Family formation and labor force participation among immigrants in Spain[1]

Alberto del Rey (*University of Salamanca, Spain*)

Rafael Grande (*University of Salamanca, Spain*)

Enrique Fernández-Macías (*European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions,* Ireland)

José Ignacio Antón (*Johannes Kepler University Linz, Austria*)

Rafael Muñoz de Bustillo (*University of Salamanca, Spain*)

1. ABSTRACT

The aim of this paper is to analyze the interferences between the process of family formation and labor force participation among the migrant population in Spain. This population faces two conflicting circumstances; on the one hand, the need-urgency for the children they delayed having due to the migration process, and on the other, the need-urgency to find employment, given that their main reason for migrating was an economic one.

This study uses data from the Spanish National Immigration Survey 2007, and multivariable models have been applied, with the dependent variables being the birth of the first child following the migration process and labor mobility after the first job in the host country.

Our findings reveal different interferences between the process of family formation and labor force participation for migrant men and women. According to a patriarchal family model, men prioritize their labor trajectory over family life, while women adopt the opposite approach. For men, their labor trajectory is not affected by the family trajectory, and their labor trajectory in turn has no effect on the family trajectory, with the exception that unemployment reduces the probability of having children. For women, the family trajectory clearly has an impact on employment, but by contrast, employment does not affect family formation. Note should be taken of the unequal effect that partnership status has on the labor force participation of men and women, as being single or not living with a partner favors the participation of women, but by contrast it facilitates the exit from employment of migrant men. Finally, mention should be made of the lack of significance of job mobility within the labor market in the process of family formation, which may reflect the major segmentation of the Spanish labor market.

[1] This paper is supported by the research projects “Labor and reproduction trajectories among immigrant population during the crisis time. Spain and the international context” (Ref.: CSO2013-41828-R) and "Labour market and social assimilation integration of South-South and South-North migrants. The case of Latin American and Caribbean" (Ref.: CSO2014-57410-JIN), Spanish Ministry of Economic and Competitiveness.

2. INTRODUCTION AND APPROACH

The aim of this paper is to analyze the interference between family and work among the migrant population: on the one hand, we analyze the effect of labor trajectory on family reproduction; and on the other hand, we analyze the effect of family reproduction on labor trajectory.

The relationship between family formation and employment, particularly in the case of women, is a long-standing topic of discussion in sociology, economics and demographics. An initial line of study has focused on an analysis of the direction that relationship takes and on a definition of both its cause and consequence (Cramer, 1980; Bernhardt, 1993; Budig, 2003). A second line has analyzed the specific effects of the number of children on labor force participation (Smith-Lovin and Tickamyer, 1978; Hout, 1978; Smith-Lovin and Tickamyer, 1981; Bernhardt, 1993; Felmlee, 1993; Chenga, 1996), as well as the effects of this participation on family formation (Kravdal, 2002; Adsera, 2004, 2005 and 2011; Baizan, 2006; Kreyenfeld, 2010; Özcan, Mayer and Luedicke, 2010; Lundström and Andersson, 2012; Pailhé and Solaz, 2012; Schmitt, 2012a, 2012b; Ciganda, 2015). This study considers both these perspectives.

This paper's main novelty lies in the study of the interdependence between employment and childbearing in the case of the migrant population. Migration in itself affects the process of family formation. Several studies have shown how labor migration affects the family formation process (Goldstein and Goldstein, 1983; Massey and Mullan, 1984; Carlson, 1985; Stephen and Bean, 1992; Carter, 2000; Cerruti and Massey, 2001; Toulemon and Mazuy, 2004; Andersson, 2004; Parrado and Flipen, 2005). For instance, many migrants delay or postpone having children due to labor migration (Alders, 2000; Cerruti and Massey, 2001; Parrado and Flipen, 2005), since they prioritize work over family formation. Hence the reason that following the migration process, the "urgency-need" for having children coexists alongside the "urgency-need" for work, as the migrant collective studied here singles out economic reasons as the main cause of emigration, both for men (68.7%) and for women (53.1%), according to data from the Spanish National Immigration Survey 2007 (NIS-07).

The second novelty lies in the use of the labor trajectory from the moment of arrival as an employment indicator. This indicator has been constructed by considering the initial job following migration and the last job recorded in 2007. This indicator enables us to consider a broad range of job situations, as employed, not employed and unemployed, as well as upward or downward mobility within the labor market and its relationship with family formation. Many of the studies reviewed consider simply the states of employment and unemployment (Matysiak and Vignoli, 2008; Kreyenfeld and Andersson, 2014)..

The third novelty is considering both men and women. The vast majority of studies focus solely on the female population, and scant attention is paid to the possible relationship between childbearing and male participation in the labor force. Only a handful of studies consider the employment status of men in relationship to childbearing (Kravdal, 2002; Andersson and Scott, 2007). However, having a child is usually a couple's joint decision (Beckman, 1984; Corijn, Liefbroer, Gierveld, and de Jong, 1996; Bauer and Kneip, 2012; Vignoli, Drefahl, and De Santis, 2012; Jalovaara and Miettinen, 2013; Begall, 2013), and most migrations are the result of family strategies (Stark and Levhari, 1982; Stark, 1991; Taylor, 1999).

