\_2013.pdf](http://www.inea.gob.mx/transparencia/pdf/marco_normativo/Acuerdo_662_ROPINEA_2013.pdf) (referred on 06/07/2014).
- Paleta Pérez, G. (2012), 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).
- PNUD (2014), Informe sobre Desarrollo Humano 2014 “Sostener el Progreso Humano: reducir vulnerabilidades y construir resiliencia”, Naciones Unidas // <http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/HDR/2014HDR> (referred on 06/12/2014).
- Sánchez, P., Rodríguez, R. (2008), *La migración de los oaxaqueños en el siglo XX*, Oaxaca: CIIDIR-IPN.
- SEDESOL (2007), *Reglas de operación del Oportunidades 2008*, México: SEDESOL.
- SEP (Secretaría de Educación Pública) (2013), *Programa Sectorial de Educación 2013-2018*, México: SEP.
- Principales cifras del sistema educativo nacional 2012-2013*, México, SEP, 2014

---

**Annexes*****Cuestionario para la entrevista dirigida a los jornaleros agrícolas migrantes que trabajan en el estado de Zacatecas*****Estimado señor(a),**

Esta entrevista se realiza con el objetivo de obtener la información acerca de la implementación del Programa de Atención a Jornaleros Agrícolas operado por el Instituto Nacional de Educación de Adultos (INEA) a través del Instituto Zacatecano de Educación para Adultos, a fin de desentrañar la realidad existente respecto a este tema, a través del análisis, jerarquización, tamizado de la información recogida y, posteriormente, una evaluación de la misma; forjar planteamientos soportados en las teorías y un dialogo interpretativo en torno a la problemática de la *investigación* “Programas socioeducativos para los jornaleros agrícolas migrantes en México”. Sus respuestas serán de gran utilidad para el desarrollo de este trabajo. Le agradezco de antemano su colaboración esperando que sus respuestas sean lo más claras, honestas y extensas con el fin de que los resultados de la investigación se presenten con la mejor calidad posible.

Atentamente,

Dra. Elena Anatolievna Zhizhko, Responsables de la investigación “Programas socioeducativos para los jornaleros agrícolas migrantes en México”, docente investigadora de la Maestría en Investigaciones Humanísticas y Educativas de la Unidad de Docencia Superior, Universidad Autónoma de Zacatecas.

**Instrucciones:** Al responder cada pregunta, piense en su propia experiencia y responda cada pregunta abierta- y ampliamente. Recuerde, no hay respuestas correctas ni incorrectas y la información proporcionada será confidencial y utilizada estrictamente para fines académicos. ¡Gracias de antemano!

De dónde viene Usted? De qué estado, municipio, comunidad es Usted?

A cuál grupo étnico pertenece (wixarika, tlapaneco, tepehuano, mixteco, etc.)?

Cuál es su idioma materno?

Habla Usted español? Dónde lo aprendió?

Qué edad tiene?

Tiene familia, hijos? Cuántos?

Sabe leer y escribir en español?

Terminó la escuela primaria? Y la secundaria?

Sabe algún oficio (carpintería, albañearía, etc.)?

En qué trabaja en su comunidad?

Trabaja Usted en el campo en otros estados del país? En cuáles? Desde cuándo?

Cuándo se va a trabajar a otros estados y cuándo regresa a su comunidad?

Cuando va a buscar el trabajo en otros estados, lleva con Usted a toda su familia?

Cuándo fue la última vez que estuvo en Zacatecas trabajando en el campo?

Cómo llegó a Zacatecas? Quién le ayudó? Cómo encontró este trabajo?

Cuando llegó a Zacatecas, qué hizo? con quién se dirigió?

Ahí donde trabajó, le dieron casa/albergue para Usted y su familia?

Cuántas personas trabajaban con Usted en este campo agrícola?

De qué hora a qué hora tenía que trabajar?

Cuánto le pagaban?

En qué emplea Usted el dinero ganado fuera?

Vive su familia mejor que otros integrantes de su comunidad que no salen a trabajar fuera?

Sus hijos, iban a la escuela en los campos agrícolas? En qué idioma les daban clases?

Ha participado Usted en algún programa socioeducativo del Instituto Nacional de Educación de Adultos (alfabetización, primaria/secundaria para adultos, indígenas bilingües, etc.)?

Alguno de sus compañeros/as del campo agrícola zacatecano, ha participado en algún programa socioeducativo del Instituto Nacional de Educación de Adultos (alfabetización, primaria/secundaria para adultos, indígenas bilingües, etc.)?

