

Family versus work among the immigrant population from a gender perspective. The recent Spanish case

Alberto del Rey (*University of Salamanca*)

Rafael Grande (*University of Salamanca*)

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

José Ignacio Antón (*University of Salamanca*)

APPROACH

The aim of this paper is to conduct a two-pronged analysis of the interference between the labor trajectory of migrants and their family reproduction:

- According to the effect of labor trajectory on family reproduction
- According to the effect of family reproduction on labor trajectory

Different studies have reported the interconnection between labor trajectory and family reproduction: labor participation as a factor affecting family formation, and at the same time, the formation of the family affecting the labor market participation of its members.

Our working hypothesis focuses on the immigrant population, and considers that the family situation on arrival and labor background will lead to the prioritization of the labor trajectory or family reproduction. Furthermore, as the patriarchal family model prevails among the migrant population, and in accordance with the literature, we expect that men tend to prioritize their working career over the family, while the opposite is true for women, who tend to sacrifice their working life in favor of family reproduction. Moreover, we define particular hypotheses about career trajectories by considering marital status on arrival (single, married, separated/divorced) and the number of previous children. Similarly, we formulate different hypotheses about the reproductive trajectory according to the career path, taking into account the initial occupation in the destination country and working experience in the country of origin. These paths are controlled primarily by the time of residence, as well as by different socio-demographic and socioeconomic characteristics upon arrival (age, gender, education, reason for migration, nationality, region/country of origin...).

Our analysis uses multi-variable models (logistics and multinomial), with occupational mobility and number of children in Spain as dependent variables. The data are provided by the 2007 National Immigration Survey.

The preliminary results allow us to point to different behaviors by gender. In general, women seem to favor family over work, since most of them tend to leave work or not work directly. Yet there are no significant differences in the upward or downward labor mobility between men and women. Furthermore, family status on arrival (number of children and marital status) plays a key role in the career path.

ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

The framework for this paper is articulated around the relationship between family and work in the case of the immigrant population, which is double-barreled: on the one hand, we emphasize the close link between reproductive behavior and employment, particularly in women. On the other hand, we highlight the strong interconnection between labor migration and family formation processes.

Firstly, several studies in different societies have found that the labor participation of women is a key factor affecting reproductive behavior. In general, there is a negative relationship between female labor participation and fertility level, noting for example the opportunity cost of having children (Becker, 1993) or the greater economic independence of women from the perspective of the second demographic transition (Van de Kaa, 1987; Lesthaeghe, 1992). However, since the 1980s those European countries with the highest labor force participation rates among women have also recorded the highest fertility rates (Engelhardt et al., 2004), considering a new relationship between fertility and well-being (Myrskylä, Kohler, & Billari, 2009). These opposing relationships between labor participation and fertility led Engelhardt et al. (2004) to consider what causes what, i.e., what is the correlation between labor force participation and fertility? It even led them to consider the existence of spurious relationships caused by the common antecedents of both variables. The results of their study indicate relationships in both directions. Similar results are reported by Matysiak and Vignoli (2008) from an extensive review of the literature on the relationship between fertility and female labor force participation.

Secondly, other 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). The highest labor force participation among migrants takes place during the ages of family formation, generating different interferences between each path. On the one hand, different papers have noted that labor migration affects the family reproduction process. Thus, 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. On the other hand, participation in the labor market depends on the migration profile, such as work experience or education, among others (Long, 1974; Alwin, Braun, and Scott, 1992; Liefbroer and Corijn, 1999). Thus, according to the migration profile, they may prioritize family formation over work, and vice versa, work over family.

Although the analysis of fertility and family reproduction, together with its implications and consequences, has focused almost exclusively on women, 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). Some of these studies highlight the close relationship between a person's status in the labor market and the decision to have a child (Vignoli, Drefahl, and De Santis, 2012; Begall, 2013; Jalovaara and Miettinen, 2013). Moreover, considering that most migrations are the result of family strategies (Stark and Levhari, 1982; Stark, 1991; Taylor 1999), it is essential to take both women and men into account in order to understand the interference between labor and reproductive trajectories.

METHODOLOGICAL STRATEGY

For this work, we use the 2007 Spanish National Immigration Survey conducted by the Spanish National Institute of Statistics (INE). We have included only migrants of reproductive age, that is, 16 years old or over at the time of arrival and under 49 in 2007, with all of them migrating between 1990 and 2005. We separately constructed 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 salary, we built an appropriate indicator to measure the labor mobility of immigrants 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 the migrants' level and sector of occupation, and their wages. Finally, we have defined the following five occupational categories: high, 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:

- *Upward*: recording an improvement in their employment. A case apart 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. 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
Unemployment	751	8,88	105	2,73	646	14,01
Total	8.457	100,00	3.847	100,00	4.610	100,00

The *reproductive trajectory* is defined by whether or not the migrants have 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

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 2007 ENI 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. The length of residence in Spain is included as an explanatory variable in both trajectories. We also consider the socio-demographic and family characteristics of the migrant as explanatory variables.