Finally, it should be noted that we consider here the different personal and family situations at the time of arrival, and the particular context in which it takes place. On the one hand, we are dealing with people largely from developing countries, for whom the economic reason for migrating is accompanied by a prevailing patriarchal family model, with the responsibility for family care corresponding almost exclusively to women, while men are the main breadwinners. On the other hand, one needs to remember that the Spanish labor market is characterized by major occupational segregation, affecting both migrants and nationals alike, as

well as between migrant men and women (Bernardi and Garrido, 2008; Stanek and Veira, 2012; Fernández-Macías et al., 2015). There is a major concentration of migrant women in domestic service and of migrant men in the building sector during an economic period with very low rates of unemployment. Furthermore, there is a dearth of public measures for reconciling family life and work in Spain (Baizán, 2006; Peterson, 2007).

Our analysis uses multi-variable models (logistics and multinomial), with job mobility in the host country and the birth of the first child in Spain as dependent variables. The data are provided by the Spanish National Immigration Survey 2007.

The following are the working hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1. We expect men to prioritize their labor trajectory and women their family trajectory, according to the family model prevailing among most migrants. Even when the main reason for migrating is an economic one among both men and women, women will prioritize the family due to their scant work experience, their limited level of education, and the Spanish labor market's absence of measures for combining a working life with a family one.

Hypothesis 2. For men: in a traditional family, we expect the male breadwinner's stable economic position to be a prerequisite for having children.

Hypothesis 3. For women: in a traditional family and in societies with weaker welfare systems, we expect a woman's position of unemployment or no-employment to increase the likelihood of having children.

Hypothesis 4. For men, we do not expect having a child will impact upon their labor force participation, but it may even have a positive effect by reinforcing upward job mobility and weakening downward mobility.

Hypothesis 5. For women, we expect having a child to negatively impact upon their labor force participation, both for those that were working and for those that were not.

3. METHODOLOGICAL STRATEGY

For this work, we use the 2007 Spanish National Immigration Survey (NIS-2007) carried out by the Spanish National Institute of Statistics (INE). This is a representative survey of the population over the age of 16 born abroad and living in Spain for at least a year, or intending to live in the country for at least a year (n=15465). We have only included migrants of reproductive age, 16-49 years old, who arrived in Spain between 1990 and 2005. This sub-sample consists of 8710 migrants, 3883 men and 4727 women, and permits us to observe all the migrants for a period of at least two years.

3.1. Dependent Variables

We define two dependent variables: (1) the birth of a child after emigrating, and (2) labor and occupational trajectory in Spain. In turn, each one of these variables constitutes the main explanatory variable of the other.

We separately reconstructed the migrants' labor and reproductive trajectories since their arrival in Spain. The *labor trajectory* has been defined by taking into account a migrant's first job in Spain and their employment at the time of the survey in 2007. By using the International Socio-Economic Index (ISEI), an indicator of labor mobility that considers both occupation level and wage, we built an appropriate indicator to measure the labor mobility of migrants in Spain. To do this, we have used the national classification of occupations (CNO, Spanish version of the International Standard Classification of Occupations -ISCO-), which takes into account

migrants' level and sector of occupation, and their wages. As shown in Table 1 in the annex, the five-category occupational codes we generate group occupations with similar ranking positions[2]. To facilitate the subsequent analysis, we make these five categories relatively even in size, which requires making the middle categories slightly larger than they would otherwise have been. Finally, we have defined the following five occupational categories: high or upper occupations, medium-industrial, medium-services, low-industrial, and low-services. In addition, we have considered the unemployed, housewives, and students. Based on these categories, we have defined the following trajectories in Spain:

- *Upward*: recording an improvement in their employment. A particular case are the unemployed who have found employment
- *No change* in their employment
- *Downward*: recording a worsening of their employment
- *From employment to unemployment*
- *Unemployment*: never worked in Spain

Table 1 shows labor mobility by gender. It is noted that the majority maintain their occupational status, while only a minority record slightly upward mobility, with more men doing so than women. Also of note is the significant number that move from situations of employment to no-employment (unemployment or no activity), particularly among women.

Table 1. Descriptive data: labor mobility in Spain by gender

	Total		Men		Women	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Upward	1.344	15,89	743	19,31	601	13,04
No change	4.629	54,74	2.399	62,36	2.230	48,37
Downward	385	4,55	193	5,02	192	4,16
Employment to Unemployment	1.348	15,94	407	10,58	941	20,41
Never worked	751	8,88	105	2,73	646	14,01
Total	8.457	100,00	3.847	100,00	4.610	100,00

Source: Authors' analysis from NIS-07. *253 missing cases

The *reproductive trajectory* is defined by whether or not the migrants have had children in Spain. Among women who have had children, we distinguish between those who have had one child and those who have had two or more children.

- *Childless*: no children since coming to Spain
- *With children*: one, and two or more children

Table 2. Descriptive data: number of children in Spain by gender

	Total		Men		Women	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Childless	5.423	62,26	2.493	62,59	2.930	61,98
One child	2.315	26,58	1.052	26,41	1.263	26,72
Two or more children	972	11,16	438	11,00	534	11,30
Total	8.710	100,00	3.983	100,00	4.727	100,00

[2] For more details see (Fernández-Macía et al., 2015).

Table 2 shows the results of migrants' reproductive trajectory in Spain, with 62% not having had children during their time in the country, so fewer than 40% have had children, mostly just a single child.