Conoce Usted el Programa de Atención a Jornaleros Agrícolas operado por el Instituto Nacional de Educación de Adultos (INEA) a través del Instituto Zacatecano de Educación para Adultos? Ha participado en él?

Alguno de sus compañeros/as del campo agrícola zacatecano, ha participado en el Programa de Atención a Jornaleros Agrícolas de INEA?

### ***Cuestionario para la entrevista dirigida a los investigadores del Instituto de Docencia e Investigación Etnológica de Zacatecas (IDIEZ)***

**Estimado investigador(a),**

Esta entrevista se realiza con el objetivo de obtener la información acerca de la implementación del Programa de Atención a Jornaleros Agrícolas operado por el Instituto Nacional de Educación de Adultos (INEA) a través del Instituto Zacatecano de Educación para Adultos, a fin de desentrañar la realidad existente respecto a este tema, a través del análisis, jerarquización, tamizado de la información recogida y, posteriormente, una evaluación de la misma; forjar planteamientos soportados en las teorías y un diálogo interpretativo en torno a la problemática de la investigación “Programas socioeducativos para los jornaleros agrícolas migrantes en México”. Sus respuestas serán de gran utilidad para el desarrollo de este trabajo. Le agradezco de antemano su colaboración esperando que sus respuestas sean lo más claras, honestas y extensas con el fin de que los resultados de la investigación se presenten con la mejor calidad posible.

Atentamente,

Dra. Elena Anatolievna Zhizhko, Responsables de la investigación “Programas socioeducativos para los jornaleros agrícolas migrantes en México”, docente investigadora de la Maestría en Investigaciones Humanísticas y Educativas de la Unidad de Docencia Superior, Universidad Autónoma de Zacatecas.

**Instrucciones:** Al responder cada pregunta, piense en su propia experiencia y responda cada pregunta abierta- y ampliamente. Recuerde, no hay respuestas correctas ni incorrectas y la información proporcionada será confidencial y utilizada estrictamente para fines académicos. ¡Gracias de antemano!

Qué formación profesional tiene Usted (licenciatura en...)?

Desde cuándo estudia en la Maestría en Investigaciones Humanísticas y Educativas de la UAZ?

Cuál es el tema de su investigación que está llevando a cabo en la Maestría en Investigaciones Humanísticas y Educativas de la UAZ?

A cuál grupo étnico pertenece Usted? De qué parte de México es Usted?

Su lengua materna es náhuatl? Dónde aprendió el español?

Ha colaborado Usted con algún organismo gubernamental en cuestiones de la problemática indígena? Con cuál/es?

En qué consistía su colaboración?

Tuvo algún apoyo económico por su colaboración?

En la comunidad de donde procede Usted, hay personas que se emplean como jornaleros agrícolas en otros estados del país?

En su mayoría, estas personas tienen educación elemental (primaria), saben leer y escribir en español?

A qué se dedican estas personas en sus comunidades?

Cómo se trasladan a otros estados? Quién les ayuda?

Normalmente, viajan solos o con toda la familia?

Cuánto tiempo duran en estos trabajos de campo?

Cuando salen a trabajar fuera, ganan mucho más que en su comunidad? En qué emplean el dinero ganado fuera?

Viven mejor que otros integrantes de la comunidad que no salen a trabajar fuera?

Dónde viven cuando van a trabajar fuera?

Los hijos de los jornaleros agrícolas, van a la escuela? En qué idioma les dan clases?

Los jornaleros agrícolas adultos, participan en algún programa socioeducativo del Instituto Nacional de Educación de Adultos (alfabetización, primaria/secundaria para adultos, indígenas bilingües, etc.)?

Conoce Usted el Programa de Atención a Jornaleros Agrícolas operado por el Instituto Nacional de Educación de Adultos (INEA) a través del Instituto Zacatecano de Educación para Adultos?

### ***Cuestionario para la entrevista dirigida al experto en estudios indígenas***

**Estimado investigador(a),**

Esta entrevista se realiza con el objetivo de obtener la información acerca de la implementación del Programa de Atención a Jornaleros Agrícolas operado por el Instituto Nacional de Educación de Adultos (INEA) a través del Instituto Zacatecano de Educación para Adultos, a fin de desentrañar la realidad existente respecto a este tema, a través del análisis, jerarquización, tamizado de la información recogida y, posteriormente, una evaluación de la misma; forjar planteamientos soportados en las teorías y un diálogo interpretativo en torno a la problemática de la investigación “Programas socioeducativos para los jornaleros agrícolas migrantes en México”. Sus respuestas

---

**RECENT ISSUES IN SOCIOLOGICAL RESEARCH**


---

serán de gran utilidad para el desarrollo de este trabajo. Le agradezco de antemano su colaboración esperando que sus respuestas sean lo más claras, honestas y extensas con el fin de que los resultados de la investigación se presenten con la mejor calidad posible.