PRELIMINARY RESULTS

The preliminary results allow us to observe significant relationships between labor and reproductive trajectories among the immigrant population.

- In the reproductive trajectory (table 3), the first thing to note is that the labor trajectory does not affect the probability of having a child in the case of men. For women, certain career paths, such as stopping working or never having worked, favor family reproduction in the destination country. However, neither upward nor downward mobility in Spain affects the probability of having a child for men and women. Second, family status on arrival affects the reproductive trajectory in the destination country, i.e., marital status and the number of children significantly affects the probability of having a child, particularly in the case of women. Finally, the reason for migrating does not affect the probability of having a child after emigration for either men or women, once the labor trajectory and family status have been controlled.

- In the labor trajectory (table 4), gender is not significant for upward and downward labor mobility, but by contrast, it is very significant in the move from employment to non-employment, as well as in the case of women that have never worked in the destination country. Having a child after emigrating has a similar effect on labor mobility: it is not significant for those with upward or downward labor mobility, albeit very significant among women who stop working or have never worked. Finally, among women who have never worked in the destination country, their employment status before emigrating is a significant variable and, in particular, studying or household duties favor this path. There is therefore a close correlation between being outside or leaving the labor market and being female, having children and not having worked before emigrating. Yet having or not having children is not associated with upward or downward labor mobility.

Table 3: Reproductive trajectory by gender. Logistic regression models: having a child in Spain (0, 1).

		MEN			WOMEN		
		Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Origin	EU15	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>
	Eastern Europe	-0.436 **	-0.499 **	-0.530 **	-0.260	-0.247	-0.278
	Latin America	0.508 ***	0.451 **	0.418 **	0.261 *	0.303 *	0.257 *
	Africa	0.005	0.032	-0.040	0.820 ***	0.651 ***	0.637 ***
	Asia and Oceania	0.283	0.296	0.283	0.284	0.243	0.150
Year of arrival		-0.186 ***	-0.182 ***	-0.186 ***	-0.187 ***	-0.209 ***	-0.202 ***
Age at arrival	16-24	-0.075	-0.020	-0.011	0.224 **	0.292 **	0.289 **
	25-34	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>
	35 or over	-0.691 ***	-0.632 ***	-0.661 ***	-10.479 ***	-10.502 ***	-10.508 ***
Education attainment	Primary or less	0.214 *	0.201	0.201 *	0.250 **	0.206 *	0.197 *
	Secondary	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>
	Tertiary and more	-0.171	-0.181	-0.139	-0.268 **	-0.153	-0.199 *
Spanish nationality at birth	Yes (No)	-0.300 *	-0.301 *	-0.317 *	-0.388 ***	-0.412 ***	-0.389 ***
Economic reasons	Yes (No)	-0.043	-0.081	-0.089	-0.028	0.024	-0.003
Family reasons	Yes (No)	0.068	0.179	0.144	0.109	0.096	0.096
Children before arrival	No	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>
	1	-0.161	-0.190	-0.185	-0.498 ***	-0.550 ***	-0.564 ***
	2	-0.828 ***	-0.883 ***	-0.861 ***	-10.273 ***	-10.344 ***	-10.365 ***
Marital status at arrival	Single	-10.935 ***	-10.918 ***	-10.897 ***	-10.436 ***	-10.345 ***	-10.349 ***
	With partner: arrived before	-0.383 **	-0.417 ***	-0.385 **	-0.389 ***	-0.370 ***	-0.325 **
	With partner: arrived after	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>
	With partner: arrived together	-0.211	-0.283	-0.256	-0.700 **	-0.569 *	-0.606 *
	With partner: living apart	-0.925 ***	-0.909 ***	-0.908 ***	-0.764	-0.697 ***	-0.650 ***
Labor trajectory in Spain	Upward		0.025			0.028	
	No change		<i>ref.</i>			<i>ref.</i>	
	Downward		0.284			-0.062	
	Employment to Unemployment		-0.218			0.760 ***	
	Never worked		-0.594			0.831 ***	
Occupation in country of origin	High-Upper		0.100	0.141		-0.226	-0.183
	Medium-industrial/services		<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>		<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>
	Low-industrial/services		0.167	0.158		-0.167	-0.133
	Unemployed		-0.019	-0.054		-0.180	-0.157
	Studying		-0.327 *	-0.330 *		-0.480 ***	-0.459 ***
	Household duties		-0.174	-0.213		0.038	0.070
First occupation in Spain	High- Upper occupations			-0.238			-0.232
	Medium-industrial/services			<i>ref.</i>			<i>ref.</i>
	Low-industrial/services			-0.036			-0.069
	Never worked			-0.642 *			0.533 ***
Probability associated with gender in a model (not shown) with all the sample		<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	<i>ref.</i>	0.097	0.020	0.051
Cons		373.001 ***	365.034 ***	371.074 ***	375.038 ***	417.080 ***	403.080 ***
N		3983	3770	3871	4727	4576	4651
r2_p		0.1976	0.2017	0.2006	0.2214	0.2465	0.2317
legend:			* p<0.05;	** p<0.01;	*** p<0.001		