3.2. Explanatory and Control Variables

The variables considered for the study of the interdependence between the labor and family trajectories of migrant men and women, according to the theoretical framework reviewed and the availability of data from the Spanish National Immigration Survey 2007, are as follows (table 3):

Table 3. Characteristics of the sample

		Total		Men		Women	
		%	N	%	N	%	N
Gender	Men	45.7	3983				
	Women	54.3	4727				
Origin	EU15/developed economies	11.5	1000	12.1	480	11.0	520
	Eastern Europe	21.7	1892	20.4	813	22.8	1079
	Latin America and Caribbean	45.8	3991	39.4	1569	51.2	2422
	Africa	18.2	1585	24.2	964	13.1	621
	Asia and Oceania	2.8	242	3.9	157	1.8	85
Year in Spain (mean)		6.4	8710	6.6	3983	6.2	4727
Age at arrival	16-24	34.7	3021	33.6	134	35.6	1681
	25-34	46	4004	48	1913	44.2	2091
	35 or more	19.3	1685	18.3	730	20.2	955
Education attainment	Primary or less	24.7	2148	26.5	1054	23.1	1094
	Secondary	54.5	4751	55.4	2207	53.8	2544
	Tertiary and more	20.8	1811	18.1	722	23	1089
Spanish nationality	Yes (Non)	11.6	1010	10.2	405	12.8	605
Economic reasons	Yes (Non)	60.3	5249	68.7	2738	53.1	2511
Family reason	Yes (Non)	24.8	2161	15.5	619	32.6	1542
Marital status	Single	38.1	3318	41.9	167	34.9	1648
	With partner and live together	53.7	4681	53.2	2119	54.2	2562
	With partner but live apart	8.2	711	4.9	194	10.9	517
Children before arriving	0	61.1	5325	68.4	2723	55.0	2602
	1	19.7	1718	16.1	643	22.7	1075
	2 or more	19.1	1667	15.5	617	22.2	105
Temporary contract (permanent)		60.0	3818	58.9	1964	61.3	1854
Occupation at origin	Employed	64.2	5502	72.3	2818	57.5	2684
	Unemployed	11.9	1022	12.7	494	11.3	528
	Study	15.1	1295	14.4	559	15.8	736
	Household duties	8.7	746	0.6	23	15.5	723
Total		100.0	8710	100.0	3983	100.0	4727

Source: Authors' analysis from NIS-07.

3.3. MODELS

The study of causality between family and reproductive trajectories would require the use of longitudinal models that allow ordering the sequence of events along the length of stay in Spain. This would allow us to see the effect the birth of a child has on labor trajectory, or the effect of a change in employment on family

formation. However, the NIS-2007 survey only provides detailed information for reconstructing the reproductive history of each migrant, but not the history of their labor mobility. In the latter case, we have information only for the first job on arrival and employment at the time of the survey. Hence the reason we can only use cross-sectional models, although we propose the double causality between labor force participation and family formation. This involves methodological problems, which means that we should be cautious in our interpretations, and further research is encouraged. The length of residence in Spain is included as an explanatory variable in both trajectories.

We applied logistic (*logit*) and multinomial (*mlogit*) regression models to analyze reproductive and labor trajectories, respectively.

4. RESULTS: INTERPLAY BETWEEN REPRODUCTIVE AND LABOR TRAJECTORIES

The preliminary results allow us to observe significant relationships between labor and reproductive trajectories among the migrant population, albeit with important differences by gender.

4.1. The reproductive trajectory

The first aspect to be noted is that only two labor trajectories affect the probability of having children after the migration process, namely, stopping work and never having worked (table 4). The second aspect to be highlighted is that the effect of these trajectories is completely the opposite for men and women: in the case of men, stopping work or never having worked in the host country reduces the probability of having a child; the opposite is true in the case of women, and significantly more so; in other words, a woman who does not work is more likely to have a child compared to all the other possible labor trajectories.

In third place, specific mention should also be made of the lack of significance of all the other labor trajectories. Regarding this aspect, it is important to refer to the particular nature of the Spanish labor market for the migrant population, given that most of its labor mobility occurs within the same sectors, without entailing a major change in people's working conditions (Simón, Ramos and Sanromá, 2014; Fernández-Macías et al, 2015).

These findings confirm the major division between the roles of men and women as regards the responsibility of being the breadwinner, for the former, and responsibility for the family, for the latter, and so reflect a patriarchal family model among the migrant collective.

Table 4. Reproductive trajectory by gender. Logistic regression models: having a child in Spain (0, 1).

		MEN			WOMEN		
		OR	*Std. Err.*	*Sig.*	*OR*	*Std. Err.*	*Sig.*
Labor trajectory in Spain	Up	1.031	0.103		1.050	0.118	
	No-change	*1*			*1*		
	Down	1.325	0.236		0.955	0.176	
	Employment to Unemployment	0.781	0.111	•	2.494	0.282	***
	Never worked	0.545	0.175	•	2.806	0.396	***
Temporary contract (permanent)		0.965	0.081		1.286	0.123	**
Years in Spain		1.194	0.016	***	1.230	0.016	***
Age at arrival	16-24	0.946	0.093		1.325	0.120	**
	25-34	*1*			*1*		
	35 or more	0.545	0.063	***	0.221	0.028	***
Education attainment	Primary or less	1.241	0.121	*	1.227	0.123	*
	Secondary	*1*			*1*		
	Tertiary and more	0.848	0.095		0.837	0.081	•
Spanish nationality	Yes (Not)	0.755	0.103	*	0.675	0.081	***
Economic reasons	Yes (Not)	0.915	0.090		1.019	0.087	
Family reason	Yes (Not)	1.224	0.140	•	1.166	0.100	•
Children before arriving	0	*1*			*1*		
	1	0.912	0.103		0.599	0.060	***
	2 or more	0.452	0.059	***	0.277	0.034	***
Marital status	Single	0.187	0.017	***	0.321	0.028	***
	With partner and live together	*1*			*1*		
	With partner but live apart	0.476	0.085	***	0.592	0.078	***
Probability associated with gender in a (not shown) model with all the sample		*1*			0.966	0.057	
	Cons	0.743	0.117	•	0.339	0.054	***
	Number of observations		3770		4576		
	R2 (coefficient of determination)		19.89		24.47		