Atentamente,

Dra. Elena Anatolievna Zhizhko, Responsables de la investigación “Programas socioeducativos para los jornaleros agrícolas migrantes en México”, docente investigadora de la Maestría en Investigaciones Humanísticas y Educativas de la Unidad de Docencia Superior, Universidad Autónoma de Zacatecas.

**Instrucciones:** Al responder cada pregunta, piense en su propia experiencia y responda cada pregunta abierta- y ampliamente. Recuerde, no hay respuestas correctas ni incorrectas y la información proporcionada será confidencial y utilizada estrictamente para fines académicos. ¡Gracias de antemano!

Desde cuándo se dedica Usted a los estudios indígenas?

Qué formación profesional tiene Usted (licenciatura en...)?

Domina Usted náhuatl?

Ha convivido Usted con los representantes de la cultura náhuatl?

Ha visitado Usted las comunidades náhuatl? En qué parte de México?

En estas comunidades, lo han aceptado, le permitieron con facilidad que conviviera con ellos?

Según Usted, qué es lo más importante de la cultura náhuatl? Qué es lo que la distingue de las otras culturas?

Según Usted, a los representantes de la cultura náhuatl, una vez insertos en el sistema educativo nacional, se les debe de aplicar la misma metodología de la enseñanza que a otros alumnos?

Conoce Usted el Programa de Atención a Jornaleros Agrícolas operado por el Instituto Nacional de Educación de Adultos (INEA) a través del Instituto Zacatecano de Educación para Adultos?

Participó Usted en la elaboración de este Programa? Fue Usted invitado como experto en estudios indígenas para asesorar la elaboración de este Programa?

***Cuestionario para la entrevista dirigida al subdirector técnico del Instituto Zacatecano de Educación para Adultos***

**Estimado responsable,**

Esta entrevista se realiza con el objetivo de obtener la información acerca de la implementación del Programa de Atención a Jornaleros Agrícolas operado por el Instituto Nacional de Educación de Adultos (INEA) a través del Instituto Zacatecano de Educación para Adultos, a fin de desentrañar la realidad existente respecto a este tema, a través del análisis, jerarquización, tamizado de la información recogida y, posteriormente, una evaluación de la misma; forjar planteamientos soportados en las teorías y un dialogo interpretativo en torno a la problemática de la investigación “Programas socioeducativos para los jornaleros agrícolas migrantes en México”. Sus respuestas serán de gran utilidad para el desarrollo de este trabajo. Le agradezco de antemano su colaboración esperando que sus respuestas sean lo más claras, honestas y extensas con el fin de que los resultados de la investigación se presenten con la mejor calidad posible.

Atentamente,

Dra. Elena Anatolievna Zhizhko, Responsables de la investigación “Programas socioeducativos para los jornaleros agrícolas migrantes en México”, docente investigadora de la Maestría en Investigaciones Humanísticas y Educativas de la Unidad de Docencia Superior, Universidad Autónoma de Zacatecas.

**Instrucciones:** Al responder cada pregunta, piense en su propia experiencia y responda cada pregunta abierta- y ampliamente. Recuerde, no hay respuestas correctas ni incorrectas y la información proporcionada será confidencial y utilizada estrictamente para fines académicos. ¡Gracias de antemano!

Desde cuándo ocupa Usted este cargo?

Cuáles programas socioeducativos (alfabetización, primaria/secundaria para adultos, indígenas bilingües, etc.) se ofrecen en IZEA?

En qué comunidades, municipios operan?

Cuántas personas fueron atendidas en 2013-2014?

Participan en éstos programas los jornaleros agrícolas migrantes?

Tiene IZEA las estadísticas sobre la atención educativa de los grupos vulnerables en el estado?

Cuenta IZEA con las estadísticas por cada grupo vulnerable atendido (campesinos, trabajadores, indígenas, etc.)?

Opera en Zacatecas el Programa de Atención a Jornaleros Agrícolas? Desde cuándo?

Opera en Zacatecas algún otro programa que brinde la atención educativa a los jornaleros?