Table 4: Labor trajectory. Multinomial regression model: labor mobility in Spain

Refer. categ.: No change		Upward	Downward	Employment to Unemployment	Never Worked
Gender	Women (men)	-0.094	-0.106	0.947 ***	1.415 ***
Origin	EU15/developed economies				
	Eastern Europe	0.659 ***	0.229	0.356 **	-0.683 ***
	Latin America and Caribbean	0.686 ***	0.440 *	0.232	-0.582 ***
	Africa	0.552 ***	0.128	0.745 ***	1.091 ***
	Asia and Oceania	0.667 **	-0.147	-0.218	0.765 **
Year of arrival		-0.089 ***	-0.082 ***	-0.016	0.275 ***
Age at arrival	16-24	0.180 *	0.103	0.169 *	0.229
	25-34				
	35 or over	-0.245 *	-0.291	-0.123	0.283 *
Education attainment	Primary or less	-0.397 ***	-0.301 *	0.012	0.315
	Secondary				
	Tertiary and more	-0.048	-0.126	-0.292 **	-0.017
Spanish nationality at birth	Yes (No)	-0.059	0.152	0.042	-0.086
Economic reasons	Yes (No)	0.100	-0.126	-0.219 **	-1.287 ***
Family reasons	Yes (No)	-0.111	0.247	0.145	0.474 ***
Children before arrival	Yes (No)	0.051	0.101	-0.097	-0.089
Marital status at arrival	Single	-0.143	0.360 *	-0.078	-0.391 **
	With partner: arrived before				
	With partner: arrived after	-0.095	0.238	-0.048	0.220
	With partner: arrived together	-0.054	-0.144	-0.043	-0.107
	With partner: living apart	-0.105	-0.038	-0.213	-0.936 ***
Children in Spain	Yes (No)	0.021	0.146	0.383 ***	0.503 ***
Occupation at origin	High- Upper occupations				
	Medium-industrial	0.013	-0.376	-0.161	-0.460
	Medium-services	-0.002	-0.013	0.021	-0.014
	Low-industrial	-0.214	-0.142	-0.074	-0.398
	Low-services	-0.313	0.158	0.073	0.055
	Unemployed	-0.073	-0.074	0.310 *	0.371
	Studying	-0.136	-0.169	0.133	0.664 ***
	Household duties	-0.519 **	-0.161	-0.044	1.123 ***
	Cons	176.060 ***	161.144 ***	30612311	-553.383 ***
	N	8710	8710	8346	8346
r2_p	0.12	0.19	0.14	0.20	
legend:		* p<0.05;	** p<0.01;	*** p<0.001	

REFERENCES

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-JRU Conference on New Paths in Exploring and Analysing Demographic Data, Utrecht.

Alwin, D.F., M. Braun and J. Scott. (1992). "The Separation of Work and the Family: Attitudes Towards Women's Labour-Force Participation in Germany, Great Britain, and the United States". *European Sociological Review*, 8 (1): 13-37.

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

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.

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.
- Carlson, E. E. (1985). "The Impact of International Migration upon the Timing of Marriage and Childbearing". *Demography*, 22 (1): 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
- 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.
- 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.
- Goldstein, S. and A. Goldstein. (1983). "Migration and Fertility in Peninsular Malaysia: An Analysis Using Life History Data". Santa Monica: Rand Corporation.
- 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.
- Lesthaeghe, R. (1992). "The second demographic transition in western countries". In M. K. Oppenheim & A. Jensen (Eds.), *Gender and family change* (pp. 17–62). Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- 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.
- Long, L. H. (1974). "Women's Labor Force Participation and the Residential Mobility of Families". *Social Forces*, 52 (3): 342-348.
- 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: 363-384
- Myrskylä, M., H-P., Kohler and F.C. Billari. (2009). "Advances in development reverse fertility declines". *Nature* 460: 741-743.
- Parrado, E. A. and C.A. Flippen. (2005). "Migration and Gender among Mexican women". *American Sociological Review*, 70 (4): 606-632.
- 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 (1): 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.