Legend: • p<0.1; * p<0.05; ** p<0.01; *** p<0.001 // Control Variables: origin region, labor situation at origin.

4.2. The labor trajectory

The reproductive trajectory in the host country only has significant effects on some of the labor trajectories of migrant men and women, although these differ from one to the other (tables 5 and 6). In the case of men, having had children after emigrating only has a significant impact on the labor trajectory that goes from *employment to unemployment* in a negative sense. That is, having children significantly reduces the likelihood of stopping work, with the effect being greater in step with the higher number of children born after the migration process. In this case, children seem to act as a form of "insurance" against unemployment or rein in the possibility of men stopping work. None of the other labor trajectories of migrant men is affected by having or not having children, which means there is no relationship between labor mobility and the process of family formation.

In the case of migrant women, having children has a highly significant impact on two trajectories, *stopping work* and *never having worked*, albeit in the opposite way to men. Those women who have had one child, or two or more children, face a greater risk of both moving from employment to unemployment and remaining

without work, with the impact being greater in those women with more children. As in the case of men, none of the other labor trajectories (no change, and upward or downward mobility) has a significant relationship with the fact of having a child. Therefore, the fact of having children is clearly linked to a situation of not working among migrant women.

Migrants' family situation upon arrival also has some significant effects on their labor mobility. First, partnership status, especially in the case of those without partners, has an impact on labor trajectories: being single among men entails a greater probability of stopping work, increases the probability of downward mobility, and reduces the likelihood of upward mobility. By contrast, in the case of women, being single reduces both the probability of stopping work, as well as of never having worked. In other words, while not having a partner, and therefore no family responsibilities, means that men are more likely to stop work, for women it reduces those options, which may be interpreted as meaning that not having a partner "forces" or "facilitates" the assumption of the role of breadwinner. Finally, those women who have a partner, but do not co-habit, have a lower risk of never having worked; that is, a similar effect to that observed in single women.

Table 5. Labor trajectory for men in Spain (multinomial regression model)

		MEN											
		Up			Down			Employment to Unemployment			Never Worked		
Ref. Categ. Non-Change		*RR*	*Std. Err.*	*Sig.*	*RR*	*Std. Err.*	*Sig.*	*RR*	*Std. Err.*	*Sig.*	*RR*	*Std. Err.*	*Sig.*
Children in Spain	0	*1*			*1*			*1*			*1*		
	1	1.095	0.116		1.235	0.235		0.808	0.119	•	0.575	0.208	
	2 or more	0.849	0.130		1.488	0.369		0.799	0.163	•	0.701	0.497	
Marital status	Single	0.826	0.089	•	1.388	0.259	•	1.375	0.189	*	0.970	0.288	
	With partner & live together	*1*			*1*			*1*			*1*		
	With partner but live apart	0.897	0.188		1.244	0.440		1.522	0.391		0.724	0.474	
Children before arriving	0	*1*			*1*			*1*			*1*		
	1	1.094	0.140		0.946	0.225		1.001	0.176		1.169	0.459	
	2 or more	0.916	0.138		1.124	0.296		0.852	0.170		1.038	0.434	
Years in Spain		1.117	0.016	***	1.087	0.027	***	1.038	0.020	*	0.595	0.040	***
Age at arrival	16-24	1.137	0.123		0.994	0.191		1.072	0.147		0.939	0.291	
	25-34	*1*			*1*			*1*			*1*		
	35 or more	0.939	0.127		0.861	0.211		1.108	0.189		1.187	0.406	
Education attainment	Primary or less	0.728	0.081	**	0.839	0.167		1.039	0.139		1.040	0.309	
	Secondary	*1*			*1*			*1*			*1*		
	Tertiary and more	0.812	0.105		0.994	0.209		0.798	0.135		1.129	0.327	
Spanish nationality	Yes (Not)	0.750	0.118	*	1.058	0.248		0.930	0.193		1.261	0.522	
Economic reasons	Yes (Not)	1.228	0.138		0.946	0.174		0.780	0.108	*	0.309	0.081	***
Family reason	Yes (Not)	0.938	0.128		1.696	0.333	**	1.183	0.187		1.689	0.412	*
Occupation at origin	Employed	*1*			*1*			*1*			*1*		
	Unemployed	0.948	0.129		0.984	0.250		1.994	0.292	***	2.506	0.913	**
	Study	1.112	0.157		0.900	0.224		1.187	0.206		6.177	1.857	***
	Household duties	1.145	0.686		2.193	1.732		0.547	0.575		17.183	13.179	***
Probability associated with gender in a (not shown) model with all the sample		*1*			*1*			*1*			*1*		
	Cons	0.170	0.032	***	0.049	0.015	***	0.105	0.025	***	0.373	0.175	*
	Number of observations	3770											
	R2 (coefficient of determination)	0.067											

Legend: • p<0.1; * p<0.05; ** p<0.01; *** p<0.001 // Control Variables: origin region.

Table 6: Labor trajectory for women in Spain (multinomial regression model)

		WOMEN											
		Up			Down			Employment to Unemployment			Never Worked		
Ref. Categ. Non-Change		*OR*	*Std. Err.*	*Sig.*	*OR*	*Std. Err.*	*Sig.*	*OR*	*Std. Err.*	*Sig.*	*OR*	*Std. Err.*	*Sig.*
Children in Spain	0	*1*			*1*			*1*			*1*		
	1	1.053	0.124		0.941	0.183		1.946	0.193	***	1.944	0.264	***
	2 or more	0.886	0.168		0.897	0.273		2.920	0.422	***	3.543	0.691	***
Marital status	Single	0.990	0.111		1.500	0.270	*	0.848	0.082	•	0.611	0.086	***
	With partner & live together	*1*			*1*			*1*			*1*		
	With partner but live apart	1.198	0.177		0.929	0.256		0.987	0.132		0.377	0.092	***
Children before arriving	0												
	1	1.070	0.139		1.234	0.262		0.972	0.110		1.025	0.162	
	2 or more	0.948	0.146		1.037	0.268		0.915	0.121		0.868	0.152	
Years in Spain		1.075	0.017	***	1.078	0.027	***	0.990	0.014		0.763	0.017	***
Age at arrival	16-24	1.231	0.148	•	1.211	0.234		1.196	0.124	•	1.263	0.183	
	25-34												
	35 or more	0.699	0.097	***	0.625	0.153	*	0.831	0.101		1.361	0.208	*
Education attainment	Primary or less	0.566	0.083	***	0.613	0.142	*	0.998	0.107		1.299	0.181	•
	Secondary												
	Tertiary and more	1.130	0.130		0.828	0.163		0.742	0.081	**	1.025	0.148	
Spanish nationality	Yes (Not)	1.325	0.187	*	1.095	0.260		1.483	0.189	**	0.978	0.208	
Economic reasons	Yes (Not)	0.938	0.102		0.802	0.141		0.793	0.073	**	0.265	0.034	***
Family reason	Yes (Not)	0.905	0.105		1.088	0.197		1.115	0.105		1.600	0.190	***
Occupation at origin	Employed												
	Unemployed	1.080	0.160		1.061	0.265		1.128	0.147		1.471	0.305	•
	Study	0.759	0.113	•	0.891	0.206		1.084	0.133		1.421	0.235	*
	Household duties	0.697	0.124	*	0.902	0.245		0.927	0.123		2.661	0.394	***
Probability associated with gender in a (not shown) model with all the sample		0.891	0.061	•	0.987	0.114		2.634	0.195	***	4.638	0.591	***
	Cons	0.214	0.040		0.056	0.017	***	0.365	0.059	***	0.574	0.125	*
	Number of observations	4576											
	R2 (coefficient of determination)	0.125											

Legend: • p<0.1; * p<0.05; ** p<0.01; *** p<0.001 // Control Variables: origin region.

5. CONCLUSIONS

First, our findings reveal a close interrelationship between family trajectory and labor trajectory, in particular in the case of migrant women: having children after the migration process is strongly correlated with men's participation in the labor market and, by contrast, with no participation or leaving the labor force among women. These results show, according to our first hypothesis, that there is a traditional family model among the migrant population, with a clear division of tasks and responsibilities between the sexes: the main breadwinner in the household is the man, while the woman's priority function is to bring up the children. An increase in family responsibilities, in terms of the number of children, makes it less likely that a man will not have a job, while making a woman's labor force participation more difficult. Regarding this latter aspect, note should be taken of the absence of measures in the Spanish labor market that allow women to combine a family life with work, as well as their level of education and lack of work experience, which restricts their job opportunities, as posited in the literature reviewed.

The family model of organization and childbearing is readily apparent when one looks at the relationship between the status of being single and the labor participation of a single man, that is, without any family responsibilities of his own, as it reveals a greater likelihood of stopping work than among men with partners; by contrast, a single woman, that is, one without a man to play the part of breadwinner, is less likely either to stop working or to have never worked than a woman with a partner. Therefore, in the case of a woman, the non-presence of a partner enables (forces) her to work, and to some extent releases her from having to devote herself to her family.

Second, it should be noted that there is no relationship whatsoever between labor market mobility and the processes of family formation, which contradicts our hypotheses: mobility within the labor market itself, in an upward or downward direction, or immobility, does not affect the family formation process; and an increase in family size has no positive or negative impact either on job mobility. On the one hand, this result confirms what other scholars have reported on the interference between family formation and employment, highlighting exclusively the fact of working or not in its relationship with having a child and vice versa, the effect of having a child is measured in the fact of working or not, without considering changes in job. On the other hand, note should be taken of the peculiarities of the Spanish market in general, and as regards the migrant population in particular, such as its major segmentation, the large size of the secondary sector, and the scant mobility between sectors (Bernardi and Garrido, 2008; Simón, Ramos and Sanromá, 2014; Fernández-Macías et al., 2015). Migrants mostly find jobs in certain specific market niches (mainly the building sector for men and domestic service for women), in which little mobility is possible. Furthermore, this mobility does not generally involve higher wages or better working conditions, given the high level of irregularity involved (Stanek and Veira, 2012). In other words, mobility does not lead to a better or worse family situation that may have an impact on the family formation process.

The specific nature of the labor market in which migrants work is endorsed by the almost zero impact that education has on a labor trajectory and the total lack of consideration for any work experience prior to the migration process. In addition, the length of stay, which many studies have singled out as a key factor for improving migrants' labor force integration, has an uneven effect: the only clear impact it has is to reduce the condition of not having worked, but it has a similar effect on both upward and downward job mobility.

The outcomes of the different interferences occurring between labor trajectory and the family formation process among migrants are consistent with their traditional family models. Nevertheless, the fact that future studies may provide information on a partner's job status will allow further exploration not only of individual interferences, but also of possible family strategies for combining family and work. Within the current scenario of economic crisis, with high rates of unemployment among the migrant population, especially among men, it would be highly pertinent to analyze the interferences between labor and family trajectories from a family strategy perspective. Finally, having full job histories would allow making a much more accurate measurement of the effect that changes in job status have on family formation, as well as the short- and medium-term effect that the birth of a child has on labor trajectories.

REFERENCES

Adsera, A. (2004). "Changing fertility rates in developed countries. The impact of labor market institutions". *Journal of Population Economics,* 17(1): 17-43.

Adsera, A. (2005). Vanishing children: "From high unemployment to low fertility in developed countries". *American Economic Review,* 95(2): 189-193.

Adsera, A. (2011). "Where Are the Babies? Labor Market Conditions and Fertility in Europe". *European Journal of Population*, 27(1): 1–32.

Ahn, N. and Mira, P. (2002). "A note on the changing relationship between fertility and female employment rates in developed countries". *Journal of Population Economics,* 15(4): 667-682.

Alders, M. (2000). "Cohort fertility of migrant women in the Netherlands: Developments in fertility of women born in Turkey, Morocco, Suriname, and the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba", paper presented at the BSPS-NVD-URU Conference on New Paths in Exploring and Analysing Demographic Data, Utrecht.

Andersson, G. (2004). "Childbearing after migration: Fertility patterns of foreign-born women in Sweden". *International Migration Review,* 38 (3): 747-774.

Andersson, G., and Scott, K. (2007). "Childbearing dynamics of couples in a universalistic welfare state: The role of labor-market status, country of origin, and gender". *Demographic Research,* 17(30): 897–938.

Baizán, P. (2006). "El efecto del empleo, el paro y los contratos temporales en la baja fecundidad española de los años 1990". *Revista Española de Investigaciones Sociológicas*, 115: 223–253.

Bauer, G. and T. Kneip (2012). "Fertility From a Couple Perspective: A Test of Competing Decision Rules on Proceptive Behaviour". *European Sociological Review,* 29(3): 535-548.

Becker, Gary S. (1981). *A Treatise on the Family*. Cambridge, Harvard University Press.

Beckman, L. (1984). Husbands' and wives' relative influence on fertility decisions and outcomes. *Population and Environment,* 7(3): 182–197.

Begall, K. (2013). "How do educational and occupational resources relate to the timing of family formation? A couple analysis of the Netherlands". *Demographic Research,* 29(34): 907-936.

Bernardi, F. and Garrido, L. (2008). Is there a new service proletariat? Post-industrial employment growth and social inequality in Spain. *European Sociological Review,24 (3)*, 299-313.

Bernhardt, E.M. (1993). "Fertility and Employment". *European Sociological Review*, 9(1): 25-42.

Blau, D. and P. Robins (1989). "Fertility, Employment, and Child-Care Costs". *Demography,* 26(2): 287-299.

Bowen, W.G. and Finegan, T.A. (1969). *The Economics of Labor Force Participation*. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press.

Brewster K.L. and Rindfuss, R.R. (2000) ."Fertility and Women's Employment in Industrialized". *Annual Review of Sociology.* 26: 271-296.

Budig, M.J. and England, P. (2001). "The wage penalty for motherhood". *American Sociological Review*, 66(2): 204–225.

Budig. M.J. (2003). "Are women's employment and fertility histories interdependent? An examination of causal order using event history analysis". *Social Science Research*, 32(3): 376–401.

Bumpass, L., and Westhoff, C.F. (1970). *The Later Years of Childbearing*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Carlson, E. E. (1985). "The Impact of International Migration upon the Timing of Marriage and Childbearing". *Demography*, 22(l): 61-72.

Carter, M. (2000). “Fertility of Mexican immigrant women in the U.S: A closer look”. *Social Science Quarterly* 81(4): 1073-1086.

Cerrutti, M. and D. S. Massey. (2001). “On the Auspices of Female Migration from Mexico to the United States”. *Demography*, 38(2): 187-200.

Chenga, B.S. (1996). "An investigation of cointegration and causality between fertility and female labour force participation". *Applied Economics Letters*, 3(1): 29-32.

Ciganda, D. (2015). "Unstable work histories and fertility in France: An adaptation of sequence complexity measures to employment trajectories". *Demographic Research*, 32 (28): 843-876.

Corijn, M., A. C. Liefbroer and J. de Jong Gierveld. (1996). "It Takes Two to Tango, Doesn't It? The Influence of Couple Characteristics on the Timing of the Birth of the First Child". *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 58(1): 117-126.

Cramer, J.C. (1980). "Fertility and female employment: Problems of causal direction". *American Sociological Review*, 45 (2): 167-190.

Chiswick, B. R., Lee, Y. L., and Miller, P. W. (2005). "Longitudinal analysis of immigrant occupational mobility: A test of the immigrant assimilation hypothesis". *International Migration Review, 39*(2): 332–353.

del Rey, A., and D. Vono. (2014). "Marrying after arriving: the role of individuals’ networks for immigrant choice of partner’s origin". *Advances in Life Course Research,* 19(1): 28-39.

Easterlin, R.A. (1980). *Birth and Fortune: The Impact of Numbers on Personal Welfare*. New York: Basic Books.

Engelhardt, H. and Prskawetz, A. (2004). "On the changing correlation between fertility and female employment over space and time". *European Journal of Population* 20(1): 35-62.

Engelhardt, H., T,. Kögel, and A., Prskawetz. (2004). "Fertility and women’s employment reconsidered: A macro-level time-series analysis for developed countries, 1960–2000". *Population Studies*, 58(1): 109–120.

Esping-Andersen, G. and Billari, F. C. (2015), "Re-theorizing Family Demographics". *Population and Development Review*, 41 (1): 1–31.

Felmlee, D.H. (1993). "The dynamic interdependence of women's employment and fertility". *Social Science Research*, 22(4): 333‑360.

Fernández-Macías, E., Grande, R., del Rey, A., and Antón, J-I. (2014). "Employment and Occupational Mobility among Recently Arrived Immigrants: The Spanish Case 1997–2007". *Population Research and Policy Review,* 34 (2): 243-277.

Goldstein, S. and A. Goldstein. (1983). “Migration and Fertility in Peninsular Malaysia: An Analysis Using Life History Data”. Santa Monica: Rand Corporation.

Gonzalez, M.J. and Jurado-Guerro, T. (2006). Remaining childless in affluent economies: A comparison of France, West Germany, Italy and Spain, 1994- 2001. *European Journal of Population* 22(4): 317-352.

Hakim, C. (2003). A new approach to explaining fertility patterns: Preference theory. *Population and Development Review*, 29(3), 349–374.

Hoffman EP. (1985). "Fertility and female employment". *Quarterly Review of Economics and Business*, 25(1): 85-95.

Hout, M. (1978). "The determinants of marital fertility in the United States, 1968‑70: inferences from a dynamic model". *Demography*, 15(2): 139‑160.

Jalovaara, M. and Miettinen, A. (2013). "Does his paycheck also matter? The socioeconomic resources of co-residential partners and entry into parenthood in Finland". *Demographic Research,* 28(31): 881–916.

Kahn J.R., García-Manglano J., and Bianchi, S.M., (2014). "The Motherhood Penalty at Midlife: Long-Term Effects of Children on Women's Careers". *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 76(1): 56-72.

Kravdal, Ø. (2002). "The impact of individual and aggregate unemployment on fertility in Norway". *Demographic Research,* 6(10): 263-294.

Kreyenfeld, M., and Andersson, G. (2014). "Socioeconomic differences in the unemployment and fertility nexus: Evidence from Denmark and Germany". *Advances in Life Course Research, 21*: 59-73.

Kreyenfeld, M. (2010). Uncertainties in female employment careers and the postponement of parenthood in Germany. *European Sociological Review*, 26(3), 351–366.

Kreyenfeld, M., Andersson, G., and Pailhé , A. (2012). "Economic Uncertainty and Family Dynamics". *Demographic Research*, 27(28): 835-852.

Lesthaeghe, R. (1992). "The second demographic transition in western countries". In M. K. Oppenheim & A. Jensen (Eds.), *Gender and family change*. Oxford: Clarendon Press: 17–62.

Liefbroer, A. and M. Corijn (1999). "Who, What, Where, and When? Specifying the Impact of Educational Attainment and Labour Force Participation on Family Formation". *European Journal of Population*, 15(1): 45-75.

Lundström, K. E., and Andersson, G. (2012). "Labor-market status, migrant status and first childbearing in Sweden". *Demographic Research*, 27(25): 719–742.

Massey, D. S. and B. P. Mullan. (1984). "A Demonstration of the Effect of Seasonal Migration on Fertility". *Demography*, 21(4): 501-517.

Matysiak,A. and D. Vignoli. (2008). "Fertility and Women's Employment: A Meta-analysis". *European Journal of Population* 24(4): 363-384.

McDonald, P. (2000). "Gender Equity in Theories of Fertility Transition". *Population and Development Review*, 26(3): 427–439.

Myrskylä, M., H-P., Kohler and F.C. Billari. (2009). "Advances in development reverse fertility declines". *Nature* 460: 741-743.

Oppenheimer, V. K. (1988). A theory of marriage timing: Assortative mating under varying degrees of uncertainty. *American Journal of Sociology*, 94(3): 563–591.

Özcan, B., Mayer, K. U., and Luedicke, J. (2010). "The impact of unemployment on the transition to parenthood". *Demographic Research*, 23(29): 807–846.

Pailhé , A., and Solaz, A. (2012). The influence of employment uncertainty on childbearing in France: A tempo or quantum effect? *Demographic Research*, 26(1): 1–40.

Parrado, E. A. and C.A. Flippen. (2005). “Migration and Gender among Mexican women”. *American Sociological Review*, 70(4): 606-632.

Peterson, E. (2007). "The Invisible Carers. Framing Domestic Work(ers) in Gender Equality Policies in Spain". *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 14(3): 265-280

Raymo, J.M., Musick, K., and Iwasawa, M. (2015). "Gender Equity, Opportunity Costs of Parenthood, and Educational Differences in Unintended First Births: Insights from Japan". *Population Research and Policy Review*, 34 (2): 179-199.

Schmitt, C. (2012a). "A cross-national perspective on unemployment and first births". *European Journal of Population*, 28 (3): 303–335.

Schmitt, C. (2012b). "Labour market integration, occupational uncertainties, and fertility choices in Germany and the UK". *Demographic Research*, 26 (12): 253–292.

Simón, H., Ramos,R., and Sanromá, E. (2014). “Immigrant Occupational Mobility: Longitudinal Evidence from Spain.” *European Journal of Population* 30(2):223–55.

Smith-Lovin, L. and Tickamyer, A. (1981). "Fertility patterns of labor force participation among married women". *Social Biology*, 28(1-2): 81‑95.

Smith-Lovin, L., and Tickamyer, A. (1978). "Nonrecursive models of labor force participation, fertility behavior, and sex role attitudes". *American Sociological Review*, 43(4): 541‑557.

Stanek M. and A. Veira. (2012). “Ethnic Niching in a Segmented Labour Market: Evidence from Spain”, *Migration Letters*, 9(3): 249-262.

Stark, O. 1991. *The Migration of Labor*. Basil Blackwell, Cambridge.

Stark, O. y D. Levhari, 1982, “On migration and risk in LDCs”. *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 31(1): 191-196.

Stephen, E. H. and E D. Bean. (1992). "Assimilation, Disruption and the Fertility of Mexican-Origin Women in the United States". *International Migration Review*, 6 (l): 67-88.

Taylor, J.E. (1999). “The new economics of labour migration and the role of remittances in the migration process”, *International Migration,* 37(1): 63-88.

Toulemon, L. and M. Mazuy. (2004). “Comment prendre en compte l’âge à l’arrivée et le durée de séjour en France dans la mesure de la fécondité des immigrants?”. *Documents de travail,* Paris, INED.

Van de Kaa, D. J. (1987). "Europe’s second demographic transition". *Population Bulletin*, 42(1). Population Reference Bureau, Washington, DC, USA.

Vignoli, D., Drefahl, S., and De Santis, G. (2012). "Whose job instability affects the likelihood of becoming a parent in Italy? A tale of two partners". *Demographic Research* 26(2): 41–62.

Waite, L. and Stolzenberg, R. (1976). "Intended childbearing and labor force participation of young women: insights from nonrecursive models". *American Sociological Review*, 41(2): 235‑252.

ANNEX

Table 1. Construction of the occupational classification

Code	Occupation ENI07 (ISCO88 - 2 digits)	ISEI	Monthly wage ENI 2007 (only migrants)	Annual wage SES 2006 (all Spanish workers)	Cases ENI 2007	%	Rank ISEI	Rank migrant wages	Rank Spanish wages	Proposed codes	%
3	Professionals and high-level technicians	70	1747.033	35505.28	348	5%	1	3	3	Upper occupations	10.4%
1	Managers of public sector and big firms	68	2227.58	60453.18	85	1%	2	1	1		
2	Managers of small firms	51	1868.326	38661.71	149	2%	4	2	2		
4	Technicians and support professionals	54	1514.23	27591.92	324	5%	3	4	4		
14	Drivers	32	1352.619	19677.69	160	3%	10	5	8	Middling industrial	13.8%
11	Skilled manual workers - heavy industries	34	1224.747	23685.15	189	3%	7	6	5		
12	Skilled manual workers - light industries	34	1009.322	16496.89	189	3%	8	10	11		
10	Skilled manual workers - construction	31	1219.288	20073.27	846	13%	11	7	7		
5	Administrative staff	45	1045.81	18991.08	303	5%	5	9	9	Middling services	21.9%
8	Demonstrators and salespersons	43	842.3764	14425.88	288	5%	6	16	15		
20	Other service workers	30	1007.164	13573.18	180	3%	13	11	17		
6	Hostels and restaurant service workers	32	920.5021	14389.61	685	11%	9	14	16		
13	Operators and assemblers	31	967.4072	21437.06	214	3%	12	12	6	Lower Industrial	25.8%
18	Unskilled manual workers - construction	21	1053.997	15328.05	395	6%	17	8	12		
19	Unskilled manual workers - industry	23	921.4985	15328.05	222	3%	16	13	13		
9	Skilled manual workers - agriculture	23	882.8441	18052.66	95	1%	15	15	10		
17	Unskilled manual workers - agriculture	16	831.1571	15328.05	312	5%	20	17	14		
7	Unskilled workers in the care sector	25	798.9117	13573.18	268	4%	14	18	18	Lower services	28.1%
16	Cleaning & other unskilled service workers	16	734.0327	13573.18	357	6%	19	19	19		
15	Domestic workers	16	653.1036	13573.18	749	12%	18	20	20		
	Total	31.87	1066.15		6,358						